Asian Journal of **Biological**Sciences



ISSN 1996-3351 DOI: 10.3923/ajbs.2019.797.803



Research Article Influence of Water Activity (a_w) on Mould Infestation and Mycotoxin Contamination of Rice Fodder

¹Saini Kiran, ²Maganti Surekha and ²Solipuram Madhu Sudhan Reddy

Abstract

Background and Objective: Mycotoxigenic fungi infest stored foods and feeds depending on environmental conditions prevailing in storage specially water activity (a_w) prevailing. Besides, physical conditions, the relationship of storage moulds which may act antagonistically or synergistically on individual surface moulds of fodders and feeds which in turn may influence the elaboration of mycotoxins by moulds will determine the degree of mycotoxin contamination. Therefore, it was considered worthwhile to determine the influence of water activity (a_w) on mycotoxins elaboration both qualitatively and quantitatively. Varieties of moulds are reported to infest paddy straw and elaborate mycotoxins and cause health hazards to cattle which consume it. Interaction of infesting moulds and water activity (a_w) are reported to be complex and determine mycotoxin elaboration. **Materials and Methods:** The stored paddy straw with different a_w activity was inoculated by spore suspension of individual mycotoxigenic fungi and incubated at 30°C for 15 days. Mould infested straw was analyzed for the presence of different mycotoxins. The water activity (a_w) of straw was maintained by standard methods. **Results:** The analysis of mould infested rice fodder revealed the presence of mycotoxin which differed quantitatively depending on the water activity (a_w). Moulds present in the rice fodder are likely to interact and act either synergistically or antagonistically and contribute to the management of most mycotoxigenic fungi through biologically and ecofriendly. **Conclusion:** Management of mycotoxins can be accomplished by maintaining most adverse environmental conditions and promoting antagonistic moulds. As temperature, water activity and pH have a great impact on mycotoxin production by fungi, these factors have to be considered for developing management practices.

Key words: Rice fodder, water activity (a_w), interaction, mycotoxigenic fungi, mycotoxins, synergism, antagonism, management

Citation: Saini Kiran, Maganti Surekha and Solipuram Madhu Sudhan Reddy, 2019. Influence of water activity (a_w) on mould infestation and mycotoxin contamination of rice fodder. Asian J. Biol. Sci., 12: 797-803.

Corresponding Author: Saini Kiran, Department of Botany, Satavahana University, Karimnagar, Telangana State, India

Copyright: © 2019 Saini Kiran *et al.* This is an open access article distributed under the terms of the creative commons attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author and source are credited.

Competing Interest: The authors have declared that no competing interest exists.

Data Availability: All relevant data are within the paper and its supporting information files.

¹Department of Botany, Satavahana University, Karimnagar, Telangana State, India

²Department of Botany, Toxicology Laboratory, Kakatiya University, Warangal, Telangana State, India

INTRODUCTION

In nature wide variety of fungi on the substrate interacts with each other either for space or nutrients. A variety of interactions such as antagonism, mutualism, synergism and metabiosis leading to either favourable or adverse conditions for the activity of the target fungus. The outcome of these associations in turn is influenced by variety of environmental conditions including water activity (a_w). The problem of mycotoxins is more acute under cultural conditions than what is envisaged in nature. This is probably the reason for comparatively more incidence of mycotoxins under laboratory conditions in comparison to what is experienced in nature¹. Kumar et al.² and Palumbo et al.³ elegantly discussed different aspects of interaction of fungi and components of environment on mycotoxin contamination of agricultural commodities, the key factor in preventing mycotoxigenic fungi in foods and feeds. Akbar and Magan⁴ feet that water activity (a_w) influence and determine the colonization of foods and feeds by both mycotoxigenic and non-toxigenic spoilage fungi. Combined effect of high temperature and water stress in some regions, the contamination of mycotoxigenic fungi of food commodities becomes a serious problem in preventing food spoilage and degeneration of nutrients⁵. Therefore, it is important to understand how these fungi enter food chain in relation to environmental factors. Destroy or removal of mycotoxins from food or feed biologically is beset with number of problems such as economics, nutritive value and its biological safety. Prevention of mycotoxigenic mould infestation of food or feed is the best option but requires a thorough understanding of the conditions under which mycotoxigenic fungi are favoured. The information gathered from one fungal species cannot be transferred to another species⁶. Therefore, in the present investigations influence of water activity (a_w) of paddy straw on the proliferation of different mycotoxigenic fungi and mycotoxin elaboration was assessed. The water activity (a_w) of paddy straw was maintained by standard methods and its affect on mould infestation and mycotoxin elaboration was assessed and the results are discussed in this communication.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Fungal culture: Isolates of *A. flavus, A. nidulans, A. terreus, A. ochraceus, P. griseofulvum* and *P. aurantiogriseum* isolated from paddy straw (*Oryza sativa* L.) and maintained on Asthana and Hawkers medium A (Glucose 10 g, KNO₃ 3.5 g, KH₂PO₄ 1.75 g, MgSO₄.7H₂O 0.75 g, agar 16 g and distilled

water 1000 mL) were employed for these studies. Seven days old cultures were employed for inoculum preparation. Inoculum was prepared in 10 mL of sterile water containing 0.05% so as to get final spore concentration to 1×10^6 conidia per mL⁻¹.

Effect of water activity: The water activity (a_w) of rice fodder was maintained as suggested by Loncin *et al.*⁷. Hundred grams of rice fodder was taken in 250 mL Erlenmeyer conical flask and different fungi were inoculated at the rate of 10 mL spore suspension. Rice fodder thus inoculated was mixed thoroughly to ensure uniform spreading of the inoculum in rice fodder. The rice fodder thus inoculated was incubated at $27\pm2^{\circ}$ C for 15 days at different water activity (0.95, 0.92, 0.87, 0.85, 0.80 and 0.75). Five replicates were maintained and the experiment was repeated three times.

Biochemical changes: The chemical changes in rice fodder due to the inoculation of different mycotoxigenic fungi was analyzed at the end of 15 days incubation. The infested rice fodder was homogenized in distilled water and centrifuged at x1800 for 30 min to get a clear supernatant. The supernatant was taken for determining protein, phenols, free amino acids, reducing sugars, free fatty acids, total nitrogen and crude fiber as described earlier by Kiran *et al.*8. Ash content and loss of weight of rice fodder was determined by Ward and Johnston9.

Mycotoxin analysis: The infested rice fodder by different fungi for 15 days was analyzed for mycotoxins as described by Surekha *et al.*¹⁰. One gram of fungal infested rice fodder was homogenized in methanol and shaken thoroughly for 5 min in Vertex mixer. The suspension was left for 60 min without shaking. The extracts were shaken again and filtered through Whatman no 1 filter paper. The clear extracts were employed for estimation of different mycotoxins quantitatively or semi-quantitatively as described for aflatoxins¹¹, sterigmatocystin and ochratoxin A¹², terreic acid¹³, patulin¹⁴, penitrem B¹⁵ and cyclopiazonic acid¹⁶. The details of detection of different mycotoxins are precised in Table 1.

Statistical analysis: The results obtained in the present investigations were subjected to statistical analysis using SPSS package 12.0 version. It computed statistical parameters mean, S.D, S.E and t-value are interpreted at $\alpha = 0.05$ level of significance.

Table 1: Solvent system spray reagents used in the detection of different mycotoxins in rice fodder

			Detection	
Name of the toxin	Solvent system	Spray reagent	UV	Visible
Aflatoxins	C:A (95:5)	-	blue and green	-
Sterigmatocystin	C:M:A (1:1:1)	20% AICI ₂	yellow	-
Ochratoxin A	T:Ea:F (6:3:1)	20% AICI ₃	Bright blue	-
Patulin	T:Ea:F (6:3:1)	2% phenylhydrazine hydrochloride	-	yellow
Terreic acid	T:Ea:F (6:3:1)	Quantitative estimation	-	-
Penitrem B	H:Ea (6:4)	Ce(SO ₄) ₂ 1% in 6N H ₂ SO ₄ , FeCl ₃	Pale green	-
Cyclopiazonic acid	T:Ea:F (6:3:1)	Ce $(SO_4)_2$ 1% in 6N H_2SO_4 2,4- DNP, FeCl ₃ 3% in ethanol, AlCl ₃	yellow	blue, red brown, brown

C: Chloroform, A: Acetone, M: Methanol, T: Toluene, Ea: Ethyl acetate, F: Formic acid, H: Hexane

RESULTS

The influence of water activity (a_w) on mould infestation of rice fodder and mycotoxin elaboration by different mycotoxigenic fungi was analyzed and the results are precised in Table 2.

