

Fishery discards do not compensate natural prey shortage in Northern gannets from the English Channel

Tangi Le Bot, Amélie Lescroel, Jérôme Fort, Clara Péron, Olivier Gimenez,

Pascal Provost, David Grémillet

► To cite this version:

Tangi Le Bot, Amélie Lescroel, Jérôme Fort, Clara Péron, Olivier Gimenez, et al.. Fishery discards do not compensate natural prey shortage in Northern gannets from the English Channel. Biological Conservation, 2019, 236, pp.375-384. 10.1016/j.biocon.2019.05.040. hal-02329861

HAL Id: hal-02329861 https://hal.science/hal-02329861v1

Submitted on 25 Oct 2021

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.



Distributed under a Creative Commons Attribution - NonCommercial 4.0 International License

Fishery discards do not compensate natural prey shortage in Northern gannets from the English Channel.

Tangi Le Bot^{1*}, Amélie Lescroël², Jérôme Fort³, Clara Péron⁴, Olivier Gimenez¹, Pascal Provost⁵ & David Grémillet^{1,6}

- CEFE, CNRS, Univ Montpellier, Univ Paul Valéry Montpellier 3, EPHE, IRD, Montpellier, France
- 2- Point Blue Conservation Science, 3820 Cypress Drive, Suite 11, Petaluma, CA 94954, USA
- 3- Littoral Environnement et Sociétés (LIENSs), UMR 7266 CNRS-Université de La Rochelle, La Rochelle, France
- 4- Laboratoire d'Océanographie et du Climat, UMR 7159. 4 Place Jussieu 75005 Paris, France.
- 5- Ligue pour la Protection des Oiseaux, Réserve Naturelle Nationale des Sept-Iles,
 22560 Pleumeur Bodou, France
- 6- Percy FitzPatrick Institute and DST-NRF Centre of Excellence at the University of Cape Town, Rondebosch, South Africa
- * Corresponding author

1	Evaluation of methods for elution of HEV particles in naturally contaminated
2	sausage, figatellu and pig liver
3	
л	Catherine Hennechart-Collette, Audrey Fraisse, Laurent Guillier, Sylvie Perelle*
4	Catherine Hermechan-Conette, Addrey Fraisse, Ladrent Guinier, Sylvier erene,
5	Sandra Martin-Latil*
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	Université Paris-Est, Anses, Laboratory for food safety, F-94700 Maisons-Alfort,
13	France.
14	
15	
16	
17	* Corresponding author. Tel: +33 (0)1 49 77 28 24; fax: +33 (0)1 43 68 97 62.
18	E-mail address: sandra.martin-latil@anses.fr and sylvie.perelle@anses.fr
19	
20	

21 Abstract

Foodborne transmission of HEV is a growing public health concern in industrialised 22 countries, where the disease is mainly autochthonous, caused by zoonotic HEV of 23 either genotype 3 or 4. Foodstuffs containing pig's liver were suspected on several 24 occasions to be the cause of autochthonous cases of HEV infection, while the 25 transmission was associated with animal contact and the ingestion of raw or 26 uncooked meat, especially liver. In assessing the risk related to the presence of HEV 27 in food, detection methods were previously developed but HEV detection rates seem 28 to vary with the type of samples and methods. The ISO procedures (15216-1:2017) 29 only propose standard methods for quantifying NoV and HAV in bottled water, 30 shellfish, vegetables and soft fruit. As foodstuff containing pig liver can be 31 contaminated with HEV internally, an efficient virus extraction procedure is required. 32 The aim of this study was to evaluate six methods for their efficiency in releasing 33 HEV viral particles from figatelli, pig liver sausages and liver samples previously 34 tested positive for the presence of HEV. The ratio weight to volume of elution buffer 35 (1:5) and the FastPrep®-24 homogenizer showed to significantly improve the 36 quantity of HEV genomes released per gram of figatelli and pig liver sausages. To our 37 knowledge, this study is the first to evaluate several methods for elution of HEV 38 particles from naturally contaminated pig liver products, and may be extended for 39 quantifying other viral genomes from food of animal origin. 40

41

42 **1. Introduction**

Hepatitis E virus (HEV) is a positive single-stranded RNA virus classified in the genus
Orthohepevirus within the family *Hepeviridae* (Emerson et al., 2004, Khuroo et al.,
2016, Smith et al., 2013). HEV has been recognised as a cause of acute hepatitis

46 occurring during waterborne outbreaks in most parts of Asia and Africa where it is 47 endemic and primarily spread by the faecal-oral route (World Health Organization, 48 2013). In the industrialized countries, HEV infection leads to sporadic and 49 autochthonous cases of acute viral hepatitis and has increased as a result of 50 zoonotic transmission from the animal reservoir. Among the major HEV genotypes, 51 the genotypes G3 and G4 are known to be zoonotic.

