



**QUEEN'S
UNIVERSITY
BELFAST**

The End user Sensor Tree: An end-user friendly sensor database

Nelis, J. L. D., Tsagkaris, A. S., Zhao, Y., Lou-Franco, J., Nolan, P., Zhou, H., Cao, C., Rafferty, K., Hajslova, J., Elliott, C. T., & Campbell, K. (2019). The End user Sensor Tree: An end-user friendly sensor database. *Biosensors and Bioelectronics*. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bios.2019.01.055>

Published in:

Biosensors and Bioelectronics

Document Version:

Peer reviewed version

Queen's University Belfast - Research Portal:

[Link to publication record in Queen's University Belfast Research Portal](#)

Publisher rights

Copyright 2019 Elsevier.

This manuscript is distributed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivs License

(<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>), which permits distribution and reproduction for non-commercial purposes, provided the author and source are cited.

General rights

Copyright for the publications made accessible via the Queen's University Belfast Research Portal is retained by the author(s) and / or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing these publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

Take down policy

The Research Portal is Queen's institutional repository that provides access to Queen's research output. Every effort has been made to ensure that content in the Research Portal does not infringe any person's rights, or applicable UK laws. If you discover content in the Research Portal that you believe breaches copyright or violates any law, please contact openaccess@qub.ac.uk.

Open Access

This research has been made openly available by Queen's academics and its Open Research team. We would love to hear how access to this research benefits you. – Share your feedback with us: <http://go.qub.ac.uk/oa-feedback>

The End user Sensor Tree: An end-user friendly sensor database

J.L.D. Nelis¹, A.S. Tsagkaris², Y. Zhao^{1,3}, J. Lou-Franco¹, P. Nolan¹, H. Zhou^{3,4}, C. Cao¹,

K. Rafferty³, J.Hajslova², C.T. Elliott¹ and K. Campbell¹

- ¹. Institute for Global Food Security, School of Biological Sciences, Queen's University, David Keir Building, Stranmillis Road, Belfast UK BT9 5AG.
- ². Department of Food Analysis and Nutrition, Faculty of Food and Biochemical Technology, University of Chemistry and Technology Prague, Technická 5, 166 28 Prague 6 – Dejvice, Prague, Czech Republic.
- ³. School of Electronics, Electrical Engineering and Computer Science, Queen's University Belfast, Stranmillis Road, Belfast, UK.
- ⁴. Department of Informatics, University of Leicester, University Road, Leicester UK LE1 7RH.

Abstract

Detailed knowledge regarding sensor based technologies for the detection of food contamination often remains concealed within scientific journals or divided between numerous commercial kits which prevents optimal connectivity between companies and end-users. To overcome this barrier The End user Sensor Tree (TEST) has been developed. TEST is a comprehensive, interactive platform including over 900 sensor based methods, retrieved from the scientific literature and commercial market, for aquatic-toxins, mycotoxins, pesticides and microorganism detection. Key analytical parameters are recorded in excel files while a novel classification system is used which provides, tailor-made, experts' feedback using an online decision tree and database introduced here. Additionally, a critical comparison of reviewed sensors is presented alongside a global perspective on research pioneers and commercially available products. The lack of commercial uptake of the academically popular electrochemical and nanomaterial based sensors, as well as multiplexing platforms became very apparent and reasons for this anomaly are discussed.

Keywords:

Sensors, repository, database, toxins, pesticides, food contaminants.

1. Introduction

It has been suggested that the scientific community invests little effort in the production of robust, calibrated and reliable tools ready for mass production but often produces a myriad of highly sophisticated ‘gadgets’ instead (Mohammed et al., 2015) (Whitesides, 2013) (Chin et al., 2012). Moreover, the cornucopia of different sensors presented both in the scientific literature and commercial resources does not help informed decision making regarding which sensor would best fit the end-users’, or researchers’ needs. As a result, many different point-of-site sensors of outstanding quality remain hidden from potential end-users. Moreover, a fair comparison of novel developed sensors with similar existing products is inhibited due to the lack of an orderly classification system outlining sensor specifications. A possible remedy is the mapping of sensor capabilities in an open access repository. Such a system could boost commercialisation of recently developed sensors and provide independent expert advice to end-users which can help to promote the use of successful sensors whilst deselecting superfluous systems. Moreover, online repositories can stimulate communication between actors and speed up product design by avoiding the reinvention of the wheel and ignite citizen science developments (Glen Martin et al., 2017). Some examples are: (i) the microfluidics repository “metafluidics” which allows researchers and science enthusiasts alike to download and upload design schematics for microfluidic related systems (Kong et al., 2017) (ii) the Synthetic Biology Open Language (SBOL) initiative, connecting software developers and wet lab based scientists (Galdzicki et al., 2014) and (iii) the Protein Capture Reagents Program providing a database for validated monoclonal antibodies (Venkataraman et al., 2018). In this work the creation of an end-user-friendly sensor database, mapping sensor capabilities throughout the commercial and scientific sector is described. The platform, named “The End-user Sensor Tree”, or TEST, applies a non-linear approach aimed at improving the communication between actors while markedly increasing novel sensor visibility. TEST uses end user focused classification criteria aimed to sort information on available sensors into comprehensive, easy-to-read sections, tailored for both the expert and non-expert. These e-docs are accessible through a decision tree on the website (<http://test.foodsmartphone.net/>) further facilitating ease of use. The system has currently been established for sensors enabling the detection of four food safety related target groups i.e. aquatic toxins (in marine- fresh- and drinking water), mycotoxins, pesticides, and microorganisms in food. The last of these groupings was split into spoilage organisms and pathogens where possible. In the following sections the system was used to analyse and compare the development of novel sensors/methods and commercially available sensors using both classic (transducer based) and novel (TEST) criteria. This study resulted in the generation of a highly informative database providing an easily visualised, in-depth, critical comparison of sensing possibilities encompassing portability, quantification and expertise axes, for each target group, which is introduced here. Moreover, analytical parameters of reported devices are recorded in excel files, generating a dataset that allowed for the global inter-target group comparison reported, which exposes several gaps between commercially available and scientifically reported sensors, and, visualises target group specific trends in sensor use.