Fungi under investigation failed to grow and elaborate mycotoxins at a_w 0.75 (Table 2). However, *A. flavus, A. terreus* and *A. ochraceus* could record poor growth and elaborated trace amount of aflatoxins, terreic acid and ochratoxin A respectively at this water activity (a_w) . Interestingly, *P. aurantiogriseum* and *P. griseofulvum* failed to elaborate penitrem B and cyclopiazonic acid, respectively even at a_w 0.80. This may be attributed to hostile conditions of rice fodder or these fungi require more water activity (a_w) .

Critical perusal of Table 2 reveals significant changes in biochemical composition of rice fodder which varied significantly with the water activity (a_w) of fodder and the fungus involved. When free amino acids, free fatty acids, total nitrogen and ash content increased with the increase of water activity (a_w) of stored paddy straw, reducing sugars and crude fiber content decreased with the increase of water activity. The increase in ash content of fodder was significant incubated at above a_w 0.92 which may be attributed to the increased infesting fungal activity. On the other hand, marginal increase in ash content was recorded in control fodder at all a_w tried.

DISCUSSION

From the present investigations it is clear that the activity fungi in rice fodder increased with the increase of water activity and progress of incubation period. Most of the fungi under investigation failed to grow and elaborate respective mycotoxins at a_w 0.75. However, *A. flavus, A. terrues* and *A. ochraceus* could record poor growth and elaborate trace amount of aflatoxins, terreic acid and ochratoxin A, respectively. Interestingly *P. aurantiogriseum* and

P. griseofulvum failed to elaborate penitrem B and cyclopiazonic acid respectively even at a_w 0.8. This may be attributed to hostile condition of rice fodder or these fungi required more water activity (a_w). Lahouar et al.¹⁷ have recorded failure of A. flavus to produce aflatoxins at a_w 0.85. Aspergillus nidulans could elaborate sterigmatocystin in rice fodder maintained at a_w 0.92 and above water activity. Ochratoxin A production by A. ochraceus was recorded at all a_w tried but the amount of Ochratoxin A produced increased with increase of a_w above 0.87. Esteban et al. 18 also reported production of Ochratoxin A by Aspergillus carbonarius at wide range of water activity at different temperature. Aspergillus flavus could produce trace amount of aflatoxins when the a_w was 0.7 but increased significantly with increase of a_w 0.95. In agreement with present observations A. flavus and A. ochraceus are reported to be ubiquitous and could be active over wide range of water activity¹⁷. Ghali et al.¹⁹ also feet that relative humidity and temperature are important critical factors in storage of food grains to keep them free from mycotoxin contamination. Belli et al.²⁰ and Kapetanakou et al.²¹ observed production of ochratoxin A by A. carbonarius at higher water activity (a_w). Similarly Mitchell et al.²² recorded increased growth with increase of water activity (aw) from 0.96-0.98. Schmidt-Heydt et al.²³ while critically analyzing the factors contributing to mycotoxin contamination concluded that storage temperature was a key factor for aflatoxins B₁ elaboration, while water activity (a_w) influenced the aflatoxin G₁ biosynthesis. Amani *et al.*¹⁷ and Mousa *et al.*²⁴ have also recorded significant amount of aflatoxin in foods with a_w 0.85-0.99 and 0.82-0.92, respectively. The differentially produced amount of either aflatoxin B₁ or G₁ may be attributed to the changing environment. It has been demonstrated that fungi produce mycotoxins to improve their competitiveness under natural conditions²⁵. Rice fodder suffered significant weight loss at a_w above 0.85. Marin et al.²⁶ observed that conidia of A. flavus germinated freely and exhibited strong deteriorative activity at a_w 0.85 and above. On the other hand, A. flavus and A. ochraceus were active

