

UNIVERSITY OF JOHANNESBURG

**AN INVESTIGATION OF FUNGI AND MYCOTOXINS IN BARLEY
GRAIN AND MATERIALS USED FOR BREWING**



PHOLO WILSON MAENETJE

**AN INVESTIGATION OF FUNGI AND MYCOTOXINS IN BARLEY
GRAIN AND MATERIALS USED IN BREWING**

By

PHOLO WILSON MAENETJE

DISSERTATION

Submitted in compliance of the requirement for the

MASTERS'S DEGREE IN TECHNOLOGY

in the Department of

BIOTECHNOLOGY

at the

UNIVERSITY OF JOHANNESBURG

SUPERVISOR AND PROMOTOR: PROFESSOR M. F DUTTON

CO-SUPERVISOR:

MR E. VAN ZYL

ABSTRACT

Mycotoxins, secondary metabolites of filamentous fungi, are associated with foods due to the ubiquitous nature of certain fungi that infect crops during harvesting or storage. These toxins have been implicated as chemical agents of acute and chronic diseases in animal and man. The most commonly acute effects of mycotoxin poisoning is the deterioration of the liver and kidney functions, allergic responses and immunosuppression, whereas chronic effects include mutagenicity, teratogenicity and carcinogenicity. The most common toxigenic fungal genera include *Aspergillus*, *Fusarium* and *Penicillium*. Aflatoxins (AFs), ochratoxin A (OTA), fumonisins (FBs), trichothecenes and zearalenone (ZEA) are the most important mycotoxins in terms of occurrence on food.

A study was conducted to evaluate and quantify the occurrence of mycotoxins in barley as well as barley-producing beer products in South Africa. A total of 86 barley samples were randomly obtained from Gauteng retail outlets, Maltsters and South African Breweries and were screened for toxigenic fungi. Two fungal genera, *Aspergillus*, *Penicillium* occurred regularly whereas *Fusarium* and *Mucor* were detected at low incidences. High levels of fungal contamination were found in barley obtained in Gauteng as compared to Maltsters barley samples, however, most of the fungal strains isolated from Gauteng purchased barley were non-toxigenic as compared to Maltsters.

Barley samples were further screened for mycotoxins by multi-mycotoxins extraction coupled with thin layer chromatography (TLC). Mycotoxins detected in the barley extracts were aflatoxins, ochratoxins, deoxynivalenol (DON) and zearalenone at trace levels on the thin layer chromatograms. However, TLC only indicated qualitative results. The presence of the toxins were confirmed by techniques that a highly sensitive and quantitative, such as gas chromatography-mass spectroscopy (GC-MS) and immunoaffinity analysis.

The presence of deoxynivalenol in the barley fractions was confirmed by GC-MS at mean concentration levels ranging from 0.0628 to 0.832 ppm. Barley samples from Maltsters, however, showed to be highly contaminated with DON compared to barley

obtained in Gauteng ($p < 0.05$). As barley is known to be one of the major ingredients of beer, a total of 48 beer samples were also randomly collected from retail outlets in the Gauteng region and were surveyed for the presence of AFB₁, AFB₂ and ochratoxin A. Trace levels of AFB₁ were detected in some of the beer samples, whereas AFB₂ was not detected. Ochratoxin A contamination, however, in beer ranged from 0.07 to 0.081 ppb.

The level of mycotoxins contamination in barley samples analysed by immunoaffinity analysis ranged from: 0.0 to 3.9 ppb AFs, 5.0 to 10.0 ppb OTA, 0.0 to 10.0 ppm DON, 0.0 to 5.0 ppm FBs and 0.4 to 2.9 ppm ZEA in Maltsters barley, whereas in Gauteng samples mycotoxin contamination levels ranged from 0.0 to 6.0 ppb OTA, 2.0 to 2.0 ppm DON, 0.0 to 2.0 ppm FBs and 0.5 to 3.4 ppm ZEA. Although high fungal infection was found in Gauteng samples, Maltsters samples were found to be more contaminated with mycotoxins ($p < 0.05$).

