Monitoring the freshness of fish: development of a qPCR method applied to MAP chilled whiting

Running title : qPCR method targeting *torA* applied to monitoring the freshness of fish

Alexandre Dehaut ^a, Frédéric Krzewinski ^b, Thierry Grard ^c, Marlène Chollet ^d, Philippe Jacques ^d,
Anne Brisabois ^a & Guillaume Duflos ^{a,*}

^a ANSES, Laboratoire de Sécurité des Aliments - Département des Produits de la Pêche et de l'Aquaculture, Boulevard du Bassin Napoléon, 62200 Boulogne-sur-Mer, France

^b Université de Lille 1, Unité de Glycobiologie Structurale et Fonctionnelle - UGSF - Bâtiment C9, 59650 Villeneuve d'Ascq, France

^c Université du Littoral Côte d'Opale - ANSES, Équipe Biochimie des Produits Aquatiques, Boulevard du Bassin Napoléon, 62200 Boulogne-sur-mer, France

^d Laboratoire Régional de Recherche en Agroalimentaire et Biotechnologie - Institut Charles Viollette, Equipe ProBioGEM, Université de Lille1, Sciences et Technologies, Polytech'Lille, Avenue Paul Langevin, 59655 Villeneuve d'Ascq, France

*Corresponding author: E-mail: guillaume.duflos[at]anses.fr - Phone: +33 321 992 500 - Fax: +33 321 991 725

Published in Journal of the Science of Food and Agriculture and available online at <https://doi.org/10.1002/jsfa.7322>

ABBREVIATIONS

bp: Base pair, Cq: Cycle quantification, HyC: Hybridisation coefficient, IAC: Internal amplification control, MAP: Modified atmosphere packed, SSO: Specific spoilage organisms, TMA: Trimethylamine, TMAO: Trimethylamine N-oxide, TSA-YE: Tryptone soya agar - yeast extract, TVB-N: Total volatile basic nitrogen, TVC: Total viable count.

ABSTRACT

BACKGROUND: Monitoring of early stages of freshness decay is a major issue for the fishery industry to guarantee the best quality for this highly perishable food matrix. Numerous techniques have been developed, but most of them have the disadvantage of being reliable only either in the last stages of fish freshness or for the analysis of whole fish. This study describes the development of a qPCR method targeting the *torA* gene harboured by fish spoilage microorganisms. *torA* encodes an enzyme that leads to the production of trimethylamine responsible for the characteristic spoiled-fish odour.

RESULTS: A degenerate primer pair was designed. It amplified *torA* gene of both *Vibrio* and *Photobacterium* with good efficiencies on 7-log DNA dilutions. The primer pair was used during a shelf-life monitoring study achieved on modified atmosphere packed, chilled, whiting (*Merlangius merlangus*) fillets. The qPCR approach allows detecting an increase of *torA* copies throughout the storage of fillets in correlation with the evolution of both total volatile basic nitrogen (-0.86) and trimethylamine concentrations (-0.81), known as spoilage markers.

CONCLUSION: This study described a very promising, sensitive, reliable, time-effective, technique in the field of freshness characterisation of processed fish.

Keywords: *torA*, qPCR, modified atmosphere packed fish, freshness assessment.

INTRODUCTION

The fishing industry is a sector in constant evolution which in Europe has been committed to quality assurance processes for nearly twenty years,^{1,2} in response to the expectations of both consumers and the professionals in this sector. Quality assurance in the food and feed industry is a concept that includes many factors such as food safety, freshness, nutritional composition, and organoleptic properties; these can be affected by numerous parameters along the supply chain, such as catching conditions, handling, processing and storage.³ The major issue is thus to develop tools to improve quality control through traceability, good production practices and laboratory analysis.

The fish freshness state could be defined as the early phase of shelf-life. In fishery products, there is a particularly close relationship between freshness and quality. Indeed, numerous studies using quality indicators established that the global quality of fish decreases with the increase of shelf-life,⁴⁻⁶ while a development of spoilage and/or pathogenic flora is recorded.⁷ Fish spoilage is the result of the variation of physical, biochemical and microbial parameters in fish muscle. Spoilage flora is one of the major causes of quality decay in fish products, responsible for the alteration of organoleptic properties^{7,8} and the production of hazardous molecules such as biogenic amines.⁹

Generally, fish quality can be assessed using a wide range of techniques such as sensory, chemical or microbiological analyses.¹⁰⁻¹³

For a long time, fish quality was assessed in the fish industry through sensory analysis by well-trained in-house panel, with the evaluation of many parameters characterizing skin, eyes, gills or texture thanks to methods as Torry scheme, EU scheme or more recently QIM.^{1,10} Unfortunately, much skills were lost with the arrival of new staff, very few of whom were experienced in fish quality assessment.¹⁴ Despite this problem, sensory analysis remains one of the most suitable methods of assessing fish freshness; although it suffers from drawbacks such as panel subjectivity and training costs or the impact of environmental factors.¹⁰

Chemical analysis can be routinely used to assess the freshness of fish, using total volatile basic nitrogen analysis (TVB-N). This technique is particularly suitable for species belonging to the *Pleuronectidae*, *Merlucciidae* and *Gadidae* families and redfish (*Sebastes* spp.), but it is more a rejection tool than a monitoring method. Indeed, TVB-N analysis is usually described as unsuitable during the first 10 days of chilled storage.¹⁵ Rejection values have been fixed for three different groups of species. For the group comprising *Merlucciidae*, *Gadidae* and Atlantic salmon (*Salmo salar*) the maximum TVB-N value accepted has been set to 35 mg of nitrogen/100 g.¹⁶ The major drawback concerning TVB-N analysis is that there is a large range of fish, commonly classified as oily fish such as *Scombridae*, *Clupeidae* or sea bass (*Dicentrarchus labrax*),¹⁷ for which it cannot be used for assessing freshness nor can it be used for numerous kinds of processed fish.

The microbiology of fish is well documented^{7, 18, 19} and the microbial ecology of the entire flora observed on fish has been described.^{20, 21} In addition, two concepts have been defined: spoilage flora, describing all species able to spoil a food matrix, and specific spoilage organisms (SSOs). SSOs are a restricted range of the spoilage flora, active depending on the conservation process, such as *Shewanella putrefaciens* on chilled marine fish and *Photobacterium phosphoreum* on CO₂ and modified atmosphere packed (MAP) chilled fish.¹⁸ A selective and sensitive conductance method exists allowing quantification of *Photobacterium* between 15 and 55 hours,²² but as numerous microbiological methods, the major drawback of such technique is that they are highly time-consuming. Despite this knowledge, to date no microbial techniques are routinely used to assess fish freshness. Nonetheless, one of the metabolites synthesised by SSOs, trimethylamine (TMA), contributes to the characteristic odour of spoiled fish and can be considered as a fingerprint of the presence of SSOs. Most TMA production is the result of trimethylamine N-oxide (TMAO) reductase (EC 1.6.6.9) activity²³ encoded by the *torA* gene part of *tor* operon.²⁴ This gene is documented in the literature^{25, 26} with numerous sequences available in databases such as GenBank and EMBL thanks to whole genome sequencing of various *Vibrio* strains.

Thus the aim of this study was to explore a new field of investigation for fish freshness assessment that had only been slightly explored so far.^{27,28} Based on a previous study,²⁷ a new qPCR method was developed targeting the *torA* gene, a marker of specific spoilage flora. This study first aimed to design new primers with a reduced number of degenerate nucleotides using a new design strategy. Particular care was paid to decreasing the amplicon size, providing more insight into the specificity and efficiency of the developed primer pair and amplifying the *torA* gene in SSOs other than *S. putrefaciens*. The developed technique was applied, along with other routine freshness estimation methods, to a shelf-life study on MAP whiting (*Merlangius merlangus*) fillets. Whiting was chosen as it was the fourth most consumed species in France in 2012 and because MAP fish is increasingly popular among fish consumers.

MATERIAL AND METHODS

Bacterial strains and culture conditions

Numerous strains were used to carry out the development of this qPCR method. Five strains from the genera *Shewanella*, *Photobacterium* and *Vibrio*, preferentially originating from sea water or sea products, were used for the optimisation of the quantitative PCR (Table 1). Additional strains were used for a specificity study, consisting of *Vibrio* strains from the Centre de Ressources Biologiques de l'Institut Pasteur (Paris, France) and strains from the American Type Culture Collection (ATCC) (Manassas, VA, United States) (Table 1). Finally, ten strains from the laboratory's own collection were also added to this specificity study (Table 1). Four of these strains were previously isolated from a spoiled whiting (*M. merlangus*) and identified as *Shewanella baltica* thanks to 16S rRNA and *gyrB* gene sequencing;²⁹ the remaining six were previously isolated from different fish industry environments and were identified by 16S rRNA gene sequencing.

All strains were grown in aerobic conditions. All *Vibrio* strains were grown on tryptone soya agar - yeast extract (TSA-YE) plates using CM0131 base from Oxoid (Dardilly, France) complemented with NaCl 1.5% (w/v) at 30 °C for 24 h. All *Photobacterium* and *Shewanella* strains were grown

under the same conditions but the incubation temperature was lowered to 25 °C. The six strains from the fish industry were incubated on TSA-YE plates at 30 °C for 24 h. Strains purchased at ATCC were grown on TSA-YE plates at 37 °C for 24 h, except *E. coli* which was grown at 44 °C for 24 h and *S. enterica* grown on nutritive agar from Biorad (Marnes-la-Coquette, France).

