

Efficacy of Ammonization to Eliminate Common Mycotoxins

Veysel Doğan^{1,a,*}, Armağan Hayırlı^{1,b}

¹Department of Animal Nutrition and Nutritional Disorders, Faculty of Veterinary Medicine, Atatürk University, Erzurum 25240 Türkiye *Corresponding author

ARTICLE INFO	A B S T R A C T	
Research Article	Mycotoxin is a worldwide problem threatening animal health and performance as well as public health. The objective of this experiment was to test the effect of ammonization on elimination of common mycotoxins in laying hen compound feed (CF) and dairy cattle total mixed ration (TMR).	
Received : 07/07/2022 Accepted : 24/07/2022	The CF for laying hens and TMR for dairy cows were contaminated with commonly occurring mycotoxins [aflatoxin B ₁ (AFB ₁), ochratoxin A (OTA), and zearalenone (ZEA)] at 25 times of their accepted legal limits (20 ppb, 200 ppb and 500 ppb, respectively). They were then subjected to ammonization with ammonium bicarbonate (NH ₄ HCO ₃) at 50°C for 24 hours under the atmospheric pressure. Mycotoxin levels were analyzed using the LC-MS/MS technique. The elimination levels in CF and TMR were 53% and 54% for AFB ₁ ; 31% and 31% for OTA and 22% and 22% for ZEA, respectively. In conclusion, ammonization was effective in destroying common mycotoxin, at an order of AFB ₁ > OTA > ZEA.	
Keywords: Ammonization Aflatoxin B1 Ochratoxin Zearalenone Mycotoxin		
▲ d_veysel@yahoo.com	b https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1148-5416 b ahayirli_2000@yahoo.com b https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4446-0848 This work is licensed under Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License	

Introduction

Mycotoxins are secondary metabolites that are produced by certain fungi such as *Aspergillus, Penicillium and Fusarium* and that stimulate the toxic response in animals when ingested even at low concentrations (Bennet, 1987; Moss, 1991). The common mycotoxins that most capable to contaminate the feedstuffs and food materials among the thousands of mycotoxins are aflatoxins (AFB), ochratoxin A (OTA), and zearalenone (ZEA) (Ismaiel and Papenbrock, 2015). Mycotoxins deliver detrimental effects in animals including mortality, production loss, and feed conversion inefficacy as well as hepatotoxic, nephrotoxic, immunotoxic, cancerogenic, and genotoxic effects (Bitay et al., 1979; Smith et al., 1992; Dierheimer,1998; Gabal and Azzam, 1998; Wild and Gong, 2012).

Different methods have been developed to eliminate the negative impacts of mycotoxins. These methods can be classified as: physical methods such as irradiation, heating, extraction, and adsorption (Jalili et al., 2010). Adsorptive agents are feasible and practical under the farm conditions. In some studies, mineral compounds as adsorptive agents demonstrate efficient adsorbing effects *in vitro*, in contrast, some of them are not able to adsorb mycotoxins efficiently in vivo (Jaynes et al., 2007). It was also shown that the adsorptive agents were selectively bound to mycotoxins (Gregorio et al., 2014). Chemical and physical properties adsorbents and mycotoxins, such as surface of phenomenon, size and distribution of the porous, total charge, mycotoxins polarity, shape, size and low surface area are another factor for the effectiveness of binders and adsorbents for mycotoxins (Huwing et al., 2001). Biological methods include fungi (i.e., nontoxigenic Aspergillius spp.), bacteria (i.e., Actinomycetales spp.), and enzymes (i.e., laccase and manganese peroxidase) (Alberts et al., 2009; Wu et al., 2009; Wang et al., 2011; Kong et al., 2012). There are some limitation factors on the elimination of mycotoxins such as required long incubation periods for effective detoxification and complicated extraction procedures to obtain the active extracts (Ji et al., 2016).

