

# Validation of an optical surface plasmon resonance biosensor assay for screening (fluoro)quinolones in egg, fish, and poultry meat

Anne-Catherine Huet, Caroline Charlier, Stefan Weigel, Samuel Godefroy,

Philippe Delahaut

## ▶ To cite this version:

Anne-Catherine Huet, Caroline Charlier, Stefan Weigel, Samuel Godefroy, Philippe Delahaut. Validation of an optical surface plasmon resonance biosensor assay for screening (fluoro)quinolones in egg, fish, and poultry meat. Food Additives and Contaminants, 2009, 26 (10), pp.1341-1347. 10.1080/02652030903013328 . hal-00573907

# HAL Id: hal-00573907 https://hal.science/hal-00573907

Submitted on 5 Mar 2011

**HAL** is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

#### **Food Additives and Contaminants**



### Validation of an optical surface plasmon resonance biosensor assay for screening (fluoro)quinolones in egg, fish, and poultry meat

Journal:	Food Additives and Contaminants
Manuscript ID:	TFAC-2009-069.R1
Manuscript Type:	Original Research Paper
Date Submitted by the Author:	20-Apr-2009
Complete List of Authors:	Huet, Anne-Catherine; CER Groupe, santés animale et humaine Charlier, Caroline; CER Groupe, santés animale et humaine Weigel, Stefan; RIKILT, Institute of Food Safety Godefroy, Samuel; Health Canada, Food Research Division Delahaut, Philippe; CER Groupe, Santés animale et humaine
Methods/Techniques:	Screening - biosensor
Additives/Contaminants:	Veterinary drug residues - fluoroquinolones
Food Types:	Animal products – meat, Eggs, Fish



1	Validation of an optical surface plasmon resonance biosensor
2	assay for screening (fluoro)quinolones in egg, fish, and poultry
3	meat
4	
5	AC. HUET <sup>1</sup> , C. CHARLIER <sup>1</sup> , S. WEIGEL <sup>2</sup> , S. BENREJEB GODEFROY <sup>3</sup> and
6	Ph. DELAHAUT <sup>1</sup>
7	
8	<sup>1</sup> CER Groupe, Santés animale et humaine, Rue Point du Jour 8, 6900 Marloie,
9	Belgium
10	<sup>2</sup> RIKILT – Institute of Food Safety, Wageningen UR, P.O. Box 230, 6700 AE
11	Wageningen, The Netherlands
12	<sup>3</sup> Food Research Division, Health Canada, Ottawa, Ontario, Canada, K1A 0L2

### 13 Abstract

14	A surface plasmon resonance biosensor immunoassay has been developed for
15	multi-residue determination of 13 (fluoro)quinolone antibiotics in poultry meat,
16	egg, and fish. The following performance characteristics were determined
17	according to the guidelines laid down for screening assay validation in the
18	European Decision 2002/657/EC: detection capability, specificity/selectivity,
19	decision limit, repeatability, ruggedness, and stability. The detection capability
20	estimated for norfloxacin, the reference fluoroquinolone, was below 0.5, 1, and 1.5
21	ng $g^{-1}$ for poultry meat, egg and fish respectively. The screening assay proved
22	specific and showed satisfactory sensitivity, below the MRL levels even though
23	flumequine and oxolinic acid had lower cross-reactivities. A wide range of non-
24	MRL substances were also detected at concentrations below 10 ng g <sup>-1</sup> .
25	Repeatability was good with both intra-assay and inter-assay coefficients of
26	variation < 6 % and ruggedness was also demonstrated.
27	

**Keywords:** quinolones, biosensor, surface plasmon resonance, validation

### 29 Introduction

30	Over the last few decades, consumers, regulators, and industry have been very
31	concerned about the quality and safety of food. Several crises, mainly of animal
32	origin, have broken out in the last 20 years, causing a decline of consumption of
33	certain foodstuffs. To prevent such crises in the future and to ensure that food is
34	safe for consumers, effective monitoring is necessary. This concern has been
35	integrated into a European project aiming to develop new technologies to screen
36	for multiple chemical contaminants in foods ( <u>http://www.biocop.org/</u> ). Among
37	these contaminants, fluoroquinolones (FQs) have been chosen as one of the
38	priority residue groups.