tholans Phebols Acids Sugals tholans Photeins Photeins Acids Sugals tholans 622 0.60 276 1200 flauss 622 0.60 276 1200 cohaceus 455 0.66 600 486 189 erreus 455 0.66 600 486 285 erreus 437 0.75 3.16 800 486 miscofuluum 437 0.75 3.16 800 486 285 an 987 0.08 0.73 3.68 2.88 188 illue 403 0.73 3.68 2.88 2.88 illue 403 0.07 3.16 8.00 illue 403 0.07 3.16 1.50 illue 0.03 0.04 0.43 0.05 2.76 1.50 illue 0.03 0.04 0.43 0.25 0.04	adds (mg g ⁻¹) 2.76 7.98 8.97 6.00 4.86 3.96 3.16 5.82 2.28 0.02 2.76 5.09		acids (mg	nitrogen	100+00	TIDLE			
Control 38.5 0.60 276 A filtowas 46.2 0.66 8.76 A nichulans 46.2 0.66 6.00 A nichulans 46.5 0.06 6.00 A nichulans 43.7 0.75 3.96 P auramiogniseum 62.5 0.09 4.86 Stical analysis P griseofulyum 9.87 0.03 2.28 Control 987 0.03 0.03 3.16 A nichulans 43.3 0.67 4.41 A nichulans 43.3 0.67 4.41 A nichulans 43.3 0.67 4.41 A nichulans 50 0.67 5.09 A nichulans 50 0.67 5.09 A terrantiogniseum 550 0.67 5.09 Stical analysis Mean 7.23 0.11 1.05 Stical analysis Mean 2.59 0.04 4.75 A terrantiogriseum 30.0 0.54 3.12	2.76 7.98 8.97 8.97 6.00 4.86 3.96 3.16 5.82 2.28 0.03 0.02 5.09	12.00	(CH/100g)	(mg g ⁻¹)	(mg g ⁻¹)	(mg g ⁻¹)	Loss of weight (%)	Mycotoxin	Amount or (intensity) $ppb/\mu g mL^{-1} mg g^{-1}$
A flavus 622 070 798 A nichaeus 46.2 070 798 A nichaeus 46.2 066 897 A nichaeus 48.5 066 600 A nichaeus 45.5 073 346 P griseofulvum 43.7 0.75 316 SD 987 0.03 316 SD 987 0.03 318 SD 987 0.03 318 SD 987 0.03 0.03 Control 38.5 0.54 2.76 A nichaecus 43.3 0.67 441 A nichaecus 33.0 0.63 2.16 A nichaecus 33.3 0.67 443 A nichaecus 33.3 0.64 473 A nichaecus 33.4	7.98 8.97 6.00 6.00 3.16 5.82 2.28 0.09 5.09		0:30	2.50	62.0	0.06	37.0		
A cocharceus 39,6 0,66 897 A cocharceus 39,6 0,66 8,97 A cocharceus 34,5 0,66 8,97 A teneus 45,5 0,90 4,86 P, griscochiurum 43,7 0,75 3,16 SE 50 0,73 3,96 P, griscochiurum 43,7 0,75 3,16 SE 60 0,73 3,86 Control 38,5 0,73 5,73 A cocharceus 43,3 0,67 5,76 A file analysis Mean 6,99 0,05 0,01 A file analysis Mean 6,99 0,059 0,01 Control 5,90 0,04 0,04 A teneus 34,0 0,05 5,16 B S	8.97 6.00 6.00 3.16 5.82 2.28 0.02 5.09	1.80	0.35	2.08	140.2	83.7	48.9	AFB ₁ /B ₂	+2/+4
A contracteds 3950 000 000 A tentrous 4550 000 000 P aniomicopriseum 625 0072 396 P aniomicopriseum 625 0072 396 P aniomicopriseum 625 0073 396 P control 828 003 003 028 C control 828 003 003 003 A fibrates 609 007 579 A fibrates 609 007 579 A nickulans 40 002 007 579 P aniomicopriseum 609 007 579 A fibrates 800 007 579 P aniomicopriseum 600 007 007 579 A fibrates 800 007 007 579 A fibrates 800 007 007 007 007 007 007 007 007 007	6,000 3,16 5,82 2,28 0,03 5,09 5,09	5.45	0.32	0.99	129.3	83.5	48.0	Sterigmatocystin	+5
stical analysis P. aurantogriseum 625 0.72 3.05 Stical analysis P. guisantogriseum 437 0.75 316 SE 9.87 0.05 328 SD 403 0.07 228 SD 403 0.07 228 SD 403 0.07 228 Control 385 0.64 2.75 A nichauss 609 0.67 4.41 A nichauss 403 0.67 4.41 A nichauss 403 0.67 4.41 A nichaus 403 0.67 4.41 A nichaus 550 0.67 4.49 SD 2.05 0.04 4.49 SD 2.05 0.04 4.49 SD 2.05 0.05 2.81 A characeus 3.71 0.02 2.81 SD 2.05 0.04 0.43 SD 2.05 0.04 0.43	3.16 3.16 5.82 2.28 0.02 2.76 5.09	7.85	0.36	1.78	1.6.1	75.4	48.7	Ochratoxin A Patulip/terraic acid	+3 +T/35
stical analysis P. griseotukum 43.7 0.75 3.16 Stical analysis Mean 43.9 0.75 3.16 SC 0.03 0.03 0.03 5.82 EVAlue 0.03 0.03 0.03 0.03 Control 38.5 0.54 2.76 A flewes 40.3 0.03 0.03 A flewes 40.3 0.04 2.76 A flewes 44.3 0.65 5.73 A flewes 40.0 0.05 5.73 A flewes 44.0 0.05 5.73 A flewes 44.0 0.05 5.73 SE 2.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 Control 5.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 Control 3.2 0.0 4.75 A characeus 3.3 0.0 0.0 4.75 A characeus 3.3 0.0 0.0 2.28 A control 2.2 0.0 0.0 </td <td>3.16 5.82 2.28 0.93 0.02 2.76</td> <td>10.00</td> <td>0.37</td> <td>1.87</td> <td>140.0</td> <td>65.0</td> <td>47.8</td> <td>Penitrem B</td> <td>S II</td>	3.16 5.82 2.28 0.93 0.02 2.76	10.00	0.37	1.87	140.0	65.0	47.8	Penitrem B	S II
stical analysis Mean 499 077 582 SE 403 003 028 SE 403 003 028 SE 403 003 028 Control 385 054 028 A Anichareeus 440 050 067 509 A Anichareeus 440 050 057 509 A Anichareeus 440 050 057 509 A Anichareeus 440 050 057 509 Control Control 320 054 441 A Anichareeus 360 050 050 372 A terreus 320 050 050 050 SD 223 054 441 Control Control 320 054 321 A terreus 330 054 321 A terreus 330 054 321 A terreus 360 059 050 SE 001 002 001 Control Control 320 056 251 A terreus 380 056 251 A terreus 381 056 251 A terreus 381 056 050 251 A terreus 381 050 051 052 A terreus 381 050 051 051 A terreus 381 056 051 A terreus 382 056 050 318 A terreus 4 terreus 382 050 052 A terreus 382 050 052 A terreus 382 050 052 A terreus 383 052 A terreus 383 052 A terreus 383 053 053 A terreus 383 053 A terreus	5.82 2.28 0.93 0.02 5.09	8.00	0.30	1.49	106.5	62.3	48.4	CPA	Ē
SD 987 0.08 228 EE 403 0.08 228 Evalue 0.03 0.01 0.03 A Handlens 609 0.67 2.76 A A chraceus 443 0.69 5.73 A chidulars 443 0.69 5.73 A chidulars 443 0.69 5.73 A chidulars 443 0.69 5.73 P griscofulvum 46.9 0.67 4.49 SD 7.23 0.11 1.05 SE 2.95 0.04 4.49 Control 32.0 0.69 4.49 A richalars 3.0 0.69 4.49 A richalars 3.0 0.69 4.75 A richalars 3.0 0.42 2.28 A richalars 3.0 0.44 2.24 A richalars 3.1 0.75 3.81 A richalars 3.2 0.03 0.44 A richalars <th< td=""><td>2.28 0.93 0.02 2.76 5.09</td><td>5.48</td><td>0.33</td><td>1.57</td><td>120.1</td><td>74.6</td><td>48.3</td><td>p<0.05 = Significant</td><td></td></th<>	2.28 0.93 0.02 2.76 5.09	5.48	0.33	1.57	120.1	74.6	48.3	p<0.05 = Significant	
SE 403 003 093 Evalue 003 001 002 Control 38.5 0.54 2.76 A flavus 60.9 0.67 5.09 A cortraceus 43.3 0.67 5.09 A terreus 44.3 0.69 5.73 A terreus 44.0 0.69 5.73 P griscoclulyum 46.9 0.63 2.86 P griscoclulyum 46.9 0.63 2.86 SD 2.23 0.11 1.05 SD 2.95 0.04 4.75 A flavus 3.56 0.63 2.86 A flavus 3.71 0.72 4.38 A flavus 3.73 0.64 4.75 A cortraceus 3.3 0.04 4.75 A ferreus 3.71 0.72 3.01 A ferreus 3.73 0.66 2.74 A cortraceus 3.73 0.64 4.75 A cortraceus	0.02 2.76 5.09	3.08	0.02	0.40	20.3	9.13	0.38		
control 6,03 0,01 0,02 A niculans 60,9 0,54 2,76 A niculans 60,9 0,67 5,09 A niculans 44,3 0,69 5,73 A corfraceus 43,3 0,67 4,41 A correction 6,09 0,67 5,09 E value 0,01 0,02 0,61 E value 0,01 0,00 0,62 E value 0,01 0,00 0,02 E value 0,00 0,02 0,03 E value 0,00 0,02 0,03 E value 0,00 0,02 0,03 E value 0,00 0,03 0,03 E value 0,0	0.02 2.76 5.09	1.26	0.10	0.16	7.30	3.73	0.15		
A flavis A control A flavis Stical analysis Stical analysis A charceus A flavis A control Control Control Control A flavis A flavis SD Control Control Control Control A flavis A flavis A flavis SD Control Control Control Control Control A flavis A flavis A flavis A flavis A flavis A flavis SD Control Control Control Control Control Control A flavis A flavis A flavis A flavis A flavis A flavis Control Control Control Control Control Control A flavis A flavis A flavis A flavis A flavis Control Control Control Control Control Control A flavis Control Control Control Control Control A flavis Control	5.09	0.004	0.01	0.003	0.001	0.009	0.00		
A flavius 60.9 0.67 50.9 A niculans 40.9 0.67 5.0 A niculans 44.3 0.69 5.73 A corinaceus 43.3 0.67 5.16 A tenreus 44.0 0.92 5.16 P girseofulvum 46.9 0.63 2.86 SE 2.95 0.04 4.49 SE 2.95 0.04 0.43 F value 0.01 0.02 0.01 Control 2.95 0.04 0.43 A niculans 33.0 0.44 4.75 A niculans 33.3 0.54 3.21 A niculans 33.0 0.46 4.75 A niculans 35.2 0.65 2.51 A terreus 37.1 0.72 4.43 SE 1.05 0.03 0.44 E griscofulvum 38.7 0.56 2.51 A niculans 37.2 0.57 2.85 A corrincol </td <td>5.09</td> <td>15.00</td> <td>0.30</td> <td>2.50</td> <td>54.6</td> <td>170.0</td> <td>36.0</td> <td>•</td> <td>•</td>	5.09	15.00	0.30	2.50	54.6	170.0	36.0	•	•
