

Molecular Detection of Foodborne Bacterial Pathogens

Azlin Mustapha*, Ph.D. and Yong Li, Ph.D.

Food Science Program, University of Missouri-Columbia,¹ Columbia, MO 65211

¹Food Science and Human Nutrition Program, University of Manoa, Honolulu, HI 96822

Introduction

Conventional PCR Detection of Foodborne Pathogens

Multiplex PCR Detection of Foodborne Pathogens

Reverse Transcriptase PCR Detection of Foodborne Pathogens

Real-Time PCR Detection of Foodborne Pathogens

Conclusions

References

INTRODUCTION

Since its discovery in the mid 1980s, the Nobel prize-winning polymerase chain reaction (PCR) has gained acceptance as a powerful microbial detection tool. The application of automated PCR technology in the medical and pharmaceutical industries has a longer history than its use in the food industry. In recent years, however, PCR technology has become more recognized for its potential at becoming a powerful alternative to cultural methods of pathogen detection in foods. The BAX PCR system manufactured by Dupont Qualicon, Inc. and the TaqMan Pathogen Detection kits by Applied Biosystems Co. are two examples of automated PCR systems that have found application in the food industry. The BAX PCR is currently an AOAC-approved PCR-based method that can be used to detect *Listeria monocytogenes*, *Listeria* species, *Salmonella* and *Escherichia coli* O157:H7 in food products, and is used by the USDA Food Safety and Inspection Service (FSIS) for detecting *L. monocytogenes* and *Salmonella* in meat, poultry, egg, and ready-to-eat meat products.

The advantage of using PCR techniques for food products is the specificity and rapidity of the tests as compared to traditional cultural techniques. However, the sensitivity of a PCR-based test for detection of pathogens in foods will depend on the type of food matrix involved. Because of the complexity of food matrices, many compounds in foods can prove to be inhibitory to PCR reactions (74). Thus, in most PCR assays, including the automated BAX and

*Corresponding author. Food Science Program, 256 William Stringer Wing, University of Missouri-Columbia, Columbia, MO 65211, Phone: (573) 882-2649; FAX: (573) 882-0596; e-mail: MustaphaA@missouri.edu.

TaqMan systems, food samples are enriched prior to the amplification steps in order to overcome this hurdle. In addition to increasing the number of target microorganisms, and thus the detection sensitivity, enrichment is also helpful at reducing the risk of amplifying nucleic acids from dead or nonculturable cells (11). Following PCR, target species can be detected by agarose gel electrophoresis or hybridizations with labeled DNA probes (60).

Despite its limited use in the food industry, numerous studies have been reported in the literature on the development of PCR-based detection methods for foodborne pathogens. The following text will discuss the various PCR detection methods that have been successful at detecting various pathogens in different types of foods. Table 1 illustrates the target genes, primer sequences, tested foods, detection limits, specificity, and references of certain published PCR protocols.

CONVENTIONAL PCR DETECTION OF FOODBORNE PATHOGENS

Conventional PCR relies on the amplification of nucleic acids via a single pair of primers to detect one pathogen at a time, and the PCR reaction is optimized for the specific food product tested. With enrichment of tested samples, conventional PCR assays can detect *Clostridium perfringens* at 10 cfu/g in meat, milk, and salad (17), enterohemorrhagic *E. coli* O157:H7 at $ca\ 10^{-1}$ cfu/g in beef (55), enterotoxigenic *E. coli* at 1 cfu/ml in milk (70), *L. monocytogenes* at $ca\ 10^{-2}$ to 10^0 cfu/g in various foods (19, 30, 48, 63), *Salmonella* at $ca\ 10^{-1}$ to 10^1 cfu/g in milk and meat products (11, 22, 43, 44), *Shigella* at 2 cfu/g in mayonnaise (71), *Staphylococcus aureus* at 5–15 cfu/g in skim milk and cream (65), and 10 cfu/ml in raw milk and curd (16), and *Vibrio parahaemolyticus* at 10 cfu in fish (31). However, other studies have found much higher detection limits of PCR assays for foods, without enrichment, including 4×10^2 to 4×10^3 cfu/g for *C. perfringens* in Korean ethnic foods (32), 10 cfu/ml for *L. monocytogenes* in milk (3), 5×10^1 to 5×10^2 cfu/ml for *Shigella* in various produce washes (36), 10^2 cfu/g for *S. aureus* in skim milk and cheddar cheese (67), 3×10^2 cfu/g for *V. parahaemolyticus* in shellfish (74), and 4×10^4 cfu/g for *Yersinia enterocolitica* in pork (37). A PCR based on degenerate primers targeting known nonribosomal peptide synthetases (NRPS) has also been successfully developed for detecting emetic strains of *Bacillus cereus* (15).

MULTIPLEX PCR DETECTION OF FOODBORNE PATHOGENS

In multiplex PCR, two or more gene loci are simultaneously amplified in one reaction. This technique has been used widely to characterize pathogenic bacteria on the basis of their virulence factors and antigenic traits. Fratamico et al. (21) employed primers for a plasmid-encoded hemolysin gene (*hlyA*₉₃₃),

Table 5.1. Representative PCR methods for common foodborne bacterial pathogens

Bacterial Pathogen	Target Gene	Primer sequence (5' to 3')	Tested Food	Detection Limit ^a	Specificity	Reference
<i>Bacillus cereus</i>	<i>cerAB</i>	F: GAGTTAGAGAACGGTATTATGCTGC R: GCATCCCAAGTCGCTGTATGTCAG	milk	1 cfu/ml ^{2,3}	<i>B. cereus</i> group	60
16S rRNA		F: TCGAAATTGAAAGGCCGGC R: GGTGCCAGCTTATTCAC	NA ⁴	NA	<i>B. cereus</i> group	24
<i>groEL</i>		F: TGCAACTGTATTAGCACAAAGCT R: TACCAAGAAGTTGTTCACTACT	NA	NA	<i>B. cereus</i> group	9
<i>gyrB</i>		F: GTTTCTGGTGGTTAACATGG R: TTTTGAGCGATTTAACATGC	coffee concentrate	10 cfu/ml ²	<i>B. cereus</i> group	51
NA		F: GACAAGAGAAATTCTACGAGCAAGT R: GCAGCCCTTCCAATTCTACTCTCTGCCACAGT	NA	NA	Emetic toxin producing <i>B. cereus</i>	15
<i>Campylobacter</i>	<i>flaA1B</i>	F: CCAAATCGGTTCAAGTTCAAATCAAAAC R: CCACTACCTACTGAAAATCCGAACC	NA	5–20 cells ³	<i>C. jejuni</i> , <i>C. coli</i>	58
16S rRNA		F1: AATCTTAATGGCTTAACCATTA R1: GTAACTTAGTTTGTATTCCGG	NA	NA	<i>C. jejuni</i> , <i>C. coli</i>	46
<i>hippurase</i>		F2: GAAGAGGGTTGGTGGTGTG				
<i>ask</i>		R2: AGCTAGCTTCGCATAATAACTTG F3: GGTATGATTCTAACAAAGCGAG				
16S rRNA		R3: ATAAAAGACTATCGTCGGTGTG F1: ATCTTAATGGCTTAACCATTAAC R1: GGACGGTAACTAGTTAGTATT	NA	NA	<i>C. jejuni</i> , <i>C. coli</i>	14

