

PCB 118 and Aryl Hydrocarbon Receptor Immunoassays for Screening Dioxins in Retail Fish

TOMOAKI TSUTSUMI,^{*,†} YOSHIAKI AMAKURA,[†] KAZUNORI ASHIEDA,[‡]
 AKIRA OKUYAMA,[§] YOUHEI TANIOKA,[#] KAZUTO SAKATA,[#]
 YASUO KOBAYASHI,^{⊥,∇} KUMIKO SASAKI,[†] AND TAMIO MAITANI[†]

National Institute of Health Sciences, Kamiyoga 1-18-1, Setagaya-ku, Tokyo 158-8501, Japan; Nisshin Environmental Planning Inc., Nishiarai-Sakaecho 1-19-8, Adachi-ku, Tokyo 123-0843, Japan; EnBioTec Laboratories Company, Ltd., Chiyoda-Parion Building, Sixth Floor, Kandasuda-cho 2-3-16, Chiyoda-ku, Tokyo 101-0041, Japan; Daiichi Fine Chemical Company, Ltd., Chokeiji 530, Takaoka, Toyama 933-8511, Japan; and Kubota Corporation, Nihonbashi-muromachi 3-1-3, Chuo-ku, Tokyo 103-8310, Japan

The efficacy of a combination of two enzyme-linked immunosorbent assay (ELISA) kits was examined for screening the toxic equivalent (TEQ) concentrations of dioxins in retail fish. The coplanar PCB-EIA system, which is a competitive immunoassay specific for polychlorinated biphenyl (PCB) 118, was tested as a screening method for mono-*ortho* PCBs. The Ah immunoassay (Ah-I), which is an ELISA-based aryl hydrocarbon receptor binding assay, was analyzed for its screening ability for non-*ortho* PCBs, polychlorinated dibenzo-*p*-dioxins (PCDDs), and dibenzofurans (PCDFs). Dilution and recovery tests using purified fish extracts revealed no major interference of the matrix in the PCB-EIA and suggested that the matrix effect was minimized in the Ah-I. Finally, the results for the fish samples ($n = 20$) showed a strong correlation between this method and high-resolution gas chromatography coupled to high-resolution mass spectrometry for the determination of the TEQ concentrations of mono-*ortho* PCBs ($r = 0.99$) and non-*ortho* PCBs and PCDD/Fs ($r = 0.97$). These data indicate that our method is suitable for screening retail fish to determine the TEQ concentrations of dioxins.

KEYWORDS: Dioxins; immunoassay; bioassay; Ah receptor; fish; screening

INTRODUCTION

Fishery products have been identified as the main source of polychlorinated dibenzo-*p*-dioxins (PCDDs), polychlorinated dibenzofurans (PCDFs), and dioxin-like polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs)—collectively referred to as dioxins—in the Japanese diet (1, 2). We previously carried out a nationwide survey of dioxin concentrations in various fishery products available on the Japanese market during the past few years (3–5) and found that fish often showed high toxic equivalent (TEQ) levels of dioxins. It is therefore important to develop screening methods for the determination of dioxin TEQs in retail fish in order to carry out risk assessments.

High-resolution gas chromatography coupled to high-resolution mass spectrometry (HRGC-HRMS) is generally viewed as the most reliable method for determining the TEQ concentrations of dioxins. This technique is sensitive and reproducible; however, it is also time-consuming and requires expensive instruments, which limits its capacity. A reporter-gene assay, such as the chemical-activated luciferase gene expression (CALUX) assay, is currently considered to be the best screening method for the TEQ concentrations of dioxins in food [as reviewed by Hoogenboom et al. (6)]. The CALUX assay detects dioxin-like compounds based on their activation of the aryl hydrocarbon receptor (AhR), which increases the expression of the luciferase reporter gene as reviewed by Behnisch et al. (7) and Overmeire et al. (8). The response for a sample containing dioxin-like compounds can be converted into 2,3,7,8-tetrachlorodibenzo-*p*-dioxin (2,3,7,8-TCDD) equivalents, which are known as CALUX-based TEQs, using a 2,3,7,8-TCDD standard curve. The CALUX assay has been applied to the detection of dioxins in fish and fishery products (9–13); however, its drawbacks include the need for cell culture, which requires skilled personnel and elaborate equipment, and the likely requirement of a license for the assay.

* Author to whom correspondence should be addressed [telephone (+81-3) 3700-1141, ext. 334; fax (+81-3) 3707-6950; e-mail tutumi@nihs.go.jp].

[†] National Institute of Health Sciences.

[‡] Nisshin Environmental Planning Inc.

[§] EnBioTec Laboratories Co., Ltd.

[#] Daiichi Fine Chemical Co., Ltd.

[⊥] Kubota Corp.

[∇] Present address: ENTEST Japan Inc., Venture Plaza Funabashi 111, Kita-Honcho 1-17-25, Funabashi, Chiba 273-0864, Japan.

An enzyme-linked immunosorbent assay (ELISA) based screening tool, in the form of a commercially available kit, might be a simpler alternative that does not require cell culture. The objective of the current study was therefore to evaluate two commercially available ELISA kits for dioxin TEQ concentration screening in retail fish. We recently developed the coplanar PCB-EIA system, which is a competitive ELISA kit, using a monoclonal antibody (mAb) that is highly specific for 2,3',4,4',5-pentachlorobiphenyl (PCB 118) (14). According to the HRGC-HRMS data produced by our Japanese national survey (15), PCB 118 accounts for about 50% of the total TEQ concentrations of the mono-*ortho* PCB isomers in fish. The PCB-EIA method is rapid, taking approximately 2 h, and performed well in the analysis of PCB 118 in fish samples after purification (16); we therefore consider it to be a good screening method for mono-*ortho* PCB TEQ concentrations in fish.