Several cases of hepatitis E have been reported after consumption of contaminated 52 raw or undercooked meat, liver, and liver sausages from infected animals (eg: wild 53 boar, pig) (Colson et al., 2010; Deest et al., 2007; Tamada et al., 2004; Yazaki et al., 54 2003; Masuda et al., 2005; Tei et al., 2003). A previous study confirmed that HEV 55 detected in pork liver sausage is infectious, highlighting the risk for consumers (Berto 56 et al., 2013). To date, there is no standardised protocol for the detection of HEV in 57 meat products. Various protocols have been published and applied to detect HEV on 58 soft fruits and vegetables, in water, shellfish, and pork products (Brassard et al., 59 2012; Leblanc et al., 2010; Martin et al., 2012; Thesale et al., 2010; Grodzki et al., 60 2014; Renou et al., 2014; Wilhelm et al., 2014; Martin-Latil et al., 2014; Di Bartolo et 61 al., 2015; Szabo et al., 2015; Terio et al., 2017). Given that foodstuffs containing pig 62 liver have an animal origin, the virus extraction is a crucial step and requires an 63 efficient grinding for releasing HEV from food with an internal contamination. 64

The aim of this study was to evaluate six methods for their efficiency to eluate viral particles of HEV from naturally contaminated food samples containing raw pig liver and to determine the most efficient method for extracting HEV from figatelli, pig liver sausages and liver.

69

70 2. Materials and methods

71 **2. 1. Food samples containing pig liver**

Pig liver samples were collected in the framework of a national official surveillance 72 plan organised by the French Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Forestry in 2011, 73 according to EC Regulation 882/2004 and EC Directive 2003/99/EC (2003; 2004). Of 74 the 400 samples gualitatively analysed to detect HEV (Pavio et al., 2014), 70 75 samples were quantitatively analysed (Martin-Latil et al., 2014) and conserved at -76 80°C. One liver, one figatellu and one sausage found positive for the presence of 77 HEV genomes were selected for this study because of their high (>10⁶ genome 78 copies per gram) HEV contamination levels. 79

80

81 2.2. Sample processing for recovering HEV

Six elution methods were tested for recovering HEV from sausage, figatellu and liver. Among them, the reference method B was the one previously developed in the framework of a French monitoring program (Martin-Latil et al., 2014). Figure 1 gives an overview of these six methods. Details of the extraction methods are described below.

87

88 2.2.1 Method of elution and viral RNA extraction

89 Three parameters were tested (weight of food sample, ratio of weight-of-90 sample/elution-volume and homogenisation method) as described in Figure 1.

For each sample of sausage and figatellu, fat was removed manually with a surgical blade. All samples were separated into 3 g (Methods A, B, D, E) or 10 g (Methods C and F) portions, and were homogenised in 15 mL (Methods D and E), 30 mL (Methods A and B), 50 mL (Method F) or 100 mL (Method C) of distilled water with

the FastPrep®-24 tissue (Methods A and D) and cell homogeniser (MP 95 Biochemicals) or with the Stomacher 400 apparatus (Fisher Bioblock Scientific, 96 Illkirch, France) (Methods B, C, E, F). For homogenisation with the stomacher 97 apparatus, food samples were placed in a 400 mL polypropylene bag containing a 98 filter compartment and were homogenised in distilled water using a stomacher 99 apparatus at a normal velocity of 230 rpm for 2 min as previously described (Fumian 100 et al., 2009; Martin-Latil et al., 2014). For the FastPrep®-24 homogeniser, samples 101 were transferred to a 50 mL tube containing lysing matrix D ceramic beads (MP 102 Biochemicals, Solon, OH, USA) and were homogenised using FastPrep®-24 tissue 103 and cell homogeniser for 20 sec at 6 ms⁻¹. 104

Viral elution was carried out by incubating all samples for 10 min at room temperature with constant shaking regardless the homogenisation method used. The tube sample containing lysing matrix D ceramic beads was transferred to a 400 mL polypropylene bag containing a filter compartment. Then, all filtrates were transferred to a 50 mL centrifuge tube and centrifuged at 8,000 g for 15 min at 4°C to be clarified for removal of particles of debris.