Continued

Table 5.1. Representative PCR methods for common foodborne bacterial pathogens—cont'd

Bacterial Pathogen	Target Gene	Primer sequence (5' to 3')	Tested Food	Detection Limit ^a	Specificity	Reference
<i>mapA</i>	F2: CTTATTTCATTTCATTGAGCTTGTG R2: GCTTTATTTGGCATTTGTTTATTAA					
<i>ceuE</i>	F3: AATTGAAAATTGCTCCAACATATG R3: TGATTTTAAATTATTTGAGCAGCG					
<i>ccoN</i>	F: TTGGTATGGCTATAGGAACCTTATAGCT R: CACACCTGAAGTATGAAAGTGGTCAAGT	Raw chicken, offal, shellfish, raw meat, milk	NA	C. jejuni	59	
	PROBE: TGGCATATCCPAATTAAATTATTAACAGGAC					
<i>ompS0</i>	F: TGTAAAAGCTGAACCTGCC R: GCGTTCCCTCTTGTCATTC		NA	NA	<i>Campylobacter</i>	5, 13
<i>ccoN</i>	F: AGAACACGGGACCTATATA R: CGATGCATCCAGGAATGTAT	water, milk	25 to 2 × 10 ³ cfu ^b	C. jejuni, C. coli, C. upsالensis	27	
<i>ctxB/D</i>	F: TACTCATACTGTCGGAACTTCGATAACAAGC R: CTCATCTCCCCATAACTGGCACTATAATTCC		NA	Type B or D strains of <i>C. perfringens</i>	23	
<i>Clostridium perfringens</i>	F1: AAGTTACCTTGTGCTGCATAATCCC F2: CTCATCTCCCCATAACTGGCACTATAATTCC	cooked food, pork butchery, raw meat, milk, salad	10 cfu/g	<i>C. perfringens</i>	17	
<i>pls</i>						

<i>cpe</i>	R1: ATAGATACTCCATATCATCCTGCT F2: GAAAGATCTGTATCTACAACITGCCTGGTCC R2: GCTGGCTAAGATCTATATTTTGTCAGT F1: TGCTTAATGTTACTGCCGGTGTAGT	NA	NA	<i>C. perfringens</i> producing different toxins	70
<i>cpb</i>	R1: ATAAATCCCATTACATCCCAACTATG F2: AGGGGGTTTTTTATGAAG R2: TCTAAATAGCTCTTACTTTGT F3: TACTCATACTGGGAACCTTCGATAACAGC R3: CTCATCTCCCCATAACTGCACTATAATTCC F4: TTTTAACTAGTTICATTTCTAGTTA				
<i>etx</i>	R4: TTCTTGTATCTCTTCTCTAGATT F: ACTTAGAGTATCTATAAACTTGATACTC	Korean ethnic foods	4×10^2 cfu/g to 4.5×10^3 cfu/g ²	Enterotoxigenic <i>C. perfringens</i>	32
<i>iap</i>		ground beef	10–100 cfu/g	total <i>E. coli</i> , ETEC, EIEC, EHEC	40
<i>cpe</i>	R: TAAATTGTTACTAAGCATATTATAATTAAACATC F1: TGACCACACGGCTGACGCTGACCA				
<i>Pathogenic Escherichia coli</i>					
<i>hly</i>	R1: TTACATGACCTCGGGTTAGTTACAGA F2: TTACGGGGTTACTATCCTCTCTA				
<i>inv</i>	R2: GGTCCTGGGTAGATATGTGATTIC F3: TCCTGCTTATGATGAGGAGTAAAT R3: CTCACCATACCATCAGAAAAGAAG				
<i>vt</i>	R4: TAAACACACCCACGGCAGT R4: GCTCTGGATGCATCTCTGGT				

Continued

Table 5.1. Representative PCR methods for common foodborne bacterial pathogens—cont'd

Bacterial Pathogen	Target Gene	Primer sequence (5' to 3')	Tested Food	Detection Limit ^a	Specificity	Reference
<i>Shiga-toxin-producing E. coli</i>	<i>stx-2</i>	F1: TGTTTATGGCGGTATTATTTG R1: ATTATAAAATGCACCTTCAG	ground beef	1 cfu/g ^b ^c	viable Shiga-toxin-producing <i>E. coli</i>	52
<i>Enterohemorrhagic E. coli (EHEC)</i>	<i>stx-1/2</i>	F2: GGATCCCTTAACGATAGACCTTCTCGAC R2: GGATCCCACATAAAATTATTCGCTC				
	<i>stx 1</i>	F1: GACTGCAAAGACGTATGTAGATTCG R1: ATCTATCCCTCTGACATCAACTGC F2: ATTAACCCACACCCACCG	ground beef	1–10 cfu/g ^d	EHEC O157, O111, O26	62
	<i>eaeA_{O111}</i>	R2: GTCATGGAAACCGTGTGTCAC F3: CTCTGCCAAAGAACACTGGTTACAG R3: TTTCATGTTATTTCATTGC F4: GCTCCGAATTATGATAAGAGTGG				
	<i>eaeA_{O157}</i>	R4: TCTGTGAGGTGTTAATAATTTC F5: GAAAGTTACACTATAAAAGCACCGTGC R5: TCTGTGTCATGTTAATAATTTC F1: CAGTTAATGTTGGCGAAGG	NA	NA	EHEC O157:H7, O157:NM	8
	<i>stx 1</i>	R1: CACCAAGACAATGTAACCGCTG F2: ATCCATATTCCCCGGAGTTACG				
	<i>uidA</i>	R2: GCGTCATCGTATAACAGGAGC F3: GCGAAAACGTGGAATTGGG R3: TGATGGCTCCATAACTTCCCTG				