The Ah immunosorbent assay (Ah-I) kit is a hybrid of an immunoassay and an in vitro AhR-binding assay (17). Dioxin-like compounds bind to the AhR and form complexes with the AhR nuclear translocator (ARNT) and dioxin-responsive element (DRE) DNA oligomer. The complexes are then detected by an immunoassay-based color reaction using an enzyme-conjugated Ab. The response for a sample containing dioxin-like compounds in the Ah-I can be converted into 2,3,7,8-TCDD equivalents using a 2,3,7,8-TCDD standard curve. The assay is rapid, taking approximately 6 h, and has a simple-to-use format without the need for live cell culture. We previously examined the ability of the Ah-I to screen dioxins in flue gas, soil, ash, and wastewater samples (18, 19). We also applied it to detect dioxins in fish samples (Tsutsumi et al., unpublished work) and obtained a positive reading for non-*ortho* PCBs and the PCDD/F fraction, although we were unsuccessful in detecting mono-*ortho* PCBs, probably due to strong antagonistic effects in the fraction. Therefore, the Ah-I was introduced as a method for screening the TEQ concentrations of non-*ortho* PCBs and PCDD/Fs in fish.

In the present study, we assessed the efficacy of combining the PCB-EIA (as a screening method for mono-*ortho* PCBs) and the Ah-I (as a screening method for non-*ortho* PCBs and PCDD/Fs).

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Reagents. The solvents used in this study (acetone, dichloromethane, *n*-hexane, methanol, and toluene) were obtained from Kanto Kagaku (Tokyo, Japan). Silica gel S-1, 22% sulfuric acid-impregnated silica gel, dimethyl sulfoxide (DMSO), and 2,3,7,8-TCDD were obtained from Wako Pure Chemicals Co. (Osaka, Japan). The 10% silver nitrate-silica gel and 44% sulfuric acid-impregnated silica gel were obtained from GL Sciences Inc. (Tokyo, Japan). Alumina B-Super I was obtained from ICN Pharmaceuticals Inc. (Costa Mesa, CA).

A multilayer silica gel column was prepared by filling it from bottom to top with 2.0 g of anhydrous sodium sulfate, 0.9 g of silica gel, 4.5 g of 44% sulfuric acid-impregnated silica gel, 6.0 g of 22% sulfuric acid-impregnated silica gel, 0.9 g of silica gel, 3.0 g of 10% silver nitrate-silica gel, and 1.5 g of anhydrous sodium sulfate. An alumina column was prepared by filling it from bottom to top with 2.0 g of anhydrous sodium sulfate, 15 g of alumina, and 0.5 g of anhydrous sodium sulfate. A sulfuric acid-silica gel column was prepared by filling it from bottom to top with 2.0 g of anhydrous sodium sulfate, 0.2 g of silica gel, 6.0 g of 44% sulfuric acid-impregnated silica gel, and 0.5 g of anhydrous sodium sulfate.

The PCB-EIA kit was purchased from EnBioTec Laboratories (Tokyo, Japan). The Ah-I kit was purchased from Kubota Corp. (Osaka, Japan).

Fish Samples. The fish samples (bonito, mackerel, mullet, salmon, sea bass, tuna, and yellowtail) were actual retail products purchased during 2003 and 2005 from supermarkets in Tokyo, Japan. The samples were skinned, and the muscular parts of the samples were homogenized using a GM200 food cutter obtained from Retsch Co., Ltd. (Haan, Germany) and stored at -20°C until required for analysis.




Figure 1. Sample preparation of retail fish.

Sample Preparation for the PCB-EIA and the Ah-I. The procedure for preparing the fish samples is shown schematically in Figure 1. Samples (20 g) of retail fish were homogenized and incubated in 100 mL of 2 M aqueous KOH for 16 h at room temperature. The alkaline hydrolysates were added to 150 mL of methanol and extracted three times by mechanical shaking for 10 min with 100 mL of *n*-hexane; the *n*-hexane layers were then washed twice with 150 mL of 2% (w/v) aqueous NaCl. The extracts were treated several times with concentrated sulfuric acid (H_2SO_4) and were passed through anhydrous sodium sulfate. The eluate was evaporated to near dryness at 40°C using a rotary evaporator and then was loaded onto a multilayer silica gel column. The eluate obtained with 200 mL of *n*-hexane was evaporated to near dryness at 40°C using a rotary evaporator and was loaded onto an alumina column. After washing with 150 mL of *n*-hexane, the first fraction (containing mono-*ortho* PCBs) was eluted with 150 mL of 2% (v/v) dichloromethane/*n*-hexane, and the second fraction (containing non-*ortho* PCBs and PCDD/Fs) was eluted with 200 mL of 60% (v/v) dichloromethane/*n*-hexane. The first fraction was evaporated to near dryness at 40°C using a rotary evaporator and was dried under nitrogen at room temperature. The residue was redissolved in 100 μL of DMSO and then used in the PCB-EIA. The second fraction was evaporated to near dryness at 40°C in a rotary evaporator and was further purified on a sulfuric acid-silica gel column. This reduced the background AhR-agonist activity in the Ah-I from the alumina column. The eluate obtained with 100 mL of *n*-hexane was evaporated to near dryness at 40°C in a rotary evaporator and was evaporated to dryness under nitrogen at room temperature. The residue was then redissolved in 20 μL of DMSO and used in the Ah-I.

PCB-EIA. The PCB-EIA kit was used according to the manufacturer's instructions (EnBioTec Laboratories) (20). Samples (12.5 μL /well) or various concentrations of 3,3',4'-trichloro-4-methoxybiphenyl, which is a surrogate standard for PCB 118, were mixed with competitor-horseradish peroxidase conjugate (1:3) and added to a microtiter plate (50 μL /well) coated with an mAb against PCB 118 and then incubated for 30 min at room temperature with gentle shaking. After washing with the solution provided, the enzyme-substrate solution containing 3,3',5,5'-tetramethylbenzidine was added to each well (50 μL /well) and incubated for 20 min. The enzyme reaction was stopped with 0.5 M H_2SO_4 (50 μL /well), and the absorbance at 450 nm was measured. All of the experiments were conducted in duplicate. The standard curves were fitted using a four-parameter logistic model. The PCB-EIA had a detection limit for PCB 118 of 10 ng/mL (125 pg/well), corresponding to 50 pg/g in the test samples.

