

Detection of celery (*Apium graveolens*) allergen in foods of animal and plant origin by droplet digital PCR assay

Questa è la versione Post print del seguente articolo:

Original

Detection of celery (*Apium graveolens*) allergen in foods of animal and plant origin by droplet digital PCR assay / Cau, S.; Tilocca, M. G.; Spanu, C.; Soro, B.; Tedde, T.; Salza, S.; Melillo, R.; Piras, G.; Virgilio, S.; Vodret, B.; Mudadu, A. G.. - In: FOOD CONTROL. - ISSN 0956-7135. - 130:(2021), p. 108407. [10.1016/j.foodcont.2021.108407]

Availability:

This version is available at: 11388/255920 since: 2022-02-24T11:47:30Z

Publisher:

Published

DOI:10.1016/j.foodcont.2021.108407

Terms of use:

Chiunque può accedere liberamente al full text dei lavori resi disponibili come "Open Access".

Publisher copyright

note finali coverpage

(Article begins on next page)

Journal Pre-proof

Detection of celery (*Apium graveolens*) allergen in foods of animal and plant origin by droplet digital PCR assay

S. Cau, M.G. Tilocca, C. Spanu, B. Soro, T. Tedde, S. Salza, R. Melillo, G. Piras, S. Virgilio, B. Vodret, A.G. Mudadu



PII: S0956-7135(21)00545-4

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foodcont.2021.108407>

Reference: JFCO 108407

To appear in: *Food Control*

Received Date: 13 May 2021

Revised Date: 25 June 2021

Accepted Date: 5 July 2021

Please cite this article as: Cau S., Tilocca M.G., Spanu C., Soro B., Tedde T., Salza S., Melillo R., Piras G., Virgilio S., Vodret B. & Mudadu A.G., Detection of celery (*Apium graveolens*) allergen in foods of animal and plant origin by droplet digital PCR assay, *Food Control* (2021), doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foodcont.2021.108407>.

This is a PDF file of an article that has undergone enhancements after acceptance, such as the addition of a cover page and metadata, and formatting for readability, but it is not yet the definitive version of record. This version will undergo additional copyediting, typesetting and review before it is published in its final form, but we are providing this version to give early visibility of the article. Please note that, during the production process, errors may be discovered which could affect the content, and all legal disclaimers that apply to the journal pertain.

© 2021 Published by Elsevier Ltd.

CREDIT AUTHOR STATEMENT

To the attention of the editor-in-chief of the Scientific journal Food Control,
Dear editor
On behalf of my co-authors, I am declaring the authors contribution to the present paper:

Simona Cau: Data curation, Investigation, Writing - original draft, Writing - review & editing
Maria Giovanna Tilocca: Formal analysis, Investigation, Methodology, Writing - review & editing
Carlo Spanu: Data curation, Software, Data analysis, Writing - original draft, Writing - review & editing
Barbara Soro: Formal analysis, Investigation, Methodology, Writing - review & editing
Tiziana Tedde: Formal analysis, Investigation, Methodology, Writing - review & editing
Sara Salza: Formal analysis, Investigation, Methodology, Writing - review & editing
Rita Melillo: Formal analysis, Investigation, Methodology, Writing - review & editing
Gabriella Piras: Formal analysis, Investigation, Methodology, Writing - review & editing
Sebastiano Virgilio: Conceptualization, Funding acquisition, Resources, Supervision, Writing - review & editing
Bruna Vodret: Conceptualization, Funding acquisition, Resources, Writing - review & editing
Alessandro Mudadu: Conceptualization, Project administration, Writing - review & editing

Date: June 24th, 2021

Dott. Carlo Spanu

1 **Detection of celery (*Apium graveolens*) allergen in foods of animal and plant origin by droplet**
2 **digital PCR assay**

3 Cau S.¹, Tilocca M. G.¹, Spanu C.^{2*}, Soro B.¹, Tedde T.¹, Salza S.¹, Melillo R.¹, Piras G.¹, Virgilio
4 S.¹, Vodret B.¹, Mudadu A. G.¹

5 ¹Veterinary Public Health Institute of Sardinia, Complex Structure of Food Hygiene, Via Duca
6 degli Abruzzi 8, Sassari, 07100, Italy

7 ²Department of Veterinary Medicine, University of Sassari, Via Vienna 2, 07100, Sassari, Italy

8

9 *Corresponding author. Tel.: +39 079 229425; fax: +39 079 229458. E-Mail address:
10 cspanu@uniss.it (C. Spanu); Via Vienna 2, 07100, Sassari, Italy.

11

12 **Abstract**

13 Celery is included among the allergenic foods that, under the EU 1169/2011 regulation, must be
14 declared in the ingredient list. However, disposition covers only allergens that are voluntary used as
15 ingredients and not the accidental presence of allergens in a food as consequence of cross
16 contamination. To guarantee compliance with food allergen regulations and protect health of food-
17 allergic consumers are needed specific and sensitive methods to detect the presence of allergens in
18 foods. Detection of allergens relies of protein- and DNA-based methods. Real-time PCR (RT-PCR)
19 targeting sequences from the mannitol dehydrogenase (*Mtd*) gene is currently the method of choice
20 for detection and quantification of celery in foods. However, quantification by RT-PCR methods
21 needs standard calibration curves of the target DNA. To overcome this limitation in the present
22 study the use of a droplet digital PCR (dd-PCR) assay has been proposed for the quantification of
23 celery in foods. A preliminarily optimization of the dd-PCR protocol was conducted using serial

24 DNA dilution extracted from celery powder. Ideal primer probe concentrations were 0.9 μM of both
25 forward and reverse primers and 0.250 μM of probe. The optimal annealing temperature was at 60
26 $^{\circ}\text{C}$. The limit of detection (LOD) was 0.20 ± 0.12 Cp/ μL while the limit of quantification (LOQ)
27 was 0.83 ± 0.20 Cp/ μL . The dd-PCR assay showed no cross-reactivity with other vegetal species,
28 indicating a good specificity. No effect of food matrix was observed on the dd-PCR performance.
29 The method was able to quantify the presence of celery in commercial foods of animal and plant
30 origin.

31 **Keywords:** Mannitol dehydrogenase gene; Limit of detection (LOD); Limit of Quantification
32 (LOQ); Food labelling.

33

34 1. Introduction

35 The term food allergy is used to refer to an immune response directed toward foods
36 (Sicherer, & Sampson, 2014). Food allergic reactions include a wide variety of symptoms involving
37 the skin, the gastrointestinal and respiratory tract and a potentially life-threatening anaphylactic shock
38 (Renz et al., 2018). The onset of the symptoms is generally rapid, within a few minutes after the
39 ingestion of the eliciting food leading, in extreme circumstances, to a fatal reaction (Ho, Wong, &
40 Chang, 2014).

41 The frequency of food allergies has increased over the last 3 decades in both industrialized
42 and developing countries. In Western Countries (i.e., Europe, North America and Australia) it is
43 estimated that they affect up to 8% of young children and 2-3% of adults (Nwaru et al., 2014;
44 Prescott, & Allen, 2011; Sicherer, & Sampson, 2014). In other geographical areas there is limited
45 available information since until recently it has been perceived as uncommon issue (EFSA 2014;
46 Loh, & Tang, 2018). Several factors such as difference in the exposure to environmental allergens
47 (e.g., pollen), dietetic habits and individual sensitivity influence geographical variation in the

48 prevalence and in the spectrum of food allergens (EFSA 2014; Eriksson et al., 2004; Tang, &
49 Mullins, 2017).

