#### Food Control 34 (2013) 752-755



Contents lists available at SciVerse ScienceDirect

#### Food Control

journal homepage: www.elsevier.com/locate/foodcont

## Aflatoxin M<sub>1</sub> survey on randomly collected milk powder commercialized in Argentina and Brazil





Victor Alonso García Londoño<sup>a</sup>, Agustina C. Boasso<sup>b</sup>, Maria Cristina Z. de Paula<sup>c</sup>, Laura P. Garcia<sup>d</sup>, Vildes M. Scussel<sup>d</sup>, Silvia Resnik<sup>a,e,\*</sup>, Ana Pacín<sup>f</sup>

<sup>a</sup> Departamento de Industrias y Química Orgánica, Facultad de Ciencias Exactas y Naturales (FCEN), Universidad de Buenos Aires (UBA),

Intendente Güiraldes 2160, 1428 Ciudad Universitaria, Buenos Aires, Argentina

<sup>b</sup> Departamento de Industrias, Facultad de Ciencias Exactas y Naturales (FCEN), Universidad de Buenos Aires (UBA), Intendente Güiraldes 2160, Ciudad Universitaria, Buenos Aires, Argentina

<sup>c</sup> Programa de Pós-Graduação em Ciências e Tecnologia de Alimentos, Centro de Ciências Agrárias, Universidade Federal de Santa Catarina (UFSC), Rodovia Admar Gonzaga, 1346, Itacorubí, Florianópolis, CEP 88034-001, SC, Brazil

<sup>d</sup> Departamento de Ciências e Tecnologia de Alimentos, Centro de Ciências Agrárias, Universidade Federal de Santa Catarina (UFSC), Rodovia Admar Gonzaga, 1346, Itacorubí, Florianópolis, CEP 88034-001, SC, Brazil

<sup>e</sup> Comisión de Investigaciones Científicas de la Provincia de Buenos Aires (CIC), Calle 526 entre 10 y 11, La Plata, Provincia de Buenos Aires, Argentina <sup>f</sup> Fundación de Investigaciones Científicas Teresa Benedicta de la Cruz, Dorronzoro 141, 6700 Luján, Buenos Aires, Argentina

#### A R T I C L E I N F O

Article history: Received 29 March 2013 Received in revised form 11 June 2013 Accepted 18 June 2013

Keywords: Aflatoxin M<sub>1</sub> Powder milk HPLC

1. Introduction

#### ABSTRACT

Aflatoxin  $M_1$  (AFM<sub>1</sub>), the main monohydroxylated of aflatoxin  $B_1$  (AFB<sub>1</sub>) formed in liver and excreted in the milk, has toxicological proprieties comparable to those of AFB<sub>1</sub>, albeit a lower carcinogenic potency. The presence of AFM<sub>1</sub> was investigated in 30 samples of powdered milk purchased in Argentina and Brazil. The samples were analyzed using an immunoaffinity column for cleanup and HPLC-FLD for determining AFM<sub>1</sub>. The quantification limit was 0.1  $\mu$ g/kg. AFM<sub>1</sub> was found in all the samples at levels ranging from 0.1 to 0.92  $\mu$ g kg<sup>-1</sup> with average concentration of 0.39  $\mu$ g kg<sup>-1</sup>.

© 2013 Elsevier Ltd. All rights reserved.

# Aflatoxins are toxic secondary metabolites produced mainly by fungi *Aspergillus flavus, A. parasiticus* and *A. nomius,* species that can be found in feeds. The carcinogenic effect and hepatotoxicity of these mycotoxins have been established and classified as a Group 1 (human carcinogen) by the International Agency on Research on Cancer (IARC, 2002). AFM<sub>1</sub> is the 4-hydroxy derivate of AFB<sub>1</sub> and is secreted in the milk of mammals that consume AFB<sub>1</sub> (JECFA, 2001, pp. 1–102). The quantity of AFM<sub>1</sub> in the milk depends on the concentration of AFB<sub>1</sub> in the contaminated feed, with a conversion rate around 0.3–6.2% (Creppy, 2002).

The international trading of milk ensures that AFM<sub>1</sub> is not only a problem for producing countries but it is also of concern for

importing countries (Prandini et al., 2009) Many countries have declared limits for the presence of  $AFM_1$  in milk and milk products. The milk used in the manufacture of milk powder, shall comply with the  $AFM_1$  maximum tolerable levels of 0.5 µg kg<sup>-1</sup>, referred by the General Standard for Contaminants and Toxins in Food and Feed (CAC, 2010). European Union regulations establishes that the  $AFM_1$  maximum level in raw milk, heat-treated milk and milk-based products should not exceed 0.05 µg kg<sup>-1</sup>; for infant milk and follow-on milk no more than 0.025 µg kg<sup>-1</sup> is allowed (EC, 2006). The maximum level refers to the products ready to use (marketed as such or after reconstitution as instructed by the manufacturer). The Mercosur (Southern Common Market) established a limit of 0.5 µg L<sup>-1</sup> for fluid milk and 5 µg kg<sup>-1</sup> for milk powder (MERCOSUR/GMC, 2002).

