# SPECIES AUTHENTICATION IN POULTRY MEAT PRODUCTS BY NEXT-GENERATION SEQUENCING

**Mottola A.[1], Piredda R. [1], Lorusso L.* [1], Armani A. [2], Di Pinto A. [1]**

**Mottola A., Piredda R. as co-first author**

[1] Department of Veterinary Medicine – University of Bari Aldo Moro – Prov. le Casamassima, Km 3, 70010, Valenzano (Bari), Italy

[2]Department of Veterinary Sciences, University of Pisa, Viale delle Piagge 2, 56124, Pisa (Italy)

***Corresponding author:**

**Department of Veterinary Medicine, University of Bari Aldo Moro, Strada Provinciale 62 per Casamassima Km 3,00, 70010 Valenzano, Bari, Italy**

**Phone: +39 0805443878**

**Fax: +39 0805443855**

**E-mail:**

**Keywords:** meat product, metabarcoding, mixed poultry product, species substitution; NGS, meat product mislabelling

## Abstract

The growing demand for poultry meat and the complexity of the supply chain affect traceability. Therefore, the aim of this study was to apply DNA metabarcoding to verify the labelling compliance of multi-species poultry meat commercial products .

Overall, the molecular identifications conducted in this study confirm that all products contain the species declared in the label and all the non-conformities regard the addition of one or more undeclared meat species which could reflect both unintentional and fraudulent behaviors. In particular, the presence of undeclared species, such as swine and bovine, were highlighted in 8/13 (60%) of the samples. Such composition? pattern could be due to technological purposes or accidental contamination linked to inappropriate sanitation practices during processing. However, the presence of undeclared species can affect the ability to choose for consumers with of specific needs (e.g., ethic, religious) or health risk (e.g., cardiovascular diseases, obesity) and should be not neglected. Results of this study show that metabarcoding is a promising tool to identify meat species in mixtures. Therefore, its application by competent companies and institutions, could help to innovate the food management system with the creation of a favorable environment for the protection and respect of the consumer needs.

## INTRODUCTION

Meat consumption has been shifting towards poultry, driven by two different forces. In lower income developing countries, poultry has lower price compared to other meats, while in high-income countries poultry meats are considered more convenient to prepare and perceived as a healthier food choice with a risk reduction of cardiovascular diseases (Falkovskaya & Gowen, 2020; Marangoni et al., 2015; OECD-FAO Agricultural Outlook 2021-2030). Poultry meat is the meat of domesticated birds, such as turkey and chicken, and poultry products foods such as sausages, patties, hamburgers are gaining growing interest among consumers due to their convenience in preparation (ready to cook), handling, and storage (Barbut, 2012; Kennedy et al., 2004). However, in these kinds of products, the ingredients are naturally less traceable due to international trade, market globalization, and long and complex food supply chains. In addition, with the booming of e-commerce, the opportunities for their fraud increased and mixed meat products are often considered among the most frequently adulterated foods (Di Pinto et al., 2015; Hassoun et al., 2020; Walker et al., 2013). In general, food frauds involving partial or full species substitutions are expected to increase economic gain with high-priced species being substituted by cheaper ones or even illegally trade matrices (Barbarossa et al., 2016). On the other hands, accidental species substitution could occurs and may be associated with unintentional cross-contamination in processing plants sharing common machinery or equipment to produce different meat products or improper human handling (Keyvan et al., 2017). Whether intentional or not, the incorrect description of meat products is an issue of primary importance not only for economic value, but also for the potential public health risks. Indeed species substitution could have a direct impact on health of consumers when meat not compliance with hygiene requirements or even coming from illicit trade is used(Vidal Junior et al., 2020). Moreover, species substitution affects the possibility for the consumers to choose products based on ethical issues as sustainable production, animal health and wellness, health problems or religious laws (Bertolini et al., 2015). The implementation of control systems is fundamental, and several methods,

including molecular, chromatography, spectroscopy, and/or spectrometry, as well as imaging approaches, have been used for the authentication of meat products (Ballin, 2010; Ellis et al., 2015; Fengou et al., 2021; Ropodi et al., 2017). However, considering the high stability and highly specificity of DNA present in almost all tissue types, molecular approaches are considered the most appropriate allowing the differentiation even in cases of closely related species. Many DNA-based methods such as DNA sequencing, species specific PCR, randomly amplified polymorphic DNA (RAPD), restriction-fragment-length polymorphism (RFLP), real-time PCR, Droplet digital PCR (ddPCR) loop-mediated isothermal amplification (LAMP), and touchdown PCR (TD-PCR) have effectively and largely been developed, tested and used for identification and differentiation of animal species in meat products both in single ingredient commodities and in complex matrices (Cai et al., 2017; Di Pinto et al., 2015, 2019; Haider et al., 2012; Kumar et al., 2017; Lin et al., 2019; Nischala et al., 2022). However, these analytical techniques require knowledge about which species to search for, and therefore are not appropriate for detecting all the species used in mixed meat products. Currently, DNA metabarcoding, the combination of DNA barcoding with Next Generation Sequencing platforms (NGS), could plays an important role in food authentication without the requirement for previous knowledge of the supply chain, production process, ingredients or about the species to search for. Thank to these new generation of sequencers, all the DNA molecules extracted from the matrices can be simultaneously amplified and sequenced allowing species identification also in complex foods containing multiple ingredients. Although application of metabarcoding to trace ingredients is still in its infancy, several studies have tested this approach for species identification in different food products including dairy (Ribani et al., 2018), seafood (Giusti et al., 2017; Piredda et al., 2022), commercial plant (Bruno et al., 2019), herbal medicinal (Anthoons et al., 2021), candies (Muñoz-Colmenero et al., 2017) honey (Prosser & Hebert, 2017; Wirta et al., 2021), probiotics (Patro et al., 2016) and pet food (Palumbo et al., 2020; Preckel et al., 2021). Few studies applied metabarcoding to investigate the species composition in artificially prepared mixtures or commercial

