Investigation of Farm Gate Cow Milk for Aflatoxin M$_1$
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ABSTRACT. Importance of cow milk in human, especially in infant nutrition, is well known. Nevertheless, contamination of milk with aflatoxins is considered as a potential risk for human health. The aim of this study was to determine the levels of aflatoxin M$_1$ (AFM$_1$), metabolite of aflatoxin B$_1$ in raw cow milk in high milk producing areas in Sri Lanka. Aflatoxin M$_1$ levels were investigated by high performance liquid chromatography (HPLC) equipped with a fluorescence detector, monitoring at wave lengths 365 nm and 425 nm for excitation and emission, respectively. Eighty seven samples of raw milk were collected from randomly selected dairies in seven provinces in the country, and analyzed for AFM$_1$ using the Official Methods of Analysis of Association of Official Analytical Chemists (AOAC) International. The percentage recovery of AFM$_1$ was 85.2 ± 4.03 with respect to an artificially contaminated concentration of 48.6 ng/L. AFM$_1$ was detected in 33% of locally manufactured raw milk samples in concentrations ranging from 13.1 ng/L to 84.5 ng/L with a mean level of 40.2 ng/L. Percentage of contaminated samples (9.2%) exceeded the European Communities/Codex Alimentarius recommended limit of 50 ng/L. None of the milk samples from Western, Uva & Sothern provinces were contaminated at a detectable level of AFM$_1$. The results suggest a need to introduce safety measures for AFM$_1$ levels in liquid milk in local market under Prevention of Food Adulteration Act of Sri Lanka as well as to prescribe a limit of aflatoxin AFB$_1$ level in dairy cattle feedstuffs in order to minimize the health hazard risk in Sri Lanka.

INTRODUCTION

Aflatoxins (AF) are a group of mycotoxins mainly produced by common fungi, namely Aspergillus flavus, A. parasiticus and A. nomius (JECFA, 2001). These fungi infect a wide range of agricultural commodities, especially cereals and oilseeds, both in the pre-harvest and post-harvest seasons (Galvano et al., 1996; Sarimehmetoglu et al., 2004). The occurrence of Aflatoxin B1 (AFB$_1$) in feed material and their consumption has caused not only health hazards but also economic losses (Sarimehmetoglu et al., 2004). Aflatoxins, even in small amounts, are biologically active compounds that pose potential toxic, carcinogenic, teratogenic and/or mutagenic effects in human as well as in farm animals (Galvano et al., 1996) due to poor quality feeds. Aflatoxin B1 is usually regarded as a potent liver carcinogen
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for most mammalian species including humans (Zinedine et al., 2007). Aflatoxin M₁ (AFM₁), the 4-hydroxylated metabolite of AFB₁ known as “milk toxin” is less toxic compared to its parent material (Galvano et al., 1996; Galvano et al., 2005). Aflatoxin M₁ is formed in the liver by means of cytochrome P450-associated enzymes. It is known as a hepatic carcinogenic metabolite found in milk of lactating animals consuming AFB₁ (JECFA, 2001; Manetta et al., 2005). International Agency for Research on Cancer (IARC) of World Health Organization defined AFB₁ as primary and AFM₁ as secondary group of carcinogenic compounds (Kaniou-Grigoriadou et al., 2005).

