Veterinary Medical Journal –Giza (VMJG), Vol. 60(2), 1 -22, December 2014
http://www.vetmedjcu.com/
ISSN 1110-1423

Study on fungal contamination of some chicken meat products with special reference to the use of PCR for its identification

Shaltout, F. Aziz; **El-diasty, E. Mahmoud;Manal, M. El-mesalamy and**** Manal, I. El-shaer**
*Department of Food Hygiene, Faculty of Vet. Med. Moshtohor Benha University
** Department of Mycology, Animal Health Research Institute Dokki, Giza
***Zagazig Provincial Lab, Department of Mycology, Animal Health Research Institute
**** Zagazig Provincial Lab, Department of Food Hygiene, Animal Health Research Institute
Email: emanhoda2003@yahoo.com

Abstract

This work was carried out to evaluate the fungal contamination of chicken meat products sold in local markets as well as identification of some isolated moulds using PCR technique. For identification of the isolated moulds, samples were subjected to mycological examination using the morphological (macroscopic and microscopic) characterization. Molecular identification using (ITS) was carried out for isolated *Aspergillus* and *Penicillium* species. The average total mould counts in the examined samples of chicken luncheon, chicken pane and chicken minced meat were $3.1 \times 10^2 \pm 0.82 \times 10^2$, $7.4 \times 10^2 \pm 5.4 \times 10^2$ and $1.7 \times 10^2 \pm 0.16 \times 10^2$cfu/gm, respectively. In the examined samples, 9 mould genera were identified. The identified mould genera were *Aspergillus*, *Eurotium*, *Penicillium*, *Geotrichum*, *Fusarium*, *Cladosporium*, *Mucor*, *Eupencillium* and *Acremonium* species. The isolated species of *Aspergillus parasiticus* and *Penicillium purpurogenum* were subjected to PCR identification, and were sequenced in both directions. Sequences were analysed and aligned by Clustal method using the program of DNAstar (Laser-gene, Wisconsin, USA).

Keywords: *A. parasiticus*, chicken meat, PCR, sequences, *P. purpurogenum*.

Introduction

Poultry meat industry started in Egypt in the mid 1960 with a competitive advantage over other meat industries. Meat is a perishable food item because it contains all the nutrients required for microorganisms to grow, and its pH (5.5–6.5) is not inhibitory to most microorganisms. The extensive fabrication, handling and distribution of raw and processed meat further increases exposure to microbial contamination. Some of the principal contamination sources encountered during processing are the slaughtering and evisceration processes (Barbut, 2002).Poultry meat products may be contaminated from raw materials, workers, equipment's, feathers, feet, faeces and skin if GMP (Good Manufacturing Practice) not applied (Barbut, 2002). In addition to processing procedures as scalding, evisceration, and cooling. However, mould and yeasts are of great importance in spoilage of poultry meat products resulting in different changes in flavor, color, texture and odor and also these fungi responsible for

CamScanner

major portion of food deterioration especially in poor developing countries. This may be attributed to lake of hygienic measure and the use of contaminated additive and spices which considered a major important source of mould contamination (Abd El-Rahman, 1987).

Polymerase chain reaction (PCR) is a technique widely used in fungal research. One of its advantages is the ability to amplify very small amounts of DNA, in the picograms range, even in the presence of diverse contaminants. In spite of this, most of the extraction protocols of fungal DNA are designed for the obtaining of microgram amounts of highly purified DNA, requiring the establishment of relatively large fungal cultures and long extraction procedures. These protocols are needlessly complicated for PCR experiments. On the other hand, some authors have pointed out the feasibility of using single spores (1) or boiled mycelium (2) as a source of DNA in PCR experiments. This is advantageous for detection purposes, but when working with hundreds of strains in population studies, obtaining the material from the culture plate can be cumbersome and favor contaminations Cenis (1992).

Therefore, the present study was planned out to throw a light on the total mould counts of chicken meat products (pane, minced meat and luncheon), as well as differentiation and species identification of contaminating fungi isolated from these products using PCR technique.

Materials and Methods

Collection of samples

A total of hundred and eighty (180) samples of processed chicken products (60 samples of each chicken pane, chicken luncheon and chicken minced meat) were collected from shops and supermarkets. These samples were obtained and preserved in an ice box, until transferred to the laboratory under complete aseptic conditions examined as rapidly as possible.

Fungal isolation and identification

Total fungal count was carried out according to the techniques recommended by **ISO (217-1-2:2008)**.Fungi were isolated and identified according to macroscopical and microscopical characteristics as described by Pitt and Hocking (2009).

DNA extraction and PCR amplification

Genomic DNA of the strains was obtained using the genomic DNA Extraction Kit (Gene JET Genomic DNA purification Kit Thermo scientific, Lithuania) following the manufacturer's instructions. DNA concentration was determined spectrophotometrically at 260/230 nm. The PCR primers used for identification of *Aspergillus* and *Penicillium* spp are listed in (Table 1). The PCR reaction was performed in an Gradient Thermal cycler (1000 S Thermal cycler Bio-RAD USA).The reaction mixture (total volume of 50 μl) was 25 μl Dream green PCR Mix (Dream Taq Green PCR Master Mix (2X) Fermentas Company,

cat., No.K1080, USA.), 5 µl target DNA, 2 µl of each primers (containing 10 p mole/ µl) and the mixture was completed by sterile D. W. to 50 µl.

Table (1): General primer used in PCR reactions for the identification of *Aspergillus* and *Penicillium* species.

Primer	Primer Design	Amplicon Size
Forward ITS1	5′- TCCGTAGGTGAACCTGCGG-3′.	**550 bp**
Reverse ITS4	5′--TCCTCCGCTTTATTGATATG3′.	

PCR master Mix: Dream Taq Green PCR Master Mix (2X) Fermentas Company, cat., No.K1080, USA.)

PCR amplification conditions for all strains was: 4 min initial step at 94°C followed by 35 cycles at 94 °C for 1 min, 56 °C for 1 min and 72°C for 1 min and a final extension step at 72 °C for 10 min. Amplification products were electrophoresed in agarose gels (1.5 % w/v) (Sigma, USA), which was used for running of DNA. Stained with Ethidium bromide using Gene Ruler 100bp DNA Ladder: Fermentas Company, Cat.No.SM0243, US.