An investigation was also conducted to confirm the natural occurrence of fumonisin B₁ (FB₁) in barley samples at levels of up to 5 ppm, as determined by Vicam immunoaffinity analysis. The HPLC analysis was used to determine FB₁ in these barley samples. HPLC analysis of the barley samples previously found to be positive for fumonisins revealed detectable levels of ≤ 0.21 ppm FB₁ in only 7 samples of the 24 samples analysed.

Materials found to contain fungi and mycotoxins were further examined for cytotoxicity using human lymphocytes for possible chronic effects. Pure mycotoxins and selected barley fractions were found to be toxic to the lymphocytes. A study was also conducted to determine whether cytotoxicity testing could be used as additional tool for estimating the amount of toxin present in a commodity.

The differences in the level of fungal and mycotoxins contamination between Gauteng and Maltsters could have been due to the difference in the environmental conditions, which the barley was harvested, or the varying degree of handling and storage within the companies. This study may also present the general picture on the quality of products in the brewery industry. Although some of the barley samples were of low quality in regards

to food safety, the issue of upgrading quality control measures in the barley producing regions in South Africa will be of paramount importance.



DECLARATION

I hereby declare the dissertation, which I herewith submit for the research qualification

.....
to the University of Johannesburg is, apart from recognized assistance, my own work and has not previously been submitted by me to another institution to obtain a research diploma or degree.



ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

There are a number of people to whom I am indebted for their contribution to this study and I wish to express my gratitude and sincerest thanks to them.

Thanks firstly, to my supervisor Professor M. F Dutton, for his timely acceptance as my supervisor, giving me the opportunity to conduct this study and providing professional guidance and suggestions regarding all aspects of the study.

To Mr Eric Van Zyl, my Head of Department for all the assistance he offered during my studies through the provision of financial assistance as well literature materials relevant to my research. I am eternally grateful for the assistance you have given to me.

I am sincerely grateful to Dr I. Meijering of South African Maltsters and Dr P. Toline of South African Breweries for the supplying me with barley samples.

My sincerest thanks to Mr Neil De Villiers, of The Department of Biomedical Technology for his invaluable assistance with statistical analysis of data and with the use of Bench Mark plate reader as well as other aspects of the laboratory.

I am also grateful to Mr Patrick Njobeh for his assistance with the preparation of this manuscript. His insightful, relevant and critical assessment of the writing was most helpful.

Thanks to Mr. Jan Voster and Mr. Rui Krause of The Department of Chemistry for their assistance with the use of the Gas Chromatography-Mass Spectroscopy and the High Performance Liquid Chromatography.

Thanks to Prof. A. Chuturgoon of the Department of Physiology in Natal University for the assistance with analysis of samples using High Performance-Liquid Chromatography.

To Mr Alaister Campbell, of the Department of Biotechnology for his assistance in drawing blood necessary for the lymphocytes studies and valuable technical advice and assistance with many aspects of my study, I offer my sincerest thanks.

My profound gratitude to all members of Food, Health and Environmental Research Group, for their invaluable advice and assistance with various aspects of this study.

I would like to offer my sincerest gratitude to my friends, particularly Mr Josef Rakoma, Mr Lebo Mmatli, Mr Lucas Ledwaba, Mr Thabo Makena, Miss Mabusha Mabetoa and Miss Thokozile Ledwaba for their encouragement in the darker hours, of they were many.

To Miss Nomfanelo Matiwane, you have been a constant source of love, support and assistance. Thank you so much for everything that you have done. You are my guiding light and I don't know what I would have done without you!

To all the students and staff in The Department of Biotechnology and throughout the University of Johannesburg, past and present. Many of you have contributed in some way towards this study, that any assistance received was truly appreciated.

My utmost thanks and appreciation go to my parents for their sacrifice, support, motivation and encouragement. They have stood by me, prayed for my success and supported me all my life. God's protection and love for me is due to their prayers. I also thank my brothers; Tshepo Maenetje and Samuel Maenetje and my sisters; Maurine Maenetje and Margate Maenetje for the trust and support. Thanks to my grandmother Elsie Maenetje (Blessed memory) for her love and guidance in my life.