DNA extraction from pure culture

Firstly, a control of the homogeneity of CFU on plates, for instance shape, texture and colour, and Gram colorations were performed as basic controls of purity. Then, a loop of biomass was harvested on plates and subjected to DNA extraction with the DNeasy Blood & Tissue Kit from Qiagen (Courtaboeuf, France). The manufacturer's instructions were then followed except for the final step; RNase from Promega (Charbonnières-les-Bains, France) was added after the lysis step at 56 °C. As advised by a previous study,³⁰ the final elution with AE buffer was split into two elutions of 50 µL to increase the DNA concentration of the eluate. Finally, DNA concentration was measured with a DS-11 Spectrophotometer from Denovix (Wilmington, NC, USA). DNA purity of the samples was checked regarding the A_{260}/A_{280} and A_{260}/A_{230} ratio. DNA samples were conserved at +4 °C for a maximum of one week. On the day of analysis, all sample concentrations were set to a maximum concentration of 15 µg mL⁻¹, as required by Roche Diagnostic (Meylan, France), the manufacturer of the qPCR master mix, and 10-fold DNA dilutions were achieved on 8-log scale, down to 0.15 pg mL⁻¹.

Design of degenerate oligonucleotides

Design of degenerate oligonucleotides involved six steps (Figure S1). First, data concerning coding sequences of the *torA* gene from the genera *Shewanella*, *Photobacterium* and *Vibrio* were retrieved from GenBank and EMBL using SeqinR package with R 3.0.0 (Algorithm S1).³¹ Redundancy in the recovered sequences was checked using the non-redundant databases (NRDB) program³² to ensure that there was no duplicate sequence in the dataset. This first step lead to the selection of 58 *torA* coding sequences comprising 9 sequences of *Shewanella*, 9 of *Photobacterium* and 40 of *Vibrio* (Table S1). Alignment of *torA* sequences shown heterogeneity

among species. This fact and the willingness of developing a qPCR able to amplify the maximum number of *torA* sequences from different species lead to decide to design degenerate primers and use them in SYBR green qPCR, although it offers potentially less specificity than the use of probes. Two sets of suggested degenerate primers, forward and reverse, were obtained for each bacterial genus thanks to software developed by ProBioGEM laboratory (Lille, France). Briefly, as described in a previous publication,³³ after alignment, this software calculates the hybridisation coefficient (HyC). HyC value depends directly from the number of degenerate nucleotides and the number of possible combinations. It is reflecting the hybridisation ability of the primer: the lower the value, the greater the probability of specific annealing will be. For this purpose, primers size and the lower and upper limits of the Hyc were set as follows: 20 bp primers with HyC between 1 and 32 to avoid non-specific hybridisations. The sets of primers were then screened with an algorithm developed specifically (Algorithm S2) in R 3.0.0 following the usual prerequisites for the design of oligonucleotides.³⁴ Retained primers were then tested against initial sequences with AmplifX v.1.6.2³⁵ and results were collected in an *ad hoc* database allowing an improved and reliable dynamic comparison of primer pairs and theoretical PCR products. The first letter of primer identifiers corresponds to the first letter of genus, e.g. S for *Shewanella*, and the second letter, F or R, corresponds to the type of primer: forward or reverse. Primers selected after consulting the database were then analysed using the Oligoanalyzer 3.1 program³⁶ to check their propensity to form secondary structures. The limit of primer dimer tolerance concerning binding energy was fixed as follows: down to -3 kcal/mol for hairpin, -5 kcal/mol in the 3' region, and -6 kcal/mol in the internal region of the primer for self and cross-dimer. In regard to the risk of cross-dimer formation, two approaches were used regarding both intra-species cross-dimer (e.g. SF against SR) and inter-species cross-dimer (e.g. SF with PF, PR, VF and VR). Finally, primers were compared with *M. merlangus* (taxid: 8058) sequences in BLAST. Once design and screening were completed, desalted primers were synthesised by Sigma-Aldrich (Saint-Quentin Fallavier, France).

Amplification conditions

Amplifications were performed in a final volume of 20 μ L using a LightCycler 480 system II from Roche Diagnostics (Meylan, France). 5 μ L of template DNA was amplified with pairs of primers. The LightCycler® 480 SYBR Green I Master kit from Roche Diagnostics (Meylan, France) was used with final concentration of primers of 0.5 μ M and 1 μ M. DNA samples, primers and master mix were dispensed into 96-well white microplates from Roche Diagnostics (Meylan, France). The initial denaturing step was carried out at 95 °C for 10 min. The amplification cycle was 95 °C for 30 s, annealing for 30 s and elongation at 72 °C for 30 s. The cycle was repeated 45 times. Annealing temperatures of 62 °C and 64 °C were tested to avoid non-specific hybridisation, which can easily occur with degenerate primers. Finally, a melting curve was plotted from 60 °C to 95 °C with a slope of 0.11 °C.s⁻¹.

Post qPCR controls

At the end of qPCR, each PCR product, mixed with the appropriate volume of 6X gel loading dye from New England Biolabs (Evry, France), were ran in a 1.2% agarose - Tris EDTA Buffer provided by Eurobio (Les Ulis, France), together with a New England Biolabs 100 bp DNA ladder. Forward and reverse sequencing were performed by Genoscreen (Lille, France) either directly on the PCR product or on band extracts from the gel by Wizard SV Gel and PCR Clean-Up System from Promega (Charbonnières-les-Bains, France), depending on the quality of electrophoresis pattern. Consensus of forward and reverse sequences were obtained using the CAP3 algorithm.^{37, 38}

Preparation of modified atmosphere packed fillets

Twenty-one whole gutted whiting were bought at a local fish wholesaler in Boulogne-sur-Mer (France), acquired from the morning auction to guarantee a better freshness grade. Initial good qualities of fish were estimated by looking at various parameters such as skin, eyes and gills. Fish were caught during spring, in the north-east Atlantic and packed with ice into insulated polystyrene boxes; unfortunately no precise date of catch was given by the retailer. Fish were processed at the *PFI-Nouvelles Vagues* innovation platform (Boulogne-sur-Mer, France). The two

fillets of each fish were skinned and placed in a unique container equipped with a piece of blotting paper. The 21 containers were then each placed in a T200 tray-sealer from Multivac (Lagny-sur-Marne, France) for modified atmosphere packing. The modified atmosphere was achieved by creating a vacuum down to 10 kPa, and injecting Aligal 15 gas, CO₂ (50%) and N₂ (50%), to a pressure of 90 kPa. Finally, the containers were thermally sealed with a plastic film. Containers were then placed in a Binder climatic chamber (Tuttlingen, Germany) at 1 ± 1 °C throughout the shelf-life study. The day the fillets were prepared was considered as D01 of the study.

Fish shelf-life assessment

The qPCR method was applied for the assessment of modified atmosphere packed, whiting fillets throughout shelf-life. Three containers, each containing the fillets of a single fish, were retrieved from the climatic chamber on days D01, D03, D06, D08, D10, D13 and D15. qPCR analysis was performed on each container as described below and, simultaneously, total viable count (TVC), total volatile basic nitrogen (TVB-N) and trimethylamine (TMA) assays were carried out, serving as a reference for monitoring the overall microbial load and freshness grade of the fillets. TVC, TVB-N and TMA measurement methods were performed as previously reported.^{27, 39} Briefly, TVB-N and TMA analysis were performed by acid titration on a deproteinized, steam distilled extract. TVC was achieved on plate count agar according to the ISO 7218 standard.

Fillet preparation for analyses

The process described below was the same for each container. The container was opened under sterile conditions and the two fillets were cut into approximately 1 cm edge cubes that were mixed to obtain a representative matrix of the overall state of fish flesh. 25 g of mixed flesh cubes were reserved for microbiological and molecular analysis and 100 g for TVB-N/TMA assays. Concerning molecular analysis, a 10-fold diluted sample was used, consisting of 25 g of flesh cubes stomached in 225 mL of buffered peptone water solution. Two mL of the filtrate were distributed in cryotubes and conserved in liquid nitrogen until DNA extraction, performed for all samples five days after the 15th day of shelf-life. Before DNA extraction, 1.5 mL of the filtrate was

centrifuged at 5000 g for 10 min. The supernatant was then eliminated and extraction was performed on the pellet as described above. PCR amplification was carried out as previously described with primer concentrations of 1 μ M and an annealing temperature of 62 °C.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Degenerate primer design and selection *in silico*

The first step of primer design, involving the calculation of HyC leads to lists of potential forward and reverse primers for each bacterial genus. Thus, 1667 forward and reverse primers were suggested from the alignment of *torA* sequences of *Vibrio*, the majority having HyC values lower than 16. Concerning *Shewanella*, the software revealed 546 forward and reverse primers with also a majority of HyC values under 16. Regarding the alignment of *Photobacterium torA* gene sequences, 395 forward and reverse primers were found for HyC values ranging from 2 to 32. The subsequent screening using R software, used to ensure that primers met the usual conditions for primer design, considerably reduced the lists of potential primers, with a percentage of primer suppression between 88.2% and 95.7%, depending on the lists.