Similar to treatment with common chemicals such as sodium bisulfite and calcium hydroxide (Samarajeewa et al., 1990), ammonization is considered chemical methods, based on the principle to convert the mycotoxins into the non-toxic or less toxic metabolites by the oxidation or hydrolyze of the lactone ring present in their structure, through the binding of chlorine to furan ring and breaking down the double bonds in the lactone ring (Swenson, 1981). Ammonization occurs by two step chemical reactions: first, hydrolysis of the lactone rings and then decarboxylation (Lee et al., 1974; Grove et al., 1984). In ammonization, the lactone ring in the aflatoxins is the main target and opened by aminolysis and ammonia forms an amide by binding to the carboxyl terminal end, due to in the acidic nature, of this group. In the latter step, remains a β-keto acid after the removing of ammonia from the amide moiety. Presence of the H_2O , H^+ or OH^- ions in the environment or presence of the heat cause to the decarboxylation of the β -keto acid and to remove the CO₂ from the structure. After this step, formed new structure is called aflatoxin D₁, which is 2000-20000 times less toxic than AFB_1 (Hawortha et al., 1989).

The objective of this experiment was to test the efficacy of the ammonization procedure on destruction of commonly occurring mycotoxins (AFB₁, OTA, and ZEA) in laying hen compound feed (CF) and dairy cattle total mixed ration (TMR).

Material and Methods

Samples, Contamination, and Ammonization

Commercial compound feed for laying hens (CF) (11.09 MJ/kg, 17% crude protein, 4% crude fiber, 3.4% crude fat and 12.5% crude ash) and total mixed ratio for dairy cattle (TMR) (19.4% grass hay, 19.2% barley silage, 24.0% corn silage, 9.7% rolled barley grain, 27.8% protein-energy concentrate on a dry matter basis) were dried at 60°C for three days and then ground to pass 1 mm screen. The mycotoxins were purchased (A6636: 1 mg aflatoxin B₁, Z2125: 25 mg zearalenone, and 32937: 5 mg ochratoxin A, Sigma-Aldrich, Taufkirchen, Germany).

The feedstuffs were subjected to contamination of mycotoxins at 25-fold of the legal limits [(AFB₁, OTA and ZEA are 20 μ g/kg, 200 μ g/kg and 500 μ g/kg, respectively (Amtsblatt der Europäischen Union, 2006) (Table 1). The mycotoxins at the contamination level were suspended within 1.500 L distilled water. The feeds were split into two group: the control group and the contaminated group (800 g). After spraying mycotoxin cocktail in plastic containers, the contaminated feeds were subjected to the drying process at 60°C for three days. The feedstuffs were shaken every three hours during the drying process to achieve homogeneous contamination. Contaminated CF and TMR

were split into two groups: the contaminated group and the contaminated plus ammonized group (400 g). The ammonization process was applied at the dose of 10 g/kg NH₄HCO₃ (Toxifarm Dry, Farmavet International, Manisa, Türkiye). While the ammonization at 50°C for 24 hours in oven, the lids of plastic containers were slightly secured in order to prevent the gas escape as NH₄HCO₃ gasifies as soon as contact with air and heat. The containers were shaken every three hours during the ammonization process.

The feeds of the control, contaminated and ammoniated groups were subsampled 8 bags, each weighing 50 g for analyses of mycotoxins using the liquid chromatography/mass spectrometry (LC/MS 6420, Agilent, Santa Clara, CA).

Before analyses of mycotoxins, the feed samples were extracted by weighing 2 g feed samples in the falcon tube and adding 10 ml extraction-1 solution [79% acetonitrile (HPLC grade), 20% distilled water and 1% formic acid (HPLC grade)]. The samples were centrifuged for 5 min at 4500 rpm after stirring process at 250-300 rpm for one hour. At the end of the centrifugation, 1 ml extraction-2 solution [79% distilled water, 20% acetonitrile (HPLC grade) and 1% formic acid (HPLC grade)] were added to 1 ml supernatant (this process ensured both the solvation and 10 times distillation of mycotoxins) and filtered through 0.45 μ m filter and transposed to another falcon tube. The obtained specimens were analyzed by taking into the vials.