I thank TCR funding of Technikon Witwatersrand for the financial assistance of this research.

Finally, TO THE ALMIGHTY GOD, for giving the strength to overcome obstacles I had.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT	III
DECLARATION	VI
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	VII
TABLE OF CONTENTS	X
LIST OF FIGURES	XIV
LIST OF TABLES	XVIII
CHAPTER ONE	1
1.0 Introduction.....	1
1.1 Mycotoxins.....	1
1.2 Aims of this study.....	2
CHAPTER TWO	3
2.0 Literature review.....	3
2.1 Introduction.....	3
2.2 Toxigenic fungi.....	4
2.2.1 <i>Aspergillus</i> spp.	6
2.2.2 <i>Fusarium</i> spp.	7
2.2.3 <i>Penicillium</i> spp.	8
2.3 Occurrence of mycotoxins.....	8
2.3.1 Aflatoxins.....	10
2.3.2 Ochratoxins.....	10
2.3.3 Fumonisin.....	12
2.3.4 Zearalenone.....	13
2.3.5 Trichothecenes.....	14
2.3.6 Other significant mycotoxins.....	15
2.4 Mycotoxin intake and their biological effects.....	19
2.4.1 Aflatoxins.....	19
2.4.2 Ochratoxins.....	20

2.4.3	Fumonisin	21
2.4.4	Zearalenone	22
2.4.5	Trichothecenes	22
2.4.6	Other mycotoxins	23
2.5	Control of mycotoxin contamination in the food industry	25
2.5.1	Concept of quality control	25
2.5.1.1	Fungal control	25
2.5.1.2	Mycotoxin control	26
2.6	Agricultural and food commodities as reservoir for mycotoxin	27
2.6.1	Barley as a reservoir of mycotoxins	27
2.6.1.1	The brewing process	28
2.6.1.2	Fungal contamination in South African barley and malt	29
2.6.1.3	Mycotoxins in barley, malt and beer	30
2.7	Legislation	31
2.8	Conclusion	33
CHAPTER THREE		34
3.0	Morphological studies on fungal screening	34
3.1	Fungal contamination	34
3.2	Methodology	34
3.2.1	Sample collection and preparation	34
3.2.2	Evaluation of toxigenic fungi	35
3.3	Statistical analysis	35
3.4	Results	36
3.4.1	Fungal screening	36
3.4.2	Toxigenic potential of the fungal isolates	40
3.5	Discussion	42
3.5.1	Fungal screening	42
3.5.2	Evaluation of toxigenic fungi	46
3.6	Conclusion	48

CHAPTER FOUR	49
4.0 Multi-Mycotoxin screening.....	49
4.1 Thin layer chromatography.....	49
4.2 Methodology.....	50
4.2.1 Extraction of toxins.....	50
4.3 Statistical analysis.....	51
4.4 Results.....	51
4.4.1 Determination of spots on thin layer chromatograms.....	51
4.4.2 Determination of spots on thin layer chromatograms using spray reagents.....	54
4.5 Discussion.....	58
4.6 Conclusion.....	61
 CHAPTER FIVE	 62
5.0 Gas Chromatography- Mass Spectrometry (GC-MS) and High Performance Liquid Chromatography (HPLC).....	62
5.1 Overview.....	62
5.2 Methodology.....	62
5.2.1 Gas-Chromatography-Mass Spectroscopy determination.....	62
5.2.1.1 Derivatisation of mycotoxins.....	63
5.2.1.2 Analysis.....	63
5.2.2 High Performance Liquid Chromatography determination.....	64
5.2.2.1 Aflatoxin B ₁ analysis.....	64
5.2.2.2 Ochratoxin A analysis.....	64
5.3 Statistical analysis.....	65
5.4 Results.....	65
5.4.1 Gas-Chromatography-Mass Spectroscopy.....	65
5.4.2 High Performance Liquid Chromatography.....	70
5.4.2.1 Aflatoxin B ₁	70
5.4.2.2 Ochratoxin A.....	73
5.5 Discussion.....	75