DNA fragment purification Kit: The amplified DNA fragments were purified using Gene JET PCR purification kit (USA) and were sequenced by Chromogen Company, Germany. The two strains were sequenced in both directions. Sequences were analysed and aligned by Clustal method using the program DNAstar (Laser-gene, Wisconsin, USA).

CamScanner

Veterinary Medical Journal –Giza (VMJG), Vol. 60(2), 1-22, December
http://www.vetmedjcu.com/
ISSN 1110-1423



Figure (1): Incidence of moulds in examined chicken meat products

Table (2): Total mould counts (CFU/g) of chicken meat processed products:

Products	Min.	Max.	Mean ± SE.
Chicken luncheon	20	3×10^3	$3.1 \times 10^2 \pm 0.82 \times 10^2$
Chicken pane	50	3.1×10^3	$7.4 \times 10^2 \pm 5.4 \times 10^2$
Chicken minced meat	<10	5.1×10^2	$1.7 \times 10^2 \pm 0.16 \times 10^2$

The total number of examined sample for each product is 60 (N=60).

CamScanner

Table (3): Incidence of identified mould species in examined chicken meat products:

Mould genera	Chicken luncheon		Chicken pane		Chicken minced meat	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
***Aspergillus* species**						
A. flavus	**8**	**13.3**	**5**	**8.3**	**9**	**15.0**
A. parasiticus	**0**	**0**	**1**	**1.7**	**2**	**3.3**
A. niger	**6**	**10.0**	**8**	**13.3**	**9**	**15.0**
A. ochraceus	**0**	**0**	**2**	**3.3**	**1**	**1.7**
A. terreus	**0**	**0**	**1**	**1.7**	**2**	**3.3**
A. clavatus	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**1**	**1.7**
A .candidas	**1**	**1.7**	**1**	**1.7**	**0**	**0**
***Eurotium* species**						
E. chevalieri	**1**	**1.7**	**2**	**3.3**	**0**	**0**
E. repens	**0**	**0**	**1**	**1.7**	**0**	**0**
***Pencillium* species**						
P. corylophilum	**4**	**6.7**	**6**	**10.0**	**1**	**1.7**
P. griseofulvum	**0**	**0**	**1**	**1.7**	**0**	**0**
P. citreonigrum	**1**	**1.7**	**2**	**3.3**	**1**	**1.7**
P. brevicompactum	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**1**	**1.7**
P. simplicissimum	**1**	**1.7**	**2**	**3.3**	**0**	**0**
P. purpurogenum	**0**	**0**	**2**	**3.3**	**1**	**1.7**
P. thomii	**2**	**3.3**	**1**	**1.7**	**0**	**0**
P. verrucosum	**0**	**0**	**1**	**1.7**	**0**	**0**
Geotrichum species	**10**	**16.7**	**3**	**5.0**	**7**	**11.7**
Fusarium species	**2**	**3.3**	**4**	**6.7**	**0**	**0**
Cladosporium species	**0**	**0**	**1**	**1.7**	**3**	**5.0**
Mucor species	**3**	**5.0**	**2**	**3.3**	**5**	**8.3**
Eupencillium species	**4**	**6.7**	**5**	**8.3**	**3**	**5.0**
Acremonium specie	**1**	**1.7**	**0**	**0**	**4**	**6.7**

The % was calculated according to the total number of examined sample (N=60 for each product)

CamScanner



Photo (1): Agarose gel electrophoresis of *Aspergillus* spp. DNA (PCR) resulting from PCR amplification, single PCR performed with genomic DNA, Lane 1: 100bp DNA ladder, Lane 2: Control Positive, Lane3: Control Negative and Lane 4: sample



Photo (2): Agarose gel electrophoresis of *Penicillin* spp. DNA (PCR) resulting from PCR amplification, single PCR performed with genomic DNA ,Lane 1: 100bp DNA ladder, Lane 2: Control Positive, Lane3: Control Negative and Lane 4: sample

CamScanner

Veterinary Medical Journal –Giza (VMJG), Vol. 60(2), 1 -22, December 2014
http://www.vetmedjcu.com/
ISSN 1110-1423

Primer sequence of A. parasiticus and Penicillium purpurogenum

A. parasiticus Forward primer sequence

GATCTCGAGTCTTTGAACGCACATTGCGCCCCCTGGTATTCCG
GGGGGCATGCCTGTCCGAGCGTCATTGCTGCCCATCAAGCACGGCTTG
TGGGTTGGGCCGCCGTCCCCTCTCCGGGGGGGACGGCCCCAAAGAC
AACGGCGANCCGCGTCCGATCCTCGAGCGTATGGGATTTGTCACCCG
CTCTGCCCCCCGGCCGGCGCTTGCCGAACGCAAAACAACCATTTTTC
CAGGTGACCTCTCATCAGGTAGGGATACCCGTTGAATTTAACTATATC
CTAATCGAAGCA

A. parasiticus Reverse primer sequence

TGTTTTGCGTTCGGCAAGCGCCGGCCGGGCCTACAGAGCGGGT
GACAAAGCCCCATACGCTCGAGGATCGGACGCGGTGCCGCCGCTGCC
TTTGGGGCCCGTCCCCCCCGGAGAGGGGACGACGACCCAACACACAA
GCCGTGCTTGATGGGCAGCAATGACGCTCGGACAGGCATGCCCCCCG
GAATACCAGGGGGCGCAATGTGCGTTCAAAGACTCGATGATTCACGG
AATTCTGCAATTCACACTAGTTATCGCATTTCGCTGCGTTCTTCATCGA
TGCC