JECFA (2001, pp. 1–102) has update AFM<sub>1</sub> evidence until 2001; on the other hand, several countries have carried out studies on the AFM<sub>1</sub> incidence in milk. Regarding milk powder, some studies were conducted from different regions. Assem, Mohamad, and Oula (2011) evaluated 14 cows and goat powder milk samples, from Lebanon and found 35.7% of the samples positive for AFM<sub>1</sub> with an average of 4.9 ng L<sup>-1</sup>. The goat milk level was below the detection

<sup>\*</sup> Corresponding author. Departamento de Industrias, Ciudad Universitaria, Intendente Güiraldes 2190, Buenos Aires, Argentina. Tel.: +54 11 4576 3389.

*E-mail addresses*: gunk85@hotmail.com (V.A. García Londoño), agusboa@ gmail.com (A.C. Boasso), mcris31@hotmail.com (M.C.Z. de Paula), laurinhapg@ hotmail.com (L.P. Garcia), vildescussel\_2000@yahoo.co.uk (V.M. Scussel), sresnik2000@yahoo.com.ar (S. Resnik), fundacion@ictbdelacruz.or.ar (A. Pacín).

<sup>0956-7135/\$ –</sup> see front matter  $\odot$  2013 Elsevier Ltd. All rights reserved. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.foodcont.2013.06.030

limit, Eight cow milk powder samples from Syrian market, showed only one sample contaminated with 0.012  $\mu$ g L<sup>-1</sup> (Ghanen & Orfi, 2009). In China (Pei, Zhang, Eremin, & Lee, 2009) found that 100% of 15 powder samples were contaminated; among these, 10 of them ranged between 0.16 and 0.32  $\mu$ g L<sup>-1</sup>, and the other five, were from levels higher than 0.32–0.5  $\mu$ g L<sup>-1</sup>; while Wang et al. (2012) comparing clean up column performance in milk powder, detected AFM<sub>1</sub> ranging from 0.077 to 0.197  $\mu$ g kg<sup>-1</sup>, with immunoaffinity column. In Turkey (Kabak, 2012) AFM1 was detected in 8% of 62 baby formula samples with a concentration ranged from 0.016 to 0.022 µg kg<sup>-1</sup>. In Iran, Oveisi, Jannat, Sadeghi, Hajimahmoodi, and Nikzad (2007) reported a 96.6% of infant formula contaminated with AFM<sub>1</sub> with an average of 0.0073  $\mu$ g kg<sup>-1</sup>. Rastogi, Dwivedi, Khanna, and Das (2004) studied AFM<sub>1</sub> contamination in infant milk products from Indian market, showing that 94-100% were positive, ranging from 0.267 to 0.350  $\mu$ g kg<sup>-1</sup>. The occurrence of AFM<sub>1</sub> in different infant formulas from Spain was detected in 37.7% of the 69 samples, with an average of 0.0031  $\mu$ g kg<sup>-1</sup> (Gomez-Arranz & Navarro-Blasco, 2010). Egypt detected an AFM1 average contamination of 0.0098  $\mu$ g L<sup>-1</sup> corresponding to 43.2% (125) positive infant

formula milk powders samples (El-Tras, El-Kady, & Tayel, 2011). The occurrence of AFM<sub>1</sub> in powder milk has been also studied in few samples from Argentina and Brazil (Becker, Negrelo, Racoulte, & Drunkler, 2010; López, Ramos, Ramadán, & Bulacio, 2003; Oliveira, 2010; Oliveira & Ferranz, 2010; Shundo, Navas, Lamardo, Ruvieri, & Sabino 2009).

The aim of this study was to evaluate the AFM<sub>1</sub> concentration in milk powder commercialized in Argentina and Brazil countries.

#### 2. Materials and methods

#### 2.1. Samples

During 2012, a total 30 different trade mark samples of powdered milk were randomly purchased in Argentina (21) and Brazil (9) from supermarkets and grocery stores. Of these samples, 20 were whole (or fat) milk, 9 skimmed milks and one infant milk formula; one of the whole milk came from goat.