Statistics

The data were subjected to one-way ANOVA using the PROC. GLM procedure (SAS, Statistical Analysis System, Version 9.0, Cary, NC, 2002). The linear model was as follows: Y_{ij} = μ + G_i + e_{ij} , where Y: response variable, μ : population mean, G: group (i: control, contaminated and ammoniated), and e: experimental error (i: in group, j: in sample). Difference between-groups was evaluated with the LSD option. Statistical difference among groups was considered significant at p<0.05 and the group values were presented as least square mean \pm standard error.

Results

Intra- and Inter-Assay Variation

When the control feed groups were considered, the intra-assay variations were 13.5%, 39.0% and 45.5% and inter-assay variations were 16.7%, 63.8% and 46.0% for AFB, OTA, and ZEA, respectively.

Table 1. Effects of the ammonization procedure on mycotoxin levels ($\mu g/kg$) in laying hen compound feed (CF) and dairy cow total mixed ration (TMR) upon contamination.

Groups*				
Feed	Control	Contaminated	Ammonized	
Laying Hen CF				
AFB ₁	1.61±0.05°	324.71±2.89ª	152.73±1.36 ^b	
OTA	5.47±0.51°	1831.61 ± 51.28^{a}	1267.27±29.11 ^b	
ZEA	4.73±1.58°	3045.20 ± 94.68^{a}	2383.82±135.13 ^b	
Dairy Cow TMR				
AFB ₁	1.89±0.12°	146.59±2.59ª	67.95±1,64 ^b	
OTA	12.28±2.24°	877.65 ± 20.36^{a}	$608.04{\pm}18.05^{b}$	
ZEA	2.44±1.10°	2827.88±233.81ª	2192.87±147.09 ^b	

^{*}The different superscripts among the groups differ (P<0.05). The feedstuffs were subjected to contamination of mycotoxins at 25-fold of the legal limits [aflatoxin (AFB₁), ochratoxin A (OTA), and zearalonol (ZEA) are 20, 200, and 500 μ g/kg, respectively (Ambsblatt der Europäischen Union, 2006). The ammonization process was applied at the dose of 10 g/kg NH₄HCO₃ (Toxifarm Dry, Farmavet International, Manisa, Türkiye).

Contamination and Ammonization

The mycotoxin levels in the laying hen CF and dairy cow TMR when they were not contaminated (control), contaminated with mycotoxins about 25-fold of legal limits (contaminated), and ammoniated after contamination were summarized in Table 1. The levels of AFB1, OTA and ZEA in the control laying hen CF were much lower than the legal limits determined by the international standards (20, 200, and 500 μ g/kg, respectively), which were 1.61, 5.47, and 4.73 µg/kg, respectively (Table 1). Experimental contamination for AFB₁, OTA and ZEA were achieved by 65%, 37%, and 24%, respectively, of the intention, which were 325 (500), 1832 (5000), and 3045 (12500) µg/kg, respectively (Table 1). Significant decreases in concentration of AFB1 (-53%), OTA (-31%) and ZEA (-22%) were obtained in the contaminated laying hen CF after the ammonization process. However, the ammonization process was not fully successful to decrease the mycotoxin levels below to the legal limits.

The levels of AFB₁, OTA and ZEA in the control dairy cow TMR were much lower than the legal limits determined by the international standards, which were 1.89 (20), 12.28 (200), and 2.44 (500 μ g/kg, respectively (Table 1). Experimental contamination for AFB₁, OTA, and ZEA were achieved by 29%, 18%, and 23%, respectively, of the intention, which were 147 (500), 878 (5000), and 2828 (12500) μ g/kg, respectively (Table 1). Significant decreases in concentration of AFB₁ (-54%), OTA (-31%), and ZEA (-22%) were obtained in the contaminated dairy cow TMR after the ammonization process. However, the ammonization process was not fully successful to decrease the mycotoxin levels below to the legal limits.

