

Copyright is owned by the Author of the thesis. Permission is given for a copy to be downloaded by an individual for the purpose of research and private study only. The thesis may not be reproduced elsewhere without the permission of the Author.

F U S A R I A A N D F U S A R I U M T O X I N S
I N M A I Z E

A thesis presented in partial fulfilment
of the requirement for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy in
Veterinary Pathology and Public Health
at Massey University

HASSAN M. HUSSEIN

1987

ABSTRACT

Many species of Fusarium are commonly associated with cereals, particularly maize, but in New Zealand, little is known of their significance as mycotoxin producers. These studies have examined the prevalence of fusaria and other fungi in maize and maize fields and have investigated the presence and sources of some major Fusarium toxins in maize.

Fungi in maize, husk, litter and soil from maize fields and in grain at harvest and in storage were assayed. The distribution of fungi was found to be uneven within maize, husk and litter substrates within a field but in soil was more homogeneous. Sampling techniques were therefore developed to ensure representative subsamples were obtained from each source.

Similarly isolation procedures were chosen to ensure adequate recovery of fungi. Dilution and direct platings were used to provide information on total populations and on fungi actually invading kernels, with two media, PDA-D and PCNB. The medium used showed no significant influence on either viable counts or kernel contamination rates nor on the number of different Fusarium spp recovered on the two media, but PDA-D supported a greater overall variety of fungi. The numbers of genera and of Fusarium spp recorded by direct plating were significantly higher than with dilution plating.

The total population and the number of different genera and of Fusarium spp were compared for the four "field" substrates. A total of 25 genera was isolated, most being recovered from soil and litter. Fusarium was present in all samples. Acremonium, Cladosporium, Penicillium and Mucor occurred regularly. The four substrates gave up to ten different Fusarium spp, F. graminearum, F. culmorum and F. acuminatum being the most frequent. Husk and litter samples gave the highest viable counts for both total fungi and Fusarium spp.

Field samples of maize kernels showed 13 genera and ten Fusarium spp. At harvest time total genera increased to 17 but Fusarium spp remained constant. While the total genera remained constant at 17 in stored samples, the number of Fusarium spp dropped to three, only F.

subglutinans, F. graminearum and F. poae being detected. The contamination rate of kernels by fusaria also changed significantly from field samples (75.8%) to harvest samples (58.3%) to only 1.5% in stored maize.

As with Fusarium, Acremonium and Mucor populations decreased from harvest to storage but other genera (e.g. Aspergillus, Beauveria) were only found in stored maize. The frequency of occurrence of Penicillium remained stable over the whole period.

Three analytical methods, TLC, GC and GC-MS were used for screening maize, poultry ration samples and cultures of Fusarium isolates for five Fusarium toxins. The GC-MS method was the most reliable and sensitive for detection and quantitation of DON, DAS and T-2 toxin, but not for quantitation of ZEA, due to derivatisation problems. TLC and TLC-densitometry were sensitive and reliable enough for detection and quantitation of ZEA and MON respectively. Although the GC results were closer to the GC-MS results, a high percentage of false positives, particularly for T-2 toxin, was noticed.

Of the examined maize samples, 85% were contaminated with fungal toxins. The majority contained ZEA and three samples were each contaminated with four toxins. No MON was detected.

Many isolates, particularly of F. graminearum, were found to be ZEA-producers. Some 63% produced ZEA at >2 ppm. T-2 toxin was produced by 46% of the isolates but at low levels (<1.7 ppm). Low levels of DON and DAS were produced by a few isolates. MON was produced by 30% of isolates, particularly F. subglutinans, and in large amounts (up to 64 ppm).

This thesis is the first report on the natural occurrence of Fusarium toxins in New Zealand maize. T-2 toxin and DAS have not been reported as natural contaminants in this country. MON production has also not been reported in New Zealand.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Many people and organisations have helped me in a variety of ways to get this thesis into its present form, for which I am very grateful. I would like to thank the Iraqi Government and Massey University for financial support of this project and the Department of Veterinary Pathology and Public Health for the opportunity to undertake this study.