Ah-I. The Ah-I kit was used according to the manufacturer's instructions (Kubota Corp.) (21). Samples (up to 2 μL /well) or various

concentrations of 2,3,7,8-TCDD were mixed with a reagent containing DRE DNA oligomers, ARNT, and cytosol components containing AhR. The mixtures were added to microtiter wells (200 μ L/well) coated with DRE-binding protein and then incubated for 2 h at 30 °C. The presence of dioxins promoted the formation of AhR–ARNT complexes, which then bound DRE DNA oligomers, and so bound to the wells. After washing with the solution provided, an anti-ARNT Ab solution was added to each well (200 μ L/well) and incubated for 1 h at 30 °C. After another washing, a second Ab conjugated to alkaline phosphatase solution was added to each well (200 μ L/well) and incubated for 1 h at 30 °C. After yet another washing, an enzyme–substrate solution was added to each well (200 μ L/well) and incubated for 30 min at 30 °C, and then the absorbance at 405 nm was measured. All of the experiments were conducted in triplicate wells for standard solutions and in a single well for serially diluted fish extracts. The assay used a standard curve with various concentrations of 2,3,7,8-TCDD, for which the detection limit was 5.0 pg/mL (1.0 pg/well). The standard curves were fitted using a cubic polynomial model. The measurements for samples containing dioxin-like compounds were converted into Ah-I-based 2,3,7,8-TCDD equivalents (dioxin equivalents or DEQs) and were corrected by subtracting the blank concentration for the sample preparation procedure. The minimum concentration measurable in the samples was 1.0 pg-DEQ/g.

HRGC-HRMS Analysis. Extraction, cleanup, and analysis of the dioxins were performed as described previously (22). Briefly, 50 g of homogenized fish sample was spiked with a $^{13}\text{C}_{12}$ -labeled internal quantification standard mixture (containing 17 2,3,7,8-chlorine substituted PCDD/Fs and 12 dioxin-like PCBs) and then digested with 2 M aqueous KOH. The alkaline hydrolysate was extracted three times with *n*-hexane. After treatment with concentrated sulfuric acid, the extract was purified on a silver nitrate–silica gel column followed by an alumina column. On the alumina column, mono-*ortho* PCBs were eluted with 2% (v/v) dichloromethane/*n*-hexane, and non-*ortho* PCBs and PCDD/Fs were eluted with 60% (v/v) dichloromethane/*n*-hexane. The latter fraction was further purified on an activated carbon column. Both fractions were spiked with $^{13}\text{C}_{12}$ -labeled recovery standards (3,3',4,5'-tetrachlorobiphenyl and 1,2,3,4-TCDD) and concentrated before HRGC-HRMS analysis.

The quantification of 17 2,3,7,8-chlorine-substituted PCDD/Fs, 4 non-*ortho* PCBs, and 8 mono-*ortho* PCBs was performed by HRGC-HRMS using an HP-6890 plus gas chromatograph coupled to a JEOL JMS-700 MStation mass spectrometer (Tokyo, Japan). The determination of 2,3,7,8-chlorine substituted PCDD/Fs was performed in DB-5MS and DB-17 fused silica capillary columns (J&W Scientific, Folsom, CA). The determination of non-*ortho* and mono-*ortho* PCBs was performed in an HT-8 fused silica capillary column (SGE, Austin, TX). The TEQ was calculated using the World Health Organization Toxic Equivalency Factor (WHO-TEF) scheme (23). The limits of quantification (LOQ) were around 0.01 pg/g for TCDDs/tetrachlorodibenzofurans (TCDFs) and pentachlorodibenzo-*p*-dioxins (PeCDDs)/pentachlorodibenzofurans (PeCDFs), 0.02 pg/g for hexachlorodibenzo-*p*-dioxins (HxCDDs)/hexachlorodibenzofurans (HxCDFs), and heptachlorodibenzo-*p*-dioxins (HpCDDs)/heptachlorodibenzofurans (HpCDFs), 0.05 pg/g for octachlorodibenzo-*p*-dioxin (OCDD)/octachlorodibenzofuran (OCDF), 0.1 pg/g for non-*ortho* PCBs, and 1.0 pg/g for mono-*ortho* PCBs. Calculations of the total TEQ in a sample were carried out by assuming that all isomer concentrations lower than the LOQs were equal to zero.

RESULTS

Recovery of Dioxins in the Sample Preparation Step for the PCB-EIA and Ah-I. The recovery of WHO-TEF dioxin isomers in the sample preparation step for the PCB-EIA and the Ah-I was determined by HRGC-HRMS analysis. Two varieties of fish contaminated in the natural environment were purified by the sample preparation procedure, their extracts were spiked with the $^{13}\text{C}_{12}$ -labeled internal quantification standard mixture, and HRGC-HRMS analysis was carried out. As shown in **Table 1**, dioxin isomer recovery in the fish samples was good in the mono-*ortho* PCB fraction (80.1–103.5%) and the non-*ortho* PCB and PCDD/F fraction (76.6–103.3%). In addition,

Table 1. Recoveries of Dioxins from Fish in the Sample Preparation for the PCB-EIA and Ah-I Determined by HRGC-HRMS Analysis^a