50 Despite almost a thousand of proteins have been recognized as food allergens by the World
51 Health Organization and the International Union of Immunological Societies (WHO/IUIS) most of
52 these food allergenic proteins belong to a few families, such as albumins, globulins, and other
53 storage protein plants, muscle proteins in animal-related food (Faeste, Rønning, Christians, &
54 Granum, 2011). The IgE-mediated food allergic reactions are generally accountable to 8 “major”
55 food allergens including: milk, egg, peanut, tree nut, seafood, shellfish, soy and wheat (Burks et al.,
56 2012). Even if the incidence of fatal cases is low (Umasunthar et al., 2013), food allergies represent
57 a serious public health concern with additional burdens for health care, food safety authorities and
58 the food industry (e.g., food recalls cost and reputational damage). It is generally accepted that a
59 zero risk for food-allergic people is not a feasible food safety objective (Madsen et al., 2012).
60 However, it is difficult to set allergen threshold in foods that would allow management control
61 strategies to obtain a tolerable level of risk (Walker, Burns, Elliott, Gowland, & Mills, 2016). In
62 fact, a food allergic reaction may occur as consequence of the direct ingestion of a small amount or
63 even traces of an allergen as consequence of cross-contamination (e.g., foods processed on shared
64 equipment) (Ho, Wong, & Chang, 2014; Monaci, Tregogat, van Hengel, & Anklam, 2006). A major
65 complication here is the fact that the amount of protein necessary to induce an allergic reaction vary
66 from protein to protein, from person to person and from time to time within one individual (Sathe,
67 Teuber, & Roux, 2005). Any exposure to a food allergen can potentially trigger an allergic reaction
68 and should be regarded as a potential threat to human health (Gendel, 2012).

69 Much effort has been put on the definition of “threshold”, “action levels” or “reference
70 doses” of major allergens in foods through challenge studies conducted in food-allergic individuals
71 (Muraro et al., 2014; Taylor et al., 2014; Walker, Burns, Elliott, Gowland, & Mills, 2016). Despite
72 the increasing availability of reference doses, to date several international public health authorities

73 defined no population threshold for any of the allergenic foods. The European Food Safety
74 Authority (EFSA) declined to define threshold advocating the absence of allergens reference
75 materials.

76 To date there is no effective cure or treatment for food allergies, therefore the most effective
77 option to protect susceptible population is the permanent avoidance of ingestion of the eliciting
78 foods (Arshad et al., 2007; Burks et al., 2012). A critical measure for the implementation of safe
79 and effective avoidance diets is the correct labeling of the presence of allergenic foods (Costa,
80 Mafra, Carrapatoso, & Oliveira, 2012; Sheth et al., 2010). For this reason, regulatory risk
81 management strategies have focused on promoting consumers awareness on the presence of
82 allergens in foods through label declarations. International public health authorities and regulatory
83 bodies have taken different approaches in the identification of priority allergens, therefore food
84 allergen labelling regulations differ significantly around the world.

85 Under the EU legislation (EU Regulation No. 1169/2011), among allergenic substances
86 whose presence in food must be indicated on the label is included the celery (*Apium graveolens*).
87 Celery is an important member of the *Apiaceae* family which is cultivated worldwide. Even small
88 amounts of celery can immediately lead to allergic reactions in sensitive individuals. Cross
89 reactivity between the major birch pollen allergen (Bet v 1) with the homologous PR10 allergen in
90 celery (Api g 1), known as Pollen Food Syndrome (PFS), increase the risk of reaction to celery in
91 people with birch pollen sensitization (Popescu, 2015; Skypala 2019; Wüthrich, Stäger, &
92 Johansson, 1990). Other major identified celery antigens are: Api g 1, Api g 2, Api g 4, and Api g 6.
93 Celery is generally eaten raw, as a spice mixture or as ingredient in various foods of animal or plant
94 origin (e.g., meat products, sausages, soups and pureed vegetable).

95 To verify the compliance with labelling requirements and avoid unintentional cross-
96 contamination it is necessary to develop reliable, specific and sensitive methods for the detection
97 and quantification of allergens in food products (Poms, Anklam, & Kuhn, 2004). The analytical

98 detection of allergens faces several issues related to the type of food matrix, insufficient extraction
99 techniques, detection limit outside the dose of clinical significance, cross-reactivity among
100 allergens, laboratory reproducibility (EFSA, 2004; Poms, Anklam, & Kuhn, 2004).

101 Currently for the detection of allergens in foods the most common techniques are based on the
102 recognition of the allergen itself, generally a protein, such as the enzyme-linked immunosorbent
103 assay (ELISA) or on specific DNA-based methods such as Real-Time quantitative PCR (qPCR)
104 indicating the presence of the allergenic ingredient (Holzhauser, 2018). Advantages and
105 disadvantages of both approaches have been reviewed (Prado et al., 2016). For the detection of
106 celery, where the protein content is low, DNA-based methods may be a better choice as compared
107 to ELISA methods that are generally non-specific due to cross-reactivity with other vegetal species
108 (EFSA, 2014; van Hengel, 2007). The highly specific real-time PCR (RT-PCR) is currently the
109 method of choice for detection and quantification of celery in food (Luber, Demmel, Pankofer,
110 Busch, & Engel, 2015). Both conventional PCR and RT-PCR methods target the gene encoding for
111 mannitol dehydrogenase (UNI EN 15634-2:2019). The main limitation of DNA-based methods for
112 the quantification of allergens is the unavailability of certified reference materials (CRMs) for most
113 target allergens which makes it very difficult to standardize analytical protocols. The use of droplet
114 digital PCR (dd-PCR) is an alternative method to overcome RT-PCR limitation when determining
115 allergenic ingredients in food (Sena-Torralba, Pallás-Tamarit, Morais, & Maquieira, 2020). The
116 principle of dd-PCR is the random partitioning of target molecules into several thousands or
117 millions of individual droplets in a water-oil emulsion, such that some droplets will contain the
118 target DNA, while other will no contain the target molecules. The absolute number of target DNA
119 contained in the original sample before partitioning can be calculated directly from the ratio of
120 positive to total partitions, using binomial Poisson statistics (Pinheiro et al., 2012). Differently to
121 RT-PCR for the quantification of the target DNA standard calibration curves are not required,
122 making the method more accurate (Hindson et al., 2011; 2013).

123 The dd-PCR has already been used for various applications, such as the detection and
124 quantification of genetically modified organisms (Demeke, & Dobnik, 2018), of meat species in
125 raw and processed food (Ren, Deng, Huang, Chen, & Ge, 2017) and the food allergens peanut and
126 soybean (Pierboni et al., 2018) and fish (Daga et al., 2018). To date no study has been conducted to
127 evaluate the use of dd-PCR for the detection and quantification of the celery allergen in foods. The
128 general aim of the present paper was to evaluate the feasibility of using a dd-PCR method for the
129 detection and quantification of celery DNA in foods. Therefore, was conducted a preliminary
130 optimization of the dd-PCR protocol. Successively were assessed the assay performances: limit of
131 detection, limit of quantification, specificity, and selectivity. Finally, the method was tested on
132 commercial samples of various foods of animal and plant origin.