One mL of filtered homogenates was processed on a NucliSens® easyMAG[™]
platform (bioMérieux) for viral RNA extraction using the "off-board Specific A"
protocol according to the manufacturer's instructions.

114 Nucleic acids were eluted in 70 μ L of elution buffer, aliquoted and stored at -80°C.

The experimental step from elution to RNA extraction was performed five times. The same RNA extract (undiluted and 10-fold diluted) was analysed in duplicate with RTqPCR assay to detect and quantify HEV. Results were expressed as log genome copies of HEV per gram.

120 **2.3.2 Primers and probes**

The primers and the TaqMan® probe targeting the ORF2/ORF3 overlapping region of HEV used in this study were adapted from the published model by Jothikumar et al. (2006). The sequence of the primer pairs and the TaqMan probes used was as follows: the sense primer (HEV-5260-F) was: 5'-CGGTGGTTTCTGGGGTGAC-3', the antisense primer (HEV-5330-R) was: 5'-AGGGGTTGGTTGGATGAATATAG-3' and the TaqMan probe (HEV-5280-T) was: 5'-ROX-GGGTTGATTCTCAGCCCTTCGC -BHQ2-3'.

128

129 2.3.3 RT-qPCR conditions

Viral genomes were detected using one-step RT-qPCR, which was performed in
duplicate on the CFX96[™] real-time PCR detection system from Bio-Rad (Marnes-laCoquette, France).

Reactions were performed in a 25 µL reaction mixture containing 1×RNA 133 UltraSense[™] master mix and 1.25 µL of RNA Ultrasense[™] enzyme mix, which are 134 components of the RNA UltraSense[™] One-Step Quantitative RT-PCR System 135 (Fisher Bioblock Scientific, Illkirch, France), 2 U RNAse inhibitor (Applied 136 Biosystems), 5 µg of bovine serum albumin (Ambion), 600 nM of HEV-5260-F 137 forward primer, 600 nM of HEV-5330-R reverse primer, 250 nM of HEV-5280-T probe 138 and 5 µL of RNA extract. Positive controls containing RNA extracted from virus 139 suspensions and a negative control containing all the reagents except the RNA 140 template were included with each set of reaction mixtures. The one-step RT-qPCR 141 programme was 60 min of reverse transcription of RNA at 55°C, followed by a 5 min 142 denaturation step at 95°C, and finally 45 cycles of 15 sec at 95°C, 1 min at 60°C and 143 1 min at 65°C. The fluorescence was recorded by the apparatus at the end of the 144

elongation steps (1 min at 65°C) for each amplification cycle. All samples were
characterised by a corresponding Cycle threshold (Ct) value. Negative samples gave
no Ct value.

The slopes (S) of the regression lines were used to calculate the amplification efficiency (E) of the RT-qPCR reactions, according to the formula: E = 10|-1/s| - 1. To establish the standard curves, the genomic stock of HEV viral RNA was obtained as previously described by Martin-Latil et al. (2014) and had a titre of approximately 1.75 × 10⁶ genome copies/mL. The recovery quantity of HEV in food samples was calculated by reference to the corresponding standard curves obtained from ten-fold dilution of the titrated clarified suspension stock of HEV.

155

156 **2.3.4 Statistical analysis**

The quantitative data of HEV recovered with different elution methods from naturally contaminated figatellu, sausage and liver are expressed in log genome copies per g follow a normal distribution N (μ , σ). The Normal distribution is completely characterized by the sample mean (μ) and sample standard deviation (σ).

The standard normal distribution curve of data is a symmetrical bell-shaped. The peak is located at the sample mean μ and its height indicates weather values in the population fall near the mean value or not. The width of the bell is determined by the population standard deviation (σ) that measures the spread of a data distribution.

