

AperTO - Archivio Istituzionale Open Access dell'Università di Torino

**A review on the most frequently used methods to detect antibiotic residues in bovine raw milk**

**This is a pre print version of the following article:**

*Original Citation:*

*Availability:*

This version is available <http://hdl.handle.net/2318/1902075> since 2023-05-02T10:34:32Z

*Published version:*

DOI:10.1016/j.idairyj.2023.105695

*Terms of use:*

Open Access

Anyone can freely access the full text of works made available as "Open Access". Works made available under a Creative Commons license can be used according to the terms and conditions of said license. Use of all other works requires consent of the right holder (author or publisher) if not exempted from copyright protection by the applicable law.

(Article begins on next page)

1 **Review**

2

3 **Methods to identify antibiotic residues in bovine raw milk**

4

5

6 Cristina Vercelli,<sup>a</sup> Michela Amadori,<sup>a</sup> Graziana Gambino,<sup>a, \*</sup> and Giovanni Re<sup>a</sup>

7

8 <sup>a</sup> *Department of Veterinary Sciences, University of Turin, Largo Paolo Braccini 2, 10095, Grugliasco*

9 *(Turin), Italy*

10

11

12

13 \* Corresponding author.

14 *E-mail address:* graziana.gambino@unito.it (G. Gambino).

15

16 **Abstract**

17 Bovine milk is a low cost and high nutritional value product, which is worldwide commercialized.  
18 To maintain high standard levels and to preserve consumer's health, tests could be used to identify  
19 antimicrobial drug residues, and control procedures must be planned and performed, according to  
20 legislative requirements. Ideally, a test should detect a large number of antibiotic molecules, should  
21 be rapid in the execution and not expensive. None of the actually available methods possesses the  
22 characteristics of the ideal test. Authors decided to write this review to resume the key features of  
23 immunoassays, high-performance liquid chromatography, liquid chromatography – tandem mass  
24 spectrometry, microbiological test, and biosensor assays, representative of the most used methods to  
25 detect antimicrobial residues in bovine raw milk. The final aim was to give essential information to  
26 veterinary practitioners and researchers who are engaged in on site screenings, official controls or in  
27 research.

28 *Keywords:* Analytical methods, Antimicrobials, Bovine milk, Residues, Screening test

29 **1. Introduction**

30 Bovine milk is one of the most consumed foods in the world and it is important for its high  
31 nutritional value and for its key role in the worldwide economy (FAO, 2019). Its composition  
32 comprehends proteins (3.0-3.9%), carbohydrates lactose and oligosaccharides (4.4-5.6%), fat (3.3-  
33 5.4%), and ash (0.7-0.8%) (Roy, Ye, Moughan, & Singh, 2020). Milk is an important dietary source  
34 of a variety of micronutrients, including calcium, phosphorus, magnesium, zinc, iodine, potassium,  
35 vitamin A, vitamin D, vitamin B12, and vitamin B2 (Dror & Allen, 2014). This variety of components  
36 is responsible for biochemical and nutritional features, and the derived energy is mainly due to the  
37 high presence of lactose fraction (Luiz, Bell, Rocha, Leal, & Anjos, 2018; Roy, et al., 2020).

38

39 One of the most important concerns about bovine milk is the contamination with veterinary  
40 medicine: antibiotics and anti-inflammatory drugs are administered to dairy cows to treat pathologies  
41 such as mastitis, endometritis, bronchopathies, pneumonia and lameness (EMA and EFSA, 2017; Han  
42 et al., 2015). The treatment of animals is mandatory to respect animal welfare but must be performed  
43 in a rational way: focusing on antibiotics, a targeted therapy with narrow spectrum molecules should  
44 be preferred, for the shortest time necessary to achieve a therapeutic outcome (Rajala-Schultz,  
45 Nødtvedt, Halasa, & Persson Waller, 2021). In the past, antibiotics were employed not only for the  
46 sole therapeutic purpose, but also to promote growth of food-producing animals and in metaphylactic  
47 protocols (Lees, Pelligand, Giraud, & Toutain, 2021). Without a stringent regulation, an overuse, or  
48 a misuse of antibiotics was diffused and, consequently, foodstuff contamination due to antibiotics and  
49 antibiotic residues was not unusual (Lees et al., 2021). The interest of the scientific community  
50 pushed several nations to change legislation to restrict antibiotic drug usage and preserve consumers'  
51 health (Lees et al., 2021; Luiz et al., 2018). European legislation (Regulation EU 2019/6) confirmed  
52 the ban of these substances as growth promoting agents and severely restricted prophylactic and  
53 metaphylactic uses. Recently, USA and China banned the use of antimicrobial drugs as growth  
54 promoting agents, as well (Lees et al., 2021).

55

56 Antibiotic residues might persist after the treatment and therefore, a withdrawal period is  
57 mandatory to ensure that the foodstuff derived from the treated animal do not contain levels of the  
58 drug that exceed the maximum residue limit (MRL) (Almashhadany, 2021; Jayalakshmi,  
59 Paramasivam, Sasikala, Tamilam, & Sumithra, 2017).

60

61 As defined by the European Union, a residue is a pharmacologically active substance, the  
62 parental drug, or its metabolites, which remains in foodstuff obtained from animals to which a  
63 medicinal product was administered (Regulation EC 470/2009; Regulation EU 37/2010). For each  
64 active substance, a MRL value has been established and is a precautionary value, which does not  
65 guarantee the absence of drug residues in milk or dairy products, thus adverse reactions in consumers  
66 are not excluded and might occur (Treiber & Beranek-Knauer, 2021). The MRLs established for  
67 antibiotics frequently used in dairy cows are summarized in Table 1.

68

69 Antibiotic residues from food can impair human health causing allergic reactions, mutations  
70 in cells, development of intestinal microbiome imbalances, and permitting to bacteria to get used to  
71 subtherapeutic concentrations of antibiotic drug and leading to the development and spread of AMR  
72 (Sachi, Ferdous, Sikder, & Azizul Karim Hussani, 2019; Treiber & Beranek-Knauer, 2021;  
73 Yazdanpanah et al., 2021). The direct consequences are complicated therapeutic outcomes, treatment  
74 failure, or the possibility to share and diffuse resistant pathogen microorganisms among animals and  
75 humans (Vercelli, Gambino, Amadori, & Re, 2022).