133

134 **2. Material and methods**

135 *2.1. Celery DNA extraction and quantification*

136 Fresh celery stalks (*A. graveolens* var. *dulce*) were manually grated using stainless steel cutter and
137 dried at 60°C in a laboratory oven. Dried celery matrix was homogenized in a rotary blender
138 (Sterilmixer, International PBI, Milan, Italy) for 10 min. to obtain a fine powder. DNA was
139 extracted in duplicate (celery A and B) using the Sure Food® Prep Advanced kit (CONGEN, R-
140 Biopharm, Germany) according to the manufacturer's instructions. The concentration and purity of
141 the extracted DNA was determined by measuring the absorbance at 260 and 280 nm (A260 and
142 A280) using a Sinergy 2 multi-mode microplate reader (BioTeK Instrument, Inc., Vermont, USA).
143 The extracted celery DNA was diluted 1:5, 1:10 and 1:20 and successively used for optimization of
144 the dd-PCR assay.

145 *2.2. Primers and probe*

146 Primers and probes were designed targeting the celery (*Apium graveolens*) specific sequences of the
147 mannitol dehydrogenase (*Mtd*) gene (GenBank acc. no. AF067082). The following sequences:

148 forward primer (Cel-MDH-iF) 5'-CGATGAGCGTGTACTGAGTC-3', reverse primer (Cel- MDH-
149 iR) 5'-AATAGGAACTAACATTAATCATACCAAAC-3' and Probe (Cel-MDH-probe) 5'-FAM-
150 AACAGATAACGCTGACTCATCACACCG-TAMRA-3' (UNI EN 15634-2:2019) were
151 synthesized by Sigma-Aldrich (Darmstadt, Germany).

152 2.3. Droplet digital PCR assay

153 The dd-PCR was carried out using a QX200™ Droplet Digital PCR System (Bio-Rad Laboratories,
154 Hercules, CA, USA) according to manufacturer's instructions. Preliminary optimization of dd-PCR
155 assay parameters was conducted testing three mix containing different primers and probe
156 concentrations (supplementary table 1). Each primer/probe mix was tested amplifying the undiluted
157 and diluted (1:5, 1:10 and 1:20) DNA extracted from the celery powder. For each combination
158 duplicate samples of both celery DNA extraction were tested. Results of the dd-PCR optimization
159 assay are reported in supplementary figure 1. Based on the optimization protocol the following
160 parameters were selected for dd-PCR reaction: DNA dilution 1:20, primers and probe
161 concentrations respectively 0.9 μ M and 0.25 μ M. To allow an optimal distinction between positive
162 and negative droplets, PCR annealing temperature was optimized by thermal gradient from 55°C to
163 65°C. The optimal annealing temperature was at 60 °C, which resulted in the greatest fluorescence
164 amplitude difference between positive and negative droplets (Figure 1 and Supplementary figure 2).
165 After the optimization assay, the dd-PCR reaction was carried out using a 1:20 DNA dilution in a
166 total volume of 20 μ L dd-PCR supermix for Probes (Bio-Rad Laboratories, USA) containing: 10 μ L
167 supermix 2X, 4 μ l of DNA and the primers and probe at final concentrations of 0.9 μ M and 0.25 μ M,
168 respectively.

169 No template controls (NTC) were used for monitoring primer-dimer formation and
170 contaminations. Twenty microliters dd-PCR mixture/sample were placed in each well of droplet
171 generator DG8 cartridge (BioRad Laboratories, USA) with 70 μ l of droplet generator oil (Bio-Rad,
172 Hercules), emulsified in QX-200 Droplet Generator (BioRad Laboratories, USA) and randomly

173 partitioned into approximately 20,000 water in oil nanoliter-size droplet. Then, a volume of 40 μ l of
174 emulsion/sample was transferred to a 96-well reaction plate (Eppendorf, Hauppauge, NY, USA),
175 heat-sealed with pierceable foil sheets by the PX1TM PCR Plate Sealer (BioRad Laboratories, USA),
176 and amplified in C1000 TouchTM Thermal Cycler (BioRad Laboratories, USA). The cycling
177 conditions were: 95°C for 10 min, followed by 45 cycles of 95°C for 15 sec, at 60°C for 60 sec, 1
178 cycle of 98°C for 10 min essential for droplet stabilization and infinite 12°C hold. It was used a
179 2.5°C/sec ramp rate to ensure each droplet reached the correct temperature for each step during the
180 cycling. At the end of amplification, the PCR plates were read by the QuantaSoft Droplet Reader
181 (BioRad Laboratories, USA) that measures the fluorescence intensity of each droplet and detects the
182 size and shape as droplets pass detector. The discrimination between positive droplets (containing
183 target DNA) and negative droplets (not containing target DNA) was based on a good separation
184 between them expressed as amplitude in fluorescence unit. The absolute concentration of each
185 sample was automatically reported as copy number CelMDH/ μ L by the dd-PCR QuantaSoft
186 Software V.1.7.4.0917 (Bio-Rad, Hercules) by calculating the ratio of the positive droplets over the
187 total droplets combined with Poisson distribution with 95% confidence interval.

188 *2.4. Performance of dd-PCR assay: dynamic range, linearity, limits of detection and quantification*
189 *and repeatability*

190 The pure DNA extracted from powder celery, previously submitted to spectrophotometric
191 quantification was diluted to obtain a 1:20 initial dilution (I). After quantification by dd-PCR, celery
192 DNA concentration was adjusted to ca 200 expected copies per μ L (Cp/ μ L). From the initial
193 dilution were prepared twelve two-fold serial dilutions (S₁-S₁₂). Each of the 13 dilutions and a non-
194 template control (NTC) were analyzed in ten replicates for DNA quantification by dd-PCR (table
195 1).

196 The dynamic range, defined as the range of concentration over which the method performs
197 in a linear manner with an acceptable level of trueness and precision, was obtained plotting the log
198 values of expected Cp/μL against the log Cp/μL measures by dd-PCR.

199 Linearity over the dynamic range was determined by the coefficient of correlation R^2 of the
200 linear regression line calculated on the average of the target copy numbers measured in the
201 replicated dilution series. Repeatability over the dynamic range was determined by the percentage
202 coefficient of variation (CV%) of the measured target copy number between the replicates of the
203 dilution series. The limit of detection (LOD) for dd-PCR assay was determined as the last serial
204 dilution detected in 95% of replicates, while the limit of quantification (LOQ) was set at the lowest
205 concentration showing a coefficient of variation percentage below the threshold (CV% = 25) for
206 acceptance criteria of quantitative methods (EURL-GMFF, 2015).

207 To determine intra-assay and inter-assay repeatability of the method for detection of celery DNA,
208 for each of three DNA dilutions were run ten replicates of dd-PCR assay which were all repeated in
209 two different days.

210 2.4 Specificity and applicability

211 To determine the specificity of celery DNA dd-PCR assay the following food matrices were also
212 tested: laurel (*Laurus nobilis*), sage (*Salvia officinalis*), thyme (*Thymus vulgaris*), oregano
213 (*Origanum vulgare*), black pepper (*Piper nigrum*), parsley (*Petroselinum crispum*), onion (*Allium*
214 *cepa*), cucumber (*Cucumis sativus*), carrot (*Daucus carota*), pea (*Pisum sativum*), potato (*Solanum*
215 *tuberosum*), mixed spices and peeled tomato. The DNA was extracted and tested using
216 primers/probe and dd-PCR conditions previously described. Duplicate reactions of each non-target
217 DNA were conducted to assess potential cross-reactivities with celery DNA.