The package size ranged between 0.150 kg and 1 kg. The samples were picked from shelves, where the number of products was less than 10, to fit the European Norm EC (2006) N° 401/2006, when the package sizes were smaller than 1 kg, more packages were bought to have a representative sample of lot. Samples were kept in their original packages, properly identified, and stored under refrigeration ( $4 \pm 1$  °C) until the day of the analyzes at the Laboratory of Mycotoxicology and Food Contaminants and Mycotoxins of the Federal University of Santa Catarina, Southern Brazil.

#### 2.2. Standard, reagents and solution

The AFM<sub>1</sub> standard was purchased from Sigma (No. A6428-5UG, Saint Louis, USA). The standard reference solution utilized for accuracy was Aflatoxin M<sub>1</sub> solution of Supelco (No. 46319-U, Bellefonte, USA) with AFM<sub>1</sub> concentration of 9.699  $\pm$  0.078 µg mL<sup>-1</sup>.

Acetonitrile and methanol Panreac (No. 361881 and 361091, Barcelona, Spain, respectively) and hexane Veteco (Rio de Janeiro, Brazil) were HPLC grade. Sodium hydroxide, monobasic sodium phosphate and sodium chloride, all from Vetec (Rio de Janeiro, RJ, Brazil), dibasic sodium phosphate and potassium chloride Biotec (Sao Paulo, Brazil), trifluoroacetic acid (TFA) Merck-Schuchardt (Darmstadt, Germany) were analytical grade. Water was purified in a Milli-Q system on 18.2 M $\Omega$ /cm.

Five hundred mL of PBS buffer was prepared using 0.13 g monobasic sodium phosphate, 0.57 g sodium phosphate dibasic, 3.51 g sodium chloride and 0.1005 g of potassium chloride (pH: 7.4).

#### 2.3. Apparatus

The HPLC equipment was from Gilson (No 712, Villiers-le-Bel, France) consisting of an isocratic pump (No 305), a manifold module (No 805), manual injector (20  $\mu$ l loop), fluorescence detector (FLD, model 121) with 095442 emission (range between 430 and 470 nm) and 095312 excitation (range of 305–395 nm) filters. The chromatographic column used was a C<sub>18</sub> 150  $\times$  4, 5 mm, 5  $\mu$ m particle size, ACE (Edinburgh, Scotland) and a centrifuge at 6000 rpm, Hermle, model 200AZ (Wehingen, Germany) was selected for centrifugation.

#### 2.4. AFM<sub>1</sub> quantification

All powdered milk samples were analyzed for the presence of AFM<sub>1</sub> using an immunoaffinity columns for clean-up and HPLC/ FLD for determination based on the method of Aflatest WB M1TM, according to Vicam protocol, No G1024 USA (VICAM, 2013), with modifications. Briefly, 10 g of each sample were weighed on an

#### Table 1

Levels of aflatoxin  $M_1$  in milk powder samples from Argentina and Brazil collected randomly from supermarkets in 2012 and their comparison to literature data.

Country of pr	Milk powder		Samp	le Aflatoxin M <sub>1</sub>	
Commercializ	ed Produced	type		numb	per ( $\mu g k g^{-1}$ )
Argentina	Argentina	Whe	ole	1	0.50
				2	0.25
				3	0.15
				4	0.17
				5	0.32
				6	0.35
				7	0.27
				8	0.14
				9	0.88
				10	0.34
				11	0.10 <sup>a</sup>
Argentina	Argentina	Skimmed		12	0.41
				13	0.44
				14	0.25
				15	0.44
				16	0.22
				17	0.61
				18	0.81
				19	0.92
				20	0.37
Argentina	Argentina	Infa	nt formula	21	0.32
Brazil	Brazil	Whole		22	0.74
				23	0.53
				24	<loq<sup>b</loq<sup>
				25	<loq<sup>b</loq<sup>
				26	0.25
				27	0.14
				28	0.37
Brazil	Argentina	Whe	ole	29	0.27
				30	0.81
Country	Positive/total samples <sup>c</sup>	LOD	Aflatoxin Ν (μg kg <sup>-1</sup> )	И1	References
			Average (with ND = 0)		
Argentina & Prazil	28/28	0.03	0.39		This work
Brazil	1/4	0.1	0.002		Becker et al. 2010
Argenting	1/4	0.1	0.002		López et al. 2010
Prozil	4/0 50/50	0.1	0.10		Olivoira 2010
Brazil	50/50 62/65	0.03	0.54		Shundo et al 2000
	02/03	0.05	0.01		Silunuo et al., 2009

LOD: limit of detection; LOQ: limit of quantification.

<sup>a</sup> Goat milk.

 $^{b}$  <LOQ (LOQ: 0.10 µg kg<sup>-1</sup>).

<sup>c</sup> Cow powder milk.

Download English Version:

### https://daneshyari.com/en/article/6392442

Download Persian Version:

https://daneshyari.com/article/6392442

Daneshyari.com