

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.

STUDIES OF THE MYCOFLORA OF BARLEY DURING STORAGE  
AND ITS RELATION TO  
MYCOTOXIN CONTAMINATION

A thesis presented in partial fulfilment  
of the requirements for the degree of  
Doctor of Philosophy in Microbiology  
at  
Massey University

WEN SHYA LEE

1986

## ABSTRACT

Much of the economic loss occurring during storage of barley grain is that due to fungal deterioration. In addition, the development of mycotoxins during storage may result in contamination of animal feedstuffs.

In this study barley from samples obtained at harvest, from commercial silos after 5 and 9 months' storage, from farm silos after 5 months' storage and from laboratory-stored samples held at 4°C and at ambient temperature were subjected to various fungal isolation techniques. These techniques were designed to provide information on the total viable counts of the whole grain and of the outside and inside surfaces of the husks and caryopses. Isolates of Aspergillus flavus were screened for toxigenicity and the barley itself was subjected to multimycotoxin analysis.

To investigate levels of contamination, dilution plating of supernatants from the inner and outer parts of grains were examined. Differential viable counts revealed wide variations between samples at harvest and after storage with most contamination on the outer surface. "Clean" grain showed higher outer than inner counts, but for mouldy grains inside counts were greatly increased. It was concluded that inside counts give a better indication of grain condition.

Commercially-stored grain showed a marked decrease in viable counts over time, as did the laboratory-stored grain although those held at 4°C showed a smaller decrease. In contrast, the farm-stored grain continued to yield high viable counts. These counts could be related to storage conditions.

Amongst the genera isolated from dilution plates, Alternaria was the most frequent and persistent, whilst others, including Cladosporium and Fusarium, showed falling levels over the period of investigation. The genera Penicillium and Aspergillus showed rising frequencies with storage and were predominant in mouldy samples.

Microscopic examination and culturing of caryopsis sections and husk surfaces revealed the significance and distribution of various

genera. Alternaria was found in all fractions whereas Penicillium was completely absent from grain at harvest, later appearing on the outer husk and finally on the inner husk after prolonged storage at ambient temperature.

Microscopy of stained caryopsis sections showed hyphae only in those from mouldy grain. Microscopy of stained husks revealed hyphae on and in both husk surfaces of all grains, with a greater abundance on the inner surface and in mouldy husks. S.E.M. observations confirmed these findings and established the adherence of spores and hyphae to grain structures and their rough surfaces.

Some hyphal fragments associated with the grain can cause mycotoxin contamination. Loosely-attached hyphae were examined using membrane filtration and micro-manipulation techniques. It was found that whilst total levels of hyphal fragments showed little decrease during storage, their viability dropped considerably. For silo- and laboratory-stored grain, the viability dropped from over 20% to 5%. In contrast, over 45% were viable in a mouldy sample.

Of the fungal species isolated, species of the Aspergillus flavus group were screened for aflatoxin production using coconut agar fluorescence. Positive isolates ranged from 3% for farm-stored grain to 25% of those from grain at harvest. Selected A. flavus isolates were cultured on moist barley which when analysed for aflatoxin gave identical results to those from the coconut agar.

A multimycotoxin technique was used to screen 14 barley samples for aflatoxins, citrinin, ochratoxin, T-2 toxin and zearalenone. Only one obviously-mouldy sample proved positive for aflatoxin, citrinin and ochratoxin. It appears that although A. flavus and other potentially toxigenic fungi can be regularly isolated from barley grains, only in exceptional circumstances are they of significance in relation to mycotoxin contamination of stored grain.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to acknowledge the assistance that was given to me by the following people and organisations:

Professor D.F. Bacon and the Department of Microbiology and Genetics, Massey University, for the opportunity to undertake this study and for financial support and facilities;

Dr. M. Baxter, my supervisor, for his encouragement and patience throughout and for his guidance in the preparation of this thesis;

The Department of Veterinary Pathology and Public Health for the use of its facilities, and the Department of Scientific and Industrial Research for the use of their scanning electron microscope and facilities;

Manawatu Farm Products, especially the Manager Mr. K. Taylor and Mr. Jan Van Oossanen for providing samples;

Hodder and Tolley's Manager, Mr. Bob Nicholls, and staff for helping in the collection and provision of samples;

For technical help, all the technicians, especially Mr. Ron Tucker, Mr. D. Hopcroft, D.S.I.R. for assistance with both Scanning Electron Microscopy and photography, and Mr. Tom Law for photographic help;

Mrs. E.J. Baxter for typing so much so quickly.