I am indebted to my Supervisors, Drs M. Baxter, I.G. Andrew and G. Peterson for their constructive criticism and encouragement throughout the project. I sincerely thank Dr G. Samuels (D.S.I.R. - Auckland) and Mr M.J. Christensen (D.S.I.R. - Palmerston North) for confirming the identity as well as identifying some of the isolates; Dr D. Ward and the Dairy Research Institute for the use of their gas chromatography facility; Dr R.A. Franich and the Forest Research Institute, Rotorua, for use of their gas chromatography-mass spectrometry facility; Dr G.L. Robertson for use of the TLC densitometer; Professor R. Hodges for confirming the identity of zearalenone toxin by mass spectrometry and Dr D. Officer for the chemical structure illustrations.

I wish to thank those staff and technicians of the Department of Microbiology and Genetics and Chemistry and Biochemistry who have been very helpful and for their friendly relationship; the Department of Veterinary Pathology and Public Health, particularly Mr Peter Wildbore, for administrative help and for lyophilizing the Fusarium cultures; Mr Tom Law and others in the University Photographic Unit for photographic assistance.

I would like to acknowledge Dr P.G. Thiel, National Research Institute for Nutritional Disease, Tygerberg 7505, South Africa, and Dr J.L. Richard, National Animal Disease Center, Ames, Iowa, U.S.A. for their generosity in providing the moniliformin standard; Mr Wolfenden, Plant Propagation Laboratories, Havelock North, New Zealand for supplying the carnation leaves, and Rohm and Haas NZ Ltd for generously providing the Amberlite XAD-4.

Personal thanks are extended to my Chief Supervisor, Dr M. Baxter, for his very patient reading and help with the thesis manuscript in all its stages; special thanks to my friend, Mrs M. Hilder, for initial proof-reading of some of the draft. I sincerely thank Mrs E.J. Baxter for her excellent typing and advice, and I appreciate her extreme patience.

Finally I wish to thank my family and friends in Iraq as well as those in New Zealand for their help and financial support; to my wife Azhar who patiently worked through all my study as unpaid technician to me, and to our children Hutheifa, Kuteiba and Areege, for a debt of time and neglect. I promise I will be more kind to you.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Abstract	ii
Acknowledgements	iv
List of Tables	xi
List of Figures	xvi
List of Plates	xviii
List of Abbreviations	xix
PREFACE	1
CHAPTER 1. INTRODUCTION - LITERATURE REVIEW	5
1.1. THE GENUS <u>FUSARIUM</u> - TAXONOMY, ECOLOGY AND METHODS OF STUDY	5
1.1.1. Taxonomy	5
✓ 1.1.2. Ecology of <u>Fusarium</u> Species	17
1.1.2.1. Factors influencing distribution	17
1.1.2.2. Common habitats of fusaria	19
1.1.2.3. Incidence and significance of fusaria in maize crops	21
✓ 1.1.2.4. <u>Fusarium</u> species in New Zealand	24
1.2. SAMPLING METHODS FOR THE MYCOLOGICAL STUDY OF <u>FUSARIUM</u> SPP	28
1.2.1. Soil	30
1.2.2. Soil Organic Matter (Litter)	33
1.2.3. Maize Grains	34
1.2.3.1. Sampling maize in the field	35
1.2.3.2. Sampling stored maize	35
1.2.4. Sub-sampling and the Number of Replications	36
1.2.5. Laboratory Storage of Samples	37
1.3. ISOLATION TECHNIQUES FOR <u>FUSARIUM</u> SPP	38
1.3.1. Isolation Procedures	38
1.3.2. Media for Isolation and Identification	40
1.3.3. Single Spore Culturing	43
1.3.4. Incubation Conditions	43

TABLE OF CONTENTS (continued)