meat and meat products (i.e., sausages, balls, canned luncheon meat, minced meats, kebab) made of several animal species including beef, camel, horse, sheep, deer, swine and/or poultry (Cottenet et al., 2020; Dobrovolny et al., 2019; Pan et al., 2020; Preckel et al., 2021; Xing et al., 2019). Despite the paucity, these studies have shown that metabarcoding is a promising tool to species authentication also able to reveal the presence of unexpected taxa in addition to those declared.

In this study, the DNA metabarcoding approach will be applied to multi-species poultry meat products to verify the declared list of ingredient in term of animal species  Results of this work, by highlighting the potential application of DNA metabarcoding for food authentication and traceability, could innovate the food management system throughout the supply chain.

## 2. MATERIALS AND METHODS

### 2.1 Sampling

A total of 10 packaged and 3 unpackaged poultry meat products samples including sausages, cutlets hamburgers and meat patties, reporting in the ingredient list as manufactured using pure chicken (6), pure turkey (2), chicken and turkey meat (4) and chicken, turkey, and swine meat (1) (Table1)

| Sample ID | Type of product | Type of production | Packaged or unpackaged | Market/ supermarket???? | Declared species |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **S**ample **01** | Sausage | Artisanal | | | Chicken |
| **S**ample **02** | Hamburger | Artisanal | | | Chicken |
| **S**ample **03** | Patties | Industrial | | | Chicken, milk traces |
| **S**ample **04** | Hamburger | Industrial | | | Chicken |
| **S**ample **05** | Hamburger | Industrial | | | Chicken |
| **S**ample **06** | Hamburger | Industrial | | | Chicken, milk traces |
| **S**ample **07** | Hamburger | Industrial | | | Chicken, Turkey, Bovine proteins |
| **S**ample **08** | Sausage | Artisanal | | | Chicken, Turkey |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Sample 09** | Cutlet | Industrial | | | Chicken, Turkey, milk traces |
| **Sample 10** | Hamburger | Industrial | | | Chicken, Turkey |
| **Sample 11** | Sausage | Industrial | | | Turkey, Chicken, Swine |
| **Sample 12** | Hamburger | Industrial | | | Turkey |
| **Sample 13** | Hamburger | Industrial | | | Turkey |

were purchased from different markets and supermarkets in the Apulia region (SE, Italy). Samples were stored at -20 °C until processed. Positive control was generated using an artificial DNA pool constructed from 50 ng of VERYfinder Poultry Pure DNA Extract – HEAT TREATED MEAT (Generon, Italy), 50 ng of VERYfinder Turkey Pure DNA Extract – HEAT TREATED MEAT (Generon, Italy), 50 ng of VERYfinder Bovine Pure DNA Extract – HEAT TREATED MEAT (Generon, Italy), and 50 ng of VERYfinder Swine Pure DNA Extract – HEAT TREATED MEAT (Generon, Italy).

**2.2. DNA extraction, purification, and sequencing**

Total genomic DNA was extracted from all samples starting from aliquots of 25 mg of each sample using the DNeasy Blood and Tissue Kit (QIAGEN, Hilden, Germany) following producer instructions. To verify the purity of the extraction reagents, blank negative control (no added tissue) was included. DNA concentration and purity were established by evaluating the ratio A260 nm/A280 nm using a BioPhotometer D30 filter (Eppendorf, Milan, Italy). Then, the DNA was amplified using the primer pairs previously tested by Pan et al. (2020), consisting in mini-COI-F: 5′-GGTCAACAAATCATAAAGATATTGG-3′ (Folmer et al., 1994) and mini-COI-R:5′-ACTATAAAGAAGATTATTACAAAGGC-3′ (Pan et al., 2020), amplifying a fragment of about 136bp of the cytochrome oxidase I (COI) mitochondrial gene. The sequencing was carried out on the Illumina NextSeq platform by LGC Genomics GmbH (Berlin, Germany) (2×150 bp). PCR negative controls (no template) were included during the amplification step of library preparation.