<i>eaeA</i>	F1: CCATAATCATTTTATTAGAGGA R1: GAGAAATAAATTATAATTAGATCGGA	NA	NA	EHEC O157:H7, O157:NM	54
<i>stx 1</i>	F2: TGTAACTGGAAAGGTGGAGTATACA R2: GCTATTCCTGAGTCACGAAAAATAAAC				
<i>stx 2</i>	F3: GTTTTCTTCGGTATCCTATTCC R3: GATGCATCTCTGGTCATTGGTATAC				
<i>flxC_{h7}</i>	F1: GCGCTGTGGAGTTCTATCGAGC R1: CAACGGTGACTTTATGCCATTCC F2: TGTAACTGGAAAGGTGGAGTATACA R2: GCTATTCCTGAGTCACGAAAAATAAAC F3: GTTTTCTTCGGTATCCTATTCC R3: GATGCATCTCTGGTCATTGGTATAC F4: ATTACCATCC2CACAGACGGT R4: ACAGGGTGGTGGATCAAACCT F5: ACGATGTTGGTTATCTGGA R5: CTTCACGTCACCATACATAT	ground beef, blue cheese, mussels, alfalfa sprouts,	1 cfu/g	EHEC O157:H7	21
<i>hlyA_{O157}</i>	F: AGCACTGAATGACGCCGCAATTGAGACA R: TCTGAGGGACCTTAATTTCCTGATTCCTC	beef	10^{-1} cfu/g	EHEC O157:H7, O157:NM	55
<i>Enterotoxigenic E. coli (ETEC)</i>	F1: GCTGACTCTAGACCCCCAG R1: TGTAAACCAATCCCTCTGCCGGA	milk	1 cfu/ml	ETEC	69

Continued

Table 5.1. Representative PCR methods for common foodborne bacterial pathogens—cont'd

Bacterial Pathogen	Target Gene	Primer sequence (5' to 3')	Tested Food	Detection Limit ^a	Specificity	Reference
	<i>est II</i>	F2: CTGTGTGAAACATTATAGACAAATA R2: ACCATTATTGGCCGCCCCAAG	NA	NA	ETEC	56
<i>uspA</i>		F1: CCGATACGGTGCACATCAGT R1: ACGCAGACCCCTAACGGCCAGAT				
<i>elt I</i>		F2: TATCCCTCTCTATATGCACAG R2: CTGTAGTGGAAAGCTGTTATA				
<i>est I</i>		F3: TCTTTCCTCTCTTGTAGTCAG R3: ACAGGGGGATTACAACAAAG				
<i>est II</i>		F4: GCCTATGCCATCTACACAATC R4: TGAGAAATGGACAATGTCCG	NA	NA	<i>L. monocytogenes</i>	6
<i>Listeria monocytogenes</i>	<i>iap</i>	F: CAAACTGCTAACACAGCTACT R: GCACTTGAATTGCTGTTATTG F: CTAATCAAGACAATAAAATC	cheese	1.6 × 10 ⁰ cfu/g	<i>L. monocytogenes</i>	19
	<i>hlyA</i>	R: GTTAGTTCTACATCACCTGA F: CAAACTGCTAACACAGCTACT	cooked ground beef	3 cfu/g	viable <i>L. monocytogenes</i>	34
		R: GCACTTGAATTGCTGTTATTG F: GGGAAATCTGTCAGGTGATGT	cabbage	6 cfu/g ^{b,5}	<i>L. monocytogenes</i>	25
		R: CGATGATTGAACTTCATCTTTGCG F: CTTCAGGGATAAGATTAGG	frankfurters	4 × 10 ⁻¹ cfu/g	<i>L. monocytogenes</i>	30
		R: TTTCGCAAAGTGAGCTTACGTC				

16S rRNA	F1: GCTTAATAACCGAATGATAAGA F2: GGCTTAATAACCGAATGATGAA R: AAGCAGTTACTCTTATACCT F: GTGATAAAAATCGACGAAAATCC	fresh and ready-to-eat meat and fish, potato salads, vegetable salads, pasta, ice cream	4×10^{-2} to 2×10^{-1} cfu/g	<i>L. monocytogenes</i> 63
<i>actA</i>		soft cheeses	4×10^{-2} to 4 cfu/g	<i>L. monocytogenes</i> 48
<i>hlyA</i>	R: CTTCGTAAAACCTAGCAATTCTAGCG F: TTGCCAGGAATGACTAATCAAG	milk	$10 \text{ cfu/ml}^{2,6}$	<i>L. monocytogenes</i> 3
transcrip-tional regulatory gene	R: ATTCACTGTAAGCCATTTCGTC F: CGCAAGAAGAAATTGCCATC	NA	10 pg DNA	<i>L. monocytogenes</i> 47
<i>Salmonella</i>	R: TCCGGGTTAGAAAAATTCCA F: AGCCAACCAATTGCTAAATTGGCGCA R: GGTAGAAATTCCAGGGGTACTIG F: TTATTAGGATCGCCAGGC R: AAAGAAATAACCGTTGTTCAAC F: GATCATCCATTICGGCATTAAACA R: CTCAGCGACGGAAAGGGTAAATC	beef, pork chicken frozen chicken	NA NA 10^{-1} cfu/g^6 3 cfu/g	<i>Salmonella</i> 1, 2 <i>Salmonella</i> 20 <i>Salmonella</i> 28

Continued

Table 51. Representative PCR methods for common foodborne bacterial pathogens—cont'd

Bacterial Pathogen	Target Gene	Primer sequence (5' to 3')	Tested Food	Detection Limit ^a	Specificity	Reference
<i>ompC</i>	F: ACCGCTAACGGTGGCTGTAT	ground beef	20 cfu/g	<i>Salmonella</i>	35	
<i>invA</i>	R: AGAGGTGGACGGGTGGCTGCCGTT F: GCTGCGGCCAACGGCGAAG	pork, beef, poultry meat, fermented sausage, fish	4 × 10 ⁻¹ cfu/g	<i>Salmonella</i>	11	
<i>invA</i>	R: TCCCGGCAGAGTTCCCATT F: CGGTGGTTAAAGGTTACTCTT	ground beef, apple cider	1 cfu/g	<i>Salmonella</i>	21	
16S rRNA	R: CGAATATGCTCCACAAGGTAA F: GTGTTGGTTAAATAACCGCAGCA	whole milk, chicken	1 to 9 cfu/g	<i>Salmonella</i>	43	
<i>rfbS</i>	R: TGTTBGMTCGCCACGGTTTCG F: TCACGACTTACATTCCTAC	NA	10 cfu ³	<i>Salmonella</i> serotype D	49	
<i>sefA</i>	R: CTGCTATATCAGGACAAAC F: GGCTTCGGTATCTGGGTGTA	egg	1.7 × 10 ⁻³ cfu/g ⁵	<i>Salmonella</i> serotype D	61	
<i>orf6e</i>	R: GGTCAATTAAATTTGGCCCTGAAATA F: GCCGTACACGGACCTTATAGA	NA	NA	<i>Salmonella</i>	64	
<i>fliC</i>	R: ACCTACAGGGCACATAAAC F: CGGTGTTGCCAGGTGGTAAT R: ACTGGTAAAGATGGCT	NA	NA	<i>Salmonella</i>	64	Typhimurium

