# OZONE EFFECT ON FUNGI PROLIFERATION AND GENERA SUSCEPTIBILITY OF TREATED STORED DRY PADDY RICE (Oryza sativa L.)

MENITHEN BEBER-RODRIGUES, GEOVANA D. SAVI and VILDES M. SCUSSEL<sup>1</sup>

Laboratory of Mycotoxicology and Food Contaminants, Food Science and Technology Department, Center of Agricultural Sciences, Federal University of Santa Catarina, Rodovia Admar Gonzaga, n.1346, Itacorubi, Florianópolis, Santa Catarina CEP: 88034-001, Brazil

<sup>1</sup>Corresponding author. TEL: +55.048.3721.5386, +55.048.3721.5387; FAX: +55(48)3721.9943; EMAIL: vildescussel\_2000@yahoo.co.uk

Received for publication February 19, 2014 Accepted for publication July 15, 2014

doi: 10.1111/jfs.12144

#### ABSTRACT

This work reports the ozone (O<sub>3</sub>) gas effects on stored dry paddy rice (*Oryza sativa* L.) mycoflora (fungi reduction/genera susceptibility/yeast) and humidity microorganism proliferation factors (moisture content [mc]/water activity [ $a_w$ ]. From the three O<sub>3</sub> concentrations applied (10, 20 and 40 mg/L – groups I, II and III, respectively) on silos stored rice (n = 10), it was observed a rather high reduction on the total fungi load especially in group III from an initial count of  $3.0 \times 10^5$  down to  $1.4 \times 10^2$  cfu/mL. Regarding the samples naturally contaminated fungi genera isolated, they were *Aspergillus, Penicillium, Acremonium, Alternaria* and *Aureobasidium* (a yeast-like fungi), as well as yeast, which were reduced after O<sub>3</sub> treatment. Despite this, some strain gas susceptibility differences were observed as follows (decreasing order): *Acremonium > Alternaria > Aureobasidium > Aspergillus > Penicillium*. As expected, mc and  $a_w$  reduced after gas treatment, which was proportional to the time of exposure and O<sub>3</sub> gas stream flow rate applied on the rice stored samples. O<sub>3</sub> treatment showed to be an effective green alternative tool to reduce paddy stored rice contamination and keep safety during storage.

## PRACTICAL APPLICATIONS

The  $O_3$  gas treatment showed to be an effective green alternative tool to avoid paddy stored rice fungi growth, especially toxigenic species responsible for mycotoxin formation in the paddy rice, and to keep safety during storage. Excess ozone is decomposed rapidly to  $O_2$ , thus no food residue is left.

# INTRODUCTION

Fungal development and mycotoxin production are results of the interaction between fungi, substrate and environmental conditions, in which mycotoxin-producing fungi and their spores can contaminate crops, including rice (Moreno *et al.* 2009; Duarte *et al.* 2010; Scussel *et al.* 2012; Beber-Rodrigues and Scussel 2013). Because the factors that contribute to fungi proliferation include environmental and ecological conditions that often are beyond human control, world food contamination by fungi represents a significant problem (Hussein and Brasel 2001; Scussel 2005). Thus, studies on developing methods for fungi decontamination in order to reduce its impact on grains and their by-products are necessary. In that sense, modified atmospheres have been applied, including carbon dioxide, nitrogen, oxygen and, more recently, ozone (Scussel *et al.* 2011a; Giordano *et al.* 2012; Savi *et al.* 2014a,b).

One of the important applications of ozone in agriculture is the postharvest treatment of crops (Zorlugenic *et al.* 2008), reducing or eliminating undesirable mycoflora from grains and their by-products (Tiwari *et al.* 2010). Ozone acts through a progressive oxidation of vital cellular components on destroying microorganisms preventing the microbial growth, thus extending the shelf life of several foods (Guzel-Seydim *et al.* 2004; Aguayo *et al.* 2006).

This gas is a powerful sanitizer oxidant recognized since 1997 as a GRAS (generally recognized as safe) substance by the Food and Drug Administration and has been used in a number of applications in the food industry for destruction or detoxification of chemicals or bacteria (United States Food and Drug Administration [FDA] 1982; Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations [FAO] 1996). These applications include the surface decontamination, food storage, and preservation, as well as packaging sterilization (Desvignes *et al.* 2008; Cárdenas *et al.* 2011).