FQs constitute an entirely synthetic class of antibiotics that have found wide application in both human and veterinary clinical practice. The widespread use of FQs in agriculture has resulted in the potential presence of residues of these compounds in foodstuffs of animal origin. In parallel to exposure to low levels of these compounds, an upsetting increase in resistant human pathogens has been observed. This constitutes a public health hazard, primarily through the increased risk of treatment failure (Sarközy, 2001). The European Commission has thus established maximum residue levels (MRLs) for various FQs in different tissues (EMEA, 1998-2002). Rapid diagnostic methods for screening for the presence of all FQs in animal products are therefore needed for effective control, i.e. to ensure the correct use of these antibiotics.

52 Recently, our team developed a generic immunoassay based on surface plasmon

53	resonance (SPR) biosensor technology for a set of 13 (fluoro)Qs in three matrixes
54	(Huet et al., 2008). The current paper describes the validation of this qualitative
55	screening assay according to the criteria specified in European Commission
56	Decision 2002/657/EC (EEC, 2002). The validation parameters
57	specificity/selectivity, decision limit (CC $\alpha$ ), detection capability (CC $\beta$ ),
58	repeatability, ruggedness, and stability are presented in this work. In the literature,
59	two main references have been reported which dealt with validation of a
60	multiresidual method by SPR biosensor (Traynor et al., 2003 and Gaudin et al.,
61	2007).
62	
63	Materials and methods
64	Apparatus and reagents
65	The Optical SPR Biosensor System Biacore Q and HBS-EP buffer were obtained
66	from Biacore AB (Uppsala, Sweden).
67	Sarafloxacin, ofloxacin, flumequine, norfloxacin, ciprofloxacin hydrochloride,
68	oxolinic acid, lomefloxacin, enoxacin, and nalidixic acid were provided by Sigma
69	(St Louis, MO, USA). Enrofloxacin was obtained from Bayer (Leverkusen,
70	Germany), difloxacin hydrochloride from Chemos GmbH (Regenstauf, Germany),
71	pefloxacin from Rhone Poulenc (Vitry sur Seine, France), danofloxacin from
72	Pfizer Inc (New York, USA), and marbofloxacin was kindly provided by UBE
73	Europe (Lure, France). The related compounds nicotinic acid, nicotinamide, and
74	ethoxyquin were purchased from Sigma-Aldrich (St Louis, MO, USA).
75	Acetonitrile was provided by Biosolve (Valkenswaard, the Netherlands); hexane
76	from Merck (Haar, Germany); sodium chloride, sodium hydroxide, di-sodium
77	hydrogen phosphate, and potassium dihydrogen phosphate from VWR

78	International (Leuven, Belgium); HPLC-grade water from Acros Organics (Geel,
79	Belgium).
80	Antibodies and core-FQ sensor chip preparation
81	The polyclonal antibodies raised against norfloxacin hapten-flumequine-BSA
82	were produced in our animal facilities. They were purified by affinity
83	chromatography on a Protein A-Sepharose column (Amersham Biosciences,
84	Belgique) and then concentrated with a centricon (with a molecular weight cut-off
85	of 30,000) purchased from Millipore (Brussels, Belgium). Antibody concentration
86	was measured by the Bio-Rad protein assay (Bio-Rad Laboratories, Hemel
87	Hempstead, UK). Antibody stock solution was diluted 1/4 (v/v) with HBS-EP
88	buffer just before use.
89	
90	The core-FQ derivative was immobilised by a standard amine-coupling procedure,
91	it was synthesized from starting product 6-fluoro-4-oxo-1,4-dihydro-3-
92	quinolinecarboxylic acid (Apollo Scientific Limited, Bredbury, UK) on which a 3-
93	aminopropyl was added at position 1. Between analyses the chips were stored over
94	desiccant at 4°C in a sealed container.
95	
96	The full antibody production and FQ derivative immobilisation protocols have
97	been described in a previous publication (Huet et al., 2008).
98	
99	Preparation of standard curves in matrixes
100	A stock solution of norfloxacin at 100 $\mu$ g mL <sup>-1</sup> was prepared in methanol. From
101	this solution, spiking solutions were prepared in HBS-EP buffer. A set of five
102	matrix-matched standards at 0.1, 0.5, 1, 2.5 and 10 ng $g^{-1}$ (poultry meat and egg)

4	
4	
5	
6	
7	
0	
0	
9	
10	
11	
10	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
10	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
∠ I 00	
22	
23	
24	
25	
20	
20	
27	
28	
29	
30	
30	
31	
32	
33	
34	
25	
35	
36	
37	
38	
30	
39	
40	
41	
42	
43	
11	
44	
45	
46	
47	
48	
40	
49	
50	
51	
52	
52	
55	
54	
55	
56	
57	
50	
50	
59	
60	