I would like to take this opportunity of thanking all those friends and colleagues who assisted and encouraged me throughout, especially Ms. L.Y. Lam, Mr. H. Hussein and Mr. D.G. Brook.

I would finally thank my parents and brothers for the encouragement and financial support.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Abstract .....	ii
Acknowledgements .....	iv
List of Tables .....	x
List of Figures .....	xii
List of Plates .....	xiii
PREFACE .....	1
1. CHAPTER 1. THE MYCOFLORA OF BARLEY AND ITS RELATIONSHIP TO SPOILAGE OF STORED GRAINS - A REVIEW.....	3
1.1. BARLEY PRODUCTION AND USAGE.....	4
1.2. GRAIN STORAGE.....	6
1.2.1. Storage Methods .....	6
1.2.2. Storage systems for Barley in New Zealand.....	7
1.2.3. Storage Failures and Resulting Spoilage Problems..	7
1.3. THE MYCOFLORA OF STORED BARLEY GRAIN.....	8
1.3.1. The Fungal Flora of Stored Barley.....	9
1.3.2. The Fungal Flora of Freshly-harvested Barley.....	10
1.3.3. The Changing Fungal Flora During Storage .....	10
1.3.3.1. Moist barley grains.....	10
1.3.3.2. Dried barley grains.....	12
1.4. OCCURRENCE AND LOCATION OF FUNGI IN STORED BARLEY .....	14
1.4.1. The Structure of Barley Grains.....	14
1.4.2. Distribution of Various Fungal Propagules .....	17
1.4.3. Fungal Mycelium in Husk Tissue.....	18
1.4.3.1. Early studies.....	18
1.4.3.2. Recent studies.....	20
2. CHAPTER 2. MYCOTOXIN CONTAMINATION OF BARLEY - A REVIEW.....	23
2.1. MYCOTOXINS AND MYCOTOXICOSES .....	24
2.1.1. Mycotoxins Contaminating Cereal Grains.....	25
2.2. MYCOTOXINS DETECTED IN BARLEY.....	30

2.2.1. Early Mycotoxicoses and Consumption of Mouldy Barley .....	30
2.2.1.1. Ergotism.....	31
2.2.1.2. Alimentary Toxic Aleukia (A.T.A.) .....	31
2.2.2.3. Red Mould Disease.....	32
2.2.1.4 Other spontaneous diseases attributable to mouldy barley.....	32
2.3. AFLATOXINS PRESENT IN BARLEY.....	34
2.3.1. Reports of Contamination.....	34
2.3.2. Aflatoxin Formation in Cereal Grains.....	36
2.3.2.1. Aflatoxin producers.....	36
2.3.2.2. Other factors influencing aflatoxin formation .....	37
2.3.3. Screening <u>A. flavus-oryzae</u> strains for Aflatoxin producers .....	38
2.3.3.1. Liquid media.....	39
2.3.3.2. Natural substrates.....	39
2.3.3.3. Agar fluorescence.....	40
2.4 ASSAY METHODS FOR AFLATOXINS AND OTHER MYCOTOXINS IN CEREAL GRAIN .....	41
2.4.1 Introduction .....	41
2.4.2 Sampling .....	43
2.4.3 Sub-sampling .....	43
2.4.4 General Methods of Analysis for Aflatoxins .....	44
2.4.4.1 Toxin extraction .....	44
2.4.4.2 Purification and concentration of toxins	45
2.4.4.3 Separation of components .....	45
2.4.4.4 Quantitation of toxins .....	46
2.4.4.5 Methods of confirmation .....	47
2.4.5 Multimycotoxin Analysis .....	48
2.5 THE MYCOTOXIN SITUATION IN AUSTRALIA AND NEW ZEALAND ....	48
CHAPTER 3. THE FUNGAL FLORA OF STORED BARLEY. ....	52
3.1. INTRODUCTION.....	53