Although commercial ozone application for grain management is not well documented, there are numerous studies that describe the potential benefits of that technology (McDonough *et al.* 2011), especially in wheat, barley, corn and Brazil nuts (Kells *et al.* 2001; Allen *et al.* 2003; Kottapalli *et al.* 2005; Raila *et al.* 2006; Wu *et al.* 2006; McDonough *et al.* 2011; Scussel *et al.* 2011a; Giordano *et al.* 2012).

Ozone efficacy depends on several factors that include its concentration applied, the characteristics of each food, and environmental factors such as temperature and humidity. Each ozone-treated food, i.e., rice, wheat or nuts, may present different behaviors due to their physical structures that get in contact with the gas; therefore, for a better knowledge of its effectiveness detailed studies are necessary (Giordano *et al.* 2012; Savi *et al.* 2014a).

Considering that: (1) there is no study carried out on the effect of ozone gas on rice reported to date; (2) commodity is highly consumed in Latin America (mainly by the Brazilian population) extensive to several Eastern countries as staple food; (3) studies have reported stored rice losses due to fungi proliferation (deterioration/fermentation); and (4) ozone gas is reported as GRAS and inexpensive, this study was carried out to evaluate the gas effect (at three different concentrations) on stored dry paddy rice mycoflora destruction and possible water reduction.

### MATERIALS AND METHODS

#### **Rice Samples**

Paddy rice (12.4 kg) grains were grown under irrigation system, stored free of impurities, dried (moisture content [mc]: 12.03%, water activity  $[a_w]$ : 0.67) and had a total fungi count of  $3 \times 10^5$  cfu/mL. They were obtained from a rice silo (capacity: 25,000 tons) from Juriti Cooperative factory located in Santa Catarina State, Southern Brazil.

#### **Chemicals and Culture Media**

Sulfuric acid and sodium thiosulfate (Synth; Diadema, SP, Brazil), potassium iodine (Synth; Diadema, SP, Brazil), lactophenol dye (Sigma; St. Louis, MO, USA), starch indicator, chloramphenicol (Sigma; St. Louis, MO, USA), peptone, malt extract agar (MEA), potato dextrose agar (PDA; (Himedia; Curitiba, PR, Brazil)).

## Equipment

Thermometer and hygrometer (J. Prolab; Sao Jose dos Pinhais, PR, Brazil); vertical silos (n = 7), built with vinyl polychloride tubes with dimensions of  $25 \times 10$  cm for height and diameter, respectively, containing an upper lid and two apertures (top and lower parts of the silos) for sample collection and ozone application, respectively; ozone gas generator model OP-35-5L (Interzone; Jundiaí, SP, Brazil), aw meter Aqua Lab (Decagon Devices; São Jose dos Campos, SP, Brazil); flow meter 0-15 L/ min (Protec; Cotia, SP, Brasil); impurities remover equipment (Ouro Peças; Alvorada, RS, Brazil); autoclave (Phoenix; Araraquara, SP, Brazil); laminar flow cabinet (Veco; Campinas, SP, Brazil); optical microscope (Olympus; Shinjuku, Tokyo, Japan); stereoscopic microscope (Carlzeiss Jena; Cambridge, United Kingdom); incubator (Quimis; Diadema, SP, Brazil); analytical (Shimadzu; Sao Paulo, SP, Brazil) and semi-analytical (Shimadzu; Sao Paulo, SP, Brazil) scales; colonies counter (Phoenix); automatic pipette, 10-100 µL capacity (Digipet; Curitiba, PR, Brazil); oven (Olidef Cz; Riberao Preto, SP, Brazil); inoxidable blender (Metvisa; Brusque, SC, Brazil).