Discussion

Studies involving the ammonization process at various concentrations and different temperatures under the pressure in a laboratory setting for destructions of AFs and OTA are available (Brekke et al., 1979, 1977a, 1977b; Jensen et al., 1977; Bagley, 1979; Norred, 1982; Price et el., 1982; Lee et al., 1984; Koltun, 1986; Norred et al., 1991; Kwon et al., 1997).

The data obtained from the LC-MS/MS analysis demonstrated that a significant degradation in the mycotoxin levels on the AFB₁, OTA and ZEA contaminated laying hen CF and dairy cow TMR (Table 1). The degradation levels for AFB₁, OTA and ZEA were 54%, 31% and 22%, respectively, in the laying hen CF and 53%, 31% and 22%, respectively, in the dairy cow TMR. The data confirms that the ammonization mechanism affects the epoxy terminal end in the lactone ring of the resorcylic acid lactone structure of ZEA similarly at a short period (24 hrs) to the AFB₁ and OTA. The decomposition rates were not fully successful to decrease the levels under the legal limits.

 AFB_1 and AFG_1 contain a double bond on the C8-9 point of the furan rings while AFB_2 and AFG_2 do not contain a double bond on the C8-9 of the furan rings. These features of the AFs create the concentration differences in the ozonation method, which is a detoxification/elimination method based on oxidation. For instance, AFB_1 and AFG_1 require low concentrations while AFB_2 and AFG_2 require high concentrations (McKenzie et al., 1997). Likewise, in the microwave application, the double bond on the C8-9 point of furan ring causes wavelength differences (Atalla et al., 2004; Diao et al., 2015). These concentration differences arising from the double bond are not thought to occur in the ammonization method.

The lactone ring in the OTA is irreversibly cleaved opened in the alkaline environment (Müller, 1983). LD_{50} dose for a metabolite produced by the ammonization of the epoxy terminal in the lactone ring has been determined to be 200 µg/egg (Chelkowski et al., 1981), which confirms decreased OTA levels upon the ammonization process in the present study (Table 1).

ZEA is in the resorcylic acid lactone structure and contain an epoxy terminal end in the lactone ring (Kuiper-Goodman et al., 1987). In agreement with the present study, ZEA degradation was observed upon the ammonization process in the earlier studies (Bennet et al., 1980; Chelkowski et al., 1981). However, these levels are not satisfied despite a long processing time for destruction (Bennet et al., 1980; Chelkowski et al., 1981).

The decomposition of mycotoxins by ammonization were found most effective for degradation of AFs and OTAs. In addition, the temperature, pressure and processing time were thought to be critical for evaporate of ammonia and breaking down the double bond in the lactone ring (Brekke et al., 1979, 1977a; Chelkowski et al., 1981; Norred, 1982; Price et al., 1982; Lee et al., 1984; Koltun, 1986).

1% solution of ammonium bicarbonate in water has approximately 7.8 pH at 25°C. In addition, Sutter and Mazzotti (2017) have shown that NH_4^+ and HCO_3^- activity existed in the NH_4HCO_3 - H_2O binary system by contrast with the contact of NH_4HCO_3 with air. In this situation, an extra alkaline environment may be created in the presence of water. However, this effect is low for the hydroxylation of the epoxy terminal end in the lactone rings. In a study conducted by Gomma (1987) has shown that 5% sodium bicarbonate provide 10% degradation in aflatoxins. In the present study, dry form of NH_4HCO_3 used for detoxification process. In this case, no an extra alkaline environment was created for hydroxylation.

In our experimental design, the water attached to the feedstuffs was evaporated at 60°C for 3 days. This process creates DM > 88%. Up to 5% ammonium concentration requires 10-20% moisture content in the feedstuffs to provide an effective aflatoxin degradation depending on the temperature and time (Samarajeewa et al., 1990). The total water, both releasing from the NH₄HCO₃ and attached to the feedstuffs, is not sufficient for hydroxylation reaction in the lactone ring.