Using AmplifX software, more than 13,600 potential amplicons (from 100 to 700 bp) were suggested for the 58 *torA* gene coding sequences used for primer design, using the reduced list of primers created with the screening step described above. By setting up a database it was possible to consign all the potential amplicons and to facilitate the selection process. A first list of primers suitable for the study of secondary structure formation risk was established (Table 2), based on their ability to theoretically give PCR products in a majority of the 58 *torA* gene coding sequences.

None of the primers displayed presented a risk of hairpin formation; however six primers showed a self-dimer formation risk (Table 2). At this stage, the six most promising pairs were preserved for further investigation (Table 2). None of these primers led to proven homology with *M. merlangus* sequences in BLAST (data not shown). Regarding the risk of formation of intra-species cross-dimer, only SF34 x SR288 is able to produce a dimer (Table 2). Concerning inter-species

cross-dimer, seven primers risk forming secondary structures (Table 2), that is why the multiplex approach was reconsidered and the following studies were focused on a genus-specific primer pair selection.

***In vitro* characterisation of primer pairs**

In a first step, each primer of the six promising pairs was screened for their ability to auto-amplify under qPCR conditions, using the melting curve as a marker of dimer formation (data not shown). This step led to the exclusion of PF23xPR167, SF34xSR288 and VF351xVR572, as a clear peak appeared in the melting curves of PR167, SR288 and VR572 (Table 2). The three last pairs were used to amplify bacterial DNA, although it was noted that PR168 and SF240 should not be used at a final concentration above 0.5 μ M as secondary structures were observed at 1 μ M. Among these pairs, PF23xPR168 displayed the expected PCR product at 200 bp for *P. phosphoreum* and *P. damsela*; unfortunately, more than ten different and non-specific bands were observed for *Shewanella* and *Vibrio* species. Similarly, SF140xSR36 gave poor results for each species with numerous and non-specific bands and absence of PCR product at the expected size of 450 bp. More interestingly, at 1 μ M VF239xVR353 gave a single band at the expected size of 420 bp for *Vibrio* and *Photobacterium* genera (Table 1), and a single band was also observed for *S. putrefaciens* but of a smaller size. After this first characterisation, VF239xVR353 was the only pair selected for optimisation of the conditions for amplification, sensitivity and efficiency testing.

Primer pair efficiency, qPCR condition adjustments and sensitivity

The efficiency and the sensitivity of the VF239xVR353 pair was assessed by amplifying 10-fold dilutions of DNA extracts of *P. phosphoreum*, *P. damsela*, *V. vulnificus* and *V. alginolyticus*. Results obtained with two primer concentrations and two different annealing temperatures are given in Table 3. Among all the above-mentioned conditions, the R^2 values were higher than 0.99 from 75 ng to 75 pg of template DNA. Special care was paid to target DNA quality and only fresh DNA extracts were used for qPCR analysis; indeed after several freezing/thawing cycles of DNA samples, a Cq drift was observed for the more highly-diluted samples (data not shown). The

conditions giving the best amplification efficiency were 62 °C for annealing temperature with primer concentrations of 1 µM. The mean efficiency values were respectively 92.6%, 91.6%, 92.6% and 93.0% for *P. phosphoreum*, *P. damsela*, *V. vulnificus* and *V. alginolyticus*. Thus, despite a size longer than the average PCR products described in the literature, the use of this primer pair allowed to produce an amplicon with acceptable efficiencies with regard to the different tested species. Finally, the estimated limit of detection of the primer pair for all the strains is around 75 pg of template DNA, as it was the last quantity of DNA where clear differences of Cq were observed with the decrease of DNA quantity (Figure S2).

Primer pairs selectivity

Results of the selectivity test are shown in Table 1. The selectivity approach confirmed that VF239xVR353 is able to give a unique *torA* PCR product for a wide range of *Vibrio* species. Only two species out of the eleven tested gave more than one PCR product but this is not a concern for this study as they were never described in fishery products. Concerning *Vibrio* species, Cq values ranging from 10.98 ± 0.02 for *V. mimicus* to 13.98 ± 0.01 for *V. fluvialis* were recorded for 75 ng template DNA. For the rest of the tested species, recorded Cq values were higher than 30, except for *E. coli* and *P. agglomerans*. Concerning *S. putrefaciens* and *S. baltica*, no single PCR product pattern was observed. *S. putrefaciens* showed no band in the neighbourhood of 400 bp, whereas *S. baltica* despite three different patterns among the four strains always displayed a band of approximately 400 bp identified as part of the *torA* gene. For the remaining strains, only *B. subtilis*, *S. enterica*, *C. divergens* and *C. gilleni* displayed a band in the neighbourhood of 400 bp. Except for *S. enterica*, these PCR products displayed good identities with *torA* sequences of *V. vulnificus* and *S. baltica*, suggesting that these species might harbour closely-related *torA* genes. *E. coli* and *P. agglomerans* displayed wide bands at sizes different from 400 bp, with respective Cq values of 29.68 ± 0.15 and 17.84 ± 0.22 . Finally, *S. aureus*, *S. epidermidis* and *C. maltaromaticum* showed no distinct band on the gel electrophoresis.

Application to fish shelf-life assessment

After optimisation steps with pure DNA samples, qPCR method was applied, with other freshness estimation methods, in the course of a shelf-life study on MAP chilled whiting fillets. Throughout the study, TMA and TVB-N measurements constantly increased with a slow phase from D01 to D06 and a more consequent increase from D06 to D15 (Figure 1). In addition, it was noted that these variables are highly correlated ($r=0.99$; $p\text{-value} < 0.001$). Regarding TVB-N analysis, the first fillet unsuitable for human consumption was analysed at D10. In the following days the number of fish judged unfit for consumption, increased with two out of three on D13 and all the fillets on D15. These results suggest that the limit of consumption of MAP chilled whiting fillets should be in the neighbourhood of D10. TVB-N showed a slight increase throughout shelf-life compared to fish conserved on melting ice. Conflicting opinions can be found on the use of TVB-N assay for shelf-life monitoring of MAP fish. Some authors indicated that MAP had no effect on TVB-N and TMA values, as for whiting and salmon at diverse MAP conditions including one close to those studied in this work (60% N_2 / 40% CO_2).⁴⁰ For others, MAP do have effect, lowering the TVB-N and TMA values, but it was described on a different species of fat fish.⁴¹ Currently, no QIM scheme has been developed for the evaluation of the studied matrix, so TVB-N and TMA were, for this study, the most suitable methods for recording the deterioration of fillet freshness. Nonetheless, sensory analyses will need to be developed for future studies, to better estimate the limit of consumption. The TVC study led to inconclusive results (Table 4). Indeed, the average evolution tended to increase between D01 and D06, when the maximum counts were recorded, and decreased until D15, when the lowest counts of the shelf-life study were obtained. The above-mentioned results are markedly different from those described in a previous work on whiting conserved on melting ice.²⁷ The differences observed could be explained by the development of non-cultivable bacteria with the ISO 7218 standard growth conditions, in MAP chilled whiting. As a consequence, the ISO 7218 standard appears not to be suitable for the quantification of microorganisms in MAP chilled whiting.

Regarding the qPCR approach, application of the VF239xVR353 pair to fish samples gave encouraging results (Figure 2) with a clear decrease of C_q values from 31.2 at D01 to 20.2 at D10.

For D13 and D15 some lower Cq values were recorded, but these showed heterogeneity among the three fish fillets analysed. Additionally, an abnormally low value was recorded at D06 that remains unexplained as no atypical value was recorded in the TVB-N / TMA assays; this data was discarded for the following results. Based on average values, a good linearity of the signal was observed from D01 to D08 ($R^2=0.99$). Moreover, an encouraging correlation was calculated ($r = -0.86$; $p\text{-value} < 0.001$) from D01 to D13 between the freshness grade indicator (TVB-N) and Cq values. This correlation even improved in the early phase of storage between D01 and D06 ($r = -0.96$; $p\text{-value} < 0.001$). Concerning TMA concentrations, coming from the metabolism of the *torA* gene-harbouring microorganisms, similar observations were made with respective correlation coefficients of -0.81 ($p\text{-value} < 0.001$) and -0.92 ($p\text{-value} < 0.001$). The heterogeneity of Cq values observed each day was not clearly explained in this experiment, although heterogeneous initial quality of the whiting could be hypothesised, as this study was carried out on wild fish. A tendency for signal stabilisation was observed from D10 which could mark the stationary phase of spoilage flora growth, explaining the increase of TMA while no significant evolution of Cq values was observed. The marked decrease of Cq value is consistent with the previous work;²⁷ it could also be used as an indirect indicator of freshness, although the type of conservation and the targeted flora were different. Application of this qPCR technique needs to be tested on larger sampling size to strengthen conclusions from this study and better characterize the variability among fish. In the meantime, other storage conditions and other fish species should be analysed to assess the portability of the method.

PCR products were inspected on gel electrophoresis (Figure 3), which highlighted a band of strong intensity at the expected size, located in the neighbourhood of 400 bp for all days of shelf-life assessment. It should be mentioned that at D01, an additional slight band was observed for fish 1.