76

77 The control of milk to adhere to law requirements, the risks to share AMR through the  
78 worldwide consumption of milk and the preservation of consumers' health, are elements of a  
79 complicated network and they are all related each other (Ortelli, Cognard, Jan, & Edder, 2009).  
80 Ideally, a screening test should detect a large number of molecules in the same assay, should not be

81 time- and money-consuming and should be easy in the execution, even if performed by not  
82 specialized personnel. Nowadays several tests are commercially available or are under investigation  
83 to evaluate their possible use on site or in laboratory conditions, as confirmatory tests or for research  
84 purposes. Unfortunately, none of them possesses the characteristics of the ideal test. Thus, prior to  
85 use a test to detect the presence of antibiotic residues, advantages and disadvantages should be  
86 carefully evaluated to reach the most reliable result. Moreover, milk is a complex matrix, composed  
87 by several elements that may interfere with residues identification: purification, dilution and  
88 preparation of samples or specific storage conditions might be required (Serraino et al., 2013).  
89 Additionally, the purposes of the tests might be different: some tests are easy and fast in their  
90 execution and suitable for screening purposes but necessitate confirmation methods in case of  
91 positivity, leading to delay in obtaining result and to increased costs (Bilandžić et al., 2011; Burke &  
92 Adley, 2021). Regardless of the final use, test validation is mandatory accordingly to Commission  
93 Decision 2002/657/EC, concerning the performances of analytical methods and interpretation of  
94 results, thus establishing the criteria of linearity, sensitivity, specificity, intra- and inter-assay  
95 precision, and accuracy (2002/657/EC).

96

97       Considering all aforementioned factors, authors would like to summarize in the present review  
98 the most important methods that are currently used to identify antibiotic residues in bovine raw milk.

99

## 100       **2. Current available methods to detect antibiotics residues in milk**

### 101       *2.1 Immunoassays*

102       Enzyme-Linked Immunosorbent Assay (ELISA) technique was first described in 1971 by  
103 Engvall et al. (1971) and found multiple applications ranging from medical to biotechnological  
104 purposes. The method is based on an antigen-antibody linkage that produces a colorimetric reaction  
105 due to the presence of a chromophore linked to the antigen. The ELISA technique may be designed  
106 as qualitative (positive/negative result) or quantitative (result as measurement or concentration). Also,

107 a semiquantitative test exists, giving different levels of positivity and negativity that must always be  
108 compared to a reference scale (Belmar, Aly, Karle, & Pereira, 2019). Several ELISA-based kits are  
109 commercially available and used to rapidly detect a few families of antibiotics in bovine milk: due to  
110 the easy execution and the low cost, they can be performed as screening tests by veterinarians and  
111 dairy industry personnel (Belmar et al., 2019) (Table 2).

112  
113         Anyway, in case of positivity and official controls, a confirmation test is necessary, using  
114 more specific and sensitive tests, such as high-performance liquid chromatography (HPLC) or Liquid  
115 Chromatography-Tandem Mass Spectrometry - LC-MS/MS) (Belmar et al., 2019). These two  
116 methods will be described in further paragraphs. In fact, the limit of detection (LOD – the lowest  
117 amount of analyte that can be identify in a sample) and the limit of quantitation (LOQ) (lowest amount  
118 of analyte in a sample that can be quantitatively determined) of immunoassay – based techniques are  
119 proven to be higher of that of analytical methods, such as HPLC or LC-MS/MS (Ahmed et al., 2020;  
120 Moudgil, Bedi, Aulakh, Gill, & Kumar, 2019).

121  
122         The ELISA method was a milestone to develop new detection techniques such as a biochip-  
123 based test, which has been recently validated and seems to represent a significant improvement of the  
124 actual screening methods, considering the relative low-cost and rapid execution, even if it is able to  
125 detect only  $\beta$ -lactams (Yazdanpanah et al., 2021). Taking inspiration from antigen-antibody  
126 interaction, a new technique based on a magnetic immunoreaction has been developed to detect  
127 kanamycin and penicillin in dairy milk, demonstrating an extremely low LOD and a high sensitivity,  
128 but pretreatment and dilution steps of samples are necessary. This method is a proof-of-concept, not  
129 yet on the market (Pietschmann, Dittmann, Spiegel, Krause, & Schröper, 2020). A microarray assay  
130 ELISA- based has been recently validated: it can detect simultaneously norfloxacin, tetracycline,  
131 lincomycin and streptomycin in milk samples, reaching a remarkably high accuracy rate (ranging

132 from 77,6% to 116,4% of the different antibiotics), but having the disadvantage to require specialized  
133 and trained personnel. So far, this method is suggested for control programs in the dairy industry (Du  
134 et al., 2019).

135  
136 A commercially available immunoassay method is Lateral Flow Immunoassay (LFIA), that  
137 compared to ELISA is less time – consuming (easier samples preparation), with fast results  
138 acquisition, permits to analyze a large quantity of samples, and it is less expensive (Ahmed et al.,  
139 2020, Jiang et al., 2022). In the last few years, this method has been widely used to detect antibiotics  
140 in milk, such as  $\beta$ -lactams, tetracyclines, streptomycin and chloramphenicol and it has been recently  
141 implemented also for other matrices, such as honey, muscle, and liver (Ahmed et al., 2020).

142  
143 Among immunoassays also radioimmunoassay (RIA), fluorescence immunoassay (FIA) and  
144 colloidal gold immune-chromatographic assay (CGIA) must be listed (Ahmed et al., 2020).  
145 Radioimmunoassays have been widely used in the past to detect antibiotic residues in foodstuff due  
146 to its fast execution and low LOD (Yang & Carlson, 2004), but the short half-life of the radioisotopes  
147 used to label the analyte, and the possible risks for the personnel and the environment connected to  
148 the use of radioisotopes limited its application to a few clinical purposes (Ahmed et al., 2020).  
149 Fluorescence immunoassay is based on the linkage of a fluorophore to the antigen, giving a precise  
150 and well visualized detection, but background signal can interfere with the emission thus giving  
151 ambiguous results (Ahmed et al., 2020). This specific immunoassay has been extensively used to  
152 detect fluoroquinolones (Hu, Sheng, Zhang, Wu, & Wang, 2015), beta lactamases (Benito-Peña,  
153 Moreno-Bondi, Orellana, Maquieira, & van Amerongen, 2005) and tetracyclines (Song et al., 2015)  
154 in milk. Colloidal gold immune-chromatographic assay has been validated and used to detect  
155 tetracycline, sulphonamides, and fluoroquinolones residues rapidly and simultaneously in milk  
156 (Wang et al., 2017) but the scarce precision of the method leads in some cases to unclear results that  
157 limited its application (Zhou et al., 2018).