A naturalism 443 0.69 5.73 A cochaceus 443 0.69 5.73 A terreus 50 0.60 3.72 P aurantiogriseum 55.0 0.60 3.72 P aurantiogriseum 55.0 0.69 3.72 P aurantiogriseum 6001 0.02 0.01 Control 3.0 0.42 2.28 A A favus 3.6 0.64 4.75 A naturalism Mean 3.0 0.46 4.75 A control 3.0 0.45 3.71 A control 3.0 0.45 3.71 A control 3.0 0.45 3.71 A control 3.0 0.46 4.75 A terreus 3.1 0.72 4.38 P aurantiogriseum 3.0 0.44 3.71 Control 3.0 0.42 2.50 Stical analysis Mean 3.7 0.65 A terreus 3.7 0.65 A terreus 3.7 0.65 A terreus 3.7 0.65 Control 3.0 0.44 2.27 Stical analysis Mean 3.7 0.65 Control 3.0 0.7 0.60 B griscotifhum 3.1 0.52 2.85 A terreus 3.1 0.52 2.85 Control 3.0 0.7 0.02 Control 3.0 0.7 0.03 A terreus 3.1 0.52 2.85 A terreus 3.1 0.55 0.29 A terreus 3.1 0.51 2.43 A terreus 3.2 0.00 0.42 2.70 Control 3.0 0.76 0.02 Control 3.0 0.76 0.02 Control 3.0 0.76 0.02 Control 3.0 0.76 0.03 A terreus 3.1 0.51 2.43 A terreus 3.1 0.51 2.43 A terreus 3.1 0.51 2.43 A terreus 3.2 0.50 B griscotifhum 3.5 0.50 Control 3.0 0.7 0.05 Control 3.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0		2.50	0.31	2.24	106.8	149.3	45.3	AFB ₁ /B ₂	+3/+3
At terreace 44.3 0.05 4.41 A terreace 45.3 0.05 5.16 P aurantiogniseum 55.0 0.66 3.75 P griseofulvum 46.9 0.63 2.86 P griseofulvum 46.9 0.69 4.49 SE 5.0 0.01 0.02 0.01 Control 32.0 0.42 2.28 A flavus 36.6 0.63 5.51 A niculans 33.0 0.46 4.75 A terreac 33.1 0.72 4.38 A niculans 38.7 0.56 2.50 A flavus 38.7 0.56 2.51 A flavus 38.7 0.55 0.04 A flavus 38.7 0.56 2.51 A flavus 37.2 0.63 2.44 A flavus 37.2 0.63 2.44 A flavus 37.2 0.50 0.52 A terreus 37.5 0.51 3.00 B aurantiogriseum 37.5 0.51 3.00 Control 37.5 0.03 0.25 E value 0.009 0.02 0.02 Control 30.0 0.02 0.02 Control 30.0 0.02 0.02 A flavus 31.1 0.51 2.43 A flavus 32.3 0.79 3.21 A flavus 32.3 0.79 3.21 A flavus 32.3 0.79 3.21 A flavus 32.3 0.79 2.29 A cochraceus 31.1 0.51 2.43 A cochraceus 32.5 0.52 2.03 Stical analysis Mean 33.5 0.58 2.64	5./3	7.50	0.31	0.63	120.7	125.2	45.6	Sterigmatocystin	<u> </u>
tical analysis	14.4	7.50	0.33	2.08	10.6	140.0	45.6	Ochratoxin A	+ 1 + 3
stical analysis Resortinum 530 0.50 27.2 Stical analysis Mean 49.0 0.69 2.86 SD 723 0.11 1.05 SD 723 0.11 1.05 SD 723 0.11 1.05 SE 2.95 0.04 0.43 Fvalue 0.01 0.02 0.01 Control 32.0 0.46 4.75 A chitaceus 33.3 0.64 4.75 A chitaceus 37.1 0.72 4.38 A cothaceus 37.1 0.75 3.91 SD 2.59 0.08 1.14 SD 2.59 0.08 1.14 A flavus 37.2 0.55 2.51 Control 37.2 0.66 3.98 A cothaceus 37.2 0.60 3.98 A terreus 37.2 0.60 2.21 A terreus 37.5 0.51 2.27	5.16 2.72	3.75	0.34	2.08	6.701	75.0	46.5	Patulin/terreic acid	NII/20
stical analysis Mean 450 6.69 449 SD SE 2.95 0.01 0.05 449 SD 7.23 0.11 1.05 228 F value 0.01 0.02 0.01 0.02 0.01 Control 32.0 0.12 2.28 4.75	2.72	00:01	0.30	1.87	77.3	100.8	45.3		Ē
SD 723 0.11 1.05 SE 2.95 0.04 0.43 F-value 0.01 0.02 0.01 Control 32.0 0.42 2.28 A nidulans 36.6 0.63 5.51 A nidulans 33.3 0.54 4.75 A terreus 37.1 0.72 4.38 P aurantiogriseum 39.0 0.54 3.21 P gissedulvum 38.7 0.56 2.50 SD 1.05 0.03 0.46 SD 2.59 0.08 1.14 SD 2.59 0.08 1.14 SD 2.59 0.08 1.14 A nidulans 3.20 0.57 3.91 A nidulans 3.25 0.60 3.98 A terreus 3.48 0.44 2.27 A terreus 3.48 0.44 2.27 SD A terreus 3.48 0.44 2.29 SD <t< td=""><td>4.49</td><td>6.54</td><td>0.32</td><td>1.90</td><td>108.2</td><td>121.3</td><td>45.7</td><td>p<0.05 = Significant</td><td></td></t<>	4.49	6.54	0.32	1.90	108.2	121.3	45.7	p<0.05 = Significant	
SE 295 0.04 0.43 Evalue 0.01 0.02 0.01 Control 0.01 0.02 0.01 A flavus 366 0.63 5.51 A nichulans 33.3 0.64 4.75 A terreus 33.3 0.54 3.21 A terreus 37.1 0.75 4.73 P gitscofulvum 38.7 0.56 2.50 SD Control 2.59 0.08 1.14 SD Control 32.0 0.42 2.91 A nichulans 3.20 0.55 3.91 2.44 A nichulans 3.72 0.63 2.44 A nichulans 3.72 0.63 2.51 A cortraceus 34.8 0.46 2.91 A terreus 3.26 0.60 3.98 P aurantiogriseum 37.5 0.50 2.85 SD Control 0.76 0.02 2.29 E valuantiogriseum <t< td=""><td>1.05</td><td>2.83</td><td>0.02</td><td>0.00</td><td>16.2</td><td>8.2</td><td>0.44</td><td></td><td></td></t<>	1.05	2.83	0.02	0.00	16.2	8.2	0.44		
trial analysis (Control Control S.20) Control S.20 0.04 2.28 A. Malues S.60 0.63 5.51 A. Nachaeus S.3.0 0.46 4.75 A. Lerreus S.3.1 0.72 4.38 A. Lerreus S.7.1 0.72 4.38 P. Briseofulvum S.7.2 0.56 2.50 Control S.20 0.01 0.008 0.01 Control S.20 0.03 0.46 A. Mean S.20 0.04 2.04 A. Mean S.20 0.05 0.05 E. A. Indulans S.20 0.05 0.05 Control S.20 0.05 0.05 A. Mean S.20 0.05 0.05 Control S.20 0.05 0.05 A. Mean S.20 0.05 0.05 Control S.20 0.05 A. Mean S.20 0.05 Control S.20 0.05 A. Mean S.20 0.05 A. Mean S.20 0.05 Control S.20 0.05 A. Mean S.20 0.05 A. Mean S.20 0.05 Control S.20 0.05 A. Mean S.20 0.05 A. Mean S.20 0.05 Control S.20 0.05 A. Mean S.20 0.05 A. Mean S.20 0.05 A. Mean S.20 0.05 Control S.20 0.05 A. Mean S.20 0	0.43	1.15	600.0	0.26	6.64	11.5	0.18		
Control 32.0 0.42 22.8 A flavus 36.6 0.63 551 A nichtaeus 33.0 0.46 475 A cothaceus 33.3 0.54 3.21 A terreus 37.1 0.72 4.38 P garantogriseum 39.0 0.54 3.12 P griseofulvum 36.2 0.57 3.91 SD Nean 2.59 0.08 1.14 SD Control 0.25 0.08 1.14 A ridulans 37.2 0.65 2.51 A terreus 34.8 0.46 2.91 A terreus 37.2 0.60 3.98 A terreus 37.2 0.60 3.98 SD 1.86 0.00 0.00 0.00 SD 1.86 0.00 0.02 0.02 E value 0.009 0.02 0.02 0.02 E value 0.009 0.02 0.02 0.02 Co	0.01	0.001	0.04	0.07	0.00	0.008	0.00		
A flavus 366 0.63 551 A nidulans 330 0.46 4.75 A nidulans 33.3 0.46 4.75 A nidulans 33.3 0.54 3.21 P aurantiogriseum 39.0 0.54 3.12 P griseofulvum 38.7 0.56 2.50 SD 2.59 0.08 1.14 SE 1.05 0.03 0.46 E-value 0.01 0.008 0.01 Control 32.0 0.42 2.94 A nidulans 34.2 0.63 2.44 A nidulans 34.8 0.46 2.91 A nidulans 37.5 0.51 3.08 P surantiogriseum 34.8 0.44 2.27 SE 0.76 0.03 0.62 P griseofulvum 35.1 0.52 2.85 SE 0.76 0.03 0.02 Control 0.76 0.03 0.25 A nidulans </td <td>2.28</td> <td>17.00</td> <td>0.29</td> <td>3.12</td> <td>54.0</td> <td>180.0</td> <td>33.9</td> <td>•</td> <td>•</td>	2.28	17.00	0.29	3.12	54.0	180.0	33.9	•	•
A niculans 330 0.46 4.75 A cochaecus 33.3 0.54 3.21 A terreus 37.1 0.72 4.38 P aurantiogriseum 39.0 0.54 3.12 P griseofulvum 38.7 0.56 2.50 SD 0.57 3.91 F-value 0.01 0.008 0.01 Control 32.0 0.42 2.74 A niculans 34.2 0.50 2.51 A cochaecus 34.8 0.46 2.91 A niculans 34.8 0.46 2.91 A niculans 35.1 0.52 2.85 SD 0.00 0.00 P griseofulvum 34.8 0.46 2.91 A niculans 35.1 0.52 2.85 SD 0.00 0.00 Control 30.00 0.00 A flavus 32.3 0.79 3.21 A niculans 32.3 0.59 2.29 A niculans 32.3 0.59 2.29 A niculans 32.3 0.59 2.29 A niculans 32.3 0.50 3.31 A niculans 32.3 0.50 3.31 A niculans 32.3 0.50 2.20 B griseofulvum 35.5 0.52 2.03	5.51	5.31	0.37	2.77	84.6	171.5	44.4	AFB ₁ /B ₂	+2/+1
A cornaceus 33.3 0.54 3.21 A terreus 33.3 0.54 3.21 P aurantiogriseum 39.0 0.54 3.12 P griseofulvum 38.7 0.56 2.50 SD 2.59 0.08 1.14 SE 1.05 0.03 0.46 t-value 0.01 0.008 0.01 Control 32.0 0.42 2.04 A flavus 37.2 0.63 2.44 A chidulans 32.6 0.60 3.98 P aurantiogriseum 37.5 0.51 3.00 P griseofulvum 37.5 0.51 3.00 P griseofulvum 37.5 0.52 2.85 SD 7.0009 0.02 0.02 Control 30.0 0.02 0.02 A flavus 32.3 0.79 3.21 A ochraceus 32.3 0.79 3.21 A niculans A flavus 32.3 0.79 3.27 A niculans A cochraceus 31.1 0.51 2.43 A cochraceus 32.3 0.79 3.27 A niculans A flavus 32.3 0.79 3.27 A niculans A flavus 32.3 0.70 3.27 A niculans A cochraceus 31.1 0.51 2.20 A niculans A cochraceus 31.1 0.51 2.20 A niculans A cochraceus 32.2 0.52 A niculans A cochraceus 32.2 0.55 A nicu	4.75	8.50	0.33	2.49	99.8	102.3	47.1	Sterigmatocystin	ǰ