In some cases, sequencing gave double sequences with a clear principal sequence signal and another low secondary signal. Systematic visual inspection of the chromatograms was performed

to avoid secondary signal problems. From D01 to D03, sequencing led to only 76% to 89% similarity with the *P. phosphoreum* DSM 2167 *torA* gene partial sequence. Sequencing results showed that PCR products obtained from spoiling whiting from D06 to D15 shared between 89% and 91% identity with the *P. phosphoreum* DSM 2167 *torA* gene partial sequence amplified by VF239xVR353. All the PCR products displayed nucleotide sequences very close to each other, with identity percentage ranging from 97% to 100%. The above-mentioned results led to the hypothesis that a unique *P. phosphoreum* population outgrew the microbial flora and led to an increase in quantities of *torA* gene between D06 and D15, confirming previous observations on the specific spoilage organisms in MAP fish.^{21,42} Thus, double sequences recorded mostly in the early phase of shelf-life could be explained by more than a single microbial species harbouring the *torA* gene. Another work quantified *P. phosphoreum*, thanks to TaqMan qPCR, during the storage of farmed turbot (*Scophthalmus maximus*).⁴³ Contrary to the results presented in our work, *P. phosphoreum* was not detected in turbot. However a lot of parameters could explain this fact, as Roth *et al.* studied the fish skin, with fish of a different species, which dwell in different habitats and were stored in different conditions. Additionally, contrary to what is commonly admitted in qPCR spoilage studies,⁴⁴ *luxA*, unlike *torA*, is not a gene directly “related to the spoilage effect”, as it encodes a luciferase.

The qPCR method developed is easily applicable in routine food control, allowing confident analysis of almost 30 samples within a working day, confirmation on gel not included. That time can be decreased with the use of automation devices for DNA quantification or automated PCR preparation. This technique offers an objective analysis tool to assess freshness which is an advantage over sensory analysis. The qPCR approach allows to potentially analysing a higher number of samples than with reference chemical analyses. Finally, compared with usual microbial techniques used in food control, the results are obtained more rapidly.

Nonetheless, further developments will be needed to improve the level of reliability of the observed results. Concerning qPCR new chemistry as SYTO dyes or EvaGreen, better than

SYBR,^{45, 46} could be tested in a way to assess their impact on efficiencies and reproducibility. New amplification protocols should be tested using, for example, touchdown qPCR which has previously been shown to improve specificity.⁴⁷ Moreover, as there is very little degeneration in the primers, substitution by regular primers should be tested to assess the impact of degenerate primers on specificity. In addition, a new primer pair should be designed for targeting *torA* gene of *Shewanella* species in order to develop a multiplex approach quantifying all types of fish SSOs. The results presented in Figure 2 are absolute Cq values and a way to normalise data should be developed for future monitoring studies, so as to reduce variability generated by all manipulation steps. Special care should also be taken in the evaluation of any matrix effect by confirming good efficiencies and quantitative aspect of the DNA isolation procedure by testing on spiked paucimicrobial fillets. Any matrix effect could also be evaluated by implementation of controls, such as samples process control or negative sample process control to improve the reliability analyses of results.⁴⁸ In light of the above-mentioned Cq values, the number of amplification cycles could confidently be reduced to 30, thereby reducing the analysis time. As a consequence, the use of an internal amplification control (IAC) and its integration into the qPCR mix should be considered. Indeed, IAC has proven to be a good tool to go further in the interpretation of negative results and for distinguishing true negative results from false negative results caused by PCR inhibition.⁴⁹ Finally, it would be interesting to confirm the results with addition of ethidium monoazide (EMA) or propidium monoazide (PMA) in a way to solely detect live bacteria.

CONCLUSIONS

Care taken during the primer elaboration step and *in silico* control, together with the use of various software application, ensured that the design process was reliable. A single pair of primers with a low number of degenerate nucleotides was selected. This pair was used to amplify a 420 bp region of the *torA* gene for both *Vibrio* and *Photobacterium*. Applied here for monitoring the shelf-life of fish, the results suggest that this method would be a great benefit in the field of food control and fish freshness assessment. This work is the second using the qPCR approach targeting *torA* gene

to assess fish freshness, and conclusions are consistent. Concerning Cq values, a decrease was recorded together with the increase in shelf-life and is correlated with both TVB-N and TMA evolution. A highly probable outgrowth of *P. phosphoreum*, a specific spoilage organism was observed from D06. New controls will be necessary to improve the reliability of the results obtained, before being routinely applied for food control.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The authors would like to thank Sabine Debuiche, Sylvie Degremont, Charlotte Himber and Virginie Raguenet for their kind technical assistance throughout shelf-life assessment, Bruno Le Fur and Mathieu Volz from the *PFI-Nouvelles Vagues* innovation platform and Marie-Laure Quilici (CNRVC) for providing the *Vibrio parahaemolyticus* strain. Alexandre Dehaut is grateful to the Nord-Pas de Calais Regional Council (France) and ANSES for providing financial support for his PhD studies.

REFERENCES

1. The Commission of the European Communities, Council Regulation (EC) N° 2406/96 laying down common marketing standards for certain fishery products. *Official Journal of the European Union* **L334** (1996).
2. The Commission of the European Communities, Commission Regulation (EC) n°790/2005 of 25 May 2005 amending Council Regulation (EC) No 2406/96 laying down common marketing standards for certain fishery products. *Official Journal of the European Union* **L132** (2005).
3. Luten JB, Introduction to and outcome of the Concerted Action 'Fish Quality Labelling and Monitoring', in *Quality of Fish from Catch to Consumer - Labelling, Monitoring and Traceability*, Ed by Luten JB, Oehlenschläger J and Olafsdottir G. Wageningen Academic Publisher, Wageningen, Nederland, pp 33-42 (2003).
4. Cardenas Bonilla A, Sveinsdottir K and Martinsdottir E, Development of Quality Index Method (QIM) scheme for fresh cod (*Gadus morhua*) fillets and application in shelf life study. *Food Control* **18**:352-358 (2007).
5. Triqui R and Bouchriti N, Freshness Assessments of Moroccan Sardine (*Sardina pilchardus*) : Comparison of Overall Sensory Changes to Instrumentally Determined Volatiles. *J Agric Food Chem* **51**:7540-7546 (2003).
6. Duflos G, Leduc F, N'Guessan A, Krzewinski F, Kol O and Malle P, Freshness characterisation of whiting (*Merlangius merlangus*) using an SPME/GC/MS method and a statistical multivariate approach. *J Sci Food Agric* **90**:2568-2575 (2010).
7. Gram L and Huss HH, Microbiological spoilage of fish and fish products. *International Journal of Food Microbiology* **33**:121-137 (1996).

- 444 8. Olafsdottir G, Jonsdottir R, Lauzon HL, Luten J and Kristbergsson K, Characterization of
445 Volatile Compounds in Chilled Cod (*Gadus morhua*) Fillets by Gas Chromatography and
446 Detection of Quality Indicators by an Electronic Nose. *J Agric Food Chem* **53**:10140-10147
447 (2005).
- 448 9. Visciano P, Schirone M, Tofalo R and Suzzi G, Biogenic Amines in Raw and Processed
449 Seafood. *Frontiers in microbiology* **3** (2012).
- 450 10. Hyldig G, Martinsdóttir E, Sveinsdóttir K, Schelvis R and Bremner A, Quality index
451 Methods, in *Handbook of Seafood and Seafood Products Analysis*, ed. by Nollet LML and Toldrá
452 F. CRC Press, pp 463-480 (2010).
- 453 11. Malle P and Tao S, Rapid quantitative determination of trimethylamine using steam
454 distillation. *J Food Prot* **50**:756-760 (1987).
- 455 12. Leduc F, Tournayre P, Kondjoyan N, Mercier F, Malle P, Kol O, Berdagué JL and Duflos
456 G, Evolution of volatile odorous compounds during the storage of European seabass
457 (*Dicentrarchus labrax*). *Food Chem* **131**:1304-1311 (2012).
- 458 13. Koutsoumanis K, Giannakourou M, Taoukis P and Nychas G, Application of shelf life
459 decision system (SLDS) to marine cultured fish quality. *International Journal of Food*
460 *Microbiology* **73**:375-382 (2002).
- 461 14. Olafsdottir G, Nesvadba P, Di Natale C, Careche M, Oehlenschläger J, Tryggvadóttir SV,
462 Schubring R, Kroeger M, Heia K, Esaiassen M, Macagnano A and Jørgensen BM, Multisensor for
463 fish quality determination. *Trends in Food Science & Technology* **15**:86-93 (2004).
- 464 15. Huss HH, Quality and quality changes in fresh fish. *FAO fisheries technical paper* (1995).
- 465 16. The Commission of the European Communities, Council Regulation (EC) No 2074/2005
466 of 5 December 2005 laying down implementing measures for certain products under Regulation
467 (EC) No 853/2004. *Official Journal of the European Union* **L338**:36 (2005).
- 468 17. Castro P, Padrón JCP, Cansino MJC, Velázquez ES and Larriva RMD, Total volatile base
469 nitrogen and its use to assess freshness in European sea bass stored in ice. *Food Control* **17**:245-
470 248 (2006).
- 471 18. Gram L and Dalgaard P, Fish spoilage bacteria - problems and solutions. *Curr Opin*
472 *Biotechnol* **13**:262-266 (2002).
- 473 19. Dalgaard P, Modelling of microbial activity and prediction of shelf life for packed fresh
474 fish. *International Journal of Food Microbiology* **26**:305-317 (1995).
- 475 20. Austin B, The bacterial microflora of fish. *ScientificWorldJournal* **2**:558-572 (2002).
- 476 21. Chaillou S, Chaulot-Talmon A, Caekebeke H, Cardinal M, Christieans S, Denis C, Helene
477 Desmonts M, Doussset X, Feurer C, Hamon E, Joffraud J-J, La Carbona S, Leroi F, Leroy S, Lorre
478 S, Mace S, Pilet M-F, Prevost H, Rivollier M, Roux D, Talon R, Zagorec M and Champomier-
479 Verges M-C, Origin and ecological selection of core and food-specific bacterial communities
480 associated with meat and seafood spoilage. *ISME J* **9**:1105-1118 (2015).
- 481 22. Dalgaard P, Mejlholm O and Huss HH, Conductance method for quantitative
482 determination of *Photobacterium phosphoreum* in fish products. *Journal of Applied Microbiology*
483 **81**:57-64 (1996).
- 484 23. Czjzek M, Dos Santos J-P, Pommier J, Giordano G, Méjean V and Haser R, Crystal
485 structure of oxidized trimethylamine-oxide reductase from *Shewanella massilia* at 2.5 Å resolution.
486 *J Mol Biol* **284**:435-447 (1998).
- 487 24. Méjean V, Iobbi-Nivol C, Lepelletier M, Giordano G, Chippaux M and Pascal M-C,
488 TMAO anaerobic respiration in *Escherichia coli*: involvement of the tor operon. *Mol Microbiol*
489 **11**:1169-1179 (1994).