dioxin isomer	recovery ^b (%)	
	mullet	sea bass
non- <i>ortho</i> PCBs and PCDD/Fs fraction		
PCDDs		
2,3,7,8-TCDD	76.9 ± 6.8	86.9 ± 15.8
1,2,3,7,8-PeCDD	92.7 ± 18.8	78.5 ± 4.7
1,2,3,4,7,8-HxCDD	— ^c	—
1,2,3,6,7,8-HxCDD	96.3 ± 10.2	80.8 ± 8.5
1,2,3,7,8,9-HxCDD	—	—
1,2,3,4,6,7,8-HpCDD	92.5 ± 14.2	80.7 ± 8.0
OCDD	95.8 ± 4.9	76.6 ± 6.7
PCDFs		
2,3,7,8-TCDF	94.0 ± 1.1	96.8 ± 5.3
1,2,3,7,8-PeCDF	94.3 ± 19.7	93.9 ± 7.8
2,3,4,7,8-PeCDF	96.5 ± 5.9	89.6 ± 3.9
1,2,3,4,7,8-HxCDF	96.9 ± 12.5	103.3 ± 11.4
1,2,3,6,7,8-HxCDF	99.2 ± 6.9	80.5 ± 16.6
1,2,3,7,8,9-HxCDF	—	—
2,3,4,6,7,8-HxCDF	89.2 ± 12.1	84.7 ± 8.3
1,2,3,4,6,7,8-HpCDF	—	—
1,2,3,4,7,8,9-HpCDF	—	—
OCDF	—	—
non- <i>ortho</i> PCBs		
3,3',4,4'-TCB (77)	95.7 ± 7.8	92.0 ± 3.5
3,4,4',5'-TCB (81)	92.8 ± 2.5	88.9 ± 7.4
3,3',4,4',5'-PeCB (126)	93.3 ± 6.7	94.3 ± 5.9
3,3',4,4',5,5'-HxCB (169)	99.1 ± 3.0	94.5 ± 9.2
mono- <i>ortho</i> PCBs fraction		
mono- <i>ortho</i> PCBs		
2,3,3',4,4'-PeCB (105)	101.5 ± 5.3	89.4 ± 3.5
2,3,4,4',5'-PeCB (114)	97.0 ± 11.7	80.1 ± 4.7
2,3',4,4',5'-PeCB (118)	94.7 ± 3.8	89.6 ± 3.8
2',3,4,4',5'-PeCB (123)	103.5 ± 6.1	85.0 ± 3.0
2,3,3',4,4',5'-HxCB (156)	93.9 ± 6.1	89.4 ± 6.9
2,3,3',4,4',5',5'-HxCB (157)	91.2 ± 6.2	86.3 ± 9.0
2,3',4,4',5,5'-HxCB (167)	96.5 ± 4.3	94.4 ± 4.8
2,3,3',4,4',5,5'-HpCB (189)	84.4 ± 11.2	96.6 ± 0.0

^a Natively dioxin-contaminated samples (1.3 pg-TEQ/g in mullet and 2.9 pg-TEQ/g in sea bass) were extracted and cleaned up following the sample preparation for the PCB-EIA and Ah-I under Materials and Methods. The cleaned-up fractions were then spiked with the $^{13}\text{C}_{12}$ -labeled internal quantification standard mixture. The mono-*ortho* PCBs fraction was analyzed by HRGC-HRMS. The non-*ortho* PCBs and PCDD/Fs fraction was further purified on an activated carbon column and then analyzed by the HRGC-HRMS. Three examinations were carried out on different days ($n = 3$). ^b Recoveries of dioxin isomers in the sample preparation step were calculated with respect to the concentrations obtained by the HRGC-HRMS analysis under Materials and Methods. ^c Concentration below the LOQs.

Table 2. LOQs of the PCB-EIA and Ah-I with the Sample Preparation

	blank value ^a (mean ± SD)	LOQ in kit	LOQ with sample preparation
PCB-EIA (pg/well)	— ^b	125	125
Ah-I (pg-DEQ/well)	1.5 ± 0.25	1.0	2.0

^a Blank values were determined by replicate analyses of the procedural blank samples on four different days ($n = 4$). ^b Not detected.

the standard deviations (SDs) of the dioxin isomer recovery percentages were relatively small (<19.7%). These data indicate that no significant loss of dioxins occurred during the sample preparation step for the PCB-EIA and Ah-I.

Determination of the LOQs for the PCB-EIA and Ah-I Combined with the Sample Preparation Procedure. We performed procedural blank tests on four different days to determine the assay LOQs using the sample preparation procedure. As shown in **Table 2**, no procedural blanks were observed in the PCB-EIA, and the LOQ was equal to that defined by the kit. By contrast, a slight procedural blank was observed in the Ah-




Figure 2. Effect of the dilution factor on the determination of dioxins in fish. Cleaned-up extracts from natively contaminated fish were serially diluted with DMSO and assayed by the (A) PCB-EIA and (B) Ah-I in duplicate.

Table 3. Recovery of Dioxins from Spiked Fish Extracts after Sample Preparation^a

composite extract	PCB-EIA		Ah-I		
	spiked PCB 118 (pg/well)	recovery (%) (mean \pm SD)	spiked TCDD (pg-DEQ/well)	recovery (%) (mean \pm SD)	
tuna and yellowtail	190	115.1 \pm 6.9	salmon and yellowtail	10	104.8 \pm 6.4
	500	117.7 \pm 5.3			
	1250	102.9 \pm 3.2			
	2500	96.5 \pm 14.7			
mackerel and sea bass	500	103.6 \pm 11.5	sea bass and yellowtail	10	89.7 \pm 18.3

^aThe two kinds of cleaned-up composite extracts from fish samples were spiked with known quantities of PCB 118 or 2,3,7,8-TCDD and analyzed repeatedly by the PCB-EIA and Ah-I ($n = 3$).

I. Sample measurements in the Ah-I were corrected by subtracting the mean blank value, and the LOQ was defined as 2.0 pg-DEQ/well, which corresponded to 8 SDs of the blank value. Testing a 20 g fish sample revealed the LOQ to be 50 pg/g in the PCB-EIA and 1.0 pg-DEQ/g in the Ah-I.

Effect of Fish Matrix on the PCB-EIA and Ah-I. Purified extracts of fish samples contaminated in the natural environment were subjected to 2-fold serial dilutions with DMSO before being assayed. In the PCB-EIA, the measured concentrations were 83.5–107.9% of those expected from the starting concentrations (Figure 2A), suggesting that the matrix did not greatly interfere with the assay performed using this sample preparation technique. By contrast, the Ah-I-measured concentrations of some samples, especially sea bass and yellowtail, appeared to increase with dilution (Figure 2B). This indicates that the dilution process might eliminate the matrix effect in the Ah-I. For this reason, serial dilutions of fish extracts (dilution factors of 1, 2, 4, and 8) were measured in the Ah-I, and the maximum concentration was used to reduce the rate of false-negative results. When the highest dilution is used, the LOQ will be 8 times higher than when using the lowest dilution.

