



HAL
open science

Immunochemical methods for rapid mycotoxin detection: evolution from single to multiple analyte screening. A review.

Sarah de Saeger

► To cite this version:

Sarah de Saeger. Immunochemical methods for rapid mycotoxin detection: evolution from single to multiple analyte screening. A review.. Food Additives and Contaminants, 2007, 24 (10), pp.1169-1183. 10.1080/02652030701557179 . hal-00577368

HAL Id: hal-00577368

<https://hal.science/hal-00577368>

Submitted on 17 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.



**Immunochemical methods for rapid mycotoxin detection:
evolution from single to multiple analyte screening. A
review.**

Journal:	<i>Food Additives and Contaminants</i>
Manuscript ID:	TFAC-2007-151.R1
Manuscript Type:	Special Issue
Date Submitted by the Author:	29-Jun-2007
Complete List of Authors:	De Saeger, Sarah
Methods/Techniques:	Mycology
Additives/Contaminants:	Mycotoxins
Food Types:	

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Immunochemical methods for rapid mycotoxin detection: evolution from single to multiple analyte screening. A review.

Irina Yu. Goryacheva^{1,2}, Sarah De Saeger^{1,*}, Sergei A. Eremin³, Carlos Van Peteghem¹

¹Ghent University, Faculty of Pharmaceutical Sciences, Laboratory of Food Analysis, Harelbekestraat 72, 9000 Ghent, Belgium;

²Saratov State University, Chemistry Faculty, Department of Common and Inorganic Chemistry, Astrakhanskaya 83, 410012 Saratov, Russia;

³Moscow State University, Chemistry Faculty, Department of Chemical Enzymology, 119992 Moscow, Russia;

* Corresponding author [Tel.: +32 92648137; Fax: +32 92648199; e-mail: sarah.desaeger@ugent.be]

Abstract

This review focuses on recent developments in immunochemical methods for detection of mycotoxins, with a particular emphasis on the simultaneous multiple analyte determination. This includes high-throughput instrumental analysis for the laboratory environment (microtiter plate ELISA, different kinds of immunosensors, fluorescence polarization immunoassay and capillary electrophoretic immunoassay), as well as rapid visual tests for on-site testing (lateral-flow, dipstick, flow-through and column tests). For each type of immunoassay perspectives for multiple analyte application are discussed and examples are cited.

Introduction

Mycotoxins are toxic secondary fungal metabolites with deleterious effects for humans and animals. Some mycotoxins have been proven to be carcinogenic while others are nephrotoxic, hepatotoxic or immunosuppressive. Many kinds of food and feed can be contaminated with mycotoxins since they can be formed in commodities before as well as after harvest. Commodity circulation around the world, irregular storage and a lot of (other) uncontrolled reasons cause mycotoxin contaminations. Therefore many countries have set regulations with maximum levels for the major mycotoxins in different commodities.

Two main groups of methods exist for mycotoxin analysis: laborious methods for determination of mycotoxins with high sensitivity and precision, and screening methods for rapid detection in a non-laboratory environment. The first group of methods is particularly represented by liquid chromatography in combination with mass spectrometry or fluorescent (FI) detection. Recently advanced chromatographic methods are more and more shifted to multiple mycotoxin detection. Indeed, several mycotoxins co-occur and can simultaneously contaminate foodstuffs: aflatoxin B1 (AfB1), fumonisin B1 (FB1) and zearalenone (ZEA) in Korean corn (Park et al. 2002), FB1, other *Fusarium* mycotoxins and AfB1 in corn from China (Chu and Li, 1994), fumonisins and aflatoxins in Brazilian corn (Ono et al. 2001), AfB1 and ochratoxin A (OTA) in spices (Fazekas et al. 2005). Simultaneous determination of multiple mycotoxins makes mass spectrometric detection more popular. Multiple mycotoxin determination however causes changes in extraction, clean-up and preconcentration procedures. This requires compromises to establish optimal conditions during extraction and sample preparation. Instead of immunoaffinity columns (IAC) for single and few analyte determination, MycoSep® columns (Berthiller et al. 2005; Biselli and Hummert, 2005), C₁₈ sorbents (Sørensen and Elbaek, 2005) and re-extraction with hexane (Rundberget and Wilkins, 2002) were used for multiassay clean-up. At present the determination of 16 mycotoxins in fungal cultures (Delmulle et al. 2006), 18 mycotoxins and

1
2 metabolites in bovine milk (Sørensen and Elbaek, 2005), 9 mycotoxins in cheese (Kokkonen et
3
4 al. 2005) and 39 mycotoxins in wheat and maize (Sulyok et al. 2006) are described.

5
6
7 Absolute leaders in the second group of analytical methods for mycotoxins are
8
9 immunochemical methods with high sensitivity and selectivity provided by specific antibodies.
10
11 Application of immunoassays for individual mycotoxin rapid screening is now a common
12
13 analytical practice. Main trends for research in this field are sensitivity improvement, matrix
14
15 effect reduction, simplification and shorter time of analysis. Immunomethods for rapid detection
16
17 of individual mycotoxins are summarized in recent reviews concerning immunochemical
18
19 methods (Maragos 2004; Zheng et al. 2006) and analytical methods in general (Krska et al. 2005;
20
21 Gilbert 1999). Besides, reviews were published devoted to the determination of single
22
23 mycotoxins or groups of related toxins, such as ochratoxin A (OTA) (Visconti and De Girolamo
24
25 2005), trichothecenes (Krska et al. 2001; Koch 2004; Schneider et al. 2004), aflatoxins (Maragos
26
27 2002), citrinin (Xu et al. 2006).

28
29
30
31
32
33 By analogy with chromatographic methods, the new trend is the development of multi-
34
35 mycotoxin screening methods. This review summarizes immunochemical methods for rapid
36
37 mycotoxin analysis with focus on multiple analyte determination. State of the art and
38
39 perspectives for multiple mycotoxin detection are described in comparison with existing multi-
40
41 methods for other groups of low molecular analytes. Both instrumental and non-instrumental
42
43 immunochemical methods are presented.
44
45
46
47
48

49 **Instrumental methods**

50
51
52
53
54 To obtain quantitative or semi-quantitative results immunochemical methods, based on relatively
55
56 simple equipment (microplate reader, luminometer, capillary electrophoresis system, etc.) are
57
58 usually used. Contrary to chromatographic methods, immunoassay is usually combined with a
59
60 simple extraction, pre-concentration and clean-up procedure, or often without pre-concentration

1
2 and clean-up. The most frequently used approaches for mycotoxin immunoassay are binding of
3
4 specific antibodies to a solid support (direct competitive enzyme-linked immunosorbent assay
5
6 (ELISA) format) or coated antigens (indirect competitive ELISA format). These formats are
7
8 realized in all non-homogenic assays: microtiterplate immunoassays and sensors. Homogenic
9
10 assays are represented by fluorescent polarization immunoassay and capillary electrophoretic
11
12 immunoassay.
13
14

15 16 17 18 *Microtiter plate enzyme-linked immunosorbent assays* 19

20
21
22
23
24 The microtiter plate ELISA format is commonly used as a rapid test for mycotoxins. ELISA tests
25
26 are commercially available for the determination of individual mycotoxins (Aflatoxin B₁, (AfB₁)
27
28 aflatoxin M₁ (AfM₁), deoxynivalenol (DON), OTA, ZEA, T-2 toxin, citrinin) in some foodstuffs
29
30 as well as for groups of mycotoxins, e.g. aflatoxins (B₁, B₂, G₁, G₂), fumonisins (B₁, B₂ and B₃)
31
32 and trichothecenes. They are useful tools for screening and quantification and offer benefits with
33
34 respect to speed and sensitivity. Adaptability of the standard ELISA procedure for individual or
35
36 groups of related mycotoxins determination depends on the cross-reactivity of the antibodies. For
37
38 rare mycotoxins in special matrices ELISAs are under development. An ELISA was developed
39
40 for satratoxin G and other macrocyclic trichothecenes associated with indoor air (Chung et al.
41
42 2003).
43
44
45
46
47

48 Different approaches are used for simultaneous determination of several analytes. The
49
50 multiple label method for simultaneous analyte detection is not widespread. The possibility to
51
52 determine two different analytes in one tube using a direct ELISA format was shown for the
53
54 thyroid hormones thyroxin and triiodothyronine using conjugates with two different enzyme
55
56 labels – alkaline phosphatase and β-D-galactosidase (Blake et al. 1982). But this approach is not
57
58 prevalent, mainly because the optimal conditions for enzymatic reactions are different.
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

At present two main ways for multiassay with ELISA exist: by using antibodies with suitable cross-reactivities for the determination of groups of related compounds and also by application of antibodies to different compounds in separate rows in one ELISA plate. Determination of the total concentration of related compounds (total aflatoxins, total fumonisins) can be realized using one antibody with high cross-reaction to all representatives of the target group of mycotoxins. Recently, a competitive direct and indirect ELISA format was developed using a monoclonal antibody specific for an acetylated form of DON, but also showing sensitivity and cross-reactivity for nivalenol (NIV), DON and some DON derivatives (Maragos et al. 2006). Also, application of several antibodies with different cross-reaction allows to differentiate and to quantify the individual concentration of cross-reacting analytes using different mathematical models. This approach was developed for the determination of triazine herbicides and their metabolites (Wortberg et al. 1995, 1996; Jones et al. 1996; Muldoon et al. 1993; Bhand et al. 2005) and also for the determination of 2,4-dinitro-phenol and 4-nitrophenol (Nistor et al. 2004). We suppose that this approach can also be successfully realized for AfB1 determination in the presence of other aflatoxins, DON in the presence of NIV, T-2 toxin in the presence of HT-2 toxin, etc.