218 2.5. Selectivity

219 The selectivity was defined as the performance of the dd-PCR assay in the identification and
220 quantification of celery allergens in the presence of interfering substances. Therefore, to determine

221 the matrix effect different types of food matrix spiked with celery were tested. Spiked samples were
222 prepared at the Food Hygiene Laboratory (Veterinary Public Health Institute of Sardinia, Sassari,
223 Italy) by mixing 2.5 g of celery powder with either 247.5 g of ground beef meat, pureed soup and
224 tomato sauce (1% w/w). DNA extracted from spiked samples was quantified by both
225 spectrophotometric and dd-PCR assay. Spiked samples were successively submitted to five two-
226 fold serial dilutions which were prepared using the respective food matrix and then analyzed by dd-
227 PCR. Celery DNA extracted from celery powder was also included in the assay (supplementary
228 table 2). The matrix effect was evaluated comparing R^2 values obtained by plotting the log values of
229 celery expected $\log \text{Cp}/\mu\text{L}$ and $\log \text{Cp}/\mu\text{L}$ measured by dd-PCR as previously described.

230

231 2.6. Commercial samples

232 To demonstrate the applicability of newly developed dd-PCR assay, twenty-one commercial
233 packaged food samples were analyzed. Samples included different type of food matrices: composite
234 foods and food of animal and plant origin (Table 3). Commercial food samples were selected based
235 on the presence of celery in the ingredients label. The celery content (%), when declared on the
236 label, was reported. Each sample was analyzed in duplicate.

237 3. Results

238 3.1. Performance evaluation of dd-PCR assay: dynamic range, linearity, limits of detection and 239 quantification and repeatability

240 In the optimization protocol of the dd-PCR assay celery DNA concentration ranged between
241 5.0 ng/ μL and 0.001 ng/ μL which corresponded to a number of expected copies per μL (Cp/ μL) in
242 the range between 200 and 0.05 Cp/ μL . The average celery DNA content (Cp/ $\mu\text{L} \pm \text{SD}$) by dd-PCR
243 ranged between 178.21 ± 30.60 and 0.06 ± 0.06 (Table 1). The dynamic range and linearity are

244 showed in the regression line obtained by plotting the log values of expected Cp/μL and Cp/μL
245 obtained by dd-PCR (Figure 2). The results showed that a good degree of linearity ($R^2 \geq 0.999$).
246 The LOD of dd-PCR was as low as 0.005 ng/μL corresponding to approximately 0.20 ± 0.12 Cp/μL
247 of celery DNA with a detection rate of 100%. The LOQ of dd-PCR was 0.02 ng/μL corresponding
248 to approximately 0.83 ± 0.20 Cp/μL of celery DNA with an average droplet number of 16,696 (Table
249 1). Intra- and inter-assay variability showed a CV% of variation below the threshold (CV% = 25) for
250 acceptance criteria of quantitative methods indicating a good repeatability of dd-PCR (Table 2).

251 3.2. Cross-reactivity

252 The two pairs of species-specific primers and the probe used in the dd-PCR assay amplified only
253 CelMDH. Supplementary figure 3 shows a clear separation of positive droplets (celery DNA) from
254 negative droplets (other food matrix DNA) showing no cross-reaction with non-target DNA.
255 These results confirmed the specificity of the dd-PCR qualitative and quantitative method for celery
256 DNA.

257 3.3. Matrix effect

258 The matrix effect was tested on six different DNA dilutions of celery spiked ground meat,
259 pureed soup and tomato sauce. As showed in figure 3, all celery-spiked food samples revealed a
260 good linearity with $R^2 > 0.990$ indicating no matrix effect on the performance of the method.

261 3.4. Commercial samples

262 Table 3 and figure 4 report the results of the dd-PCR assay conducted on different food matrices
263 collected from the market. The celery DNA was detectable in 18 out of 19 samples where celery
264 was stated in the ingredient list while was not detectable in the two samples where label stated
265 traces content. For all the positive sample the CV% was below the 25.0% threshold for acceptance
266 criteria of quantitative methods.

267 These results showed that dd-PCR can reliably quantify the presence of celery when stated on the
268 ingredient label even at concentration as low as 0.03%. The dd-PCR assay was also able to quantify
269 the presence of celery DNA in food samples in which celery was declared in the label but with no
270 indication of the % content.

271 **Discussion**

272 Food allergen labelling is a fundamental strategy in the protection of food allergic
273 consumers safety and health. However, food allergen labelling covers only allergenic ingredients
274 voluntary used in food preparation but not the unintentional presence due to cross-contamination.
275 To limit the risk of allergy as consequence of accidental presence of an allergen in the food,
276 voluntary precautionary statements have been implemented by food industry (Gendel, 2012).
277 Hence, reliable and rapid food allergen test methods are needed by both official control and food
278 industry laboratories to ensure compliance with regulatory requirements and protect consumers
279 health. To date the gold standard for the determination of celery food allergen is real-time (i.e.,
280 quantitative) PCR (qPCR) assay targeting sequences from the mannitol dehydrogenase (*Mtd*) gene
281 due to the lower risk of cross-reactivity with sequences of closely related species (Hupfer,
282 Waiblinger, & Busch, 2007). The dd-PCR is a molecular method with the advantage over qPCR to
283 provide an absolute quantification of the nucleic acid with no need of standard curves (Hindson et
284 al., 2011; 2013). In the dd-PCR the reaction is randomly distributed into thousands of droplets, then
285 individual PCR reactions are conducted in each droplet to determine whether they contain or not
286 one or more copies of the template DNA (Pinheiro et al., 2012).

287 To our knowledge the present is the first study aimed to investigate the feasibility of using a
288 dd-PCR assay for the determination of celery allergens in foods. With this aim it was conducted a
289 preliminary optimization of the dd-PCR protocol. The optimization was conducted on serial twofold
290 dilution of celery DNA extracted from celery powder. The average ratio of absorbance at 260 nm

291 to 280 nm was between 1.7 to 2.0 indicating that the commercial kit used for the extraction
292 provided a high-quality DNA. Primers and probes were designed to target the celery (*Apium*
293 *graveolens*) specific sequences of the mannitol dehydrogenase (*Mtd*) gene. The performance of the
294 dd-PCR was optimized testing three different primer and probe concentration and the annealing
295 temperature. The optimal primer and probe concentrations were at 0.9 μM of both forward and
296 reverse primers and 0.250 μM of probe in the final concentration of PCR reaction. The optimal
297 annealing temperature was at 60 $^{\circ}\text{C}$. The different amplitude in fluorescens observed in the dd-PCR
298 assay showed a good separation between positive droplets (containing celery DNA) and negative
299 droplets (not containing celery DNA), indicating the good discrimination of the method. The dd-
300 PCR assay performances were also conducted. The limit of detection in serially diluted celery
301 extract was 0.20 ± 0.12 Cp/ μL , corresponding to ca 5 pg/ μL of celery DNA while the limit of
302 quantification was 0.83 ± 0.20 Cp/ μL corresponding to 20 pg/ μL . Previous investigation conducted
303 on celery extract by real-time PCR method showed a limit of detection of 10 pg/ μL (Fuchs, Cichna-
304 Markl, & Hochegger, 2012). The repeatability of the dd-PCR was tested on 3 different celery DNA
305 concentrations which were performed each in ten replicates (intra-assay repeatability) and in two
306 consecutive days (inter-assay repeatability). The method showed a good repeatability with intra-
307 assay and inter-assay coefficient of variation ranging from 13.82% to 20.80%.