Penicillium purpurogenum Forward primer sequence

GTCTTCTGAGTGCGAGACCCTCGCGGGTCCACCTCCCACCCGT
GTCTCTTGAATACCCTGTTGCTTTGGCGGGCCCACCGGGTCGCCCCGG
TCGCCGGGGGGCACTGCGCCCCCGGGCCTGCGCCCGCCAGAGCGCTC
TGTGAACCCTAATGAAGATGGGCTGTCTGAGTGTGATTTTGAATTATC
AAAACTTTCAACAATGGATCTCTTGGTTCCGGCATCGATGAAGAACGC
AGCGAAATGCGATAAGTAATGTGAATTGCAGAATTCCGTGAATCATC
GAATCTTTGAACGCACATTGCGCCCCCTGGCATTCCGGGGGGCATGCC
TGTCCGAGCGTCATTTCTGCCCTCAAGCGCGGCTTGTGTGTTGGGTGT
GGTCCCCCCGGTGTTGGGGGGACCTGCCCGAAAGGCAGCGGCGACGT
CCCGTCTAGGTCCTCGAGCGTATGGGGCTTTGTCACCCGCTCGGGAGG
GGCCTGCGGGCGTTGGCCACCCACGATATTTTTTTACCGTTGACCTCG
GATCAGGTAGGAGTTACCCGCTGAACTTAAGCATATCAAAAGTGGGG
GAGAGAAAATTAT

Penicillium purpurogenum Reverse primer sequence

AGATTTCGGGGTACTTCCTACCTGATCCGAGGTCAACGGTAAA
AAAATATCGTGGGTGGCCAACGCCCGCAGGCCCCTCCCGAGCGGGTG
ACAAAGCCCCATACGCTCGAGGTCCTAGACGGGACGTCGCCGCTGCC
TTTCGGGCAGGTCCCCCCAACACCGGGGGGACCACACCCAACACACA
AGCCGCGCTTGAGGGCAGAAATGACGCTCGGACAGGCATGCCCCCCG
GAATGCCAGGGGGCGCAATGTGCGTTCAAAGATTCGATGATTCACGG
AATTCTGCAATTCACATTACTTATCGCATTTCGCTGCGTTCTTCATCGA
TGCCGGAACCAAGAGATCCATTGTTGAAAGTTTTGATAATTCAAAATC

CamScanner

ACACTCAGACAGCCCATCTTCATTAGGGTTCACAGAGCGCTCTGGCGG
GCGCAGGCCCGGGGGCGCAGTGCCCCCCGGCGACCGGGGCGACCCGG
TGGGCCCGCCAAAGCAACAGGGTATTCAAGAGACACGGGTGGGAGGT
TGGACCCGCGAGGGGTCCGCACTCAGTAATGATCCTTCCGCAGCACC
CCCTTCAGGGAAAAG



Fig. (2): Phylogenetic tree of *A. parasiticus*

Percent Identity (upper) / Divergence (lower)

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17		
1		95.3	95.3	95.3	95.3	95.3	95.5	95.3	95.3	95.0	95.0	94.7	95.7	95.2	94.4	94.9	94.1	1	APar-EME-EG-1
2	4.9		100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	99.7	99.7	99.4	99.7	100.0	99.1	99.4	98.8	2	A.parasiticus.A-3352
3	4.9	0.0		100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	99.7	99.7	99.4	99.7	100.0	99.1	99.4	98.8	3	A.parasiticus.CS18
4	4.9	0.0	0.0		100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	99.7	99.7	99.4	99.7	100.0	99.1	99.4	98.8	4	Aspergillus.sp.SWP-2011c-isolate-CS22
5	4.9	0.0	0.0	0.0		100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	99.7	99.7	99.4	99.7	100.0	99.1	99.4	98.8	5	A.chungii.NRRL4868
6	4.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0		100.0	100.0	100.0	99.7	99.7	99.4	99.7	100.0	99.1	99.4	98.8	6	A.aff.parasiticus.A20
7	4.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0		100.0	100.0	99.7	99.7	99.4	99.7	100.0	99.1	99.4	98.8	7	A.terricola.var.americanus.CBS-580.65
8	4.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0		100.0	99.7	99.7	99.4	99.7	100.0	99.1	99.4	98.8	8	A.oryzae.KCCM60241
9	4.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0		99.7	99.7	99.4	99.7	100.0	99.1	99.4	98.8	9	A.sojae.ATCC-14895
10	5.2	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.3		99.4	99.7	100.0	99.7	99.4	99.1	99.1	10	A.pseudotamarii.NRRL-443
11	5.2	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.6		99.7	99.4	99.7	99.4	99.1	99.1	11	A.caelatus.NRRL-26104
12	5.5	0.6	0.6	0.6	0.6	0.6	0.6	0.6	0.6	0.3	0.3		99.7	99.4	99.7	98.8	99.4	12	A.tamarii.GEF-5
13	4.4	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.0	0.6	0.3		99.7	99.4	99.1	99.1	13	A.flavus.TN-432
14	5.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.3	0.3	0.6	0.3		99.1	99.4	98.8	14	A.toxicarius.CBS-822.72
15	5.9	0.9	0.9	0.9	0.9	0.9	0.9	0.9	0.9	0.6	0.6	0.3	0.6	0.9		98.5	99.7	15	A.bombycis.NRRL-25593
16	5.3	0.6	0.6	0.6	0.6	0.6	0.6	0.6	0.6	0.9	0.9	1.2	0.9	0.6	1.5		98.2	16	A.oryzae.USMO17
17	6.2	1.2	1.2	1.2	1.2	1.2	1.2	1.2	1.2	0.9	0.9	0.6	0.9	1.2	0.3	1.8		17	A.nomius.culture-collection
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17		

Fig. (3): Sequences producing significant alignments with Accession in Genbank

CamScanner

Veterinary Medical Journal –Giza (VMJG), Vol. 60(2), 1 -22, December 2014
http://www.vetmedjcu.com/
ISSN 1110-1423

Nucleotide Sequence pair distances of Penicillium ITS2 sequences

Percent Identity (upper triangle) / Divergence (lower triangle)