#### **Ozone Paddy Rice Treatment**

Silos were primarily cleaned with sodium hypochloride, rinsed with distilled water and dried. Then they were loaded with paddy rice (i.e., grain in the husk) (400 g) for ozone application. Silos were divided into four groups as follows: group I (10 mg/L of ozone); group II (20 mg/L of ozone); group III (40 mg/L of ozone); and group control (no ozone treatment). Each treatment was carried out in 10 replicates (n = 10), except for the group control (n = 1).

The ozone gas was applied through the silo inlet aperture by means of a compressed air pump and an ozone generator to get the established concentration in each silo (10, 20 and 40 mg/L of ozone at a flow of 1 L/min). The ozone gas stream was kept flowing until the silo volume was fulfilled (1.6 min) and then held for 30 min (Fig. 1). After that period, rice samples were collected immediately for mycological tests and humidity (mc and  $a_w$ ) analysis including the control group. The ozone concentration was measured by iodine metrical method through the ozone equipment outlet according to APHA (1999), in which the gas was bobbled into a potassium iodide solution and followed by titration with sodium thiosulfate for ozone quantification. Figure 2 shows the flowchart of the sample preparation, ozone treatments and analysis performed on the stored paddy rice studied.

#### **Mycological and Humidity Analysis**

The mycological tests (total fungi load and fungi genera identification) were performed as follows: *total fungi load* 



through the method of Samson *et al.* (2004) in duplicate (n = 2) by plating serial dilutions on PDA medium with 50 ppm of chloramphenicol; *fungi genera identification* by employing micro-cultivation on MEA according to the Riddell technique described by Weber and Pitt (2000), followed by Samson *et al.*'s (2004) keys of identification; and *rice humidity determinations* in which mc was determined in triplicate (n = 3) by drying the sample in an oven  $(105 \pm 5C)$  according to the gravimetric method of the

AOAC (2005), and  $a_w$  performed (n = 3) using an  $a_w$  meter, which electronically obtains data.

#### **Statistical Analysis**

Data were organized on absolute relative frequencies, ranges, averages and standard deviations. In order to compare the ozone treatments, the following were used: (1) the *F*-test analysis of variance (ANOVA factor 1) regarding



FIG. 2. FLOWCHART OF THE SAMPLE PREPARATION, OZONE TREATMENTS AND ANALYSIS PERFORMED ON THE STORED PADDY RICE STUDIED. O<sub>3</sub>, OZONE

quantitative variables; (2) the *k-independent proportions test* regarding fungi genera proportions observed; and (3) the independent *Chi-square test* to verify differences between fungi and yeast occurrence through the ozone treatments applied. In all the tests used in the survey, results were considered significant if *P* value <0.05 (Box *et al.* 1978; Siegel and Castellan 1988). Furthermore, a regression equation was developed in order to verify the logarithm behavior of the total fungi load reduction after ozone treatment. For data analysis, the software Statistica version 7 (StatSoft 2004) was used.

## **RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

From the data obtained, it was possible to observe variations on fungi growth genera susceptibility as well as on the paddy rice ozone-treated humidity parameters.

The statistical test performed showed that the total fungi load and humidity distribution varied with the different ozone concentrations applied (P < 0.05), leaving to a reduction through the treatment. The total fungi load expressed consistent reduction after each treatment as follows: for 10 mg/L a reduction of 90.40% (from 5.5 to 4.4, in log) and an increase with the ozone concentration (20 and 40 mg/L) of 99.95% (from 5.5 to 2.2 and 2.1, in log, respectively). The mc and  $a_w$  also presented significant differences among the ozone treatments; however, they had a minor reduction when compared to the total fungi load reduction (mc: from 12.03 to 11.34%;  $a_w$ : from 0.67 to 0.61) (Table 1 and Fig. 3).

This was in accordance with Tiwari *et al.* (2010) and McDonough *et al.* (2011), who reported a high reduction (3 logs) on microorganisms in cereal grains. Nevertheless, Antony-Babu and Singleton (2009) verified that the fungal inhibition caused by ozone treatment was prominent even in organisms that have been exposed to quite low levels (0.2 mg/L) of ozone during a short period of time (10 min), being able to degrade both mycelium spores of the fungi studied.