A one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was further performed with Statgraphics Centurion XVII software to evaluate the influence of the elution method on the recovered quantity of HEV. Quantitative data obtained from undiluted and 10-fold diluted RNA samples were taken into account for this statistical analysis. The result of the ANOVA is a p value associated with the hypothesis that the mean recovery

quantities of all groups (expressed as percentages) were the same. Because the 170 HEV recovered quantities were statistically different depending on the elution method 171 used (ANOVA, p < 0.05), a multiple comparison procedure was applied to determine 172 which elution method provided the highest recovery quantity. This post-hoc test 173 allowed to evaluate the influence of three other factors on the recovered quantity of 174 HEV obtained for each sample: (1) the weight of the sample (3 g or 10 g), (2) dilution 175 of the food sample (ratio 1:5 or 1:10 in buffer elution) and (3) the homogenisation of 176 the sample (stomacher or FastPrep). 177

Graphs plotting the mean and its standard error for each group illustrate the multiple comparison procedure. When confidence intervals of means do not overlap, the difference between two groups of a factor is significant.

181

182 **3. Results**

3.1 Quantification of HEV in naturally contaminated figatellu, sausage and liver samples according to the elution method used

To compare the efficiency of six elution methods in extracting HEV from food samples, HEV genomes were quantified from naturally contaminated figatellu, pig liver sausage and liver. The amounts of HEV genomes recovered from food samples by using each of the elution method were normally distributed as illustrated by the symmetrical bell-shaped of quantitative data obtained with the reference method B (Figure 2). The means and standard deviations of HEV quantities obtained for each food type according to the elution method used are displayed in Figure 3.

HEV genomes were detected in all RNA samples. The quantification of HEV in sausage, figatellu and liver ranged respectively from 8.79 to 9.70, 6.92 to 7.82 and

194 8.64 to 8.96 log₁₀ HEV genome per gram whatever the elution method used. 195 Quantitative data calculated from undiluted and 10-fold diluted RNA extracts were 196 similar since their ratio ranged from 0.90 to 0.99 regardless the food type and the 197 elution method used. Thus, there was no relevant inhibition of HEV RNA 198 amplification.

Comparisons between quantitative data obtained by using the reference method B 199 with those obtained by using other elution methods indicated that the method D 200 provided the highest guantification for HEV (Figure 3). Indeed, the means of HEV 201 recovered by using the method D were 7.82 and 9.70 log₁₀ HEV genome per gram in 202 Figatellu and pig liver sausage respectively, whilst they were 6.92 and 8.94 log₁₀ 203 HEV genome per gram with the method B. In addition, a slightly increase in HEV 204 quantification could be also observed by using methods F (9.28 log₁₀ HEV genome 205 206 per gram) and E (9.50 log₁₀ HEV genome per gram) for pig liver sausages. On the contrary, HEV levels found in liver were similar regardless the elution method since 207 their ranges were from 8.64 to 8.96 log₁₀ HEV genome per gram. 208

The standard deviation values were higher for liver (from 0.37 to 0.68 log₁₀ HEV genome per gram) than for figatellu (from 0.15 to 0.34 log₁₀ HEV genome per gram) regardless the elution method used. The standard deviation values obtained from pig liver sausage were close to the ones obtained for figatellu (from 0.13 to 0.30 log₁₀ HEV genome per gram) except by using the method D (0.68 log₁₀ HEV genome per gram) (Figure 3). This result showed that quantitative data of liver samples were the most widely spread, also illustrated by the flattened peak in Figure 2.

As a whole, these results indicated that the elution method influenced the amounts of HEV genome recovered from figatellu and sausage; and that the quantitative data

obtained from liver were the most widely distributed regardless the elution methodused.

220

3.2. Assessment of the experimental factors essential to increase HEV genomes recovery from figatellu, pig liver sausage

To determine whether elution method has an impact on HEV extraction from food, statistical analysis was further performed on HEV quantitative data obtained according to the elution method used. Results of the one-way ANOVA showed that the elution method was a significant factor for improving the HEV recovery from figatellu (ANOVA; p=0.0011) and from sausage (ANOVA; p<0.0001). On the contrary, none of the elution methods could significantly improve HEV recovery from liver (ANOVA; p=0.5295).

A multiple comparison test was further performed to identify the most efficient elution method in extracting HEV. As shown in Figure 4, the method D provided the highest HEV recovery from figatellu and pig liver sausage and the methods E and F also showed a better efficiency in HEV recovery from sausages.