103 or 0.1, 1, 2.5, 5 and 100 ng g	<sup>1</sup> (fish) were prepared by fortifying blank extracts.
------------------------------------	---

- 104 Duplicate injections at each concentration were performed and the mean response
  105 was used to construct a calibration curve.
- 106 *Extraction of samples*
- 107 *Egg and poultry meat:* 2g homogenised muscle or whole egg were extracted with
- 108 8 mL acetonitrile. Each tube was immediately vortexed before vigorous head-
- 109 over-head shaking for 10 min. After centrifugation, all of the supernatant was
- 110 evaporated to dryness. The residue was reconstituted in 1 mL PBS pH 7.4 and
- 111 mixed. Then 1 mL hexane was added and the tubes were vortexed. The sample
- 112 was centrifuged and the hexane layer and any traces of emulsion at the interface
- 113 were removed. The washing step was repeated once again and the reconstituted
- 114 sample was quickly vortexed and centrifuged just before application to the 96-well
- 115 plate.
  - *Fish:* as above except that only a 2-mL aliquot of the supernatant was transferred
    into a new tube and evaporated to dryness.
  - 118 Sample analysis
- 119 Antiserum freshly diluted in HBS-EP buffer was mixed 25% : 75% with sample
- 120 extract and injected for 210 seconds over the sensor chip surface at a flow rate of
- 121  $25\mu l \text{ min}^{-1}$ . The chip surface was regenerated between cycles with a 30-second
- pulse of 10mM NaOH prepared from 1M NaOH with HPLC grade water at a flow
  rate of 10 µl min<sup>-1</sup>.
  - 124 *Method validation*
- 125 Validation of our SPR biosensor method was conducted in accordance with table 9
- 126 of the document of European Commission Decision, 20002/657/EC (EEC, 2002).

#### **Food Additives and Contaminants**

127	Specificity means the ability of a method to distinguish between the analyte being
128	measured and other substances. In keeping with the EU Decision requirements,
129	two approaches were used to test this aspect. Firstly, 20 blank samples from
130	different origins of each of the three studied matrixes (egg, poultry meat, and fish)
131	were analysed by the biosensor procedure to detect the presence of possible
132	interferences from endogenous substances and matrix constituents. Secondly,
133	cross-reactivity (CR) profiles were determined for a range of potentially
134	interfering substances by spiking blank samples at relevant concentration (1000 ng
135	$g^{-1}$ ) with ethoxyquin, nicotinamide, and nicotinic acid considered as FQ analogues.
136	The CR profile of the polyclonal antibody was also determined for a range of
137	common (fluoro)Qs. Calibration curves were prepared in each matrix using the
138	compounds of interest in the range 0-1000 ng $g^{-1}$ (0, 0.25, 1, 2.5, 10, 25, 100, and
139	1000). The CR was calculated from the relevant calibration curves as $IC_{50}$
140	(norfloxacin)/ $CR_{50}$ (competitor) x 100, where IC <sub>50</sub> (inhibitory concentration) is the
141	concentration at midpoint of the standard curve and $CR_{50}$ is the concentration of
142	competitor required to cause the same decrease in signal as obtained with
143	norfloxacin used at its $IC_{50}$ concentration. The calculations were done with the
144	BIAevaluation software provided by Biacore AB (Uppsala, Sweden).
145	
146	The detection capability $CC\beta$ was determined for the reference molecule
147	norfloxacin. According to the Commission Decision, in the case of substances for
148	which no permitted limit has been established, where no quantitative results are
149	available (i.e. qualitative screening), the $CC\beta$ can be determined by investigation
150	of fortified blank material at and above the decision limit (CC $\alpha$ ). In this case the
151	concentration level at which only $\leq 5\%$ false compliant results remain equals the

#### **Food Additives and Contaminants**

152	CC $\beta$ . In practice, the CC $\beta$ was chosen as the lowest tested fortification level
153	giving no negative result in an analysis of 20 spiked blanks. This decision should
154	avoid the problem of false negatives. At least twenty negative samples of fish,
155	egg, and chicken muscle were fortified with norfloxacin at 1.5, 1, and 0.5 ng $g^{-1}$
156	respectively, and then assayed in the biosensor assay.

For the repeatability step, a standard curve and six samples fortified with norfloxacin at the corresponding  $CC\beta$  value were prepared in each studied matrix, and then samples were extracted and injected. This experiment was realized three times in three days, giving intra- and interday variability. The detected concentration of each spiked sample was calculated as were the mean concentrations, the standard deviations (STDEVPA), and the coefficients of

- 164 variation (CVs).