Raw sequences were deposited in the Sequence Read Archive (SRA) under the BioProject (under submission).

Illumina paired-end raw reads were pre-processed to generate Amplicon Sequence Variants (ASVs) using DADA2 R package (Callahan et al., 2016). Briefly, primers were removed, forward and reverse trimmed based on the Quality score and, the reads filtered, were then used to train the error model using machine learning approach. Then forward and reverse were dereplicated to generate unique sequences and denoised (collapsed) in amplicon sequence variants (ASVs) applying the trained error model. Finally forward and reverse reads were merged and checked for chimera sequences. Representative sequence for each ASV were taxonomic assigned blasting the representative sequences against GenBank in remote mode using the standalone blast + suite (Altschul et al., 1990; Camacho et al., 2009) and assignments with a similarity of <90%, representing potential low-quality reads, were discarded. Sequences assigned in the range 100-98% of similarity were assigned at species level (Barbuto et al., 2010) and merged. Molecular results were then compared with the list on ingredients reported on the labels.

## 3. RESULTS

The Illumina sequencing of the 13 meat samples generated a total of 5,695,822 raw reads and filtering reduced the dataset to 5,473,877 reads. Positive control sample confirmed the efficiency of the primers and generated 396,128 raw reads reduced to 376,484 (Suppl. Table 1). Taxonomic assignments revealed the presences of four species *Bos taurus*, *Gallus gallus, Meleagris gallopavo* and *Sus scrofa*.

The comparison between the results of the molecular identification and ingredient lists confirmed that all the samples contained the species reported on the label. In eight cases 8/13 (61,5%) the presence of unexpected species was highlighted. All the six samples labeled as pure chicken were found to contain additional species: turkey in 4/6 cases (67%), turkey, swine and bovine in 2/6 (33%). As regards the 2 samples of turkey hamburger, the analysis confirmed the presence of turkey, but in one

149 case (50%) also the presence of chicken. Within the 4 chicken and turkey products, one sample (25%)
150 revealed also the presence of bovine. Finally, in the chicken, turkey and swine sausages molecular
151 data confirmed the species reported on the label (Figure 1 and Table 1). In the sample Sample 04
152 (chicken hamburger) the presence of the avian feather mites *Proctophyllodes sylviae* (Acari:
153 Astigmata), an important symbiont of birds, was even detected.

154 **4. DISCUSSION**

155 The globalization of meat supply and the consequent increase in the complexity of supply chains has
156 significantly increased the risks of food fraud. The European Union (EU) is one of the world's largest
157 poultry meat producers. However, EU imports high value poultry products, including breast meat and
158 poultry preparations, mainly from Brazil, Thailand, and Ukraine, while the EU exports poultry
159 products of lower value (European Union, 2022). Such complexity reduces the ability of both
160 regulators and industry to effectively oversee food supply chains, creating further confusion and
161 weakness that can facilitate inadequate practices. Furthermore, considering the reduced worldwide
162 regulatory monitoring that appears to have occurred during the pandemic, the COVID-19 pandemic
163 played a role in the observed increase in food fraud incidents from January to June 2020 compared to
164 the same period in 2019 (Brooks et al., 2021).

165 Overall, the molecular identifications conducted in this study, focusing on poultry meat products,
166 confirm that all products contain the species declared in the label and all the non-conformities regard
167 the addition of one or more undeclared meat species which could reflect both unintentional and
168 fraudulent behaviors. The primers pair used in this study were proved to be able to identify 51 edible
169 animal species (swine, bovine, poultry, ovine, caprine, and some fish and shrimp), also including
170 *Homo sapiens* (Pan et al., 2020); however, only four edible species (chicken, turkey, swine, and
171 bovine) have been detected in the analyzed products. In particular, in this study, we revealed a high
172 rate of non-conformity (61.5%) as found by Xing et al., 2019 who reported a non-conformity rate of
173 59% in processed meat and poultry products. Despite the reduced number of samples, this study