In addition, pairwise comparisons of HEV quantities obtained between the reference
method B and others could determine the most efficient experimental factors leading
to a significant improvement in extracting HEV from figatellu and pig liver sausage.

To evaluate independently the influence of the type of grinding, the sample weight and the ratio weight to volume of elution buffer (w/v), HEV quantities obtained by using the method B were respectively compared to the ones obtained with method A, method C and method E. The ratio weight to volume of elution buffer was the only factor leading to a significant increase in HEV recovery from pig liver sausages.

The influence of sample weight as an additional factor to the ratio w/v was further 242 evaluated by comparing HEV quantities obtained using method B with those obtained 243 with method F. Nevertheless, the increase of sample weight from 3 g (method B) to 244 10 g (method F) did not lead to a significant increase in HEV quantities recovered 245 from figatellu. On the contrary, the use of FastPrep homogenizer when elution buffer 246 was added to figatellu samples with a ratio of 1:5 (method D) instead of 1:10 (method 247 B) showed to be a significant experimental factor. This result showed that both 248 experimental parameters are necessary to significantly increase HEV recovery from 249 figatellu. 250

As a whole, the method D proved to be the most effective for HEV extraction from 251 figatellu and sausage whereas none of the elution method had impact on HEV 252 recovery from liver. 253

254

4. Discussion 255

The foodborne transmission of HEV is mainly due to consumption of raw or 256 undercooked liver, meat or sausage from infected animal reservoirs such as pigs or 257 wild boar (Yugo and Meng, 2013). The detection of HEV genome was reported in 258 several organs of infected pigs (liver, plasma, bile, hepatic lymph node, etc.) with the 259 highest viral load reported in liver, *i.e.* 10⁷ per gram (Leblanc et al., 2010; Son et al., 260 2014). In assessing the risk related to the presence of HEV in food, detection 261 methods were previously developed and allowed highlighting the high prevalence 262 (*i.e.* up to one third) of HEV in Europe for foodstuffs containing pig liver, (Szabo et al., 263 2015; Giannini et al., 2018; Di Bartolo et al., 2015; Moor et al, 2018; Martin-Latil et 264 al., 2014). Regarding the quantitative data, virus load of up to 5.7 log10 HEV genome 265 copies per gram were measured (Moor et al., 2018; Giannini et al., 2018; Martin-Latil 266

et al., 2014). In the framework of a French monitoring programme, the developed method was efficient for the detection of HEV in figatelli and pig liver sausages as most of the samples tested had a recovery rate of MNV process control enough raised to validate analysis. On the contrary, the low recovery rates obtained for MNV from pig dried salted liver and quenelle samples underlined that the performance of the method should be further improved (Martin-Latil et al., 2014).

In this aim, the present study focuses on the extraction of the virus from food, which 273 is a critical step because of the internal contamination of pig liver products with HEV. 274 An improvement in HEV recovery was found for figatellu and sausage samples with 275 the method D in comparison with the previously published method B (Martin-Latil et 276 al., 2014). To validate method D according to the EN ISO 16140, further analysis 277 should be performed by increasing the sampling for every type of food and by taking 278 279 into account at least, three levels of viral contamination as previously for method B (Martin-Latil et al., 2016). Both crucial parameters were the ratio weight to volume of 280 elution buffer and the type of mechanical cell disruption for figatelli and pig liver 281 sausages. Nevertheless, the ratio weight to volume of elution buffer 1:5 was sufficient 282 to significantly increase the recovered quantities of HEV from pig liver sausages. The 283 use of the FastPrep®-24 homogeniser showed to be an additional significant factor 284 for releasing HEV from naturally contaminated figatellu samples. Since the grinding 285 step is important for extracting virus from food of animal origin, the efficiency of 286 several strategies of mechanical cell disruption was previously described, e.g. the 287 use of vortex mixer or stomacher, which is part of the standard equipment in many 288 laboratories, or a FastPrep®-24 instrument, which is a more drastic mechanical 289 homogeniser (Di Bartolo et al., 2015; Szabo et al., 2015; Wilhelm et al., 2014; Berto 290 et al., 2013; Martin-Latil et al., 2014). A more efficient homogenisation of food 291 12 samples was found with stomacher and FastPrep®-24 by detecting the released pig DNA following the homogenisation process (Szabo et al., 2015). Different cycles of freeze thawing could be also used to disrupt mechanical samples of liver (Serracca et al., 2015). Nevertheless, the strategies of mechanical cell disruption should be chosen to keep intact viral particles for further analysis of HEV infectivity once a suitable cell culture method will be available for routine use.