25. Dos Santos J-P, Iobbi-Nivol C, Couillault C, Giordano G and Méjean V, Molecular analysis of the trimethylamine N-oxide (TMAO) reductase respiratory system from a *Shewanella* species. *J Mol Biol* **284**:421-433 (1998).
26. Dunn AK and Stabb EV, Genetic analysis of trimethylamine N-oxide reductases in the light organ symbiont *Vibrio fischeri* ES114. *J Bacteriol* **190**:5814-5823 (2008).
27. Duflos G, Theraulaz L, Giordano G, Mejean V and Malle P, Quantitative PCR Method for Evaluating Freshness of Whiting (*Merlangius merlangus*) and Plaice (*Pleuronectes platessa*). *J Food Prot* **73**:1344-1347 (2010).
28. Giordano G, Dos Santos J-P and Mejean V, Nucleotide sequences derived from genes coding for trimethylamine n-oxide reductase, uses thereof in particular for detecting bacteria. Institut National de la Propriété Industrielle. France Patent (2001).
29. Dehaut A, Midelet-Bourdin G, Brisabois A and Duflos G, Phenotypic and genotypic characterization of H₂S-positive and H₂S-negative strains of *Shewanella baltica* isolated from spoiled whiting (*Merlangius merlangus*). *Lett Appl Microbiol* **59**:542-548 (2014).
30. Robert-Pillot A, Copin S, Gay M, Malle P and Quilici ML, Total and pathogenic *Vibrio parahaemolyticus* in shrimp: Fast and reliable quantification by real-time PCR. *International Journal of Food Microbiology* **143**:190-197 (2010).
31. Charif D and Lobry JR, SeqinR 1.0-2: a contributed package to the R project for statistical computing devoted to biological sequences retrieval and analysis, in *Structural approaches to sequence evolution*. Springer, pp 207-232 (2007).
32. Gish W, *Non-redundant databases (NRDB)* (<http://pubmlst.org/analysis/>, accessed May, 2013).
33. Tapi A, Chollet-Imbert M, Scherens B and Jacques P, New approach for the detection of non-ribosomal peptide synthetase genes in *Bacillus* strains by polymerase chain reaction. *Appl Microbiol Biotechnol* **85**:1521-1531 (2010).
34. Rodriguez-Lazaro D and Hernandez M, Real-time PCR in Food Science: Introduction, in *Real-time PCR in Food Science Current Technology and Application*. Caister Academic Press, pp 3-19 (2013).
35. Jullien N, Amplifx 1.6.2 by Nicolas Jullien (<http://crn2m.univ-mrs.fr/pub/amplifx-dist>, accessed May, 2013). (2013).
36. Anonymous, Oligoanalyzer 3.1 by Integrated DNA Technologies, Inc (<http://eu.idtdna.com/analyzer/Applications/OligoAnalyzer/>, accessed September, 2013). (2008).
37. Perrière G, CAP3 Sequence Assembly Program. (<http://doua.prabi.fr/software/cap3>, accessed April, 2014). (1996).
38. Huang X and Madan A, CAP3: A DNA sequence assembly program. *Genome research* **9**:868-877 (1999).
39. Leduc F, Krzewinski F, Le Fur B, N'Guessan A, Malle P, Kol O and Duflos G, Differentiation of fresh and frozen/thawed fish, European sea bass (*Dicentrarchus labrax*), gilthead seabream (*Sparus aurata*), cod (*Gadus morhua*) and salmon (*Salmo salar*), using volatile compounds by SPME/GC/MS. *J Sci Food Agric* **92**:2560-2568 (2012).
40. Fagan J, Gormley TR and Uí Mhuirheartaigh M, Effect of modified atmosphere packaging with freeze-chilling on some quality parameters of raw whiting, mackerel and salmon portions. *Innovative Food Science & Emerging Technologies* **5**:205-214 (2004).
41. Özogul F, Polat A and Özogul Y, The effects of modified atmosphere packaging and vacuum packaging on chemical, sensory and microbiological changes of sardines (*Sardina pilchardus*). *Food Chem* **85**:49-57 (2004).

42. Dalgaard P, Qualitative and quantitative characterization of spoilage bacteria from packed fish. *International Journal of Food Microbiology* **26**:319-333 (1995).
43. Roth B, Kramer L, Skuland AV, Løvdaal T, Øines S, Foss A and Imsland AK, The Shelf Life of Farmed Turbot (*Scophthalmus maximus*). *J Food Sci* **79**:1568-1574 (2014).
44. Martínez N, Martín MC, Herrero A, Fernández M, Alvarez MA and Ladero V, qPCR as a powerful tool for microbial food spoilage quantification: Significance for food quality. *Trends in Food Science & Technology* **22**:367-376 (2011).
45. Monis PT, Giglio S and Saint CP, Comparison of SYTO9 and SYBR Green I for real-time polymerase chain reaction and investigation of the effect of dye concentration on amplification and DNA melting curve analysis. *Anal Biochem* **340**:24-34 (2005).
46. Eischeid AC, SYTO dyes and EvaGreen outperform SYBR Green in real-time PCR. *BMC research notes* **4**:263 (2011).
47. Wunderlichová L, Buňková L, Koutný M, Valenta T and Buňka F, Novel touchdown-PCR method for the detection of putrescine producing Gram-negative bacteria in food products. *Food microbiology* **34**:268-276 (2013).
48. Rodríguez-Lázaro D, Lombard B, Smith H, Rzezutka A, D'Agostino M, Helmuth R, Schroeter A, Malorny B, Miko A and Guerra B, Trends in analytical methodology in food safety and quality: monitoring microorganisms and genetically modified organisms. *Trends in Food Science & Technology* **18**:306-319 (2007).
49. Cook N, de Ridder GA, D'Agostino M and Taylor MB, Internal Amplification Controls in Real-time Polymerase Chain Reaction-based Methods for Pathogen Detection, in *Real-time PCR in Food Science Current Technology and Application*. Caister Academic Press, pp 35-42 (2013).

Figure 1: Evolution of TVB-N and TMA concentrations, expressed in nitrogen g per kg of flesh, throughout the shelf-life of fish. Values represent the mean of duplicate measurements assessed on three fish samples and error bars illustrating 95% confidence intervals (2 standard errors).
127x127mm (600 x 600 DPI)

Figure 2: Evolution of Cq values obtained after qPCR amplification of fish fillet DNA extracts, with VR239 x VR353 primer pairs throughout the shelf-life study. Values represent the mean of quadruplicate measurements assessed for a DNA extract from each fillet, and error bars illustrating 95% confidence intervals (2 standard errors). The grey dashed line corresponds to the regression line obtained with the average values from D01 to D08, the atypical value at D06 being discarded.

127x127mm (600 x 600 DPI)

Figure 3: Gel electrophoresis performed with PCR products amplified from DNA extracts from fillets. M tagged tracks correspond to molecular size markers. A and B lanes respectively correspond to the non-target control and a positive control consisting of *P.phosphoreum* DNA extract. The daily PCR products are shown for the three fish fillets (F1, F2 and F3). The symbols "+", "-" and "*" respectively correspond to band sizes of 1000 bp, 500 bp and 400 bp.

69x24mm (300 x 300 DPI)

Table 1: Bacterial strains used for this study. The use and the result of specificity test by qPCR with VF239 x VR 353 are given for all the strains (Cq, gel electrophoresis patterns and sequencing).