	Page
✓ 1.4. THE <u>FUSARIUM</u> TOXINS AND FUSARIOTOXICOSES	44
✓ 1.4.1. The Toxins of <u>Fusarium</u> Species	44
1.4.2. Natural Occurrence	46
1.4.2.1. National surveys	49
1.4.2.2. Naturally contaminated cereals and feedstuffs	51
✓ 1.4.3. Effects of <u>Fusarium</u> Toxins on Human and Animal Health	55
✓ 1.4.3.1. Humans	57
1.4.3.2. Horses	59
1.4.3.3. Cattle	60
1.4.3.4. Swine	62
1.4.3.5. Poultry	64
✓ 1.4.4. <u>Fusarium</u> Mycotoxins in New Zealand	67
1.4.5. Laboratory Methods for the Production of <u>Fusarium</u> mycotoxins	69
1.4.5.1. Substrate	69
1.4.5.2. Initial moisture content (IMC)	71
1.4.5.3. Temperature and period of incubation	71
1.4.5.4. Fungal strain (the biological factor)	72
1.4.5.5. Miscellaneous factors	73
1.5. PROCEDURES FOR THE ANALYSIS OF <u>FUSARIUM</u> MYCOTOXINS	74
1.5.1. Sample Extraction	74
1.5.1.1. Sample and subsample size	74
1.5.1.2. Extraction solvents and methods	74
1.5.1.3. Clean-up procedures	76
1.5.2. Physico-chemical assays	78
1.5.2.1. Thin-layer chromatography	79
1.5.2.2. High performance liquid chromatography	82
1.5.2.3. Gas chromatographic and associated techniques	83
1.5.2.4. Multi-mycotoxin assay	90
1.5.2.5. Biological detection methods	91

TABLE OF CONTENTS (continued)

	Page
CHAPTER 2. MATERIALS AND METHODS	94
2.1. MYCOLOGICAL TECHNIQUES	94
2.1.1. Principal Media	94
2.1.2. Source of Samples	96
2.1.2.1. Maize	96
2.1.2.2. Soil, husk and litter samples	99
2.1.3. Sampling Technique	99
2.1.3.1. Field samples	99
2.1.3.2. Samples of maize at harvest	101
2.1.3.3. Samples from stored maize	101
2.1.4. Sub-sampling Technique	103
2.1.4.1. Maize	103
2.1.4.2. Husk and Litter	104
2.1.4.3. Soil Samples	104
2.1.5. Processing of Samples	104
2.1.5.1. Moisture content (MC) deter- mination (for maize only)	104
2.1.5.2. Assaying of fungal flora	105
2.1.5.3. Preservation of fungal cultures	108
2.2. TECHNIQUES FOR MYCOTOXIN EXTRACTION AND ANALYSIS	110
2.2.1. Source of Samples	110
2.2.2. Reagents	111
2.2.2.1. Mycotoxin reference standards	111
2.2.2.2. Column chromatography materials (for clean-up of samples)	111
2.2.2.3. TLC reagents	113
2.2.2.4. Reagents for gas chromatography (GC and GC-MS)	114
2.2.3. Apparatus	115
2.2.3.1. Gas chromatography	115
2.2.3.2. Thin-layer chromatography (TLC)	116
2.2.3.3. U.V. spectrophotometry	117
2.2.3.4. Glassware	117

TABLE OF CONTENTS (continued)

	Page
2.2.4. Mycotoxin Production under Laboratory Conditions	118
2.2.5. Extraction of Samples and Cultures	118
2.2.5.1. Column chromatographic fractionation and clean-up	118
2.2.5.2. Clean-up of F1	119
2.2.5.3. Florisil chromatographic column for clean-up of F2	119
2.2.6. Screening Methods	120
2.2.6.1. Thin-layer chromatography	120
2.2.6.2. Gas chromatography	121
2.2.6.3. Gas chromatography - mass spectrometry	122
2.2.6.4. Quantitation of ZEA	122
2.2.6.5. Densitometric analysis for quantitation and confirmation of moniliformin	123
2.2.6.6. U.V. spectroscopy for confirmation of MON	124
2.2.7 Safety Measures	124
 CHAPTER 3. RESULTS	 125
3.1. THE MYCOFLORA OF MAIZE AND ASSOCIATED SUBSTRATES FROM FIELD TO STORAGE	125
3.1.1. Preliminary Investigations	125
3.1.1.1. Field sampling techniques	125
3.1.1.2. Laboratory subsampling technique	129
3.1.1.3. Evaluation of media and isolation techniques for the recovery of <u>Fusarium</u> spp	131
3.1.1.4. Moisture content of maize grains	134
3.1.2 The Mycoflora of Growing Maize and Associated Substrates in the Field	136
3.1.3. The Mycoflora of Maize at Harvest	148
3.1.4. The Mycoflora of Stored Maize	156