A recovery test using purified composite fish extracts was also carried out to further examine the effect of the matrix on the assays. In the PCB-EIA, purified extracts spiked with various concentrations of PCB 118 were assayed. In the Ah-I, purified extracts spiked with 2,3,7,8-TCDD were assayed with serial dilutions. Recovery over the tested range was 96.5–117.7% (SD = 3.2–14.7%) for the PCB-EIA and 89.7–104.8% (SD = 6.4–18.3%) for the Ah-I (Table 3). These results were satisfactory, suggesting that the assays can detect and measure dioxins with good accuracy following sample preparation.

Reproducibility of the PCB-EIA and Ah-I. The reproducibility of the PCB-EIA and Ah-I using the sample preparation procedure described above was tested by analyzing replicate

Table 4. Reproducibility of the PCB-EIA and Ah-I Combined with the Sample Preparation Procedure^a

sample	PCB-EIA		Ah-I		
	pg/g (mean \pm SD)	CV (%)	pg-DEQ/g (mean \pm SD)	CV (%)	
mullet	3466 \pm 17	0.5	mullet	3.8 \pm 0.8	21.1
sea bass	832 \pm 41	5.0	yellowtail	3.4 \pm 0.8	23.5

^aThe fish contaminated in the natural environment (1.5 pg-TEQ/g in mullet, 1.3 pg-TEQ/g in sea bass, and 1.3 pg-TEQ/g in yellowtail) were extracted, cleaned up, and assayed by the PCB-EIA and Ah-I in three separate runs on different days ($n = 3$).

fish samples. The fish were extracted, cleaned, and assayed in three separate analyses on different days. The coefficients of variation for two varieties were 0.5–5.0% for the PCB-EIA and 21.1–23.5% for the Ah-I (Table 4), which indicated an acceptable level of precision for dioxin analysis.

Comparison of the PCB-EIA and Ah-I with HRGC-HRMS Analysis. Dioxin concentrations were measured by the PCB-EIA and Ah-I in 20 retail fish samples and compared to the TEQ concentrations obtained by HRGC-HRMS analysis. Both the concentrations of mono-ortho PCBs obtained by the PCB-EIA (Figure 3A) and the concentrations of non-ortho PCBs and PCDD/Fs obtained by the Ah-I (Figure 3B) showed good correlations with the TEQ concentrations measured by HRGC-HRMS ($r > 0.98$ and $r = 0.97$, respectively). These results show that a combination of the PCB-EIA and Ah-I is a practical method for estimating the TEQ concentrations of dioxins in retail fish.

Although the PCB-EIA is specific to PCB 118, it has slight cross-reactivity with other PCB isomers (16, 20), many of which are found in fish samples. To interpret the positive PCB-EIA readings, we therefore compared the results with the PCB 118




Figure 3. Comparison of the (A) PCB-EIA and (B) Ah-I with HRGC-HRMS measurements of fish samples. In total, 20 samples (bonito, two mackerels, mullet, four salmon, three sea bass, three tuna, and six yellowtail) were analyzed by the PCB-EIA and Ah-I and by HRGC-HRMS. Undetectable data in the PCB-EIA (one sample) and the Ah-I (two samples) were assigned a value of zero. For PCB-EIA concentrations <5000 pg/g, the regression equation is illustrated in the inset of A ($n = 18$).




Figure 4. Comparison of PCB-EIA concentrations with HRGC-HRMS measurements of PCB 118 concentrations in fish samples ($n = 20$). The dashed line represents $x = y$.

concentrations measured by HRGC-HRMS analysis of the 20 fish samples (Figure 4). As shown in Figure 4, a good correlation was obtained between the two methods, and the linear regression slope was approximately 1, suggesting that a positive reading in the PCB-EIA was mainly attributable to PCB 118 in most samples.

The Ah-I has the potential to estimate all of the compounds acting as AhR agonists, whereas HRGC-HRMS analysis is restricted to the target dioxin isomers assigned by the WHO-TEF scheme. To assess whether the positive Ah-I results were consistent with the target dioxins, we compared the Ah-I results with the expected concentrations based on the HRGC-HRMS results of the 20 fish samples. The expected concentrations were calculated by multiplying the concentrations of four non-ortho PCBs and 17 PCDD/Fs determined by HRGC-HRMS and their relative potency values in the Ah-I (18). As shown in Figure 5, a good correlation was observed between the obtained and expected values, with the slope of the linear regression equation approximating 1. This suggests that a positive Ah-I reading was largely attributable to the target compounds in the samples.




Figure 5. Comparison of observed and expected Ah-I concentrations ($n = 20$). The dashed line represents $x = y$.

DISCUSSION

In the present study, we found a good correlation between our combined PCB-EIA and Ah-I results and the HRGC-HRMS analysis, suggesting that this method is suitable for measuring dioxin concentrations and screening for TEQ concentrations in retail fish. Figure 6 shows the 95% prediction interval for the regression lines in the comparative study of 20 fish samples. To eliminate distortion of the results, two highly contaminated PCB-EIA samples and samples with undetectable levels in both assays were excluded. For example, 0.5 pg-TEQ/g mono-ortho PCBs in the HRGC-HRMS analysis corresponded to 2300–3800 pg/g in the PCB-EIA. Similarly, 3 pg-TEQ/g non-ortho PCBs and PCDD/Fs in the HRGC-HRMS analysis corresponded to 6.7–13 pg-DEQ/g in the Ah-I. Each assay easily detected the lowest concentration of the predicted interval, as these were higher than the LOQ of the assay. Future assessments of the assays will require more practical data points in a comparative study in order to determine variation in the assay results and allow the accurate monitoring of TEQ concentrations.