Martins and Martins (2004) reported that about 1-2% of AFB₁ in animal feed is transformed to AFM₁ in milk with variations from animal to animal, from day to day and from one milking to the next. When the intake of AFB₁ is stopped, the AFM₁ concentration in the milk decreases to an undetectable level after 72 hours. Moreover, Galvano et al., (2005) reported that 0.3-6% of ingested AFB₁ is available as AFM₁ in milk. Many studies in the world reported the occurrence of AFM₁ in dairy products and evidence of potential hazardous human exposure, as milk is a key source of nutrients for humans (Galvano et al., 1996). This is especially significant for infants and children, who are potentially more sensitive and have less variety in their diets. Seasonal trend in milk contamination was noted as there were occurrence of low levels of AFM₁ during the spring and summer seasons. During these periods, the animals tend to consume more forage, roughage and pasture that are widely available than concentrate feed (Galvano et al., 1996; Sarimehmetoglu et al., 2004). Further, the climatic and storage conditions of the tropical and subtropical countries in the world are most favorable for the development and growth of aflatoxigenic fungi in food and feed stuffs. The geographical distribution and climatic variations within a country also can influence AFM₁ occurrence and contamination levels in milk (Galvano et al., 1996). Sarimehmetoglu et al., (2004) reported that AFM₁ is relatively stable in raw and processed milk products and is unaffected by pasteurization or processing into cheese. Even though AFM₁ is more frequent in powdered milk than in fluid milk in Argentina, results indicate that the incidence is not much serious (López et al., 2003). Being a metabolite, AFM₁ is stable under severe environmental conditions such as elevated temperatures and relative humidity. Human exposure to AFM₁ is due to the consumption of contaminated milk and dairy products of which daily intake could be highly variable in the world. Infants represent the most exposed population due to their high consumption of dairy products either as bovine milk and related by-products in their diet or from breast milk where the mycotoxin can be excreted. JECFA (2001) reported that the intake of AFM₁ from milk was 6.8 ng/person/day for the European diet, 3.5 ng/person/day for the Latin American diet, 12 ng/person/day for the Far Eastern diet, 0.7 ng/person/day for the Middle Eastern diet and 0.1 ng/person/day for the African diet. Thus, many countries have introduced regulations to control the levels of AFB₁ in feed and have proposed Maximum Permissible Levels (MPL) for AFM₁ in milk to reduce the risk.

Therefore, establishment of legal limit for AFM₁ in Sri Lanka is very important to protect consumers from hazards that may occur due to AFM₁ contamination. Currently, the legal limits are highly variable depending on the degree of the development and economic involvement of different countries (Galvano et al., 1996; Kaniou-Grigoriadou et al., 2005). According to the U.S. Food and Drug Administration, AFM₁ in milk should not exceed 500 ng/L (US-FDA 2000; Manetta et al., 2005; Rastogi et al., 2004). Aflatoxin M₁ level in milk has been set more restrictively to 50 ng/L by the European Union (EU) for adult consumption (EU Regulation 466/2001; Rastogi et al., 2004), while in baby-food products this level cannot be greater than 25 ng/L (EU Regulation 466/2001).
There is little information about the occurrence of AFM$_1$ in milk and milk products in Sri Lanka. Wimalasiri et al., (2005) found that there is high incidence of AFM$_1$ in 82% of the local market samples of raw cattle milk and milk powder. Rostogi et al., (2004) reported that out of 87 milk and infant milk products in Indian market, almost 99% of the contaminated samples exceeded the European Community/Codex Alimentarius recommended limits, while 9% samples exceeded the prescribed limit of US regulations.

The consumption of cow milk is highly popular among people in Sri Lanka. Further, these products are largely consumed by children including infants who are more sensitive to mycotoxins than adults (Galvano et al., 1996). Therefore, this study was carried out with the objective of investigating the presence of AFM$_1$ in bovine milk samples from 29 selected dairies using High Performance Liquid Chromatograph (HPLC) equipped with a fluorescence detector.

**MATERIALS AND METHODS**

**Chemicals**

PrepSep™ SPE-C$_{18}$ cartridges (particle size 40-45 µm, pore size 600 Å and surface area 500 m$^2$g$^{-1}$) were purchased from Fisher Scientific (Pittsburgh, USA). HPLC grade acetonitrile was purchased from BDH (Poole, England) and other chemicals and solvents of analytical grade were supplied by Merck (Darmstadt, Germany), Fluka (Buchs, Switzerland) and HIMEDIA (Mumbai, India). AFM$_1$ stock standard solution with a concentration of 486 µg L$^{-1}$ in acetonitrile was purchased from Biopure (Konrad Lorenz Strasse, Austria) and stored in the dark at 4°C. A working solution of 4860 ng L$^{-1}$ was daily prepared in acetonitrile:water (25:75 v/v) wrapped in aluminum foil and stored under the same conditions to prevent gradual break down of aflatoxins under UV light.