represents one of the few studies available for poultry products and it corroborates the hypothesis that processed foods with no morphological structure are vulnerable to species substitution, either intentionally or unintentionally, practiced at any stage of the supply chain (Lianou et al., 2021). However, we have to consider that chicken, turkey, swine, and bovine, represent the top consumed meat types worldwide and are expected to be routinely present in the butchery, so their presence in the products could be related to an accidental introduction due to the fact that different raw materials are processed within the same processing plants (Di Pinto et al., 2019; Marchetti et al., 2021). Indeed, cross-contamination, can easily occur when improperly cleaned equipment is used to process meat of multiple species. This hypothesis could be the reason why, according to our results, all the samples purchased from butcher's shop contain four types of meat independently to those declared in label and suggesting more risks of incident in 'artisanal' products than in industrial ones. On the other hand, the addition driven by economic benefit cannot be excluded since undeclared meat could be intentionally and illegally incorporated into the products for technological purposes. In particular, the presence of bovine or porcine DNA could be due to the fraudulent addition to poultry of water containing proteins of porcine or bovine origin, aimed at aid carcasses water retention (Fuseini et al., 2017; Lianou et al., 2021). Yet, in the unpackaged sausage sample, pork casings could have been used to contain the products. In addition, more mechanically recovered meat (MRM), often produced from pork and chicken carcass, is added as cheap protein source to meat products such as sausages, hamburgers, or cured meats (Surowiec et al., 2011). Similarly, the undeclared bovine presence could have been due to intentional addition of non-fat dry milk powder to increase taste and to improve binding qualities (Di Pinto et al., 2015, 2019). Whatever was the reason or source, the non-conformity due to species substitution to the presence od undeclared species has always consequences for the consumers, and this is especially important in the case of poultry meat products which are often chosen and purchased on the bases of specific needs. Indeed, poultry products are allowed in presence of strict religious restrictions on the consumption of pork and bovine, as is the case of Muslim food

199 laws (Halaal) and in Jewish food laws (Kashrut) that forbid swine meats, or Hindus that abstain from
200 eating beef meat (Ng et al., 2022). For this reason, the simultaneous presence of bovine and swine
201 (three samples) and bovine (two samples) found in our samples in addition to poultry meats, should
202 be seriously considered. Indeed, Europe's societies are undergoing change and, even if Italy cannot
203 be considered as multiethnic or multicultural country right away, we can predict an increase of
204 consumers with different cultural values for which the undeclared presence of bovine and swine will
205 have more impact and weight in comparison with the traditional Italian consumers.
206 In addition to ethical aspects, species substitution includes violation of the EU traceability
207 requirements of the transparent food labelling systems set forth respectively in Reg. EC 178/02 and
208 Reg. EU 1169/2011, as well as the code of conduct on the management of food allergens established
209 by the recent Commission Regulation (EU) 2021/382 (Mottola et al., 2022). A full traceability of
210 ingredients is fundamental for people with allergies to milk or with allergic reactions to gelatin
211 (Caponetto et al., 2013; Zin et al., 2021). Moreover, although the allergy to meat itself has historically
212 been considered quite rare, cases of allergy to meat from mammals and birds, beef, pork, lamb, and
213 poultry have become more common starting around 20 years ago (Marques et al., 2021; Wilson &
214 Platts-Mills, 2018, 2019).
215 Despite the European Union Commission defines food fraud as "*any suspected intentional action by*
216 *businesses or individuals for the purpose of deceiving purchasers and gaining undue advantage*
217 *therefrom, in violation of the rules referred to in Article 1(2) of Regulation (EU) 2017/625*", to date
218 from a regulatory point of view, it lacks a specific body of legislation and a clear and shared definition
219 of "food fraud", as well as details concerning the approaches of discriminating between accidental
220 and intentional. In the routine analysis of samples in public laboratories, mass concentrations below
221 1% (w/w) are generally reported as possible process contaminants and do not constitute a violation
222 of declaration since substitution at such low levels should not have an economic advantage (Al-
223 Kahtani et al., 2017). However, this requires specific discipline and great inspection attention. Indeed,

any possible accidental or low-level presence linked to the unintentional presence and accidental traces of a type of food product with another species during processing and handling must in any case be indicated on the label as "May contain traces". On the contrary, to prevent or react on food fraud-incidents, companies need to plan mitigation practices and prevention strategies for species replacement practices, making use of the Food Fraud Vulnerability Assessment, an effective measure for specific risk management for the food industries, food authorities and consumers (Marchetti et al., 2021). A comprehensive food fraud and adulteration prevention program could be a decisive and fundamental development factor in the innovation of the processed poultry sector for more accurate and truthful labeling (Di Pinto et al., 2019).The main tools for controlling vulnerabilities include the traceability plan vulnerability and severity analyses and assessment of risk, evaluation of the preventive measures in place, identification of critical points for controlling origin of the fraud, establishing a system for monitoring and critical limits, corrective actions and verification and validation of the system. Specifically, the development of standardized tests (Pan et al., 2020) play a crucial role in meat product authentication and in the mitigation of food fraud related to species substitution.

Our outcomes show that metabarcoding is a promising tool to identify meat species in mixtures which often contain multiple animals including species not routinely used, which were not suspected to be present or for which real-time PCR methods are not available (Piredda et al., 2022). In addition, the high sensitivity of metabarcoding approach could also help the estimation of hygienic conditions of meat supply chain. Indeed, Pan et al. (2020) detected the presence of fly and cockroach in their artificial meat mixture samples, probably due to a contamination of laboratory working environment, showing that the application of metabarcoding on food products could trace not only the mislabeling but also the history of environmental and hygienic-sanitary conditions. In this sense, very positive outcomes emerge from our poultry samples in which none ‘unexpected’ eukaryotic taxa are detected except for one sample in which we detected trace of avian feather mites belonging to