In the ammonization process, the lactone ring in the mycotoxins is opened by aminolysis and ammonia forms an amide by binding to the carboxyl terminal end, due to in the acidic nature of this group. The opening of the lactone ring is a reversible reaction in the acidic environment (Piva et al., 1995). In the latter step, remain a β -keto acid after the removing of ammonia from the amide moiety. Presence of the H₂O, H⁺ or OH⁻ ions in the environment or presence of the heat cause to the decarboxylation of the β -keto acid and to remove the CO₂ from the structure. In addition, thermal decomposition of NH₄HCO₃ between 35-60°C

releases $NH_{3(g)}$, $H_2O_{(g)}$ and $CO_{2(g)}$ to the environment. In the present case, the CO₂, released both from NH_4HCO_3 and mycotoxins, may acidify the environment. This reaction may convert the formed metabolite to the original state.

In conclusion, mycotoxin degradation by ammonization method was confirmed. However, the degradation rate was not satisfactory, reaching below their legal limits. Future studies should perform different doses at different temperatures while identifying new products occurring in addition to nutrients in case they are lost and/or denatured.

References

- Alberts JF, Gelderblom WCA, Botha A, van Zyl WH. 2009. Degradation of aflatoxin B₁ by fungal laccase enzymes. International Journal of Food Microbiology, 135: 47-52. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijfoodmicro.2009.07.022.
- Atalla MM, Hassanein NM, El-Beih AA, Youssef YA. 2004. Effects of fluorescent and UV light on mycotoxin production under different relative humidities in wheat grains. International Journal of Agriculture and Biology, 6: 1006-1012.
- Bagley EB. 1979. Decontamination of corn containing aflatoxin by treatment with ammonia. Journal of the American Oil Chemists' Society, 56: 808-811. https://doi.org/ 10.1007/BF02909524.
- Bennet GA, Shotwell OL, Hesseltine CW 1980. Destruction of zearalenone in contaminated corn. Journal of the American Oil Chemists' Society, 80: 245-247. https://doi.org/10.1007/ BF02668251.
- Bennett JW. 1987. Mycotoxins, mycotoxicoses, mycotoxicology and mycopathologia. Mycopathologia. 100: 3-5. https:// doi.org/10.1007/BF00769561.
- Bitay Z, Glavits R, Sellyey G. 1979. Feeding experiments on broiler chickens with ochraxoin A, patulin, T-2 and butenolide. Magyar Allatorvosok Lapja, 34: 417-422.
- Brekke OL, Peplinski AJ, Lancater EB. 1977a. Aflatoxin inactivation in corn by aqua ammonia. Transactions of the American Society of Agricultural Engineers, 20: 1160-1168. https://doi.org/10.13031/2013.35721.
- Brekke OL, Peplinski AJ, Nofsinger GW, Conway HF, Stringfellow AC, Montgomery RR, Silman RW, Sohns VE, Bagley EB. 1979. Aflatoxin inactivation in corn by ammonia gas: a field trial. American Society of Agricultural and Biological Engineers 22: 425-432. https://doi.org/ 10.13031/2013.35033.
- Brekke OL, Sinnhuber RO, Peplinski AJ, Wales JH, Putnam GB, Lee DJ, Ciegler A. 1977b. Aflatoxin in corn: ammonia inactivation and bioassay with rainbow trout. Applied and Environmental Microbiology, 34: 34-37. https://doi.org/10.1128/AEM.34.1.34-37.1977.
- Chelkowski J, Golinski P, Godlewska B, Radomyska W, Szebiotko K, Wiewirowska M. 1981. Mycotoxins in cereal grain. Part IV. Inactivation of ochratoxin A and other mycotoxins during ammoniation. Nahrung, 25: 631-637. https://doi.org/10.1002/food.19810250705.
- Diao E, Li X, Zhang Z, Ma W, Ji N, Dong H. 2015. Ultraviolet irradiation detoxification of aflatoxins: a review. Trends in Food Science and Technology, 42: 64-69. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tifs.2014.12.001.
- Dierheimer G. 1998. Recent advances in the genotoxicity of mycotoxins. Revue de Medecine Veterinaire, 149: 585-590.
- Empfehlung der Kommission, betreffend das Vorhandensein von Deoxynivalenol, Zearalenon, Ochratoxin A, T-2- und HT-2-Toxin sowie von Fumonisien zur Verfütterung an Tiere bestimmten Erzeugnissen. Amtsblatt der Europäischen Union, 2006/576/EG, vom 17. August 2006.