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10		
1		98.0	98.3	99.0	98.3	92.3	94.0	93.8	92.3	90.8	1	Pen-EME-EG-1
2	2.1		100.0	100.0	100.0	91.8	95.7	95.9	94.4	92.9	2	Penicillium_purpurogenum.FRR-1061
3	1.7	0.0		100.0	100.0	91.8	95.7	95.8	94.3	92.8	3	Talaromyces_purpurogenus.IAM13755
4	1.0	0.0	0.0		100.0	92.5	95.6	95.8	94.3	92.8	4	Penicillium_purpurogenum.CASMB-SEF7
5	1.7	0.0	0.0	0.0		91.8	95.7	95.8	94.3	92.8	5	Penicillium_sp.ML172
6	8.1	8.7	8.7	7.9	8.7		87.4	87.5	86.4	84.8	6	Talaromyces_purpurogenus.IAM15392
7	6.3	4.4	4.4	4.5	4.4	13.8		100.0	94.0	92.3	7	Penicillium_minioluteum.IFV
8	6.5	4.2	4.3	4.3	4.3	13.6	0.0		94.2	92.5	8	Penicillium_samsonii.CBS-137.84
9	8.1	5.8	5.9	6.0	5.9	15.0	6.3	6.1		92.6	9	Penicillium_diversum.KUC1284
10	9.8	7.5	7.6	7.7	7.6	17.0	8.2	7.9	7.8		10	Talaromyces_purpureus.CBS-475.71
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10		

Fig. (4): Nucleotide Sequence pair distances of *Penicillium purpurogenum* ITS2 sequences



Fig. (5): Nucleotide Phylogenetic tree of Pen-EME-EG-1 with some reference *Penicillium purpurogenum* ITS2 sequences

CamScanner

Fig. (6): *Aspergillus parasiticus* strain A-3352 18S ribosomal RNA gene, partial sequence; internal transcribed spacer 1, 5.8S ribosomal RNA gene, and internal transcribed spacer 2, complete sequence; and 28S ribosomal RNA gene, partial sequence

Sequence ID: gb|JQ316518.1|Length: 596Number of Matches: 1

Query 2 ATC-TCGAGTCTTTGAACGCACATTGCGCCCCCTGGTATTCCGGGGGGCATGCCTGTCCG 60

||| |||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||

Sbjct 310 ATCATCGAGTCTTTGAACGCACATTGCGCCCCCTGGTATTCCGGGGGGCATGCCTGTCCG 369

Query 61 AGCGTCATTGCTGCCCATCAAGCACGGCTTGTGGGTTGGGCCGCCGTCCCCTCTCCGGGG 120

||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||| ||||| || ||||||||||||||||||

Sbjct 370 AGCGTCATTGCTGCCCATCAAGCACGGCTTGTGTGTTGGGTCGTCGTCCCCTCTCCGGGG 429

Query 121 GGGACGGGCCCCAAAGACAACGGCG-ANCCGCGTCCGATCCTCGAGCGTATGGGA-TTTG 178

|||||||||||||| || ||||| ||||||||||||||||||||||||| ||||

Sbjct 430 GGGACGGGCCCCAAAGGCAGCGGCGGCACCGCGTCCGATCCTCGAGCGTATGGGGCTTTG 489

Query 179 TCACCCGCTCTGCCC-CCCGGCCGGCGCTTGCCGAACGCAAAACAACCATTTTTTCCAGG 237

||||||||||||| ||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||

Sbjct 490 TCACCCGCTCTGTAGGCCCGGCCGGCGCTTGCCGAACGCAAAACAACCATTTTTTCCAGG 549

Query 238 -
TGACCTCTCATCAGGTAGGGATACCCGTTGAATTTAACTATATC 281

|||||| |||||||||||||| ||| ||| |||||

Sbjct 550
TTGACCTCGGATCAGGTAGGGATACCCGCTGAACTTAAGCATATC 594

Reverse Aspergillus

Aspergillus parasiticus isolate 1 12B 18S ribosomal RNA gene, partial sequence; internal transcribed spacer 1, 5.8S ribosomal RNA gene, and internal transcribed spacer 2, complete sequence; and 28S ribosomal RNA gene, partial sequence

Query 15
TGTTTTGCGTTCGGCAAGCGCCGGCCGGGCCTACAGAGCGGGTGACA
AAGCCCCATACGC 74

||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||

Sbjct 514
TGTTTTGCGTTCGGCAAGCGCCGGCCGGGCCTACAGAGCGGGTGACA
AAGCCCCATACGC455

Query 75
TCGAGGATCGGACGCGGTGCCGCCGCTGCCTTTGGGGCCCGTccccccG
GAGAGGGGAC134

||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||

Sbjct 454
TCGAGGATCGGACGCGGTGCCGCCGCTGCCTTTGGGGCCCGTCCCCCC
CGGAGAGGGGAC395

Query 135
GACGACCCAACACACAAGCCGTGCTTGATGGGCAGCAATGACGCTCG
GACAGGCATGCCC194

||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||

Sbjct 394
GACGACCCAACACACAAGCCGTGCTTGATGGGCAGCAATGACGCTCG
GACAGGCATGCCC335

CamScanner

Query 195
CCCGGAATACCAGGGGGCGCAATGTGCGTTCAAAGACTCGATGATTC
ACGGAATTCTGCA254

||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||

Sbjct 334
CCCGGAATACCAGGGGGCGCAATGTGCGTTCAAAGACTCGATGATTC
ACGGAATTCTGCA275

Query 255
ATTCACACTAGTTATCGCATTTCGCTGCGTTCTTCATCGATGCC 298

||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||

Sbjct 274
ATTCACACTAGTTATCGCATTTCGCTGCGTTCTTCATCGATGCC 231

Fig. (7): *Penicillium purpurogenum* strain FRR 1061 18S ribosomal RNA gene, partial sequence; internal transcribed spacer 1, 5.8S ribosomal RNA gene, and internal transcribed spacer 2, complete sequence; and 28S ribosomal RNA gene, partial sequence ,Sequence ID: gb|AY373926.1|Length: 620Number of Matches: 1Related InformationRange 1: 31 to 603GenBankGraphicsNext

|||||||| || |||||||||||| ||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||

