

CALIFORNIA STATE SCIENCE FAIR 2011 PROJECT SUMMARY

| Name(s) | Project Number |
|---|----------------------------|
| Jessica J. Wu-Woods | |
| | |
| | 31630 |
| Project Title | |
| Comparison of Three Methods to Rapidly Detect E. coli Water | |
| | \sim |
| | $\sum \sum$ |
| Objectives/Goals Abstract | |
| Fecal contamination of drinking and recreational water is a serious problem. The | is contamination is |
| determined by measuring the presence of coliform bacteria, such as Escherichia methods to detect these besterie take 18,48 hours, therefore a reliable prior test | coll. Current established |
| methods to detect these bacteria take 18-48 hours, therefore a reliable rapid test focused on evaluating three methods to rapidly test for E. coli in water. | |
| Methods/Materials | 7 |
| Laboratory reagents, PCR machine, DNA gel box, antibody based lateral flow lateral flow strips. Bacterial strains. There were three strains of bacteria used in | strips, metabolite based |
| Results | this experiment. |
| In the first experiment, a dilution series was tested in order to confirm that the | netabolite strips worked |
| correctly. It was concluded that these strips could be used to detect different co | ncentrations of ligand. In |
| correctly. It was concluded that these strips could be used to detect different co the next experiment we tested the idea that a small charge in ligend concentrati change on the test lines. This produced a positive result. The last experiment we | on would cause a visible |
| where we tested different E, coli concentrations. The experiment included all three rapid detection | |
| where we tested different E. coli concentrations. The experiment vicluded all three rapid detection methods. Both the metabolite-based strips and the PCR-based method could detect low concentrations of | |
| bacteria. | |
| Conclusions/Discussion | |
| PCR was the most sensitive and best for detecting E. coll based on this data. However the metabolite strip show promise as a quick and expensive alternative to the PCR. The antibody strips failed to detect E. coli | |
| except at very high concentrations. | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| Summony Statement | |
| Summary Statement | |
| Determining the best method to rapidly test for E. coli in water. | |
| | |
| | |
| Help Received | |
| I used lab equipment under the supervision of Dr. Woods at Inscent, inc. | |
| | |