3.2. MATERIALS AND METHODS.....	56
3.2.1. The Barley Samples.....	56
3.2.1.1. Sources of samples.....	56
3.2.1.2. Sampling of grain.....	57
3.2.1.3. Sub-sampling in laboratory.....	58
3.2.1.4. Moisture content of samples.....	61
3.2.2. Mycoflora of Barley Grains.....	65
3.2.2.1. Total viable counts.....	65
3.2.2.2. Viable counts inside grain.....	66
3.2.2.3. Viable counts outside grain.....	67
3.2.2.4. Fungi of barley fractions.....	67
3.2.2.5. Identification and maintenance of cultures .....	68
3.3. RESULTS.....	69
3.3.1. Moisture Contents.....	69
3.3.2. Viable Counts of Barley Fungi.....	72
3.3.2.1. Samples obtained at harvest .....	72
3.3.2.2. Samples from commercial silos - 5 and 9 months' storage .....	82
3.3.2.3. Laboratory storage samples - ambient and cold temperatures (9 months' storage).....	82
3.3.3. Farm-stored grain .....	83
3.3.4. Fungi Isolated by Dilution Plating.....	83
3.3.5. Fungi from Barley Tissues.....	87
3.3.5.1. Microscopic observations.....	87
3.3.5.2. Barley tissues cultured on PDAX.....	91
3.3.6. Changing Levels of Fungal Contamination with Storage .....	92
3.3.6.1. Viable counts .....	92
3.3.6.2. Fungal genera.....	93
3.4. DISCUSSION.....	95
3.4.1. Location and Identification of Fungal Propagules on grain .....	104
3.4.2. Changing Levels of Fungal Flora During Storage....	107
Appendix 3-1 Fungi associated with barley .....	111

CHAPTER 4. FUNGAL MYCELIUM ASSOCIATED WITH BARLEY GRAIN ....	115
4.1 INTRODUCTION .....	116
4.2 MATERIALS AND METHODS .....	117
4.2.1 Scanning Electron Microscopy (S.E.M.) .....	117
4.2.2 Obtaining Hyphal Fragments on Membrane Filters ..	117
4.2.2.1 Whole grains .....	117
4.2.2.2 Husk and caryopsis .....	119
4.2.2.3 Microscopy and culture of membrane filters .....	119
4.2.3 Separation of Hyphae by Micro-manipulation .....	120
4.2.3.1 Source of supernatants .....	120
4.2.3.2 Preparation of agar slabs .....	120
4.2.3.3 Micro-manipulation technique .....	120
4.2.3.4 Observation and isolation of fungi .....	121
4.3 RESULTS .....	123
4.3.1 Location of Mycelium and Spores Determined by Scanning Electron Microscopy .....	123
4.3.2 Total Counts of Hyphal Fragments .....	134
4.3.2.1 Comparisons of total viable counts and total hyphal units (T.H.U.) .....	137
4.3.2.2 Fungi isolated from cultured membrane filters .....	137
4.3.3 Viability of Hyphal Fragments .....	137
4.3.3.1 Fungi from hyphal fragments .....	140
4.4 DISCUSSION .....	140
Appendix 4-1 Table showing barley sources, samples and subsamples .....	148
CHAPTER 5. AFLATOXIN-PRODUCING POTENTIAL OF <u>Aspergillus</u> <u>flavus</u> ISOLATES .....	149
5.1. INTRODUCTION.....	150
5.2. MATERIALS AND METHODS .....	153
5.2.1. Aspergillus Strains.....	153

5.2.2. Screening Method.....	153
5.2.3. Selection of <u>A. flavus</u> Isolates for Screening.....	155
5.2.3.1. Culturing <u>A. flavus</u> for toxins.....	155
5.2.3.2. Recovery of aflatoxins from barley cultures .....	155
5.2.3.3. Detection of aflatoxins present in extracts .....	156
5.3. RESULTS.....	158
5.3.1. Screening of <u>A. flavus</u> Isolates on Coconut Agar...	158
5.3.2. Screening of Selected <u>A. flavus</u> Isolates on Barley .....	162
5.4. DISCUSSION.....	167
CHAPTER 6 MULTIMYCOTOXIN SCREENING OF SELECTED BARLEY SAMPLES.....	176
6.1. INTRODUCTION.....	177
6.2. MATERIALS AND METHODS.....	177
6.2.1. Selection of Barley Samples.....	177
6.2.2. Sampling.....	178
6.2.3. Multimycotoxin Assay .....	178
6.2.4. Extraction and Cleanup.....	178
6.2.4.1. Concentration of extracts.....	180
6.2.5. Detection of Mycotoxins in Extracts.....	180
6.2.5.1. Thin layer chromatography (T.L.C.).....	180
6.2.5.2. Analysis for T-2 toxin.....	181
6.2.6. Additional and Confirmatory Tests.....	181
6.3. RESULTS.....	184
6.4. DISCUSSION.....	188
CHAPTER 7 GENERAL DISCUSSION .....	196
REFERENCES .....	212