**Instrumentation**

Aflatoxin M$_1$ was analyzed using an HPLC (SHIMUDZU, Kyoto, Japan) system consisting of a solvent delivery module (LC-10AT), column oven (CTO-10AVP/10ALVP) maintained at 35±1.0 °C and a fluorescence detector (RF-10AXL) in which excitation and emission wavelengths were set at 365 nm and 435 nm, respectively. The eluate was passed through a Shim-pack CLC G-ODS 4 mm guard column followed by reversed phase C$_{18}$ Shim-pack separating column (150 mm × 6.0 mm) and data manipulation and chromatograms were obtained using SHIMUDZU chromatopac (C-R7A plus).

**Samples**

A total of 87 raw cow milk samples were collected from 29 dairies, representing seven provinces out of nine provinces in Sri Lanka, namely Western, Central, North-Central, Uva, Wayamba, Southern and Sabaragamuwa provinces. These provinces are particularly important due to their considerable contribution to the national milk production. Each sample of 200 mL volume, immediately after collection, was transported to the laboratory in ice boxes at temperatures about 4±2 °C and then stored at -20 °C until analysis for AFM$_1$. 
Sample preparation

The sample preparation was based on the method described by Manatta et al., (2005), with slight modifications. A sample of milk was homogenized and centrifuged at 1700 g for 20 min. Then, 5 mL of the aqueous phase, diluted with an equal volume of deionized water, were purified on a SPE-C18 cartridge, after conditioning with acetonitrile (5 mL) followed by deionized water (10 mL). After applying the diluted samples and washing with water (10 mL), followed by acetonitrile:water (20:80, v/v) (20 mL), fats were removed by washing with n-hexane (2×5 mL). Aflatoxin M1 was eluted with dichloromethane:acetone (95:5, v/v) (6 mL), the eluate was evaporated under a gentle stream of nitrogen and the residue dissolved in 1 ml of acetonitrile. Then an aliquot (20 µL) of the AFM1 extract was analyzed by HPLC.

HPLC separation

The mobile phase used for the analysis has been acetonitrile:water (25:75, v/v). Isocratic elution of HPLC was performed at a flow rate of 1.0 mL min. Identification of AFM1 was based on its retention time with respect to the standard. Further identity confirmation was carried out by pre and post-injection of standard for each 10 batch sample set. The calibration curve, of peak area versus concentration, was linear as expected and data were fitted by the least-squares method. The line of regression was used to compute the amount of the analyte in sample extracts by extrapolation, using external standard method. Standard solutions for calibration curve of AFM1 were prepared by diluting stock solution with acetonitrile to obtain final concentrations in the range 30–486 ng L⁻¹ (Fig. 1).

Fig. 1. Standard curve for AFM1 reference standards

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Validation and Method Performance

The chromatogram shown in Fig. 2A illustrates the efficiency of the proposed method; i.e. there are no interferences in the region where AFM1 is eluted. The retention time is about 13.0 min. The lower detection limit or the minimum level at which the analyte can be
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reliably detected was found to be 10 ng L\textsuperscript{-1}. Recovery percentage of AFM\textsubscript{1} added to milk at a concentration of 48.6 ng L\textsuperscript{-1} was calculated to be 85.2\% ± 4.03 by HPLC (Table 1)

