

## Risk assessment scenarios of children's exposure to aflatoxin M1 residues in different milk types from the Greek market

Ioannis N. Tsakiris<sup>a</sup>, Manolis N. Tzatzarakis<sup>b</sup>, Athanasios K. Alegakis<sup>b</sup>, Maria I. Vlachou<sup>b</sup>, Elisabet A. Renieri<sup>b</sup>, Aristidis M. Tsatsakis<sup>b,\*</sup>

<sup>a</sup>TEI of Western Macedonia, Florina Branch, Department of Agricultural Products Management and Quality Control, Terma Kontopoulou, 53100 Florina, Greece

<sup>b</sup>Laboratory of Toxicology, Department of Medicine, University of Crete, Voutes, 71003 Heraklion, Greece

### ARTICLE INFO

#### Article history:

Received 15 January 2013

Accepted 12 February 2013

Available online 21 February 2013

#### Keywords:

Aflatoxin M1  
Risk assessment  
ELISA  
Milk

### ABSTRACT

Occurrence of aflatoxin M1 (AFM1) was determined in 196 milk samples (conventional, organic and kids milk) from the Greek market during November 2009 to June 2010. AFM1 content was analyzed using an Enzyme-Linked Immunosorbent Assay (ELISA) commercial kit. Aflatoxin M1 was detected in 46.5% of the samples. 46.5% of the samples were found positive for AFM1. The most frequent range of detection was between 5 and 10 ng/l. Based on the EU regulation only 2 milk samples presented AFM1 levels higher than the maximum residue limits. Two different scenarios were used for the determination of hazard index: (a) scenario 1 using only positive (detected AFM1) samples and (b) scenario 2 when missing values were imputed with Limit of Detection (LOD) divided by 2. Significant statistical differences between different milk categories were presented only when the results were imputed with LOD/2 values. Exposure assessment scenarios were developed for ages 1, 3, 5, 7 and 12 and their respective estimated weights and daily milk consumption. Under the worst-case scenario all milk types presented a Hazard Index (HI) less than one. The highest HI values appear in the ages of 1–3.

© 2013 Elsevier Ltd. All rights reserved.

## 1. Introduction

Quantitative exposure assessment is a methodology developed to analyze scientific information in order to evaluate the severity and probability of an adverse event. Risk assessment can be used to estimate human exposure to xenobiotics through the consumption of food and therefore to provide a link between possible hazards in the food chain and the risks reflected to human health. Risk assessment results may also offer the scientific grounds for risk management decisions and options. Two of the most important parameters affecting the risk assessment are the amount of food consumed during a specific period of time and the concentration of xenobiotic residues. As far as the evaluation of the toxicological properties of xenobiotic mixtures in foods is concerned, detailed information on the composition of the mixture and the mechanism of action of each specific xenobiotic are required (Reffstrup et al., 2010).

**Abbreviations:** AFB1, aflatoxin B1; AFM1, aflatoxin M1; ALARA, as low as reasonably achievable; EDI, estimated daily intake; ELISA, Enzyme-Linked Immunosorbent Assay; HI, hazard index; LOD, limit of detection; MRLs, maximum residues limits; TD<sub>50</sub>, threshold dose; TDI, tolerable daily intake.

\* Corresponding author. Address: Toxicology Laboratory, Medical School, University of Crete, P.O. Box 1393, 71409 Heraklion, Crete, Greece. Tel.: +30 2810 542098/394679; fax: +30 2810 394688/542098.

E-mail address: [aris@med.uoc.gr](mailto:aris@med.uoc.gr) (A.M. Tsatsakis).

Milk is considered to be a perfect natural food for consumers of all age groups due to its high nutritional value. It is high in protein and a valuable source of calcium, vitamins and antioxidants (Zeluta et al., 2009). Additionally, certain milk lipids such as butyric acid are known to present anticarcinogenic properties (Michalski and Januel, 2006). Due to the central role milk plays in human diet it holds a great economical significance on a global level. According to the latest statistics from the European Commission (2011), milk production is a very important component of the agricultural economy as its total production share varies between 5.8% and 33.5% ([http://ec.europa.eu/agriculture/publi/fact/milk/2007\\_en.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/agriculture/publi/fact/milk/2007_en.pdf)). Out of the 136.360.000 tonnes of total collected cow milk, 31.540.000 tonnes are consumed as dietary milk (Eurostat, 2011). Due to globalization, milk and its products may travel worldwide. This fact in combination with major food crisis situations (e.g. milk pollution with melamine) has rendered consumers increasingly conscious in terms of product safety and quality. Through recent bibliography it has been demonstrated that aflatoxin M1 (AFM1) is one of the most important xenobiotics affecting the two previously reported parameters.