5.5.1 Gas-Chromatography-Mass Spectroscopy.....	75
5.5.2 High Performance Liquid Chromatography.....	77
5.5.2.1 Aflatoxin B ₁	77
5.5.2.1 Ochratoxin A.....	78
5.6 Conclusion.....	80
CHAPTER SIX.....	81
6.0 Quantification of mycotoxins using Vicam.....	81
6.1 Immunoaffinity analysis.....	81
6.2 Methodology.....	81
6.2.1 Spiking of barley samples.....	81
6.2.2 Extraction and immunoaffinity clean-up of barley samples.....	81
6.2.2.1 Summary of clean-up procedures.....	82
6.3 Confirmation of Fumonisin B ₁ in barley samples using High-Performance Liquid Chromatography.....	82
6.3.1 HPLC analysis.....	82
6.4 Statistical analysis.....	82
6.5 Results.....	83
6.5.1 Quantification of mycotoxins in barley samples.....	83
6.5.2 Comparison between samples from Gauteng region.....	86
6.5.3 Comparison between samples from Maltsters	88
6.5.6 Confirmation of FB ₁ in barley fractions.....	89
6.6 Discussion.....	90
6.6.1 Confirmation fumonisin in barley.....	94
6.7 Conclusion.....	95
CHAPTER SEVEN.....	97
7.0 Cytotoxicity testing.....	97
7.1 Methyl tetrazolium analysis.....	97
7.2 Methodology.....	97
7.2.1 Sample collection.....	97

7.2.2 Isolation and purification of peripheral blood mononuclear cells.....	98
7.2.2.1 Cell enumeration by Trypan blue method.....	98
7.2.2.2 Dose response to individual mycotoxins.....	99
7.2.2.3 Methyl thiazole tetrazolium assay.....	99
7.2.3 Estimation of toxin concentration in extracts using cytotoxicity test...	100
7.4 Statistical analysis	100
7.5 Results.....	100
7.5.1 Toxicity of mycotoxin standards and barley fractions.....	100
7.5.2 Estimation of toxin concentration in barley fractions using cytotoxicity test.....	105
7.6 Discussion.....	107
7.5.1 Toxicity of mycotoxin standards.....	107
7.5.2 Toxicity of mycotoxin standards in comparison to barley fractions....	109
7.5.3 Estimation of toxin concentration in barley fractions using cytotoxicity test.....	110
7.7 Conclusion.....	111
CHAPTER 8.....	112
8.0 General Conclusion.....	112
REFERENCES.....	115
APPENDICES.....	146
Appendix I.....	146
Appendix II.....	147
Appendix III.....	150
Appendix IV.....	151
Appendix V.....	153
RAW DATA.....	157

LIST OF FIGURES

CHAPTER TWO

Fig. 2.1 <i>Penicillium</i> (left), <i>Fusarium</i> (middle) and <i>Aspergillus</i> (right) (Kendrick, 1986).....	5
Fig. 2.2 Chemical structure of Aflatoxin B ₁ (Sweeney and Dobson, 1998).....	10
Fig. 2.3 Chemical structure of Ochratoxin A (Sweeney and Dobson, 1998).....	11
Fig. 2.4 Chemical structure of Fumonisin B ₁ (Sweeney and Dodson, 1998).....	13
Fig. 2.5 Chemical structure of Zearalenone (Bhatnagar <i>et al.</i> , 2002).....	14
Fig. 2.6 Chemical structure of Deoxynivalenol (Moss, 1996).....	15
Fig. 2.7 Chemical structure of Ergotamine (Moss, 1996).....	16
Fig. 2.8 Chemical structure of Sterigmatocystin (Sweeney and Dobson, 1998).....	17
Fig. 2.9 Chemical structure of Patulin (Sweeney and Dobson, 1998).....	17
Fig. 2.10 Chemical structure of Citrinin (Sweeny and Dobson, 1998).....	18
Fig. 2.11 Chemical structure of Moniliformin (Pineda-Valdes and Bullerman, 2000).....	19
Fig. 2.12 The simplified scheme for brewing (Linko <i>et al.</i> , 1998).....	28