This reduction behavior verified corresponds to a logarithm regression, in which after a specific ozone concentration it has not expected further fungi load reduction. Therefore,

**TABLE 1.** OZONE-TREATED DRY PADDY RICE DATA REGARDING TOTAL FUNGI LOAD, HUMIDITY FACTORS, FUNGI GENERA ISOLATED AND THEIRDISTRIBUTION

| Total fungi l             | oad and humic        | dity factors |                         |                |                                                     |                               |                                               |         |
|---------------------------|----------------------|--------------|-------------------------|----------------|-----------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------|---------|
| Ozone tr                  |                      |              | eatment                 |                | Data                                                |                               |                                               |         |
| Parameters                |                      | Group        | Concentration<br>(mg/L) | Replicates     | Average ± SD (log)                                  |                               | Range (log)                                   | P*      |
| Total fungi load (cfu/mL) |                      | Control      | No ozonet               | 1              | $3.0 \times 10^5 \pm NA (5.5 \pm NA)$               |                               | NA (NA)                                       | 0.00002 |
|                           |                      | I            | 10                      | 10             | $2.8 \times 10^4 \pm 8.1 >$                         | < 10 <sup>4</sup> (4.4 ± 4.9) | $1.0 \times 10 - 2.6 \times 10^{5} (1 - 5.4)$ |         |
|                           |                      |              | 20                      | 10             | 1.6 × 10 <sup>2</sup> ± 5.4 >                       | < 10 (2.2 ± 1.7)              | 9.5 × 10–2.5 × 10 <sup>2</sup> (2 – 2.4)      |         |
|                           |                      |              | 40                      | 10             | $1.4 \times 10^2 \pm 7.7 \times 10 \ (2.1 \pm 1.9)$ |                               | $2.5 \times 10 - 2.9 \times 10^2 (1.4 - 2.5)$ |         |
| Humidity                  | mc (%)               | Control      | No ozone                | 1              | 12.03 ± NA                                          |                               | NA                                            | 0.00666 |
|                           |                      | I            | 10                      | 10             | $11.34 \pm 0.3$                                     |                               | 11.01–11.85                                   |         |
|                           |                      |              | 20                      | 10             | 11.68 ± 0.31                                        |                               | 11.23–12.02                                   |         |
|                           |                      |              | 40                      | 10             | 11.81 ± 0.29                                        |                               | 11.4–12.24                                    |         |
|                           | a <sub>w</sub>       | Control      | No ozone                | 1              | 0.67 ± NA                                           |                               | NA                                            | 0.00025 |
|                           |                      | 1            | 10                      | 10             | $0.65 \pm 0.01$                                     |                               | 0.63–0.66                                     |         |
|                           |                      | 11           | 20                      | 10             | $0.63 \pm 0.02$                                     |                               | 0.61–0.66                                     |         |
|                           |                      | III          | 40                      | 10             | $0.61\pm0.02$                                       |                               | 0.56–0.64                                     |         |
| Fungi isolate             | ed and distribu      | tion         |                         |                |                                                     |                               |                                               |         |
|                           |                      |              | Ozone-treat             | ed positive fu | ingi colony detecte                                 | ed rice samples (%            | %)                                            |         |
|                           |                      |              |                         |                | Group I                                             | Group II                      | Group III                                     |         |
| Fungi genera              |                      |              | No ozone†               |                | (10 mg/L)                                           | (20 mg/L)                     | (40 mg/L)                                     | P*      |
| Storage                   | Aspergillus          |              | 10 (100)                |                | 3 (30)                                              | 6 (60)                        | 6 (60)                                        | <0.001  |
|                           | Penicillium          |              | 10 (100)                |                | 10 (100)                                            | 6 (60)                        | 7 (70)                                        | <0.001  |
| Field                     | Alternaria           |              | 10 (100)                |                | 1 (10)                                              | 1 (10)                        | NG (NA)                                       | <0.001  |
|                           | Acremonium           |              | 10 (100)                |                | 1 (10)                                              | NG (NA)                       | NG (NA)                                       | <0.001  |
| Yeasts                    | Aureobasidium        |              | 10 (100)                |                | 1 (10)                                              | 1 (10)                        | 1 (10)                                        | <0.001  |
|                           | Other yeasts         |              | NG (NA)                 |                | NG (NA)                                             | 3 (30)                        | 2 (20)                                        | <0.001  |
| * 0 . 0 05.               | ain aifi an at aliff |              |                         |                |                                                     |                               |                                               |         |

\* P < 0.05: significant differences.</li>

+ Control group.

