







Potential use of MIR spectrometry to assess the origin of milk produced in a PDO area

F.G. Colinet¹, J.A. Fernandez Pierna², F. Dehareng², C. Bertozzi³, D. Veselko⁴, M. Sindic¹, M. Tielemans¹ and N. Gengler¹

¹ University of Liège, Gembloux Agro-Bio Tech, Gembloux, Belgium

² Walloon Agricultural Research Centre, Gembloux, Belgium

³ Walloon Breeding Association, Ciney, Belgium

⁴ Milk Committee, Battice, Belgium

Belgian local products





Ham e.g. Jambon d'Ardenne



Beer e.g. Vieille Gueuze



European protected products







Assessing the milk origin within Wallonie



Assessing the milk origin within Wallonie



Are data available ?



- Milk delivered to dairies
- □ Bulk milk sampling → Milk composition to set the price
- □ Mid Infrared (MIR) spectrometry analysis → Fast and cost-efficient

→ Walloon bulk milk MIR spectra data base

How to discriminate milk from the 2 areas ?

□ 1st data editing

- > Bovine raw milk bulk samples from January 2012 to December 2015
- > Standardized MIR spectra (Grelet et al., 2015)

→ 1 800 000 spectra from ±3 300 milk producers

- Partial Least Square Discrimination Analysis (PLS-DA)
 - > Pretraitment: Savitsky-Golay 1st derivative (5 wavenumbers window size)
 - > PLS Toolbox (Eigenvector research, Inc.)

Many data & sampling every 2-3 days

→ Daily datasets analysis instead of whole dataset analysis

Editing of the daily datasets

| D-6 | D-5 | D-4 | D-3 | D-2 | D-1 | D | D+1 | D+2 | D+3 |
|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|---|-----|-----|-----|
| | | | | | | V | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | |

- External validation dataset
 - Samples collected today

Editing of the daily datasets



Calibration dataset

- > 5 days window
- > 1 sample randomly selected per producer
- > Producer not included in validation dataset

Editing of the daily datasets

| D-6 | D-5 | D-4 | D-3 | D-2 | D-1 | D | D+1 | D+2 | D+3 |
|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|---|-----|-----|-----|
| | С | С | С | С | С | V | | | |
| | | С | С | С | С | С | V | | |
| | | | С | С | С | С | С | V | |

1 640 pairs of datasets



1 640 calibrations by PLS-DA

Daily correct classification rates



1 640 calibrations by PLS-DA

Daily correct classification rates



| | Cross- Validation |
|-----------------------------|----------------------|
| Correct classification rate | 79.9 % (±1.6) |

| | | Cross- Validation | |
|-------------|------------------------------------|----------------------|--|
| Correct | 79.9 % (±1.6) | | |
| Soncitivity | Correct classified PDO samples | 79 1 9/ (+2 0) | |
| Sensitivity | PDO samples | 78.1 /8 (±2.0) | |
| Specificity | Correct classified non-PDO samples | 81.1 % (±1.9) | |
| Specificity | non-PDO samples | | |

| | | Cross- Validation | |
|--------------------------|------------------------------------|----------------------|--|
| Correct | 79.9 % (±1.6) | | |
| Soncitivity | Correct classified PDO samples | 79 1 9/ (+2 0) | |
| Sensitivity | PDO samples | 78.1 % (±2.0) | |
| Spacificity | Correct classified non-PDO samples | | |
| Specificity | non-PDO samples | 01.1 /0 (±1.9) | |
| Positivo Prodictod Valuo | Correct classified PDO samples | | |
| Positive Predicted value | Classified PDO samples | 74.1 /0 (12.2) | |
| Nogative Producted Value | Correct classified non-PDO samples | | |
| Negative Fredicted Value | Classified non-PDO samples | 04.3 % (11.7) | |

| | | Cross- Validation | Validation | |
|--------------------------|------------------------------------|----------------------|---------------|--|
| Correct | 79.9 % (±1.6) | 75.4 % (±3.2) | | |
| Soncitivity | Correct classified PDO samples | 79 1 % (+2 0) | 60 / % (+7 c) | |
| Sensitivity | PDO samples | 70.1 % (±2.0) | 09.4 % (I7.0) | |
| Spacificity | Correct classified non-PDO samples | 91 1 % (+1 0) | 70 9 % (+6 1) | |
| Specificity | non-PDO samples | 01.1 % (±1.9) | 79.8 % (10.1) | |
| Positivo Prodictod Valuo | Correct classified PDO samples | 7/1 2/ (+2 2) | 71.4 % (±6.0) | |
| Positive Predicted value | Classified PDO samples | 74.1 /8 (±2.2) | | |
| Nogativo Prodictod Valuo | Correct classified non-PDO samples | 9/ 2 % (+1 7) | 78.6 % (±4.8) | |
| Negative Fredicted Value | Classified non-PDO samples | 04.3 % (II./) | | |

Varying results between milk producers

Frequencies for each class of correct classification rate by producers in 2014



Varying results at zip code area level



Main land uses



Take home message

□ Feasability to discriminate milk samples

- > Produced in 2 areas from Walloon Region
- > Based on MIR spectra
- > Daily PLS-DA models
- > 70-80 % of corrrect classification, sensitivity and specificity

Possibility to assess the origin of milk produced in a PDO area

- Results linked to pedoclimatic conditions and to main land uses for feeding dairy cows
 - Grassland
 - Maize for silage

Acknowledgments for financial support

Service Public de Wallonie (SPW – DGO3, Belgium) through project D32-0196

DGO 3







Corresponding author's e-mail : Frederic.Colinet@ulg.ac.be