

1 **AOAC SMPR 2020.XXX; Draft AOAC Standard Method Performance Requirements (SMPRs) for Non-**
2 **Targeted Testing (NTT) of Ingredients for Food Authenticity/Fraud Evaluation of Extra Virgin Olive Oil;**
3 **version 4; February 18, 2020**

4
5 **Intended Use**

6 AOAC SMPRs describe the minimum recommended performance characteristics to be used during the
7 evaluation of a method. The evaluation may be an on-site verification, a single-laboratory validation,
8 or a multi-site collaborative study. SMPRs are written and adopted by AOAC stakeholder panels
9 composed of representatives from the industry, regulatory organizations, contract laboratories, test
10 kit manufacturers, and academic institutions. AOAC SMPRs are used by AOAC expert review panels in
11 their evaluation of validation study data for method being considered for *Performance Tested*
12 *Methods*SM or AOAC *Official Methods of Analysis*SM, and can be used as acceptance criteria for
13 verification at user laboratories.

14
15 **1. Applicability**

16 This document contains assessment parameters on the performance of Non-Targeted Testing (NTT)
17 methods to monitor extra virgin olive oil (EVOO) for the probable presence of Economically Motivated
18 Adulterants (EMA).

19
20 This SMPR was designed to evaluate Non-Targeted Testing (NTT) methods developed to assess
21 potential economic adulteration in defined commodities. The SMPR was purposely designed with
22 general descriptions to be applicable to a broad range of innovative analytical platforms and
23 chemometric approaches. Binary analytical results of “Authentic” or “Not Authentic” on defined
24 samples from the performance of the method will be used to perform the evaluations by the Expert
25 Review Panel.

26
27 Complete documentation of the collection and use of authentic samples is to be supplied by the
28 method authors. The scope of authentic samples will be the applicable scope of the NTT method and
29 expansion of the scope is possible with the inclusion of additional authentic samples into the baseline
30 calibration, and validation using the protocol listed in this SMPR.

31
32 **2. Analytical Technique**

33 A non-targeted method to be used to evaluate foods and ingredients for possible EMAs. Any method
34 generating a baseline fingerprint of the authentic material and comparing test sample fingerprints to
35 assess differences will be considered. The final binary result identifies test samples as either authentic
36 or potentially adulterated. This method demonstrates reliability using the requirements listed in this
37 SMPR.

38
39 For single lab validation studies, the method will be evaluated using prescribed adulterated materials
40 as shown in Table 1. Methods approved at this level will proceed to a second level of evaluation (i.e.,
41 multi-laboratory validation) where blinded samples containing unknown adulterants will be sent to
42 laboratories participating in the ensuing multi-laboratory validation.

43
44 The scope of the NTT method will be defined by the authentic samples used in generating the baseline
45 fingerprint.

46
47 **3. Definitions**

48 *Applicability Statement* – a general statement about the intended purpose and scope of the method
49 entailing key aspects of expected achievements for the specific situation and circumstances. Key
50 points to cover are the intended matrix, the purpose, and an indication of sensitivity, specificity, and
51 significance (USP Appendix XVIII).

52

53 Authentic Samples – Samples representative of the genuine commodity. These samples should
 54 represent the food’s or ingredient’s variability seen naturally in the commodity. The authentic
 55 samples used to generate the product baseline fingerprint will be used to properly define the NTT
 56 method testing scope.

57
 58 Baseline Fingerprint – A food-specific model created by software evaluation of collected analytical
 59 data.

60
 61 Economically Motivated Adulteration – The fraudulent addition of non-authentic substances or
 62 removal or replacement of authentic substances without the purchaser's knowledge for economic
 63 gain of the seller (USP Appendix XVIII).

64
 65 False Origin – Extra Virgin Olive Oil containing mislabeled geographic and botanical sources.

66
 67 Authentic EVOO – The type(s) of EVOO used to generate the baseline fingerprint. The method’s scope
 68 of authenticity is defined by the EVOO(s) used in generating the baseline fingerprint.

69
 70 Single Laboratory Validation – Demonstration by one laboratory of method performance on samples
 71 described in Table 1.

72
 73 Multilaboratory Validation – Demonstration between laboratories using adulterated samples created
 74 by a third-party group and supplied blindly to the participating laboratories.

75
 76 **4. Method Performance Requirements**

77 **(Table 1: Method Performance Requirements)**

78

Test	Adulterant	%Adulterant in Test Materials	Number of Samples to be Tested ¹	Number of Test Results Qualified as Adulterated
Baseline	None (Authentic EVOO)	0%	Establish Baseline Fingerprint ²	
Validation using Authentic Samples ³	None	0%	30	0
Validation ⁴	Sunflower Oil	5%	30	30
Validation	Validation ⁴	5%	30	30
Validation ⁴	Corn Oil	5%	30	30
Validation ⁴	Hazelnut Oil	5%	30	30
Validation ⁴	Canola Oil	5%	30	30
Validation ⁴	Safflower Oil	5%	30	30
Validation ⁴	Non-EVOO	5%	30	30
Validation ⁴	False Origin	5%	30	30

- 79 1. Multiple samples from the same batch of adulterated material can be used for method evaluation.
 80 2. Full details on protocol used to establish an authentic fingerprint must be supplied.
 81 3. Method validation using authentic samples shall cover the entire scope used in creating the baseline fingerprint.
 82 4. Method validation using adulterated samples shall cover the entire scope used in creating the baseline fingerprint.
 83

- 84 **5. System Suitability Tests and/or Analytical Quality Control**
85 Suitable methods will include blanks, and appropriate check standards.
86
- 87 **6. Reference Materials**
88 Detailed protocols used to identify reference materials as authentic and to create adulterated samples
89 must be supplied.
90
- 91 **7. Validation Guidance**
92 a) Data demonstrating method performance is required.
93 b) Available guidance documents:
94 a. AOAC INTERNATIONAL Guidelines for Validation of Botanical Identification Methods, Journal of AOAC
95 International Vol. 95, No. 1, 2012
96 b. Statistical analysis of interlaboratory studies. LII. Sample size needed to meet performance
97 requirement on proportion. [http://lcfilt.com/AOAC/tr347-SAIS-LII-sample-size-needed-for-PR-for-](http://lcfilt.com/AOAC/tr347-SAIS-LII-sample-size-needed-for-PR-for-proportion.pdf)
98 [proportion.pdf](http://lcfilt.com/AOAC/tr347-SAIS-LII-sample-size-needed-for-PR-for-proportion.pdf)
99 c. United States Pharmacopeia (USP). Appendix XVIII: Guidance on Developing and Validating Non-
100 targeted Methods for Adulteration Detection. Food Chemicals Codex, 3rd supplement to 11th ed.;
101 USP: Rockville, MD, 2019
102
- 103 **8. Maximum Time-to-Results**
104 None.