## LIST OF TABLES

1-1: Suggested safe moisture contents for storage of barley grains.....	13
2-1: Early mycotoxicoses associated with cereals and animal feeds .....	27
2-2: Some mycotoxins found in cereal grains.....	28
2-3: Some mycotoxins present in barley.....	29
2-4: Spontaneous disease attributed to mycotoxins in mouldy barley .....	33
2-5: Natural occurrence of aflatoxins in barley.....	35
2-6: Reputed cases of aflatoxicosis in Australia .....	50
3-1: Moisture content and conditions of barley samples .....	70
3-2: Average viable counts (colony-forming units $g^{-1}$ ) of grain at 25°C .....	73
3-3: Principal fungal genera isolated from grain samples on PDAX at 25°C .....	84
3-4: Principal fungal genera isolated from grain samples on PDAX at 37°C .....	86
3-5: Principal Aspergilli isolated from 6 sources .....	87
3-6: Principal fungal genera obtained on culturing grain tissues on PDAX at 25°C .....	88
3-7: Overall incidence of selected fungal genera in the barley samples examined based on isolations from all total count determinations at 25°C .....	90
4-1: Counts of hyphal units on membrane filters of barley grains from 6 sources .....	133
5-1: Production of fluorescence by toxigenic <u>A. flavus</u> isolates...158	
5-2: Fluorescence of <u>A. flavus</u> isolates on coconut agar.....160	
5-3: Production of fluorescence and pigmentation on coconut agar medium by <u>A. flavus</u> isolates .....	161
5-4: Aflatoxin production by selected <u>A. flavus</u> isolates on sterile barley .....	162
5-5: Aflatoxin production on coconut agar and in sterile barley culture by selected <u>A. flavus</u> isolates .....	166

5-6: Toxigenic <u>A. flavus</u> isolates from natural substrates in Australia and New Zealand .....	170
5-7: Isolates of the <u>A. flavus</u> group producing aflatoxins in various parts of the world .....	171
5-8: Some laboratory screenings of naturally-occurring <u>A. flavus</u> isolates which produce only aflatoxin B1 .....	174
6-1: Fluorescent colours of toxins under both short- and long-wave U.V. light after 2 different treatments .....	183
6-2: Multimycotoxin screening of 14 selected barley samples.....	185
6-3: Moisture content required for growth of selected mycotoxin-producing fungi .....	191
6-4: Aflatoxin, citrinin and ochratoxin-producing fungi.....	192

## LIST OF FIGURES

1-1: Structure of barley grain .....	16
2-1: Diagrammatic representation of general assay methods .....	42
3-1: Simplified structure of a barley kernel showing location of the distinct areas of mycological interest .....	55
3-2: Apparatus for sub-sampling in the laboratory.....	60
3-3: Summary of Total Counting Technique for non-surface sterilised grain (n.s.s. total counts) and surface-sterilised grain (s.s. "inside counts") .....	63
3-4: Total, inner and outer surface counts of grains at harvest .....	76
3-5: Total, inner and outer surface counts of grains stored in commercial silos for 5 months .....	77
3-6: Total, inner and outer surface counts of grains stored in commercial silos for 9 months .....	78
3-7: Total, inner and outer surface counts of grains stored at ambient temperature for 9 months .....	79
3-8: Total, inner and outer surface counts of grains stored in cold (4-5 <sup>0</sup> C) for 9 months .....	80
3-9: Total, inner and outer surface counts of grains stored on farms .....	81
4-1: Technique for obtaining hyphal fragments on membrane filters .....	118
4-2: Micro-manipulation technique in separating hyphal fragments.....	122
4-3: Comparative levels of hyphal units obtained from supernatants of grain samples .....	135
4-4: Comparison of viable counts as obtained by the dilution plating technique and the counts of hyphal units obtained by the membrane filtration technique from 6 grain samples ...	136
4-5: Histogram of combined frequencies in grain samples of various genera obtained with total counts and on membrane filters at 25 <sup>0</sup> C .....	138
4-6: Viable hyphal fragments in supernatants of grain samples from 6 different sources .....	139

5-1: Proportion of barley samples from the 6 sources yielding <u>A. flavus</u> .....	151
5-2: Serial transfers of <u>A. flavus</u> species on barley grains.....	154
5-3: Recovery of aflatoxins from barley cultures .....	156
6-1: Method for the extraction of aflatoxins, ochratoxin, zearalenone, sterigmatocystin, T-2 toxin and citrinin .....	179