2. Material and Methods

2.1 Construction of the TEST tree and e-docs

The TEST repository is based on an online decision tree (<http://TEST.foodsmartphone.net/>) which directs the user to tailored e-docs (<http://TESTwiki.foodsmartphone.net/>), with a fixed layout (figure 1a). The tree uses four classification criteria in the following consecutive order 1) expert training needed 2) sensor portability 3) quantification ability 4) single or multiplex screening ability. This classification system was chosen to enable a more practical, non-linear approach (figure 1a), which, unlike the classic linear approach often used for sensor development (figure 1b), stimulates interaction of all stakeholders in the sensor development pipeline. Moreover, the system aims to meet the needs of the end-user by using the bespoke classification system rather than the bio-recognition elements and/or transducers based classification system (figure 1c) which is classically used (Monošík et al., 2012) (Thevenot et al., 2001). The collected information from supplementary tables 1-8 was used to build the decision tree, e-docs and most of the information reported herein. A scaled overview of the division of these detection methods between target groups is shown in figure 1d. The TEST repository aims to provide information both for the expert and the non-expert regarding all detection methods for the mentioned targets. Thus all identified detection methods, were included. This allowed the inclusion of reference method and allowed comparison of novel sensors with the reference. Moreover, some non-biosensor methods are equally commercially available (mass spectrometry (MS) analyses of pesticides and mycotoxins for example) which makes including them valuable for the end-user. Space for the user to leave comments for discussion and for relevant companies to advertise their products are also provided to stimulate stakeholder interaction. In total 942 detection systems (633 research reports and 309 commercial sensors) have been included in the TEST repository.




Figure 1: Overview of the TEST classification system and database. a) The TEST decision tree (left web address in blue) and hierarchal classification system are visualised using pathogens as an example. After running through the nodes the user is directed to an e-doc providing tailored information (right web address in blue) which has a fixed layout (point 1-4 green) and is designed to provide an interactive platform for all users. b) A scheme showing the classic, linear, sensor development pipeline often applied. c) An overview of the classic biosensor classification system showing both the major recognition and transducer elements used. d) A scaled overview of the total amount of detection methods integrated in the TEST repository. Colours are according groups i.e. blue for aquatic toxins (AqT), magenta for mycotoxins (MyT), green for pesticides (PST) and red for microorganisms (MRO). The yellow square represents 100%. The number of systems per square is indicated.

The following online methods are further described in the Supplementary Material:

2.2 Search criteria to collect literature

2.3 Definitions used for the TEST criteria to classify sensors

2.4 The TEST website construction

3. Results and discussion

3.1 Sensors/methods investigated using TEST classification

A classification system was designed in an attempt to visualise trends and differences between the identified target groups regarding sensor development in reported scientific literature. To this end figure

2a was analysed over 3 axes i.e. expert/non-expert, portability and quantification. When focussing on sensors developed for the non-expert (figure 2a, yellow internal bubbles), the most striking differences were between the microorganism group (20% split into pathogens and spoilage organisms) and the pesticide (4%) target groups. An explanation for this might be the trend towards using quantitative non-portable chromatographic techniques for pesticides (almost half of all reports for pesticides fall in that bubble). This is logical since it is the only method to simultaneously quantify multiple analytes (there are hundreds of pesticides) in a single analytical cycle within a wide linear range. For microorganisms however, Polymerase Chain Reaction (PCR) is often used as a reference method. This technique is more easily made portable by use of isothermal techniques such as Loop-mediated isothermal amplification, for which user friendly portable systems utilizing microfluidics exist although sensitivity is of yet sub-optimal (Sayad et al., 2016) (Oh et al., 2016). Equally, electrochemistry (EC) has potential as a non-expert portable technique for microorganisms with even multiplex options at low LODs (Primiceri et al., 2016). EC sensors are equally reported for other target groups. One notable prototype for pesticide detection, developed by Mishra et al., (Mishra et al., 2017), is a lab on a glove EC sensor, allowing real time wireless data transmission to a smartphone based device. Even if this pioneering approach did not detect its target pesticides at the required sensitivities, it may pave the way for fast, portable and simple on-site methods using EC. Compared to optical methods however EC is rarely used for non-expert sensors while colorimetric are gaining traction due to easy visual interpretation of the results generated. Cholinesterase inhibition assays in dipstick format (Badawy and El-Aswad, 2014) (Apilux et al., 2015) or immunochromatographic assays (Fang et al., 2015) for pesticides are good examples despite the fact they lack quantification. This could be altered if a smartphone camera is used as a detector which has been the case for both pesticides (Comina et al., 2016) and mycotoxins (Machado et al., 2018). In fact when reviewing the portable axes of the TEST system, colorimetric techniques currently prevail with microorganisms (Liu et al., 2015) (Wu et al., 2015) (Jiang et al., 2016) and mycotoxins (Zhang et al., 2018) (Liu et al., 2017) (Song et al., 2014) being the most mentioned targets. As for the semi-portable section almost all reports fall in the semi-quantitative group and of these more than half of the reports used a variant of nanotechnology often using EC technology such as Palmsens for detection. The high cost of the potentiostats combined with sensitivity to electrostatic variance, especially for impedance measurements, (which can happen outside of a Faraday cage) might be a reason why these sensors often remain in the semi-portable group. A potential way to overcome this problem is to piggyback on commercially available glucose sensors for other targets. For example, it has been demonstrated that the aquatic toxin brevetoxin (BTX-2) can be detected at very low concentrations (LOD 0.01 $\mu\text{g/L}$) using a nanocontainer packed with glucose and gated by antibody/hapten complexes without the need for extensive sample handling (Gao et al., 2014). Other semi-portable detection methods reported are portable Raman spectrometers (Yang et al., 2014) (Huang et al., 2016) or mass spectrometers (Wang et al., 2016) used for the detection for pesticides. Non-portable sensors, however, still prevail with approximately 80, 66, 50 and 43 % of the sensors reported for pesticides, microorganisms, mycotoxins and aquatic toxin detection respectively. With liquid chromatography coupled mass spectrometry (LC-MS) being the most described method for pesticides, aquatic toxins and mycotoxin analyses in this section. For microorganisms, quantitative plating techniques are most described for pathogen detection (Lambert et al., 2015) while qualitative metabolomics high resolution MS techniques are mainly used for spoilage organism detection (Xu et al., 2013). An interesting development for non-portable quantitative