To prove the ruggedness of the developed SPR-based FQ assay, the same experiment was performed three times by changing one factor per experiment, namely (i) the pH of the buffer (phosphate-buffered saline, PBS) in which dried residues were reconstituted: pH 6.4 instead of PBS pH 7.4; (ii) the operator; (iii) the time of evaporation (it was doubled). Each experiment was conducted as follows: one calibration curve of norfloxacin was extracted simultaneously with five blank samples of different origins and five blank samples fortified with norfloxacin at its  $CC\beta$  value in the matrix used. The detected concentration of each spiked sample and each known negative sample was calculated for the egg, fish, and chicken muscle matrix.

177	Results	and	discussion
-----	---------	-----	------------

178	As explained by Spinks in 2000, the current need is to develop assays for more
179	than one analyte per test and to increase sample throughput. Progress in
180	immunoassay development is constrained by the availability of antibodies with
181	appropriate affinity and specificity characteristics. It was a real challenge to
182	develop a single efficient biosensor immunoassay for the entire class of FQ
183	antibiotics. Four immunogens and one engineered antibody were synthesised, and
184	three different FQ derivatives were immobilised on the sensor chip surface. Huet
185	et al. (2008) described all the tested approaches in detail, revealing for the first
186	time the new concept of the bi-active antibody. The most difficult aspect of
187	development was taking into account the fact that some substances have different
188	MRLs, others have no MRLs, and the use of some is prohibited in animals from
189	which eggs are produced for human consumption.

All samples were determined free of FQ residues by LC-MS/MS before being used in the biosensor procedure. One norfloxacin calibration curve was prepared and extracted for each experiment of the validation study (see experimental section). The midpoints of all these standard curves were evaluated with the BIAevaluation software and compared with the expected values, midpoints at about 1, 1.5, and 3 ng  $g^{-1}$  having been previously determined for poultry muscle, egg, and fish, respectively. All IC<sub>50</sub> values obtained in the validation study were in keeping with the values just mentioned since they ranged from 0.8 to 1.2 ng  $g^{-1}$  for poultry, from 0.9 to 2 ng  $g^{-1}$  for egg and from 2.6 to 4.1 ng  $g^{-1}$  for fish. 

201 Specificity/selectivity

202	The specificity of the entire procedure was investigated against the following
203	quinolones: norfloxacin, flumequine, enrofloxacin, ciprofloxacin, sarafloxacin,
204	pefloxacin, enoxacin, difloxacin, lomefloxacin, danofloxacin, ofloxacin,
205	marbofloxacin, and oxolinic acid. The calibrants selected for the test were added
206	at six levels concentration. The CR of the binding protein used in the assay is
207	shown in table 1. The specificity of the antibody towards norfloxacin is the 100%
208	reference. It was confirmed that the selected antibody could detect 11
209	fluoroquinolones with high cross-reactivities ranging from 26 to 183 %. Lower
210	cross-reactions (between 1 and 14 %) were observed for flumequine and oxolinic
211	acid. Although low, these cross-reactivities remain acceptable, as the European
212	Union has established a maximum residue limit (MRL) at 100 ng g <sup>-1</sup> for oxolinic
213	acid in fish and chicken muscle, at 600 for flumequine in fish, and at 400 ng $g^{-1}$ for
214	flumequine in poultry muscle. The cross-reactivity profile was already presented
215	in the previous article (Huet et al., 2008), the results were compared and some
216	differences appeared. The assay's sensitivity was better with lower $IC_{50}$ values in
217	this work. The two CR profiles for oxolinic acid were quite different, much lower
218	here. These differences are explained by the use of an antibody purified on a
219	protein A-Sepharose column in this publication whereas a crude antibody was
220	working last year. On the other hand, there was no measurable cross-reactivity
221	with the common FQ analogues ethoxyquin, nicotinamide, and nicotinic acid at
222	high concentration.
223	
224	The specificity of the SPR assay was also demonstrated after analysis of 20 known
225	negative poultry meat, egg, and fish samples. These showed no interference, when