TABLE OF CONTENTS (continued)

	Page
3.1.5 Analysis of Mycological Assays	160
3.1.5.1. Media and techniques and their effect on the isolation of fungal genera	160
3.1.5.2. Frequency of occurrence of individual genera and <u>Fusarium</u> spp from all samples	170
3.2. OCCURRENCE OF <u>FUSARIUM</u> MYCOTOXINS IN MAIZE	179
3.2.1. Thin Layer Chromatography	179
3.2.2. Gas Chromatography with Flame Ionisation Detection	182
3.2.3. Gas Chromatography - Mass Spectrometry	193
3.2.4. TLC and TLC Densitometry Screening for Moniliform	202
3.2.5. Final Assessment of the Analyses	204
3.3. PRODUCTION OF TOXINS BY <u>FUSARIUM</u> SPP ISOLATED FROM MAIZE FIELDS	208
3.3.1. Isolates Tested	210
3.3.2. Mycotoxin Assay	210
3.3.3. Final Assessment of the Analyses	216
3.3.4. MON Production	219
CHAPTER 4. DISCUSSION	223
CONCLUSION	262
APPENDIX A	265
APPENDIX B	267
REFERENCES	268

LIST OF TABLES

	Page
1-1: The principal taxonomic systems for the genus <u>Fusarium</u>	15
1-2: Comparison of the numbers of sections and species in the principal taxonomic systems for <u>Fusarium</u>	15
1-3: Sections and species in the genus <u>Fusarium</u> as listed by Burgess and Liddell (1983)	16
1-4: Structure and some chemical properties of the most common <u>Fusarium</u> toxins (Ueno, 1983; Cole & Cox 1981)	45
1-5: The principal <u>Fusarium</u> spp producing mycotoxins	47
1-6: Some Fusariotoxicoses associated with cereal grain and animal feedstuffs	56
1-7: Names of derivatising reagents	84
2-1: Source of samples	97
2-2: <u>Fusarium</u> isolates tested for their potential toxigenicity	110
2-3: Mass-to-charge ratios (M/Z) of ions used for selective ion monitoring during GC-MS	116
3-1: Total fungal viable counts (CFU/g) of maize, husk, litter and soil from the five plot samples in field J1	126
3-2: Viable counts of <u>Fusarium</u> spp (CFU/g) of maize, husk, litter and soil from the five plot samples in field J1	126
3-3: Total fungal viable counts (CFU/g) of maize, husk and litter from five plot samples in field T3	128
3-4: Viable counts of <u>Fusarium</u> (CFU/g) of maize, husk and litter from the five plot samples in field T3	128
3-5: Relationship between numbers of rotations of sample mixer and the subsequent total fungal viable counts (CFU/g) as determined by dilution plating	129
3-6: Preliminary evaluation of the two media (PDA-D and PCNB) agars and their efficiency for recovery of <u>Fusarium</u> spp from maize kernels by the direct plating and dilution plating techniques	132
3-7: The numbers of different <u>Fusarium</u> spp recovered on PDA-D and PCNB agars by the direct plating and dilution plating techniques	133

LIST OF TABLES (continued)