TEF values have been revised recently (24). The WHO advises that the new TEFs (TEF₂₀₀₅) be used because they




Figure 6. Combined use of the PCB-EIA and Ah-I as a screening method for TEQ concentrations of dioxins in fish samples. The dashed lines represent the 95% prediction interval for regression lines. Two highly contaminated PCB-EIA samples (>19000 pg/g) and one sample with undetectable levels were excluded from the regression calculation in **A** ($n = 17$). Two Ah-I samples with undetectable levels were excluded from the regression calculation in **B** ($n = 18$).

replace the previous TEFs (23) reported in 1998. As a result of recalculation using TEF₂₀₀₅ in the 20 samples employed in the comparison study, the contribution of mono-ortho PCBs to the total TEQ decreased significantly (data not shown). This is mainly because the TEF₂₀₀₅ of PCB 118 (0.00003) is slightly lower than the TEF₁₉₉₈ value (0.0001). However, the contribution of mono-ortho PCBs still accounted for 10–20% of total TEQ concentrations in three fish samples, such as mullet and sea bass. It would therefore be better to screen mono-ortho PCBs along with non-ortho PCBs and PCDD/Fs. Good correlations were also observed between the assay's results and TEQ concentrations calculated by TEF₂₀₀₅ in the 20 fish samples: the linear regression equations $y = 36165x - 640$ ($r = 0.99$) and $y = 3.56x - 0.50$ ($r = 0.97$) were obtained for PCB-EIA versus mono-ortho PCBs and Ah-I versus non-ortho PCBs and PCDD/Fs, respectively.

Recently, the European Commission set the maximum limits for combined PCDD/Fs and dioxin-like PCBs in consumer foods available on the European market at 8 pg-TEQ/g in fish muscle on a fresh weight basis (25). As our screening method measures dioxin TEQ concentrations in two separate fractions, it is unable to directly determine the sum of the PCDD/Fs and dioxin-like PCBs. However, our HRGC-HRMS data previously revealed that mono-ortho PCBs account for approximately 15% of the total amount of dioxins in fish samples, with non-ortho PCBs and PCDD/Fs making up the remainder (15). Therefore, fish samples containing a combined PCDD/F and dioxin-like PCB level of at least 8 pg-TEQ/g are likely to give positive PCB-EIA and Ah-I readings, although close attention must be paid to the variable ratios of mono-ortho PCBs and non-ortho PCBs and PCDD/Fs in fish samples.

The positive PCB-EIA results were mainly caused by the reactivity with PCB 118 in the samples (Figure 4). However, the slope of the linear regression equation was slightly larger than 1, suggesting that fish samples appeared to contain other PCB isomers recognized by the PCB-EIA, along with PCB 118. The PCB-EIA is known to have slight cross-reactivity with PCB 31, PCB 66, and PCB 70 (12.9–17.8% of PCB 118) (16, 20),

which can be fractionated into mono-ortho PCB fractions. The presence of high concentrations of these isomers might have influenced the PCB-EIA results, although it is not certain that these compounds were present in the samples.

Many compounds, such as polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs), brominated dioxins, and non-2,3,7,8-substituted chlorinated dioxins, also possess relatively strong AhR-agonist activity in the Ah-I (18), in addition to the target dioxins assigned by the WHO-TEF scheme. As the behaviors of brominated and non-2,3,7,8-substituted chlorinated dioxins in the sample preparation step are similar to those of target dioxins, it is difficult to exclude them. However, surprisingly, our data suggested that the positive Ah-I readings were mainly attributed to target dioxin isomers in the samples (Figure 5). In general, brominated dioxins have not been detected in fish (26–28) or have been identified less often and at lower concentrations than chlorinated dioxins (29). Additionally, the major non-2,3,7,8-substituted chlorinated dioxins that are frequently found in retail fish samples—that is, 1,3,6,8-TCDDs and 1,3,7,9-TCDDs (5, 30)—are insensitive to the Ah-I (18).

The main advantage of our combined method is that it is less likely to produce false-negative results than cell-based assays, such as the CALUX assay. Some mono-ortho PCBs, such as PCB 118, show a relatively weak response in the CALUX assay (31–33), and so samples containing high levels of mono-ortho PCBs might be underestimated (13). However, as shown in the present study, the PCB-EIA strongly reacts to PCB 118, which is a good indicator of the TEQ concentrations of mono-ortho PCBs. Indeed, the two highly contaminated samples in our study were shown by HRGC-HRMS analysis to contain high concentrations of mono-ortho PCBs (2.3 and 2.9 pg-TEQ/g) and were not underestimated by the PCB-EIA (Figure 3A). Moreover, sample cytotoxicity causes false-negative CALUX results, but does not affect the PCB-EIA and Ah-I because they are cell-free tests.

We did not minimize the gel and elution volumes used in the sample preparation procedure for the assays to speed the process. At present, it takes about three days to produce a final extract for the assays. However, it is possible to determine dioxin concentrations in a final extract using the assays in one day. Total time for determination of dioxins in a fish sample is similar for other bioassays for dioxins, like the CALUX assay, in retail fish, as we have reported previously (10).

In conclusion, the present study evaluated a novel combination of the PCB-EIA and Ah-I for the determination of dioxin concentrations in retail fish. Our method has increased throughput and reduced costs compared with conventional HRGC-HRMS analysis and is a useful dioxin TEQ screening method prior to HRGC-HRMS analysis.

ABBREVIATIONS USED

Ah-I, Ah immunoassay; AhR, aryl hydrocarbon receptor; ARNT, aryl hydrocarbon receptor nuclear translocator; CALUX, chemical-activated luciferase gene expression; DEQs, dioxin equivalents; DMSO, dimethyl sulfoxide; DRE, dioxin-responsive element; ELISA, enzyme-linked immunosorbent assay; HpCDDs, heptachlorodibenzo-*p*-dioxins; HpCDFs, heptachlorodibenzofurans; HRGC, high-resolution gas chromatography; HRMS, high-resolution mass spectrometry; HxCDDs, hexachlorodibenzo-*p*-dioxins; HxCDFs, hexachlorodibenzofurans; LOQ, limits of quantification; mAb, monoclonal antibody; OCDD, octachlorodibenzo-*p*-dioxins; OCDF, octachlorodibenzofuran; PCB-EIA, coplanar PCB EIA system; PCBs, polychlorinated biphenyls; PCDDs, polychlorinated dibenzo-*p*-dioxins; PCDFs, polychlorinated dibenzofurans; PeCDDs, pentachlorodibenzo-*p*-dioxins; PeCDFs, pentachlorodibenzofurans; SDs, standard deviations; TCDDs, tetrachlorodibenzo-*p*-dioxins; TCDFs, tetrachlorodibenzofurans; TEF, toxic equivalency factor; TEQ, toxic equivalent; WHO, World Health Organization.