In the literature we did not find any example of determination of multiple non-cross-reacting mycotoxins by ELISA using the second multi-assay approach (application of antibodies for different compounds in separate rows of one ELISA plate). For other compounds however we did. A single qualitative ELISA format, based on the application of three different polyclonal antibodies (anti-azaperol, anti-propionylpromazine and anti-carazolol) was developed for the rapid screening of sedatives including butyrophenone, azaperone, phenothiazines acepromazine, propionylpromazine, chlorpromazine and the β -blocker carazolol (Cooper et al. 2004). An analogous approach was used in a multi-antibiotic ELISA for screening five banned antimicrobial growth promoters. In this test kit four polyclonal antibodies were applied: anti-bacitracin, anti-olaquinox and anti-virginiamycin were used for the detection of the

1
2 corresponding antibiotics while the anti-spiramycin antibody was also used for tylosin as this
3
4 antibody showed high cross reactivity with tylosin (Situ and Elliot 2005; Situ et al. 2006).
5
6
7

8 9 *Immunosensors*

10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
Immunosensors are devices based on the detection of analyte-antibody interactions. When biological molecules specifically interact, changes in physicochemical parameters are generated and are electronically sensed (Marco et al. 1995; Patel, 2002; Tothill, 2001). To transform this interaction to an analytical signal suitable for analyte concentration measurement, three main groups of sensors have been developed: luminescent/colourimetric sensors, surface plasmon resonance sensors and electrochemical sensors. They are mainly based on different ELISA formats and use automated flow devices. Usually the term biosensor implies reversibility or real-time readout. The analytical cycle includes steps of competition (not for the non-competitive format), immunocomplex capture, display (for enzyme labels), and sensor regeneration, all operations being carried out automatically (Gonzalez-Martinez et al. 2001). As for other rapid immunoassays, the sensor is usually combined with a simple methanol (or acetonitrile) - water-extraction of mycotoxins from food samples.

Colourimetric and luminescent sensors. Colourimetric and luminescent sensors are based on the visible or UV light transformation into the analytical signal. These sensors use different supports – microbeads, waveguides or optical fibers.

A colourimetric sensor was developed for AfB1 detection using the direct competitive ELISA principle with anti-AfB1 antibodies bound to polymethylmethacrylate microbeads as the solid support. As enzymatic label alkaline phosphatase was used. The colour development was measured with a spectrometer by reading the absorbance across the beads at 620 nm. This method could detect AfB1 down to a level of 0.2 ng/mL in artificially contaminated food

1 materials, which is comparable to the sensitivity of a microtitre plate ELISA (Garden and
2 Strachen, 2001).
3
4

5
6
7 Fluorescent sensors for mycotoxin determination are more frequently described. They
8 have been realized for mycotoxin detection in three different formats: a direct competitive format,
9 based on the fluorescence of a special label, an indirect competitive format with labelled
10 fluorescent antibodies and a non-competitive format, based on the native fluorescence of the
11 mycotoxin molecules. In comparison with the colourimetric sensor, fluorescent labelling speeds
12 up the assay time by eliminating the need for substrate addition and colour development.
13
14
15
16
17
18
19

20
21 A sensor, based on the competitive direct ELISA format was developed for FB1
22 determination in corn. Monoclonal antibodies were covalently bound through a
23 heterobifunctional silane to an etched 800 μm core optical fiber. The analytical signal was
24 generated by the fluorescence intensity of fluorescein isothiocyanate (FITC) -labelled fumonisin
25 derivatives. This sensor showed a working range of 10 - 1000 ng of FB1/mL, a midpoint of
26 dynamic range of 70 ng/mL, and a limit of detection of 10 ng/mL. (Thompson and Maragos,
27 1996; Maragos and Thompson, 1999). A completely automated flow-through immunosensor
28 with fluorescence detection, based on the direct competitive ELISA format, was developed for
29 ZEA detection. For standard solutions the immunosensor showed a dynamic range from 0.019 to
30 0.422 ng/mL and a detection limit of 0.007 ng/mL. Corn, wheat, and swine feed samples were
31 analyzed with this device after extraction of ZEA using accelerated solvent extraction (Urraca et
32 al. 2005).
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48

49 The possibility to apply immunosensors with horseradish peroxidase (HRP) as a
50 fluorescent label for multi-analyte format was tested for the simultaneous determination of the
51 insecticide carbaril, the herbicide atrazine and the antifouling agent irgarol 1051 as model targets.
52 It was shown that this approach with one fluorescent label allowed to only determine the total
53 concentration of analyte (Gonzalez-Martinez et al. 2001).
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Fluorescent biosensors using the indirect competitive ELISA principle were developed for AfB1 (Strachan et al. 1997) and ZEA (Carter et al. 2000). FITC fluorescence intensity was measured. The immunosensor allowed detecting AfB1 down to a level of 4 ng/g in reference food materials such as nut puree, peanuts, pistachio. This approach is suitable for both fluorescent and non-fluorescent analytes and can be applied for multiple mycotoxin assays if separate zones of beads with conjugates for different analytes are used.

An array biosensor system was developed for simultaneous, multiplexed detection of OTA, FB1, AfB1 and DON. NeutrAvidin slides patterned with biotinylated analogs of the mycotoxins allowed realizing a one-step indirect competitive assay in the flow cell. A biotinylated secondary antibody lane was also added on the planar waveguides as a positive control. The slides were then exposed to a mixture of various combinations of mycotoxin standards and Cy5-labelled anti-mycotoxin antibodies. The ability to run both sandwich and competitive immunoassay formats on a single waveguide surface was also shown. This allowed the user to monitor for both large and small molecular weight food contaminants simultaneously (Sapsford et al. 2006). An analogous array biosensor was developed using a single waveguide for the detection of multiple toxins (staphylococcal enterotoxin B, ricin, cholera toxin, botulinum toxoids, trinitrotoluene, and also FB1). For the different analytes various immunoassay formats were used. For FB1 detection biotinylated FB1 was immobilized on the waveguide surface. FB1 in solution competed with the immobilized FB1 for binding to the Cy5-labelled fluorescent antibodies. Decreased fluorescence indicated the presence of fumonisin in the samples. For the large analytes the sandwich format was used (Ligler et al 2003).

Non-competitive formats suppose binding of target mycotoxins without competition with a labelled molecule. No competition between reagents and absence of washing steps simplify the assay. The main restriction here is the presence of native fluorescence of mycotoxins. Because the fluorescence of the mycotoxin itself is detected, the response of the sensor is directly proportional to the analyte concentration. This approach was used for AfB1 detection (Maragos

1 and Thompson, 1999). Carter et al. (1997) compared the sensitivity of several fiber-optic
2 approaches for AfB1 detection in peanut extract with ELISA: indirect competitive ELISA
3 showed an LOD at 0.1 ng/mL, the same format, transferred to a fiber-optic detection system had
4 an LOD for AfB1 at 5 ng/mL. Replacement of the enzymatic alkaline phosphatase label by FITC
5 allowed to increase the sensitivity up to 1 ng/mL. The native fluorescence-based sensor was
6 found to be the most sensitive format with an LOD of 0.05 ng/mL. Since many mycotoxins have
7 their own fluorescence (aflatoxins, OTA, ZEA, citrinin) this approach could be expanded for
8 their simultaneous determination. Separate signals could be obtained by using specific locations
9 of the antibodies on the waveguide or by spectral selection. The disadvantage of this approach,
10 however, is the sensitivity of the signal to the refractive index of the sample solution.

11 To our knowledge chemiluminescent sensors have not yet been applied for multiple
12 mycotoxin analysis, however they show good potentials for multianalyte detection.
13 Chemiluminescence could provide high sensitivity, while no excitation source or additional
14 optics are necessary. A parallel affinity sensor array (PASA) using chemiluminescent labels
15 (peroxidase/luminol) was developed for detection of triazine herbicides. Reagents such as
16 antibodies or hapten conjugates were immobilized on a glass slide, which formed a biochip.
17 Direct and indirect competitive immunoassay formats were developed with detection limits at 20
18 ng/L terbutylazine (Weller et al. 1999).

19 For the simultaneous determination of cross-reacting analytes the same approach as for
20 microtiterplate ELISA was used, e.g. the application of different antibodies and mathematical
21 analysis of results. Five separately immobilized antibodies with different cross-reactivity towards
22 s-triazines were used in combination with neural network to identify and estimate amounts of
23 atrazine, terbutylazine and ametryn (Samsonova et al. 1999). An approach for identification of
24 cross-reacting analytes on the base of PASA was described for triazines as a model substance
25 class. Samples of atrazine, terbutylazine and simazine at a concentration level of 0.1 mg/L, and
26 deethylatrazine at 0.3 mg/L were quantified (Winklmaier et al. 1999).

1
2 Thus, although luminescent sensors allow spectral discrimination of compounds, separate
3 disposition of immunoreagents for individual compounds serves as more practical use for
4 miniaturization, process standardization, and consequently shows more perspectives for multiple
5 mycotoxin determination.
6
7
8
9

10
11
12
13
14 *Surface plasmon resonance sensors.* Surface plasmon resonance (SPR) is an optical
15 phenomenon used to measure changes on the surface of thin metal films (usually Au or Ag)
16 under conditions of total internal reflection (Homola et al. 1999). This principle allows the direct
17 detection of the biological interaction without labelling any of the interactants. In contrast to
18 fluorescence sensors, based on different kind of equipment, almost all present-day SPR sensors
19 for mycotoxins are based on Biacore sensors (Biacore AB, Uppsala, Sweden). Immunoassay
20 formats for the SPR sensor are similar to the ones described above: indirect competitive ELISA,
21 in which antigen is attached to the metal surface, direct competitive ELISA or non-competitive
22 format with attached antibodies. Because most mycotoxins have a low molecular mass, the mass
23 change caused by binding to the surface could be too small to result in a significant change in
24 refractive characteristics. Therefore, for mycotoxin quantification indirect methods with antigen-
25 modified surfaces have mostly been used.
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41

42 Sensitivity of SPR sensors and microtiter plate ELISAs were compared for AfB1 using
43 the same immunoreagents (polyclonal antibody and AfB1-BSA conjugate). In contrast to ELISA
44 (12 – 25000 ng/mL) the SPR sensor (3.0 – 49 ng/mL) had a more sensitive, but narrow, linear
45 range of detection (Daly et al. 2000). Van der Gaag et al. (1999) developed an assay for the
46 detection of AfB1 in spiked grain samples based on commercially available monoclonal
47 antibodies with a detection level of 0.2 ng/mL.
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55

56 For SPR sensors, as for other sensor types, one of the critical characteristics is the
57 regeneration process. If the antibody has high affinity, the regeneration solution cannot
58 completely remove the bound antibody from the sensor surface immobilized with hapten–protein
59
60

1
2 conjugates. Application of single chain antibody fragments instead of antibodies for AfB1
3
4 determination allowed to simplify the regeneration procedure and to make regeneration
5
6 conditions less stringent (Dunne et al. 2005). A similar approach allowed to detect AfB1 at a
7
8 level of 3 ng/g in grain sample extracts (Daly et al. 2002).
9