CHAPTER THREE

Fig. 3.1 Level of fungal infection in barley samples from Gauteng and Maltsters.....	39
Fig. 3.2 Level of fungal infection in barley and malted barley samples from Maltsters...	40

CHAPTER FOUR

Fig. 4.1 A flow diagram representing an overview of multi-mycotoxin extraction procedure (Patterson and Roberts, 1979).....	50
Fig. 4.2 Diagrammatic representation of the overall spots occurring on TLC plates from barley and malted barley neutral fractions under UV light.....	51
Fig. 4.3 Diagrammatic representation of the overall spots occurring on TLC plates from barley and malted barley neutral fractions under UV light.....	52
Fig. 4.4 A thin layer chromatogram indicating AFB ₁ (A) and AFB ₂ (B) and OTA (C) under UV light.....	54
Fig. 4.5 A thin layer chromatogram indicating pure T-2 toxin (A) and DON (B). Mobile phases: CEI (1 st dimension) and TEF (2 nd dimension).....	55

Fig. 4.6 A thin layer chromatogram indicating a barley neutral fraction indicating the presence of DON. Mobile phases: CEI (1st dimension) TEF (2nd dimension)..... 55

Fig. 4.7 A thin layer chromatogram indicating pure zearalenone. Mobile phases: 2 % methanol in dichloromethane (1st dimension) and cyclohexane (2ⁿ dimension)..... 56

CHAPTER FIVE

Fig. 5.1 Chromatogram of a silylated barley sample spiked with 50 ppm DON..... 66

Fig. 5.2 Mass spectrum of a silylated barley sample spiked with 50 ppm DON.....66

Fig. 5.3 Chromatogram of a silylated blank barley fraction..... 67

Fig. 5.4 Chromatogram of a naturally contaminated barley fraction with DON68

Fig. 5.5 Level of DON contamination in Gauteng and Maltsters barley samples..... 70

Fig. 5.6 Chromatogram of a spiked beer sample with 0.05 ppb AFB₂ (A) and AFB₁ (B)....70

Fig. 5.7 UV-spectra and the absorption maxima (nm) of a spiked beer sample (0.1 ppb AFB₁).....71

Fig. 5.8 UV-spectra and the absorption maxima (nm) of a spiked beer sample (0.1 ppb (AFB₂))..... 71

Fig. 5.9 UV-spectra and absorption maxima (nm) of naturally contaminated beer sample with AFB₁ 72

Fig. 5.10 Chromatogram of a beer sample spiked with 0.05 ppb OTA.....73

Fig. 5.11 UV-spectra and the absorption maxima (nm) of a spiked beer sample.....73

Fig. 5.12 UV-spectra and the absorption maxima (nm) of a naturally contaminated beer sample at estimated concentration of 0.09 ppb OTA.....74

CHAPTER SIX

Fig. 6.1 Level of aflatoxin and ochratoxin contamination in Gauteng and Maltsters barley sample using Vicam fluorometry analysis..... 85

Fig. 6.2 Level of deoxynivalenol, fumonisin and zearalenone in Gauteng and Maltsters barley samples using Vicam fluorometry analysis.....85

Fig. 6.3 Level of aflatoxin and ochratoxin in barley samples from Gauteng using Vicam fluorometry analysis.....87

Fig. 6.4 Level of deoxynivalenol, fumonisin and zearalenone in barley samples from Gauteng using Vicam fluorometry analysis..... 87

Fig. 6.5 Level of aflatoxin and ochratoxin in barley samples from Maltsters using Vicam fluorometry analysis.....88

Fig. 6.6 Level of deoxynivalenol, fumonisin and zearalenone in barley samples from Maltsters using Vicam fluorometry analysis.....89

Fig. 6.7 Chromatogram of a derivatised pure fumonisin at 10 ppm FB₁ indicated by 90