158

159 *2.2 High-Performance Liquid Chromatography (HPLC)*

160 As previously explained, rapid tests are such as ELISA and other immunoassays are used as  
161 first line, in-field screening methods and in case of positivity, the results must be confirmed using  
162 more accurate methods such as HPLC or LC-MS/MS (Bilandžić et al., 2011).

163

164 The HPLC is a chromatographic technique that requires specific and expensive instruments,  
165 time-consuming procedures and must be performed by trained personnel (Table 2). It is considered a  
166 gold standard method to detect antibiotic residues due to the high sensitivity, specificity, and  
167 quantification capability (Parmar, Chaubey, Gupta, & Bharath, 2021). The HPLC instrument is  
168 composed of 5 major components: mobile phase, detector, pump, column, and sampler (manual or  
169 automatic) (Fig. 1). Samples are injected and carried by the mobile phase flow through the column  
170 where separation of compounds occurs according to their differential affinity for the mobile phase.  
171 The pump generates optimal flow and pressure and pushes the mobile phase through the column that  
172 reaches the detector: a signal is generated, and it is proportional to the amount of the compounds in  
173 the sample (Parmar et al., 2021). Comparing the peaks resulting from the analysis to the calibration  
174 curve (that is the reference), it is possible to identify the compound that has been isolated and to  
175 calculate its concentration in the sample.

176

177 It has been validated the use of HPLC to detect tetracycline, sulfonamides and amphenicols  
178 in milk (Darko, Borquaye, Acheampong, & Opong, 2017) but it is sometimes very challenging to  
179 adequately prepare and purify milk sample prior performing the procedure: fat, protein and sugars  
180 present in milk can compromise the correct identification of residues (Luiz et al., 2018; Roy et al.,  
181 2020; Yang, Guo, Liang, Zhou, & Zhu, 2022). The problems due to the matrix effect are reported in  
182 the most recent literature related to innovative technique based on ultraviolet/visible spectroscopy  
183 that has been validated to simultaneously identify multiple residues in milk (Parmar et al., 2021).

184 Moreover, results can vary according to pH and temperature, leading to alteration of some analytes  
185 that are not stable, such as tetracycline, leading to an incorrect or missing identification of  
186 antimicrobial residues in milk (Kurjogi et al., 2019).

187

188 A recent paper (Kumar, Panda, & Sharma, 2022) described the optimization and validation  
189 of HPLC-diode array detection (HPLC-DAD) method for the simultaneous determination of seven  
190 antimicrobial drugs: sulphadiazine, sulphamethoxazole, oxytetracycline, doxycycline, tetracycline,  
191 enrofloxacin and chloramphenicol residues in bovine milk. The final aim of this advances HPLC  
192 technique is to improve the features of the method, allowing multiple identifications and saving time.  
193 Samples preparation is a fundamental step and authors explained that solid-phase extraction (SPE)  
194 was performed to eliminate proteins from milk samples. This highlights once again the importance  
195 of a careful sample preparation prior the execution of analysis. This advanced technique was  
196 successfully validated in accordance with European Commission Decision 2002/657/EC  
197 (2002/657/EC) and applied for the analysis of antibiotic residues in 21 raw milk samples obtaining  
198 recovery values ranging from 83.3 to 111.8% (3.5-16.2% standard deviation). The LOQ values  
199 relative to all tested antibiotics, except for chloramphenicol, were below the MRLs, making the  
200 method dependable and susceptible for further implementation for routine application (Kumar et al.,  
201 2022).

202

### 203 *2.3 Liquid Chromatography -Tandem Mass Spectrometry (LC-MS/MS)*

204 Liquid Chromatography-Tandem Mass Spectrometry is an advanced analytical technique  
205 characterized by a high performance in identifying and quantifying antimicrobials, their metabolites  
206 or residues present in various foodstuff, also in milk, with remarkably high accuracy and precision  
207 (Parmar et al., 2021). Sample constituents eluted from the column are ionized and vaporized,  
208 subjected to fragmentation, and separated according to the mass-to-charge ratio ( $M/Z$ ) in the mass

209 analyzer. The abundance or intensity of each ion with a different M/Z value is measured by the  
210 detector and it is proportional to the concentration of the analyte in the sample (Fig. 2).

211

212         When an MS/MS is used the “first MS” is set to select a parent ion (the M/Z value is most  
213 often the molecular ion of the substance), which then is passed into the “second MS” where it  
214 undergoes further fragmentation (Parmar et al., 2021). Ions are usually extremely specific to a given  
215 substance, and therefore their analysis provides an exceptionally reliable identification and  
216 quantification (Cronly et al., 2010; Zhao, Zulkoski, & Mastovska, 2017). This technique is extremely  
217 accurate (more than HPLC), and it is intended as high standard and confirmation tool. The main  
218 disadvantages of this technique are the high cost, the long execution, and the need to work in  
219 standardized experimental conditions (i.e., control ionization, pH, analyte stability) (Zhao et al.,  
220 2017). Also in this case, the complexity of milk composition may lead to misleading results and recent  
221 papers underlined that a reliable sample preparation is fundamental before LC-MS/MS analysis  
222 (Meklati et al., 2022; Zhao et al., 2017). The undoubted advantages are the simultaneous detection of  
223 multiple residues of different antibiotic classes and the very high analytical accuracy: this is ensured  
224 by the fact that structural information of the analyte is gained permitting the identification and  
225 quantification of very small amounts, having lower LOD and LOQ compared to HPLC (Parmar et  
226 al., 2021).

227

228         An advanced technique that has been successfully applied to detect antimicrobial residues is  
229 ultra-high performance liquid chromatography (UPLC), used alone (Castillo-Aguirre, Cañas, Honda,  
230 & Richter, 2021; Rahman, Hassan, & Chowdhury, 2021) or coupled with electrospray ionization and  
231 tandem mass spectrometry (UPLC–ESI–MS/MS) (Castillo-Aguirre et al., 2021; Luiz et al., 2018;  
232 Meklati et al., 2022). The method proposed by Igualada, Giraldo, Font, & Yusà (2022) aimed to  
233 identify 255 veterinary drug residues and contaminants in bovine raw milk. The procedure included  
234 two-step precipitation and ultra-performance liquid chromatography, operating both in positive and

235 negative multiple reaction mode (MRM). For most of the analytes, pretreatment process was a crucial  
236 step to ensure a successful identification.