308 The evaluation of specificity is essential to determine the applicability of a qualitative and
309 quantitative method. Therefore, cross-reactivity with non-target DNA from laurel, sage, thyme,
310 oregano, black pepper, parsley, onion, cucumber, carrot, pea, potato, mixed spices and peeled
311 tomato was tested. The Cel-*Mtd* primers and probe only amplified target sequences from celery,
312 indicating a good specificity of the dd-PCR assay. To test the effect of the food matrix on the
313 performance of the method, the dd-PCR was conducted on celery-spiked food samples (ground
314 meat, pureed soup and tomato sauce). From an initial celery concentration of 1% (w/w) samples
315 were diluted up to 0.003%. The dd-PCR quantified celery DNA in all spiked samples with a good

316 linearity ($R^2 > 0.990$) indicating no matrix effect on the performance of the method. This result is
317 comparable with the LOD observed in celery spiked sausage by real-time PCR which detected
318 celery at concentration as low as 0.005% (Fuchs, Cichna-Markl, & Hochegger, 2012).

319 After the evaluation of the method performances, the dd-PCR assay was tested on 21
320 commercial samples of various types with celery stated in the ingredient list. In the case of
321 precautionary labelling the dd-PCR assay did not revealed the presence of celery, suggesting that
322 the content was below the detection limit. In one sample, Bolognese meat sauce, where the label
323 declaration indicated the presence of 3% celery, the assay was not able to identify the presence of
324 the allergen. This result could be a consequence of the manufacturing process. While other foods
325 included in the study were either raw or pasteurized, the Bolognese meat sauce was submitted after
326 cooking to a sterilization treatment into an autoclave at 121 °C (Prandi et al., 2019). In highly
327 processed foods (e.g., heated at temperature above 100 °C) the application of PCR techniques for
328 DNA amplification may be negatively affected by DNA degradation (Bansal, Singh, Mangal,
329 Mangal, & Kumar, 2015; Bauer, Weller, Hammes, & Hertel, 2003). Therefore, while analyzing
330 different food matrices including in their composition oils, fats and animal tissues, the potential
331 presence of PCR inhibitors should be accounted in the DNA extraction procedure (Di Pinto et al.,
332 2007).

333

334 **Conclusions**

335 The dd-PCR assay described in the present study represent a novel, accurate and reliable method to
336 determine and quantify the presence of celery in various types of foods (i.e., composite, of animal
337 and plant origin). The advantages of this method are the specificity with no cross-reactivity with
338 other allergens and the little impact of the food matrix. In addition, this DNA-based method is
339 particularly suitable for low protein content allergens such as celery. A limitation of the method is
340 that the obtained results, expressed in copy numbers per microliter, cannot be directly converted in

341 the content of the allergen in the food (e.g., mg/kg or % w/w). Therefore, more investigation is
342 needed to introduce a constant (conversion factor) to transform the copy numbers into the actual
343 content of allergen in the food. With this aim, specific study should be conducted to compare dd-
344 PCR quantitative results with other analytical techniques such as real-time PCR or liquid
345 chromatography–mass spectrometry (LC–MS). Even with this limitation the dd-PCR could be
346 applied as a routine screening method for quantification of celery when assessing compliance with
347 labeling requirements or to ensure food quality and safety for the presence of accidental
348 contamination.

349

350 **Acknowledgements**

351 This work was supported by “Ministero del Lavoro, della Salute e delle Politiche Sociali;
352 Dipartimento per la Sanità Pubblica Veterinaria, la Nutrizione e la Sicurezza degli Alimenti”.

353 **References**

- 354 1. Arshad, S. H., Bateman, B., Sadeghnejad, A., Gant, C., & Matthews, S. M. (2007).
355 Prevention of allergic disease during childhood by allergen avoidance: the Isle of Wight
356 prevention study. *Journal of Allergy and Clinical Immunology*, 119(2), 307-313.
357 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jaci.2006.12.621>.
- 358 2. Bansal, S., Singh, A., Mangal, M., Mangal, A. K., & Kumar, S. (2015). Food adulteration:
359 Sources, health risks, and detection methods. *Critical Reviews in Food Science and*
360 *Nutrition*, 57(6), 1174–1189. <https://doi.org/doi:10.1080/10408398.2014.967834>.
- 361 3. Bauer, T., Weller, P., Hammes, W. P., & Hertel, C. (2003). The effect of processing
362 parameters on DNA degradation in food. *European Food Research and Technology*, 217(4),
363 338-343. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00217-003-0743>.

- 364 4. Burks, A. W., Tang, M., Sicherer, S., Muraro, A., Eigenmann, P. A., Ebisawa, M., Fiocchi,
365 A., Chiang, W., Beyer, K., Wood, R., Hourihane, J., Jones, S. M., Lack, G., & Sampson, H.
366 A. (2012). ICON: food allergy. *Journal of Allergy and Clinical Immunology*, 129(4), 906-
367 920. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jaci.2012.02.001>.
- 368 5. Costa, J., Mafra, I., Carrapatoso, I., & Oliveira, M. B. P. (2012). Almond allergens:
369 molecular characterization, detection, and clinical relevance. *Journal of Agricultural and*
370 *Food Chemistry*, 60(6), 1337-1349. <https://doi.org/10.1021/jf2044923>.
- 371 6. Daga, C., Cau, S., Tilocca, M. G., Soro, B., Marongiu, A., & Vodret, B. (2018). Detection of
372 fish allergen by droplet digital PCR. *Italian Journal of Food Safety*, 7(4). 10.1007/s00216-
373 018-1010-1.
- 374 7. Demeke, T., & Dobnik, D. (2018). Critical assessment of digital PCR for the detection and
375 quantification of genetically modified organisms. *Analytical and Bioanalytical Chemistry*,
376 410(17), 4039-4050. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00216-018-1010-1>.
- 377 8. Di Pinto, A., Forte, V. T., Guastadisegni, M. C., Martino, C., Schena, F. P., & Tantillo, G.
378 (2007). A comparison of DNA extraction methods for food analysis. *Food Control*. 18:76-
379 80. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foodcont.2005.08.011>.
- 380 9. EFSA Panel on Dietetic Products, Nutrition and Allergies (NDA). (2014). Scientific
381 Opinion on the evaluation of allergenic foods and food ingredients for labelling purposes.
382 *EFSA Journal*, 12(11), 3894. <https://doi.org/10.2903/j.efsa.2014.3894>.
- 383 10. Eriksson, N. E., Moller, C., Werner, S., Magnusson, J., Bengtsson, U., & Zolubas, M.
384 (2004). Self-reported food hypersensitivity in Sweden, Denmark, Estonia, Lithuania and
385 Russia. *Journal of Investigational Allergology and Clinical Immunology*, 14(1), 70-79.
- 386 11. EURL-GMFF (European Union Reference Laboratory for GM Food and Feed). Definition
387 of Minimum Performance Requirements for Analytical Methods of GMO Testing. (2015).