analyzed against a corresponding matrix curve. Determination of the CCα is not

#### **Food Additives and Contaminants**

227	required by document 2002/657/EC but can easily be calculated from the data
228	obtained so far. The decision limit CC $\alpha$ , determined as the concentration
229	corresponding to the mean response for negative samples minus three times the
230	standard deviation, was 0.13 (poultry meat), 0.29 (egg), and 0.31 ng $g^{-1}$ (fish).
231	
232	Detection capabilities
233	To calculate the detection capability (CC $\beta$ ), 20 known negative samples were
234	spiked with the reference molecule norfloxacin, chosen because the polyclonal
235	antibody used as binding protein was raised against a norfloxacin hapten.
236	Norfloxacin is also commonly used for treatment of animals in many countries
237	(Webber and Piddock, 2001) and very often mentioned in the literature. The
238	negative samples of fish, egg, and chicken muscle were fortified with norfloxacin
239	at 1.5, 1 and 0.5 ng $g^{-1}$ respectively and then assayed in the biosensor assay. All
240	fortified samples were declared positive (above their respective cut-off values).
241	The CC $\beta$ of the assay thus proved inferior to the tested level of fortification. To
242	ascertain if a sample was negative or not, the cut-off level for each matrix was
243	determined from the graphs presented in figure 1, which combine the calculated
244	mean norfloxacin concentrations for blank samples and for samples spiked at the
245	appropriate $CC\beta$ level. The means calculated for blank and fortified samples were
246	found to be different and the variability of known negative samples was much
247	lower than that of samples containing norfloxacin. To limit the number of pseudo-
248	false positives, all cut-off levels were set near the mean of the spiked samples, as
249	in the case of MRL-regulated compound/matrix combinations, a considerable rate
250	of pseudo-false positive results can be generated; for instance samples containing
251	FQs, but below the MRL. In fact, this high sensitivity of the assay is essential to

252	detect flumequine and oxolinic acid at satisfactory levels even if it implies the
253	acceptance of a certain pseudo-false positives rate. This aspect is well-known in
254	the field of immunochemical screening assays using a generic antibody
255	(Scortichini et al., 2009). The cut-off values were set at 1.5, 1, and 0.5 ng $g^{-1}$ for
256	fish, egg, and poultry meat respectively. More precisely, when the calculated
257	concentration of an unknown sample was below the corresponding cut-off level,
258	this sample was considered negative, but when it was above or equal to the cut-off
259	level, the sample was considered suspect and to require analysis by a confirmatory
260	method for identifying and quantifying (fluoro)Qs.
261	
262	The determination of cross-reactivities with other (fluoro)Qs (specificity/
263	selectivity section) then enabled us to calculate the detection capabilities of all
264	investigated compounds. This was done for each matrix according to the following
265	formula: CC $\beta$ compound = (CC $\beta$ norfloxacin / corresponding CR) X 100. The
266	obtained values are presented in table 2. They range from 0.9 to 3.7 ng $g^{-1}$ for the
267	fish matrix, from 0.5 to 2.2 ng g <sup>-1</sup> for the egg matrix, and from 0.4 to 1.9 ng g <sup>-1</sup> for
268	chicken muscle, except for flumequine and oxolinic acid which show higher
269	values due to their lower specificity. The assay could nevertheless detect both
270	residues at or below their half-MRL levels. These results are satisfactory, since the
271	$CC\beta$ values for all (fluoro)Qs were well below the established MRL levels set by
272	EMEA for specified analyte/matrix combinations (table 1). Moreover, the assay
273	proved sensitive enough to detect also the non-MRL substances at levels below 10
274	$ng g^{-1}$ .
275	

*Repeatability* 

#### **Food Additives and Contaminants**

277	As explained in the experimental section, six replicate samples were spiked with
278	norfloxacin at the appropriate $CC\beta$ level and then extracted simultaneously with
279	one calibration curve. The experiment was performed three different times for
280	each matrix of interest. The intra- $(n = 6)$ and interday variations $(n = 3)$ calculated
281	are listed in tables 3 and 4, respectively. CVs varied from 2.8 to 5.8 $\%$ under
282	intraday repeatability-testing conditions and from 1.9 to 5.7 % under interday
283	repeatability-testing conditions. Since a CV of 15% was set for the desired
284	repeatability, these repeatability results are satisfactory.
285	
286	Ruggedness
287	A series of key parameters (the pH of reconstitution buffer (PBS), the operator,
288	and the duration of evaporation) were investigated. Usually, reconstitution of
289	dried residues after evaporation is carried out in 1 ml PBS adjusted to pH 7.4. In
290	this experiment 16 samples per matrix, corresponding to 6 calibration points and
291	10 known negative samples of which 5 were fortified at the corresponding $CC\beta$
292	level were reconstituted in 1 ml PBS at pH 6.4. All blank samples were declared
293	negative because the results were lower than the respective cut-off levels (0.5, 1,
294	and 1.5 ng $g^{-1}$ respectively in poultry meat, egg, and fish). The result for one
295	sample of chicken muscle, however, was very near to the cut-off value for this
296	matrix. This suggests that reconstitution in PBS with a small change in pH could
297	generate a false positive in this matrix. All spiked samples were declared positive,
298	giving values slightly higher than with the unchanged protocol.
299	
300	A different operator carried out all the steps described under the instructions for
301	use of the prototype kit: preparation of calibrant solutions and spiking solutions,