	Page
3-8: Moisture contents (MC) of maize grain from field, harvest and stored samples	135
3-9: Total fungal viable counts (CFU/g) of field samples of maize, husk, litter and soil (mean of two media)	137
3-10: Contamination rates (%) of field samples of maize, husk, litter by fungi (direct plating technique, mean of two media)	137
3-11: Fungal genera isolated from field samples of maize, husk, litter and soil (direct and dilution plating techniques, both media)	138
3-12: Contamination rate (%) of field maize, and segments of husk and litter by fungi (direct plating technique, mean of two media)	140
3-13: Total viable counts (CFU/g substrate) of fusaria recorded from field samples of maize, husk, litter and soil (mean of two media)	141
3-14: Contamination rate (%) of field samples of maize, husk and litter by fusaria (direct plating technique, mean of two media)	141
3-15: <u>Fusarium</u> spp isolated from field samples of maize, husk, litter and soil (direct and dilution plating techniques, both media)	143
3-16: Viable counts (CFU/g) of the most commonly-occurring <u>Fusarium</u> spp in field samples (mean of three fields T3, T4 and J2)	143
3-17: Contamination rates (%) of field maize and segments of husk and litter by individual <u>Fusarium</u> spp, (direct plating technique, mean of two media)	146
3-18: Total fungal population of harvest samples of maize (direct and dilution plating techniques, mean of two media)	149
3-19: Contamination rates (%) by different genera in harvest samples of maize (direct plating technique, mean of two media)	150
3-20: Fungal genera isolated from harvest samples of maize (direct and dilution plating techniques, both media)	151

LIST OF TABLES (continued)

	Page
3-21: Total population of <u>Fusarium</u> spp contaminating harvest samples of maize (mean of two media)	153
3-22: Contamination rates (%) of harvest samples of maize by individual <u>Fusarium</u> spp (direct plating technique, mean of two media)	153
3-23: <u>Fusarium</u> viable counts (CFU/g) in harvest samples of maize (dilution plating technique, mean of two media)	154
3-24: <u>Fusarium</u> spp isolated from harvest samples of maize (direct and dilution plating techniques, both media)	155
3-25: Contamination rates (%) of stored maize (direct plating technique, mean of two media)	157
3-26: Contamination rates (%) of maize from four silos by different fungal genera (direct plating technique, mean of two media)	158
3-27: Contamination rates (%) of stored maize from four silos by individual <u>Fusarium</u> spp (direct plating technique, mean of two media)	159
3-28: Evaluation of two media PDA-D and PCNB for their effect on the estimated populations of total fungi and <u>Fusarium</u> spp from maize as determined by the dilution plating technique	161
3-29: Evaluation of two media PDA-D and PCNB for their effect on the recovery rate (% contamination of kernels) of total fungi and <u>Fusarium</u> spp from maize as determined by the direct plating technique	162
3-30: Evaluation of the two media PDA-D and PCNB for their effect on the number of fungal genera and of <u>Fusarium</u> spp recovered from maize by the direct plating technique	165
3-31: Evaluation of the direct plating and dilution plating techniques for their effect on the numbers of fungal genera and of <u>Fusarium</u> spp recovered from maize (both media)	167
3-32: Evaluation of two media PDA-D and PCNB and two techniques dilution and direct plating for their effect on the total numbers of fungal genera and of <u>Fusarium</u> spp recovered from maize	169

LIST OF TABLES (continued)

	Page
3-33: Occurrence of fungi in the 37 samples of maize, husk, litter and soil examined (both techniques, both media)	169
3-34: Comparison of the mean contamination rates (%) and the frequency of occurrence (%) of eight fungal genera in all field, harvest and stored maize samples	172
3-35: Occurrence of <u>Fusarium</u> spp in 34 samples examined (both techniques, both media)	176
3-36: Contamination rates (%) of maize kernels by all fungi and by <u>Fusarium</u> spp in field and harvest samples (direct plating technique, mean of two media)	177
3-37: Contamination rates (%) of maize kernels by individual <u>Fusarium</u> spp, field and harvest samples (direct plating technique, mean of two media)	178
3-38: Thin layer chromatography analysis of maize and poultry ration samples for DON, DAS, T-2 toxin and ZEA	180
3-39: Retention time (min) of the peaks of the mycotoxin standard mixture (MTM) and some of those from the samples, (computer analysis)	189
3-40: Semiquantitative assessment of four <u>Fusarium</u> mycotoxins in 24 samples of maize and poultry rations, using the GC-FID method	192
3-41: Semiquantitative assessment of <u>Fusarium</u> mycotoxins in 24 sample of maize and poultry rations, using the GC-MS method	201
3-42: Presence of moniliformin in samples of maize and poultry rations using TLC and TLC densitometry of MON-2,4-DNPH derivatives	203
3-43: Frequency of occurrence of four <u>Fusarium</u> mycotoxins in 24 samples of maize and poultry rations as recorded by the three analytical methods	204
3-44: Number of samples contaminated with one or more <u>Fusarium</u> mycotoxins as recorded by the three analytical methods	204
3-45: "Contaminated sample status" and semiquantitative assessment (ppm) of DON, DAS, T-2 toxin, ZEA and MON in maize and poultry ration samples	207