- 388 Available online at: <https://gmo-crl.jrc.ec.europa.eu/guidancedocs.htm> (accessed may 5,
389 2021).
- 390 12. European Union (EU). Regulation (EU) No 1169/2011 of the European Parliament and of
391 the Council of 25 October 2011 on the provision of food information to consumers,
392 amending Regulations (EC) No 1924/2006 and (EC) No 1925/2006 of the European
393 Parliament and of the Council, and repealing Commission Directive 87/250/EEC, Council
394 Directive 90/496/EEC, Commission Directive 1999/10/EC, Directive 2000/13/EC of the
395 European Parliament and of the Council, Commission Directives 2002/67/EC and
396 2008/5/EC and Commission Regulation (EC) No 608/2004. *Official Journal of the*
397 *European Union*, L 2011, 54, 18–63.
- 398 13. Faeste, C. K., Rønning, H. T., Christians, U., & Granum, P. E. (2011). Liquid
399 chromatography and mass spectrometry in food allergen detection. *Journal of Food*
400 *Protection*, 74(2), 316-345. <https://doi.org/10.4315/0362-028X.JFP-10-336>.
- 401 14. Fuchs, M., Cichna-Markl, M., & Hochegger, R. (2012). Development and validation of a
402 novel real-time PCR method for the detection of celery (*Apium graveolens*) in food. *Food*
403 *Chemistry*, 130(1), 189-195. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foodchem.2011.07.005>.
- 404 15. Gendel, S. M. (2012). Comparison of international food allergen labeling regulations.
405 *Regulatory Toxicology and Pharmacology*, 63(2), 279-285.
406 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.yrtph.2012.04.007>.
- 407 16. Hindson, B. J., Ness, K. D., Masquelier, D. A., Belgrader, P., Heredia, N. J., Makarewicz,
408 A. J., Bright, I. J., Lucero, M. Y., Hiddessen, A. L., Legler, T. C., Kitano, T. K., Hodel, M.
409 R., Petersen, J. F., Wyatt, P. W., Steenblock, E. R., Shah, P. H., Bousse, L. J., Troup, C. B.,
410 Mellen, J. C., Wittmann, D. K., Erndt, N. G., Cauley, T. H., Koehler, R. T., So, A. P., Dube,
411 S., Rose, K. A., Montesclaros, L., Wang, S., Stumbo, D. P., Hodges, S. P., Romine, S.,
412 Milanovich, F. P., White, H. E., Regan, J. F., Karlin-Neumann, G. A., Hindson, C. M.,

- 413 Saxonov, S., & Colston, B. W. (2011). High-throughput droplet digital PCR system for
414 absolute quantitation of DNA copy number. *Analytical Chemistry*, 83(22), 8604-8610.
415 <https://doi.org/10.1021/ac202028g>.
- 416 17. Hindson, C. M., Chevillet, J. R., Briggs, H. A., Gallichotte, E. N., Ruf, I. K., Hindson, B. J.,
417 ... & Tewari, M. (2013). Absolute quantification by droplet digital PCR versus analog real-
418 time PCR. *Nature Methods*, 10(10), 1003-1005. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nmeth.2633>.
- 419 18. Ho, M. H. K., Wong, W. H. S., & Chang, C. (2014). Clinical spectrum of food allergies: a
420 comprehensive review. *Clinical reviews in allergy & immunology*, 46(3), 225-240.
421 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12016-012-8339-6>.
- 422 19. Ho, M. H. K., Wong, W. H. S., & Chang, C. (2014). Clinical spectrum of food allergies: a
423 comprehensive review. *Clinical Reviews in Allergy & Immunology*, 46(3), 225-240.
424 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12016-012-8339-6>.
- 425 20. Holzhauser, T. (2018). Protein or no protein? Opportunities for DNA-based detection of
426 allergenic foods. *Journal of Agricultural and Food Chemistry*, 66(38), 9889-9894.
427 <https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.jafc.8b03657>.
- 428 21. Hupfer, C., Waiblinger, H. U., & Busch, U. (2007). Development and validation of a real-
429 time PCR detection method for celery in food. *European Food Research and Technology*,
430 225(3), 329-335. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00217-006-0418-6>.
- 431 22. Loh, W., & Tang, M. L. (2018). The epidemiology of food allergy in the global context.
432 *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 15(9), 2043.
433 <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph15092043>.
- 434 23. Luber, F., Demmel, A., Pankofer, K., Busch, U., & Engel, K. H. (2015). Simultaneous
435 quantification of the food allergens soy bean, celery, white mustard and brown mustard via
436 combination of tetraplex real-time PCR and standard addition. *Food Control*, 47, 246-253.
437 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foodcont.2014.06.047>.

- 438 24. Madsen, C. B., Hattersley, S., Allen, K. J., Beyer, K., Chan, C. H., Godefroy, S. B.,
439 Hodgson, R., Mills, E. N. C., Muñoz-Furlong, A., Schnadt, S., Ward, R., Wickman, M., &
440 Crevel, R. V. (2012). Can we define a tolerable level of risk in food allergy? Report from a
441 Euro Prevall/UK Food Standards Agency workshop. *Clinical & Experimental Allergy*,
442 42(1), 30-37. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2222.2011.03868.x>.
- 443 25. Monaci, L., Tregoeat, V., van Hengel, A. J., & Anklam, E. (2006). Milk allergens, their
444 characteristics and their detection in food: a review. *European Food Research and*
445 *Technology*, 223(2), 149-179. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00217-005-0178-8>.
- 446 26. Muraro, A., Werfel, T., Hoffmann-Sommergruber, K., Roberts, G., Beyer, K., Bindslev-
447 Jensen, C., Cardona, V., Dubois, A., duToit, G., Eigenmann, P., Fernandez Rivas, M.,
448 Halken, S., Hickstein, L., Høst, A., Knol, E., Lack, G., Marchisotto, M. J., Niggemann, B.,
449 Nwaru, B. I., Papadopoulos, N. G., Poulsen, L. K., Santos, A. F., Skypala, I., Schoepfer, A.,
450 Van Ree, R., Venter, C., Worm, M., Vlieg-Boerstra, B., Panesar, S., de Silva, D., Soares-
451 Weiser, K., Sheikh, A., Ballmer-Weber, B. K., Nilsson, C., de Jong, N. W., Akdis, C. A., &
452 EAACI Food Allergy and Anaphylaxis Guidelines Group. (2014). EAACI food allergy and
453 anaphylaxis guidelines: diagnosis and management of food allergy. *Allergy*, 69(8), 1008-
454 1025. <https://doi.org/10.1111/all.12429>.
- 455 27. Nwaru, B. I., Hickstein, L., Panesar, S. S., Muraro, A., Werfel, T., Cardona, V., Dubois, A.,
456 E. J Halken, S., Hoffmann-Sommergruber, K., Poulsen, L. K., Roberts, G., Van Ree, R.,
457 Vlieg-Boerstra, B. J., Sheikh, A., & EAACI Food Allergy and Anaphylaxis Guidelines
458 Group. (2014). The epidemiology of food allergy in Europe: a systematic review and meta-
459 analysis. *Allergy*, 69(1), 62-75. <https://doi.org/10.1111/all.12305>.
- 460 28. Pierboni, E., Rondini, C., Torricelli, M., Ciccone, L., Raquel Tovo, G., Mercuri, M. L.,
461 Altissimi, S., Haouet, N. (2018). Digital PCR for analysis of peanut and soybean allergens
462 in foods. *Food Control*, 92, 128-136. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foodcont.2018.04.039>.