Aflatoxins are a group of toxic chemical compounds produced by the species of *Aspergillus flavus*, *Aspergillus parasiticus* and rarely by *Aspergillus nomius*. B aflatoxins are primarily produced by *A. flavus*, while the other two species produce both B and G aflatoxins (Pei et al., 2009). Cereals and silage seem to be the most common

feedstuffs susceptible to mycotoxin contamination (Scudamore et al., 1998). Aflatoxin B1 (AFB1) is the most toxic metabolite, demonstrating teratogenic, mutagenic and carcinogenic effects (Stagos et al., 2012). AFM1 is the main hydroxylated derivative of AFB1 formed in liver by means of P450 cytochrome enzymes and secreted into milk through the mammary gland of dairy cows. The AFM1 derivative can be detected in milk within 12–24 h after the first intake of AFB1, while its concentration decreases to an undetectable level 72 h after the initial intake is stopped (Fallah, 2010). AFM1 is very resistant to thermal treatments such as pasteurization and sterilization during dietary milk production (Galvano et al., 1996). Upon entering the body it may cause damage to the DNA ultimately leading to mutagenic and carcinogenic effects, whereas in the case of aflatoxicosis, liver is the main target organ (Fung and Clark, 2004). The International Agency for Research on Cancer has classified AFM1 as a group 2B carcinogen (possibly carcinogenic to humans) (Pei et al., 2009).

High milk consumption by all age groups and especially for children appears to be one of the most important exposure factors through diet for AFM1 (Rahimi et al., 2010; Prandini et al., 2009). The objective of the present study is to evaluate human exposure to AFM1 via dietary milk consumption and at the same time to evaluate the potential risk through different risk assessment scenarios.

## 2. Materials and methods

### 2.1. Sampling

A total of 196 samples of dietary cow milk from different market points were collected during November 2009 to June 2010. The characteristics of milk samples are presented in Table 1. Among 196 samples, 154 (78.57%) were conventional, 42 (21.4%) were organic and 30 (15.3%) of the milk samples were specific for children older than 12 months. Fresh milk samples represented 51% of the total samples while the rest were Ultra High Temperature (UHT) processed milk. The majority of samples were bottled in a Tetrapak® type package while the rest were bottled in plastic containers.

All samples were transported at 2–4 °C in dry ice to the laboratory and were analyzed with ELISA on the same day of sampling, while sub-samples were kept in the deep-freeze for pesticide residue analysis (performed in less than 5 days).

Sampling was completed according to the principles of European Commission Regulation No. 401/2006 and European Commission Directive No. 63/2002.

### 2.2. AFM1 residue determination analysis

#### 2.2.1. Sample Preparation for AFM1 analysis

Ten ml of the milk samples were centrifuged at 3500g for 10 min at 10 °C. The upper creamy layer was removed by a Pasteur pipette and from the lower phase (defatted supernatant) 100 µl per well was used in the test plate.

**Table 1**  
Characteristics of milk samples collected from Greek market during 2009–2010 and analyzed for AFM1.

	N	%
Organic	42	21.4
Kid	30	15.3
<i>Milk fat</i>		
Full (>3.0% fat)	112	57.1
Semi-skimmed (2.0–3.0% fat)	28	14.3
Light (<2.0% fat)	56	28.6
<i>Type of milk</i>		
Fresh (storage life up to 4 days)	100	51.0
Long Life (storage life >4 days)	96	49.0
<i>Type of bottle</i>		
Tetrapack	135	89.1
Plastic	61	31.1

N: Number of samples.

%: Percentage of total samples.