detection methods is replacing chromatography by direct MS measurements. Indeed, some MS techniques showing sensitive and quantitative analysis without applying chromatography beforehand for aquatic toxin detection using either matrix assisted laser desorption ionisation (MALDI) (Roegner et al., 2014) or ambient source high resolution MS solutions (Roy-Lachapelle et al., 2015) when compared to classic triple quadrupole LC-MS (Pekar et al., 2016). Evidently, such systems can speed up analysis and enable rapid screening in the lab using non-portable devices, an alternative to the point-of-site solution. Finally, when looking at qualitative versus quantitative detection, it is clear that the latter is hardly ever portable. An interesting exception, though lacking in sensitivity, is semi-portable quantitative chromatographic techniques (Abdul Keyon et al., 2014). It combines capillary electrophoresis with a contactless conductivity detector to quantify paralytic shellfish toxins. Qualitative sensors for pesticides and mycotoxin detection are clearly not popular with mycotoxin analysis having only one reported, portable, qualitative multiplex sensors (Beloglazova et al., 2014). This highlights the desired need for quantitative analysis in mycotoxin testing, even for portable devices. For microorganisms and aquatic toxins however, qualitative sensors are being employed. Here most interesting is the use of non-portable eco-toxicity tests for freshwater (Häder and Erzinger, 2017), and seawater (Y. Huang et al., 2016) screening. Such tests require minimal time while allowing continuous screening which can be useful as an early warning system. Overall, a push towards portable, user friendly quantitative point-of-site instruments was observed throughout the literature. However, as seen in figure 2a, these three properties together have not yet been materialized into a sensor. On the contrary, most sensors reported are still non-portable or, in the case of being (semi)portable, show poor quantification (strip tests) or require expertise (EC sensors). Thus further development of these methods is needed to truly realise the desired point-of-site testing so often discussed in the scientific literature. Apart from these observations it is interesting to note the distribution of these (+/- 600) publications on sensors for food worldwide (figure 2b), just two countries (China and USA) account for half of them. The EU accounts for another 35%, with the remaining distributed elsewhere in the world with a focus on Korea, Canada, India and Japan.




Figure 2: TEST sensor classification. a) Each bubble is scaled by area to the total amount of detection methods reported. The 5 target groups (each with a specific colour indicated in legend) are discretely divided between the 9 sections made up of the combinations between portable, semi-portable and non-portable with qualitative, semi-quantitative and quantitative. Non-expert % shown within bubbles is scaled by area to total amount of articles (expert and non-expert) within the individual bubbles. b) Worldwide distribution of detection methods for the listed contaminants reported from 2013 up to 2017. Colours correspond to percentage of total reports as indicated in legend.

3.2 Analytical techniques and their sensitivity

In order to accurately represent the numerous analytical methods employed an attempt was made to cluster these into uniform classes based on the applied analytical principle. In this way, 9 different

groups were defined including chromatographic, spectroscopic, vibrational, EC, PCR, ambient mass spectrometry and other techniques (cases with less than 3% of the total). The separate cases of enzyme-linked immunosorbent assay (ELISA) and test-strips were separated because they account for 10% of the TEST database and play an important role in contaminant screening. Focusing on an overall description of the results (figure 3a) spectroscopic detection methods were the most widely used (about 23%) while EC techniques accounted for 20%. Importantly, it was noted that both methods used various recognition elements (enzymes, antibodies, aptamers and molecular imprinted polymers) to predominately determine a single analyte demonstrating a significant reason for the predominance of chromatography in multiplex analysis. Surprisingly, chromatographic techniques ranked in the third place of the TEST database (16%) even though it is thought by many to be the gold standard for all target groups except microorganisms (where PCR based techniques are the norm). An explanation may be that only novel use such as nanomaterial implementation for increased sensitivity and non-targeted analysis by high resolution MS, appear in the recent literature while routine LC-MS analysis remains less well reported. Noticeably most other sensors, focussing more on (portable) screening, were strip tests and ELISA for mycotoxins and food pathogens analysis, surface enhanced Raman spectroscopy (SERS) for pesticides screening and EC for aquatic toxins. The reason for this discrepancy in preferred sensors between target groups is unclear but might be the result of intellectual phase locking, with research groups specializing in the detection of a certain target group building on each other's work improving the state of the art of a specific detection method for that target thus increasing reporting on that type of sensor. As for target diversity, figure 3b clearly shows that the majority of the sensors/methods were developed against few target analytes. In detail, 70% (aquatic toxins), 67% (microorganisms), 58% (mycotoxins) and 44% (pesticides) of the studies focused on 5 specific compounds in each case. The variety is particularly low in the pesticides case, where all the analytes belong to the organophosphorus and carbamate insecticide families sharing a common neurotoxic mode of action using cholinesterase assays. After classification it was attempted to further analyse the quality of the methods reported. Quality characteristics, for instance precision and trueness are indispensable for the analytical evaluation of a method and determine whether the method is fit for purpose. However, sensitivity maybe an equally crucial validation feature regarding food contamination detection as the obtained LODs should be below the regulated maximum residue levels (MRLs) or as low as reasonably possible in the case of an absence of legislation. Thus, the LODs for the various methods included in the TEST database are used as an, albeit somewhat rough, quality indicator here. In figure 3c the LODs of various detection methods are shown on a scale of magnitude for each target group. Here detection methods were not classified according the common analytical principle but rather by a combination of transducer elements, recognition elements and use of nanomaterials. This classification was chosen to highlight the effect of adding recognition or nanomaterial elements into a sensor (figure 3c, pink sensors) can have on its sensitivity. Perhaps the most striking revelation of figure 3c is the sub-ppt sensitivity that can be reached by EC sensors which was only exceeded by fluorescence sensors in one case (pathogens) (Cho et al., 2014b). However, such LODs might be misleading if they were calculated in buffer and not verified in real matrix, which, is sometimes the case (Zhao et al., 2015) (Epifania et al., 2018) (Lillehoj et al., 2014). Regarding chromatographic methods, the hyphenation of the chromatographic system with various types of detectors strongly affects method sensitivity with more costly MS detectors prevailing over conventional detectors such an ultraviolet-visible detector (UV-Vis) or a flame ionization detector. In fact, LC-MS