Sbjct 31 CTGAGTGCG-
GACCCCTCGCGGGTCCAACCTCCCACCCGTGTCTCTTGAATACCCTGT
TG 89

Query 64
CTTTGGCGGGCCCACCGGGTCGCCCCGGTCGCCGGGGGGCACTGCGC
CCCCGGGCCTGCG123

||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||

Sbjct 90
CTTTGGCGGGCCCACCGGGTCGCCCCGGTCGCCGGGGGGCACTGCGC
CCCCGGGCCTGCG149

Query 124
CCCGCCAGAGCGCTCTGTGAACCCTAATGAAGATGGGCTGTCTGAGT
GTGATTTTGAATT183

||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||

Sbjct 150
CCCGCCAGAGCGCTCTGTGAACCCTAATGAAGATGGGCTGTCTGAGT
GTGATTTTGAATT209

CamScanner

Query 184
ATCAAAACTTTCAACAATGGATCTCTTGGTTCCGGCATCGATGAAGAA
CGCAGCGAAATG243

Sbjct 210
ATCAAAACTTTCAACAATGGATCTCTTGGTTCCGGCATCGATGAAGAA
CGCAGCGAAATG269

Query 244
CGATAAGTAATGTGAATTGCAGAATTCCGTGAATCATCGAATCTTTGA
ACGCACATTGCG303



Sbjct 270
CGATAAGTAATGTGAATTGCAGAATTCCGTGAATCATCGAATCTTTGA
ACGCACATTGCG329

Query 304
CCCCCTGGCATTCCGGGGGGCATGCCTGTCCGAGCGTCATTTCTGCCC
TCAAGCGCGGCT363

Sbjct 330
CCCCCTGGCATTCCGGGGGGCATGCCTGTCCGAGCGTCATTTCTGCCC
TCAAGCGCGGCT389

Query 364
TGTGTGTTGGGTGTGGTCCCCCCGGTGTTGGGGGACCTGCCCGAAAG
GCAGCGGCGACG423

Sbjct 390
TGTGTGTTGGGTGTGGTCCCCCCGGTGTTGGGGGACCTGCCCGAAAG
GCAGCGGCGACG449

Query 424
TCCCGTCTAGGTCCTCGAGCGTATGGGGCTTTGTCACCCGCTCGGGAG
GGGCCTGCGGGC483

Sbjct 450
TCCCGTCTAGGTCCTCGAGCGTATGGGGCTTTGTCACCCGCTCGGGAG
GGGCCTGCGGGC509

Query 484
GTTGGCCACCCACGATAttttttACCGTTGACCTCGGATCAGGTAGGAGTT
ACCCGCTG543

|||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||

Sbjct 510
GTTGGCCACCCACGATATTTTTTACCGTTGACCTCGGATCAGGTAGG
AGTTACCCGCTG569

Query 544 AACTTAAGCATATCAA-AAGTGGGGGAGA-GAAA
575

||||||||||||||| ||| || ||| | ||||

Sbjct 570 AACTTAAGCATATCAATAAGCGGAGGAAAAGAAA
603

DownloadGenBankGraphicsNextPreviousDescriptions

Penicillium purpurogenum strain CASMB-SEF 7 18S ribosomal RNA gene, partial sequence; internal transcribed spacer 1, 5.8S ribosomal RNA gene, and internal transcribed spacer 2, complete sequence; and 28S ribosomal RNA gene, partial sequence

Sequence ID: gb|JQ663996.1|Length: 585Number of Matches: 1

Related Information

Range 1: 19 to 577GenBankGraphicsNext Match Previous Match

Query 6 CTGAGTGCGAGA-CCCTCGCGGGTCC-
ACCTCCCACCCGTGTCTCTTGAATACCCTGTTG 63

|||||||| || ||||||||||| ||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||

Sbjct 19 CTGAGTGCG-
GACCCCTCGCGGGTCCAACCTCCCACCCGTGTCTCTTGAATACCCTGTTG 77

Query 64
CTTTGGCGGGCCCACCGGGTCGCCCCGGTCGCCGGGGGCACTGCGCCCCC
GGGCCTGCG 123

Veterinary Medical Journal –Giza (VMJG), Vol. 60(2), 1 -22, December 2014
http://www.vetmedjcu.com/
ISSN 1110-1423