237

238 A study specifically focused to simultaneously detect 38 veterinary antibiotic residues in raw  
239 milk was recently performed using UPLC–MS/MS (Han et al., 2015). The methodology differs from  
240 others present in literature due to a purification of samples by Oasis HLB cartridge and a dilution  
241 with water and acetonitrile (1mL sample; 0.5 mL water; 3 mL acetonitrile), before the injection into  
242 the UPLC–MS/MS system. The results indicated variable recoveries of 68–118% for drugs belonging  
243 to  $\beta$ -lactams groups, 79–118% for quinolones, 71–106% for sulfonamides, 76–116% for  
244 tetracyclines, 78–106% for macrolides, and 88–103% for lincosamides, with coefficients of variation  
245 less than 15% (Han et al., 2015).

246

#### 247 *2.4 Microbiological tests*

248 Microbiological tests have been used for a long time as screening tests to detect residues in  
249 milk: they are still used with significant improvements (Sachi et al., 2019). No sample preparation is  
250 needed, and a milk sample is considered positive when an inhibition zone appears in the reference  
251 bacterial cultures. The diameters of the inhibition zone must be measured to interpret the results  
252 (Gaudin et al., 2004). This technique has a low specificity that might lead to incorrect results: high  
253 somatic cells or pH variations in case of mastitis, may lead to false negative results (Wu et al., 2019).  
254 Nevertheless, this kind of method continues to be the focus of several investigations to improve the  
255 current method due to the brief time of execution (Table 2) and to the versatility with various products  
256 of animal origin, i.e., eggs and honey and raw, pasteurized, and bulk milk (Wu et al., 2019).

257

258 Advancement of this technique permitted to design the use of specific bacteria, sensitive to  
259 particular antibiotics on agar gel including nutrients for bacterial growth and a pH indicator (Tumini,  
260 Nagel, & Althaus, 2019). All elements are set up in a test tube where milk is added and then the tube

261 is incubated at the appropriate temperature to allow bacteria grow. Without antibiotic residues, the  
262 normal growth of bacteria is unaltered and visually detectable, appreciating a change of opacity of  
263 the medium and of the color due to acid pH. Otherwise, the growth of bacteria is inhibited, without  
264 observable changes (Nagel, Molina, & Althaus, 2013). Nowadays several kits based on this technique  
265 are commercially available. Anyway, few families of antibiotics can be identified using this kind of  
266 methods, and it is not possible to obtain a quantification of residues amount. Considering two of the  
267 most popular kits, Delvotest ST-NP can detect  $\beta$ -lactams, aminoglycosides, macrolides,  
268 sulphonamides, tetracyclines and diamino pyrimidine, while Charm Quad 1 test identifies only  $\beta$ -  
269 lactams, quinolones, sulfonamides and tetracyclines. Both tests claim in their datasheet the possibility  
270 to identify the presence of residues corresponding at least to MRL values, and both declare 95% of  
271 sensitivity (Charm QUAD1 datasheet; Delvotest datasheet;).

272

273 Low costs and simple execution are the main pros of this technique, while limitations could  
274 be the relative long incubation period (3-24 hours), the possibility of acquisition of antimicrobial  
275 resistance in the bacteria used for the detection, the subjective interpretation, the presence of  
276 inhibitors in abnormal milk (e.g., mastitis milk or colostrum) leading to misinterpretations (Tumini  
277 et al., 2019; Wu et al., 2019). The interest of the scientific community is to develop and validate new  
278 kits based on this method that can permit a qualitative identification of antibiotic residues even at  
279 concentrations lower than MRL (Gaudin et al., 2004; Tumini et al., 2019; Wu et al., 2019).

280

### 281 *2.5 Other methods*

282 A methodology based on Fourier transform near-infrared (FT-NIR) spectroscopy associated  
283 with principal component analysis (PCA) permitted to develop a portable prototype to detect ceftiofur  
284 hydrochloride traces in bovine milk in a fast and accurate way (Luiz et al., 2018). The method  
285 permitted to identify the parental molecule and the metabolites (Luiz et al., 2018).

286

287 Another promising technique that has been validated in the last years and that is continuously  
288 improved is the method based on the biosensors (Kivirand, Kagan, & Rinke, 2015). Several current  
289 methods of analysis are based on this technique, which does not require preliminary preparation of  
290 samples, enabling a selective detection for the on-site assessment of milk quality (Martins et al., 2019;  
291 Tumini et al., 2019). Biosensors are compact and usually portable devices, able to transfer the  
292 selective biochemical recognition into a measurable physical signal for real-time analysis, user-  
293 friendly, not requiring specific skills (Kivirand et al., 2015). Five distinct types of biosensor-based  
294 techniques are nowadays available: microbial biosensor, immunosensor, receptor and enzyme-based  
295 biosensors, aptasensors and molecularly imprinted polymer (MIP) sensors (Babington, Matas, Marco,  
296 & Galve, 2012; Beltrán, Berruga, Molina, Althaus, & Molina, 2015; Rebe Raz, Bremer, Haasnoot, &  
297 Norde, 2009). The most diffuse are immunosensors and aptasensors, that allow to perform the  
298 analysis without an extensive pretreatment of samples and in a brief time (30-40 minutes) (McGrath,  
299 Elliott, & Fodey, 2012; Reder-Christ & Bendas, 2011).

300

### 301 **3. Discussion**

302 In this review, authors aimed to summarize the current available methods to identify antibiotic  
303 residues in bovine raw milk, giving some simple explanations about the most notable features, a brief  
304 description of how they work, highlighting advantages and disadvantages. Authors are veterinarians  
305 having clear in mind the necessity to treat diseased animals, to apply reliable methods to correctly  
306 identify antimicrobial residues in milk, to preserve consumers' health, to limit AMR spread and to  
307 avoid alterations of dairy products (Burke & Adley, 2021; Kneebone, Tsang, & Townson, 2010).