showed LODs rarely exceeding 10 ng/g regardless of the analyte or matrix used. The sensitivity of other techniques however can highly vary between target groups. SERS, in particular, seems to be in this category, showing the sensitive detection of pathogens, with LODs under 100 CFU/ml (Cho et al., 2014a) while sensitive pesticide detection remains a pickle. The latter might be because pesticide detection was performed on the peel of the fruit. However, this seems to be no impediment to reach better LODs in some cases, as it was proved by Yang et al. who were able to detect thiram at 15 pg/kg (Yang et al., 2014). This contrasts with the results found by Tang et al., whose sensor LOD was 150 µg/kg (Tang et al., 2013). The reason for the 7 orders of magnitude difference is unclear but might be related to the nanostructures applied which can strongly affect the enhancement factor observed by SERS which can result in the high sensitivity of SERS sensors (Le Ru and Etchegoin, 2013). Interestingly, across all target groups, nanomaterials seem to be a major factor in effecting sensitivity (pink sensors figure 3c). Striking examples were the multiplexed method for the detection of 5 chemical contaminants with LODs of 0.1 to 5 ppb in drinking water by using monoclonal antibodies conjugated to gold nanospheres (Xing et al., 2015), a plasmonic ELISA for aflatoxin-B1 detection, using gold nanorods with IC₅₀ of 22 pg/mL (reported as 32 fold lower than the LOD of conventional ELISA) (Xiong et al., 2018) and a device for pathogen detection which implemented superparamagnetic nanoparticles with a LOD as low as 158 CFU/g in seafood (Liu et al., 2015). However, the targets and matrixes used for these sensors were different. To fairly compare the LODs of such nanomaterial systems between each other and against conventional systems one should, of course, 'compare the comparable'. Thus, all sensors analysing microcystins were filtered on the term "microcystin" in the analyte column of the supplementary table 2 as an example. This produced 30 records. Eight of the top 10 sensors (classified by LOD) use nanomaterials, with a capacitive immunosensor using gold nanosphere conjugated antibodies which ranked highest with a LOD of 20 pg/L in freshwater (Lebogang et al., 2014) and a photoelectrochemical aptasensor using graphene in third place with an LOD of 30 pg/L in fish (Du et al., 2016). The 10 least performing sensors (in terms of LOD) are either chromatographic or optical sensors with the latter type at the last position with an LOD of 130 µg/L in algae extracts (Brothier and Pichon, 2013). Thus, there are 7 orders of magnitude difference in the LODs for this analyte between sensors while matrixes employed were similar. This comparison clearly showcases the potential high sensitivity using EC sensors combined with nanomaterials which was observed throughout all target groups.




Figure 3: Analytical methods, main targets and overall sensitivity. a) Analytical method classification per target. Percentages of each analytical technique are shown per target group in colour code (see legend). Sum shows average for total amount of analytical methods reported in the scientific literature. Chroma is chromatography, Spectro is spectroscopy, EC is electrochemistry, AMS is ambient mass spectrometry, PCR is polymerase chain reaction. PST is pesticides, MyT is mycotoxins, AqT is aquatic toxins, MRO microorganisms and sum is the sum of all targets. b) Top 5 analytes reported per target group (acronyms as indicated above). Percentages (top of the bars) show the fraction (in %) that this top 5 makes up of the total variety in reported analytes within the target groups. The abbreviations for each analyte are scaled to the total analytes within the target group, with the least abundant down and most

abundant on top in each bar. For aquatic toxins: MC-LR is microcystin-LR, OA is okadaic acid, STX is saxitoxin, CyB is cyanobacteria, BTX is brevetoxin. For Pathogens: E.col is *Escherichia coli*, L.Mon is *Listeria monocytogenes*, S.Typ is *Salmonella typhimurium*, S.Aur is *Staphylococcus aureus*, S.Ent is *Salmonella enterica*. For mycotoxins: FB1 is Fumonisin B1, ZEN is Zearalenone, DON is Deoxynivalenol, AFB1 is Aflatoxin B1, OTA is Ochratoxin A. For Pesticides: PRX is paraoxon, MPT is methyl parathion, CBF is carbofuran, CBR is carbaryl and CPY is chlorpyrifos. c) LOD comparison for detection methods reported in literature for all target groups. LODs for the first 3 groups are expressed in g/kg (left arrow) and LODs for microorganism detection in colony forming units (CFU) per ml (right arrow). Similar sensors with different LODs are encircled using the same colour. Sensors having the same transducing element with or without additional enhancement are pink. MRL is maximum residue level, CE is capillary electrophoresis, C4D is contactless conductivity detector, FLD is fluorescence detector, HPLC is high performance liquid chromatography, SERS is surface enhanced Raman spectroscopy, (L)SPR is (local) surface plasmon resonance, Au-NP is gold nanospheres, AMS is ambient mass spectrometry, EC is electrochemical and PEC is photoelectrochemical.

3.3 Commercially available sensors and kits

In total, 309 commercially available detection systems were identified (47 for aquatic toxins, 57 for pesticides, 82 for pathogens and 123 for mycotoxins). These were classified regarding the TEST classification criteria and analytical parameters reported by the test kit providers (supplementary info tables 5-8). A short synopsis, showing key commercial detection systems for each target group, is shown in table 1. Figure 4a shows the analytical techniques used per target group. Clearly, ELISA is the predominant test on the market followed by test strips (regardless the recognition element used) for all target groups except microorganisms, where PCR and bacterial plating predominates. For pesticides analysis there are several cholinesterase assays, which, in our opinion, can improve the current status as they can detect both organophosphates and carbamates. However, cholinesterase assays are sometimes not so sensitive. For example some advertised commercial ones had reported LODs that do not meet MRLs set in the EU (Pesticide Detection Test Cards by RenekaBio, Agri-Screen® Tickets by Neogen and OrganaDx by MyDx). Others however (by Enviroligix & MyBioSource) did meet EU set MRLs. Lateral flow immunoassays (LFIA) (Abraxis) and ELISA (Bioo Scientific, Creative Diagnostics & Abraxis) tests can also detect at MRLs. Although the library of detectable pesticides using these antibody based techniques is more limited. For mycotoxins, ELISA, LFIA and fluorometric tests are popular. Fluorometric tests use immunoaffinity columns read by a reader which the company typically offers. For example, Romer labs offers all 3 kit types for a variety of mycotoxins. Moreover, they equally offer LC-MS analyses. Other companies that offer these kits are Vicam, Enviroligix and Neogen. Finally, R-biopharm is using smartphone technology and LFIA for mycotoxin detection thus creating a portable and user-friendly piece of equipment for mycotoxin detection. For aquatic toxins the variety is limited as well with ELISAs and strip tests making up 85% of the total (figure 4a). Other kits include non-portable phosphatase inhibition, cholinesterase and fluorescence based tests. Of these, especially the phosphatase inhibition test of Zeulab (MICROCYS) stands out since it claims detection of all toxic microcystin congeners with an LOQ of 0.25 µg/L, 4 fold lower than the limit advised by the WHO.