249 *Proctophyllodidae*. However, such presence cannot be related to a scarce hygienic condition since
250 the general avian slaughter process operations does not remove avian skin, and thus could justify the
251 *Proctophyllodidae* presence. Furthermore, it does not represent a sanitary risk given that, to date, this
252 avian mite has not been identified as harmful for human health. Similarly, the presence of
253 *Proctophyllodidae* seems to be not an animal welfare issue given that they are bird ectosymbionts
254 that play an important biological function in cleaning bird feathers (Dona et al., 2019). Interestingly,
255 also traces of human DNA are absent in our samples suggesting that the strong obligation of masks
256 and gloves probably due to pandemic times, could have avoid the occasional contamination with the
257 operator's saliva from talking while work with a consequent improvement of safety.
258 Despite the great potential of metabarcoding approach, the semiquantitative nature of metabarcoding
259 approach is well known and the limitations for DNA quantification have been reported in several
260 field including in meat products (Cottenet et al., 2020; Preckel et al., 2021). Different reasons
261 contribute to this bias as tissue type, genome size, copy number for nuclear regions, number of
262 mitochondrial in cells/tissues/organs (Ren et al., 2017). Moreover, since metabarcoding is a PCR-
263 based method, variations in primer binding capacity, could overestimate low abundant taxa with
264 higher primers affinity or underestimate high abundant taxa with lower primer affinity, especially in
265 complex food matrices with competitive affinity of animal species. On the other hand, in most of the
266 cases, the labels of sampled products didn't include the proportion of animals used in the mixtures
267 so, a qualitative approach for the comparison remains the most practicable way for the metabarcoding
268 assessments in meat products.
269
270 **5 CONCLUSIONS**
271 Poultry meat product species substitution result from the combination of opportunities, motivations,
272 and inadequate control measures. The poultry meat is the fastest growing segment in the world meat
273 market (Roiter et al., 2021) and it is necessary to conduct baseline studies of the current state, identify

strengths and weaknesses of the supply chain specific, build vulnerability assessment and critical control point system. The development and application of strategies and tools for traceability are required especially for processed poultry meat products because these products are often the target of consumers with of specific needs (e.g., ethic, religious) or health risk (e.g., cardiovascular diseases, obesity, diabetes) that should be respected. The innovative approach of DNA metabarcoding could be a suitable method helping the authentication of animal species in mixed meat products. Its application in routine assays may verifying compliance with food labeling for the protection of consumers and contribute to the achievement of the European Green Deal objectives for the food systems.


**Figure 1. Comparison between species reported in label and metabarcoding identification**. Number and type of species reported in Label (yellow on the left) and Metabarcoding identification (blue on the right) with unexpected species highlighted in bold. Mislabeled samples are indicated with asterisk (*)

289 **Table 1.** Details of information of poultry products and molecular identification by metabarcoding

| Sample ID | Type of product | Type of production | Declared species | Molecular Identification |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **S**ample **01** | Sausage | Artisanal | Chicken | Chicken, Turkey, Bovine, Swine |
| **S**ample **02** | Hamburger | Artisanal | Chicken | Chicken, Turkey, Bovine, Swine |
| **S**ample **03** | Patties | Industrial | Chicken, milk traces | Chicken, Turkey |
| **S**ample **04** | Hamburger | Industrial | Chicken | Chicken, Turkey |
| **S**ample **05** | Hamburger | Industrial | Chicken | Chicken, Turkey |
| **S**ample **06** | Hamburger | Industrial | Chicken, milk traces | Chicken, Turkey |
| **S**ample **07** | Hamburger | Industrial | Chicken, Turkey, Bovine proteins | Chicken, Turkey, Bovine |
| **S**ample **08** | Sausage | Artisanal | Chicken, Turkey | Chicken, Turkey, Bovine, Swine |
| **S**ample **09** | Cutlet | Industrial | Chicken, Turkey, milk traces | Chicken, Turkey, Bovine |
| **S**ample **10** | Hamburger | Industrial | Chicken, Turkey | Chicken, Turkey |
| **S**ample **11** | Sausage | Industrial | Turkey, Chicken, Swine | Chicken, Turkey, Swine |
| **S**ample **12** | Hamburger | Industrial | Turkey | Turkey |
| **S**ample **13** | Hamburger | Industrial | Turkey | Chicken, Turkey |

290

## References


Akhbarizadeh, R., Dobaradaran, S., Nabipour, I., Tajbakhsh, S., Darabi, A. H., & Spitz, J. (2020). Abundance, composition, and potential intake of microplastics in canned fish. *Marine Pollution Bulletin*, *160*, 111633. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marpolbul.2020.111633

Al-Kahtani, H. A., Ismail, E. A., & Ahmed, M. A. (2017). Pork detection in binary meat mixtures and some commercial food products using conventional and real-time PCR techniques. *Food chemistry*, *219*, 54–60.