10
11 For DON rapid screening in wheat samples polyclonal antibodies were used. Additional
12
13 clean-up of extracts using MycoSep™ columns was necessary (Schnerr et al. 2002). Authors
14
15 mention that in beer DON could be analysed after degassing, without other preparations. Similar
16
17 sensitivity was reached for DON determination with monoclonal antibody. Wheat samples were
18
19 only filtered and diluted. No significant loss of surface activity was observed after more than 500
20
21 injection and determination cycles (Tudos et al. 2003). Fumonisin molecules have a larger
22
23 molecular weight than other mycotoxins. This allows using the non-competitive format with
24
25 bound antibody for direct fumonisin determination. This approach was realized with a home-
26
27 made sensor by Mullett et al. (1998) with a detection limit of 50 ng/mL.
28
29
30
31
32

33 For the simultaneous determination of AfB1, ZEA, DON and FB1 with LODs of 0.2,
34
35 0.01, 0.5 and 50 ng/g, respectively, an inhibitive sensor format with four serial connected flow
36
37 cells was developed (van der Gaag et al. 2003). Different procedures were used for immobilizing
38
39 mycotoxins on the sensor chip. DON was immobilized with BSA as a carrier protein, for FB1
40
41 aminocaproic acid was used as a spacer, while AfB1 and ZEA were immobilized after chemical
42
43 activation. Mycotoxins were extracted with acetonitrile–water (90/10 v/v), cleaned with a
44
45 Mycosep 224 MFC column and 10 times diluted. Before injection into the sensor, the sample
46
47 extract was mixed with the four mycotoxin-specific antibodies. Extraction and clean-up of the
48
49 sample required approximately 15 min. Additionally, the measurement took 10 min, including
50
51 regeneration of the sensor chip surface, making a total of approximately 25 min for the
52
53 simultaneous determination of four mycotoxins in a single sample.
54
55
56
57
58

59 Contrary to luminescent sensors and common immunoassay methods, the SPR approach
60
does not require special labels and therefore sorption by non-specific interactions could occur

1
2 and interfere under conditions of real sample analysis. This demands additional clean-up steps,
3
4 which make the analysis more complicate and extensive. Besides, since no signal enhancement is
5
6 included in SPR, the test sensitivity is relatively low compared with enzyme or fluorescence
7
8 immunoassays.
9

10
11
12
13
14 *Electrochemical sensors.* Electrochemical immunosensors for mycotoxins are usually
15
16 based on the competitive ELISA principle. Electrochemical transducers allow detecting redox
17
18 labels directly. In the indirect competitive ELISA format the immunosensor strip, coated with
19
20 analyte-protein conjugate was incubated with a small volume (few μL) of sample (or standard)
21
22 solution and specific antibody. The amount of antibody that reacted with the immobilised analyte,
23
24 was evaluated using a secondary antibody labelled with alkaline phosphatase. The enzyme
25
26 activity was detected by adding 1-naphthyl phosphate substrate resulting in the production of the
27
28 electrochemically active product, 1-naphthol. In the direct competitive ELISA format the
29
30 working electrode was coated with antibody. Competition was run between analyte and analyte-
31
32 enzyme conjugate. Finally activity of the enzymatic product 1-naphthol was detected.
33
34
35
36

37
38 An indirect competitive ELISA based screen-printed electrode was developed for simple
39
40 and fast measurement of AfB1 in barley using differential pulse voltammetry. LOD for AfB1
41
42 determination with this sensor was 30 pg/mL. It was near to the LOD of a spectrophotometric
43
44 ELISA with the same immunoreagents (20 pg/mL) (Ammida et al. 2004, 2006). Screen-printed
45
46 electrodes were also developed for OTA determination in wine (Alarcon et al. 2004) and wheat
47
48 (Alarcon et al. 2006). Direct and indirect competitive ELISA formats were compared and the
49
50 direct format was shown as more sensitive: working range was at 0.05–2.5 ng/mL in comparison
51
52 with 0.1–7.5 ng/mL in the indirect format. A similar sensor, based on direct competitive ELISA,
53
54 was used for AfM1 detection in milk. The screen-printed electrode exhibited linearity between
55
56 30 and 240 pg/mL for direct AfM1 detection in milk following a simple centrifugation step but
57
58 without dilution or other pretreatment steps. The total assay time was about 75 min (Micheli et al.
59
60

1
2 2005). Screen-printed carbon electrodes in direct competitive ELISA format was used for AfB1
3
4 detection. Using this electrochemical immunosensor, a calibration plot for AFB1 was obtained
5
6 over the concentration range 0.15 to 2.5 ng/mL, giving a detection limit of around 0.15 ng/mL in
7
8 buffer solution (Pemberton et al. 2006).
9

10
11 While redox labels are attached to reagents, immobilised at the sensor surface, enzyme
12 activity leads to soluble products. This is an obstacle for detection at multiple sites (for multiple
13 analytes) in one reaction vessel. This problem may be overcome by the use of microelectrode
14 arrays or other miniaturised transducer structures (Brecht and Abuknesha, 1995). Pemberton et al.
15 (2006) mentioned that an array configuration of the AfB1 sensor is suitable for use in
16 conjunction with 96-well microtiter plates; indeed, each step of the immunoassay was performed
17 by dipping the electrodes into microwells. These results represent the initial studies towards the
18 development of an automated instrument for multi-analyte determination using immunosensor
19 arrays for mycotoxin detection. Therefore, it can be concluded that electrochemical sensors in
20 array format are a high promising approach towards rapid, automated multi-mycotoxin analysis.
21 One of the goals of the European FP6 project BioCop is the development of electrochemical
22 sensors for rapid trichothecene analysis and first results can already be found on the website
23 (www.biocop.org).
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44

45 *Fluorescence polarization immunoassay*

46
47
48

49 Contrary to the methods described above, fluorescence polarization immunoassay (FPIA) is a
50 homogeneous method; it functions without attachment of immunoreagents to solid surfaces. In
51 this format, the analyte is labelled with a fluorophore, usually fluorescein. Free analyte and
52 labelled analyte (tracer) compete for specific antibody-binding sites in solution. The analytical
53 signal is the value of fluorescence polarization of the fluorescein label, which corresponds to the
54 rate of its rotation in solution. Free tracer is a small mobile molecule with a high rate of rotation.
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2 Tracer bound to antibody has a lower rate of rotation and, consequently, a higher fluorescence
3 polarization value. Therefore the polarization value is inversely proportional to the amount of
4 free analyte present in the sample (Figure 1).
5
6
7

8
9 As separation of free and antibody-bound analyte is not necessary in FPIA and equilibrium
10 time is usually very short, the test procedure is relatively simple, without any washing steps.
11 Polarization measurement may be performed using portable equipment. Sometimes kinetics of
12 interactions can be relatively slow and incubation time can greatly affect the assay sensitivity.
13 For DON determination with monoclonal antibodies the midpoints for the competition curves
14 ranged from 0.03 $\mu\text{g/mL}$ with a 15 s incubation to $> 1\mu\text{g/mL}$ with a 12 min incubation (Maragos
15 et al. 2002). Using another antibody clone with new DON-fluorescein tracer improved the
16 kinetics, resulting in shorter interaction time (Maragos and Plattner, 2002). With the same
17 antibody clone Lippolis et al. (2006) developed a method for the rapid quantification of DON in
18 durum wheat kernels, semolina, and pasta at levels foreseen by existing international regulations.
19 A background signal was observed in both spiked and naturally contaminated samples, strictly
20 depending on the testing matrix. After subtracting the background DON level, accurate
21 quantification of DON was possible at levels greater than 0.10 $\mu\text{g/g}$ for all matrices.
22 Comparative analyses of naturally contaminated samples performed by FPIA and HPLC-Fl
23 methods showed a good correlation ($r > 0.995$) (Lippolis et al. 2006). FPIA also allowed
24 screening FB1 in maize samples with an LOD at 0.5 $\mu\text{g/g}$ (Maragos et al. 2001). FPIA for
25 aflatoxin determination with monoclonal antibodies was developed for naturally contaminated
26 corn, sorghum, peanut butter and peanut paste. The assay could be used as a screening method
27 for aflatoxin analysis in the range of 5 - 200 ppb and showed good agreement with HPLC-Fl.
28 (Nasir and Jolley, 2002). Dynamic range of FPIA for OTA determination in barley was from 5 to
29 200 ng/mL with midpoint at 39 ng/mL and LOD at 3 ng/mL (Shim et. al. 2004). Maragos and
30 Kim (2004) developed FPIA for ZEA in maize. The assay could be used to detect as little as 0.11
31 $\mu\text{g/g}$ maize within 10 min, including extraction time.
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2 The analytical signal in FPIA is measured like a mean characteristic of the solution
3 (namely the fluorescence polarization value). Therefore it cannot be used for simultaneous
4 detection of several individual analytes in a single tube. FPIA only allows detecting a signal,
5 related to the presence of one or more compounds without discrimination. In this respect FPIA
6 was used for urine screening for multiple drugs of abuse: cocaine metabolite, amphetamine, and
7 several barbiturates (Colbert and Childerstone, 1987). However FPIA has potentials for use as an
8 array multi-immunoassay with separate tubes for simultaneous parallel detection of several
9 analytes.
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22

23 *Capillary electrophoretic immunoassay*

24
25
26
27

28 Capillary electrophoretic immunoassay (CEIA) allows combining separation of analytes from
29 each other and from sample matrix, with high specificity of antibodies and sensitive detection
30 such as laser induced fluorescence detection (LIF) (Bao, 1997; Yeung et al. 2003). Like FPIA,
31 CEIA is performed without a supporting phase, e.g. in solution. Besides, CEIA uses a similar set
32 of reagents as for FPIA, e.g. specific antisera and fluorescein-labeled tracers. The assay
33 procedure includes the incubation of extract or liquid sample with antibody solution and tracer
34 and then application of a tiny aliquot (nL to pL) of this mixture onto the capillary. Separation of
35 the unbound fluorescent tracer and the antibody-tracer complex occurs as a result of the
36 electrophoretic forces. LIF detection allows obtaining peak areas proportional to the fluorescein
37 labelled analyte concentrations. In the case of absence of free analyte, all tracer is bound to the
38 antibody, so the signal (peak area) of non-bound tracer is minimal, while the signal of the
39 complex is maximal. If analyte is present in the sample, the peak area of the non-bound tracer
40 increases, while the signal of bound tracer decreases.
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57