Moreover a similar phosphatase inhibition test developed by Zeulab (OkaTest) is a inter laboratory validated kit for diarrhetic shellfish poison detection (Turner and Goya, 2016). For spoilage organisms, no commercial kits exist currently, except perhaps the Peel Plate Microbial Test from Charm sciences (a non-selective bacterial media to detect potential shelf life issues (i.e. spoilage organisms). Other tests to detect spoilage organisms are electronic noses (Airsense Analytics) which detect volatile metabolites belonging to microbes, and a combination of microbiological techniques (catalase test, Kovac's reagent strips, selective agars) to identify the bacteria. However, none of these methods have developed to a commercially available kit. For pathogens especially non portable quantitative PCR has proven its efficiency going through validation tests, reaching very good LODs. On the other hand several consumer friendly strip tests have also been developed (Table 1). Importantly, all commercial sensors targeting pathogens require enrichment steps often prolonging analysis times over 24 hrs (up to 48 hrs) making this target group by far the slowest in terms of result generation with the biggest time differences between tests (figure 4b). The quantitative PCR based *Salmonella* Velox test of DNA diagnostics (Table 1) is the quickest with approximately 6 hrs test time to detect *Salmonella* at a LOD of 1 CFU/25 g of raw meat or fish. As for aquatic toxins, pesticides and mycotoxins, average analysis times are less with mycotoxins having the fastest tests with some strip tests that can be performed in less than 5 minutes and some ELISAs marketed with analysis times under 10 minutes (figure 4b). This showcases that, in theory, swift ELISAs could equally be developed for aquatic toxin and pesticide detection. Moreover, the group "other" of mycotoxins, which mainly includes immunoaffinity columns, equally features short analysis times. This might be caused by greater competition in the mycotoxin commercial tests kit sector which was indeed the group with the most commercial kits available, even more then there are novel sensors reported in the identified literature (figure 4c). Overall, several interesting gaps came to light when commercial kits are compared to sensors reported in the scientific literature. First off, most of the sensors have been developed by large and established companies. This raises the question if smaller companies simply do not participate much in the development of food screening tests, or small (spinoff) companies remain overlooked. If the last of these causes is the case, increased visibility through orderly classification of such systems might improve upon the current situation. The second gap identified is the lack of availability of commercial multiplex sensors compared to the many reported sensors in the literature (figure 4c). Indeed, very few multiplex commercial kits are on offer such as the Myco10 array from Randox Laboratories (Myco10 array) for 10 mycotoxins, and another for pesticides developed by Pall Corporation to detect *Escherichia coli* *Salmonella* and *Listeria* simultaneously using PCR technology. Most other multiplexed technologies for pathogen detection focus on the detection of closely related pathogens (i.e. different strains from the same species). As for aquatic toxins and pesticide detection, no real multiplex tests were identified at all. Finally, and perhaps most strikingly, no commercial test kits using EC and/or nanomaterial components (including upconversion nanoparticles, graphene, carbon nanotubes, local surface plasmon resonance, SERS or microfluidics) were identified for either of the target groups. Nonetheless, EC and nanomaterial enhanced sensors clearly seemed popular and promising when the scientific literature was analysed. Thus the question could be raised if these sensors will be able to bridge the apparent valley of death between research and commercialisation.




Figure 4: Commercially available sensors included in TEST. a) Analytical method classification of commercially available tests per target. Percentages of each analytical technique are shown per target group. Other (grey) are enzymatic assays, bacterial plating, phage engineering, immune affinity columns, chemiluminescence and fluorescent receptor binding assays. Strips (yellow) are all lateral flow and flow through devices disregarding the recognition element applied. ELISA (blue) are all standard ELISAs. Polymerase chain reaction (PCR) methods are all PCR methods including isothermal PCR, quantitative PCR and real time quantitative PCR. Sum shows average for total amount of commercially available kits for all target groups. b) Timeline showing average (mid-point) and min and max values (bar ends) per analytical technique per target group in hours. Analytical technique classification is the same as in a. In both a and b AqT is aquatic toxins, PAT is pathogens, MRO is microorganisms, PST is pesticides and MyT is mycotoxins. c) Number of commercially available kits is compared with sensors (single and multiplex) mentioned in the literature that potentially could become commercial products (named non-commercial). To avoid unfair comparison all analytical techniques deemed unlikely to become

commercialized (chromatographic, infrared, next generation sequencing, and mass spectroscopy based methods) were excluded from the non-commercial sensor groups.

Table 1: Synopsis of commercially available kits for all 4 target groups. This table shows key portable commercial kits extracted from supplementary tables 5, 6, 7 and 8. Devices that enable multiplex detection and/or short analyses time combined with varying levels of quantification are given priority. Moreover, sensors fitting both expert and non-expert needs are listed. LFIA is lateral flow immunoassay. AChE is acetylcholinesterase assay. PP2A is phosphatase inhibition assay. (q)PCR is (quantitative) Polymerase chain reaction. ELISA is enzyme-linked immunosorbent assay. IAC is immuno affinity column. A footnote alphabetically listing the abbreviations used for the analytes in the table is added below.