Fig. 2. Chromatograms of: (A) Reference standard (B) Sample matrix

Table 1. Recovery percentage of aflatoxin M\textsubscript{1} from artificially contaminated milk by HPLC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>Before aflatoxin M\textsubscript{1} addition (basal level ng/L)</th>
<th>Aflatoxin M\textsubscript{1} added (ng/L)</th>
<th>Expected Aflatoxin M\textsubscript{1} level (ng/L)</th>
<th>After aflatoxin M\textsubscript{1} addition (aflatoxin M\textsubscript{1} determined) (ng/L)</th>
<th>Recovery (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sample 1</td>
<td>38.1 ± 3.4</td>
<td>48.6</td>
<td>86.7 ± 3.4</td>
<td>72.4 ± 7.1</td>
<td>83.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample 2</td>
<td>35.6 ± 2.7</td>
<td>48.6</td>
<td>84.2 ± 2.7</td>
<td>69.3 ± 8.3</td>
<td>82.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample 3</td>
<td>40.4 ± 7.8</td>
<td>48.6</td>
<td>89 ± 7.8</td>
<td>79.9 ± 5.8</td>
<td>89.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean ± SD</td>
<td>38.0 ± 2.4</td>
<td>48.6</td>
<td>86.6 ± 2.4</td>
<td>73.9 ± 5.4</td>
<td>85.2 ± 4.03</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Milk samples spiked at different concentrations and processed as described in methodology
All analysis were performed in duplicate for each sample.

Occurrence of AFM\textsubscript{1} in milk

The incidence of AFM\textsubscript{1} contamination in milk was not very high, since only 33.3% of all samples were positive (Table 2). However, eight samples out of 87 (9.2%) were over the permissible level of 50 ng L\textsuperscript{-1}, the regulatory limit of European Union (EU).

Zinedine et al., (2007) reported that the amount of AFB\textsubscript{1} present in feed depends on temperature and moisture, under which conditions some moulds, such as A. flavus and A. parasiticus, can easily grow in feed. These moulds easily grow on feed having moisture contents between 13% and 18% and environmental moisture between 50% and 60%.
### Table 2. Incidence and levels of aflatoxin M₁ in milk samples as determined by HPLC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Province</th>
<th>Tested (No.)</th>
<th>Positive (%)</th>
<th>Frequency distribution No. (%)</th>
<th>Contamination</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(No.)</td>
<td>(No.)</td>
<td>&lt;10 ng L⁻¹</td>
<td>10-20 ng L⁻¹</td>
<td>21-50 ng L⁻¹</td>
<td>≥50 ng L⁻¹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>9 (10.3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>13 (14.9)</td>
<td>5 (5.7) 1 (1.1) 8 (9.2) 4 (4.6)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Central</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5 (5.7)</td>
<td>10 (11.5) 3 (3.4) 2 (2.3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uva</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>9 (10.3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wayamba</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7 (8)</td>
<td>8 (9.2) 1 (1.1) 3 (3.4) 3 (3.4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>9 (10.3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sabaragamuwa</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4 (4.6)</td>
<td>8 (9.2) 3 (3.4) 1 (1.1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>87</strong></td>
<td><strong>29 (33.3)</strong></td>
<td><strong>58 (66.7)</strong> <strong>5 (5.7)</strong> <strong>16 (18.4)</strong> <strong>8 (9.2)</strong></td>
<td><strong>13.1 - 84.5</strong></td>
<td><strong>40.2</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* <10 ng/L – negative for aflatoxin M₁  
* Mean of positive samples  
All analysis were performed in duplicate for each sample

Milk samples representing Uva, Western and Southern provinces were negative for AFM1 probably due to usage of quality concentrate feeding materials or minimal/non concentrate feeding of dairy cattle. Other provinces such as Central, North Central, Wayamba & Sabaragamuwa were positive for AFM1 and this may be due to poor feed quality with respect to AFB₁ contamination. This confirms that the incidence of AFM₁ contamination is often higher in countries where cows are fed with high amounts of compound concentrate feeds.

### CONCLUSIONS

Considering these results, it could be concluded that AFM₁ incidence in milk does not appear to be a serious public health problem in Sri Lanka at the moment. However, it is important to minimize exposure of milking animals to moldy feed contaminated with AFB₁ and take necessary precautions to prevent fungal contaminations/growth particularly during the storage of feed. It is important to establish the maximum permissible levels for AFM₁ in milk and milk products and AFB₁ in foods and feeds based on the ALARA (As Low As Reasonably Achievable) principles, which do not exist under Food Act of Sri Lanka. Seasonal variation of AFM₁ contamination in milk needs to be studied to assess the situation completely.
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