Sbjct 78
CTTTGGCGGGCCCACCGGGTCGCCCCGGTCGCCGGGGGGCACTGCGCCCCC
GGGCCTGCG 137

Query 124
CCCGCCAGAGCGCTCTGTGAACCCTAATGAAGATGGGCTGTCTGAGTGTGA
TTTTGAATT 183

Sbjct 138
CCCGCCAGAGCGCTCTGTGAACCCTAATGAAGATGGGCTGTCTGAGTGTGA
TTTTGAATT 197

Query 184
ATCAAAACTTTCAACAATGGATCTCTTGGTTCCGGCATCGATGAAGAACGC
AGCGAAATG 243



Sbjct 198
ATCAAAACTTTCAACAATGGATCTCTTGGTTCCGGCATCGATGAAGAACGC
AGCGAAATG 257

Query 244
CGATAAGTAATGTGAATTGCAGAATTCCGTGAATCATCGAATCTTTGAACG
CACATTGCG 303



Sbjct 258
CGATAAGTAATGTGAATTGCAGAATTCCGTGAATCATCGAATCTTTGAACG
CACATTGCG 317

Query 304
CCCCCTGGCATTCCGGGGGGCATGCCTGTCCGAGCGTCATTTCTGCCCTCAA
GCGCGGCT 363



Sbjct 318
CCCCCTGGCATTCCGGGGGGCATGCCTGTCCGAGCGTCATTTCTGCCCTCAA
GCGCGGCT 377

CamScanner

Query 364
TGTGTGTTGGGTGTGGTCCCCCGGTGTTGGGGGACCTGCCCGAAAGGCA
GCGGCGACG 423

||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||

Sbjct 378
TGTGTGTTGGGTGTGGTCCCCCGGTGTTGGGGGACCTGCCCGAAAGGCA
GCGGCGACG 437

Query 424
TCCCGTCTAGGTCCTCGAGCGTATGGGGCTTTGTCACCCGCTCGGGAGGGGC
CTGCGGGC 483

||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||

Sbjct 438
TCCCGTCTAGGTCCTCGAGCGTATGGGGCTTTGTCACCCGCTCGGGAGGGGC
CTGCGGGC 497

Query 484
GTTGGCCACCCACGATAttttttACCGTTGACCTCGGATCAGGTAGGAGTTACC
CGCTG 543

||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||

Sbjct 498
GTTGGCCACCCACGATATTTTTTACCGTTGACCTCGGATCAGGTAGGAGTT
ACCCGCTG 557

Query 544 AACTTAAGCATATCAA-AAG 562

|||||||||||||||| |||

Sbjct 558 AACTTAAGCATATCAATAAG 577

Discussion

Moulds only compete with bacteria on meat when storage temperatures are lowered to 0^{0}C or below, or when the meat surface dries to an a_w that enables fungi to compete. In earlier literature, spoilage of chilled or frozen meat by fungi was usually attributed to *Mucorales*, especially *Thamnidiumelegans* and *Mucor* species, which grew as ''whiskers'' on cold stored meat Pitt and Hocking (2009). Michener and Elliott (1964) cited several reports on bacteria and fungi growing on meats at –5^{0}C, with yeasts and moulds predominating as temperatures were

http://www.vetmedjcu.com/
ISSN 1110-1423

further lowered, to a limit at about –12^{0}C. Schmidt-Lorenz and Gutschmidt (1969) reported that moulds and yeasts grew on chickens stored at – 7.5 and –10 ± 0.2^{0}C for 1 year. Spoilage of chilled meats in postwar years has principally been the result of ''black spot'', traditionally believed to be due to *Cladosporium herbarum*.

The results achieved in figure (1) revealed that the incidence of mould in the examined chicken meat product samples were 40 (66.67%), 55 (91.7%) and 37 (61.67%) for chicken luncheon, chicken pane and chicken minced meat, respectively. The results obtained for chicken luncheon, chicken pane and chicken minced meat are similar to that recorded by many investigators such as Shaltout (2002),Bkheetet al. (2007),and Wadee (2010) who mentioned that, about 86.6% of chicken luncheon as well as chicken minced meat samples have mould contamination. While the examined chicken pane samples revealed mould isolation with an incidence of 93.33% .From the economic point of view, mould and yeast lead to certain defects that may change the food quality or render it unfit for human consumption.

The previous results recorded in table (2) showed that the total mould count of the examined positive chicken luncheon, chicken pane and chicken minced meat ranged from 20 to3 x 10^3 with a mean value of 3.1 x 10^2 ±0.82 x 10^2,5 x 10 to 3.1 x 10^3 with a mean value of 7.4 x 10^2 ±5.4 x 10^2 and <10 to 5.1 x 10^2 with a mean value of 1.7 x 10^2 ± 0.16 x 10^2cfu/g, respectively. Higher figures were reported by El-Gazzar (1995), Shaltout (1996), Farag (2000) and El-Deeb et al. (2011) who reported that the total mould counts in examined chicken luncheon, nuggets, and fillets were 7.5x10^3± 2.4x10^3, 7.8x10^3 ± 0.3 x10^3 and 7.8x10^3±0.2x10^3cfu/g, respectively.

The obtained results revealed that the ready to eat meals as luncheon usually contaminated with moulds if the moisture content exceed 10%, mould can grow on the surface and resist the fall in pH, giving a final pH value of 6.0-6.2. The comminution of poultry meat greatly increases the surface area and distribution of the microorganisms throughout the creating microenvironment (Saad et al., 1989). While whole poultry carcasses tend to have a lower microbial count than cut up poultry (Jay, 1978).

Table (3) showed that the incidence of the moulds isolated from chicken luncheon, chicken pane and chicken minced meat samples was as the following: *A. niger* (10.0%), (13.3%) and (15.0%) respectively, *A. flavus* (13.3%), (8.3%) and (15.0%) respectively. *A. parasiticus* was isolated with an incidence of (1.7%) and (3.3%), from the examined chicken pane and chicken minced meat samples, respectively, *A. ochraceus* and *A. terreus* were isolated from chicken pane and chicken minced meat samples and its incidence was (3.3%) and (1.7%), (1.7%) and (3.3%) respectively, while *A. candidas* was isolated from the examined chicken luncheon and chicken pane with an incidence of (1.7%) for each. *A. clavatus* isolated only from chicken minced meat samples (1.7%).While,

CamScanner

the number and percentage of *Penicillium* species isolated from the examined chicken luncheon, chicken pane and chicken minced meat samples were 4 (6.7%), 6 (10 %) and 1(1.7%), respectively for *P. corylophilum*, while the number and percentage of identified *P. citreonigrum* were1(1.7%),2(3.3%) and 1(1.7%), respectively.

On the other hand such number and percent for the isolated *P. simplicissimum*, *P. purpurogenum and P. thomii* were 1(1.7%) and 2(3.3%), 2(3.3%) and 1(1.7%), 1(1.7%) and 2(3.3%) from chicken luncheon, chicken pane and chicken minced meat samples respectively. Meanwhile, *P. griseofulvum* and *P. verrucosum* could be identified from only the examined chicken pane sample with number and percentage of 1(1.7%).

Also , results given in table (3) showed that *Geotrichum* species, *Fusarium* species ,*Mucor* species, *Eupencillium* species and *Acremonium* species could be isolated from10 (16.7%) , 2 (3.3%), 3 (5.0%),4 (6.7%) and 1(1.7%) of Chicken luncheon ,respectively. *Geotrichum* species, *Fusarium* species, *Cladosporium* species,*Mucor* species and *Eupencillium* species could be isolated from 3 (5.0%), 4(6.7%), 1(1.7%), 2 (3.3%) and 5 (8.3%) of examined chicken pane samples, respectively. *Geotrichum* species, *Mucor* species, *Eupencillium* species and *Acremonium* species could be isolated from 7(11.7%), 3(5.0%), 5 (8.3%), 3 (5.0%) and 4(6.7%), of examined chicken minced meat samples such mould genera could be isolated by Shaltout (2002), Altalhi and Albashan, (2004) Hussein (2008) Hassan et al. (2012) and El-Diasty et al. (2013).