### LIST OF PLATES

3-1: Mould-infested grain from a farm silo .....	96
4-1 to 4-5: Scanning electron micrographs of normal barley grains .....	125-127
4-6 to 4-9: Scanning electron micrographs of mouldy grain ..	128-129
4-10 & 4-11: Scanning electron micrographs of normal husk surfaces .....	130
4-12 to 4-14: Scanning electron micrographs of inner husk surfaces .....	131-132
5-1: Fluorescence in coconut agar under U.V. light ....	159
5-2: Thin layer chromatography plate developed in diethyl-ether followed by chloroform-acetone .....	163
5-3: T.L.C. plate of aflatoxin spots treated with T.F.A. ....	164
5-4: T.L.C. plate sprayed with 25% sulphuric acid .....	164
6-1: T.E.F. (60:30:10) developed plate sprayed with 20% sulphuric acid in methanol .....	182
6-2: Developed T.L.C. plate viewed under U.V. light for T-2 toxin .....	182
6-3: T.E.F. (60:30:10) developed T.L.C. plate spotted <sup>with spots</sup> sample extracts (I) and standards .....	186
6-4: T.E.F. (60:30:10) developed T.L.C. plate of sample extracts (II) and standards .....	187
6-5: T.E.F. (60:30:10) developed T.L.C. plates followed by spraying with $AlCl_3$ in ethanol of sample extracts (II) and standards .....	187

## PREFACE

In spite of advances in technology, millions of dollars worth of cereals are lost each year through spoilage of various sorts. In technologically-advanced countries, (such as New Zealand), where insect and rodent infestations of stored grains can usually be kept under reasonable control, fungi are considered to be the major cause of deterioration and spoilage of newly-harvested and stored grains (Ciegler, 1978). Incipient deterioration in grain quality begins as soon as grain is harvested and under suitable conditions, fungi readily proliferate resulting in gross spoilage.

For many years, there was a tendency to regard fungal growth on food commodities as harmless; a nuisance affecting commodity appearance and perhaps a cause of loss and spoilage. When contamination was severe, commodities deemed unfit for human consumption might perhaps still be used as animal feed. However, ever since the discovery of the aflatoxins and toxigenic Aspergillus flavus species two decades ago, fungal growth in cereal grains was viewed as a potential health hazard.

The genera of fungi most implicated belonged to the "storage fungi" (Ciegler, 1978), but an increasing number of studies have shown the elaboration of toxins by other fungal genera. The range of fungi which can be implicated in toxin formation is now known to be almost limitless. The widespread and frequent occurrence of toxigenic fungi in agricultural commodities indicate a constant potential hazard (Davis, 1981).

The development of specific methods of analysis has led to the discovery of a wide spectrum of mycotoxic compounds at low but significant levels in many samples of food contaminated with fungi. Cereal grains represent the most important commodity contaminated by mycotoxins (Hesseltine, 1974). Contamination is usually the result of faulty harvesting and improper storage, although mycotoxins can be produced before harvest (Scott, 1978; Stoloff, 1979). The presence of fungal toxins is potentially a serious problem as most mycotoxins are stable and even persist in food commodities after the fungi that produced them are killed (Moreau, 1979).

Ingestion of contaminated food can result in acute or chronic symptoms of toxicoses as well as insidious effects in both man and animals (Wyllie & Morehouse, 1978; National Academy of Sciences, 1979; W.H.O., 1979; Pier et al, 1980; Pier, 1981). Thus, the economic consequences of crop losses due to fungal attack and concomitant mycotoxin production are of concern when ensuring the production of wholesome food products and livestock feeds for the markets of today.

Barley is widely grown in New Zealand as a feed for livestock, for export and for human consumption and brewing. The studies on grain deterioration and mycotoxin contamination overseas have concentrated mainly on cereal grains other than barley, whilst similar studies are very limited in New Zealand. These factors, together with the increasing production and use of barley particularly in animal feed-stuffs in this country, meant that more intensive studies would be useful in understanding the local situation.

The investigations reported here concern the changing fungal flora of barley grains during storage, the topographic origins of the fungi in relation to grain deterioration and also their potential to produce toxins. Particular attention is paid to Aspergillus flavus, as this species is considered to be of considerable importance in causing gross spoilage and many isolates are important mycotoxin producers. Aflatoxins, the formidable mycotoxins produced by many isolates of A. flavus, are potent carcinogens, mutagens and hepatoxins (Goldblatt, 1969; Heathcote & Hibbert, 1978). A. flavus isolates have been screened for aflatoxin production and selected barley samples analysed for the presence of aflatoxins and other mycotoxins.