- Gabal MA, Azzam AH. 1998. Interaction of aflatoxin in the feed and immunization against selected infectious diseases in poultry. II. Effect on one day old layer chicks simultaneously vaccinated against Newcastle diseases infectious bronchitis and infectious bursal disease. Avian Pathology, 27: 290-295. https://doi.org)10.1080/03079459808419338.
- Gomma EG. 1987. Effect of alkalies on aflatoxins in solutions and in biscuits and cakes. Ain Shams Engineering Journal. 8: 23-37.
- Gregorio MC, Neeff DV, Jager AV, Corassin CH, Pinho Carao AC, Albuquerque R, Azevedo C, Oliviera CAF. 2014. Mineral adsorbents for prevention of mycotoxins in animal feeds. Toxin Reviews. 1-11. https://doi.org/ 10.3109/15569543.2014.905604.
- Grove MD, Plattner RD, Peterson RE. 1984. Detection of Aflatoxin D1 in Ammoniated corn by mass spectrometry-mass spectrometry. Applied and Environmental Microbiology, 48: 887-889.
- Hawortha SR, Lawlor TE, Zeiger E, Park DL. 1989. Mutagenic potential of ammonia-related aflatoxin reaction products in a model system. Journal of the American Oil Chemists' Society, 66: 102-104. https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02661794.
- Huwig A, Freimund S, Kappeli O, Dutler H. 2001. Mycotoxin detoxication of animal feed by different adsorbents. Toxicology Letters, 122: 179–188. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0378-4274(01)00360-5.
- Ismaiel AA, Papenbrock J. 2015. Mycotoxins: producing fungi and mechanisms of phytotoxicity. Agriculture, 3: 492-537. https://doi.org/10.3390/agriculture5030492.
- Jalili M, Jinap S, Noranizan A. 2010. Effect of gamma radiation on reduction of mycotoxins in black pepper. Food Control, 21: 1388–1393. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foodcont.2010. 04.012.
- Jaynes WF, Zartman RE, Hudnall WH. 2007. Aflatoxin B1 adsorption by clays from water and corn meal. Applied Clay Science, 36: 197–205. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.clay.2006. 06.012.
- Jensen AH, Brekke OL, Frank GR, Peplinski AJ. 1977. Acceptance and utilization by swine of aflatoxin-contaminated corn treated with aqueous or gaseous ammonia. Journal of Animal Science, 45: 8-12. https://doi.org/10.2527/jas1977.4518.
- Ji C, Fan Y, Zhao L. 2016. Review on biological degradation of mycotoxins. Animal Nutrition. 2: 127-133. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.aninu.2016.07.003.
- Koltun PS. 1986. Aflatoxin inactivation of undelinted cottonseed by ammoniation. Journal of the American Oil Chemists' Society, 63: 533-534. https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02645745.
- Kong Q, Zhai C, Guan B, Li C, Shan S, Yu J. 2012. Mathematic modeling for optimum condition on aflatoxin B₁ degradation by the aerobic bacterium Rhodococcus erythropolis. Toxins, 4: 1181-1195. https://doi.org/10.3390/toxins4111181.
- Kuiper-Goodman T, Scott PM, Watanabe H. 1987. Risk assessment of the mycotoxin zearalenone. Regulatory Toxicology and Pharmacology, 7: 253-306. https://doi.org/10.1016/0273-2300(87)90037-7.
- Kwon OS, Schmued LC, Slikker JrW. 1997. Fumonisin B1 in developing rats alters brain sphinganine levels and myelination. Neurotoxicology, 18: 571-579.
- Lee LS, Koltun SP, Stanley JB. 1984. Ammoniation of aflatoxin B₁ in a pressure chamber used to decontaminate toxin-containing cottonseed meal. Journal of the American Oil Chemists' Society, 61: 1607-1608. https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02541643.
- Lee LS, Stanley JB, Cucullu AF, Pons WA, Goldblatt LA. 1974. Ammoniation of aflatoxin B1: isolation and identification of the major reaction product. Journal-Association of Official Chemists, 57: 626-631. https://doi.org/10.1093/jaoac/ 57.3.626.
- McKenzie KS, Sarr AB, Mayura K, Bailey RH, Miller DR, Rogers TD, Norred WP, Voss KA, Plattner RD, Kubena LF, Phillips TD. 1997. Oxidative degradation and detoxification of mycotoxins using a novel source of ozone. Food and Chemical Toxicology, 35: 807-820. https://doi.org/ 10.1016/S0278-6915(97)00052-S.