### 2.2.2. ELISA test procedure

The quantitative analysis of AFM1 was performed by competitive ELISA using RIDASCREEN® Aflatoxin M1 30/15 test kit. One hundred micro litre of standard solutions and prepared samples were added into separate microtitre wells and incubated for 60 min at room temperature (22–25 °C) in the dark. The liquid was then poured out and the wells were washed with washing buffer (250 µl) twice. In the following stage, 100 µl of the diluted enzyme conjugate was added to the wells, mixed gently by shaking the plate manually and incubated for 15 min at room temperature in the dark. Again, the wells were washed twice with washing buffer. Afterwards, 100 µl of substrate/chromogen was added, mixed gently and incubated in the dark at room temperature for 15 min. Finally, 100 µl of the stop reagent was added into the wells and the absorbance was measured at  $\lambda = 450$  nm in ELISA plate reader, against air blank within 15 min. According to RIDASCREEN kit recommendations, the lowest detection limit is 5 ng/l for milk.

### 2.3. Statistical analysis and exposure estimation to AFM1

Levels of AFM1 were expressed in the form of mean and 95% confidence interval (mean 95%CI) and percentiles (25th, 50th, 75th and 80th). Differences in concentrations between two groups and more than two groups were assessed by Mann-Whitney and Kruskal–Wallis tests respectively. IBM SPSS Statistics 20.0 and EXCEL 2007 were used for statistical analysis and plots.

The estimation of Hazard Index (HI) is based on proposal of Kuiper-Goodman, 1990 which reported also in Shundo et al. (2009). In more details, estimated daily intake (EDI) was computed using 80th percentile of AFM1 residues in positive samples (scenario 1) and 80th percentiles of AFM1 residues when LOD/2 was imputed in the missing values (scenario 2). The consumption of milk was roughly estimated at 250 ml for the age of 1, 400 ml for the age of 3, 5 and 7 and 800 ml for the age of 12 (according to municipal day care centers, elementary schools and pediatric clinics).

The exposure assessment scenarios were developed for the ages of 1, 3, 5, 7 and 12 and body weights of 10, 14, 19, 24 and 37 kg respectively (based on Greek pediatric development normograms).

As a denominator for hazard index, a TD<sub>50</sub> (threshold dose per body weight which divided by 5000) was used.

## 3. Results and discussion

Out of 196 samples, 91 (46.5%) were positive for AFM1 with a mean value of 10 ng/l. Only 2 conventional milk samples presented levels of AFM1 residues higher than the Maximum Residues Levels (MRLs) according to European Commission Regulation EC 1881/2006 (European Commission, 2010). Table 2 presents the descriptive statistics of AFM1 residues (ng/l) in selected milk samples under scenario 1 and 2 assumptions. The most common range of detection was 5–10 ng/l as supported from median and quartile values for milk categories presented in Table 2.

In the first scenario AFM1 residues were detected at levels that bear no significant statistical difference between the different types of milk (see Table 2 for *p* values). However, the levels of AFM1 residues in milk samples from Tetrapak® type packaging were significantly higher than the corresponding ones from plastic bottles (*p* = 0.003). Although the current literature lacks of details about the specific issue, difference may explained by the life span of milk (fresh and long storage). In more details 51 of the 61 (77.3%) of the milk samples packaged in Tetrapak® were fresh (have a life span up to 4 days) while 15 of the 30 (60.0%) packaged in plastic bottles are long life (*p* < 0.001). Therefore, the difference in packaging could be explained by the higher AFM1 levels and the higher prevalence of fresh milk in Tetrapak®.

In the second scenario, when the AFM1 residues were imputed with LOD/2, the following significant differences were apparent. (1) The levels of AFM1 residues in semi-skimmed milk were significantly lower than the corresponding ones in light and full fat milk (*p* = 0.003). (2) The levels of AFM1 residues in children's milk were significantly lower than the corresponding ones in normal milk (*p* < 0.001). (3) The levels of AFM1 residues in long life milk were significantly lower than the corresponding ones in fresh milk (*p* < 0.001). (4) The levels of AFM1 residues in plastic bottles were significantly lower than the corresponding ones in Tetrapak® (*p* = 0.050). In both scenarios no significant statistical difference

**Table 2**

Descriptive statistics of AFM1 residues in milk samples collected from Greek market during 2009–2010, based on two different scenarios.