308

309 The necessity to correctly identify antibiotic residues is only the end of a long story. Among  
310 the different pathologies that can affect dairy cows, mastitis are surely the most painful and  
311 debilitating conditions, impairing animal welfare and requiring immediate cure using anti-  
312 inflammatory drugs and antibiotics. The administration of a therapy is necessary to limit economic

313 losses due to the reduction in milk production and the discard of milk (Alves et al., 2020). Diagnosis  
314 of causative agent is often missing, and therapeutic protocols are applied in an empiric way leading  
315 to an increased risk to induce antibiotic resistance in bacteria (Vercelli et al., 2022). The presence of  
316 small amounts of antibiotic or residue in milk could play a significant role in the outbreak of allergic  
317 phenomena and in the dissemination of resistant bacteria or genes (Alves et al., 2020; Treiber &  
318 Beranek-Knauer, 2021).

319

320         The different methods differ each other for the expensiveness and the time-consuming  
321 procedure, the necessity to prepare or purify the samples, and the interference of matrix effect: all  
322 these parameters can affect specificity, sensitivity, and accuracy of each method (Alves et al., 2020;  
323 Kurjogi et al., 2019). Along the manuscript, authors highlighted that despite many advances on the  
324 detection techniques, sample preparation remains a problem influencing the determination of  
325 antibiotics in milk and interfering in analytical procedures (Aguilera-Luiz, Martínez Vidal, Romero-  
326 González, & Garrido Frenich, 2012). For the majority of the aforementioned techniques, the high  
327 protein and fat content in milk are the main responsible of this interference. The extraction methods  
328 are often based on long and tedious procedures, involving liquid-liquid extraction (García-Mayor,  
329 Garcinuño, Fernández-Hernando, & Durand-Alegría, 2006) or SPE (Darko et al., 2017) which also  
330 include a previous step to precipitate proteins.

331

332         In recent years, the method named QuEChERS (quick, easy, cheap, effective, rugged and safe)  
333 has been investigated and now it is commercially available (Zhang et al., 2019). The method is based  
334 on an acetonitrile extraction/partitioning of various compounds, while water and proteins are removed  
335 from the sample using sodium chloride and magnesium sulphate. Then, SPE clean up permit the  
336 extraction of contaminants and antimicrobials residues that remain in the supernatant part after the  
337 centrifugation (Zhang et al., 2019). It is a rapid and reliable extraction system, flexible to different

338 situations and that can permit to achieve optimal results also in official controls for milk quality  
339 (Zhang et al., 2019).

340

341 Misleading results can occur with every methodology presented in the present review and this  
342 is the reason authors stressed the explanations about the rigorous preparation of the samples, the  
343 accuracy of the methods and the complexity of milk as matrix. There, the importance to use reliable  
344 tests and to obtain relevant results and to preserve consumers' health, especially fragile people, to  
345 maintain high standard levels in milk production and in dairy industry, limiting AMR spread.

346

#### 347 **4. Conclusions**

348 Prior to write this review, Authors had to face the vast panorama of different methods designed  
349 to identify antimicrobial residues in bovine raw milk. After a careful consultation and selection of the  
350 most recent and relevant literature, they were able to summarize the advantages and disadvantages of  
351 the most important, dependable, and frequently used methods. It might be concluded that screening  
352 tests are mainly represented by microbiological, immuno- and biosensors assays. Among these three  
353 categories, several tools are available and significant differences of cost exist while all are  
354 characterized by a short time of execution. All of them require a confirmation test in case of positivity  
355 using a validated gold standard method (i.e., HPLC or LC-MS/MS).

356

357 Authors hope to have clearly exposed and successfully resumed such a complex topic and that  
358 this review will help other veterinarians and researchers dealing with antibiotic residues in bovine  
359 raw milk.

360

#### 361 **Declarations of interest**

362 None.



363 **Funding**

364 This work was supported by Regione Piemonte, grant Tech4milk.

365

366 **References**

- 367 Aguilera-Luiz, M.M., Martínez Vidal, J.L., Romero-González, R., Garrido Frenich, A. (2012).  
368 Multiclass Method for Fast Determination of Veterinary Drug Residues in Baby Food by  
369 Ultra-High-Performance Liquid Chromatography–Tandem Mass Spectrometry. *Food*  
370 *Chemistry* 132, 2171–2180.
- 371
- 372 Ahmed, S., Ning, J., Peng, D., Chen, T., Ahmad, I., Ali, A., Lei, Z., Abubakr Shabbir, M., Cheng,  
373 G., Yuan, Z. (2020). Current Advances in Immunoassays for the Detection of Antibiotics  
374 Residues: A Review. *Food and Agricultural Immunology* 31, 268–290.
- 375
- 376 Almashhadany, D.A. (2021). Screening of Antibiotic Residues in Raw Milk of Cows and Buffalos  
377 by Diffusion Assays. *Italian Journal of Food Safety* 10, 9034.
- 378
- 379 Alves, J.F., Paula, G.H., Silva, R.C.F., Leão, P.V.T., Leão, K.M., Nicolau, E.S., Silva, M.A.P. (2020).  
380 Residues of Antibiotics in Milk: Persistence and Quality Interference. *Canadian Journal of*  
381 *Animal Science* 100, 93–101.
- 382
- 383 Babington, R., Matas, S., Marco, M. P., Galve, R. (2012). Current bioanalytical methods for detection  
384 of penicillins. *Analytical and Bioanalytical Chemistry* 403, 1549–1566.
- 385
- 386 Belmar, M., Aly, S., Karle, B.M., Pereira, R.V. (2019). Evaluation of Four Commercial Tests for  
387 Detecting Ceftiofur in Waste Milk Bulk Tank Samples. *PLoS One* 14, e0224884.
- 388
- 389 Beltrán, M.C., Berruga, M.I., Molina, A., Althaus, R.L., Molina, M.P. (2015). Performance of Current  
390 Microbial Tests for Screening Antibiotics in Sheep and Goat Milk. *International Dairy*  
391 *Journal* 41, 13–15.
- 392
- 393 Benito-Peña, E., Moreno-Bondi, M.C., Orellana, G., Maquieira, Á., van Amerongen, A. (2005).  
394 Development of a Novel and Automated Fluorescent Immunoassay for the Analysis of  $\beta$ -  
395 Lactam Antibiotics. *Journal of agriculture and food chemistry* 53, 6635–6642.
- 396
- 397 Bilandžić, N., Kolanović, B.S., Varenina, I., Scortichini, G., Annunziata, L., Brstilo, M., Rudan, N.  
398 (2011). Veterinary Drug Residues Determination in Raw Milk in Croatia. *Food Control* 22,  
399 1941–1948.
- 400
- 401 Burke, N., Adley, C.C. (2021). Prevalence of intramammary antibiotic usage in dairy farming. *Journal*  
402 *of Dairy Research* 88, 176–178.
- 403
- 404 Castillo-Aguirre, A., Cañas, A., Honda, L., Richter, P. (2021). Determination of Veterinary  
405 Antibiotics in Cow Milk Using Rotating-Disk Sorptive Extraction and Liquid  
406 Chromatography. *Microchemical Journal* 162, 105851.
- 407
- 408 Commission Regulation (EU). (2009). Commission Regulation (EU) No 37/2010 of 22 December  
409 2009 on Pharmacologically Active Substances and Their Classification Regarding