58 The combination of CE with immunoassay was used for the analysis of fumonisins in
59 maize. Fumonisin standards could be analyzed with this technique with a total analysis time of 6
60 min, 2 min of which were required for washing the capillary between analyses. In optimal

1
2 conditions the midpoint of dynamic range was between 500 and 1700 ng/mL of FB1. The
3
4 technique was able to detect FB1 in corn samples spiked with high levels of FB1 (> 10,000 ng/g)
5
6 (Maragos, 1997). The author concluded that sensitivity in this format highly depended on the
7
8 relative affinity of the antibody for fumonisin and the tracer under conditions of high electric
9
10 field strength.
11
12

13
14 The advantage of CEIA is the integration of the separation step in this technique. So, a
15
16 simultaneous multi-component analysis is possible due to the high resolving power of capillary
17
18 electrophoresis. Standard or sample is added to a mixture of specific antibodies and tracers. This
19
20 approach was applied in the clinical assay area for detection of some drugs and drugs of abuse.
21
22 Simultaneous determination of methotrexate and vancomycin was described by Suzuki et al.
23
24 (2003). Multianalyte capillary electrophoretic immunoassay was developed for methadone,
25
26 opiates, benzoylecgonine (cocaine metabolite) and amphetamines (Caslavaska et al. 1999;
27
28 Thormann et al. 2000). For morphine and phencyclidine determination in urine samples cyanine
29
30 dyes were used as fluorescent labels: morphine was derivatized with Cy5 , phencyclidine with
31
32 Cy5.5 (Chen and Evangelista, 1994).
33
34
35
36

37
38 As evidenced by the foregoing, CEIA provides good possibilities for multiassay and its
39
40 expansion in the food control area e.g. for multiple mycotoxin determination can be expected.
41
42

43 44 **Non-instrumental methods**

45
46
47
48
49 In the last decade there has been a continuous growth in development of rapid methods for
50
51 mycotoxin analysis. Moreover, non-instrumental rapid screening techniques which could be used
52
53 outside the laboratory environment, at the place of sampling, are becoming more and more
54
55 important. Indeed, results are expected immediately, so that commodities can be further
56
57 processed without delay. Additionally, quantification of the toxin concentration is not always
58
59
60

1
2 necessary as the first step of an analytical survey, and a simple presence/absence test can be
3
4 sufficient.
5

6
7 The non-instrumental estimation of results is based on visual evaluation. So, different
8
9 visual labels are used, such as enzymes for catalytic enzymatic reactions, colloidal gold,
10
11 fluorescent labels and liposomes, encapsulating a visible dye. As in instrumental-based methods,
12
13 the basic immunoassay formats used in non-instrumental tests for determination of mycotoxins
14
15 are direct or indirect competitive ELISAs. Non-instrumental tests usually give qualitative results
16
17 as positive/negative (Yes/No), characterizing the presence (or absence) of the target analyte in
18
19 concentrations higher than the fixed cut-off level. The cut-off level can be established on the
20
21 basis of either noticeably reducing of colour development or complete colour suppression. Some
22
23 tests assume semiquantitative estimation on the basis of the colour intensity. To make
24
25 interpretation of results easier, special control zones have been included in the majority of
26
27 present-day tests. All rapid tests with visual estimation of results are combined with a simple
28
29 sample preparation procedure: extraction with methanol or methanol / water (or buffer) mixture,
30
31 filtering and dilution with buffer.
32
33
34
35
36

37
38 Commercially available test kits for mycotoxin determination are presented on the
39
40 website of AOAC International (www.aoac.org) and of the European Mycotoxin Awareness
41
42 Network EMAN (www.mycotoxins.org). In this section three types of membrane-based tests and
43
44 one type of gel-based tests are examined.
45
46
47
48

49 *Lateral flow tests*

50
51
52

53 Lateral flow tests, also called immunochromatographic strip (ICS) tests, are unique rapid
54
55 and user-friendly test formats which need neither instrument nor additional chemicals or
56
57 handling steps. Usually, the lateral flow strip consists of 3 parts: conjugate pad, porous
58
59 membrane and absorbent pad. After application on the conjugate pad, the liquid components of
60
the assay move along the membrane by capillary flow to the absorbent pad. Lateral flow devices

1
2 can be made in several forms depending upon which reagent is labelled (the antigen or the
3
4 antibody) and the type of the label.
5

6
7 The most popular label for the ICS test is colloidal gold. Particles of colloidal gold with a
8
9 40 nm diameter provide binding zones with red colour. For assay realisation colloidal gold-
10
11 labelled specific antibodies are deposited on the conjugate pad (Figure 2). The test line (or lines
12
13 in the case of multiassay) is coated on the membrane with analyte-carrier protein (such as BSA)
14
15 conjugate. To simplify the result interpretation, a control line is used as a secondary zone, coated
16
17 with antibody, above the test line. Liquid sample material (or sample extract), applied on the
18
19 sample pad, dissolves colloidal-gold labelled specific antibodies and carries them along the
20
21 membrane. When target analyte is present in the sample, the specific antibodies bind it. The
22
23 whole complex migrates along the membrane and binds with the secondary antibodies on the
24
25 control line. If the analyte is absent, the labelled specific antibodies bind to the analyte-BSA
26
27 conjugate on the test line. So, absence of analyte results in red colour both for test line (lines)
28
29 and control line. In the presence of target analyte (analytes) above the cut-off value only the
30
31 control line is red.
32
33
34
35
36

37
38 Lateral flow devices with colloidal gold labels are commercially available for aflatoxins,
39
40 DON, T-2 toxin, OTA and ZEA. Assay sensitivity can be improved by using a portable hand-
41
42 held instrument for quantification. Further, ICS tests with colloidal gold labels are described in
43
44 literature. A one-step lateral flow dipstick was developed for FB1 using polyclonal antibodies.
45
46 Matrix effects were tested for corn, barley, peanuts, oats, rice and sorghum, and interference was
47
48 completely eliminated by a 15-fold dilution of the sample extract with buffer solution (Wang et
49
50 al. 2006). For OTA detection an ICS based on monoclonal antibodies was developed with a
51
52 detection limit of 500 ng/mL in buffer solutions (Cho et al. 2005). The same format was used for
53
54 AfB1 detection in pig feed with colloidal gold labeled monoclonal anti-AfB1 antibodies. In
55
56 optimal conditions the limit of detection, resulting in no colour on the test line, was at 5 ng/g
57
58 AfB1 (Delmulle et al. 2005). Comparison of membrane-based immunoassays with colloidal gold
59
60

1
2 labels to a rapid variant (20 min) of a microtiter ELISA with HRP label for FB1 determination
3
4 was realized by Wang et al. (2006), and this in similar conditions with the same immunoreagents.
5
6 Lateral flow and flow-through formats had a visual detection limit of 1.0 ng/mL, so only two
7
8 times higher than the ELISA format (0.5 ± 0.2 ng/mL).
9

10
11 A colloidal carbon - antibody conjugate, which resulted in black lines, was tested as label
12
13 for sporidesmin A ICS determination, but its sensitivity was less (25 ng/mL) than for colloidal
14
15 gold conjugate (up to 4 ng/mL) (Collin et al. 1998). Labelling with polystyrene microspheres
16
17 was proved unsuitable for use in ICS due to non-specific attachment of microspheres to protein
18
19 bands on the ICS membrane (Collin et al. 1998). A two-step procedure for AfB1 detection was
20
21 developed using a label with visible dye sulforodamine B, encapsulated into
22
23 dipalmitoylphosphatidyl derivatives liposomes. Firstly the ICS test was inserted into a test tube
24
25 with standard solution. After 3 min it was transferred to another test tube with AfB1 labeled with
26
27 liposome. The second step was needed because liposomes are instable in the presence of organic
28
29 solvent, usually used for extraction of mycotoxins (Ho and Wauchope, 2002).
30
31
32
33
34

35 A lateral flow device using an enzymatic marker, e.g. a lateral flow ELISA, needs additional
36
37 steps (washing steps) but allows improving sensitivity. It was shown that at the same conditions
38
39 of immunoassay, enzymes in the presence of chromogenic substrate could provide a 10 times
40
41 better sensitivity than with colloidal gold labels (Zhang et al. 2006).
42
43
44

45 To our knowledge, ICS tests for multiple mycotoxin determination have not yet been
46
47 developed up to this moment, but multi-analyte ICS exist for two insecticides. For simultaneous
48
49 determination of carbaril and endosulfan, the sample solution was incubated with colloidal gold
50
51 labeled anti-carbaril and anti-endosulfan antibodies and pipetted on the sample application site.
52
53 After the liquid migrated toward the two test lines and the control line, different intensities of
54
55 colour on the test lines could be visually observed (Zhang et al. 2006). This gives confidence in
56
57 the possibility to also apply multianalyte ICS tests for mycotoxin detection.
58
59
60

Dipstick tests

Dipstick or strip or dot-ELISA assay is usually based on a membrane with a spot (or spots) of the specific antibody and needs several assay steps. According to the direct competitive ELISA scheme, the dipstick with attached antibody is placed in different solutions containing the sample, the analyte-enzyme conjugate and then the chromogenic substrate.

A two step dipstick was established for 15-acetylDON (15-acDON). The dipstick with one antibody zone was applied to a mixture of sample solution and 15-acDON-HRP conjugate, and then it was transferred to the chromogenic substrate solution. A separate dipstick was used as negative control. The detection limit in buffer solution was 5 ng/mL – more than 10 times higher than with a microtiter plate ELISA (0.35 ng/mL). At this toxin level the dot colour development was sufficiently reduced in comparison with the negative control. No colour development was detected at 20 - 25 ng/mL (Usleber et al. 1993). A similar dipstick was established for T-2 toxin in wheat. In optimal conditions a visible LOD was at 0.25 ng/mL in buffer solution. Colour development was completely suppressed at 3 ng/mL T-2 toxin. It was possible to make visually a clear distinction between the negative control and a wheat extract spiked with 12 ng/g T-2 toxin (De Saeger and Van Peteghem, 1996). To integrate the negative control into the dipstick, anti-HRP antibody was used. A dipstick for FB1 determination contained two lines: one with anti-FB1 antibodies and a control line with anti-HRP antibodies. The anti-HRP antibodies bound FB1-HRP in a non-competitive format. After substrate application, colour developed on two lines (Schneider et al. 1995a).