In our study, the weight of sample did not influence the quantity of HEV recovered per 298 gram for any food matrices showing that an increase of sample weight did not 299 hamper the efficiency of the grinding step, neither the detection of HEV genomes by 300 RT-qPCR. Sample sizes of swine liver samples ranging from 250 mg to 10 g were 301 analysed for the presence of HEV in previous studied (Bouwknegt et al., 2007; 302 Leblanc et al., 2010; Son et al., 2014; Martin-Latil et al., 2014). In particular, Son et 303 304 al. (2014) showed that the detection rate of HEV in swine liver was improved (three times more detection) by increasing the sample size from 1 g to 10 g when a 305 concentration step followed HEV extraction. It should be noted that an increase of the 306 sample size, as an additional step of virus concentration, could lead to an increase in 307 PCR inhibitors. For this reason, Szabo et al. (2015) analysed 2 g of liver sausage to 308 compensate for the expected higher amounts of inhibitory substances in liver-309 containing matrices. However, no significant evidence of RT-gPCR inhibition was 310 shown in this work for detecting HEV in any food matrices whatever the method used 311 in agreement with our previous studies (Martin-Latil et al., 2014 and 2016). 312

The quantitative data obtained from liver were more widely distributed for liver than for figatellu and pig liver sausage whatever the elution method used as shown by the standard deviation values. The difference in HEV genomes distributions according to food type may reflect the actual physical distribution of HEV in a particular food 13 product. The highest variability in amounts of HEV genomes found in liver could reflect a heterogeneous contamination resulting from a focal infection in swine liver but further analysis should be performed to confirm this statement. Non-homogenous contamination of food has been already discussed since HEV could not be detected in all slices for the same sausage (Di Bartolo et al., 2015). Nevertheless, the level of HEV contamination was at least 2 log₁₀ lower than the figatellu and sausage used for this study and the weight of samples was 250 mg.

On the contrary, figatelli and pig liver sausages may be homogeneously contaminated with HEV since both matrices are already made by mixing meat, fat and liver together with salt and spices. The physical distribution of the microbial contamination among batch samples has already been shown to affect the observed microbial frequency distribution (Jongenburger et al., 2012).

To our knowledge, this study was the first to evaluate several methods for elution of HEV particles from naturally contaminated food and could be extended for analysing other food types having internal contamination with pathogens. This approach may improve the risk assessment towards HEV in food virology.

333 Acknowledgements

Samples were collected within the framework of an official national surveillance plan
organized by the French Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Forestry in 2011, according
to EC Regulation 882/2004 and EC Directive 2003/99/EC (2003), EC Regulation
882/2004 (2004). We wish to thank Dr. Nicole Pavio for providing HEV-contaminated
pig faeces.

339

340 **REFERENCES**

341

Berto, A., Grierson, S., Hakze-van der Honing, R., Martelli, F., Johne, R., Reetz, J.,
Ulrich, R.G., Pavio, N., Van der Poel, W.H., Banks, M., 2013. Hepatitis E virus in pork
liver sausage, France. Emerg Infect. Dis. 19, 264-266.

- Bouwknegt, M., Lodder-Verschoor, F., van der Poel, W.H., Rutjes, S.A., de Roda
 Husman, A.M., 2007. Hepatitis E virus RNA in commercial porcine livers in The
 Netherlands. J. Food Prot. 70, 2889-2895.
- Brassard, J., Gagne, M.J., Genereux, M., Cote, C., 2012. Detection of human foodborne and zoonotic viruses on irrigated, field-grown strawberries. Appl. Environ. Microbiol. 78, 3763-3766.
- Colson, P., Borentain, P., Queyriaux, B., Kaba, M., Moal, V., Gallian, P., Heyries, L.,
 Raoult, D., Gerolami, R., 2010. Pig liver sausage as a source of hepatitis E virus
 transmission to humans. J. Infect. Dis. 202, 825-834.
- Deest, G., Zehner, L., Nicand, E., Gaudy-Graffin, C., Goudeau, A., Bacq, Y., 2007.
 Autochthonous hepatitis E in France and consumption of raw pig meat.
 Gastroenterol. Clin. Biol. 31, 1095–1097.
- 361