Analyte	Company	Test type	Sensitivity	Analysis time	Website
Pesticides					
glyphosate	Abraxis	LFIA	2.5 ppb	45 min	https://bit.ly/2oMsyQc
OP & CMs	RenekaBio	AChE strip	0.3 - 3.5 ppm	13 min + sample prep	https://bit.ly/2CqoBKL
Trifluralin, DDT, carbendazim, ethoxyquin	Bioo Scientific (Perkin Elmer)	ELISA	sub-ppb	< 2 h	https://bit.ly/2MUv68U
OP & CMs	MyDx	AChE strip	0.3 – 100 ppm	10 min	https://bit.ly/2Cp7r08
19 different kits	Creative diagnostics	ELISA	sub-ppb	< 2 h	https://bit.ly/2M3hebV
19 different kits	Abraxis	ELISA	sub-ppb	< 2 h	https://bit.ly/2oMsyQc
atrazine, simazine	Silver Lake Research cooperation	LFIA	< 4 ppb	10 min	https://bit.ly/2NmQurl
Aquatic toxin					
Free	Abraxis	LFIA	0.3 µg/l	30 min	https://bit.ly/2Pig7lc
Microcystins		LFIA	20 mg/kg shellfish	10 min	https://bit.ly/2L1wENa
Domoic acid	Neogen	LFIA	160 µg/kg shellfish	15 min	https://bit.ly/2L1wENa
OA and DTX derivatives	Neogen	LFIA	800 µg/kg shellfish	5 min	https://bit.ly/2L1wENa
STX	Neogen	LFIA	800 µg/kg shellfish	5 min	https://bit.ly/2L1wENa
Microcystins	Zeulab	PP2A	LOQ 0.25 (µg/l)	30 min	https://bit.ly/2OK47xP
Microcystins And Nodularins	Enzolifesciences	ELISA	0.1 (µg/l)	150 min	https://bit.ly/1SP1ubv
STX	Beacon	ELISA	0.02 µg/kg shellfish	90 min	https://bit.ly/2vR0yPm

OA and DTX derivatives	Beacon	ELISA	0.2 µg/kg shellfish	90 min	https://bit.ly/2vR0yPm
Domoic acid	Zeulab	ELISA	LOQ 2000 µg/kg shellfish	60 min	https://bit.ly/2OK47xP
Mycotoxin					
AFB1/2, AFG1/G2, OTA, FUM, EA, DON, T2, ZEN, DAS, Paxilline	Radox	Chemiluminescent Biosensor	0.25 - 100 ppb	30–90 min	https://bit.ly/2NNqcv5
ZEN	Vicam	IAC + fluorescence reading	0.1 ppm	15 min	https://bit.ly/2wjzOGP
OTA	Europroxima	ELISA	0.25-1ppb	30 min	https://bit.ly/2oI5brg
DON	Neogen	ELISA	0.1 ppm	10 min	https://bit.ly/2MpWb8g
AFM1	Elabscience	ELISA	0.05ppb	85 min	https://bit.ly/2PL17Iz
T-2 / HT-2	R-biopharm	LFIA	50 ppb	5-10 min	https://bit.ly/2CqIt1H
FUM	Envirologix	LFIA	0.2 ppm	5 min	https://bit.ly/2NIWEIt
Microorganisms					
<i>Salmonella</i>	Eurofins	ELISA	1 CFU/25 g	36-46 h	https://bit.ly/2Q8TiqI
<i>Listeria</i>					
<i>E. Coli</i>	DuPont	LFIA	1 CFU/25 g	8-20 h	https://bit.ly/2wO8roD
<i>Salmonella</i>					
<i>Listeria</i>					
<i>Salmonella</i>	DNA Diagnostic	qPCR	1 CFU/25 g	5.5 h	https://bit.ly/2oKpCnm
<i>E. coli</i>	Pall Corporation	PCR	1 CFU/25 g	6-18 h	https://bit.ly/2oKqf0c
<i>Salmonella</i>					
<i>P. aeruginosa</i>					
<i>S. aureus</i>					
<i>C. albicans</i>					
<i>B. cepacia</i>					
<i>E. coli</i>	BIO-RAD	Plating	1 CFU	48 h	https://bit.ly/2NkHRxD

Footnote table 1: AF- is various Aflatoxins (AF-M1, -B1-2, -G1-2). CM is carbamates. DAS is Diacetoxyscirpenol. DDT is Dichlorodiphenyltrichloroethane. DON is Deoxynivalenol. DTX is dinophysistoxin. EA is ergot alkaloid. FU is Fumonisin. HT-2 is trichothecene toxin HT2. OA is Okadaic acid. OP is Organophosphates. OTA is Ochratoxin A. STX is Saxitoxin. T-2 is trichothecene toxin T2. ZEN is Zearalenone.

4. Conclusions

The End-user Sensor Tree is the first interactive platform for food contaminant sensors providing a novel classification, based on end-users needs, approach, maximizing the available information for commercial sensors and sensors in development. Rapid, on-site and sensitive quantitative detection is still an almost unreachable dream with lab-based instrumental methods showing a more robust and reliable analytical performance. However, nanomaterial enhanced and EC based sensors show great potential due to their ability to reach high sensitivity and provide semi-quantitative results. Unfortunately, these novel sensors

seem still far away from being implemented in real life applications. Test strips however, do seem to successfully bridge the perceived valley of death with many examples of rapid tests requiring little or no expertise. Moreover, rough quantification using a special reader or even a smartphone camera, seems possible. Another step forward to rapid screening is the use of multiplexing. Unfortunately marketing of multiplex tests has equally shown little progress and scientific reports on this are lacking. Overall, it would appear, more effort from the scientific community needs to be invested in the validation of the developed systems. Perhaps capturing the market through the sales of such systems through spinoffs might further boost development. The lack of commercial novel sensors could also be an effect of the unwillingness of companies to invest into a leap into the unknown. Moreover, it is hoped that TEST will increase sensor promulgation overall and the aim is to further grow TEST into a fully comprehensive sensor platform for numerous analytes in various matrixes providing independent expert advice stretching over both the food and medical sectors. Such development can equally lead to more rapid acceptance of novel systems and provide stakeholders with a means to actively communicate and shape the future of contaminant screening together. Other enthusiasts and stakeholders may wish to contribute to this substantial quest. Ultimately, this might lead to a more time effective and delineated bottom-up biosensing environment replacing the current top-down laboratory-based system.

5. Acknowledgements:

This project has received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under the Marie Skłodowska-Curie grant agreement No 720325. The authors would also like to acknowledge BioMensio Limited, Finland for the sponsorship of the MPhil for Philana Nolan.