More multianalyte dipsticks for mycotoxin determination were reported in comparison with other non-instrumental immunoassays. On one dipstick five specific antibody solutions (anti-AfB1, T-2 toxin, 3-acDON, roridin A and ZEA) were spotted onto spatially distinct zones of the membrane. To perform the competitive dipstick assay, a mix of the five toxin-HRP conjugates was added to the mycotoxins solution and the dipstick was incubated in it for 30 min.

1
2 For each dipstick, a separate negative control dipstick was prepared with five spots and put into a
3
4 negative control tube. The detection limits for spiked wheat samples were 30 ng/g for AFB1, 100
5
6 ng/g for T-2 toxin, 600 ng/g for 3-acDON, 500 ng/g for roridin A and 60 ng/g for ZEA
7
8 (Schneider et al. 1995b). Authors mentioned that the sensitivity of this multimycotoxin dipstick
9
10 was less than for single analytes. This was connected with two reasons. First: to simplify the
11
12 interpretation of results only a complete spot colour suppression was scored positive. Second:
13
14 immunoreagent concentrations were chosen to obtain equal colour intensities for all five
15
16 negative spots. Therefore, it was necessary to make some tests less sensitive compared with the
17
18 single analyte test, e.g. by using a higher concentration of the toxin-enzyme conjugate .
19
20
21
22

23 For simultaneous screening of FB1, AfB1 and ZEA a line immunoblot assay was
24
25 developed by binding the relevant antibodies to segmental sections of the membrane. The
26
27 proposed method allowed evaluating the concentration level of each mycotoxin as a result of the
28
29 application of three different dilutions for each specific antibody. Detection limits were
30
31 determined by visual comparison of positive strips and negative controls as 500, 0.5 and 3 ng/mL
32
33 for FB1, AfB1 and ZEA, respectively (Abouzied and Pestka, 1994).
34
35
36

37 Simultaneous determination of cross-reacting related compounds in dipstick format was
38
39 demonstrated for zearalenone and aflatoxin families. An immunoblot approach, called
40
41 ELISAGRAM, combined sensitivity and selectivity of ELISA with the capacity of thin layer
42
43 chromatography (TLC) to separate structurally related compounds. In the first step separation by
44
45 TLC allowed to discriminate the individual mycotoxins. The next step was blotting the TLC
46
47 plate with an antibody-coated membrane. The following steps, including the application of
48
49 conjugate, washing buffer and substrate were as in a common dipstick assay scheme (Pestka,
50
51 1991). This approach was used for separation and determination of four aflatoxins (AfB1, AfB2,
52
53 AfG1 and AfG2) and two zearalenones (ZEA and α -zearalenol). So, different formats of
54
55 dipsticks give potentials to simultaneously determine both cross-reacting and non-cross-reacting
56
57 mycotoxins.
58
59
60

Flow-through tests

Flow-through or immunofiltration assay (IFA) or enzyme-linked immunofiltration assay (ELIFA) for mycotoxins utilizes a direct competitive ELISA format, where specific antibodies are attached to a membrane. The membrane is placed on an absorbent body, which inhibits the immediate back-flow of fluids that could obscure results. The sample is added to the upper surface of the membrane where it flows through the membrane into the pad of absorbent material while analyte binds to the antibody spot on the membrane. Then the analyte-enzyme conjugate is added and bound by the remaining not-bound antibodies. The last step is the chromogenic substrate application to obtain coloured product in the presence of enzyme. Colloidal gold application as a visual label for IFA allowed avoiding chromogenic substrate application (Wang et al. 2006). But contrary to lateral flow tests, colloidal gold is not commonly used as a label for flow-through assays.

IFA for OTA detection in wheat was established using the format described above. An OTA concentration of 4 ng/g in spiked wheat completely suppressed the colour development (De Saeger and Van Peteghem, 1999). For T-2 toxin the detection limit was 50 ng/g. A collaborative study of five laboratories showed that these flow-through kits can be used for the screening of wheat, rye, maize and barley for the presence of OTA and T-2 toxin (De Saeger et al., 2002). Application of this format to AfM1 detection in both liquid and powdered milk was also described. However, immunoaffinity columns had to be used to clean-up the milk samples (Sibanda et al. 1999). IFA with internal control spots (anti-enzyme antibody) were applied for T-2 toxin detection with LOD at 50 ng/g in rye, wheat, barley and maize (Sibanda et al. 2000); for OTA with LOD at 4 ng/g in roasted coffee (Sibanda et al. 2002), at 8 ng/g in green coffee (Sibanda et al. 2001), for fumonisins with LOD at 1000 ng/g in maize (Paepens et al. 2004), with LODs determined as complete colour suppression. An IFA with LOD, determined as colour

1
2 intensity reduction, was developed for detection of FB1 at 40-60 ng/g in corn-based food
3
4 (Schneider et al. 1995a), and also for sporidesmin A with LOD at 1 ng/mL (Collin et al 1998).
5

6
7 Schneider et al. (1995a) compared dipstick and flow-through formats for FB1 and
8
9 concluded that both tests showed the same sensitivity in buffer solutions (7.5 – 10 ng/mL). These
10
11 tests however were 50 times less sensitive than the corresponding microtiter plate ELISA with
12
13 instrumental detection. For sporidesmin A determination with polyclonal antibodies it was also
14
15 shown that a direct competitive ELISA was more sensitive (LOD 0.2 ng/mL) than IFA (LOD 1.0
16
17 ng/mL), ICS (LOD 4 ng/mL) and dipstick (1 ng/mL). The lower sensitivity of a competitive
18
19 immunoassay using visual evaluation is mainly the result of the high antibody density at the
20
21 membrane dot required for sufficient colour development for a negative sample (Collin et al.
22
23 1998).
24
25
26
27

28 To increase the sensitivity of IFA some modifications were applied to flow-through tests.
29
30 In particular, to avoid limitations related to volumes of washing buffer, reagents and sample
31
32 another construction of a membrane-based test was proposed, in which the absorbent body was
33
34 not fixed to the reaction membrane. Between steps it was possible to wash with a stream of
35
36 washing buffer from a wash bottle. Adsorbent body replacement allowed applying several
37
38 portions of sample resulting in preconcentration of target analyte in the antibody spot. No
39
40 limitation in volume allowed to use signal amplification with biotinylated tyramine and avidin-
41
42 HRP conjugate for AfB1 determination. Signal amplification decreased the limit of detection
43
44 from 5 to 0.25 pg/spot (0.2 to 0.01 ng/mL) with densitometric detection (Pal and Dhar, 2004).
45
46 For the simultaneous screening of several samples for AfB1 they used four membrane strips with
47
48 four separate antibody zones for each. A similar test with 36 spots was used for membrane-based
49
50 IFA for T-2 toxin detection (Pal et al. 2004). To eliminate matrix interferences a clean-up step
51
52 was included in the assay. This allowed using less diluted sample extracts, which resulted in an
53
54 improvement of the detection limit. For AfB1 determination in groundnuts, wheat, corn, chilli,
55
56 soybean and poultry feed samples a cleaning solution, containing trifluoroacetic acid or
57
58
59
60

1
2 propionic acid or sodium bicarbonate, was applied over the immunosorbent areas of the
3
4 membrane as a part of the assay procedure (Pal et al. 2005). To improve the quality of
5
6 immunoreagent spots on the membrane, a new spotting method was developed by Saha et al.
7
8 (2006).
9

10
11 A prototype eight-well immunofiltration test device was developed for the simultaneous
12
13 determination of seven mycotoxins: AfB1, FB1, T-2 toxin, roridin A, DON, diacetoxyscirpenol
14
15 and OTA. Membranes coated with different anti-toxin antibodies were fixed to each well. Under
16
17 the membranes a cellulose layer support was attached as a filter pad. The assay procedure was
18
19 similar to one for a single mycotoxin determination, except that a mixture containing the
20
21 respective toxin–enzyme conjugates was used for all wells. Detection limits in spiked wheat
22
23 samples were at 10 ng/g (AfB1), 50 ng/g (OTA), 3500 ng/g (DON), 100 ng/g (T-2 toxin), 5 ng/g
24
25 (diacetoxyscirpenol), 250 ng/g (roridin A), and 50 ng/g (FB1), respectively (Schneider et al.
26
27 2004). As mentioned before for other types of multianalyte tests with visual detection, there was
28
29 a loss of sensitivity in comparison with single analyte determination, particularly because the
30
31 demands in assay simplification and easy interpretation did not allow the use of optimal reagent
32
33 concentrations.
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41

42 *Tandem column tests*

43
44
45
46
47 Flow-through kits have some advantages such as being easy-to-perform and rapid (assay
48
49 time 5-25 min). Compared with ICS tests, flow-trough tests usually show better sensitivity. For
50
51 some matrices however they need additional clean-up steps before analysis, such as an
52
53 immunoaffinity clean-up for AfM1 detection in milk (Sibanda et al. 1999), or a solid-phase
54
55 clean-up for OTA detection in roasted coffee (Sibanda et al. 2002).
56
57

58
59 Integration of solid-phase clean-up and immunoassay in one device was obtained by the
60
clean-up tandem immunoassay column, which contained a clean-up layer and a detection

1
2 immunolayer. As a clean-up layer aminopropyl derived silica was used. The purpose of the
3
4 clean-up layer was to reduce the extract colour intensity and to minimize matrix effects. The
5
6 detection immunolayer was a gel bound with specific antibodies and its aim was to bind and
7
8 preconcentrate the analyte. The clean-up layer could be positioned above or below the detection
9
10 immunolayer. Results were obtained as detection immunolayer colour development (for negative
11
12 result) or no colour development (for positive result) after performing a direct competitive
13
14 immunoassay. The analysis procedure itself could consist of seven (Lobeau et al, 2005; Lobeau
15
16 et al. 2007), five (Goryacheva et al. 2006) or three steps (Goryacheva et al., 2007a), including
17
18 washing steps. Clean-up tandem immunoassay columns allowed to detect OTA in strongly
19
20 coloured foodstuffs such as roasted coffee (Lobeau et al. 2005), cocoa (Lobeau et al. 2007) and
21
22 spices (Goryacheva et al. 2006). Cut-off levels for OTA detection for each matrix were
23
24 established according to EU acting or discussing limits: 2 ng/g for cocoa, 5 ng/g for roasted
25
26 coffee and 10 ng/g for spices. Assay sensitivity could be varied by changing antibody and
27
28 conjugate dilutions, and also volume of extract or liquid sample. This column design had no
29
30 limitation for volumes of liquid sample or extract, reagent and washing buffers. It allowed, in
31
32 particular, to use high extract volumes to improve assay sensitivity.
33
34
35
36
37
38
39