349

353

357

- Di Bartolo, I., Angeloni, G., Ponterio, E., Ostanello, F., Ruggeri, F.M., 2015. Detection
 of hepatitis E virus in pork liver sausages. Int. J. Food Microbiol. 193, 29-33.
- Emerson, S.U., Nguyen, H., Graff, J., Stephany, D.A., Brockington, A., a Purcell,
 R.H., 2004. In vitro replication of hepatitis E virus (HEV) genomes and of an HEV
 replicon expressing green fluorescent protein. J. Virol. 78, 4838-4846.
- Fumian, T. M., Leite, J. P., Marin, V. A., Miagostovich, M. P., 2009. A rapid procedure
 for detecting noroviruses from cheese and fresh lettuce. J. Virol. Methods. 155, 3943.
- Giannini, P., Jermini, M., Leggeri, L., Nüesch-Inderbinen, M., Stephan, R., 2018.
 Detection of hepatitis E virus RNA in raw cured sausages and raw cured sausages
 containing pig liver at retail stores in Switzerland. J Food Prot. 81, 43-45.
- Grodzki, M., Schaeffer, J., Piquet, J.C., Le Saux, J.C., Cheve, J., Ollivier, J., Le
 Pendu, J., Le Guyader, F.S., 2014. Bioaccumulation efficiency, tissue distribution,
 and environmental occurrence of hepatitis E virus in bivalve shellfish from France.
 Appl. Environ. Microbiol. 80, 4269-4276.
- 381

- ISO 15216-1(2017). Microbiology of Food and Animal Feed–Horizontal Method for
 Determination of Hepatitis A Virus and Norovirus in Food using Real-Time RT PCRPart1: Method for Quantification International Organization for
 Standardization, Geneva.
- Jongenburger, I., Reij, M.W., Boer, E.P., Zwietering, M.H., Gorris, L.G., 2012.
 Modelling homogeneous and heterogeneous microbial contaminations in a powdered
 food product. Int J Food Microbiol. 157, 35-44.
- Jothikumar, N., Lowther, J.A., Henshilwood, K., Lees, D.N., Hill, V.R., Vinje, J., 2005. Rapid and sensitive detection of noroviruses by using TaqMan-based one-step

395 Khuroo, M.S., Khuroo, M.S., Khuroo, N.S., 2016. Transmission of hepatitis E Virus in 396 397 developing countries. Viruses, 8. 398 Leblanc, D., Poitras, E., Gagne, M.J., Ward, P., Houde, A., 2010. Hepatitis E virus 399 load in swine organs and tissues at slaughterhouse determined by real-time RT-PCR. 400 Int. J. Food Microbiol. 139, 206-209. 401 402 Martin-Latil, S., Hennechart-Collette, C., Delannoy, S., Guillier, L., Fach, P., Perelle, 403 S., 2016. Quantification of hepatitis E virus in naturally-contaminated pig liver 404 products. Front. Microbiol. 7, 1183. 405 406 Martin-Latil, S., Hennechart-Collette, C., Guillier, L., Perelle, S., 2014. Method for 407 HEV detection in raw pig liver products and its implementation for naturally 408 contaminated food. Int. J. Food Microbiol. 176, 1-8. 409 410 Martin-Latil, S., Hennechart-Collette, C., Guillier, L., Perelle, S., 2012. Duplex RT-411 qPCR for the detection of hepatitis E virus in water, using a process control. Int. J. 412 Food Microbiol. 157, 167-173. 413 414 Masuda, J., Yano, K., Tamada, Y., Takii, Y., Ito, M., Omagari, K., Kohno, S. 2005.. 415 Acute hepatitis E of a man who consumed wild boar meat prior to the onset of illness 416 in Nagasaki, Japan. Hepatology research : the official journal of the Japan Society of 417 Hepatology 31, 178-183. 418 419 Moor, D., Liniger, M., Baumgartner, A., Felleisen, R., 2018. Screening of ready-to-eat 420 421 meat products for hepatitis E virus in Switzerland. Food Environ Virol. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12560-018-9340-x 422 423 Pavio, N., Merbah, T., Thebault, A., 2014. Frequent hepatitis E virus contamination in 424 food containing raw pork liver, France. Emerg. Infect. Dis. 20, 1925-1927. 425 426 Renou, C., Gobert, V., Locher, C., Moumen, A., Timbely, O., Savary, J., Roque-427 Afonso, A.M., 2014. Prospective study of Hepatitis E Virus infection among pregnant 428

reverse transcription-PCR assays and application to naturally contaminated shellfish

samples. Appl. Environ. Microbiol. 71, 1870-1875.

women in France. Virol. J. 11, 68.