<i>mdh</i>	F: TGCCAAACGGAAGTTGAAGTG R: CGCATTCACCAGCCTTC	milk, chicken meat	10 cfu/g	<i>Salmonella</i> Typhimurium	44
<i>Shigella</i>	spa	F: AGCGATCTTACGTCTTG R: CGAGATGTTGGAGGCAT	carrot, celery, cauliflower, radish, broccoli, coleslaw	N/A NA	<i>Shigella</i> 18
<i>rfc</i>		F1: ATCAGGGTGTGCTTAATTATA R1: GGGCTAAAGTTCCTC	<10 ⁴ cfu/g ²	<i>Shigella</i>	26
		F2: ATTGGTGGTGGTGGAGATTACTGG R2: TTTTGGCTCCAGAAGTGAGG			
		F3: AGCTTAATGCGTTTGGGAAT			
		R3: TCCCCAATGACTGATACCATGG			
<i>virA</i>		F: CTGCATTCGGCAATCTCTCACATC R: TGATGAGCTAACCTTGTAAGCCCTCC	mayon- naise	2 cfu/g <i>Shigella</i> and EIEC	71
<i>iat</i>		F1: CTGGTAGGTATGTCAGG R1: CCAGGCCAACAAATTATTTC	lettuce, shrimps, milk, blue cheese	10 cfu/g ⁷ <i>Shigella</i> and EIEC	45
		F2: TTTTTAATTAAAGGTGGGTTTGA R2: GAAACCTATGTCACCTTACCAAGAT			

Continued

Table 51. Representative PCR methods for common foodborne bacterial pathogens—*cont'd*

Bacterial Pathogen	Target Gene	Primer sequence (5' to 3')	Tested Food	Detection Limit ^a	Specificity	Reference
<i>Yersinia</i>	<i>ipaH</i>	F: GTTCCCTGACCGCCTTCGGATACCGTC R: GCGGGTAGGCCACCCCTCTGAGAGTAC	cilantro, tomato, beef, lettuce, alfalfa sprouts, apple cider, bean sprouts	50–500 cfu/ml ^b	<i>Shigella</i> and EIEC	36
<i>Staphylococcus aureus</i>	<i>sea</i>	F1: CCTTTGGAAACGGTTAAAACG R1: TCTGAAACCTTCCCCATCAAAAAAC	NA	100 pg DNA ³	<i>S. aureus</i> carrying enterotoxin A to E genes	4
<i>Staphylococcus aureus</i>	<i>seb</i>	F2: TCGCATCAAACGTGACAAACG R2: GCAGGGTACTCTATAAGTGCCTGCG				
<i>Staphylococcus aureus</i>	<i>sec</i>	F3: CTCAAGGAACTAGAACATAAAAGCTAGG R3: TCAAAATATCGGATTAAACATTATCC				
<i>Salmonella</i>	<i>sed</i>	F4: CTAGTTGGTAATAATCTCCTTTAAACG R4: TTAATGCTATPATCTTATAGGGTAAACATC				
<i>Salmonella</i>	<i>see</i>	F5: CAGTACCTATAGATAAAGTTAAAACAAGC R5: TAACTTACCGTGGACCCCTTC	NA	100 pg DNA ³	<i>S. aureus</i> carrying exfoliative toxin A and B genes and the toxic shock syndrome toxin 1 gene	4
<i>Escherichia coli</i>	<i>tst</i>	F1: AAGGCCCTTGTGCTTGCG				

<i>eta</i>	R1: ATCGAACTTGGCCATACTTT F2: CTAGTGCAATTGTTATTCAAGACG				
<i>etb</i>	R2: TGGCATTGACGCCATAGTACTTTATTC F3: ACGGCATATAAACATCAATTCAATG				
<i>23S rRNA</i>	R3: AAAGTTATCATTAAATGCCACTGTCTC F1: ACGGAGTTACAAGGACGAC	skim milk, cream	5–15 cfu/g ⁷	<i>S. aureus</i>	65
<i>entC</i>	R1: AGCTCAGCCCTTAACGAGTAC F2: ATCATCTGGAAAGATGAATCAA R2: ATCGATTAAAACGATTATAGGT F1: ACACCCAACGTATTAGCAGAGAC	skim milk, cheddar cheese	100 cfu/g ²	enterotoxigenic <i>S. aureus</i>	67
<i>muc</i>	R1: CCTGGGTGCAGGGATCATATCATAC F2: AGTATATAGTGCACACTTCAACTAA R2: ATCAGGGTTGCTCGCTCCAAAT F1: GCTATGGACACACTACAACC	NA	10 ² cfu/ml for pure culture	<i>S. aureus</i> carrying enterotoxin G to I genes	10
<i>seg</i>	R1: CCAAGTGAATTGCTATTGTCG F2: CACATCATATGCGAAAGC				
<i>seh</i>	F2: CGAATGAGTAATCTCTAGG				
<i>sei</i>	F3: GATACTGGAAACAGGACAAGC				
<i>pathogenic Vibrio species</i>	R3: CTTACAGGCAGTCCATCTCC F1: TTTCATGATTATTCAAGTTT R: TTITGTGGATATACACAT	fish	10 cfu	<i>V. parahaemolyticus</i>	31

Continued

Table 5.1. Representative PCR methods for common foodborne bacterial pathogens—cont'd

Bacterial Pathogen	Target Gene	Primer sequence (5' to 3')	Tested Food	Detection Limit ^a	Specificity	Reference
<i>vvhA</i>		F1: GACTATTCGCAATCAACAAACCG R1: AGGTAGCCGACTTATTACTGCC	seafood	10 ¹ –10 ² cfu/g ^{2,7}	<i>V. vulnificus</i>	39
		F2: GCTATTTCACCGGGCCTCAC R2: CCGCAGAGCCGTAACCGAA				
<i>toxR</i>		F: GTCTTCTGACGCATTCGTTG R: ATACGAATGGTTGCTGTCATG	NA	NA	<i>V. para-haemolyticus</i>	33
<i>hlyA</i>		F: TGCGTTAACACCGAAGCGAT R: AAGTCITCATCATTTGCTGGTCA	oyster	6–8 cfu/g ^{2,5}	<i>V. cholerae</i>	50
<i>vvhA</i>		F: TGTTTATGGTGAGAACGGTGACA R: TTCTTATCATCTAGGCCAAACTTG	oyster	10 ³ cfu/g ^{2,5}	<i>V. vulnificus</i>	7
<i>ORF8</i>		F: GTTCGCATAACAGTTGAGG R: AAGTACAGCAGGAGTGTAG	shellfish	3 × 10 ² cfu/g ²	<i>V. para-haemolyticus</i>	74
<i>elastase gene</i>		F: AAACTCAAGGTCTGATATACAGC R: CGAGAACGGAGACATTACGTC	NA	25 cfu for pure culture	<i>V. vulnificus</i>	38
<i>tdh</i>		R: AAGTTGCTACCTGGGGTTG F1: CATCTTCGTAACGCTTTCTTTTACA R1: TCTGTCCCCCTTCCTGCC	mussel	NA	<i>V. para-haemolyticus</i>	12
<i>trh</i>		F2: GCCAAGTGTAAACGTATTGGATGA R2: TGCCCATTCCGGCTCTCA				
<i>tth</i>		F3: CGAGAACGGAGACATTACGTC R3: TGCTCCAGATCGTGGTTG				