40 For multiple mycotoxin screening the number of detection immunolayers was increased.
41
42 For each detection immunolayer a specific antibody for the separate analyte was bound to the gel
43
44 before placing it into the column with the clean-up layer. This approach was realized for the
45
46 simultaneous detection of AfB1 and OTA in *Capsicum* spp. spices, nutmeg, ginger, black pepper
47
48 and white pepper. According to acting and discussing EU limits, cut-off levels were chosen at 5
49
50 ng/g for AfB1 and 10 ng/g for OTA (Goryacheva et al. 2007b). As for membrane-based multiple
51
52 immunoassays with visual detection, to prevent incorrect interpretation of results, time and
53
54 intensity of developed colour should be about the same for both analytes. Preliminary results
55
56 showed that for a future perspective the proposed multiassay design could be applied for up to
57
58 four analytes (unpublished data).
59
60

Conclusions

In this manuscript we have reviewed a number of rapid immunochemical methods for mycotoxin determination. Focus was put on the trend towards multiple analyte determination. It was clear that more attempts were made for other groups of low molecular contaminants. Therefore, besides the few existing multi-mycotoxin rapid methods (Table 1), other possible approaches and designs were discussed. Development of rapid multiple mycotoxin methods will allow to reduce costs and further shorten analysis time. We expect great potential from array immunosensors systems, even towards multiple food contaminants detection. Many efforts should be made on method validation for non-instrumental multiple mycotoxin tests. A great and important challenge is the development of high quality antibodies or synthetic alternatives against many different mycotoxins.

References

- Abouzed M, Pestka JJ. 1994. Simultaneous screening of fumonisin B1, aflatoxin B1 and zearalenone by line immunoblot a computer-assisted multianalyte assay system. *Journal of AOAC International* 77:495-500.
- Alarcon SH, Micheli L, Palleschi G, Compagnone D. 2004. Development of an electrochemical immunosensor for ochratoxin A. *Analytical Letters* 37:1545–1558.
- Alarcon SH, Palleschi G, Compagnone D, Pascale M, Visconti A, Barna-Vetro I. 2006. Monoclonal antibody based electrochemical immunosensor for the determination of ochratoxin A in wheat. *Talanta* 69:1031–1037.
- Ammida NHS, Micheli L, Palleschi G. 2004. Electrochemical immunosensor for determination of aflatoxin B1 in barley. *Analytica Chimica Acta* 520:159–164.
- Ammida NHS, Micheli L, Piermarini S, Moscone D, Palleschi G. 2006. Detection of aflatoxin B1 in barley: comparative study of immunosensor and HPLC. *Analytical Letters*. 39:1559–1572.
- Bao JJ. 1997. Capillary electrophoretic immunoassays. *Journal of Chromatography B* 699:463-480.
- Berthiller F, Schuhmacher R, Buttinger G, Krska R. 2005. Rapid simultaneous determination of major type A- and B-trichothecenes as well as zearalenone in maize by high performance liquid chromatography–tandem mass spectrometry. *Journal of Chromatography A* 1062:209-216.
- Bhand S, Surugiu I, Dzgoev A, Ramanathan K, Sundaram PV, Danielsson B. 2005. Immunoarrays for multianalyte analysis of chlorotriazines. *Talanta* 65:331–336.
- Biselli S, Hummert C. 2005. Development of a multicomponent method for *Fusarium* toxins using LC-MS/MS and its application during a survey for the content of T-2 toxin and deoxynivalenol in various feed and food samples. *Food Additives and Contaminants* 22:752 – 760.
- Blake C, Al-Bassam MN, Gould BJ, Marks V, Bridges JW, Riley C. 1982. Simultaneous enzyme immunoassay of two thyroid hormones. *Clinical Chemistry* 28:1469-1473.

- 1
2 Brecht A and Abuknesha R. 1995. Multi-analyte immunoassays application to environmental
3 analysis. Trends in Analytical Chemistry 14:361-371.
4
5
6
7 Carter RM, Jacobs MB, Lubrano GJ, Guilbault GG. 1997. Rapid detection of aflatoxin B-1 with
8 immunochemical optrodes. Analytical Letters 30:1465-1482.
9
10
11
12 Carter RM, Blake RC, Mayer HP, Echevarria AA, Nguyen TD, Bostanian LA. 2000. A
13 fluorescent biosensor for detection of zearalenone. Analytical Letters 33:405-412.
14
15
16
17
18 Caslavská J, Allemann D, Thormann W. 1999. Analysis of urinary drugs of abuse by a
19 multianalyte capillary electrophoretic immunoassay. Journal of Chromatography A 838:197-211.
20
21
22
23 Chen FTA, Evangelista RA. 1994. Feasibility studies for simultaneous immunochemical
24 multianalyte drug assay by capillary electrophoresis with laser-induced fluorescence. Clinical
25 Chemistry 40:1819-1822.
26
27
28
29
30 Cho YJ, Lee DH, Kim DO, Min WK, Bong KT, Lee GG, Seo JH. 2005. Production of a
31 monoclonal antibody against ochratoxin A and its application to immunochromatographic assay.
32 Journal of Agricultural and Food Chemistry 53:8447 -8451.
33
34
35
36
37 Chu FS, Li GY. 1994. Simultaneous occurrence of fumonisin B1 and other mycotoxins in moldy
38 corn collected from the People's Republic of China in regions with high incidences of
39 esophageal cancer. Applied and Environmental Microbiology 60:847-852.
40
41
42
43
44 Chung YJ, Jarvis BB, Tak H, Pestka JJ. 2003. Immunochemical assay for satratoxin G and other
45 macrocyclic trichothecenes associated with indoor air contamination by *Stachybotrys chartarum*.
46 Toxicology Mechanisms and Methods 13:247-252.
47
48
49
50
51 Colbert DL, Childerstone M. 1987. Multiple drugs of abuse in urine detected with a single
52 reagent and fluorescence polarization. Clinical Chemistry. 33:1921-1923.
53
54
55
56
57 Collin R, Schneider E, Briggs L, Towers N. 1998. Development of immunodiagnostic field tests
58 for the detection of the mycotoxin, sporidesmin A. Food and Agricultural Immunology 10:91-
59 104.
60

- 1
2 Cooper J, Delahaut P, Fodey TL, Elliott CT. 2004. Development of a rapid screening test for
3 veterinary sedatives and the beta-blocker carazolol in porcine kidney by ELISA. *Analyst*
4 129:169–174.
5
6
7
8
9 Daly SJ, Dillon PP, Manning BM, Dunne L, Killard A, O’Kennedy R. 2002. Production and
10 characterization of murine single chain fv antibodies to aflatoxin B1 derived from a pre-
11 immunized antibody phage display library system. *Food and Agricultural Immunology* 14: 255–
12 274.
13
14
15
16
17
18 Daly SJ, Keating GJ, Dillon PP, Manning BM, O’Kennedy R, Lee HA, Morgan MRA. 2000.
19 Development of surface plasmon resonance-based immunoassay for aflatoxin B-1. *Journal of*
20 *Agricultural and Food Chemistry* 48:5097-5104.
21
22
23
24
25 Delmulle B, De Saeger S, Sibanda L, Barna-Vetro I, Van Peteghem C. 2005. Development of an
26 immunoassay-based lateral flow dipstick for the rapid detection of aflatoxin B₁ in pig feed.
27 *Journal of Agricultural and Food Chemistry* 53:3364-3368.
28
29
30
31
32 Delmulle B, De Saeger S, Adams A, De Kimpe N, Van Peteghem C. 2006. Development of a
33 liquid chromatography/tandem mass spectrometry method for the simultaneous determination of
34 16 mycotoxins on cellulose filters and in fungal cultures. *Rapid Communication in Mass*
35 *Spectrometry* 20:771-776.
36
37
38
39
40
41 De Saeger S, Van Peteghem C. 1996. Dipstick enzyme immunoassay to detect *Fusarium* T-2
42 toxin in wheat. *Applied and Environmental Microbiology* 62:1880-1884.
43
44
45
46
47 De Saeger S, Van Peteghem C. 1999. Flow-through membrane-based enzyme immunoassay for
48 rapid detection of ochratoxin A in wheat. *Journal of Food Protection* 62:65-69.
49
50
51
52 De Saeger S, Sibanda L, Desmet A, Van Peteghem C. 2002. A collaborative study to validate
53 novel field immunoassay kits for rapid mycotoxin detection. *International Journal of Food*
54 *Microbiology* 75:135-142.
55
56
57
58
59 Dunne L, Daly S, Baxter A, Haughey S, O’Kennedy R. 2005. Surface plasmon resonance-based
60 immunoassay for the detection of aflatoxin B1 using single-chain antibody fragments.
Spectroscopy Letters 38:229–245.