302	fortification, extraction, preparation of solutions for the run, running assay. The
303	change of operator did not affect the performance of the method. The third
304	parameter, the drying time, being quite variable in the routine execution of the
305	assay, we multiplied it by two. No variation was observed except that fortified
306	samples gave values slightly higher than with the unchanged protocol.
307	
308	The midpoints of the calibration curves obtained in this ruggedness experiment are
309	summarized in the table 5. The sensitivity proved similar to that of the usual
310	method except less sensitivity for the fish and egg matrixes reconstituted in PBS at
311	lower pH.
312	
313	Stability
314	No stability study was performed since this SPR assay is a qualitative screening
315	method and could mean to unreliable observations. As described in a recent
316	publication (2007), the team of Gaudin et al. showed that their biosensor method
317	was not suitable for conducting stability studies due to the variability of
318	quantitative results. For instance, they observed an increase of residue
319	concentration in spiked samples stored at -20°C for 20 weeks; no scientific
320	explanation was found for this kind of phenomenon.
321	
322	The literature does provide, however, some stability data worth mentioning here.
323	The stability of some FQs in solution has been demonstrated by Okerman et al.,
324	2007. In this study, frozen stock solutions of flumequine, enrofloxacin, and
325	marbofloxacin were evaluated in an agar diffusion test. Diameters of inhibition
326	zones were measured at monthly intervals for 6 months, and the decline in active

#### **Food Additives and Contaminants**

327	substance was calculated. Stock solutions of 1 mg ml <sup>-1</sup> in 0.1 N NaOH were kept
328	at -20°C until needed and were never exposed to direct strong light. The loss of
329	activity was less than 10% after 6 months of storage at -20°C. The studied FQs are
330	thus relatively stable.
331	
332	The stability of FQs in chicken muscle has been demonstrated by Bailac et al.,
333	2006 and Shu-Chu et al., 2003, but we have found no information in the literature
334	for the two other matrixes. The stability of spiked chicken samples at low (25 ng
335	g <sup>-1</sup> ) and high concentration (250 ng g <sup>-1</sup> ) was evaluated by liquid chromatography-
336	ultraviolet (LC-UV). In Bailac et al., 2006, the matrix was fortified with 7
337	different quinolones: ciprofloxacin, danofloxacin, enrofloxacin, sarafloxacin,
338	difloxacin, oxolinic acid, and flumequine. Then these samples were stored at -
339	20°C for 3 months. Afterwards, they were analyzed and compared with fresh
340	chicken samples fortified at the same levels. The results proved the long-term
341	stability of most of FQs in chicken muscle, showing no significant differences in
342	concentration. In Shu-Chu et al., 2003, the stability of incurred chicken muscle
343	samples was evaluated by HPLC. The authors studied the stability of residual
344	enrofloxacin after refrigeration in wu ku chicken muscle. Incurred samples were
345	stored at 4°C for 1, 4, and 7 days to test the stability of enrofloxacin. The level of
346	residual enrofloxacin in samples was found not to have decreased after 7 days at
347	4°C.
348	
349	Method comparison
350	Besides the in-house validation of the method, the new method was compared
351	with established methods for the determination of FQ residues in the target

352	matrixes. The methods chosen were an FQ-specific microbiological screening
353	assay and a liquid chromatography-mass spectrometric (LC-MS) confirmatory
354	method. This method comparison study demonstrated the performance of our
355	developed SPR biosensor screening assay, since all spiked and incurred samples
356	containing one of the investigated FQ antibiotics, sometimes even at very low
357	concentration, were identified as suspicious by the biosensor method. Further
358	practical details and complete results are presented in a publication (Weigel et al.,
359	2009).
360	
361	Conclusions
362	Multi-residue identification of 13 fluoroquinolones in fish, egg, and poultry
363	muscle by means of our SPR-based biosensor assay has been successfully
364	validated. Satisfactory results were obtained with respect to selectivity/specificity,
365	detection capability, repeatability, and ruggedness of analysis in each matrix. The
366	pH of the reconstitution buffer might, however, influence the chicken matrix and
367	lead to false positives. Stability data from a bibliographical study are included in
368	the paper.
369	
370	Acknowledgements
371	This project was financially supported by the European Commission, project
372	"New technologies to screen multiple chemical contaminants in foods". BioCop,
373	contract FOOD-CT-2004-06988.
374	
375	References