<i>vvh</i>	F: TTCCAACCTTCAACCGAACTATGA R: ATTCCAGTCGATGCCATAACGTTG	oyster	1 cfu/g ⁵	<i>V. vulnificus</i>	57
<i>Yersinia enterocolitica</i>	16S rRNA F1: GGAATTAGCAGAGATGCTTAA R1: GGACTACGAGAGACTTATCT F2: TGTTCTCATCTCCATATGCATT R2: TTCTTTCCTTAATTGGCGGACA	pork	4 × 10 ⁴ cfu/g ²	<i>Y. enterocolitica</i>	37
<i>yadA</i>	<i>ail</i> F: GGTCAATGGTGTATGTTGATTACTATTCA R: CGGCCCGGAGTAATACCATATA F: AATGCTGTCCTCATTTGGAGC R: ATCCCCAATCACTACTGACTTC	ground pork	≤1 cfu/g ⁵	<i>Y. enterocolitica</i>	29
<i>yst</i>		ground pork, tofu	10 ³ cfu/g ² ⁵	<i>Y. enterocolitica</i>	72

¹ Samples were enriched prior to the PCR assay to determine the detection limit, unless otherwise specified.

² Samples were not enriched prior to the PCR assay to determine the detection limit.

³ Hybridization was performed to identify the PCR products.

⁴ Not available.

⁵ In the format of fluorogenic real-time PCR.

⁶ Samples were processed via immunomagnetic separation.

⁷ In the format of nested PCR

chromosomal flagella (*fliC_{H7}*; flagellar structural gene of H7 serotype), Shiga toxins (*stx₁*, *stx₂*), and attaching and effacing (*eaeA*) genes for specific identification of *E. coli* O157:H7. Similar protocols were reported for concurrent determination of multiple toxin genes in *C. perfringens* (70) and *S. aureus* (4, 10). Further, species or serotype differentiation can also be achieved via multiplex PCR. Denis et al. (14) selected 16S rRNA, *mapA*, and *ceuE* as the target genes for simultaneous detection of *Campylobacter jejuni* and *Campylobacter coli*. A similar assay was established for simultaneous identification of *Salmonella* sp., *S. Enteritidis*, and *S. Typhimurium* in one reaction (64). In multiplex PCR, bacterial pathogens belonging to different genera can also be screened in the same amplification system. Li and Mustapha (41) and Li et al. (42) established a multiplex PCR for simultaneous detection of *E. coli* O157:H7, *Salmonella*, and *Shigella* in apple cider, produce and raw and ready-to-eat meat products. In most situations of multiplex PCR, the optimal conditions for different primer sets may be unique and interference among different primer pairs may occur, resulting in uneven amplification of different target sequences and limited sensitivity (68). Thus, adjusting the concentration of Taq DNA polymerase, MgCl², or dNTPs, as well as the concentration ratio among the different primer pairs is needed in the optimization of the amplification system. Although to design a robust multiplex PCR assay for foods can be challenging, once optimized for the specific pathogens and food products, this method has the advantage of being cost effective and highly efficient. Because of its selectivity, sensitivity, and efficiency, a multiplex PCR protocol is very applicable and suitable for comprehensive testings of specific foods.

REVERSE TRANSCRIPTION-PCR DETECTION OF FOODBORNE PATHOGENS

The use of reverse transcription PCR (RT-PCR) in foods is limited due to the difficulty of extracting undegraded mRNA from pathogens in complex food matrices. By amplifying the *iap* mRNA, a RT-PCR was successfully developed for detecting viable *L. monocytogenes* cells in cooked ground beef, artificially contaminated with ca. 3 cfu/g, following a 2-h enrichment step (34). McIngvale et al. (52) established a similar protocol for Shiga-toxin-producing *E. coli* with optimal growth medium, incubation temperature, and aeration. The assay was validated in artificially contaminated ground beef. Viable *E. coli* O157:H7 at an initial inoculum of 1 cfu/g was detectable in the meat after a 12-h enrichment. In addition, a RT-PCR was developed for detecting mRNA from the *sefA* gene of *S. Enteritidis* (66). The sensitivity of the assay depended on the physiological state of the cells under different temperatures and pH. With the RT-PCR, it was possible to detect 10 cells of *S. Enteritidis* PT4 in contaminated minced beef and whole egg samples following a 16-h enrichment step. Although not cost-effective for routine testings of pathogens in

foods, these reports highlight the potential of RT-PCR for the detection of viable bacterial pathogens in foods.

REAL-TIME PCR DETECTION OF FOODBORNE PATHOGENS

Recent advances in fluorescent chemistries and detection instruments allow further development of PCR technology as a more efficient and sensitive tool for “real-time” microbiological analysis of foods. The use of nonspecific fluorescent double-stranded DNA-binding dyes (such as SYBRGreen or SYBRGold), or specific fluorescence resonance energy transfer technology (such as 5'-nuclease assay [TaqMan], or molecular beacon) has resulted in PCR assays with quantitative capability in a real-time manner (53). A number of real-time PCR assays have been described for the detection and quantification of *C. jejuni* (59), enterohemorrhagic *E. coli* serotypes O157, O111, and O26 in ground beef (62), *L. monocytogenes* in cabbage (25), *Salmonella* serotype D in egg (61), pathogenic *Vibrio* species in oyster (7, 50, 57), and *Y. enterocolitica* in ground pork (29, 72). Further, a sensitive multiplex real-time PCR has been developed for the simultaneous detection of *E. coli* O157:H7, *Salmonella*, and *Shigella* in pure culture and in ground beef (A. Mustapha, unpublished data). In addition to maintaining all the advantages of conventional PCR, real-time PCR has added speed and sensitivity. This technique can quantify a target DNA with greater reproducibility, which is very valuable in the quantitative assessment of microbial risks and the execution of HACCP programs in the food industry. The current drawback for using real-time PCR for routine food testing is the cost involved, not only in the equipment but the reagents.