Scenarios	Statistics	Scenario 1						Scenario 2							
		N (%)	Mean (95%CI)	Percentiles					N (%)	Mean (95%CI)	Percentiles				
				25	50	75	80	P*			25	50	75	80	P*
Total samples		91 (46.5%)	10.0 (8.6–11.4)	5.7	7.9	11.8	13.4		196	6.0 (5.2–6.8)	2.5	2.5	7.5	8.4	
Lipid content	Light (<2%)	26 (46.4%)	11.7 (8.1–15.4)	6.1	8.3	14.8	16	0.191	56	6.8 (4.7–8.8)	2.5	2.5	8.3	9.0	0.003
	Semi-skimmed (2–3%)	5 (17.9%)	6.5 (3.3–9.7)	5.0	5.4	8.7	10		28	3.2 (2.5–3.9)	2.5	2.5	2.5	2.9	
	Full (>3%)	60 (53.9%)	9.5 (8.1–10.9)	5.7	7.7	11.6	13.3		112	6.3 (5.3–7.3)	2.5	5.0	8.0	9.0	
Production process	Conventional	75 (48.7%)	9.7 (8.3–11.1)	5.7	8.0	11.7	13.2	0.802	154	6.0 (5.1–6.9)	2.5	2.5	7.9	8.7	0.287
	Organic	16 (38.1%)	11.3 (6.5–16.1)	5.7	6.9	15	18.1		42	5.9 (3.7–8.0)	2.5	2.5	6.0	6.9	
Consumer groups	Normal	86 (51.5%)	10.2 (8.8–11.6)	5.7	8.0	12.6	13.8	0.113	166	6.5 (5.5–7.4)	2.5	4.6	8.2	9.1	<0.001
	Kid milk	5 (16.7%)	6.5 (3.3–9.7)	5.0	5.4	8.7	10		30	3.2 (2.5–3.8)	2.5	2.5	2.5	2.5	
Life span	Fresh (up to 4 days)	61 (61.0%)	10.6 (8.9–12.3)	5.7	8.5	13.4	15.6	0.161	100	7.4 (6.1–8.7)	2.5	5.1	9.1	10.8	<0.001
	Long life (more than 4 days)	30 (31.3%)	8.8 (6.4–11.2)	5.7	6.6	10.1	11.2		96	4.5 (3.5–5.4)	2.5	2.5	5.6	5.9	
Type of bottle/ packaging	Tetra pack	66 (48.9%)	11.1 (9.3–12.9)	5.9	8.6	13.3	15.4	0.003	135	6.7 (5.6–7.8)	2.5	2.5	8.5	9.8	0.050
	Plastic	25 (41.0%)	7.2 (5.8–8.5)	5.1	6.0	7.9	8.3		61	4.4 (3.6–5.2)	2.5	2.5	5.4	6.1	

95% CI: 95% Confidence interval of the mean.

Scenario 1: Results from positive samples.

Scenario 2: Results imputed with LOD/2 values.

P\*: p-values resulted from Mann–Whitney test for two groups comparisons or Kruskal–Wallis for more than two groups comparisons.

**Table 3**

Aflatoxin M1 percentage of detection, mean value, range of concentration, percentage of samples above EU MRLs and most frequently reported category of range detection, determined in pasteurized milk samples and reported in different studies during 2000–2011.