- 463 29. Pinheiro, L. B., Coleman, V. A., Hindson, C. M., Herrmann, J., Hindson, B. J., Bhat, S.,
464 Emslie, K. R. (2012). Evaluation of a droplet digital polymerase chain reaction format for
465 DNA copy number quantification. *Analytical Chemistry*, 84 (2), 1003-1011.
466 <https://doi.org/10.1021/ac202578x>.
- 467 30. Poms, R. E., Anklam, E., & Kuhn, M. (2004). Polymerase chain reaction techniques for
468 food allergen detection. *Journal of AOAC International*, 87(6), 1391-1397.
469 <https://doi.org/10.1093/jaoac/87.6.1391>.
- 470 31. Popescu, F. D. (2015). Cross-reactivity between aeroallergens and food allergens. *World*
471 *journal of methodology*, 5(2), 31. <https://doi.org/10.5662/wjm.v5.i2.31>.
- 472 32. Prado, M., Ortea, I., Vial, S., Rivas, J., Calo-Mata, P., & Barros-Velázquez, J. (2016).
473 Advanced DNA-and protein-based methods for the detection and investigation of food
474 allergens. *Critical Reviews in Food Science and Nutrition*, 56(15), 2511-2542.
475 <https://doi.org/10.1080/10408398.2013.873767>.
- 476 33. Prandi, B., Varani, M., Faccini, A., Lambertini, F., Suman, M., Leporati, A., Tedeschi, T., &
477 Sforza, S. (2019). Species specific marker peptides for meat authenticity assessment: A
478 multispecies quantitative approach applied to Bolognese sauce. *Food Control*, 97, 15-24.
479 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foodcont.2018.10.016>.
- 480 34. Prescott, S., & Allen, K. J. (2011). Food allergy: riding the second wave of the allergy
481 epidemic. *Pediatric allergy and immunology*, 22(2), 155-160.
482 <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1399-3038.2011.01145.x>.
- 483 35. Ren, J., Deng, T., Huang, W., Chen, Y., & Ge, Y. (2017). A digital PCR method for
484 identifying and quantifying adulteration of meat species in raw and processed food. *PLoS*
485 *one*, 12(3), e0173567. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0173567>.

- 486 36. Renz, H., Allen, K. J., Sicherer, S. H., Sampson, H. A., Lack, G., Beyer, K., & Oettgen, H.
487 C. (2018). Food Allergy. *Nature Reviews Disease Primers*, 4(1), 1-20.
488 <https://doi.org/10.1038/nrdp.2017.98>.
- 489 37. Sathe, S. K., Teuber, S. S., & Roux, K. H. (2005). Effects of food processing on the stability
490 of food allergens. *Biotechnology Advances*, 23(6), 423-429.
491 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biotechadv.2005.05.008>.
- 492 38. Sena-Torralba, A., Pallás-Tamarit, Y., Morais, S., & Maquieira, Á. (2020). Recent advances
493 and challenges in food-borne allergen detection. *TrAC Trends in Analytical Chemistry*,
494 116050. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.trac.2020.116050>.
- 495 39. Sheth, S. S., Wasserman, S., Kagan, R., Alizadehfar, R., Primeau, M. N., Elliot, S., Pierre,
496 Y., Wickett, R., Joseph, L., Harada, L., Dufresne, C., Allen, M., Allen, M., Godefroy, S. B.,
497 & Clarke, A. E. (2010). Role of food labels in accidental exposures in food-allergic
498 individuals in Canada. *Annals of Allergy, Asthma & Immunology*, 104(1), 60-65.
499 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.anai.2009.11.008>.
- 500 40. Sicherer, S. H., & Sampson, H. A. (2014). Food allergy: epidemiology, pathogenesis,
501 diagnosis, and treatment. *Journal of Allergy and Clinical Immunology*, 133(2), 291-307.
502 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jaci.2013.11.020>.
- 503 41. Skypala, I. J. (2019). Food-induced anaphylaxis: role of hidden allergens and cofactors.
504 *Frontiers in Immunology*, 10, 673. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fimmu.2019.00673>.
- 505 42. Tang, M. L., & Mullins, R. J. (2017). Food allergy: is prevalence increasing? *Internal*
506 *Medicine Journal*, 47(3), 256-261. <https://doi.org/10.1111/imj.13362>.
- 507 43. Taylor, S. L., Baumert, J. L., Kruizinga, A. G., Remington, B. C., Crevel, R. W., Brooke-
508 Taylor, S., Allen, K. J., The Allergen Bureau of Australia & New Zealand, & Houben, G.
509 (2014). Establishment of reference doses for residues of allergenic foods: report of the

- 510 VITAL expert panel. *Food and Chemical Toxicology*, 63, 9-17.
511 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.fct.2013.10.032>.
- 512 44. Umasunthar, T., Leonardi-Bee, J., Hodes, M., Turner, P. J., Gore, C., Habibi, P., Warner, J.
513 O., & Boyle, R. J. (2013). Incidence of fatal food anaphylaxis in people with food allergy: a
514 systematic review and meta-analysis. *Clinical & Experimental Allergy*, 43(12), 1333-1341.
515 <https://doi.org/10.1111/cea.12211>.
- 516 45. UNI EN 15634-2:2019. Foodstuffs - Detection of food allergens by molecular biological
517 methods - Part 2: Celery (*Apium graveolens*) - Detection of a specific DNA sequence in
518 cooked sausages by real-time PCR.
- 519 46. van Hengel, A. J. (2007). Food allergen detection methods and the challenge to protect food-
520 allergic consumers. *Analytical and Bioanalytical Chemistry*, 389(1), 111-118.
521 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00216-007-1353-5>.
- 522 47. Walker, M. J., Burns, D. T., Elliott, C. T., Gowland, M. H., & Mills, E. C. (2016). Is food
523 allergen analysis flawed? Health and supply chain risks and a proposed framework to
524 address urgent analytical needs. *Analyst*, 141(1), 24-35.
525 <https://doi.org/10.1039/C5AN01457C>.
- 526 48. Wüthrich, B., Stäger, J., & Johansson, S. G. O. (1990). Celery allergy associated with birch
527 and mugwort pollinosis. *Allergy*, 45(8), 566-571. [https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1398-](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1398-9995.1990.tb00941.x)
528 [9995.1990.tb00941.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1398-9995.1990.tb00941.x).
- 529

Table 1. Limit of detection (LOD) and limit of quantification (LOQ) of celery ddPCR assay (n = 20)