Aspergillus flavus and *A. niger* caused lung disease when they grow and produce spores in the lungs. They were opportunistic and invade wounds, cornea and external ear in immuno-suppressed patients, it could cause pneumonia Jacquelum (1999). *P. purpurogenum* considered as an important fungi as it secretes rubratoxins, a mycotoxins, which originally suggested as a main reason of mouldy corn toxicosis, or haemorrhagic anaemia in chickens (Burnside et al., 1957; Forgacs et al., 1958 and Pitt and Hocking, 2009). *Penicillium purpurogenum* was isolated from cases of people with pneumonia, ear infections, keratitis, endocarditis, peritonitis, and urinary tract infections (Johanning et al., 1999).

Aspergillus parasiticus is one of the main sources of aflatoxins, the most important mycotoxins in the world's food supplies. Aflatoxins are produced in nature by *A. parasiticus, A. flavus* and a number of other species, including *A. nomius*, which are of little practical importance in foods (Pitt and Hocking, 2009). The important differences in mycotoxins production between *A. parasiticus* and *A. flavus* are that *A. parasiticus* produces G as well as B aflatoxins, while *A. parasiticus* isolates often produce aflatoxins in much higher concentrations (Pitt, 1993) also; non-toxigenic *A. parasiticus* strains are rare. Aflatoxins are both acutely and chronically toxic to both animals and human and may be responsible for greatly increasing susceptibility to many kinds of disease agents in countries where aflatoxin ingestion is common (Wogan, 1992; Wang and Groopman, 1999; Williams et al., 2004).They have long been known to

CS CamScanner

produce four distinct effects: acute liver damage, liver cirrhosis, induction of tumors and teratogenic effects (Stoloff, 1977). However more recent information indicates that the consequences of prolonged aflatoxin exposure are more widespread, including immune-suppression and interference with protein uptake (Williams et al., 2004).

Different concepts have been used by mycologist to define the fungal diversity; one of them is the morphological study, which is the classic approach where units are defined on the basis of morphological characteristics and ideally by the differences among them. This type of study is not sufficient for diversity study whereas the genetic diversity on the basis of molecular marker defeat differences among organism on the basis of size of amplified DNA, which not influence by environmental factor. Variations (mutations) on nucleotides can't be studied by morphological markers while the molecular marker may overcome such type of problem. Therefore molecular marker reveal characterization is very effective for microbial species characterization.

Two of the isolated moulds from chicken meat products were identified on morphological basis in present investigation (one isolate of *A. parasiticus* and one isolate of *P. purpurogenum)* were randomly selected for further confirmation via cloning and sequencing the ITS (Internal transcribed region) of the DNA. These regions (ITS) contain most conserved sequence at the terminal region and also contain the hypervariable sequences distinguishing between species. Therefore, they have been considered as the best tool for the identification of the fungi. The use of ITS region as compared with other molecular probes is advantageous due to many reasons including increased sensitivity because of existence of more than 100 copies per genome (Mirhadi et al., 2007).

Conclusions

It can be concluded that chicken meat products are highly contaminated with various types of moulds as a result of spore concentration in poultry meat products as improper processing and negligence. Also, the data suggested that contamination may be due to inadequate refrigeration and absence of sanitation conditions which are the principal causes of higher levels of moulds contamination and increased species diversity. Poultry meat products especially ready to eat as luncheon, must be adequately fried before eating for at least 10 minutes at 80 °C in home. Application of Food Safety Management System ISO 22000 with HACCP to poultry industry, particularly for poultry meat products should be applied to prevent or minimize all hazards including moulds, yeasts and mycotoxins. Molecular methods (PCR method), is a practical, the most sensitive, and least time-consuming method, as well as, it is considered as the most authentic way for microbial identification and have become the most common tool for the identification of fungi in food samples where genus *Aspergillus* and *Pencillium* are the most dominant mycotoxin producing strains isolated from poultry meat products in our studies.

CamScanner

References

Abd El-Rahman, H., 1987. "Mycological studies on some selected species with special references to aflatoxin producing *Aspergillus flavus* species". Assiut Vet. Med. J. 19 (37), 93-100.

Altalhi, A. and Albashan, M., 2004.Mycological study on fresh and frozen meat in Taif city, Saudia Arabia. Assuit Vet. Med. J. 50(102):22-31.

Barbut, S., 2002. Poultry products processing. CRC Press LLC. Boca Raton London New York Washington, D.C.

Bkheet, A.A., Rezk, M.S. and Mousa, M.M., 2007. Study on the microbiological content of local manufactured poultry meat products in El-Bohira governorate. Assiut Vet. Med. J. 53(112), 115-124.

Burnside, J.E., Sippel, W.L., Forgacs, J., Carll, W.L., Atwood, M.B. and Doel, E.R., 1957.A disease in swine and cattle caused by eating moldy corn. II. Experimental production with pure cultures of moulds. Am. J. Vet. Res. 18: 817–824.

Cenis, J.L., 1992. Rapid extraction of fungal DNA for PCR amplification. Nucleic Acids Research, 20(9), 2380.

El-Deeb, M. F., El-Glel, H. A. and Samaha, I. A. T., 2011. Quality assurance of some poultry meat products. Alexandria Journal of Veterinary Sciences. 33(1), 153-163.

El-Diasty, E.M., Eman-abdeen, E. and Salem, R.M., 2013. Mycological aspects and mycotoxin residues of some chicken meat products with identification of *C. albicans* and *C. zeylanoides* by using amplified polymorphic DNA. Arab J. Biotech., 16(2), 195-208.

El-Gazzar, M.M.M, 1995. Mycological studies on some meat products. Ph.D. Thesis Fac. Vet. Med. Zagazig Univ. Egypt.

Farag, R.N.E, 2000. lipolytic and proteolytic activities of some molds in some meat products. Ph.D. Thesis, Faculty of Vet. Med., Zagazig Univ., Egypt.

Forgacs, J., Kock, H., Carll, W.T. and White-Stevens, R.H., 1958.Additional studies on the relationship of mycotoxicosis to the poultry hemorrhagic syndrome. Am. J. Vet. Res. 19, 744–753.