Country – year of samples	Number of samples	Percentage of detection (%)	Mean value	Range	Above EU MRL (%)	Frequency mode	Reference
Greece, 1999–2000	82	85.4	n.r.	n.r.	0	5–10 ng/L	Roussi et al. (2002)
Japan, 2001–2002	208	99.5	9 ng/Kg	5–30 ng/Kg	0	5–10 ng/Kg	Nakajima et al. (2004)
Iran, 2003	624	100	n.r.	n.r.	17.8	<45 ng/L	Alborzi et al. (2006)
Italy, 2003–2005	316	n.r.	27 (max mean value) ng/L	10–90 ng/L	0.6	n.r.	Nachtmann et al. (2007)
India, 2004	87	87	n.r.	63–1012 ng/kg	86	n.r.	Rastogi et al. (2004)
Turkey, 2005	129	58.1	108.17 ng/L	n.d – 543.64 ng/L	43.9	n.d – 10 ng/L	Unusan, 2006
Syria, 2005–2006	10	100	492 ng/kg	8–765 ng/L	>80	n.r.	Ghanem and Orfi (2009)
Brazil, 2006	125	95.2	31 ng/kg	10–200 ng/kg	26.4	10–20 ng/Kg	Shundo et al. (2009)
Iran, 2008	50	100	50.55 ng/kg	n.d – 259 ng/L	44	50–80 ng/L	Ghazani, 2009
Spain, 2008	72	94.4	9.69 ng/Kg	n.d – 13.61 ng/kg	0	5–30 ng	Cano-Sancho et al. (2010)
Iran, 2010	225	67.10	49.7 ng/L	5.6–528.5 ng/L	22	5–500 ng/L	Fallah, 2010
Lebanon, 2010	25	68	30.6 ng/L	3.27–84.4 ng/L	16	5–25 ng/L	Assem et al. (2011)


n.r.: not reported, n.d.: not detected, EU: European Union

was observed between the levels of AFM1 in conventional and organic milk samples (scenario 1:  $p = 0.802$ , scenario 2:  $p = 0.287$ ), which is in accordance with the current bibliography (Ghidini et al., 2005). When the more conservative scenario 1 was applied the hazard index values do not exceed 0.2. Additionally, when a multiple linear regression model is applied using AFM1 log concentrations as dependent and lipid content, production process, consumers groups and life span as independent variables, significant associations were observed only with consumers group ( $\beta = -2.7$ ,  $p = 0.025$ ) and life span ( $\beta = -2.7$ ,  $p = 0.002$ ). There is no extending literature on the levels of mycotoxins in pasteurized milk or milk products and the examined in our study factors (e.g. lipid content, life span, etc). A study of Carvajal et al., 2003 showed that milk samples with greater fat content have greater but not significantly greater ( $p = 0.067$ ) levels than those of lower fat milk. Another study on spiked skimmed milk powder showed that pasteurization process could decrease AFM1 content at a percentage of 16% (Deveci and Sezgin, 2006).

There is a list of possible factors that could explain the differences observed in AFM1 levels and the measured characteristics. Different levels in life span could be related with the temperature of pasteurization process, which is higher in long life milks. The geographical origin of milk (regions of Greece or elsewhere) and the period of milk collection could possibly affect the AFM1 levels but such information is not available in our study.

Table 3 presents the results of similar studies conducted during the last decade. It is clear that the percentage of AFM1 detection is relatively high (average value almost 90%) in reported studies, which indicates that consumers are constantly exposed to these xenobiotics through milk consumption. The reported mean values present noticeable variations between different countries with EU countries presenting lower mean values compared to Middle East countries. Significant differences are also presented between Middle East countries and the EU regarding the percentage of samples that are above the EU maximum levels, which may be partially explained by the as low as reasonably achievable (ALARA) policy applied by European authorities for genotoxic carcinogens. More specifically, the percentage of samples above EU maximum levels was almost zero in EU studies while in similar Middle East studies the corresponding percentage was 45%.

Fig. 1 presents the HI values based on the 80th centile values for different milk types (all samples, semi-skimmed, full lipid, fresh, long life and organic). As far as risk assessment is concerned, a Tolerable Daily Intake (TDI) for AFM1 has yet to be determined. Kuiper–Goodman have proposed and estimated a TDI for AFM1 which is determined by dividing the  $TD_{50}$  by an uncertainty factor of 5000. The proposed value is 0.2 ng/kg of body weight (bw), a value equivalent to a risk level of 1:100,000. Thus the HI in the case of AFM1 is determined by dividing the EDI by the proposed value of 0.2 ng/kg bw. For the estimation of EDI the 80th centile values of



**Fig. 1.** Hazard Index (HI) for AFM1 in different milk types samples (all samples, full fat, semi-skimmed, organic, fresh and long life) collected from Greek market, estimation based on 80th centile values.

AFM1 concentrations were multiplied by the previously mentioned consumptions and divided by the weight values for each of the selected ages. The 80th centile values are proposed as the worst-case study in scenario 2.