stical analysis P. aurantiogiseum 37.1 0.72 4.50 stical analysis P. griseofulvum 38.7 0.56 2.50 stical analysis Mean 36.2 0.57 3.91 SE 1.05 0.08 1.14 SE 1.05 0.03 0.46 E-value 0.01 0.00 0.01 Control 32.0 0.42 2.04 A nidulans 37.2 0.63 2.44 A nidulans 37.2 0.63 2.51 A chiaceus 34.8 0.46 2.91 A chiaceus 32.6 0.60 3.98 A terrers 32.6 0.60 3.98 P aurantiogriseum 37.5 0.51 2.85 SD 1.86 0.07 0.52 2.85 SD 1.86 0.76 0.03 0.25 Control 2.06 0.07 0.02 0.25 A terrers 32.3 0.79 2.29 <td>3.21</td> <td>9.35</td> <td>0.33</td> <td>2.03</td> <td>95.1</td> <td>166.1</td> <td>1.74</td> <td>Ochratoxin A</td> <td>+3</td>	3.21	9.35	0.33	2.03	95.1	166.1	1.74	Ochratoxin A	+3
stical analysis Represeduluum 35.0 0.54 5.75 stical analysis Mean 36.2 0.57 3.91 SD 2.59 0.08 1.14 SD 1.05 0.03 0.46 t-value 0.01 0.00 0.01 Control 32.0 0.42 2.04 A. nichlans 37.2 0.63 2.44 A. nichlans 37.2 0.63 2.51 A. cortraceus 34.8 0.46 2.91 A. cortraceus 34.8 0.46 2.91 A. terreus 32.6 0.60 3.98 P. aurantiogriseum 37.5 0.51 3.00 P. aurantiogriseum 37.5 0.51 3.00 SD 1.86 0.07 0.62 2.85 SD 1.86 0.76 0.02 2.29 E-value 0.009 0.02 0.02 2.29 A. niculalans 32.3 0.79 3.21 <tr< td=""><td>4.58 3.12</td><td>3.54</td><td>0.33</td><td>0.70</td><td>1150</td><td>141.0</td><td>46.2</td><td>Patulin/terreic acid</td><td></td></tr<>	4.58 3.12	3.54	0.33	0.70	1150	141.0	46.2	Patulin/terreic acid	
stical analysis Mean 36.7 5.0 6.0 6.0 6.0 6.0 6.0 6.0 6.0 6.0 6.0 6.0 6.0 6.0 6.0 6.0 6.0 6.0 6.0 6.0 7.0 6.0 7.0 6.0 7.0 6.0 7.0 6.0 7.0 6.0 7.0	3.12 2.50	10.50	0.34	2.30	93.7	13.4.3	44.1		Ē
SD 259 0.08 1.14 SE 105 0.08 0.14 F-value 0.01 0.008 0.01 Control 32.0 0.42 2.04 A nidulans 37.2 0.63 2.44 A nidulans 34.2 0.50 2.51 A terreus 34.8 0.46 2.91 A terreus 37.5 0.50 2.91 P griscofulvum 37.5 0.51 3.00 P griscofulvum 37.5 0.51 3.00 SD 1.86 0.07 0.62 SD 1.86 0.07 0.62 SD 1.86 0.07 0.62 SD 1.86 0.07 0.62 F-value 0.009 0.02 0.02 Control 30.0 0.42 1.80 A figural 32.7 0.59 2.29 A terreus 31.1 0.51 2.43 A terreus 32.5	3.91	8,36	0.33	.30	97.3	143.0	45.7	p<0.05 = Significant	
SE 105 0.03 0.46 t-value 001 0.008 0.01 Control 37.2 0.63 2.44 A. Nalues 37.2 0.63 2.44 A. niculans 34.2 0.50 2.51 A. certraceus 34.8 0.46 2.91 A. terreus 32.6 0.60 3.98 P. aurantiogriseum 37.5 0.51 3.00 P. griscofulvum 37.8 0.44 2.27 SD Nean 0.76 0.03 0.62 SD 0.76 0.07 0.62 0.02 SE 0.76 0.03 0.25 1.80 Control 0.76 0.03 0.25 1.80 A. niculans 32.3 0.79 3.21 A. niculans 32.3 0.79 2.29 A. niculans 32.3 0.59 2.29 A. niculans 32.5 0.60 3.15 P. aurantiogriseum	1.14	3.45	0.02	0.38	10.0	4.80	1.29		
Evalue 0.01 0.008 0.01 Control 3.20 0.42 2.04 A. flavus 3.72 0.63 2.44 A. nichlans 34.2 0.50 2.51 A. crhaecus 34.8 0.46 2.91 A. terreus 37.5 0.51 3.08 P. aurantiogriseum 37.5 0.51 3.08 P. aurantiogriseum 37.5 0.51 3.00 P. griscofukum 37.5 0.51 2.27 Stical analysis Mean 37.5 0.74 2.27 Stical analysis Mean 0.76 0.03 0.25 A. hadrus 32.3 0.79 0.25 2.29 A. nichulans 32.3 0.79 2.29 A. terreus 32.7 0.59 2.29 A. terreus 32.5 0.60 3.15 A. terreus 32.5 0.60 3.15 A. aurantiogriseum 35.5 0.52 2.04 P.	0.46	1.41	0.01	0.15	4.08	9.01	0.52		
Control 32.0 0.42 2.04 A flavus 37.2 0.63 2.44 A nidulars 34.2 0.63 2.41 A cothaceus 34.8 0.46 2.91 A cerneus 32.6 0.60 3.98 P aurantiogriseum 37.5 0.51 3.00 P aurantiogriseum 37.5 0.51 3.00 P ginseofulvum 34.8 0.44 2.27 SD 1.86 0.07 0.62 SD 1.86 0.07 0.62 SD 1.86 0.07 0.62 SE 0.76 0.03 0.25 Livalue 0.009 0.02 0.02 Control 30.0 0.42 1.80 A fightans 32.3 0.79 3.21 A cothaceus 31.1 0.51 2.43 A cothaceus 32.3 0.60 3.15 A cothaceus 32.3 0.60 3.15 A cothaceu	0.01	0.002	0.01	0.003	0.00	0.01	0.00		
A flavus 37.2 0.63 244 A nidulans 34.2 0.50 251 A chiracus 34.8 0.46 291 A cerrens 32.6 0.60 3.98 P. aurantiogriseum 37.5 0.51 3.00 P. ginseofulvum 34.8 0.44 2.27 SD 1.86 0.07 0.62 SD 1.86 0.07 0.62 SD 0.76 0.03 0.25 E-value 0.009 0.02 0.02 Control 30.0 0.42 1.80 A nidulans 32.3 0.79 3.21 A chraceus 31.1 0.51 2.43 A terrens 32.3 0.60 3.15 P aurantiogriseum 35.5 0.59 2.76 P griseofulvum 35.5 0.52 2.03 Resolution 33.2 0.52 2.03 Resolution 33.2 0.52 2.05 P	2.04	20.00	0.25	3.12	52.9	192.5	33.1		
A nidulans 34,2 0.50 2.51 A corhaceus 34,8 0.46 2.91 A terreus 32,6 0.60 3.98 A terreus 37,5 0.51 3.00 B griseofulvum 37,5 0.51 3.00 Control 0,009 0.02 0.02 Control 30,0 0.02 0.02 A flavus 32,3 0.79 3.21 A nidulans 32,3 0.59 2.29 A terreus 31,1 0.51 2.43 A terreus 31,1 0.51 2.76 B automatical analysis Mean 33,2 0.58 2.64	2.44	9.23	0.28	2.49	100.1	181.3	36.8	AFB ₁ /B ₂	+2/+T
At terreus 34,6 0.40 3.98 P. aurantiogriseum 37.5 0.51 3.08 P. griseofulvum 37.5 0.51 3.00 S.D. 186 0.07 0.62 Control 0.009 0.02 0.02 Control 30,0 0.02 0.02 A. flevue 32,3 0.79 3.21 A. niculens 32,3 0.79 3.21 A. niculens 32,3 0.59 2.29 A. terreus 31.1 0.51 2.43 A. griseofulvum 35.5 0.58 2.64 P. griseofulvum 35.5 0.58 2.64	2.51	13.30	0.28	7.60	105.4	147.2	42.5	Sterigmatocystin	₹ -
Rational street 37.5 0.50 0.20 0.60 0.00	3.98	3.00	0.28	750	97.3	156.6	45.5	Datulin/terreic acid	+IN
P. griseofulvum 34.8 0.44 2.27 Stical analysis Mean 35.1 0.52 2.85 SD 1.86 0.07 0.62 2.85 SD 1.86 0.07 0.62 0.62 Evalue 0.09 0.02 0.02 0.02 Control 30.0 0.42 1.80 3.21 A nidulans 32.3 0.79 3.21 4.3 A cothaceus 32.7 0.59 2.29 A terreus 32.1 0.51 2.43 A terreus 32.5 0.60 3.15 P aurantiogriseum 35.5 0.60 2.76 P griseofulvum 35.5 0.52 2.03 stical analysis Mean 2.64 2.64	3.00	15.00	0.29	2.50	95.0	152.5	43.5	Penitrem B	Z
stical analysis Mean 35.1 0.52 2.85 SD 1.86 0.07 0.62 SE 0.76 0.03 0.25 t-value 0.09 0.02 0.02 Control 30.0 0.42 1.80 A nidulans 32.3 0.79 3.21 A cothaceus 32.7 0.59 2.29 A terreus 33.1 0.51 2.43 A terreus 32.5 0.60 3.15 P aurantiogriseum 35.5 0.60 3.76 P griseofulvum 35.5 0.52 2.03 stical analysis Mean 3.2 0.58 2.64	2.27	10.00	0.26	2.59	94.7	169.0	40.6	CPA	Ē
SD 1.86 0.07 0.62 SE 0.76 0.03 0.25 F-value 0.009 0.02 0.02 Control 30.0 0.42 1.80 A. flavus 32.3 0.79 3.21 A. ochraceus 32.7 0.59 2.29 A ochraceus 31.1 0.51 2.43 A. terreus 32.2 0.60 3.15 P. aurantiogriseum 35.5 0.52 2.03 stical analysis Mean 33.2 0.58 2.64	2.85	10.20	0.27	2.42	102.0	162.4	41.2	p<0.05 = Significant	
SE 0.76 0.03 0.25 F-value 0.099 0.02 0.02 Control 300 0.02 0.02 A flavus 32.3 0.79 3.21 A nidulans 32.7 0.59 2.29 A chraceus 31.1 0.51 2.43 A terreus 32.2 0.60 3.15 R aurantiogriseum 35.5 0.60 2.76 P griseofulvum 35.5 0.52 2.03 stical analysis Mean 33.2 0.58 2.64	0.62	4.14	0.01	0.27	9.62	12.6	2.54		
Control 300 0.02 0.02 A flavus 32.3 0.79 3.21 A nidulans 32.7 0.59 2.29 A ochraceus 31.1 0.51 2.43 A terreus 32.2 0.60 3.15 P aurantiogriseum 35.5 0.52 2.03 stical analysis Mean 33.2 0.58 2.64	0.25	1.69	0.005	0.11	3.93	5.14	1.03		
A flavus 323 0.79 3.10 A nidulans 32.3 0.79 3.21 A ochraceus 31.1 0.51 2.43 A terreus 32.2 0.60 3.15 P aurantiogriseum 35.5 0.48 2.76 P griseofulvum 35.5 0.52 2.03 stical analysis Mean 33.2 0.58 2.64	1.80	2000	0.004	3.75	52.0	200.0	100.0		,
A. nidulans 32.7 0.59 2.29 A. ochraceus 31.1 0.51 2.43 A. terreus 32.2 0.60 3.15 P. aurantiogriseum 35.5 0.68 2.76 P. griseofulvum 35.5 0.52 2.03 Mean 33.2 0.58 2.64	3.21	14.40	0.24	2.81	58.5	174.3	31.6	AFB,/B,	+2/+T
A. ochraceus 31.1 0.51 2.43 A. terreus 32.2 0.60 3.15 P. aurantiogriseum 35.5 0.48 2.76 P. griseofulvum 35.5 0.52 2.03 Mean 33.2 0.58 2.64	2.29	10.70	0.25	2.49	9.68	153.4	32.4	Sterigmatocystin	Ē
A terreus 32.2 0.60 3.15 P. aurantiogriseum 35.5 0.48 2.76 1 P. griseofulvum 35.5 0.52 2.03 1 Mean 33.2 0.58 2.64 1	2.43	9.56	0.25	1.25	74.4	146.6	32.2	Ochratoxin A	-
P. aurantiogriseum 35.5 0.48 2.76 1 P. griseofulvum 35.5 0.52 2.03 1 Mean 33.2 0.58 2.64 1	3.15	3.33	0.29	2.25	96.3	167.4	33.9	Patulin/Terreic acid	Nil/11
P. gnseotulvum 35.5 0.52 2.03 1 Mean 33.2 0.58 2.64 1	2.76	16.00	0.29	3.12	85.0	182.5	40.2	Penitrem B	₹ :
Medii 55.2 0.30 2.04	2.03	13.00	0.25	2.50	94.8 5.7	194.4	34.3	CPA CPA Considerant	
SD 184 0.11 0.47	2.64	4.50	07.0	0.40	83.I 14.4	17.8	34.1	p<0.05 = Significant	
0.75	0.19	1.83	00:0	0.26	5.88	7.30	1.29		
alue 0.008 0.01 0.007	0.007	0.005	0.01	0.004	0.003	00:00	0.05		