410 Maximum Residue Limits in Foodstuffs of Animal Origin. 72. [https://eur-](https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=CELEX:32010R0037)  
411 [lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=CELEX:32010R0037](https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=CELEX:32010R0037) Accessed October 30,  
412 2022.  
413  
414 Cronly, M., Behan, P., Foley, B., Malone, E., Martin, S., Doyle, M., Regan, L. (2010). Rapid multi-  
415 class multi-residue method for the confirmation of chloramphenicol and eleven  
416 nitroimidazoles in milk and honey by liquid chromatography-tandem mass spectrometry  
417 (LC-MS). Food additives & contaminants. Part A, Chemistry, analysis, control, exposure &  
418 risk assessment 27, 1233–1246.  
419  
420 Darko, G., Borquaye, L.S., Acheampong, A., Oppong, K. (2017). Veterinary Antibiotics in Dairy  
421 Products from Kumasi, Ghana. Cogent Chemistry 3, 1343636  
422  
423 Delvotest® the gold standard for detecting antibiotics in milk. <https://www.delvotest.com.au> ›  
424 technical\_info › Delvotest SP NT – Sensitivity list EN.pdf Accessed October 30, 2022.  
425  
426 Dror, D.K., Allen, L.H. (2014). Dairy Product Intake in Children and Adolescents in Developed  
427 Countries: Trends, Nutritional Contribution, and a Review of Association with Health  
428 Outcomes. Nutrition Reviews 72, 68–81.  
429  
430 Du, B., Wen, F., Guo, X., Zheng, N., Zhang, Y., Li, S., Zhao, S., Liu, H., Meng, L., Xu, Q., Li, M.,  
431 Li, F., Wang J. (2019). Evaluation of an ELISA-Based Visualization Microarray Chip  
432 Technique for the Detection of Veterinary Antibiotics in Milk. Food Control 106, 106713.  
433  
434 EMA (2017). EMA Committee for Medicinal Products for Veterinary Use (CVMP) and EFSA  
435 Panel on Biological Hazards (BIOHAZ). Murphy, D., Ricci, A., Auce, Z., Beechinor, J.G.,  
436 Bergendahl, H., Breathnach, R., Bureš, J., Duarte Da Silva, J.P., Hederová, J., Hekman, P.,  
437 and others. EMA and EFSA Joint Scientific Opinion on Measures to Reduce the Need to  
438 Use Antimicrobial Agents in Animal Husbandry in the European Union, and the Resulting  
439 Impacts on Food Safety (RONAFA). EFSA journal. European Food Safety Authority 15,  
440 e04666.  
441  
442 FAO. (2019). Dairy and dairy products. OECD-FAO Agricultural Outlook 2019-2028.  
443 <https://www.fao.org>CA 4076 EN Chapter 7 Dairy.Pdf> Accessed October 30, 2022.  
444  
445 García-Mayor, M.A., Garcinuño, R.M., Fernández-Hernando, P., Durand-Alegría, J.S. (2006). Liquid  
446 Chromatography–UV Diode-Array Detection Method for Multi-Residue Determination of  
447 Macrolide Antibiotics in Sheep’s Milk. Journal of Chromatography A 1122, 76–83.  
448  
449 Gaudin, V., Maris, P., Fuselier, R., Ribouchon, J. L., Cadieu, N., Rault, A. (2004). Validation of a  
450 microbiological method: the STAR protocol, a five-plate test, for the screening of antibiotic  
451 residues in milk. Food additives and contaminants 21, 422–433.  
452  
453 Han, R.W., Zheng, N., Yu, Z.N., Wang, J., Xu, X.M., Qu, X.Y., Li, S.L., Zhang, Y.D., Wang, J.Q.  
454 2015. Simultaneous Determination of 38 Veterinary Antibiotic Residues in Raw Milk by  
455 UPLC–MS/MS. Food Chemistry 181, 119–126.  
456  
457 Hashempour-Baltork, F., Hosseini, H., Shojae-Aliabadi, S., Torbati, M., Alizadeh, A.M., Alizadeh  
458 M. (2019). Drug Resistance and the Prevention Strategies in Food Borne Bacteria: An  
459 Update Review. Advanced Pharmaceutical Bulletin 9, 335-347.

Commentato [GG1]: Ci vuole il punto?

Commentato [GG2]: Non lo trovo nel testo

461 Hu, G., Sheng, W., Zhang, Y., Wu, X., Wang, S. (2015). A Novel and Sensitive Fluorescence  
462 Immunoassay for the Detection of Fluoroquinolones in Animal-Derived Foods Using  
463 Upconversion Nanoparticles as Labels. *Analytical and bioanalytical chemistry* 407, 8487–  
464 8496.

465 Iguualada, C., Giraldo, J., Font, G., Yusà, V. (2022). Validation of a Multi-Residue UHPLC-HRMS  
466 Method for Antibiotics Screening in Milk, Fresh Cheese, and Whey. *Journal of Food*  
467 *Composition and Analysis* 106, 104265.

468  
469 Jayalakshmi, K., Paramasivam, M., Sasikala, M., Tamilam, T., Sumithra, A. (2017). Review on  
470 Antibiotic Residues in Animal Products and Its Impact on Environments and Human  
471 Health. *Journal of Entomology and Zoology Studies* 5, 1446-1451.

472  
473 Jiang, J., Luo, P., Liang, J., Shen, X., Lei, H., Li, X. (2022). A highly sensitive and quantitative time  
474 resolved fluorescent microspheres lateral flow immunoassay for streptomycin and  
475 dihydrostreptomycin in milk, honey, muscle, liver, and kidney. *Analytica Chimica Acta*  
476 1192, 339360.