LITERATURE CITED

- (1) Tsutsumi, T.; Yanagi, T.; Nakamura, M.; Kono, Y.; Uchibe, H.; Iida, T.; Hori, T.; Nakagawa, R.; Tobiishi, K.; Matsuda, R.; Sasaki, K.; Toyoda, M. Update of daily intake of PCDDs, PCDFs, and dioxin-like PCBs from food in Japan. *Chemosphere* **2001**, *45*, 1129–1137.
- (2) Sasamoto, T.; Ushio, F.; Kikutani, N.; Saitoh, Y.; Yamaki, Y.; Hashimoto, T.; Horii, S.; Nakagawa, J.; Ibe, A. Estimation of 1999–2004 dietary daily intake of PCDDs, PCDFs and dioxin-like PCBs by a total diet study in metropolitan Tokyo, Japan. *Chemosphere* **2006**, *64*, 634–641.
- (3) Toyoda, M.; Iida, T.; Hori, T.; Yanagi, T.; Kono, Y.; Uchibe, H. Concentrations of PCDDs, PCDFs and coplanar PCBs in Japanese retail foods. *J. Food Hyg. Soc. Jpn.* **1999**, *40*, 111–121.
- (4) Tsutsumi, T.; Amakura, A.; Sasaki, K.; Maitani, T. Levels of PCDDs, PCDFs and dioxin-like PCBs in foods and their dietary intake in Japan. Presented at the International Workshop on “Effects of Dioxins on Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries, and their Mechanisms of Action on Animals and Fishes”, Tsukuba, Japan, Dec, 2002.
- (5) Tsutsumi, T.; Amakura, Y.; Yanagi, T.; Nakamura, M.; Kono, Y.; Uchibe, H.; Iida, T.; Toyoda, M.; Sasaki, K.; Maitani, T. Levels of PCDDs, PCDFs and dioxin-like PCBs in retail fish and shellfish in Japan. *Organohalogen Compd.* **2003**, *62*, 93–96.
- (6) Hoogenboom, L.; Goeyens, L.; Carbonnelle, S.; Van Locco, J.; Beernaert, H.; Baeyens, W.; Traag, W.; Bovee, T.; Jacobs, G.; Schoeters, G. The CALUX bioassay: current status of its application to screening food and feed. *Trends Anal. Chem.* **2006**, *25*, 410–420.
- (7) Behnisch, P. A.; Hosoe, K.; Sakai, S. Bioanalytical screening methods for dioxins and dioxin-like compounds—a review of bioassay/biomarker technology. *Environ. Int.* **2001**, *27*, 413–439.
- (8) Overmeire, I. V.; Clark, G. C.; Brown, D. J.; Chu, M. D.; Cooke, W. M.; Denison, M. S.; Baeyens, W.; Srebrnik, S.; Goeyens, L. Trace contamination with dioxin-like chemicals: evaluation of bioassay-based TEQ determination for hazard assessment and regulatory responses. *Environ. Sci. Policy* **2001**, *4*, 345–357.
- (9) Besselink, H.; Leonards, P.; Felzel, E.; Brouwer, B. Analysis of polychlorinated dibenzo-*p*-dioxins (PCDD), dibenzofurans (PCDFs) and biphenyls (PCB) in fish using DR-CALUX® and GC/MS; a comparison. *Organohalogen Compd.* **2002**, *58*, 413–415.
- (10) Tsutsumi, T.; Amakura, Y.; Nakamura, M.; Brown, D. J.; Clark, G. C.; Sasaki, K.; Toyoda, M.; Maitani, T. Validation of the CALUX bioassay for the screening of PCDD/Fs and dioxin-like PCBs in retail fish. *Analyst* **2003**, *128*, 486–492.
- (11) Schoeters, G.; Goyvaerts, M. P.; Ooms, D.; Van Cleuvenbergen, R. The evaluation of dioxin and dioxin-like contaminants in selected food samples obtained from the Belgian market: comparison of TEQ measurements obtained through the CALUX bioassay with congener specific chemical analyses. *Chemosphere* **2004**, *54*, 1289–1297.
- (12) Winald, I.; Van Wouwe, N.; Eppe, G.; Xhrouet, C.; Debacke, V.; Baeyens, W.; De Pauw, E.; Goeyens, L. Validation and interpretation of CALUX as a tool for the estimation of dioxin-like activity in marine biological matrixes. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* **2005**, *39*, 1741–1748.
- (13) Hoogenboom, R.; Bovee, T.; Traag, W.; Hoogerbrugge, R.; Baumann, B.; Portier, L.; van de Weg, G.; de Vries, J. The use of the DR CALUX bioassay and indicator polychlorinated biphenyls for screening of elevated levels of dioxins and dioxin-like polychlorinated biphenyls in eel. *Mol. Nutr. Food Res.* **2006**, *50*, 945–957.
- (14) Okuyama, A.; Takenaka, H.; Nishi, K.; Mizukami, H.; Kozaki, S.; Kirihata, M.; Miyatake, K.; Takigami, H.; Sakai, S.-I.; Morita, M. Development of enzyme-linked immunosorbent assay for the pre-screening of coplanar polychlorinated biphenyls. *Organohalogen Compd.* **2002**, *58*, 333–335.
- (15) Report on the results of dioxin concentrations in foodstuffs on the Japanese market (FY1998–2000), the Ministry of Health, Labour and Welfare, Japan (in Japanese), 2001.
- (16) Tsutsumi, T.; Amakura, Y.; Okuyama, A.; Tanioka, Y.; Sakata, K.; Sasaki, K.; Maitani, T. Application of an ELISA for PCB 118 to the screening of dioxin-like PCBs in retail fish. *Chemosphere* **2006**, *65*, 467–473.
- (17) Wheelock, G. D.; Hurst, K. R.; Babish, J. G. Bioimmunoassay of aryl hydrocarbon (Ah) receptor transformation in vitro by 2,3,7,8-tetrachlorodibenzo-*p*-dioxin (TCDD). *Toxicol. Methods* **1996**, *6*, 41–50.
- (18) Kobayashi, Y.; Lundquist, A.; Uechi, T.; Ashieda, K.; Sasaki, K.; Hughes, B.; Kaise, T. Dioxin screening in environmental samples using the Ah-immunoassay®. *Organohalogen Compd.* **2002**, *58*, 337–340.
- (19) Kobayashi, Y.; Hall, A.; Hiraoka, M.; Ashieda, K.; Nakanishi, T.; Yamada, T.; Ogiwara, K.; Uechi, T.; Hughes, B.; Inoue, N. Evaluation of Ah-immunoassay® as a screening method for dioxins and Co-PCBs in environmental samples. *Organohalogen Compd.* **2003**, *60*, 275–278.
- (20) EnBio coplanar PCB EIA system instruction booklet, EnBio coplanar PCB EIA system instruction booklet. EnBio Tec Laboratories Co. Ltd., Tokyo, Japan.
- (21) Kubota Corp. Ah-immunoassay Instruction booklet, Tokyo, Japan.
- (22) Tsutsumi, T.; Amakura, Y.; Sasaki, K.; Toyoda, M.; Maitani, T. Evaluation of an aqueous KOH digestion followed by hexane extraction for analysis of PCDD/Fs and dioxin-like PCBs in retail fish. *Anal. Bioanal. Chem.* **2003**, *375*, 792–798.