CONCLUSIONS

The PCR has come a long way since its discovery, evolving from a tool used mainly in forensic, medical, pharmaceutical, and plant sciences to food science and the food industry. It may be one of the most remarkable discoveries of the 20th century and has opened new doors in a wide array of fields that would never have been possible prior to its utilization. Although research have shown that PCR can be a powerful method for detection of foodborne pathogens in pure culture as well as in certain foods, much more work needs to be done to truly make it the best alternative detection technique to conventional cultural methods. Until the enrichment steps can be eliminated, the rapidity of PCR assays can still be argued. Foods also are so different in their composition, resulting in a multitude of compounds that may be inhibitory to the detection of some pathogens while not affecting others, thus making it more challenging to design a one-size-fits-all PCR assay for foods.

REFERENCES

1. Aabo, S., O.F. Rasmussen, L. Rossen, P.D. Sorensen, and J.E. Olson. 1993. *Salmonella* identification by the polymerase chain reaction. *Mol. Cell. Probes* **7**:171–178.
2. Aabo, S., J.K. Andersen, and J.E. Olson. 1995. Detection of *Salmonella* in minced meat by the polymerase chain reaction. *Lett. Applied Microbiol.* **21**:180–182.
3. Amagliani, G., G. Brandi, E. Omiccioli, A. Casiere, I.J. Bruce, and M. Magnani. 2004. Direct detection of *Listeria monocytogenes* from milk by magnetic based DNA isolation and PCR. *Food Microbiol.* **21**:597–603.
4. Becker, K., R. Roth, and G. Peters. 1998. Rapid and specific detection of toxigenic *Staphylococcus aureus*: Use of two multiplex PCR enzyme immunoassays for amplification and hybridization of staphylococcal enterotoxin genes, exfoliative toxin genes, and toxic shock syndrome toxin 1 gene. *J. Clin. Microbiol.* **36**:2548–2553.
5. Bolla, J.M., E. De, A. Dorez, and J.M. Pages. 2000. Purification, characterization, and sequence analysis of Omp50, a new porin isolated from *Campylobacter jejuni*. *Biochem. J.* **352**:637–643.
6. Bubert, A., S. Kohler, and W. Goebel. 1992. The homologous and heterologous regions within the *iap* gene allow genus- and species-specific identification of *Listeria* spp. by polymerase chain reaction. *Appl. Environ. Microbiol.* **58**:2625–2632.
7. Campbell, M.S. and A.C. Wright. 2003. Real-time PCR analysis of *Vibrio vulnificus* from oysters. *Appl. Environ. Microbiol.* **69**:7137–7144.
8. Cebula, T.A., W.L. Payne, and P. Feng. 1995. Simultaneous identification of strains of *Escherichia coli* serotype O157:H7 and their shiga-like toxin type by mismatch amplification mutation assay-multiplex PCR. *J. Clin. Microbiol.* **33**:248–250.
9. Chang, Y.H., Y.H. Shangkuan, H.C. Lin, and H.W. Liu. 2003. PCR assay of the *groEL* gene for detection and differentiation of *Bacillus cereus* group cells. *Appl. Environ. Microbiol.* **69**:4502–4510.
10. Chen, T.R., C.S. Chiou, and H.Y. Tsen. 2004. Use of novel PCR primers specific to the genes of staphylococcal enterotoxin G, H, I for the survey of *Staphylococcus aureus* strains isolated from food-poisoning cases and food samples in Taiwan. *Int. J. Food Microbiol.* **92**:189–197.
11. Cocolin, L., M. Manzano, C. Cantoni, and G. Comi. 1998. Use of polymerase chain reaction and restriction enzyme analysis to directly detect and identify *Salmonella typhimurium* in food. *J. Appl. Microbiol.* **85**:673–677.
12. Davis, C.R., L.C. Heller, K.K. Peak, D.L. Wingfield, C.L. Goldstein-Hart, D.W. Bodager, A.C. Cannons, P.T. Amuso, and J.C. Cattani. 2004. Real-time PCR detection of the thermostable direct hemolysin and thermolabile hemolysin genes in a *Vibrio parahaemolyticus* cultured from mussels and mussel homogenate associated with a foodborne outbreak. *J. Food Prot.* **67**:1005–1008.
13. Dedieu, L., J.M. Pages, and J.M. Bolla. 2004. Use of the *omp50* gene for identification of *Campylobacter* species by PCR. *J. Clin. Microbiol.* **42**:2301–2305.
14. Denis, M., C. Soumet, K. Rivoal, G. Ermel, D. Blivet, G. Salvat, and P. Colin. 1999. Development of an m-PCR assay for simultaneous identification of *Campylobacter jejuni* and *C. coli*. *Lett. Appl. Microbiol.* **29**:406–410.
15. Ehling-Schulz, M., M. Fricker, and S. Scherer. 2004. Identification of emetic toxin producing *Bacillus cereus* strains by a novel molecular assay. *FEMS Microbiol. Lett.* **232**:189–195.
16. Ercolini, D., G. Blaiotta, V. Fusco, and S. Coppola. 2004. PCR-based detection of enterotoxigenic *Staphylococcus aureus* in the early stages of raw milk cheese making. *J. Appl. Microbiol.* **96**:1090–1096.