Strains	Sources of isolation	Supplier ^a	Use ^b	Mean Cq ^c	Band at the expected size ^d	Aspecific bands	Sequencing results ^e
<i>V. cholerae</i> CIP 106974	Human	CRBIP	S	10.98 ± 0.02	Yes	No	100 % identity with <i>V. cholerae</i> IEC224 <i>torA</i> gene
<i>V. parahaemolyticus</i> CNRVC 010089	Fishery products	CNRVC	S	11.77 ± 0.03	Yes	No	99% identity with <i>V. parahaemolyticus</i> VP2007-007 <i>torA</i> gene
<i>V. alginolyticus</i> CIP 109819	Turbot (<i>Scophthalmus maximus</i>)	CRBIP	O, S	11.11 ± 0.00	Yes	No	99% identity with <i>V. alginolyticus</i> 40B <i>torA</i> gene
<i>V. vulnificus</i> CIP 75.4	Blood sample	CRBIP	O, S	11.26 ± 0.12	Yes	No	97% identity with <i>V. vulnificus</i> CMCP6 <i>torA</i> gene
<i>V. mimicus</i> CIP 101888	Human ear	CRBIP	S	10.93 ± 0.01	Yes	No	99% identity with <i>V. mimicus</i> VM573 <i>torA</i> gene
<i>V. fluvialis</i> CIP 103355	Human feces	CRBIP	S	13.98 ± 0.01	Yes	No	96 % identity with <i>V. furnissii</i> NCTC 11218 <i>torA</i> gene
<i>V. metschnikovii</i> CIP 69.14	Diseased fowl	CRBIP	S	34.22 ± 0.05	Yes	Yes	No sequencing
<i>V. harveyi</i> CIP 103192	Dead luminescing amphipod	CRBIP	S	11.94 ± 0.01	Yes	No	99% identity with <i>V. harveyi</i> ATCC BAA-1116 <i>torA</i> gene
<i>V. hollisae</i> CIP 104354	Human feces	CRBIP	S	29.55 ± 0.06	Yes	Yes	No sequencing
<i>V. furnissii</i> CIP 102972	Human feces	CRBIP	S	12.92 ± 0.01	Yes	No	98 % identity with <i>V. furnissii</i> NCTC 11218 <i>torA</i> gene
<i>V. nigrapulchritido</i> CIP 103195	Seawater enriched with chitin	CRBIP	S	11.44 ± 0.01	Yes	No	88 % identity with <i>V. cholerae</i> IEC224 <i>torA</i> gene
<i>P. damsela</i> CIP 100540	Turbot (<i>Scophthalmus maximus</i>)	CRBIP	O, S	13.26 ± 0.11	Yes	No	98 % identity with <i>P. damsela</i> CIP 102761 <i>torA</i> gene
<i>P. phosphoreum</i> DSM 2167	Hake (<i>Merluccius capensis</i>)	DSMZ	O, S	12.20 ± 0.07	Yes	No	99 % identity with <i>P. phosphoreum</i> ANT 220 <i>torA</i> gene
<i>S. putrefaciens</i> DSM 6067	Tainted butter	DSMZ	O, S	36.52 ± 0.11	No	Yes	No sequencing
<i>S. baltica</i> 14LSABSM1SHW	Whiting (<i>Merlangius merlangus</i>)	Anses	S	30.89 ± 0.01	Yes	Yes	90 % identity with <i>S. baltica</i> BA 175 <i>torA</i> gene
<i>S. baltica</i> 14LSABSM2SHW	Whiting (<i>Merlangius merlangus</i>)	Anses	S	33.50 ± 0.24	Yes*	Yes	80 % identity with <i>S. baltica</i> OS 185 <i>torA</i> gene
<i>S. baltica</i> 14LSABSM3SHW	Whiting (<i>Merlangius merlangus</i>)	Anses	S	32.15 ± 0.02	Yes*	Yes	No identification
<i>S. baltica</i> 14LSABSM4SHW	Whiting (<i>Merlangius merlangus</i>)	Anses	S	32.07 ± 0.21	Yes*	Yes	73% identity with <i>V. vulnificus</i> MO6-24 <i>torA</i> gene
<i>B. subtilis</i> ATCC 6633	Not communicated	ATCC	S	34.18 ± 0.53	Yes	No	75% identity with <i>V. vulnificus</i> CMCP6 <i>torA</i> gene
<i>S. aureus</i> ATCC 25923	Clinical isolate	ATCC	S	37.54 ± 0.73	No	No	No sequencing
<i>S. epidermidis</i> ATCC 12228	Not communicated	ATCC	S	36.65 ± 0.93	No	No	No sequencing
<i>E. coli</i> ATCC 25922	Clinical isolate	ATCC	S	29.68 ± 0.15	No	Yes	No sequencing
<i>S. enterica</i> ATCC 13076	Not communicated	ATCC	S	34.91 ± 1.00	Yes	Yes	98 % identity with <i>S. enterica</i> CT18 hypothetical protein
<i>C. maltaromaticum</i>	Fish industry environments	Anses	S	37.83 ± 0.36	No	No	No sequencing
<i>C. divergens</i>	Fish industry environments	Anses	S	34.92 ± 0.25	Yes	No	96 % identity with <i>V. vulnificus</i> CMCP6 <i>torA</i> gene
<i>C. gilleni</i>	Fish industry environments	Anses	S	31.16 ± 0.20	Yes	Yes	93 % identity with <i>S. baltica</i> BA175 <i>torA</i> gene
<i>S. proteamaculans</i>	Fish industry environments	Anses	S	32.82 ± 0.01	No	Yes	No sequencing
<i>P. agglomerans</i>	Fish industry environments	Anses	S	17.84 ± 0.22	No	Yes	No sequencing
<i>P. fluorescens</i>	Fish industry environments	Anses	S	34.01 ± 0.09	No	Yes	No sequencing

^a Suppliers : CRBIP, Centre de Ressources Biologiques de l'Institut Pasteur (Paris, France); CNRVC, French National Reference Centre for Vibrios and Cholera (Paris, France), DSMZ German Collection of Microorganisms and Cell cultures (Leibniz, Germany); Anses, Laboratory's own collection; ATCC, American Type Culture Collection (Manassas, VA, United States). ^b Use of the strain: S for specificity study and O for PCR optimisation. ^c Mean of Cq values recorded for duplicate measures, for 75 ng of template DNA. ^d Existence of a band close by the expected size of 420 bp, values tagged with an asterisk highlight a weak signal of the band. ^e Percentage of identification achieved thanks to BLAST; "no sequencing" is either marked for strains displaying no band at the expected size, or for band not sequenced because of the presence of another band close by; "no identification" refers to a highly weak band that did not allow to recover enough material after extraction.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49

Table 2: Nucleotide sequences of primers obtained from the first steps of design and sizes of the theoretical PCR products for each pair. Reasons and steps of rejection are communicated when appropriate for each pair.

ID ^a	Forward primers Sequences (5'-3') ^{b,d,e}	HyC ^c	ID	Reverse primers Sequences (5'-3') ^{b,d,e}	HyC	PCR products sizes	Rejection step	Reason
PF23	HCGTAAYGTNGATGAAGGTC *	24	PR167	TCTTGRTGGTGRTGCCAWGG *	8	201 bp	<i>In vitro</i>	<i>In silico</i> self-dimer risk confirmed
			PR168	ATCTTGRTGGTGRTGCCAWG	8	202 bp	<i>In vitro</i>	Aspecific PCR products
SF140	ARGGYAARATCCGCGTGATC *	8	SR36	KGAGTAGTGGTGACCATAGC	2	449 bp	<i>In vitro</i>	Aspecific PCR products
			SR37	TKGAGTAGTGGTGACCATAG	2	450 bp	<i>In silico</i>	Self-dimer risk for the forward primer
SF90	YGACTACTCMACMGGTGCAG	8	SR156	CCACAGGRTCKATRCTGATC	8	251 bp	<i>In silico</i>	Self-dimer risk for the forward primer
SF224	YGGYATYAGCTATGGTCACC	8	SR154	ACAGGRTCKATRCTGATCAC	8	419 bp	<i>In silico</i>	Self-dimer risk for the forward primer
SF34	TYAGCTATGGTCACCACTAC *	2	SR288	YGCCRTASACGTCGATATCG	8	414 bp	<i>In silico</i>	Self-dimer risk for the reverse primer
			VR353	CTCTTGACGYTGGATACACC *	2	249 bp	<i>In vitro</i>	Cross dimer risk, self-dimer risk confirmed
VF239	GCAAGTRGGTTGGAAGTGTG	2	VR349	TGACGYTGGATACACCAACC	2	424 bp	-	Single PCR product
			VR350	TTGACGYTGGATACACCAAC	2	420 bp	<i>In silico</i>	Low number of sequences potentially amplified
			VR419	TCTTGATGGTGGTGCCAWGG	2	421 bp	<i>In silico</i>	Low number of sequences potentially amplified
VF351	TTGGTGTATCCARCGTCAAG *	2	VR572	RTCTTGATGGTGGTGCCAWG *	2	369 bp	<i>In silico</i>	Self-dimer risk for the reverse primer
			VR536	GAATMGTRCGGCTGTAACCG	4	370 bp	<i>In vitro</i>	Self-dimer risk for the reverse primer
VF203	CTGTRGGTATGCAYGGTAAC	4	VR240	TCACAGTTCCAACCYACTTG	4	239 bp	<i>In silico</i>	Self-dimer risk for the reverse primer
					2	202 bp	<i>In silico</i>	Low number of sequences potentially amplified

^a Primers identifiers. ^b Nucleotides sequences with degenerations indicated according to IUPAC nomenclature. ^c HyC values calculated according to the above mentioned reference (Tapi, *et al.*, 2010). ^d Primers tagged with an asterisk possibly involved in interspecies cross-dimer formation if a multiplex approach have been developed. ^e The six most promising pair are shown in bold.