Under this scenario all milk types present an HI of less than one. All the curves present maximum values between the ages of two and three. Presumably this happens because of the amount of milk consumption versus the body weight presents the highest ratio during these ages. Then a decrease is presented until the age of six followed by another increase until the age of 12. Semi-skimmed milk presents the lowest HI values while fresh milk presents the highest ones. As far as the previously reported categories are concerned, full fat milk present a higher HI compared to semi-skimmed milk while fresh milk presents a higher HI compared to long-life milk. HI values for organic milk lay in the middle of the reported milk types.

#### 4. Conclusions

AFM1 residues were detected in 46.5% of the selected milk samples, although at levels that did not exceed the EU MRLs. This could be partially attributed to the ALARA (as low as reasonably achievable) policy followed by European authorities with regard to genotoxic carcinogens. AFM1 levels in organic and conventional milk samples did not present significant statistical differences, which is in accordance with the current bibliography. Risk assessment scenarios for AFM1 indicate that the highest HI values are for the ages of 1–3 years, which was expected given the ratio of the amount of milk consumed relative to lower body weight. According to the risk assessment, the children are not exposed to a significant risk from exposure to AFM1 through the consumption of milk.

#### Conflict of Interest

The authors declare that there are no conflicts of interest.

#### References

- Alborzi, S., Pourabbas, B., Rashidi, M., Astaneh, B., 2006. Aflatoxin M1 contamination in pasteurized milk in Shiraz (south of Iran). *Food Control* 17, 582–584.
- Assem, E., Mohamad, A., Oula, E., 2011. A survey on the occurrence of aflatoxin M1 in raw and processed milk samples marketed in Lebanon. *Food Control* 22, 1856–1858.
- Cano-Sancho, G., Marin, S., Ramos, A.J., Peris-Vicente, J., Vicente, S., 2010. Occurrence of aflatoxin M1 and exposure assessment in Catalonia (Spain). *Rev. Iberoam. Micol.* 27, 130–135.
- Carvajal, M., Bolanos, A., Rojo, F., Mentez, I., 2003. Aflatoxin M1 in pasteurized and ultrapasteurized milk with different fat content in Mexico. *J. Food Prot.* 66 (10), 1885–1892.
- Deveci, O., Sezgin, E., 2006. Changes in concentration of aflatoxin M1 during manufacture and storage of skim milk powder. *J. Food Prot.* 69 (3), 682–685.
- European Commission, 2002. Commission Directive 2002/63/EC of 11 July 2002 Establishing Community Methods of Sampling for the Official Control of Pesticide Residues in and on Products of Plant and Animal Origin and Repealing Directive 79/700/EEC. *Official Journal of the European Union*.
- European Commission, 2006. Commission Regulation (EC) No. 401/2006 of 23 February 2006 Laying Down the Methods of Sampling and Analysis for the Official Control of the Levels of Mycotoxins in Foodstuffs. *Official Journal of the European Union*.
- European Commission, 2010. Commission Regulation (EC) No. 165/2010 of 26 February 2010 Amending Regulation (EC) No. 1881/2006 Setting the Maximum Levels for Certain Contaminants in Foodstuffs Regarding Aflatoxins. *Official Journal of the European Union*.
- European Commission, Directorate General For Agriculture and Rural Development. <[http://ec.europa.eu/agriculture/publi/fact/milk/2007\\_en.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/agriculture/publi/fact/milk/2007_en.pdf)>. (accessed 03.01.11).
- Eurostat, 2011. Agriculture and Fishery Statistics, Main Results 2009–10. Brussels: European Commission, Publication Office (Chapter 1).
- Fallah, A., 2010. Assessment of aflatoxin M1 contamination in pasteurized and UHT milk marketed in central part of Iran. *Food Chem. Toxicol.* 48, 988–991.
- Fung, F., Clark, R.F., 2004. Health Effects of mycotoxins: a toxicological overview. *J. Toxicol. Clin. Toxicol.* 42, 217–234.
- Galvano, F., Galorafo, V., Galvano, G., 1996. Occurrence and stability of aflatoxin M1 in milk and milk products: a worldwide review. *J. Food Prot.* 59, 1079–1090.
- Ghanem, I., Orfi, M., 2009. Aflatoxin M1 in raw pasteurized and powdered milk available in the Syrian market. *Food Control* 20, 603–605.
- Ghazani, M., 2009. Aflatoxin M1 contamination in pasteurized milk in Tabriz (northwest of Iran). *Food Chem. Toxicol.* 47, 1624–1625.
- Ghidini, S., Zanardi, E., Battaglia, A., Varisco, G., Ferretti, E., Campanini, G., Chizzolini, R., 2005. Comparison of contaminant and residue levels in organic and conventional milk and meat products from Northern Italy. *Food Addit. Contam.* 22 (1), 9–14.
- Kuiper-Goodman, T., 1990. Uncertainties in the risk assessment of three mycotoxins: aflatoxin, ochratoxin and zearalenone. *Can. J. Physiol. Pharmacol.* 68, 1017–1024.
- Michalski, M., Januel, C., 2006. Does homogenation affect the human health and properties in cow's milk? *Trends Food Sci. Technol.* 17, 423–427.
- Nachtmann, C., Gallina, S., Rastrelli, M., Ferro, G.L., Decastelli, L., 2007. Regional monitoring plan regarding the presence of aflatoxin M1 in pasteurized and UHT milk in Italy. *Food Control* 18, 623–629.
- Nakajima, M., Tabata, S., Akiyama, H., Itoh, Y., Tanaka, T., Sunagawa, H., Tyotan, T., Yoshizawa, T., Kumagai, S., 2004. Occurrence of aflatoxin M1 in domestic milk in Japan during the winter season. *Food Addit. Contam.* 5, 472–478.
- Pei, S.C., Zhang, Y.Y., Eremin, S.A., Lee, W.J., 2009. Detection of aflatoxin M1 in milk products from China by ELISA using monoclonal antibodies. *Food Control* 20, 2080–2085.
- Prandini, A., Tansini, G., Sigolo, S., Filippi, I., Laporta, M., Piva, G., 2009. On the occurrence of aflatoxin M1 in milk and dairy products. *Food Chem. Toxicol.* 47, 984–991.