Gill, C.O., Lowry, P.D. and Di Menna, M.E., 1981. A note on the identities of organisms causing black spot spoilage of meat. J. Appl. Bacteriol. 51, 183–187.

Hassan, M.A., Shaltout, F.A. and El-Motaleb, S.F., 2012. Mycological aspect of meat cold store at Kalyobia Governorate. Benha Vet. Med. J. 23(2), 54-60.

Hussein, M. A. M., 2008. Mycological Aspect of Fresh and Processed Meat Products with Special Respect to Proteolytic and Lipolytic Mold. Ph.D. Thesis, (Meat Hygiene) Fac. Vet. Med., Zagazig Univ., Egypt.

ISO (217-1-2:2008) EAST AFRICAN STANDARD. Microbiology of food and animal feeding stuffs — Preparation of test samples, initial suspension and decimal dilutions for microbiological examination- Part 1-3: Specific rules for the preparation of meat and meat products, 2008.

Jacquelum, G.B., 1999. Microbiology Principles and Explorations. Prentice Hall College Div; (December 1998)4th Ed.

Veterinary Medical Journal –Giza (VMJG), Vol. 60(2), 1 -22, December 2014
http://www.vetmedjcu.com/
ISSN 1110-1423

Jay, J. M., 1979. Modern Food Microbiology. 2nd Ed. D. Lvan No strand Company.

Johanning, E., Landsbergis, P., Gareis, M., Yang, C.S. and Olmsted, E., 1999. Clinical experience and results of a sentinel health investigation related to indoor fungal exposure. Environ Health Perspect. 107(3), 489-494.

Michener, H.D. and Elliott, R.P., 1964. Minimum growth temperatures for food-poisoning, fecal-indicator, and psychrophilic micro-organisms. Adv. Food Res. 13, 349–396.

Mirhadi, H., Diba, K., Kordbacheh, P., Jalalizand, N. and Makimura, K., 2007. Identification of pathogenic Aspergillus species by PCR-restriction enzyme method. Journal of Medical Mycology, 56, 1568-1570.

Pitt, J.I. and Hoching, A.D., 2009. Fungi and Food spoilage. 3rdEd. Published by Springer Dordrecht Heidelberg London New York.

Pitt, J.I., 1993. Corrections to species names in physiological studies on *Aspergillus flavus* and *Aspergillus parasiticus*. J. Food Prot. 56: 265–269.

Saad, M.S., Mousa, M. M. and Edris, A. M., 1989. Microbiology of instant chicken bouillon / stock cubes. Alex. J. Vet. Sci., 5(2), 227-242.

Schmidt-Lorenz, W. and Gutschmidt, J. 1969. Mikrobielle und sensoriche Veranderun gengefrorener Brathahnchen und Poulardenbei LagerungimTemperaturbereich von –2.5^{0}C bis -10^{0}C. Fleischwirtschaft. 49, 1033–1041.

Shaltout, F. A., 2002. Microbiological aspect of Semi-cooked chicken meat products. Benha Vet. Med., J., 13(2),15-26.

Shaltout, F. A., 1996."Mycological and Mycotoxicological profile of some meat products". Ph. D. Thesis Faculty Vet. Med., Moshtohor (Zagazig Univ., Benha Branch).

Stoloff, L., 1977.Aflatoxins – an overview in Mycotoxins in Human and Animal Health, Eds Rodricks, J.V.; Hesseltine, C.W. and Mehlman, M.A. Park Forest South, IL: Pathotox Publishers. pp. 7–28.

Wadee, R. E., 2010.Mycological aspects of some chicken meat products. M.V. Sc. Thesis, Meat Hygiene, Fact. Vet. Med. Zagazig University.

Wang, J. S. and Groopman, J.D.,1999. DNA damage by mycotoxins. Mutation Res. 424, 167–181

Williams, J.H., Phillips, T.D., Jolly, P.E., Stiles, J.K., Jolly, C.M. and Aggarwal, D., 2004. Human aflatoxicosis in developing countries: a review of toxicology, exposure, potential health consequences, and interventions. Am. J. Clin. Nutr. 80, 1106–1122.

Wogan, G.N., 1992.Aflatoxins as risk factors for hepatocellular carcinoma in humans. Cancer Res. (Suppl) 52:211s–2118

CamScanner

دراسة علي التلوث الفطري لبعض منتجات لحوم الدواجن مع الاشارة الي استخدام تفاعل البلمرة المتسلسل للتعرف علي الفطريات

Shaltout, F. Aziz; **El-diasty, E. Mahmoud;Manal, M. El-mesalamy and**** Manal, I. El-shaer**

استهدفت هذه الدراسة تقييم مدي تلوث منتجات لحوم الدواجن المتداولة في الاسواق وتقييم التلوث الفطري لكل من لانشون الدجاج و البانية ولحوم الدجاج المفروم وتصنيف الفطريات المسببة للأمراض والفساد في هذه المنتجات بأستخدام تفاعلا لبلمرة المتسلسل . كان متوسط العدد الكلى للفطريات بالنسبة للانشون الدجاج و البانية ولحوم الدجاج المفروم هوعلى التوالى $3.1 \times 10^2 \pm 0.82 \times 10^2$ و $7.4 \times 10^2 \pm 5.4 \times 10^2$ و $1.7 \times 10^2 \pm 0.16 \times 10^2$

مستعمرة/ جرام على الترتيب . تم عزل وتصنيف تسعة أنواع من العفن.الأنواع التى تم عزلها من الأعفان اشتملت على أجناس الأسبرجيليس، اورتيم،البنسيليوم، الجيوتركيم، الفيوزريم، الكلادسبوريوم، الميكور، ايوبنسيليوم و الاكريمونيم . تم التعرف على بعض المعزولات الممرضة والمسببة للفساد بتلك العينات وهى من الاسبرجيليس والبنسيليوم بأستخدام تفاعلا لبلمرة المتسلسل كان التسلسل للاسبرجيليس بارازتكس والبنسيليوم بروبرجينم في كلاالاتجاهين. تم تحليل التسلسل عن طريق استخدام برنامج دى ان ايه ستار (ليزرالجينات،ويسكونسن،الولايات المتحدة الأمريكيه)

CamScanner