NA, not applicable; NG, no growth.



FIG. 3. GRAPHIC REPRESENTATION OF THE RANGE AND AVERAGE RESULTS OF (a) TOTAL FUNGI LOAD, (b) MOISTURE CONTENT, AND (c) WATER ACTIVITY FOR EACH OZONE TREAT-MENT PERFORMED ON THE PADDY RICE (0, 10, 20 AND 40 MG/L)

this logarithm regression can be used as a tool to develop cost benefit assessments on the large scale of paddy rice ozone application.

Table 1 shows the distribution and proportion of fungi genera isolated from the control samples analyzed (not treated) in the presence of *Aspergillus*, *Penicillium*, *Acremonium*, *Alternaria* and *Aureobasidium* apart from yeasts and the variation on their total counts throughout the ozone gas treatment applied (groups I–III). Significant differences (P < 0.05) were observed between the fungi genera distribution and proportion for each ozone gas treatment by the ANOVA test.

Furthermore, the data suggest an ozone resistance by the genera *Aureobasidium*, *Aspergillus* and *Penicillium* as well as for yeasts, as their proportions were maintained when ozone concentration rose. Despite that, the time between the gas exposure and sample collection (which was immediately after application in the current study) should be longer to allow better ozone effect on spores (resistant structures). The occurrence of fungi and yeasts simultaneously and only yeasts for each ozone treatment was analyzed and Chisquare test indicated significant differences (P < 0.05) between these two events, confirming that yeasts are more resistant to ozone than fungi in the conditions applied in the present study.

Cárdenas *et al.* (2011) reported that a diversity of results has been registered in the scientific literature, depending on the ozone different concentrations applied as well as on their types of application (gas or liquid) as well as the food matrix (grain, fruits, feed). Despite this, the results obtained were in accordance to the White *et al.* (2010) findings conducted an enumeration study of ozone-treated maize and found ozone-deactivated fungi genera in the following order: *Rhizopus* > *Fusarium* > *Aspergillus* > *Mucor* > *Penicillium.* Furthermore, the same authors suggested that ozone may be more effective on certain fungal genera at different concentrations, which were observed in the current research too.

It is important to emphasize that *Fusarium* genera were not isolated from the current stored paddy rice samples, because they were already stored, the sample mc was low (12.03%), and storage conditions were not adequate/ optimal for that fungi genera development. The optimal mc for field fungi including *Fusarium* is known to range from 20 to 23% (Scussel *et al.* 2011b). White *et al.* (2010) reported that *Fusarium* growth in maize at mc was as low as 16%. Nevertheless, the current paddy rice samples did not reach those mc levels. In addition, the rice stored conditions of temperature, light and aeration could also hamper *Fusarium* growth.

As far as mc and  $a_w$  data and the conditions of ozone treatments applied are concerned, although there were some differences registered, that reduction was not quite high, as

the time of gas exposure and flow rate of the ozone gas stream applied were not long enough to allow a large percentage of humidity release from rice inner tissues. Other studies report treatments of foods with longer exposure to ozone, from 60 to 189 min, allowing more time for gas effect on the fungi and humidity reduction (Tiwari *et al.* 2010; Scussel *et al.* 2011a; Giordano *et al.* 2012).

The ozone gas treatment was effective in inactivation fungi growth, especially at 40 mg/L concentration, keeping safety during storage. Considering the results, ozone gas treatment could be an effective green method in the grains storage to avoid fungi growth, mainly toxigenic species responsible for mycotoxin formation in the paddy rice.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The authors thank the Juriti Cooperative, Massaranduba City, Santa Catarina State, Southern Brazil, for the partnership and for providing the rice samples and financial support, as well as the CAPES – the Brazilian Government sponsors – for providing grant to M. B-R.