LIST OF TABLES (continued)

	Page
3-46: <u>Fusarium</u> isolates tested for toxin production	209
3-47: Production of DON, DAS, T-2 toxin and ZEA by <u>Fusarium</u> spp grown on maize kernels, as detected by TLC assay of culture extracts	212
3-48: Semiquantitative assay by GC analysis of <u>Fusarium</u> mycotoxins produced by <u>Fusarium</u> spp grown on maize kernels	213
3-49: Production of DON, DAS, T-2 toxin and ZEA by <u>Fusarium</u> spp grown on maize kernels as detected by GC-MS analysis	214
3-50: Production of DON, DAS, T-2 toxin and ZEA by <u>Fusarium</u> isolates.	217
3-51: Numbers of <u>Fusarium</u> isolates producing toxins	218
3-52: Numbers of <u>Fusarium</u> isolates producing moniliformin	220
3-53: Moniliformin production by various <u>Fusarium</u> spp	221
4-1: Comparison of TLC and GC-ECD methods for detection of DON, as reported by Eppley <u>et al.</u> , 1984	251

LIST OF FIGURES

	Page
1-1: Some spores and conidiogenous cells of <u>Fusarium</u> species (from Booth, 1971)	10
1-2: Diagram showing the relative position (o) of field sampling sites in the four sampling methods of Basu <u>et al.</u> , 1977	32
2-1: Sources of field, harvest and stored maize samples collected in the Manawatu district.	98
2-2: Field sampling method used for maize, husks, litter and soil	100
2-3: Scheme for pooling of site and plot samples of maize to the field sample and subsequent subsampling	102
2-4: Scheme showing the apparatus used for conditioning the Amberlite XAD-4 resin	112
3-1: Relationship between number of rotations (rolls) of sample mixer and the total fungal viable counts (CFU/g) of maize	130
3-2: Comparison between the viable counts of the most commonly-occurring <u>Fusarium</u> spp in field samples	144
3-3: Comparison of the mean viable counts (CFU/g) of total fungi and <u>Fusarium</u> in samples of maize, husk, litter and soil from fields T3, T4, J1 and J2	147
3-4: Comparison of the two media PDA-D and PCNB for their effect on the estimated populations of total fungi and <u>Fusarium</u> spp from maize as determined by the dilution plating technique (CFU/g)	163
3-5: Comparison of the two media PDA-D and PCNB for their effect on the recovery rate (% contamination of kernels) of <u>Fusarium</u> spp and other genera, as determined by the direct plating technique	164
3-6: Comparison of the two media PDA-D and PCNB for their effect on the number of fungal genera recovered from maize samples as determined by the direct plating technique	166

LIST OF FIGURES (continued)