1
2 Fazekas B, Tar A, Kovacs M. 2005. Aflatoxin and ochratoxin A content of spices in Hungary.
3
4 Food Additives and Contaminants 22:856–863.
5

6
7 Garden SR, Strachan NJC. 2001. Novel colorimetric immunoassay for the detection of aflatoxin
8
9 B1. Analytica Chimica Acta 444:187–191.
10

11
12 Gilbert J. 1999. Overview of mycotoxin methods, present status and future needs. Natural Toxins
13
14 7:347-352.
15

16
17 Gonzalez-Martinez MA, Puchades R, Maquieira A. 2001. Comparison of multianalyte
18
19 immunosensor formats for on-line determination of organic compounds. Analytical Chemistry
20
21 73:4326-4332.
22

23
24 Goryacheva IY, De Saeger S, Lobeau M, Eremin SA, Barna-Vetró I, Van Peteghem C. 2006.
25
26 Approach for ochratoxin A fast screening in spices using clean-up tandem immunoassay
27
28 columns with confirmation by high performance liquid chromatography–tandem mass
29
30 spectrometry (HPLC–MS/MS). Analytica Chimica Acta 577:38-45.
31

32
33 Goryacheva IY, De Saeger S, Nesterenko IS, Eremin SA, Van Peteghem C. 2007a. Rapid all-in-
34
35 one three-step immunoassay for non-instrumental detection of ochratoxin A in high-coloured
36
37 herbs and spices. Talanta 72:1230-1234.
38

39
40 Goryacheva IY, De Saeger S, Delmulle B, Lobeau M, Eremin SA, Barna-Vetró I, Van Peteghem
41
42 C. 2007b. Simultaneous non-instrumental detection of aflatoxin B1 and ochratoxin A using a
43
44 clean-up tandem immunoassay column. Analytica Chimica Acta 590:118-124.
45

46
47 Ho JAA, Wauchope RD. 2002. A strip liposome immunoassay for aflatoxin B1. Analytical
48
49 Chemistry 74:1493-1496.
50

51
52 Homola J, Yee SS, Gauglitz G. 1999. Surface plasmon resonance sensors: review. Sensors and
53
54 Actuators B 54:3–15.
55

56
57 Jones G, Wortberg M, Hammock BD, Rocke DM. 1996. A procedure for the immunoanalysis of
58
59 samples containing one or more members of a group of cross-reacting analytes. Analytica
60
Chimica Acta 336:175-183.

- 1
2 Koch P. 2004. State of the art of trichothecenes analysis. *Toxicology Letters* 153:109–112.
3
4 Kokkonen M, Jestoi M, Rizzo A. 2005. Determination of selected mycotoxins in mould cheeses
5 with liquid chromatography coupled to tandem with mass spectrometry. *Food Additives and*
6 *Contaminants* 22:449–456.
7
8
9
10
11 Krska R, Baumgartner S, Josephs R. 2001. The state-of-the-art in the analysis of type-A and -B
12 trichothecene mycotoxins in cereals. *Fresenius Journal of Analytical Chemistry* 371:285–299.
13
14 Krska R, Welzig E, Berthiller F, Molinelli A, Mizaikoff B. 2005. Advances in the analysis of
15 mycotoxins and its quality assurance. *Food Additives and Contaminants* 22:345–353.
16
17
18
19
20 Ligler FS, Taitt CR, Shriver-Lake LC, Sapsford KE, Shubin Y, Golden JP. 2003. Array
21 biosensor for detection of toxins. *Analytical and Bioanalytical Chemistry* 377:469-477.
22
23
24
25 Lippolis V, Pascale M, Visconti A. 2006. Optimization of a fluorescence polarization
26 immunoassay for rapid quantification of deoxynivalenol in durum wheat-based products. *Journal*
27 *of Food Protection* 69:2712-2719.
28
29
30
31
32 Lobeau M, De Saeger S, Sibanda L, Barna-Vetró I, Van Peteghem C. 2005. Development of a
33 new clean-up tandem assay column for the detection of ochratoxin A in roasted coffee. *Analytica*
34 *Chimica Acta* 538:57-61.
35
36
37
38
39 Lobeau M, De Saeger S, Sibanda L, Barna-Vetró I, Van Peteghem C. 2007. Application and
40 validation of a clean-up tandem assay column for screening ochratoxin A in cocoa powder. *Food*
41 *Additives and Contaminants* 24:398-405.
42
43
44
45
46 Maragos CM. 1997. Detection of the mycotoxin fumonisin B-1 by a combination of
47 immunofluorescence and capillary electrophoresis. *Food and Agricultural Immunology* 9:147-
48 157.
49
50
51
52
53 Maragos CM. 2002. Novel assays and sensor platforms for the detection of aflatoxins. *Advances*
54 *in Experimental Medicine and Biology* 504:85-93.
55
56
57
58
59 Maragos CM. 2004. Emerging technologies for mycotoxin detection. *Journal of Toxicology*
60 *Toxin Reviews*. 23:317–344.

- 1
2 Maragos CM, Thompson VS. 1999. Fiber-optic immunosensor for mycotoxins. *Natural Toxins*
3 7:371-376.
4
5
6
7 Maragos CM, Jolley ME, Plattner RD, Nasir MS. 2001. Fluorescence polarization as a means for
8 determination of fumonisins in maize. *Journal of Agricultural and Food Chemistry* 49:596–602.
9
10
11
12 Maragos CM, Plattner RD. 2002. Rapid fluorescence polarization immunoassay for the
13 mycotoxin deoxynivalenol in wheat. *Journal of Agricultural and Food Chemistry* 50:1827–1832.
14
15
16
17
18 Maragos CM, Jolley ME, Nasir MS. 2002. Fluorescence polarization as a tool for the
19 determination of deoxynivalenol in wheat. *Food Additives and Contaminants* 19: 400-407.
20
21
22
23 Maragos CM, Kim EK. 2004. Detection of zearalenone and related metabolites by fluorescence
24 polarization immunoassay. *Journal Food Protection* 67:1039-1043.
25
26
27
28
29 Maragos CM, Busman M, Sugita-Konishi Y. 2006. Production and characterization of a
30 monoclonal antibody that cross-reacts with the mycotoxins nivalenol and 4-deoxynivalenol.
31 *Food Additives and Contaminants* 23:816–825.
32
33
34
35
36 Marco MP, Gee S, Hammock BD. 1995. Immunochemical techniques for environmental analysis
37 I. Immunosensors. *Trends in Analytical Chemistry* 14:341-350.
38
39
40
41 Micheli L, Grecco R, Badea M, Moscone D, Palleschi G. 2005. An electrochemical
42 immunosensor for aflatoxin M1 determination in milk using screen-printed electrodes.
43 *Biosensors and Bioelectronics* 21:588–596.
44
45
46
47
48 Muldoon MT, Fries GF, Nelson JO. 1993. Evaluation of ELISA for the multianalyte analysis of
49 s-triasines in pesticide waste and rinsate. *Journal of Agricultural and Food Chemistry* 41:322-328.
50
51
52
53
54 Mullett W, Lai EPC, Yeung JM. 1998. Immunoassay of fumonisins by a surface plasmon
55 resonance biosensor. *Analytical Biochemistry* 258:161–167.
56
57
58
59 Nasir MS, Jolley ME. 2002. Development of fluorescence polarization assay for the
60 determination of aflatoxins in grains. *Journal of Agricultural and Food Chemistry* 50:3116-3121.

1
2 Nistor C, Christensen J, Ocio N, Norgaard L, Emneus J. 2004. Multivariate analysis to separate
3 the signal given by cross-reactants in immunoassay with sample matrix dilution. *Analytical and*
4 *Bioanalytical Chemistry* 380:898-907.

5
6
7
8
9 Ono EYS, Ono MA, Funo FY, Medina AE, Oliveira TCRM, Kawamura O, Ueno Y, Hirooka EY.
10 2001. Evaluation of fumonisin-aflatoxin co-occurrence in Brazilian corn hybrids by ELISA.
11 *Food Additives and Contaminants* 18:719-729.

12
13
14
15
16 Paepens C, De Saeger S, Sibanda L, Barna-Vetró I, Leglise I, Van Hove F, Van Peteghem C.
17 2004. A flow-through enzyme immunoassay for the screening of fumonisins in maize. *Analytica*
18 *Chimica Acta* 523:229–235.

19
20
21
22
23 Pal A, Acharya D, Saha D, Dhar TK. 2004. Development of a membrane-based immunofiltration
24 assay for the detection of T-2 toxin. *Analytical Chemistry* 76: 4237-4240.

25
26
27
28 Pal A, Acharya D, Saha D, Roy D, Dhar TK. 2005. In situ sample cleanup during immunoassay :
29 a simple method for rapid detection of aflatoxin B₁ in food samples. *Journal of Food Protection*.
30 68:2169-2177.

31
32
33
34
35 Pal A, Dhar TK. 2004. An analytical device for on-site immunoassay. Demonstration of its
36 applicability in semiquantitative detection of aflatoxin B₁ in a batch of samples with ultrahigh
37 sensitivity. *Analytical Chemistry* 76:98-104.

38
39
40
41
42 Park JW, Kim EK, Shon DH, Kim YB. 2002. Natural co-occurrence of aflatoxin B₁, fumonisin
43 B₁ and ochratoxin A in barley and corn foods from Korea. *Food Additives and Contaminants*
44 19:1073-1080.

45
46
47
48
49 Patel PD. 2002. (Bio)sensors for measurement of analytes implicated in food safety: a review.
50 *Trends in Analytical Chemistry* 21:96-115.

51
52
53
54
55 Pemberton RM, Pittson R, Biddle N, Drago GA, Hart JP. 2006. Studies towards the development
56 of a screen-printed carbon electrochemical immunosensor array for mycotoxins: a sensor for
57 aflatoxin B₁. *Analytical Letters* 39:1573–1586.

1
2 Pestka JJ. 1991. High performance thin layer chromatography ELISAGRAM. Application of a
3 multi-hapten immunoassay to analysis of zearalenone and aflatoxin mycotoxin families. Journal
4 of Immunological Methods 136:177-183.
5
6

7
8
9 Rundberget T, Wilkins AL. 2002. Determination of *Penicillium* mycotoxins in foods and feeds
10 using liquid chromatography–mass spectrometry. Journal of Chromatography A 964:189–197.
11
12

13
14 Saha D, Acharya D, Dhar TK. 2006. Method for homogeneous spotting of antibodies on
15 membranes: application to the sensitive detection of ochratoxin A. Analytical and Bioanalytical
16 Chemistry 385:847-854.
17
18

19
20 Samsonova JV, Rubtsova MY, Kiseleva AV, Ezhov AA, Egorov AM. 1999. Chemiluminescent
21 multiassay of pesticides with horseradish peroxidase as a label. Biosensors and Bioelectronics
22 14:273–281.
23
24

25
26 Sapsford KE, Ngundi MM, Moore MH, Lassman ME, Shriver-Lake LC, Taitt CR, Ligler FS.
27 2006. Rapid detection of foodborne contaminants using an Array Biosensor. Sensors and
28 Actuators B 113:599–607.
29
30
31

32
33
34 Schneider E, Usleber E, Märtlbauer E. 1995a. Rapid detection of Fumonisin B1 in corn-based
35 food by competitive direct dipstick enzyme immunoassay/enzyme-linked immunofiltration assay
36 with integrated negative control reaction. Journal of Agricultural and Food Chemistry 43:2548-
37 2552.
38
39
40

41
42 Schneider E, Usleber E, Märtlbauer E, Deitrich R, Terplan G. 1995b. Multimycotoxin dipstick
43 enzyme immunoassay applied to wheat. Food Additives and Contaminants 12:387-393.
44
45
46

47
48 Schneider E, Curtui V, Seidler C, Dietrich R, Usleber E, Märtlbauer E. 2004. Rapid methods for
49 deoxynivalenol and other trichothecenes. Toxicology Letters 153:113–121.
50
51
52

53
54 Schnerr H, Vogel RF, Niessen L. 2002. A biosensor-based immunoassay for rapid screening of
55 deoxynivalenol contamination in wheat. Food and Agricultural Immunology 14:313–321.
56
57

58
59 Shim WB, Kolosova AY, Kim YJ, Yang ZY, Park SJ, Eremin SA, Lee IS, Chung DH. 2004.
60 Fluorescence polarization immunoassay based on a monoclonal antibody for the detection of
ochratoxin A. International Journal of Food Science and Technology 39:829–837.