Celery DNA dilution	Celery DNA concentration (ng/ μ L)	Expected celery DNA (Cp/ μ L)	Average celery DNA by ddPCR (Cp/ μ L) \pm SD	CV ^a (%)	Limit of quantification ^b (LOQ)			Limit of detection ^c (LOD)		
					Average number of positive droplets	Average number of negative droplets	Average number of total droplets	Celery positive	Celery negative	Detection rate (%)
I	5.0	200	178.2 \pm 30.6	17.17	2,196	13,647	15,843	20	0	100
S ₁	2.5	100	87.1 \pm 11.7	13.42	1,114	14,696	15,810	20	0	100
S ₂	1.2	50	48.4 \pm 9.05	18.72	649	15,516	16,165	20	0	100
S ₃	0.6	25	24.0 \pm 3.2	13.23	345	16,765	17,110	20	0	100
S ₄	0.3	12.5	12.7 \pm 1.7	13.60	178	16,421	16,599	20	0	100
S ₅	0.15	6.25	6.2 \pm 0.9	14.36	90	16,993	17,083	20	0	100
S ₆	0.08	3.13	3.3 \pm 0.5	16.25	46	16,482	16,528	20	0	100
S ₇	0.04	1.56	1.6 \pm 0.4	23.49	24	17,371	17,395	20	0	100
S ₈	0.02	0.78	0.8 \pm 0.2	23.51	12	16,684	16,696	20	0	100
S ₉	0.01	0.39	0.5 \pm 0.2	40.93	7	16,855	16,862	20	0	100
S ₁₀	0.005	0.20	0.2 \pm 0.10	61.42	3	17,086	17,089	20	0	100
S ₁₁	0.002	0.10	0.10 \pm 0.09	85.14	2	17,289	17,291	15	5	75
S ₁₂	0.001	0.05	0.06 \pm 0.06	105.76	1	16,761	16,762	11	9	55
-	NTC	NTC	ND	NC	0	17,995	17,995	0	20	0

I is the initial DNA dilution corresponding to 1:20 while S₁-S₁₂ are successive serial two-fold dilution of I. NTC = no template control. ND = not detected. NC = not calculated. ^aCV = Coefficient of variation. ^bLimit of quantification (LOQ) = lowest DNA concentration showing CV% < 25%. ^cLimit of Detection (LOD) = last DNA dilution detected in 95% of replicates.

Table 2. Repeatability of dd-PCR celery assay for celery DNA.

DNA concentration (ng/ μ L)	Day	N of replicates	ddPCR assay	
			Mean values (Cps / μ \pm SD)	CV (%)
0.0691	1	10	3.6 \pm 0.5	13.8
	2	10	3.05 \pm 0.5	14.9
0.0346	1	10	1.9 \pm 0.3	16.8
	2	10	1.3 \pm 0.3	20.2
0.0173	1	10	0.9 \pm 0.2	20.8
	2	10	0.7 \pm 0.2	20.6

The dd-PCR assay was performed on 3 celery DNA concentrations, each concentration was tested in two different days (inter-assay repeatability) and on 10 replicates (intra-assay repeatability).

Table 3. Identification of celery DNA by dd-PCR in commercial food samples.

Lane ¹	Type of Sample	QD*	Mean celery DNA Cp/ μ L \pm SD	CV (%)
A	Bolognese meat sauce	(3.0%)	ND	-
B	Delicate Minestrone	% not declared	39.8 \pm 4.1	10.3%
C	Chopped vegetables	(3.0%)	36.0 \pm 1.9	5.3%
D	Vegetable Bouillon cube	% not declared	9.1 \pm 0.6	7.0%
E	Meatball	(1.0%)	22.8 \pm 0.1	0.6%
F	Hamburger	(0.10%)	1.5 \pm 0.0	0.9%
G	Tomato sauce A	(1.0%)	44.3 \pm 0.6	1.3%
H	Minestrone	(3.9%)	413.0 \pm 26.9	6.5%
I	Pureed vegetable soup A	(1.0%)	120.1 \pm 14.4	12.0%
L	Beef bouillon cube	% not declared	519 \pm 25.5	4.9%
M	Vegetable soup	% not declared	136.7 \pm 0.1	0.10%
N	Tomato sauce B	% not declared	29.0 \pm 0.8	2.7%
O	Meat sauce	% not declared	243.5 \pm 3.5	1.5%
P	Zucchini and potato soup	% not declared	75.8 \pm 5.4	7.1%
Q	Hake in green sauce	% not declared	352.0 \pm 9.9	2.8%
R	Fish stock	trace	ND	-
S	Meat loaf	(0.3%)	31.4 \pm 1.8	5.9%
T	Tomato sauce C	(0.10%)	20.3 \pm 1.3	6.2%
U	Pureed vegetable soup B	(0.10%)	22.7 \pm 0.6	2.5%
V	Chicken soup	(0.03%)	2.6 \pm 0.4	16.3%
Z	Pureed vegetable soup C	trace	ND	-

¹see correspondence with figure 4; *Quantitative declaration; Within brackets the % celery content when declared on the label. ND = not detected.




Figure 1. Optimization of dd-PCR annealing temperature. The horizontal axis indicates the thermal gradient tested: 65 °C (lane A04), 64.3°C (lane B04), 63°C (lane C04), 61.3°C (lane D04), 58.8°C (lane E04), 56.9°C (lane F04), 55.7°C (lane G04) and 55°C (H04). The vertical axis indicates the amplitude of samples. The graphs were plotted between fluorescence intensity versus droplet numbers. Blue dots represent positive droplets for celery DNA, while black dots represent negative droplets. DNA dilution 1:20, primer F 0.9 μ M, primer R 0.9 μ M, probe 0.250 μ M.




Figure 2. Linearity of the dd-PCR assay for celery DNA. The vertical axis represents the log values of measured Cp/μL by dd-PCR. The horizontal axis shows the log values of expected Cp/μL. Each datapoint is the average of 20 replicates.




Figure 3. Matrix effect. Linearity of the dd-PCR assay for celery DNA. The vertical axis represents the log values of measured Cp/μL by dd-PCR on celery powder and spiked food samples. The horizontal axis shows the log values of expected Cp/μL. Each datapoint is the average of 2 replicates.




Figure 4. dd-PCR conducted on commercial samples. The horizontal axis indicates the event number of 21 food samples: bolognese meat sauce (lane A), delicate minestrone (lane B), chopped vegetables (lane C), vegetable bouillon cube (lane D), meatball (lane E), hamburger (lane F), tomato sauce A (lane G), minestrone (lane H), pureed vegetable soup A (lane I), beef bouillon cube (lane L), vegetable soup (lane M), tomato sauce B (lane N), meat sauce (O), zucchini and potato soup (lane P), hake in green sauce (lane Q), fish stock (lane R), meat loaf (lane S), tomato sauce C (lane T), pureed vegetable soup B (lane U), chicken soup (lane V), pureed vegetable soup C (lane Z). The vertical axis indicates the amplitude of samples. The

graphs were plotted between fluorescence intensity versus droplet numbers. Blue dots represent positive droplets for celery DNA, while black dots represent negative droplets.

Journal Pre-proof

Highlights

- A dd-PCR assay for detection of celery allergen in foods was evaluated;
- Primers and probe were designed to target the mannitol dehydrogenase (*Mtd*) gene;
- The limit of detection was 0.20 ± 0.12 Cp/ μ L of celery DNA;
- The limit of quantification was 0.83 ± 0.20 Cp/ μ L of celery DNA;
- The dd-PCR assay showed no cross-reactivity with non-target DNA;

Declaration of interest to FOOD CONTROL

Declarations of interest: none

To the attention of the editor-in-chief of the scientific journal Food Control, G. Campbell-Platt

Dear editor

On behalf of my co-authors

I attest to the fact that no financial and personal relationships with other people or organizations inappropriately influenced the work.

Date: May 13th, 2021

Dott. Carlo Spanu

Journal Pre-proof