Table 2: Continue												
	y		1	Free amino	Reducing	Free fatty	Total	Ash	Crude	9)
water activity (a _w)	name of the fungus	Proteins (mg g ⁻¹)	(mg g ⁻¹)	acids (mg g ⁻¹)	sugars (mg g ⁻¹)	acids (mg KOH/100 g)	(mg g ⁻¹)	Content (mg g ⁻¹)	mg g ⁻¹)	Loss or weight (%)	Mycotoxin	Amount or (intensity) $ppb/\mu g mL^{-1} mg g^{-1}$
0.75	Control	30.0	0.36	1.56	29.00	0.20	4.37	50.8	222.5	30.5	,	1
	A. flavus	52.3	0.41	2.18	23.20	0.21	3.12	84.7	202.2	31.9	AFB ₁ /B ₂	+1/+T
	A. nidulans	40.3	0.42	1.71	16.80	0.23	3.49	84.5	200.7	32.4	Sterigmatocystin	ΞZ
	A. ochraceus	32.2	0.43	2.45	12.80	0.20	1.08	84.8	180.7	32.5	Ochratoxin A	<u></u>
	A. terreus	34.2	0.43	2.28	8.92	0.25	2.90	69.1	161.1	32.6	Patulin/terreic acid	Nil/5
	P. aurantiogriseum	33.5	0.42	2.04	17.00	0.28	3.12	75.0	187.5	40.1	Penitrem B	Ī
	P. griseofulvum	42.3	0.43	2.34	20.10	0.20	3.26	84.7	128.3	32.3	CPA	Ē
Statistical analysis	Mean	39.1	0.42	2.16	16.40	0.22	2.82	80.4	176.7	33.6	p<0.05 = Significant	±
	SD	7.60	0.008	0.26	5.08	0.03	0.87	6.78	28.0	3.17		
	SE	3.10	0.003	0.10	2.07	0.01	0.35	2.76	10.4	1.29		
	t-value	0.03	0.00	0.002	0.002	0.008	0.008	0.00	0.01	900'0		
SD: Standard deviation	SD: Standard deviation, SE: Standard error, Statistical inference: (i) Mean, sta	nference: (i) Mean	, standard dev.	iation and stano	lard error of di	fferent bio-det€	erioration of ric	re fodder, whic	h revels that is	fairly uniform res	sponse, (ii) t-values are s	ndard deviation and standard error of different bio-deterioration of rice fodder, which revels that is fairly uniform response, (ii) t-values are significant at 0.05 level of