17. Fach, P. and M.R. Popoff. 1997. Detection of enterotoxigenic *Clostridium perfringens* in food and fecal samples with a duplex PCR and the slide latex agglutination test. *Appl. Environ. Microbiol.* **63**:4232–4236.
18. Fatemeh, R., H. Michael, H. Water, and C. Carl. 1995. Survival of *Shigella flexneri* on vegetables and detection by polymerase chain reaction. *J. Food Prot.* **58**:727–732.
19. Fluit, A.C., R. Torensma, M.J.C. Visser, C.J.M. Aarsman, J.J.G. Poppelier, B.H.I. Keller, P. Klapwijk, and J. Verhoef. 1993. Detection of *Listeria monocytogenes* in cheese with the magnetic immuno-polymerase chain reaction assay. *Appl. Environ. Microbiol.* **59**:1289–1293.
20. Fluit, A.C., M.N. Widjajaotmodjo, A.T.A. Box, R. Torensma, and J. Verhoef. 1993. Rapid detection of *Salmonella* in poultry with the magnetic immuno-polymerase chain reaction assay. *Appl. Environ. Microbiol.* **59**:1342–1346.
21. Fratamico, P.M., L.K. Bagi, and T. Pepe. 2000. A multiplex polymerase chain reaction of *Escherichia coli* O157:H7 in foods and bovine feces. *J. Food Prot.* **63**:1032–1037.
22. Fratamico, P.M. and T.P. Strobaugh. 1998. Simultaneous detection of *Salmonella* spp. and *Escherichia coli* O157:H7 by multiplex PCR. *J. Industrial Microbiol. Biotechnol.* **21**:92–98.
23. Harvard, H.L., E.C. Hunter, and W. Titball. 1992. Comparison of the nucleotide sequence and development of a PCR test for the epsilon toxin gene of *Clostridium perfringens* type B and type D. *FEMS Microbiol. Lett.* **97**:77–82.
24. Hansen, B.M., T.D. Lesser, and N.B. Hendriksen. 2001. Polymerase chain reaction assay for the detection of *Bacillus cereus* group cells. *FEMS Microbiol. Lett.* **202**:209–213.
25. Hough, A.J., S.A. Harbison, M.G. Savill, L.D. Melton, and G. Fletcher. 2002. Rapid enumeration of *Listeria monocytogenes* in artificially contaminated cabbage using real-time polymerase chain reaction. *J. Food Prot.* **65**:1329–1332.
26. Hough, H.S., O. Sethabutr, and P. Echeverria. 1997. A simple polymerase chain reaction technique to detect and differentiate *Shigella* and enteroinvasive *Escherichia coli* in human feces. *Diag. Microbiol. Infect. Dis.* **28**:19–25.
27. Jackson, C.J., A.J. Fox, and D.M. Jones. 1996. A novel polymerase chain reaction assay for the detection and specification of thermophilic *Campylobacter* spp. *J. Appl. Bacteriol.* **81**:467–473.
28. Jitrapakdee, S., A. Tassanakajon, V. Boonsaeng, S. Piankijagum, and S. Panyim. 1995. A simple, rapid and sensitive detection of *Salmonella* in food by polymerase chain reaction. *Mol. Cell. Probes* **9**:375–382.
29. Jourdan, A.D., S.C. Johnson, and I.V. Wesley. 2000. Development of a fluorogenic 5' nuclease PCR assay for detection of the *ail* gene of pathogenic *Yersinia enterocolitica*. *Appl. Environ. Microbiol.* **66**:3750–3755.
30. Jung, Y.S., J.F. Frank, R.E. Brackett, and J.R. Chen. 2003. Polymerase chain reaction detection of *Listeria monocytogenes* on frankfurters using oligonucleotide primers targeting the genes encoding internalin AB. *J. Food Prot.* **66**:237–241.
31. Karunasagar, I., G. Sugumar, I. Karunasagar, and P.J. Reilly. 1996. Rapid polymerase chain reaction method for detection of Kanagawa positive *Vibrio parahaemolyticus* in seafoods. *Int. J. Food Microbiol.* **31**:317–323.
32. Kim, S., R. G. Labbe, and S. Ryu. 2000. Inhibitory effects of collagen on the PCR for detection of *Clostridium perfringens*. *Appl. Environ. Microbiol.* **66**:1213–1215.
33. Kim, Y.B., J. Okuda, C. Matsumoto, N. Takahashi, S. Hashimoto, and M. Nishibuchi. 1999. Identification of *Vibrio parahaemolyticus* strains at the species level by PCR targeted to the *toxR* gene. *J. Clin. Microbiol.* **37**:1173–1177.

34. Klein, P.A. and V.K. Juneja. 1997. Sensitive detection of viable *Listeria monocytogenes* by reverse transcription-PCR. *Appl. Environ. Microbiol.* **63**:4441–4448.
35. Kwang, J., E.T. Littledike, and J.E. Keen. 1996. Use of the polymerase chain reaction for *Salmonella* detection. *Lett. Appl. Microbiol.* **22**:46–51.
36. Lampel, K.A., P.A. Orlandi, and L. Kornegay. 2000. Improved template preparation method for PCR-based assays for detection of foodborne bacterial pathogens. *Appl. Environ. Microbiol.* **66**:4539–4542.
37. Lantz, P.G., R.K. Knutsson, Y. Blixt, W.A. Al-Soud, E. Borch, and P. Radstrom. 1998. Detection of pathogenic *Yersinia enterocolitica* in enrichment media and pork by a multiplex PCR: A study of sample preparation and PCR-inhibitory components. *Int. J. Food Microbiol.* **45**:93–105.
38. Lee, J.W., I.J. Jun, H.J. Kwun, K.L. Jang, and J. Cha. 2004. Direct identification of *Vibrio vulnificus* by PCR targeting elastase gene. *J. Microbiol. Biotechnol.* **14**:284–289.
39. Lee, J.Y., Y.B. Bang, J.H. Rhee, and S.H. Choi. 1999. Two stage nested PCR effectiveness for direct detection of *Vibrio vulnificus* in natural samples. *J. Food Sci.* **64**:158–162.
40. Lett, P.W., J.P. Southworth, D.D. Jones, and A.K. Bej. 1995. Detection of pathogenic *Escherichia coli* in ground beef using multiplex PCR. *Food Testing & Analysis* **1**:34–38.
41. Li, Y. and A. Mustapha. 2004. Simultaneous detection of *Escherichia coli* O157:H7, *Salmonella*, and *Shigella* in apple cider and produce by a multiplex PCR. *J. Food Prot.* **67**:27–33.
42. Li, Y., S. Zhuang, and A. Mustapha. 2005. Application of a multiplex PCR for the simultaneous detection of *Escherichia coli* O157:H7, *Salmonella* and *Shigella* in raw and ready-to-eat meat products. *Meat Sci.* **71**:402–406.
43. Lin, C.K., C.L. Hung, S.C. Hsu, C.C. Tsai, and H.Y. Tsen. 2004. An improved PCR primer pair based on 16S rDNA for the specific detection of *Salmonella* serovars in food samples. *J. Food Prot.* **67**:1335–1343.
44. Lin, J.S. and H.Y. Tsen. 1999. Development and use of polymerase chain reaction for the specific detection of *Salmonella* Typhimurium in stool and food samples. *J. Food Prot.* **62**:1103–1110.
45. Lindqvist, R. 1999. Detection of *Shigella* spp. in food with a nested PCR method—Sensitivity and performance compared with a conventional culture method. *J. Appl. Microbiol.* **86**:971–978.
46. Linton, D., A.J. Lawson, R.J. Owen, and J. Stanley. 1997. PCR detection, identification to species level, and fingerprinting of *Campylobacter jejuni* and *Campylobacter coli* direct from diarrheic samples. *J. Clin. Microbiol.* **35**:2568–2572.
47. Liu, D., A.J. Ainsworth, F.W. Austin, and M.L. Lawrence. 2004. Use of PCR primers derived from a putative transcriptional regulator gene for species-specific determination of *Listeria monocytogenes*. *Int. J. Food Microbiol.* **91**:297–304.
48. Longhi, C., A. Maffeo, M. Penta, G. Petrone, L. Seganti, and M.P. Conte. 2003. Detection of *Listeria monocytogenes* in Italian-style soft cheeses. *J. Appl. Microbiol.* **94**:879–885.
49. Luk, J.M., U. Kongmuang, P.R. Reeves, and A.A. Lindberg. 1993. Selective amplification of abequose and paratose synthase gene (*rfb*) by polymerase chain reaction of *Salmonella* major serotypes (A, B, C2, D). *J. Clin. Microbiol.* **31**:2118–2123.
50. Lyon, W.J. 2001. Taqman PCR for detection of *Vibrio cholerae* O1, O139, Non-O1, and Non-O139 in pure cultures, raw oysters, and synthetic seawater. *Appl. Environ. Microbiol.* **67**:4685–4693.