- Rahimi, E., Bonyadian, M., Rafei, M., Kazemeini, H.R., 2010. Occurrence of aflatoxin M1 in raw milk of five dairy species in Ahvaz, Iran. *Food Chem. Toxicol.* 48, 129–131.
- Rastogi, S., Dwivedi, P.D., Khana, S., Das, M., 2004. Detection of of Aflatoxin M1 contamination in milk and infant milk products from Indian markets by ELISA. *Food Control* 15, 287–290.
- Reffstrup, T., Larsen, J.C., Meyer, O., 2010. Risk assessment of mixtures of pesticides. Current approaches and future strategies. *Regul. Toxicol. Pharmacol.* 56, 174–192.
- Roussi, V., Govaris, A., Varagouli, A., Botsoglou, N.A., 2002. Occurrence of aflatoxin M1 in raw and market milk commercialized in Greece. *Food Addit. Contam.* 9, 863–868.
- Scudamore, K.A., Nawaz, S., Hetmanski, M.T., 1998. Mycotoxins in ingredients of animal feeding stuffs: II. Determination of mycotoxins in maize and maize products. *Food Addit. Contam.* 15, 30–55.
- Stagos, D., Amoutzias, G., Matakos, A., Spyrou, A., Tsatsakis, A., Kouretas, D., 2012. Chemoprevention of liver cancer by plantpolyphenols. *Food Chem. Toxicol.* 50, 2155–2170.
- Shundo, L., Navas, S.A., Lamardo, L.A., Ruvieri, V., Sabino, M., 2009. Estimate of aflatoxin M1 exposure in milk and occurrence in Brazil. *Food Control* 20, 655–657.
- Unusan, N., 2006. Occurrence of aflatoxin M1 in UHT milk in Turkey. *Food Chem. Toxicol.* 44, 1897–1900.
- Zeluta, A., Maurizi, A., Frigola, A., Esteve, M.J., Coli, R., Burini, G., 2009. Antioxidant capacity of cow milk, whey and deproteinized milk. *Int. Dairy J.* 19, 380–385.