even at a_w 0.75 and contributed for maximum deterioration of rice fodder and aflatoxin and ochratoxin A elaboration, which may be attributed to their xerophilic nature. Spadaro *et al.*²⁷ have also reported significant effect of water activity on ochratoxin A production by *A. carbonarius*. Hence, they felt that these factors should be taken into account for developing management practice for future research programs.

When protein content of rice fodder changed only fodder showed a significant increased which increased with increase in a_w activity. The increase in protein of rice fodder may be either due to infested fungal protein or it may be attributed to increased protein synthesis in metabolism. Ghorai *et al.*²⁸ also recorded increased in protein which was attributed to additive effect of fungal and fodder protein. On the other hand, Chattha *et al.*²⁹ recorded decrease in protein content of mould infested food grains.

Increase in phenols in fungal infested tissue was considered to be one of the defensive acts of host tissue. In the present investigations marginal increase was recorded in mould infestation fodder which may be due to the dead tissue of rice straw. Reducing sugars of rice straw infested by fungi decreased which may be due to their assimilation by infesting mycotoxigenic fungi. An inverse correlation was observed between water activity and free fatty acid content of rice fodder infested by fungi understudy. However, degree of changes in FAA of rice fodder varied both with the infesting fungus and water activity (a_w) of rice fodder. Increased FFA is reported to be indicative of substrate degradation. Differences in regulation of mycotoxin production may be attributed to variable conditions of the substratum in which the fungus occurs²³.

Marginal decrease in total nitrogen was recorded in *A. flavus* infested fodder at a_w 0.7 but the decrease was very significant at a_w above 0.92. Interestingly in *A. ochraceus* infested fodder total nitrogen was least at all a_w tried. However, no definite trend could be observed nitrogen content of fodder infested by different fungi. Total nitrogen content changes were minimum in *A. terreus* infested fodder at all a_w tried. Increase of ash content was maximum in *A. terreus* and *P. aurantiogriseum* infested fodder, while it was minimum in *A. terreus* and *P. griseofulvum* infested fodder.

From the present investigations it is clear that water activity has profound impact on the activity of infesting fungus resulting in increased deterioration of rice fodder and mycotoxin elaboration. Therefore, protecting the fodder from mould infestation is of paramount importance. However,

more detailed investigations are needed for keeping fodder free from mycotoxigenic fungi and mycotoxin contamination. Deeper studies involving individual factors and interaction of different factors are of paramount importance. Further, individual storage fungi may respond differently to various environmental conditions on the effect of different environmental factors on growth and mycotoxin production by fungi will increase our knowledge of the ecology of mycotoxin moulds. Such deeper studies with wide variety of fungi and complex environment may help to understand ecology mycotoxigenic fungi and help to formulate methods to protect foods and feeds from mycotoxins contamination and prevent various mycotoxigenic health hazards of farm animals.

CONCLUSION

Management of mycotoxins can be accomplished by maintaining most adverse environmental conditions for the growth of mycotoxigenic moulds and promoting the activity of antagonistic moulds. As temperature, water activity and pH are reported to influence mycotoxin producing mould growth and mycotoxin elaboration care should be taken to avoid storage of feeds under these favourable conditions.