#### **Food Additives and Contaminants**

3 4	376	Bailac S, Barron D, Barbosa J. 2006. New extraction procedure to improve the
5 6	377	determination of quinolones in poultry muscle by liquid chromatography with
7 8	378	ultraviolet and mass spectrometric detection. Anal Chim Acta. 580(2): 163-9.
9 10 11	379	EEC. 2002. Commission Decision 2002/657/EC. Off. J. Eur. Commun. L 221: 0008-
12 13	380	0036.
14 15	381	EMEA. 1998-2002. European Council Regulation 2377/90/EEC concerning the
16 17		
18	382	establishment of MRLs in the European Union. European Agency for the
20	383	Evaluation of Medicinal Products.
22 23	384	Gaudin V, Hedou C, Sanders P. 2007. Validation of a Biacore method for screening
24 25	385	eight sulfonamides in milk and porcine muscle tissues according to European
26 27	386	decision 2002/657/EC. J AOAC Int. 90(6): 1706-15.
28 29 30	387	Huet AC, Charlier C, Singh G, Godefroy SB, Leivo J, Vehniainen M, Nielen MW,
31 32	388	Weigel S, Delahaut P. 2008. Development of an optical surface plasmon
33 34	389	resonance biosensor assay for (fluoro)quinolones in egg, fish, and poultry
35 36 37	390	meat. Anal Chim Acta. 623(2): 195-203.
38 39	391	Okerman L, Van Hende J, De Zutter L. 2007. Stability of frozen stock solutions of
40 41	392	beta-lactam antibiotics, cephalosporins, tetracyclines and quinolones used in
42 43 44	393	antibiotic residue screening and antibiotic susceptibility testing. Anal Chim
45 46	394	Acta. 586(1-2): 284-8.
47 48	395	Sarközy G. 2001. Ouinolones: a class of antimicrobial agents. Vet. MedCzech. 46(9-
49 50	396	10): 257-274
51 52 52	207	Scortichini G. Annunziata I. Di Girolamo V. Buratti P. Galarini P. 2000. Validation
53 54	591	Scottenini G, Annunziata L, Di Gholanio V, Buratti K, Galarini K. 2009. Vandation
55 56	398	of an enzyme-linked immunosorbent assay screening for quinolones in egg,
57 58 59 60	399	poultry muscle and feed samples. Anal Chim Acta. 637: 273-8.

1
2
2
3
4
5
6
7
1
8
9
10
11
10
12
13
14
15
16
17
17
18
19
20
21
20
22
23
24
25
26
20
27
28
29
30
24
31
32
33
34
35
33
36
37
38
39
10
40
41
42
43
44
15
40
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
51
54
55
56
57
58
50
59
60

400	Shu-Chu S, Mei-Hua C, Chin-Lin C, Pi-Chiou C, Shin-Shou C. 2003. Simultaneous
401	determination of quinolones in livestock and marine products by high
402	performance liquid chromatography. Journal of Food and Drug Analysis.
403	11(2): 114-127.
404	Spinks CA. 2000. Broad-specificity immunoassay of low molecular weight food
405	contaminants: new paths to utopia. Trends in Food Science and Technology.
406	11: 210-217.
407	Traynor IM, Crooks SRH, Bowers J, Elliott CT. 2003. Detection of multi-Beta-
408	Agonist residue in liver matrix by use of a surface plasma resonance biosensor.
409	Anal Chim Acta. 483:187-191.
410	Webber M, Piddock LJ. 2001. Quinolone resistance in Escherichia coli. Vet Res.
411	32(3-4): 275-84.
412	Weigel S, Pikkemaat MG, Elferink JWA, Mulder PPJ, Huet AC, Delahaut P, Schittko
413	S, Flerus R, Nielen MWF. 2009. Comparison of a new fluoroquinolone
414	biosensor screening assay with established methods. Food Addit Contam.
415	Accepted, in press.
416	
417	