Altschul, S. F., Gish, W., Miller, W., Myers, E. W., & Lipman, D. J. (1990). Basic local alignments earch tool. Journal of Molecular Biology, 215, 403–410. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0022 - 2836(05)80360-2

Anthoons, B., Karamichali, I., Schrøder-Nielsen, A., Drouzas, A. D., de Boer, H., & Madesis, P. (2021). Metabarcoding reveals low fidelity and presence of toxic species in short chain-of-commercialization of herbal products. *Journal of Food Composition and Analysis*, *97*, 103767.

Ballin, N. Z. (2010). Authentication of meat and meat products. *Meat science*, *86*(3), 577–587.

Barbarossa, C., De Pelsmacker, P., Moons, I., & Marcati, A. (2016). The influence of country-of-origin stereotypes on consumer responses to food safety scandals: The case of the horsemeat adulteration. *Food Quality and Preference*, *53*, 71–83.

Barbut, S. (2012). Convenience breaded poultry meat products–New developments. *Trends in Food Science & Technology*, *26*(1), 14–20.

Barbuto, M., Galimberti, A., Ferri, E., Labra, M., Malandra, R., Galli, P., & Casiraghi, M. (2010). DNA barcoding reveals fraudulent substitutions in shark seafood products: The Italian case of “palombo” (Mustelus spp.). *Food research international*, *43*(1), 376–381.

Bertolini, F., Ghionda, M. C., D'Alessandro, E., Geraci, C., Chiofalo, V., & Fontanesi, L. (2015). A next generation semiconductor based sequencing approach for the identification of meat species in DNA mixtures. *PloS one*, *10*(4), e0121701.

Brooks, C., Parr, L., Smith, J. M., Buchanan, D., Snioch, D., & Hebishy, E. (2021). A review of food fraud and food authenticity across the food supply chain, with an examination of the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic and Brexit on food industry. *Food Control*, *130*, 108171.

Bruno, A., Sandionigi, A., Agostinetto, G., Bernabovi, L., Frigerio, J., Casiraghi, M., & Labra, M. (2019). Food tracking perspective: DNA metabarcoding to identify plant composition in complex and processed food products. *Genes*, *10*(3), 248.

Cai, Y., He, Y., Lv, R., Chen, H., Wang, Q., & Pan, L. (2017). Detection and quantification of beef and pork materials in meat products by duplex droplet digital PCR. *PLoS One*, *12*(8), e0181949.

Callahan, B. J., McMurdie, P. J., Rosen, M. J., Han, A. W., Johnson, A. J. A., & Holmes, S. P. (2016). DADA2: High-resolution sample inference from Illumina amplicon data. *Nature Methods*, *13*(7), 581–583. https://doi.org/10.1038/nmeth.3869

Camacho, C., Coulouris, G., Avagyan, V., Ma, N., Papadopoulos, J., Bealer, K., & Madden, T. L. (2009). BLAST+: Architecture and applications. *BMC Bioinformatics*, *10*(1), 421. https://doi.org/10.1186/1471-2105-10-421

Caponetto, P., Fischer, J., & Biedermann, T. (2013). Gelatin-containing sweets can elicit anaphylaxis in a patient with sensitization to galactose-α-1, 3-galactose. *The Journal of Allergy and Clinical Immunology: In Practice*, *1*(3), 302–303.

Chuah, L.-O., He, X. B., Effarizah, M. E., Syahariza, Z. A., Shamila-Syuhada, A. K., & Rusul, G. (2016). Mislabelling of beef and poultry products sold in Malaysia. *Food Control*, *62*, 157–164.

Cottenet, G., Blancpain, C., Chuah, P. F., & Cavin, C. (2020). Evaluation and application of a next generation sequencing approach for meat species identification. *Food Control*, *110*, 107003.

Di Pinto, A., Bottaro, M., Bonerba, E., Bozzo, G., Ceci, E., Marchetti, P., Mottola, A., & Tantillo, G. (2015). Occurrence of mislabeling in meat products using DNA-based assay. *Journal of Food Science and Technology*, *52*(4), 2479–2484. https://doi.org/10.1007/s13197-014-1552-y

Di Pinto, A., Mottola, A., Marchetti, P., Savarino, A., & Tantillo, G. (2019). Fraudulent species substitution in e-commerce of protected denomination origin (pdo) products. *Journal of Food Composition and Analysis*, *79*, 143–147.

Dona, J., Proctor, H., Serrano, D., Johnson, K. P., Oploo, A. O., Huguet-Tapia, J. C., Ascunce, M. S., & Jovani, R. (2019). Feather mites play a role in cleaning host feathers: New insights from DNA metabarcoding and microscopy. *Molecular ecology*, *28*(2), 203–218.

Ellis, D. I., Muhamadali, H., Haughey, S. A., Elliott, C. T., & Goodacre, R. (2015). Point-and-shoot: Rapid quantitative detection methods for on-site food fraud analysis–moving out of the laboratory and into the food supply chain. *Analytical Methods*, *7*(22), 9401–9414.