477  
478 Kivirand, K., Kagan, M., Rincken, T. (2015). Biosensors for the detection of antibiotic residues in  
479 milk. *Biosensors - Micro and Nanoscale Applications* (1st ed.). IntechOpen (Chapter 16).

480  
481 Kneebone, J., Tsang, P.C.W., Townson, D.H. (2010). Short Communication: Rapid Antibiotic  
482 Screening Tests Detect Antibiotic Residues in Powdered Milk Products. *Journal of dairy*  
483 *science* 93, 3961-3964.

484  
485 Kumar, A., Panda, A.K., Sharma, N. (2022). Determination of Antibiotic Residues in Bovine Milk  
486 by HPLC-DAD and Assessment of Human Health Risks in Northwestern Himalayan  
487 Region, India. *Journal of Food Science and Technology* 59, 95–104.

488  
489 Kurjogi, M., Mohammad, Y.H.I., Alghamdi, S., Abdelrahman, M., Satapute, P., Jogaiah, S. (2019).  
490 Detection and Determination of Stability of the Antibiotic Residues in Cow's Milk. *PLoS*  
491 *One* 14, e0223475.

492  
493 Lees, P., Pelligand, L., Giraud, E., Toutain, P. (2021). A History of Antimicrobial Drugs in Animals:  
494 Evolution and Revolution. *Journal of veterinary pharmacology and therapeutics* 44, 137-  
495 171.

496  
497 Luiz, L. da C., Bell, M.J.V., Rocha, R.A. da, Leal, N.L., Anjos, V. de C. dos. (2018). Detection of  
498 Veterinary Antimicrobial Residues in Milk through Near-Infrared Absorption Spectroscopy.  
499 *Journal of Spectroscopy* 18, 1–6.

500  
501 Martins, S.A.M., Martins, V.C., Cardoso, F.A., Germano, J., Rodrigues, M., Duarte, C., Bexiga, R.,  
502 Cardoso, S., Freitas, P.P. (2019). Biosensors for On-Farm Diagnosis of Mastitis. *Frontiers*  
503 *in Bioengineering and Biotechnology* 7, 186.

504  
505 McGrath, T.F., Elliott, C.T., Fodey, T.L. (2012). Biosensors for the analysis of microbiological and  
506 chemical contaminants in food. *Analytical and bioanalytical chemistry* 403, 75–92.

507  
508 Meklati, F.R., Panara, A., Hadeif, A., Meribai, A., Ben-Mahdi, M.H., Dasenaki, M.E., Thomaidis,  
509 N.S. (2022). Comparative Assessment of Antibiotic Residues Using Liquid  
510 Chromatography Coupled with Tandem Mass Spectrometry (LC-MS/MS) and a Rapid  
511

512 Screening Test in Raw Milk Collected from the North-Central Algerian Dairies. *Toxics* 10,  
513 19.

514

515 Moudgil, P., Bedi, J.S., Aulakh, R.S., Gill, J.P.S., Kumar, A. (2019). Validation of HPLC Multi-  
516 residue Method for Determination of Fluoroquinolones, Tetracycline, Sulphonamides and  
517 Chloramphenicol Residues in Bovine Milk. *Food Analytical Methods* 12, 338–346.

518

519 Nagel, O., Molina, M.P., Althaus, R. (2013). Microbiological System in Microtitre Plates for  
520 Detection and Classification of Antibiotic Residues in Milk. *International Dairy Journal* 32,  
521 150–155.

522

523 Nerval, E., Jonsson, K., Perlman, P. (1971). Enzyme-linked immunosorbent assay. II. Quantitative  
524 Assay of Protein Antigen, Immunoglobulin G, by Means of Enzyme-Labelled Antigen and  
525 Antibody-Coated Tubes. *Biochimica et Biophysica Acta* 251, 427–434.

526

527 Operator's Manual: Charm® QUAD1 Test for Beta-lactams, Quinolones, Sulfonamides, and  
528 Tetracyclines in Raw Commingled Cow Milk.  
529 [https://suporte.hexis.com.br/ci/okcsFattach/get/1028850\\_5](https://suporte.hexis.com.br/ci/okcsFattach/get/1028850_5) Accessed October 30, 2022.

530

531 Ortelli, D., Cognard, E., Jan, P., Edder, P. (2009). Comprehensive Fast Multiresidue Screening of  
532 150 Veterinary Drugs in Milk by Ultra-Performance Liquid Chromatography Coupled to  
533 Time of Flight Mass Spectrometry. *Journal of Chromatography B* 877, 2363–2374.

534

535 Parmar, J.K., Chaubey, K.K., Gupta, V., Bharath, M.N. (2021). Assessment of Various Veterinary  
536 Drug Residues in Animal Originated Food Products. *Veterinary World* 14, 1650-1664.

537

538 Pietschmann, J., Dittmann, D., Spiegel, H., Krause, H.-J., Schröper, F. (2020). A Novel Method for  
539 Antibiotic Detection in Milk Based on Competitive Magnetic Immunodetection. *Foods* 9,  
540 1773.

541

542 Rahman, M.S., Hassan, M.M., Chowdhury, S. (2021). Determination of antibiotic residues in milk  
543 and assessment of human health risk in Bangladesh. *Heliyon* 7, e07739.

544

545 Rajala-Schultz, P., Nødtvedt, A., Halasa, T., Persson Waller, K. (2021). Prudent Use of Antibiotics  
546 in Dairy Cows: The Nordic Approach to Udder Health. *Frontiers in Veterinary Science* 8,  
547 623998.

548

549 Rebe Raz, S., Bremer, M.G.E.G., Haasnoot, W., Norde, W. (2009). Label-Free and Multiple  
550 Detection of Antibiotic Residues in Milk Using Imaging Surface Plasmon Resonance-Based  
551 Immunosensor. *Analytical Chemistry* 81, 7743–7749.

552

553 Reder-Christ, K., Bendas, G. (2011). Biosensor applications in the field of antibiotic research--a  
554 review of recent developments. *Sensors* 11, 9450–9466.

555

556 Regulation (EC) No 470/2009 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 6 May 2009 laying  
557 down Community procedures for the establishment of residue limits of pharmacologically  
558 active substances in foodstuffs of animal origin, repealing Council Regulation (EEC) No  
559 2377/90 and amending Directive 2001/82/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council  
560 and Regulation (EC) No 726/2004 of the European Parliament and of the Council.  
561 <https://data.europa.eu/eli/reg/2009/470/oj> Accessed October 30, 2022.