6. Credit Author Statement

JN was the main author writing the original draft. AT and JL contributed to the writing, reviewing and editing of the original draft.. JN was responsible for the data curation. JN, AT, PN, and JL contributed to the investigation in the literature review, preparation of the supplementary tables and in the reviewing and editing of the TEST repository. YZ created the website and decision tree software. CE, KR, CC, HZ and JH provided advice and assisted in reviewing and editing the final document. KC contributed the concept to understand the end user goals, supervised this work in providing guidance and assistance in the investigation and contributed to the review and editing of the draft and final manuscript.

7. Conflict of interest:

The authors declare that there are no financial or commercial conflicts of interest.

8. References

- Abdul Keyon, A.S., Guijt, R.M., Bolch, C.J.S., Breadmore, M.C., 2014. Transient isotachophoresis-capillary zone electrophoresis with contactless conductivity and ultraviolet detection for the analysis of paralytic shellfish toxins in mussel samples. *J. Chromatogr. A* 1364, 295–302. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chroma.2014.08.074>
- Apilux, A., Ayudhya, C.I.N., Tantimongcolwat, T., Prachayasittikul, V., 2015. Paper-based acetylcholinesterase inhibition assay combining a wet system for organophosphate and carbamate pesticides detection. *EXCLI J.* 14, 307–319. <https://doi.org/10.17179/excli2014-684>
- Badawy, M.E.I., El-Aswad, A.F., 2014. Bioactive paper sensor based on the acetylcholinesterase for the rapid detection of organophosphate and carbamate pesticides. *Int. J. Anal. Chem.* 2014. <https://doi.org/10.1155/2014/536823>
- Beloglazova, N. V., Speranskaya, E.S., Wu, A., Wang, Z., Sanders, M., Gofman, V. V., Zhang, D., Goryacheva, I.Y., De Saeger, S., 2014. Novel multiplex fluorescent immunoassays based on quantum dot nanolabels for mycotoxins determination. *Biosens. Bioelectron.* 62, 59–65. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bios.2014.06.021>
- Brothier, F., Pichon, V., 2013. Immobilized antibody on a hybrid organic-inorganic monolith: Capillary immunoextraction coupled on-line to nanoLC-UV for the analysis of microcystin-LR. *Anal. Chim. Acta* 792, 52–58. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.aca.2013.07.019>
- Chin, C.D., Linder, V., Sia, S.K., 2012. Commercialization of microfluidic point-of-care diagnostic devices. *Lab Chip* 12, 2118. <https://doi.org/10.1039/c2lc21204h>
- Cho, I.-H., Bhandari, P., Patel, P., Irudayaraj, J., 2014a. Membrane filter-assisted surface enhanced Raman spectroscopy for the rapid detection of *E. coli* O157: H7 in ground beef. *Biosens. Bioelectron.* 64, 171–176. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bios.2014.08.063>
- Cho, I.-H., Mauer, L., Irudayaraj, J., 2014b. In-situ fluorescent immunomagnetic multiplex detection of foodborne pathogens in very low numbers. *Biosens. Bioelectron.* 57, 143–148. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bios.2014.02.012>
- Comina, G., Suska, A., Filippini, D., 2016. Towards autonomous lab-on-a-chip devices for cell phone biosensing. *Biosens. Bioelectron.* 77, 1153–1167. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bios.2015.10.092>
- Du, X., Jiang, D., Dai, L., Zhou, L., Hao, N., Qian, J., Qiu, B., Wang, K., 2016. Fabricating photoelectrochemical aptasensor for selectively monitoring microcystin-LR residues in fish based on visible light-responsive BiOBr nanoflakes/N-doped graphene photoelectrode. *Biosens. Bioelectron.* 81, 242–248. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bios.2016.02.072>
- Epifania, R., Soares, R.R.G., Pinto, I.F., Chu, V., Conde, J.P., 2018. Capillary-driven microfluidic device with integrated nanoporous microbeads for ultrarapid biosensing assays. *Sensors Actuators, B Chem.* 265, 452–458. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.snb.2018.03.051>
- Fang, Q., Wang, L., Cheng, Q., Cai, J., Wang, Y., Yang, M., Hua, X., Liu, F., 2015. A bare-eye based one-

step signal amplified semiquantitative immunochromatographic assay for the detection of imidacloprid in Chinese cabbage samples. *Anal. Chim. Acta* 881, 82–89.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.aca.2015.04.047>

Galdzicki, M., Clancy, K.P., Oberortner, E., Pocock, M., Quinn, J.Y., Rodriguez, C.A., Roehner, N., Wilson, M.L., Adam, L., Anderson, J.C., Bartley, B.A., Beal, J., Chandran, D., Chen, J., Densmore, D., Endy, D., Grünberg, R., Hallinan, J., Hillson, N.J., Johnson, J.D., Kuchinsky, A., Lux, M., Misirli, G., Peccoud, J., Plahar, H.A., Sirin, E., Stan, G.B., Villalobos, A., Wipat, A., Gennari, J.H., Myers, C.J., Sauro, H.M., 2014. The Synthetic Biology Open Language (SBOL) provides a community standard for communicating designs in synthetic biology. *Nat. Biotechnol.* 32, 545–550.
<https://doi.org/10.1038/nbt.2891>

Gao, Z., Tang, D., Xu, M., Chen, G., Yang, H., 2014. Nanoparticle-based pseudo hapten for target-responsive cargo release from a magnetic mesoporous silica nanocontainer. *Chem. Commun.* 50, 6256–6258. <https://doi.org/10.1039/c4cc01511h>

Glen Martin, Wakanene Sebastian Kamau, Courtney Webster, Eleonore Pauwels, T.K., 2017. Biocoder. *Biocoder*.