- Moss MO. 1991. The environmental factors controlling mycotoxin formation, in: Smith, J.E., Henderson, R.S. (Eds.), Mycotoxins and Animal Foods. CRC Press, Florida, pp. 37-56.
- Müller HM. 1983. A survey of methods of decontaminating mycotoxins. Part II chemical methods and reactions with components of feedstuffs. Übersicht Tierernach. 11: 7-37.
- Norred W. 1982. Ammonia treatment to destroy aflatoxins in corn. Journal of Food Protection, 45: 972-976. https://doi.org/10.4315/0362-028X-45.10.972.
- Norred WP, Voss KA, Bacon CW, Riley RT. 1991. Effectiveness of ammonia treatment in detoxification of fumonisincontaminated corn. Food and Chemical Toxicology, 29: 815-819. https://doi.org/10.1016/0278-6915(91)90108-J.
- Piva GFP, Galvano FRD, Pietri AAP, Piva ARD. 1995. Detoxification methods of aflatoxins. A review. Nutrition Research, 15: 767-776. https://doi.org/10.1016/0271-5317(95)00042-H
- Price RL, Lough OG, Brown WH. 1982. Ammoniation of whole cottonseed at atmospheric pressure and ambient temperature to reduce aflatoxin M1 in milk. Journal of Food Protection, 45: 341-344.

- Samarajeewa U, Sen AC, Cohen MD, Wei CI. 1990. Detoxification of aflatoxins in foods and feeds by physical and chemical methods. Journal of Food Protection, 53: 489-501. https://doi.org/10.4315/0362-028X-53.6.489.
- Smith EE, Kubena LF, Braithwaite RB, Harvey RB, Philips TD, Reine AH. 1992. Toxicological evaluation of aflatoxin and cyclopiazonic acid in broiler chickens. Poultry Science, 71: 1136-1144. https://doi.org/10.3382/ps.0711136.
- Sutter D, Mazzotti M. 2017. Solubility and growth kinetics of ammonium bicarbonate in aqueous solution. Crystal Growrth and Design. 6: 3048-3054. https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.cgd.6b01751.
- Swenson DH. 1981. Metabolic activation and detoxification of aflatoxin. Reviews in Biochemical Toxicology, 3: 155-192.
- Wang J, Ogata M, Hirai H, Kawagishi H. 2011 Detoxification of aflatoxin B₁ by manganese peroxidase from the white-rot fungus Phanerochaete sordida YK-624. FEMS Microbiology Letters, 314: 164-169. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1574-6968.2010.02158.x.
- Wild CP, Gong YY. 2012. Mycotoxins and human disease: a largely ignored global health issue. Carcinogenesis, 31: 71-82. https://doi.org/10.1093/carcin/bgp264.
- Wu Q, Jezkova A, Yuan Z, Pavlikova L, Dohnal C, Kuca K. 2009. Biological degradation of aflatoxins. Drug Metabolism Reviews, 41: 1-7. https://doi.org/10.1080/03602530 802563850.