Fig. 6.8 Chromatogram of naturally contaminated barley fraction with FB₁.....90

CHAPTER SEVEN

Fig. 7.1 Dose- response linear regression curve of pure fumonisin B₁ on the human PBMCs (r = 0.958). All plotted dots of the curves represent means of 3 measurements in 3 distinct test procedures..... 101

Fig. 7.2 Dose-response linear regression curve of pure deoxynivalenol on the human PBMCs (r = 0.713). All plotted dots of the curves represent means of 3 measurements in 3 distinct test procedures..... 102

Fig. 7.3 Dose- response linear regression curve of pure ochratoxin A on the human PBMCs (r = 0.819). All plotted dots of the curves represent means of 3 measurements in 3 distinct test procedures..... 103

Fig. 7.4 Dose- response linear regression curve of a neutral barley extract on the human PBMCs (r = 0.811). All plotted dots of the curves represent means of 2 measurements in 3 distinct test procedures..... 104

Fig. 7.5 Dose- response linear regression curve of acid barley extract on the human PBMCs (r = 0.714). All plotted dots on the curve represent means of 3 measurements in 3 distinct test procedures..... 105

Fig. 7.6 Linear regression curve of FB₁ actual and estimated concentration values (r = 0.946)..... 106

Fig. 7.7 Linear regression curve of DON actual and estimated concentration values (r = 0.802)..... 106

Fig. 7.8 Linear regression curve of FB₁ actual and estimated concentration values (r = 0.371)..... 107

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER TWO

Table 2.1 Incidence of mycotoxins in South African Agricultural commodities from 1984- 1993 (Dutton and Kinsey, 1996).....	9
--	---

CHAPTER THREE

Table 3.1 Results of fungal species detected in barley samples from Gauteng.....	36
Table 3.2 Results of fungal species detected in pearl barley samples from Gauteng.....	37
Table 3.3 Results of fungal species detected in barley samples from Maltsters.....	38
Table 3.4 Results of fungal species detected in malted barley samples from Maltsters.....	38
Table 3.5 Detected fungal species belonging to the genera <i>Penicillium</i>	40
Table 3.6 The toxigenic potential of fungal strains isolated from Gauteng barley samples..	41
Table 3.7 The toxigenic potential of fungal strains isolated from Maltsters barley samples.	42

CHAPTER FOUR

Table 4.1 Results of the averaged RF values of the spots that commonly occurred on thin layer chromatograms.....	53
Table 4.2 Results of the incidence rate of common spots on thin layer chromatograms.....	53
Table 4.3 Results of the incidence rate of mycotoxins from barley fractions determined by thin layer chromatograms.....	57
Table 4.4 Results of the intensity of mycotoxins detected on thin layer chromatograms in Gauteng barley fractions.....	57
Table 4.5 Results of the intensity of mycotoxins detected on thin layer chromatograms in Maltsters barley fractions.....	58

CHAPTER FIVE

Table 5.1 Results of the incidence rate of DON from barley fractions determined by gas chromatography- mass spectroscopy.....	68
Table 5.2 Level of DON contamination in the barley fractions from Gauteng region	69
Table 5.3 Level of DON contamination in the barley fractions from Maltsters.....	69
Table 5.4 The incidence of AFB ₁ contamination in beer samples obtained from the Gauteng region.....	72
Table 5.5 Level OTA contamination in beer samples obtained from the Gauteng region...	75

CHAPTER SIX

Table 6.1 Results of barley samples spiked with pure mycotoxins using Vicam fluorometry analysis..... 83

Table 6.2 Results of the incident rate of mycotoxin contamination in barley samples using Vicam fluorometry analysis..... 83

Table 6.3 Results of level of mycotoxin contamination in barley samples using Vicam fluorometry analysis.....84

Table 6.4 Level of mycotoxin contamination in Gauteng and Maltsters barley samples using Vicam fluorometry analysis..... 86

CHAPTER EIGHT

Table 8.1 Comparison of analytical results for barley samples from Gauteng and Maltsters.....113