1
2
3
4 Sibanda L, De Saeger S, Van Peteghem C. 1999. Development of a portable field immunoassay
5 for the detection of aflatoxin M1 in milk. *International Journal of Food Microbiology* 48:203–
6 209.
7
8

9
10
11 Sibanda L, De Saeger S, Van Peteghem C, Grabarkiewicz-Szczesna J, Tomczak M. 2000.
12 Detection of T-2 toxin in different cereals by flow-through enzyme immunoassay with a
13 simultaneous internal reference . *Journal of Agricultural and Food Chemistry* 48:5864-5867.
14
15

16
17
18 Sibanda L, De Saeger S, Bauters TGM, Nelis HJ, Van Peteghem C. 2001. Development of a
19 flow-through enzyme immunoassay and application in screening green coffee samples for
20 ochratoxin A with confirmation by high-performance liquid chromatography. *Journal of Food*
21 *Protection* 64:1597-1602.
22
23
24

25
26
27 Sibanda L, De Saeger S, Barna-Vetro I, Van Peteghem C. 2002. Development of a solid-phase
28 cleanup and portable rapid flow-through enzyme immunoassay for the detection of ochratoxin A
29 in roasted coffee. *Journal of Agricultural and Food Chemistry* 50:6964 – 6967.
30
31
32

33
34 Situ C, Elliott CT. 2005. Simultaneous and rapid detection of five banned antibiotic growth
35 promoters by immunoassay. *Analytica Chimica Acta* 529:89–96.
36
37

38
39 Situ C, Grutters E, Van Wichen P, Elliott CT. 2006. A collaborative trial to evaluate the
40 performance of a multi-antibiotic enzyme-linked immunosorbent assay for screening five banned
41 antimicrobial growth promoters in animal feedingstuffs. *Analytica Chimica Acta* 561:62–68.
42
43

44 Sørensen LK, Elbæk TH. 2005. Determination of mycotoxins in bovine milk by liquid
45 chromatography tandem mass spectrometry. *Journal of Chromatography B* 820:183–196.
46
47
48

49
50 Strachan NJC, John PG, Millar IG. 1997. Application of an automated particle-based
51 immunosensor for the detection of aflatoxin B1 in foods. *Food and Agricultural Immunology*
52 9:177-183.
53
54

55
56
57 Sulyok M, Berthiller F, Krska R, Schuhmacher R. 2006. Development and validation of a liquid
58 chromatography/tandem mass spectrometric method for the determination of 39 mycotoxins in
59 wheat and maize. *Rapid Communication in Mass Spectrometry* 20:2649-2659.
60

- 1
2 Suzuki Y, Arakawa H, Maeda M. 2003. The immunoassay of methotrexate by capillary
3 electrophoresis with laser-induced fluorescence detection. *Analytical Sciences* 19:111-115.
4
5
6
7 Thompson VS, Maragos CM. 1996. Fiber-optic immunosensor for the detection of fumonisin B-
8 1. *Journal Agricultural and Food Chemistry* 44:1041-1046.
9
10
11
12 Thormann W, Caslavská J, Ramseier A, Siethoff C. 2000. Multianalyte capillary electrophoresis
13 assays for screening and confirmation of urinary drugs of abuse. *Journal Microcolumn*
14 *Separations* 12:13-24.
15
16
17
18
19 Tothill IE. 2001. Biosensors developments and potential applications in the agricultural
20 diagnosis sector. *Computers and Electronics in Agriculture* 30:205-218.
21
22
23
24
25 Tudos AJ, Lucas-van den Bos ER, Stigter ECA. 2003. Rapid surface plasmon resonance-based
26 inhibition assay of deoxynivalenol. *Journal of Agricultural and Food Chemistry* 51:5843-5848.
27
28
29
30 Urraca JL, Benito-Pena E, Perez-Conde C, Moreno-Bondi MC, Pestka JJ. 2005. Analysis of
31 zearalenone in cereal and swine feed samples using an automated flow-through immunosensor.
32 *Journal of Agricultural and Food Chemistry* 53:3338-3344.
33
34
35
36
37 Usleber E, Schneider E, Märklbauer E, Terplan G. 1993. Two formats of enzyme immunoassay
38 for 15-acetyldeoxynivalenol applied to wheat. *Journal of Agricultural and Food Chemistry*
39 41:2019-2023.
40
41
42
43
44 Van der Gaag B, Spath S, Dietrich H, Stigter E, Boonzaaijer G, van Osenbruggen T, Koopal K.
45 2003. Biosensors and multiple mycotoxin analysis. *Food Control* 14:251–254.
46
47
48
49 Van der Gaag B, Wahlstrom L, Burggraaf R, Stigter E., Burstoff-Asp C. 1999. Application
50 development on the BIAcore for the detection of mycotoxins in food and feed. Seventh BIA
51 Symposium, 2–4 September 1998, Edinburgh, UK.
52
53
54
55
56
57 Visconti A, De Girolamo A. 2005. Fitness for purpose – ochratoxin A analytical developments.
58 *Food Additives and Contaminants*, Supplement 1:37–44.
59
60

- 1
2 Wang S, Quan Y, Lee N, Kennedy IR. 2006. Rapid determination of fumonisin B1 in food
3 samples by enzyme-linked immunosorbent assay and colloidal gold immunoassay. *Journal of*
4 *Agricultural and Food Chemistry* 54:2491 -2495.
5
6
7 Weller MG, Schuetz AJ, Winklmaier M, Niessner R. 1999. Highly parallel affinity sensor for the
8 detection of environmental contaminants in water. *Analytica Chimica Acta* 393:29-41.
9
10
11
12 Winklmaier M, Schuetz AJ, Weller MG, Niessner R. 1999. Immunochemical array for the
13 identification of cross-reacting analytes. *Fresenius Journal of Analytical Chemistry* 363:731-737.
14
15
16
17
18 Wortberg M, Kreissig SB, Jones G, Rocke DM, Hammock BD. 1995. An immunoarray for the
19 simultaneous determination of multiple triazine herbicides. *Analytica Chimica Acta* 304:339-352.
20
21
22
23 Wortberg M, Jones G, Kreissig SB, Rocke DM, Gee SJ, Hammock BD. 1996. An approach to
24 the construction of an immunoarray for differentiating and quantitating cross reacting analytes.
25 *Analytica Chimica Acta* 319:291-303.
26
27
28
29
30 Xu BJ, Jia XQ, Gu LJ, Sung CK. 2006. Review on the qualitative and quantitative analysis of the
31 mycotoxin citrinin. *Food Control* 17:271-285.
32
33
34
35
36 Yeung WSB, Luo GA, Wang QG, Ou JP. 2003. Capillary electrophoresis-based immunoassay.
37 *Journal of Chromatography B*, 797:217-228.
38
39
40
41 Zhang C, Zhang Y, Wang S. 2006. Development of multianalyte flow-through and lateral-flow
42 assays using gold particles and horseradish peroxidase as tracers for the rapid determination of
43 carbaryl and endosulfan in agricultural products. *Journal of Agricultural and Food Chemistry*
44 54:2502-2507.
45
46
47
48
49
50 Zheng MZ, Richard JL, Binder J. 2006. A review of rapid methods for the analysis of
51 mycotoxins. *Mycopathologia* 161:261-273.
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60


Figure captions

Figure 1. Principle of fluorescence polarization immunoassay


Figure 2. Principle of a lateral flow test

For Peer Review Only

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60



Review Only



Review Only

Immunochemical techniques	Mycotoxins detected	Sample matrix	Limit of detection	Reference
Fluorescent sensors	ochratoxin A	buffer	10 µg/mL	Sapsford et al. 2006
	fumonisin B1		20 µg/mL	
	aflatoxin B1		50 ng/mL	
	deoxynivalenol		10 µg/mL	
Surface plasmon resonance sensors	aflatoxin B1	<i>not specified</i>	0.2 ng/g	van der Gaag et al. 2003
	zearalenone		0.01 ng/g	
	deoxynivalenol		0.5 ng/g	
	fumonisin B1		50 ng/g	
Dipstick tests	aflatoxin B1	wheat	30 ng/g	Schneider et al. 1995b
	T-2 toxin		100 ng/g	
	3-acetyldeoxynivalenol		600 ng/g	
	roridin A		500 ng/g	
	zearalenone	60 ng/g	buffer	Abouziied and Pestka, 1994
	fumonisin B1	500 ng/mL		
	aflatoxin B1	0.5 ng/mL		
	zearalenone	3 ng/mL		
Flow-through tests	aflatoxin B1	wheat	10 ng/g	Schneider et al. 2004
	fumonisin B1		50 ng/g	
	T-2 toxin		100 ng/g	
	roridin A		250 ng/g	
	deoxynivalenol		3500 ng/g	
	diacetoxyscirpenol		5 ng/g	
	ochratoxin A		50 ng/g	
Tandem column tests	aflatoxin B1	<i>Capsicum</i> spp. spices, nutmeg, ginger, black and white pepper	5 ng/g	Goryacheva et al. 2007b
	ochratoxin A		10 ng/g	

Table 1. Overview on existing immunochemical multi-mycotoxin rapid methods.