European Union (2022) https://ec.europa.eu/info/food-farming-fisheries/animals-and-animal-products/animal-products/poultry_en (30th May 2022)

Falkovskaya, A., & Gowen, A. (2020). Literature review: Spectral imaging applied to poultry products. *Poultry Science*, *99*(7), 3709–3722.

Fengou, L.-C., Lianou, A., Tsakanikas, P., Mohareb, F., & Nychas, G.-J. E. (2021). Detection of meat adulteration using spectroscopy-based sensors. *Foods*, *10*(4), 861.

Folmer, O., Black, M., Hoeh, W., Lutz, R., & Vrijenhoek,R. (1994). DNA primers for amplification of mitochondrial cytochrome c oxidase subunit I from diverse metazoan invertebrates. *Molecular Marine Biology and Biotechnology*, *3* (3), 294–299.

363 Fuseini, A., Wotton, S. B., Knowles, T. G., & Hadley, P. J. (2017). Halal meat fraud and safety
364 issues in the UK: a review in the context of the European Union. *Food ethics*, *1*(2), 127–
365 142.
366 Giusti, A., Armani, A., & Sotelo, C. G. (2017). Advances in the analysis of complex food matrices:
367 Species identification in surimi-based products using Next Generation Sequencing
368 technologies. *PLOS ONE*, *12*(10), e0185586. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0185586
369 Haider, N., Nabulsi, I., & Al-Safadi, B. (2012). Identification of meat species by PCR-RFLP of the
370 mitochondrial COI gene. *Meat Science*, *90*(2), 490–493.
371 Hassoun, A., Måge, I., Schmidt, W. F., Temiz, H. T., Li, L., Kim, H.-Y., Nilsen, H., Biancolillo, A.,
372 Aït-Kaddour, A., & Sikorski, M. (2020). Fraud in animal origin food products: Advances in
373 emerging spectroscopic detection methods over the past five years. *Foods*, *9*(8), 1069.
374 Kennedy, O. B., Stewart-Knox, B., Mitchell, P., & Thurnham, D. (2004). Consumer perceptions of
375 poultry meat: A qualitative analysis. *Nutrition & Food Science*.
376 Keyvan, E., İPLİKÇİOĞLU, G. Ç., ÇINAR, B. K., BİLGEN, N., & ŞİRELİ, U. T. (2017).
377 Identification of meat species in different types of meat products by PCR. *Ankara*
378 *Üniversitesi Veteriner Fakültesi Dergisi*, *64*(4), 261–266.
379 Kumar, Y., Bansal, S., & Jaiswal, P. (2017). Loop-mediated isothermal amplification (LAMP): A
380 rapid and sensitive tool for quality assessment of meat products. *Comprehensive Reviews in*
381 *Food Science and Food Safety*, *16*(6), 1359–1378.
382 Lianou, A., Papakonstantinou, M., Nychas, G.-J. E., & Stoitsis, J. (2021). Fraud in meat and poultry
383 products. In *Food Fraud* (pagg. 85–108). Elsevier.
384 Lin, C.-C., Tang, P.-C., & Chiang, H.-I. (2019). Development of RAPD-PCR assay for identifying
385 Holstein, Angus, and Taiwan Yellow Cattle for meat adulteration detection. *Food Science*
386 *and Biotechnology*, *28*(6), 1769–1777.

Marangoni, F., Corsello, G., Cricelli, C., Ferrara, N., Ghiselli, A., Lucchin, L., & Poli, A. (2015). Role of poultry meat in a balanced diet aimed at maintaining health and wellbeing: An Italian consensus document. *Food & nutrition research, 59*(1), 27606.

Marchetti, P., Mottola, A., Tantillo, G., Castrica, M., & Di Pinto, A. (2021). Detection of undeclared presence of bovine milk in buffalo yogurt. *Journal of Dairy Science, 104*(4), 4056–4061.

Marques, M. L., Falcão, I., Labrador Horrillo, M., Falcão, H., & Cunha, L. (2021). *Milk and cow's meat allergy in a child: A clinical case*.

Mottola, A., Piredda, R., Catanese, G., Lorusso, L., Ciccarese, G., & Di Pinto, A. (2022). Species authentication of canned mackerel: Challenges in molecular identification and potential drivers of mislabelling. *Food Control, 137*, 108880.

Muñoz-Colmenero, M., Martínez, J. L., Roca, A., & Garcia-Vazquez, E. (2017). NGS tools for traceability in candies as high processed food products: Ion Torrent PGM versus conventional PCR-cloning. *Food chemistry, 214*, 631–636.

Ng, P. C., Ahmad Ruslan, N. A. S., Chin, L. X., Ahmad, M., Abu Hanifah, S., Abdullah, Z., & Khor, S. M. (2022). Recent advances in halal food authentication: Challenges and strategies. *Journal of Food Science*, *87*(1), 8–35. https://doi.org/10.1111/1750-3841.15998

Nischala, S., Vaithiyanathan, S., Ashok, V., Kalyani, P., Srinivas, C., Aravind Kumar, N., & Vishnuraj, M. (2022). Development of a Touchdown—Duplex PCR Assay for Authentication of Sheep and Goat Meat. *Food Analytical Methods*, 1–8.