562

Commentato [GG3]: Non lo trovo nel testo

563 Regulation (EU). (2019). Regulation (EU) 2019/6 of the European Parliament and of the Council of  
564 11 December 2018 on veterinary medicinal products and repealing Directive 2001/82/EC.  
565 <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/eli/reg/2019/6/oj> Accessed 30 October 30, 2022.  
566

567 Roy, D., Ye, A., Moughan, P.J., Singh, H. (2020). Composition, Structure, and Digestive Dynamics  
568 of Milk From Different Species—A Review. *Frontiers in nutrition* 7, 577759.  
569

570 Sachi, S., Ferdous, J., Sikder, M.H., Azizul Karim Hussani, S.M. (2019). Antibiotic Residues in Milk:  
571 Past, Present, and Future. *Journal of advanced veterinary and animal research* 6, 315-332.  
572

573 Serraino, A., Giacometti, F., Marchetti, G., Zambrini, A.V., Zanirato, G., Fustini, M., Rosmini, R.  
574 (2013). Survey on Antimicrobial Residues in Raw Milk and Antimicrobial Use in Dairy  
575 Farms in the Emilia-Romagna Region, Italy. *Italian Journal of Animal Science* 12, e68.  
576

577 Song, E., Yu, M., Wang, Y., Hu, W., Cheng, D., Swihart, M.T., Song, Y. (2015). Multi-Color  
578 Quantum Dot-Based Fluorescence Immunoassay Array for Simultaneous Visual Detection  
579 of Multiple Antibiotic Residues in Milk. *Biosensors & Bioelectronics* 72, 320–325.  
580

581 Treiber, F.M., Beranek-Knauer, H. (2021). Antimicrobial Residues in Food from Animal Origin-A  
582 Review of the Literature Focusing on Products Collected in Stores and Markets Worldwide.  
583 *Antibiotics* 10, 534.  
584

585 Tumini, M., Nagel, O.G., Althaus, R.L. (2019). Five-Assay Microbiological System for the  
586 Screening of Antibiotic Residues. *Revista Argentina de Microbiología* 51, 345–353.  
587

588 Union, P.O. of the E. CELEX1, 2002/657/EC: Commission Decision of 12 August 2002  
589 implementation Council Directive 96/23/EC concerning the performance of analytical  
590 methods and the interpretation of results [https://op.europa.eu/it/publication-detail/-](https://op.europa.eu/it/publication-detail/-/publication/ed928116-a955-4a84-b10a-cf7a82bad858/language-en)  
591 [/publication/ed928116-a955-4a84-b10a-cf7a82bad858/language-en](https://op.europa.eu/it/publication-detail/-/publication/ed928116-a955-4a84-b10a-cf7a82bad858/language-en) Accessed October 30,  
592 2022.  
593

594 Vercelli, C., Gambino, G., Amadori, M., Re, G. (2022). Implications of Veterinary Medicine in the  
595 Comprehension and Stewardship of Antimicrobial Resistance Phenomenon. From the Origin  
596 till Nowadays. *Veterinary and Animal Science* 16, 100249.  
597

598 Wang, C., Li, X., Peng, T., Wang, Z., Wen, K., Jiang, H. (2017). Latex Bead and Colloidal Gold  
599 Applied in a Multiplex Immunochromatographic Assay for High-Throughput Detection of  
600 Three Classes of Antibiotic Residues in Milk. *Food Control* 77, 1–7.  
601

602 World Health Organization, 2015. WHO estimate of the global burden of forbirne diesasse: forbirne  
603 diesasse burden epidemiologi referenze group 2007-2015. 9789241565165\_eng (1). Pdf.  
604 Accessed October 30, 2022.  
605

606 Wu, Q., Peng, D., Liu, Q., Shabbir, M.A.B., Sajid, A., Liu, Z., Wang, Y., Yuan, Z. (2019). A Novel  
607 Microbiological Method in Microtiter Plates for Screening Seven Kinds of Widely Used  
608 Antibiotics Residues in Milk, Chicken Egg and Honey. *Frontiers in microbiology* 10, 436.  
609

610 Yang, S., Carlson, K. (2004). Routine Monitoring of Antibiotics in Water and Wastewater with a  
611 Radioimmunoassay Technique. *Water Research* 38, 3155–3166.  
612

Commentato [GG4]: Dove lo trovo nell'articolo?

- 613 Yang, B., Guo, W., Liang, W., Zhou, Y., Zhu, X. (2022). Design and Evaluation of a Miniature Milk  
614 Quality Detection System Based on UV/Vis Spectroscopy. *Journal of Food Composition*  
615 *and Analysis* 106, 104341.  
616
- 617 Yazdanpanah, H., Osouli, M., Rashidi, E., Karimi, Z., Yazdanpanah, A., Maani, S., Salamzadeh, J.,  
618 Mahboubi, A., Eslamizad, S. (2021). Validation of Simultaneous Biochip-Based Method for  
619 Screening of 3 Beta-Lactam Families Residues in Cow's Milk in Accordance with the  
620 European Union Decision 2002/657/EC and Its Application on Real Samples. *Iranian*  
621 *Journal of Pharmaceutical Research* 20, 178-187.  
622
- 623 Zhang, C., Deng, Y., Zheng, J., Zhang, Y., Yang, L., Liao, C., Su, L., Zhou, Y., Gong, D., Chen, L.,  
624 Luo, A. (2019). The Application of the QuEChERS Methodology in the Determination of  
625 Antibiotics in Food: A Review. *Trends in Analytical Chemistry* 118, 517–537.  
626
- 627 Zhao, H., Zulkoski, J., Mastovska, K. (2017). Development and Validation of a Multiclass,  
628 Multiresidue Method for Veterinary Drug Analysis in Infant Formula and Related  
629 Ingredients Using UHPLC-MS/MS. *Journal of agricultural and food chemistry* 65, 7268–  
630 7287.  
631
- 632 Zhou, J., Nie, W., Chen, Y., Yang, C., Gong, L., Zhang, C., Chen, Q., He, L., Feng, X. (2018).  
633 Quadruplex gold immunochromatographic assay for four families of antibiotic residues in  
634 milk. *Food Chemistry* 256, 304–310.  
635