#### REFERENCES

- AGUAYO, E., ESCALONA, V.H. and ARTÉS, F. 2006. Effect of cyclic exposure to ozone gas on physicochemical, sensorial and microbial quality of whole and sliced tomatoes. Postharvest Biol. Technol. *39*, 169–177.
- ALLEN, B., WU, J.N. and DOAN, H. 2003. Inactivation of fungi associated with barley grain by gaseous ozone. J. Environ. Sci. Health B. *38*, 617–630.
- ANTONY-BABU, S. and SINGLETON, I. 2009. Effect of ozone on spore germination, spore production and biomass production in two *Aspergillus* species. Anton. Leeuw. *96*, 413–422.
- AOAC. 2005. *Official Methods of Analysis*, AOAC International, Gaithersburg, MD.
- APHA. 1999. Standard Methods for the Examination of Water and Wastewater, American Water Works Association, Washington, DC.
- BEBER-RODRIGUES, M. and SCUSSEL, V.M. 2013. Mycoflora and mycotoxicological quality of four freshly harvested paddy rice cultivars and relation with harvest to industry reception timing. Rice Sci. 20, 303–308.
- BOX, G.E.P., HUNTER, W.G. and HUNTER, J.S. 1978. Statistics for experimenters: an introduction to design, data analysis and model building. Wiley, New York City, NY.
- CÁRDENAS, F.C., ANDRÉS, S., GIANNUZZI, L. and ZARITZKY, N. 2011. Antimicrobial action and effects on beef quality attributes of a gaseous ozone treatment at refrigeration temperatures. Food Control *22*, 1442–1447.
- DESVIGNES, C., CHAURANDA, M., DUBOIS, M., SADOUDI, A., ABECASSIS, J. and LULLIEN-PELLERIN, V. 2008.

Changes in common wheat grain milling behavior and tissue mechanical properties following ozone treatment. J. Cereal Sci. *47*, 245–251.

DUARTE, S.C., PENA, A. and LINO, C.M. 2010. A review on ochratoxin A occurrence and effects of processing of cereal and cereal derived food products. Food Microbiol. *27*, 187–198.

FOOD AND AGRICULTURE ORGANIZATION OF THE UNITED NATIONS (FAO). 1996. Fresh water fish processing and equipment in small plants. In *Corporate DOC Depository* (P. Bykowski and D. Dutkiewicz, eds.) p. 59. Rome, Italy.

GIORDANO, B.N.E., NONES, J. and SCUSSEL, V.M. 2012. Susceptibility of the in-shell Brazil Nut mycoflora and aflatoxin contamination to ozone gas treatment during storage. J. Agr. Sci. *4*, 1–10.

GUZEL-SEYDIM, Z.B., GREENE, A.K. and SEYDIM, A.C. 2004. Use of ozone in the food industry. Lebensm.-Wiss. U.-Technol. *37*, 453–460.

HUSSEIN, S. and BRASEL, J.M. 2001. Toxicity, metabolism, and impact of mycotoxins on humans and animals. Toxicology *167*, 101–134.

KELLS, S.A., MASON, L.J., MAIER, D.E. and WOLOSHUK, C.P. 2001. Efficacy and fumigation characteristics of ozone in stored maize. J. Stored Prod. Res. *37*, 371–382.

KOTTAPALLI, B., WOLF-HALL, C.E. and SCHWARZ, P. 2005.Evaluation of gaseous ozone and hydrogen peroxide treatments for reducing Fusarium survival in malting barley.J. Food Prot. *68*, 1236–1240.

MCDONOUGH, M.X., CAMPABADAL, C.A., MASON, L.J., MAIER, D.E., DENVIR, A. and WOLOSHUK, C. 2011. Ozone application in a modified screw conveyor to treat grain for insect pests, fungal contaminants, and mycotoxins. J. Stored Prod. Res. 47, 249–254.

MORENO, E.C., GARCIA, G.T., ONO, M.A., VIZONI, É., KAWAMURA, O., HIROOKA, E.Y. and ONO, E.Y.S. 2009. Co-occurrence of mycotoxins in corn samples from the Northern region of Paraná State, Brazil. Food Chem. *116*, 220–226.

