

Considering the Design of Three-Class Sampling Plans for Process Control

Mark Powell

U.S. Department of Agriculture, Office of Risk
Assessment and Cost-Benefit Analysis

Washington, DC

Robert LaBudde

Least Cost Formulations, Ltd.

Virginia Beach, VA

Society for Risk Analysis

December 7-10, 2014

Denver, CO

Three-Class Sampling Plans

- Attribute sampling plans where quantitative microbiological concentration data are divided into three classes:
 - acceptable: $X \text{ (cfu/g)} \leq m$
 - marginal: $m < X \leq M$
 - unacceptable: $X > M$
- Used for food safety lot acceptance sampling and recommended for process control

Three-Class Sampling Plans

- Defined by sample size (n) and maximum number of analytical units allowed in the marginal class, $c_m = c$ ($c_M = 0$)
- $p_a = \sum_{i=0}^{i=c} C_i^n (p_m)^i (1 - p_d - p_m)^{n-i}$
 - $C_i^n = \frac{n!}{i!(n-i)!}$
 - $p_m = p(m < X \leq M)$
 - $p_d = p(X > M)$

Three-Class Sampling Plans

- Existing microbiological criteria intended for three-class sampling plans (e.g., ICMSF) do not consider process variability
- When applied for statistical process control, this results in highly inconsistent false alarm rates (FAR) for detecting out-of-control processes

Three-Class Sampling Plans

- Specify $F(M) = 99.5^{\text{th}}$ %ile ($p_d = 0.5\%$)
- Specify $\log_{10}(M/m) = 1$ or 2
- $FAR = 1 - p_a$
- $FAR = FAR_M + FAR_m$
- $FAR_M = 1 - (1 - p_d)^n$
- For $n = 5$ and $p_d = 0.5\%$, $FAR_M = 2.5\%$
- $FAR = 2.5\% + ?$

Three-Class Sampling Plans

- Assume $X \sim \text{Lognormal}(\mu_{\log 10}, \sigma_{\log 10})$
- Given p_d and $\sigma_{\log 10}$, we can calculate p_m from existing sampling plans based on the ratio of the limits (M/m).
- Given a fixed M percentile, the implied μ and percentile of m will vary depending on the process variability σ .
- $\mu_{\log 10} = \log_{10}(M) - \Phi^{-1}(F(M), 0, 1)\sigma_{\log 10}$
- $F(m) = \Phi(\log_{10}(m), \mu_{\log 10}, \sigma_{\log 10})$
- $p_m = F(M) - F(m)$
- $\text{FAR}_m = \text{FAR} - \text{FAR}_M$

Three-Class Sampling Plans

n	c	log(M/m)	$\sigma_{\log 10}$	m percentile	FAR(%)	FAR _M (%)	FAR _m (%)
5	2	1	0.25	7.7	99.6	2.5	97.1
			0.50	71.8	15.8	2.5	13.3
			0.80	90.8	3.1	2.5	0.6
			1.20	95.9	2.5	2.5	0.0
5	2	2	0.25	0.0	100.0	2.5	97.5
			0.50	7.7	99.6	2.5	97.1
			0.80	53.0	45.2	2.5	42.8
			1.20	81.8	6.6	2.5	4.1

Three-Class Sampling Plans

- Dahms and Hildebrandt (1998) proposed starting with assuming marginal limit (m) based on an “indifferent lot” – a lot with probability of acceptance = 0.5.
- For $n = 5$, $c = 2$, $F(m) = 50^{\text{th}}$ percentile.
- Then specify M based on additional risk of lot rejection (a) attributable to M .
- For $a = 0.01$, $p(\text{lot acceptance}) = 0.5 - 0.01 = 0.49$.
- For process control, this implies $\text{FAR} = 51\%$.

Three-Class Sampling Plans

- Various approaches to design for process control
- For example, for $n = 5$, $c = 2$, given:
 - $M = 5 \log_{10} \text{ cfu/g}$; $F(M) = 99.9^{\text{th}}$ percentile
 - $\text{FAR}_M = 0.5\%$
 - $\sigma_{\log_{10}} = 0.8 \log_{10} \text{ cfu/g}$ ($\mu_{\log_{10}} = 2.5$)
 - $\text{FAR} = 1\%$
- Solve for m ,
 - s.t. $\text{FAR}_m = 0.5\% = (1 - p_a = 1\%) - (\text{FAR}_M = 0.5\%)$
 - $m = 3.63 \log_{10} \text{ cfu/g}$ (91.6^{th} percentile)

Three-Class Sampling Plans

- If the limits (m and M) are set based on microbiological considerations (e.g., shelf-life, hazardous levels) rather than statistical design specifications, then the three-class sampling plans may continue to serve a useful food safety function by indicating marginal and unacceptable microbiological quality.
- However, this function is distinct from that of sampling plans with limits derived from observing a process under control where exceedances of the limits indicate a potential loss of statistical control.

Disclaimers

The opinions expressed herein are the views of the author and do not necessarily reflect the official policy or position of the United States Department of Agriculture. Reference herein to any specific commercial products, process, or service by trade name, trademark, manufacturer, or otherwise, does not necessarily constitute or imply its endorsement, recommendation, or favoring by the United States Government.

NACMCF

- NACMCF. Forthcoming. Microbiological Criteria as Indicators of Process Control or Insanitary Conditions
- <http://www.fsis.usda.gov/wps/portal/fsis/topics/regulations/advisory-committees>
- Follow link to “More About NACMCF”