- (23) Van den Berg, M.; Birnbaum, L.; Bosveld, A. T. C.; Brunstrom, B.; Cook, P.; Feeley, M.; Giesy, J. P.; Hanberg, A.; Hasegawa, R.; Kennedy, S. W.; Kubiak, T.; Larsen, J. C.; van Leeuwen, F. X. R.; Liem, A. K. D.; Nolt, C.; Peterson, R. E.; Poellinger, L.; Safe, S.; Schrenk, D.; Tillitt, D.; Tysklind, M.; Younes, M.; Warn, F.; Zacharewski, T. Toxic equivalency factors (TEFs) for PCBs, PCDDs, PCDFs for humans and wildlife. *Environ. Health Perspect.* **1998**, *106*, 775–792.
- (24) Van den Berg, M.; Birnbaum, L. S.; Denison, M.; De Vito, M.; Farland, W.; Feeley, M.; Fiedler, H.; Hakansson, H.; Hanberg, A.; Haws, L.; Rose, M.; Safe, S.; Schrenk, D.; Tohyama, C.; Tritscher, A.; Tuomisto, J.; Tysklind, M.; Walker, N.; Peterson, R. E. The 2005 World Health Organization reevaluation of human and mammalian toxic equivalency factors for dioxins and dioxin-like compounds. *Toxicol. Sci.* **2006**, *93*, 223–241.
- (25) Commission Regulation (EC) 199/2006 of 3 February 2006, amending regulation (EC) 466/2001 setting maximum levels for certain contaminants in foodstuffs as regards dioxins and dioxin-like PCBs. *Off. J. Eur. Union* **2006**, L32/34.
- (26) Wiberg, K.; Rappe, C.; Haglund, P. Analysis of bromo-, chloro- and mixed bromo/chloro-dibenzo-*p*-dioxins and dibenzofurans in salmon, osprey and human milk. *Chemosphere* **1992**, *24*, 1431–1439.
- (27) Loganathan, B. G.; Kannan, K.; Watanabe, I.; Kawano, M.; Irvine, K.; Kumar, S.; Sikka, H. C. Isomer-specific determination and toxic evaluation of polychlorinated biphenyls, polychlorinated/brominated dibenzo-*p*-dioxins and dibenzofurans, polybrominated biphenyl ethers, and extractable organic halogen in carp from the Buffalo River, New York. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* **1995**, *29*, 1832–1844.
- (28) Ashizuka, Y.; Nakagawa, R.; Tobiishi, K.; Hori, T.; Iida, T. Determination of polybrominated diphenyl ethers and polybrominated dibenzo-*p*-dioxins/dibenzofurans in marine products. *J. Agric. Food Chem.* **2005**, *53*, 3807–3813.
- (29) Food Standards Agency, U.K. Brominated chemicals in farmed and wild fish and shellfish and fish oil dietary supplements; Food Survey Information Sheet 04/06.
- (30) Tsutsumi, T.; Amakura, Y.; Sasaki, K.; Maitani, T. Dioxin concentrations in the edible parts of Japanese common squid and saury. *Shokuhin Eiseigaku Zasshi* **2007**, *48*, 8–12.
- (31) Bovee, T. F. H.; Hoogenboom, L. A. P.; Hamers, A. R. M.; Traag, W. A.; Zuidema, T.; Aarts, J. M. M. J. G.; Brouwer, A.; Kuiper, H. A. Validation and use of the CALUX-bioassay for the determination of dioxins and PCBs in bovine milk. *Food Addit. Contam.* **1998**, *15*, 863–875.
- (32) Brown, D. J.; Chu, M.; Overmeire, I. V.; Chu, A.; Clark, G. C. Determination of REP values for the CALUX bioassay and comparison to the WHO TEF values. *Oreanohalogen Compd.* **2001**, *53*, 211–214.
- (33) Behnisch, P. A.; Hosoe, K.; Sakai, S. Brominated dioxin-like compounds: in vitro assessment in comparison to classical dioxin-like compounds and other polyaromatic compounds. *Environ. Int.* **2003**, *29*, 861–877.

Received for review August 19, 2007. Revised manuscript received February 9, 2008. Accepted February 13, 2008. This work was supported by a Health Sciences Research Grant from the Ministry of Health, Labour and Welfare, Japan.

JF072490L