RAILA, A., LUGAUSKAS, A., STENONAVICIUS, D., RAILIENE, M., STENONAVICIUS, A. and ZVICEVICIUS, E. 2006. Application of ozone for reduction of mycological infection in wheat grain. Ann. Agric. Environ. Med. 13, 287–294.

SAMSON, R.A., HOEKSTRA, E.S. and FRISVAD, J.C. 2004. Introduction to Food and Airborne Fungi, CBS, Wageningen.

SAVI, G.D., PIACENTINI, K., BITTENCOURT, K.O. and SCUSSEL, V.M. 2014a. Ozone treatment efficiency on *F. graminearum* & deoxynivalenol degradation and its effects on whole wheat grains (*Triticum aestivum* L.) quality and germination. J. Stored Prod. Res. doi: 10.1016/j.jspr .2014.03.008. Available: http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/ article/pii/S0022474X14000423.

SAVI, G.D., PIACENTINI, K.C. and SCUSSEL, V.M. 2014b. Ozone treatment efficiency in *Aspergillus & Penicillium* growth inhibition and mycotoxin degradation of stored wheat grains (*Triticum aestivum* L.). J. Food Process Pres. doi: 10.1111/jfpp.12307. Available: http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/ doi/10.1111/jfpp.12307/abstract.

SCUSSEL, V.M. 2005. Fungos em grãos armazenados. In Qualidade de arroz na pós-colheita (I. Lorini and M.C. Elias, eds.) p. 79, UFPEL, Abrapós, Pelotas, RS.

SCUSSEL, V.M., GIORDANO, B.N., SIMAO, V., MANFIO, D., GALVAO, S. and RODRIGUES, M.N.F. 2011a. Effect of oxygen-reducing atmospheres on the safety of packaged shelled Brazil Nuts during storage. Int. J. Anal. Chem. 2011, 1–9.

SCUSSEL, V.M., BEBER, M. and TONON, K.M. 2011b. Efeitos da infecção por *Fusarium*/Gibberella na qualidade e segurança de grãos, farinhas e produtos derivados. In *Seminário sobre* giberela em cereais de inverno, 1st Ed. (E.M. Reis, ed.) pp. 131–175, Berthier, Passo Fundo.

SCUSSEL, V.M., SAVI, G.D. and BEBER, M. 2012. Micotoxinas em arroz e seus produtos. In *Qualidade de arroz da pós-colheita ao consumo*, 1st Ed., *Vol. 1* (M.C. Elias, M. Oliveira and N.L. Vanier, eds.) pp. 115–138, Universitária da UFPEL, Pelotas.

SIEGEL, S. and CASTELLAN, N.J. 1988. *Nonparametric Statistics for the Behavioral Sciences*, McGraw-Hill Book Company, New York, NY.

STATSOFT 2004. Software Statistica 7.0. StatSoft Inc., Tulsa.

TIWARI, B.K., BRENNAN, C.S., CURRAN, T., GALLAGHER, E., CULLEN, P.J. and O'DONNELL, C.P. 2010. Application of ozone in grain processing. J. Cereal Sci. 51, 248–255.

UNITED STATES FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION (FDA). 1982. GRAS status of ozone. Fed. Regist. 47, 50209–50210.

WEBER, R.W.S. and PITT, D. 2000. Teaching techniques for mycology: Riddell's slide cultures. Mycologist 14, 118–120.

WHITE, S.D., MURPHY, P.T., BERN, C.J. and LEEUWEN, J.H. 2010. Controlling deterioration of high-moisture maize with ozone treatment. J. Stored Prod. Res. *46*, 7–12.

WU, J.N., DOAN, H. and CUENCA, M.A. 2006. Investigation of gaseous ozone as an antifungal fumigant for stored wheat. J. Chem. Technol. Biotechnol. *81*, 1288–1293.

ZORLUGENIC, B., ZORLUGENIC, F.K., OZTEKIN, S. and EVLIYA, I.B. 2008. The influence of gaseous ozone and ozonated water on microbial flora and degradation of aflatoxin B<sub>1</sub> in dried figs. Food Chem. Toxicol. *46*, 3593–3597.