51. Manzano, M., C. Giusto, L. Lacumin, C. Cantoni, and G. Comi. 2003. A molecular method to detect *Bacillus cereus* from a coffee concentrate sample used in industrial preparations. *J. Appl. Microbiol.* **95**:1361–1366.
52. McIngvale, S.C., D. Elhanafi, and M.A. Drake. 2002. Optimization of reverse transcriptase PCR to detect viable Shiga-toxin-producing *Escherichia coli*. *Appl. Environ. Microbiol.* **68**:799–806.
53. McKillip, J.L. and M. Drake. 2004. Real time nucleic acid-based detection methods for pathogenic bacteria in food. *J. Food Prot.* **67**:823–832.
54. Meng, J., S. Zhao, M.P. Doyle, S.E. Mitchell, and S. Kresovich. 1997. A multiplex PCR for identifying Shiga-like toxin-producing *Escherichia coli* O157:H7. *Lett. Appl. Microbiol.* **24**:172–176.
55. Miyamoto, T., N. Ichioka, C. Sasaki, H.K. Kobayashi, K. Honjoh, M. Iio, and S. Hatano. 2002. Polymerase chain reaction assay for detection of *Escherichia coli* O157:H7 and *E. coli* O157:H-. *J. Food Prot.* **65**:5–11.
56. Osek, J. 2001. Multiplex polymerase chain reaction assay for identification of enterotoxigenic *Escherichia coli* strains. *J. Vet. Diag. Invest.* **13**:308–311.
57. Panicker, G., M.L. Myers, and A.K. Bej. 2004. Rapid detection of *Vibrio vulnificus* in shellfish and Gulf of Mexico water by real-time PCR. *Appl. Environ. Microbiol.* **70**:498–507.
58. Rasmussen, H.N., J.E. Olsen, K. Jorgensen, and O.F. Rasmussen. 1996. Detection of *Campylobacter jejuni* and *Campylobacter coli* in chicken faecal samples by PCR. *Lett. Appl. Microbiol.* **23**:363–366.
59. Sails, A.D., A.J. Fox, F.J. Bolton, D.R. Waring, and D.L. Greenway. 2003. A real-time PCR assay for the detection of *Campylobacter jejuni* in foods after enrichment culture. *Appl. Environ. Microbiol.* **69**:1383–1390.
60. Schraft, H. and M.W. Griffiths. 1995. Specific oligonucleotide primers for detection of lecithinase positive *Bacillus* spp. by PCR. *Appl. Environ. Microbiol.* **61**:98–102.
61. Seo, K.H., I.E. Valentin-Bon, R.E. Brackett, and P.S. Holt. 2004. Rapid, specific detection of *Salmonella Enteritidis* in pooled eggs by real-time PCR. *J. Food Prot.* **67**:864–869.
62. Sharma, V.K. 2002. Detection and quantitation of enterohemorrhagic *Escherichia coli* O157, O111, and O26 in beef and bovine feces by real-time polymerase chain reaction. *J. Food Prot.* **65**:1371–1380.
63. Somer, L. and Y. Kashi. 2003. A PCR method based on 16S rRNA sequence for simultaneous detection of the genus *Listeria* and the species *Listeria monocytogenes* in food products. *J. Food Prot.* **66**:1658–1665.
64. Soumet, C., G. Ermel, N. Rose, V. Drouin, G. Salvat, and P. Colin. 1999. Evaluation of a multiplex PCR assay for simultaneous identification of *Salmonella* sp., *Salmonella Enteritidis*, and *Salmonella Typhimurium* from environmental swabs of poultry houses. *Lett. Appl. Microbiol.* **28**:113–117.
65. Straub, J.A., C. Hertel, and W.P. Hammes. 1999. A 23S rDNA-targeted polymerase chain reaction-based system for detection of *Staphylococcus aureus* meat starter cultures and dairy products. *J. Food Prot.* **62**:1150–1156.
66. Szabo, E.A., and B.M. Mackey. 1999. Detection of *Salmonella Enteritidis* by reverse transcription-polymerase chain reaction. *Int. J. Food Microbiol.* **51**:113–122.
67. Tamarapu, S., J.L. McKillip, and M. Drake. 2001. Development of a multiplex polymerase chain reaction assay for detection and differentiation of *Staphylococcus aureus* in dairy products. *J. Food Prot.* **64**:664–668.

68. Taylor, M.S., A. Challed-Spong, and E.A. Johnson. 1997. Co-amplification of the amelogenin and HLA DQ^β genes: Optimization and validation. *J. Forensic Sci.* **42**:130–136.
69. Tsen, H.Y., L.Z. Jian, and W.R. Chi. 1998. Use of a multiplex PCR system for the simultaneous detection of heat labile toxin I and heat stable toxin II genes of enterotoxigenic *Escherichia coli* in skim milk and porcine stool. *J. Food Prot.* **61**:141–145.
70. Uzal, F.A., J.J. Plumb, L.L. Blackall, and W.R. Kelly. 1997. PCR detection of *Clostridium perfringens* producing different toxins in faeces of goats. *Lett. Appl. Microbiol.* **25**:339–344.
71. Villalobo, E. and A. Torres. 1998. PCR for detection of *Shigella* spp. in mayonnaise. *Appl. Environ. Microbiol.* **64**:1242–1245.
72. Vishnubhatla, A., R.D. Oberst, D.Y. Fung, W. Wonglumsom, M.P. Hays, and T.G. Nagaraja. 2001. Evaluation of a 5' nuclease (TaqMan) assay for the detection of virulent strains of *Yersinia enterocolitica* in raw meat and tofu samples. *J. Food Prot.* **64**:355–360.
73. Wilson, I.G. 1997. Inhibition and facilitation of nucleic acid amplification. *Appl. Environ. Microbiol.* **63**:3741–3751.
74. Yeung, P.S., A. Depaola, C.A. Kaysner, and K.J. Boor. 2003. A PCR assay for specific detection of the pandemic *Vibrio parahaemolyticus* O3:K6 clone from shellfish. *J. Food Sci.* **68**:1459–1466.