SIGNIFICANCE STATEMENT

The present study uncovered the intrinsic role of water activity (a_w) on mycotoxin elaboration which can be beneficial to contain the growth of mycotoxigenic fungi and mycotoxin elaboration. Further, the study facilitate the researchers to uncover the critical areas of study that may researchers were not able to explain. Thus, activity mycotoxigenic fungi may be contained by creating unfavorable conditions such as low water activity (a_w) less than 0.7.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Thanks are due to the Head, Department of Botany, Kakatiya University for providing laboratory facilities and S. Kiran and M. Surekha are grateful to UGC, New Delhi for Financial Assistance (File No. 36-131/2008 (SR), 26 March-2009). We also thank Dr. J. Srinivas, Department of Statistics, Kakatiya University for the statistical analysis.

REFERENCES

1. Magan, N., G.R. Cayley and J. Lacey, 1984. Effect of water activity and temperature on mycotoxin production by *Alternaria alternata* in culture and on wheat grain. Applied Environ. Microbiol., 47: 1113-1117.

- Kumar, V., M.S. Basu and T.P. Rajendran, 2008. Mycotoxin research and mycoflora in some commercially important agricultural commodities. Crop Protect., 27: 891-905.
- 3. Palumbo, J.D., T.L. O'Keeffe and H.K. Abbas, 2008. Microbial interactions with mycotoxigenic fungi and mycotoxins. Toxin Rev., 27: 261-285.
- 4. Akbar, A. and N. Magan, 2014. The impact of water and temperature interactions on lag phase, growth and potential ochratoxin A production by two new species, *Aspergillus aculeatinus* and *A. sclerotiicarbonarius*, on a green coffee-based medium. Int. J. Food Microbiol., 188: 116-121.
- 5. Magan, N., A. Medina and D. Aldred, 2011. Possible climate-change effects on mycotoxin contamination of food crops pre- and postharvest. Plant Pathol., 60: 150-163.
- 6. Marin, S., E. Companys, V. Sanchis, A.J. Ramos and N. Magan, 1998. Effect of water activity and temperature on competing abilities of common maize fungi. Mycol. Res., 102: 959-964.
- 7. Loncin, M., J.J. Bimbenet and J. Lenges, 1968. Influence of the activity of water on the spoilage of foodstuffs. Int. J. Food Sci. Technol., 3: 131-142.
- 8. Kiran, S., M. Surekha and S.M. Reddy, 2015. Succession of mycotoxigenic fungi and biochemical changes in paddy stored in different storage structures. J. Mycol. Plant Pathol., 45: 251-256.
- 9. Ward, D.G. and F.B. Johnston, 1962. Chemical methods of plant analysis. Publication No. 1064, Research Branch, Canada Department of Agriculture, Ottawa, Canada.
- 10. Surekha, M., K. Saini, V.K. Reddy, A.R. Reddy and S.M. Reddy, 2011. Fungal succession in stored rice (*Oryza sativa* Linn.) fodder and mycotoxin production. Afr. J. Biotechnol., 10: 550-555.
- Stack, M.E. and A.E. Pohland, 1975. Collaborative study of a method for chemical confirmation of the identity of aflatoxin.
 J. Assoc. Official Anal. Chem., 58: 110-113.
- Gimeno, A., 1976. Thin layer chromatographic determination of aflatoxins, ochratoxins, sterigmatocystin, zearalenone, citrinin, T-2 toxin, diacetoxyscirpenol, penicillic acid, patulin and penitrem A. J. Assoc. Official Anal. Chem., 62: 579-585.
- 13. Subramanian, T., K.M. Namasivayam and E.R.B. Shanmugasundaram, 1978. Colorimetric determination of terreic acid produced by *Aspergillus terreus*. J. Assoc. Official Anal. Chem., 61: 581-583.
- 14. Subramanian, T., 1982. Colorimetric determination of patulin produced by *Penicillium patulum*. J. Assoc. Official Anal. Chem., 65: 5-7.
- 15. Adye, J. and R.I. Mateles, 1964. Incorporation of labelled compounds into aflatoxins. Biochim. Biophys. Acta (BBA)-Gen. Subj., 86: 418-420.
- 16. Rathinavelu, A. and E.R.B. Shanmugasundaram, 1984. Simple colorimetric estimation of cyclopiazonic acid in contaminated food and feeds. J. Assoc. Official Anal. Chem., 67: 38-40.

- Lahouar, A., S. Marin, A. Crespo-Semper, S. Sai and V. Sanchis, 2016. Effects of temperature, water activity and incubation time on fungal growth and aflatoxin B₁ production by toxinogenic *Aspergillus flavus* isolates on sorghum seeds. Rev. Argent. Microbiol., 48: 78-85.
- Esteban, A., M.L. Abarca, M.R. Bragulat and F.J. Cabanes, 2006.
 Study of the effect of water activity and temperature on ochratoxin A production by *Aspergillus carbonarius*. Food Microbiol., 23: 634-640.
- 19. Ghali, R., K. Hmaissia-Khlifa, H. Ghorbel, K. Maaroufi and A. Hedili, 2008. Incidence of aflatoxins, ochratoxin a and zearalenone in tunisian foods. Food Control J., 19: 921-924.
- Belli, N., S. Marin, I. Coronas, V. Sanchis and A.J. Ramos, 2007.
 Skin damage, high temperature and relative humidity as detrimental factors for *Aspergillus carbonarius* infection and ochratoxin a production in grapes. Food Control, 18: 1343-1349.
- 21. Kapetanakou, A.E., E.Z. Panagou, M. Gialitaki, E.H. Drosinos and P.N. Skandamis, 2009. Evaluating the combined effect of water activity, pH and temperature on ochratoxin A production by *Aspergillus ochraceus* and *Aspergillus carbonarius* on culture medium and Corinth raisins. Food Control, 20: 725-732.
- 22. Mitchell, D., R. Parra, D. Aldred and N. Magan, 2004. Water and temperature relations of growth and ochratoxin A production by *Aspergillus carbonarius* strains from grapes in Europe and Israel. J. Applied Microbiol., 97: 439-445.
- 23. Schmidt-Heydt, M., C.E. Rufer, A. Abdel-Hadi, N. Magan and R. Geisen, 2010. The production of aflatoxin B₁ or G₁ by *Aspergillus parasiticus* at various combinations of temperature and water activity is related to the ratio of *aflS* to *afR* expression. Mycotoxin Res., 26: 241-246.

- 24. Mousa, W., F.M. Ghazali, S. Jinap, H.M. Ghazali and S. Radu, 2013. Modeling growth rate and assessing aflatoxins production by *Aspergillus flavus* as a function of water activity and temperature on polished and brown rice. J. Food Sci., 78: M56-M63.
- Magan, N. and D. Aldred, 2007. Why Do Fungi Produce Mycotoxins? In: Food Mycology: A Multifaceted Approach to Fungi and Food, Dijksterhuis, J. and R.A. Samson (Eds.). 1st Edn., Taylor & Francis, Boca Raton, FL., USA., ISBN-13: 9780849398186, pp: 121-133.
- Marin, S., V. Sanchis, R. Saenz, A.J. Ramos, I. Vinas and N. Magan, 1998. Ecological determinants for germination and growth of some *Aspergillus* and *Penicillium* spp. from maize grain. J. Applied Microbiol., 84: 25-36.
- Spadaro, D., S. Patharajan, A. Lore, M.L. Gullino and A. Garibaldi, 2010. Effect of pH, water activity and temperature on the growth and accumulation of ochratoxin A produced by three strains of *Aspergillus carbonarius* isolated from Italian vineyards. Phytopathol. Mediterr., 49: 65-73.
- 28. Ghorai, S., S.P. Banik, D. Verma, S. Chowdhury, S. Mukherjee and S. Khowala, 2009. Fungal biotechnology in food and feed processing. Food Res. Int., 42: 577-587.
- 29. Chattha, S.H., C.M. Hasfalina, T.S. Lee, B.N. Mirani and M.R. Mahadi, 2015. A study on the quality of wheat grain stored in straw-clay bin. J. Biodivers. Environ. Sci., 6: 428-437.