	Page
3-7: Evaluation of the direct plating and dilution plating techniques for their effect on the total number of fungal genera and the number of <u>Fusarium</u> spp recovered from maize (both media)	168
3-8: Contamination rates (mean %) of eight fungal genera from field, harvest and stored samples of maize	173
3-9: Frequency of occurrence of eight fungal genera in field, harvest and stored samples of maize	174
3-10: Comparison of contamination by <u>Fusarium</u> spp of maize in the field and at harvest (direct plating technique)	177
3-11: Diagrammatic representation of the analysis of mycotoxin standards according to their Rf values on developed TLC plates	181
3-12: Gas chromatogram of TMS-derivatives of mycotoxin standards on 12 m capillary column	184
3-13: Gas chromatogram on 12 m capillary column, silylated extract from naturally-contaminated maize of sample B3	185
3-14: Sample J2 contaminated with DON, DAS, T-2 toxin and ZEA.	186
3-15: Gas chromatogram of TMS-derivatives of mycotoxin standard on 50 m capillary column	187
3-16: Gas chromatogram of naturally-contaminated sample (AN-2) after derivitisation with TMS, on 50 m capillary column	188
3-17: Gas chromatography of mycotoxin standard on 12 m capillary column using Hewlett Packard GC system at Forest Research Institute	190
3-18: SIM ion chromatograms of mycotoxin standards	195
3-19: SIM mass spectra of mycotoxin standards	196
3-20: Total ion chromatogram of 4 standard mycotoxins	197
3-21: SIM ion chromatograms of mycotoxins recovered from spiked sample	198
3-22: SIM ion chromatograms of naturally-contaminated maize (sample J2)	199

LIST OF FIGURES (continued)

	Page
3-23: SIM ion chromatograms of maize samples (AN-1 and T2) naturally contaminated with ZEA	200
3-24: Comparison between three analytical methods, TLC, GC and GC-MS for detection of mycotoxins	205
3-25: SIM ion chromatograms of three toxins produced by <u>Fusarium graminearum</u> isolate SN39	215
3-26: UV spectrum of (a) moniliformin from <u>F. acuminatum</u> isolate and (B) moniliformin authentic standard	222

LIST OF PLATES

	Page
Plate 1: Five days old <u>F. subglutinans</u> culture on PDA	6
Plate 2: Five days old <u>F. poae</u> culture on PDA	7
Plate 3: Five days old <u>F. graminearum</u> culture on PDA	8
Plate 4: Conidiogenous cells and spores of some <u>Fusarium</u> spp	9

ABBREVIATIONS USED IN THIS THESIS

3-ADON	3-acetyl-deoxynivalenol
15-ADON	15-acetyl-deoxynivalenol
BSA	N,O-Bis (trimethylsilyl) acetamide
BSTFA	N,O-Bis (trimethylsilyl) trifluoroacetamide
CFU/g	Colony-forming units per gram
CDA	Czapek-dox solution agar
CLA	Carnation leaf agar
DAN	Diacetylnivalenol
DAS	Diacetoxyscirpenol
2,4-DNPH	2,4-dinitrophenylhydrazine
DON	Deoxynivalenol
ECD	Electron capture detector
EI	Electron impact
FID	Flame ionization detector
FUS-X	Fusarenon-X
GC	Gas liquid chromatography
GC-ECD	Gas liquid chromatography with electron capture detector
GC-FID	Gas liquid chromatography with flame ionization detector
GC-MS	Gas chromatography-mass spectrometry
GYEP	Glucose-yeast-extract-peptone
HFB	Heptofluorobutyryl
HFBI	Heptofluorobutyryl-imidazole
IMC	Initial moisture content
LEM	Leukoencephalomalacia
MAS	Monoacetoxyscirpenol
MC	Moisture content
MID	Multiple ion detection
MON	Moniliformin
MTM	Mycotoxin standards mixture
MS	Mass spectrometry
MS-MS	Mass spectrometry-mass spectrometry
M/Z	Mass/charge ratio of ion fragments in mass spectrometry
NEO	Neosolaniol
NIV	Nivalenol
PCNB	Pentachloronitrobenzene
PDA	Potato dextrose agar
PDA-D	Potato dextrose agar-dichloran
ppb	Part per billion (ng/g)
ppm	Part per million (mg/kg)
PSA	Potato sucrose agar
RIA	Radioimmunoassays
sdw	Sterile distilled water
SIM	Selective ion monitoring
TAS	Triacetoxyscirpenol
TLC	Thin layer chromatography
TMS	Trimethylsilyl
TMSI	N-trimethylsilyl-imidazole
TCMS	Trimethylchlorosilane
TIM	Total ion monitoring
ZEA	Zearalenone