393

- 430
 431 Serracca, L., Battistini, R., Rossini, I., Mignone, W., Peletto, S., Boin, C., Pistone, G.,
 432 Ercolini, R., Ercolini, C, 2015. Molecular Investigation on the Presence of Hepatitis E
 433 Virus (HEV) in Wild Game in North-Western Italy. Food Environ. Virol. 7, 206-212.
- 434
 435 Smith, D.B., Purdy, M.A., Simmonds, P., 2013. Genetic variability and the
 436 classification of hepatitis E virus. J. Virol. 87, 4161-4169.
 437
- Son, N.R., Seo, D.J., Lee, M.H., Seo, S., Wang, X., Lee, B.H., Lee, J.S., Joo, I.S.,
 Hwang, I.G., Choi, C., 2014. Optimization of the elution buffer and concentration
 method for detecting hepatitis E virus in swine liver using a nested reverse

- transcription-polymerase chain reaction and real-time reverse transcription-441 polymerase chain reaction. J. Virol. Methods 206, 99-104. 442 443 Szabo, K., Trojnar, E., Anheyer-Behmenburg, H., Binder, A., Schotte, U., Ellerbroek, 444 L., Klein, G., Johne, R., 2015. Detection of hepatitis E virus RNA in raw sausages 445 446 and liver sausages from retail in Germany using an optimized method. Int. J. Food Microbiol. 215, 149-156. 447 448 Tamada, Y., Yano, K., Yatsuhashi, H., Inoue, O., Mawatari, F., Ishibashi, H., 2004. 449 Consumption of wild boar linked to cases of hepatitis E. J. Hepatol. 40, 869-870. 450 451 Tei, S., Kitajima, N., Takahashi, K., Mishiro, S., 2003. Zoonotic transmission of 452 453 hepatitis E virus from deer to human beings. Lancet (London, England) 362, 371-373. 454 455 Terio, V., Bottaro, M., Pavoni, E., Losio, M.N., Serraino, A., Giacometti, F., Martella, 456 V., Mottola, A., Di Pinto, A., Tantillo, G., 2017. Occurrence of hepatitis A and E and 457 norovirus GI and GII in ready-to-eat vegetables in Italy. Int. J. Food Microbiol. 249, 458 459 61-65. 460 Teshale, E.H., Grytdal, S.P., Howard, C., Barry, V., Kamili, S., Drobeniuc, J., Hill, 461 462 V.R., Okware, S., Hu, D.J., Holmberg, S.D., 2010. Evidence of person-to-person transmission of hepatitis E virus during a large outbreak in Northern Uganda. Clin. 463 Infect. Dis. 50, 1006-1010. 464 465 Wilhelm, B., Leblanc, D., Houde, A., Brassard, J., Gagne, M.J., Plante, D., Bellon-466 Gagnon, P., Jones, T.H., Muehlhauser, V., Janecko, N., et al., 2014. Survey of 467 Canadian retail pork chops and pork livers for detection of hepatitis E virus, 468 norovirus, and rotavirus using real time RT-PCR. Int. J. Food Microbiol. 185, 33-40. 469 470 Yazaki, Y., Mizuo, H., Takahashi, M., Nishizawa, T., Sasaki, N., Gotanda, Y., 471 Okamoto, H., 2003. Sporadic acute or fulminant hepatitis E in Hokkaido, Japan, may 472 be food-borne, as suggested by the presence of hepatitis E virus in pig liver as food. 473 J. Gen. Virol. 84, 2351-2357. 474 475 Yugo, D.M., and Meng, X.J., 2013. Hepatitis E virus: foodborne, waterborne and 476 zoonotic transmission. Int. J. Env. Res. Public Health. 10, 4507-4533. 477
- 478