Table 3: Data of standard curves obtained from the four *Vibrio* and *Photobacterium* species. Two temperature values and two primer concentration were tested.

		0,5 μ M		1 μ M	
		62°C	64°C	62°C	64°C
<i>P.phosphoreum</i>	Slope ^a	-3.6794	-3.8335	-3.5118	-3.5387
	Intercept ^a	39.1	41.4	37.3	38.4
	R ² ^a	0.999	0.998	0.998	0.998
	Efficiency ^b	87.0 %	82.3 %	92.6 %	91.7 %
<i>P.damselae</i>	Slope ^a	-3.6152	-3.8125	-3.5422	-3.6314
	Intercept ^a	38.6	40.0	37.8	38.8
	R ² ^a	0.996	0.996	0.998	0.999
	Efficiency ^b	89.1 %	82.9 %	91.6 %	88.5 %
<i>V.vulnificus</i>	Slope ^a	-3.8015	-4.0299	-3.5123	-3.7739
	Intercept ^a	39.2	41.2	37.1	38.5
	R ² ^a	0.999	0.994	0.993	0.999
	Efficiency ^b	83.3 %	77.1 %	92.6 %	84.1 %
<i>V.alginolyticus</i>	Slope ^a	-3.7382	-3.9787	-3.5026	-3.8101
	Intercept ^a	38.1	40.1	36.7	38.5
	R ² ^a	0.999	0.995	0.996	0.999
	Efficiency ^b	85.1 %	78.4 %	93.0 %	83.0 %

^a Values were obtained from four replicates on 7 log DNA dilutions ranging from 75 ng to 75 fg of template DNA in the tube. ^b Efficiency was calculated with the formula given by European Network of GMO testing (European Network of GMO Laboratories, 2008).

Table 4: Evolution of total viable count (CFU log / g) of modified-atmosphere packed whiting fillets, throughout the shelf-life on cold storage.

	Fish 1	Fish 2	Fish 3
Day 1	4.81 ± 0.09	4.87 ± 0.08	5.16 ± 0.07
Day 3	5.08 ± 0.07	5.10 ± 0.08	5.24 ± 0.06
Day 6	5.46 ± 0.05	5.41 ± 0.05	6.13 ± 0.07
Day 8	5.10 ± 0.05	4.81 ± 0.07	5.16 ± 0.04
Day 10	5.10 ± 0.05	5.43 ± 0.03	5.42 ± 0.04
Day 13	4.90 ± 0.06	4.56 ± 0.08	4.98 ± 0.06
Day 15	4.64 ± 0.08	4.56 ± 0.08	4.78 ± 0.07

Values figured above were calculated according to ISO standard 7218:2007 (International Organization for Standardization, 2007). Each mean value is followed by a value illustrating the 95% confidence interval.

Monitoring the freshness of fish: development of a qPCR method applied to MAP chilled whiting

Alexandre Dehaut ^a, Frédéric Krzewinski ^b, Thierry Grard ^c, Marlène Chollet ^d, Philippe Jacques ^d, Anne Brisabois ^a & Guillaume Duflos ^{a,*}

^a ANSES, Laboratoire de Sécurité des Aliments - Département des Produits de la Pêche et de l'Aquaculture, Boulevard du Bassin Napoléon, 62200 Boulogne-sur-Mer, France

^b Université de Lille 1, Unité de Glycobiologie Structurale et Fonctionnelle - UGSF - Bâtiment C9, 59650 Villeneuve d'Ascq, France

^c Université du Littoral Côte d'Opale - ANSES, Équipe Biochimie des Produits Aquatiques, Boulevard du Bassin Napoléon, 62200 Boulogne-sur-mer, France

^d Laboratoire Régional de Recherche en Agroalimentaire et Biotechnologie - Institut Charles Viollette, Equipe ProBioGEM, Université de Lille1, Sciences et Technologies, Polytech'Lille, Avenue Paul Langevin, 59655 Villeneuve d'Ascq, France

*Corresponding author: E-mail: guillaume.duflos[at]anses.fr - Phone: +33 321 992 500 - Fax: +33 321 991 725

Supporting information file

Figure S1: Workflow of degenerate oligonucleotide design and selection	2
Algorithm S1: Sequence retrieval Algorithm	3
Table S1: Accessions corresponding to retrieved sequences	4
Algorithm S2: Primer Screening Algorithm	5
Figure S2: Efficiency curves	9
Figure S3: Melting curves	10

Figure S1: Workflow of degenerate oligonucleotide design and selection

Algorithm S1: Sequence retrieval Algorithm

```
##### A.DEHAUT 2015 #####
#####ENTRIES#####

#Instruction to avoid proxy problems
setInternet2()

#Working directory
setwd('X:/Software/R/Recupseq 2.0')

#Definitions of research parameters
gene<-c("torA")
genus<-c("vibrio","photobacterium","shewanella")
bank<-c("genbank","embl","emblwgs")
type_sequence<-c("cds")
EC_number<-c("1.6.6.9")
#####
#Working packages loading#
library(seqinr)

#Vector length calculation for loops
s_bank<-length(bank)
s_gene<-length(gene)
s_genus<-length(genus)
s_type_sequence<-length(type_sequence)

for (compt_bank in 1 : s_bank)
{
bank[compt_bank]

#Data bank assignation
choosebank(bank[compt_bank])

for (compt_genus in 1:s_genus)
{
for (compt_gene in 1:s_gene)
{

#Request writting
kry<-paste("sp=",genus[compt_genus]," AND ","k=",gene[compt_gene]," AND
","t=",type_sequence,sep = "")

#Creation of research tag
output<-paste(bank[compt_bank], '_',genus[compt_genus],sep = "")

#Request creation (Research tag + Request)
query<-query(output,kry)

#Accession and DNA sequence recovery
names<-getName(query)
sequences<-getSequence(query)
nb_access<-query$nelem

#Generation of an output file
fileout<-paste(output,"_",gene[compt_gene],".fasta",sep="")

# File writing in function of accession number
for (compt_access in 1:nb_access)
{

#File with the file recovered
write.fasta(sequences[compt_access],names[compt_access],nbchar=80,file.out=fileout,
open = "a")
#File with all files
write.fasta(sequences[compt_access],names[compt_access],nbchar=80,file.out="whole.f
asta",open = "a")
}}}}
}}}}
```

Table S1: Accessions corresponding to retrieved sequences

Genera	Accessions
<i>Shewanella</i> :	AP011177 (3680724..3683216); AJ006085 (3702..6191); AE014299 (1282266..1284755); CP000851 (4084665..4087157); CP000931 (4159330..4161828); CP000961 (4303077..4305569); CP000821 (4087725..4090217); CP000606 (3312522..3315008); AJ005974;
<i>Photobacterium</i> :	ADBS01000001 (1639115..1641538); CR378667 (269442..271910); AAOJ01000002 (448268..450736); ADBS01000001 (1581195..1583675); AAOU01000006 (68797..71265); DF093596 (708647..711127); CR378670 (285194..287671); ADBS01000001 (1429059..1431590); HQ599848 (8930..11461)
<i>Vibrio</i> :	AAUR01000023 (26120..28582); AAU01000010 (33373..35835); AAWF01000013 (33795..36257); AAWP01000118 (1588..4050); AAWQ01000016 (1518..3980); ACYU01000186 (29202..31664); ACYV01000012 (23545..26007); ACZB01000065 (18789..21251); ACZC01000014 (137538..140000); AFOQ01000009 (1055834..1058305); AFOR01000015 (232246..234708); AFOT01000135 (13798..16260); AFOU01000213 (5455..7917); AJRP01000052 (82432..84894); AJSQ01000143 (5890..8352); AJSS01000095 (136403..138865); ALDB01000139 (14508..16970); ALEC01000007 (1007755..1010217); ALED01000026 (1010917..1013379); ACFQ01000010 (768360..770822); ACHV01000001 (403446..405908); ACHW01000019 (67138..69600); ACHY01000017 (241868..244330); ACZN01000018 (875029..877491); ACZP01000013 (351551..354013); ACZT01000023 (256441..258903); ACZV01000005 (486522..488984); ADAF01000001 (1109612..1112074); ADAJ01000008 (1073998..1076460); ADAL01000239 (29982..32444); ADBD01000013 (185366..187828); AE016795 (2962329..2964791); ACFM01000025 (10359..12821); CP001805 (2456402..2458864); NC_004459 (2962329..2964791); NC_015633 (1964777..1967239); DSI79715 (29829..32291); CP000627 (1377839..1380301); CP001233 (1771825..1774287); CP002469 (1975417..1977879)