### **Tables**

- 419 Table 1. IC<sub>50</sub> values and CR profile of FQ binding protein with a range of
- 420 (fluoro)quiolones in the matrixes

	fish		egg <sup>b</sup>		chicken muscle	
	IC <sub>50</sub>	CR (%)	IC <sub>50</sub>	CR (%)	IC <sub>50</sub>	CR (%)
	$(ng g^{-1})$		$(ng g^{-1})$		$(ng g^{-1})$	
norfloxacin	2.4	100	0.9	100	0.6	100
ciprofloxacin	$2.3(50)^{a}$	106	1.1	82	$0.7(50)^{a}$	82
danofloxacin	3.4 (100)	71	0.7	124	1.1 (200)	50
difloxacin	4.3 (300)	57	0.8	106	1.2 (300)	45
enoxacin	5.7	43	1.6	56	2.1	26
enrofloxacin	$1.5(50)^{a}$	163	0.5	183	$0.5(50)^{a}$	118
flumequine	106 (600)	2	46	2	75 (400)	1
lomefloxacin	5.1	48	2.0	45	1.3	43
marbofloxacin	3.6	67	0.7	122	0.7	80
ofloxacin	2.7	91	0.8	117	0.9	65
oxolinic acid	23 (100)	11	6	14	12 (100)	5
pefloxacin	2.0	125	0.5	180	0.5	116
sarafloxacin	6.0 (30)	41	1.9	47	1.9	30

The corresponding MRL value is indicated as ()

<sup>a</sup> Sum of ciprofloxacin and enrofloxacin =  $100 \text{ ng g}^{-1}$ 

- <sup>b</sup> Not for use in animals for which eggs are produced for human consumption
- 425 Table 2. Calculated CC $\beta$ , expressed in ng g<sup>-1</sup>, for all studied (fluoro)Qs, as

## 426 determined by antibody cross-reactivity

	fish	egg	chicken muscle	
norfloxacin	1.5	1.0	0.5	
ciprofloxacin	1.4	1.2	0.6	
danofloxacin	2.1	0.8	1.0	
difloxacin	2.6	0.9	1.1	
enoxacin	3.5	1.8	1.9	
enrofloxacin	0.9	0.5	0.4	
flumequine	65	52	68	
lomefloxacin	3.1	2.2	1.2	
marbofloxacin	2.2	0.8	0.6	
ofloxacin	1.6	0.9	0.8	
oxolinic acid	14	7.0	11	
pefloxacin	1.2	0.6	0.4	
sarafloxacin	3.7	2.1	1.7	

Table 3. Intra-assay parameters determined for the FQs SPR-assay (n=6)

spiking concentration	fish	egg	chicken
1 0		66	

norfloxacin, ng g <sup>-1</sup>		1.5			1			0.5	
mean, ng g <sup>-1</sup>	1.8	2.0	2.0	1.3	1.3	1.1	0.7	0.7	0.6
standard deviation, ng g <sup>-1</sup>	0.08	0.12	0.10	0.06	0.05	0.04	0.02	0.02	0.02
coefficient variation, %	4.2	5.8	4.9	4.4	4.0	3.7	3.5	2.8	3.6

430 Table 4. Inter-assay parameters determined for the FQs SPR-assay (n=3)

spiking concentration norfloxacin, ng g <sup>-1</sup>	fish 1.5	egg 1	chicken 0.5
mean, ng g <sup>-1</sup>	1.9	1.2	0.7
standard deviation, ng g <sup>-1</sup>	0.11	0.07	0.01
coefficient variation, %	5.7	5.4	1.9

432 Table 5. Summary of midpoints of curve coming from the calibration curves of

433 norfloxacin realized during the ruggedness study and calculated thanks the

434 BIAevaluation software. These values were expressed in ng  $g^{-1}$ 

	fish	egg	chicken
standard method	3.0	1.5	1.0
small change in pH	4.0	2.5	1.2
operator	3.3	1.4	1.0
extended evaporation	3.3	1.5	1.0
ure			

### 436 Figure

- 437 Figure 1. Cut-off level determination for the analysis of egg (a), fish (b) and
- 438 chicken muscle (c). Each point represents the reference FQ, norfloxacin
- 439 concentration obtained from the analyses of different samples (blank and spiked at
- 440 CC $\beta$  value). The black lines represent the corresponding standard deviations
- 441 (mean  $\pm$  3 standard deviation SD). The cut-off values are represented on the graph

442 with dotted lines

### Page 21 of 21

### **Food Additives and Contaminants**