OECD-FAO Agricultural Outlook 2021-2030. https://www.fao.org/publications/oecd-fao-agricultural-outlook/2021-2030/en/. [accessed 27 April, 2022]

Palumbo, F., Scariolo, F., Vannozzi, A., & Barcaccia, G. (2020). NGS-based barcoding with mini-COI gene target is useful for pet food market surveys aimed at mislabelling detection. *Scientific reports*, *10*(1), 1–8.

Pan, Y., Qiu, D., Chen, J., & Yue, Q. (2020). Combining a COI Mini-Barcode with Next-Generation Sequencing for Animal Origin Ingredients Identification in Processed Meat Product. *Journal of Food Quality*, *2020*.

Patro, J. N., Ramachandran, P., Barnaba, T., Mammel, M. K., Lewis, J. L., & Elkins, C. A. (2016). Culture-independent metagenomic surveillance of commercially available probiotics with high-throughput next-generation sequencing. *MSphere*, *1*(2), e00057-16.

Piredda, R., Mottola, A., Cipriano, G., Carlucci, R., Ciccarese, G., & Di Pinto, A. (2022). Next Generation Sequencing (NGS) approach applied to species identification in mixed processed seafood products. *Food Control*, *133*, 108590. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foodcont.2021.108590

Preckel, L., Brünen-Nieweler, C., Denay, G., Petersen, H., Cichna-Markl, M., Dobrovolny, S., & Hochegger, R. (2021). Identification of Mammalian and Poultry Species in Food and Pet Food Samples Using 16S rDNA Metabarcoding. *Foods*, *10*(11), 2875.

Prosser, S. W., & Hebert, P. D. (2017). Rapid identification of the botanical and entomological sources of honey using DNA metabarcoding. *Food Chemistry*, *214*, 183–191.

Ren, J., Deng, T., Huang, W., Chen, Y., & Ge, Y. (2017). A digital PCR method for identifying and quantifying adulteration of meat species in raw and processed food. *PLoS One*, *12*(3), e0173567.

Ribani, A., Schiavo, G., Utzeri, V. J., Bertolini, F., Geraci, C., Bovo, S., & Fontanesi, L. (2018). Application of next generation semiconductor based sequencing for species identification in dairy products. *Food Chemistry*, *246*, 90–98. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foodchem.2017.11.006

Roiter, L., Vedenkina, I., & Eremeeva, N. (2021). *Analysis of the market potential of poultry meat and its forecast*. *937*(2), 022104.

Ropodi, A. I., Panagou, E. Z., & Nychas, G.-J. E. (2017). Multispectral imaging (MSI): A promising method for the detection of minced beef adulteration with horsemeat. *Food Control*, *73*, 57–63.

Surowiec, I., Fraser, P. D., Patel, R., Halket, J., & Bramley, P. M. (2011). Metabolomic approach for the detection of mechanically recovered meat in food products. *Food Chemistry*, *125*(4), 1468–1475.

Vidal Junior, P. O., Menezes, A. C. R., de Souza, L. M. P., Guimarães, A. G., & de Cassia Vieira Cardoso, R. (2020). Trade and Safety Issues of Raw Beef from the Countryside of Bahia State, Brazil. *Journal of Public Health Research*, *9*(3), jphr.2020.1752. https://doi.org/10.4081/jphr.2020.1752

Walker, M. J., Burns, M., & Burns, D. T. (2013). Horse meat in beef products—Species substitution 2013. *Journal of the Association of Public Analysts*, *41*, 67–106.

Wilson, J. M., & Platts-Mills, T. A. (2018). Meat allergy and allergens. *Molecular immunology*, *100*, 107–112.

Wilson, J. M., & Platts-Mills, T. A. (2019). Red meat allergy in children and adults. *Current opinion in allergy and clinical immunology*, *19*(3), 229.

Wirta, H., Abrego, N., Miller, K., Roslin, T., & Vesterinen, E. (2021). DNA traces the origin of honey by identifying plants, bacteria and fungi. *Scientific reports*, *11*(1), 1–14.

Xing, R.-R., Wang, N., Hu, R.-R., Zhang, J.-K., Han, J.-X., & Chen, Y. (2019). Application of next generation sequencing for species identification in meat and poultry products: A DNA metabarcoding approach. *Food Control*, *101*, 173–179.

457 Zin, Z. M., Sarbon, N. M., Zainol, M. K., Jaafar, S., Shukri, M. M., & Rahman, A. H. A. (2021).
458 *Halal and Non-Halal Gelatine as a Potential Animal By-Products in Food Systems:*
459 *Prospects and Challenges for Muslim Community*. *536*, 530–540.
460