Algorithm S2: Primer Screening Algorithm

```
##### A.DEHAUT 2015 #####

#Working directory assignation#
setwd('X:/Software/R/PrimerAnalysis')

#Package loading#
library(seqinr)

# *.fasta files recovery for the batch treatment#
name<-list.files(pattern = "\\*.fasta$")

#Estimation of the number of file to be treated
l_name<-length(name)

# 'for' loop to apply the algorithm at each file
for (compteur_name in 1 : l_name)
{
#File name recovery (standardized name)#
fichier<-name[compteur_name]

#Sliced file to isolate nucleotide (nb_pb) and file name (name_file)#
name_split<-unlist(strsplit(fichier, "-"))

#nb_pb & name_file recovery#
name_file<-unlist(strsplit(name_split[2], "\\.").)[1]
nb_pb<-as.numeric(name_split[1])

#Species name recovery#
spc_split<-unlist(strsplit(name_file, "_"))
spc<-spc_split[2]

#Forward or reverse?#
sens<-spc_split[3]

#Sequences of the file recovered and expressed as a vector#
sequ<-read.fasta(fichier)

#All sequences of the file recovered and expressed as a character string#
seq_string<-read.fasta(fichier, as.string=TRUE)

#Recovery of the number of sequences
l_sequ<-length(sequ)

#Matrix initialisation#
tag<-matrix(,l_sequ,1)
sequence<-matrix(,l_sequ,1)
place<-matrix(,l_sequ,1)
hyc<-matrix(,l_sequ,1)
gc_content<-matrix(,l_sequ,1)
gc_end<-matrix(,l_sequ,1)
nb_deg<-matrix(,l_sequ,1)
nb_gc<-matrix(,l_sequ,1)
nb_at<-matrix(,l_sequ,1)
head_tail_inter<-matrix(,l_sequ,1)
gc_content_tail<-matrix(,l_sequ,1)
gc_deg_tail<-matrix(,l_sequ,1)
repet_seek<-matrix(,l_sequ,1)

# 'For' loop to treat all the primers contained in the file#
```



```

1   for (compteur in 1 : l_sequ)
2   {
3     #Tag inclusion
4     tag[compteur,]<-paste("Primer_", spc, "_", "_", sens, "_", compteur, sep="")
5
6     #[1] Processed sequence recovery as a character string#
7     sequence[compteur,]<-seq_string[[compteur]][1]
8
9     #Processed sequence recovery as a vector#
10    seq<-sequ[[compteur]][1:nb_pb]
11
12    #[2] Recovery of primer position on the alignement#
13    info_place<-attr(sequ[[compteur]], "Annot")
14    place[compteur,]<-unlist(strsplit(info_place, ":"))[2]
15
16    #[3] Hyc number recovery#
17    info_hyc<-attr(sequ[[compteur]], "name")
18    hyc[compteur,]<-unlist(strsplit(unlist(strsplit(info_hyc, "/"))[1], "="))[2]
19
20    #[4] Determination of G/C number (degenerate nucleotides excluded)#
21    GC<-seq[seq=="g"|seq=="c"]
22    gc<-length(GC)
23    nb_gc[compteur,]<-gc
24
25    #[5] Determination of A/T number (degenerate nucleotides excluded)#
26    AT<-seq[seq=="a"|seq=="t"]
27    at<-length(AT)
28    nb_at[compteur,]<-at
29
30    #[6] Determination of the number of degenerate nucleotides#
31    deg<-nb_pb-(at+gc)
32    nb_deg[compteur,]<-deg
33
34    #[7] Determination of G/C% content estimation (degenerate nucleotides
35    excluded)#
36    pourc_gc<-round(100*(gc/(gc+at)),1)
37    gc_content[compteur,]<-pourc_gc
38
39    #[8] 'if' loop to estimate if the primer sequence is ended by a 'G' or a
40    'C'#
41    if (tail(seq, 1)=="g"|tail(seq, 1)=="c")
42    {
43      gc_end[compteur,]<-c("Yes")
44    }
45    else
46    {
47      gc_end[compteur,]<-c("No")
48    }
49
50    #[9] 'if' loop for estimation of the risk of self-dimerization 5'/3' G/C or
51    C/G#
52    if ((tail(seq, 1)=="g"&&head(seq, 1)=="c")|(tail(seq, 1)=="c"&&head(seq,
53    1)=="g"))
54    {
55      head_tail_inter[compteur,]<-c("Yes")
56    }
57    else
58    {
59      head_tail_inter[compteur,]<-c("No")
60    }
61
62    #G/C number recovery among the 5 last nucleotides in 3'#
63    nb_gc_content_tail<-length(tail(seq, 5)[tail(seq, 5)=="g"|tail(seq, 5)=="c"])

```

```

1  #[10]'if' loop screening if there is no more than 3 G or C among the 5 last
2  nucleotides in 3'#
3  if (nb_gc_content_tail<4)
4  {
5  gc_content_tail[compteur,]<-c("No")
6  }
7  else
8  {
9  gc_content_tail[compteur,]<-c("Yes")
10 }
11
12 # Determination of the nucleotide number in the last 5 nucleotides in 3'
13 (A,T,C,G & W excluded)#
14 control_deg_GC<-
15 tail(seq,5)[tail(seq,5)!="a"&tail(seq,5)!="t"&tail(seq,5)!="c"&tail(seq,5)!
16 ="g"&tail(seq,5)!="w"]
17
18 #[11] 'if' loop determining if there is no "hidden" G or C (degenerate
19 nucleotides) among the 5 last nucleotides in 3'#
20 if (length(control_deg_GC)!=0)
21 {
22 gc_deg_tail[compteur,]<-c("Yes")
23 }
24 else
25 {
26 gc_deg_tail[compteur,]<-c("No")
27 }
28
29 #Matrix initialisation to check nucleotide repetition
30 mat_repet<-matrix(,1,nb_pb)
31 mat_repet[,1]<-0
32 mat_repet[,nb_pb]<-0
33
34 # 'for' loop to screen nucleotides repeat (n-1 et n+1 comparison regarding
35 n)#
36 for (i in 2 : (nb_pb-1))
37 {
38
39 #n comparison to n-1 and n+1#
40 n_moins<-seq[i]==seq[i-1]
41 n_plus<-seq[i]==seq[i+1]
42
43 #[12]'if' loop warning the presence of 3 identical nucelotides repetitions
44 materialized with the value '1'#
45 if (n_moins=="TRUE"&n_plus=="TRUE")
46 {
47 mat_repet[,i]<-1
48 }
49 else
50 {
51 mat_repet[,i]<-0
52 }
53 }
54
55 #Repetition index creation #
56 index_repet<-as.numeric(rowSums(mat_repet))
57
58 # 'if' loop allowing the control of repetitions existence into the primer#
59 if (index_repet==0)
60 {
61 repet_seek[compteur,]<-c("No")
62 }
63 else
64 {

```

```

1      repet_seek[compteur,]<-c("Yes")
2    }
3  }
4
5  #creating a matrix containing all the following parameters
6  [1][2][6][3][4][5][7][8][9][10][11][12]#
7  array_tot<-
8  cbind(tag,sequence,place,nb_deg,hyc,nb_gc,nb_at,gc_content,gc_end,head_tail
9  _inter,gc_content_tail,gc_deg_tail,repet_seek)
10
11 #Recovering the number of column of the above matrix#
12 l_array<-ncol(array_tot)
13
14 #Placing restrictions on various parameters [7][8][5][10][11][12]#
15 array_tot<-
16 subset(array_tot,gc_end=='Yes'&head_tail_inter=='No'&gc_content>40&gc_conte
17 nt<60&gc_content_tail=='No'&gc_deg_tail=='No'&repet_seek=='No')
18
19 #Creation of an export matrix for post processing in Amplifx software
20 array_amplifx<-cbind(array_tot[,2],array_tot[,1])
21
22 #Recovery of the row number in the array#
23 n_row<-nrow(array_tot)
24
25 #Percentage of discarded primers#
26 percent<-round((1-(n_row/l_sequ))*100,1)
27
28 #Construction of a concluding sentence concerning the primer file
29 treatment#
30 ecart<-matrix(,1,l_array)
31 ecart[,1]<-paste(percent,"% des primers ont été écartés grâce à
32 l'algorithme")
33 ecart<-rbind(ecart,matrix(,1,l_array))
34
35 #Title creation#
36 head<-c('ID','Sequence','Situation in the alignment','Number of
37 degeneration','Hyc Number','Number of G/C','Number of A/T','Estimated %
38 GC','End by G or C','Head and Tail Annealing Risk ?','No more than 3 GC in
39 the tail?','No hidden GC (degeneration)in the tail?','No more than 2
40 identical nucleotides near by?')
41
42 #Title and matrice regroupment#
43 array_tot<-rbind(ecart,head,array_tot)
44
45 # *.csv file generation with the above selected informations#
46 array_tot<-as.data.frame(array_tot)
47 export<-
48 write.table(array_tot,file=paste(name_file,".csv",sep=""),dec=".",sep=";",r
49 ow.names = FALSE,col.names = FALSE,na = "")
50
51 #File generation for the automatic treatment with amplifx software#
52 export<-
53 write.table(array_amplifx,file=paste(name_file,"_amplifx.txt",sep=""),sep="
54 \t",row.names = FALSE,col.names = FALSE)
55 }
56
57
58
59
60

```

Figure S2: Efficiency curves

Legend: 62 °C – 1 µM 64 °C – 1 µM 62 °C – 0.5 µM 64 °C – 0.5 µM

Figure S3: Melting curves

Melting curves obtained for *Photobacterium* and *Vibrio*, with annealing at 62 °C, primers concentration of 1 μ M and 7.5 ng of DNA.