Häder, D.P., Erzinger, G.S., 2017. Daphniatox – Online monitoring of aquatic pollution and toxic substances. *Chemosphere* 167, 228–235. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chemosphere.2016.09.155>

Huang, S., Yan, W., Liu, M., Hu, J., 2016. Detection of difenoconazole pesticides in pak choi by surface-enhanced Raman scattering spectroscopy coupled with gold nanoparticles. *Anal. Methods* 8, 4755–4761. <https://doi.org/10.1039/c6ay00513f>

Huang, Y., Nigam, A., Campana, O., Nugegoda, D., Wlodkowic, D., 2016. Miniaturized video-microscopy system for near real-time water quality biomonitoring using microfluidic chip-based devices, in: *Proceedings of SPIE - The International Society for Optical Engineering*.
<https://doi.org/10.1117/12.2242826>

Jiang, T., Song, Y., Wei, T., Li, H., Du, D., Zhu, M.-J., Lin, Y., 2016. Sensitive detection of *Escherichia coli* O157:H7 using Pt-Au bimetal nanoparticles with peroxidase-like amplification. *Biosens. Bioelectron.* 77, 687–694. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bios.2015.10.017>

Kong, D.S., Thorsen, T.A., Babb, J., Wick, S.T., Gam, J.J., Weiss, R., Carr, P.A., 2017. Open-source, community-driven microfluidics with Metafluidics. *Nat. Biotechnol.* 35, 523–529.
<https://doi.org/10.1038/nbt.3873>

Lambert, D., Carrillo, C.D., Koziol, A.G., Manninger, P., Blais, B.W., 2015. GeneSippr: A rapid whole-genome approach for the identification and characterization of foodborne pathogens such as priority Shiga toxigenic *Escherichia coli*. *PLoS One* 10.
<https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0122928>

Le Ru, E.C., Etchegoin, P.G., 2013. Quantifying SERS enhancements. *MRS Bull.* 38, 631–640.
<https://doi.org/10.1557/mrs.2013.158>

Lebogang, L., Hedström, M., Mattiasson, B., 2014. Development of a real-time capacitive biosensor for cyclic cyanotoxic peptides based on Adda-specific antibodies. *Anal. Chim. Acta* 826, 69–76.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.aca.2014.03.028>

- Lillehoj, P.B., Kaplan, C.W., He, J., Shi, W., Ho, C.-M., 2014. Rapid, Electrical Impedance Detection of Bacterial Pathogens Using Immobilized Antimicrobial Peptides. *J. Lab. Autom.* 19, 42–49. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2211068213495207>
- Liu, L., Xu, L., Suryoprabowo, S., Song, S., Kuang, H., 2017. Development of an immunochromatographic test strip for the detection of ochratoxin A in red wine. *Food Agric. Immunol.* 0, 1–11. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09540105.2017.1401043>
- Liu, Y., Zhang, Z., Wang, Y., Zhao, Y., Lu, Y., Xu, X., Yan, J., Pan, Y., 2015. A highly sensitive and flexible magnetic nanoprobe labeled immunochromatographic assay platform for pathogen *Vibrio parahaemolyticus*. *Int. J. Food Microbiol.* 211, 109–116. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijfoodmicro.2015.07.005>
- Machado, J.M.D., Soares, R.R.G., Chu, V., Conde, J.P., 2018. Multiplexed capillary microfluidic immunoassay with smartphone data acquisition for parallel mycotoxin detection. *Biosens. Bioelectron.* 99, 40–46. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bios.2017.07.032>
- Mishra, R.K., Hubble, L.J., Martín, A., Kumar, R., Barfidokht, A., Kim, J., Musameh, M.M., Kyratzis, I.L., Wang, J., 2017. Wearable Flexible and Stretchable Glove Biosensor for On-Site Detection of Organophosphorus Chemical Threats. *ACS Sensors* 2, 553–561. <https://doi.org/10.1021/acssensors.7b00051>
- Mohammed, M.I., Haswell, S., Gibson, I., 2015. Lab-on-a-chip or Chip-in-a-lab: Challenges of Commercialization Lost in Translation. *Procedia Technol.* 20, 54–59. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.protcy.2015.07.010>
- Monošík, R., Stredánský, M., Šturdík, E., 2012. Biosensors - classification, characterization and new trends. *Acta Chim. Slovaca* 5, 109–120. <https://doi.org/10.2478/v10188-012-0017-z>
- Oh, S.J., Park, B.H., Choi, G., Seo, J.H., Jung, J.H., Choi, J.S., Kim, D.H., Seo, T.S., 2016. Fully automated and colorimetric foodborne pathogen detection on an integrated centrifugal microfluidic device. *Lab Chip* 16, 1917–1926. <https://doi.org/10.1039/c6lc00326e>
- Pekar, H., Westerberg, E., Bruno, O., Lääne, A., Persson, K.M., Sundström, L., Thim, A.-M., 2016. Fast, rugged and sensitive ultra high pressure liquid chromatography tandem mass spectrometry method for analysis of cyanotoxins in raw water and drinking water--First findings of anatoxins, cylindrospermopsins and microcystin variants in Swedish source w. *J. Chromatogr. A* 1429, 265–276. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chroma.2015.12.049>
- Primiceri, E., Chiriaco, M.S., De Feo, F., Santovito, E., Fusco, V., Maruccio, G., 2016. A multipurpose biochip for food pathogen detection. *Anal. Methods* 8, 3055–3060. <https://doi.org/10.1039/c5ay03295d>
- Roegner, A.F., Schirmer, M.P., Puschner, B., Brena, B., Gonzalez-Sapienza, G., 2014. Rapid quantitative analysis of microcystins in raw surface waters with MALDI MS utilizing easily synthesized internal standards. *Toxicon* 78, 94–102. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.toxicon.2013.12.007>
- Roy-Lachapelle, A., Sollic, M., Sinotte, M., Deblois, C., Sauvé, S., 2015. High resolution/accurate mass (HRMS) detection of anatoxin-a in lake water using LDTD-APCI coupled to a Q-Exactive mass spectrometer. *Talanta* 132, 836–844. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.talanta.2014.10.021>

- Sayad, A.A., Ibrahim, F., Uddin, S.M., Pei, K.X., Mohktar, M.S., Madou, M., Thong, K.L., 2016. A microfluidic lab-on-a-disc integrated loop mediated isothermal amplification for foodborne pathogen detection. *Sensors Actuators B Chem.* 227, 600–609. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.snb.2015.10.116>
- Song, S., Liu, N., Zhao, Z., Njumbe Ediage, E., Wu, S., Sun, C., De Saeger, S., Wu, A., 2014. Multiplex lateral flow immunoassay for mycotoxin determination. *Anal. Chem.* 86, 4995–5001. <https://doi.org/10.1021/ac500540z>
- Tang, X., Cai, W., Yang, L., Liu, J., 2013. Highly uniform and optical visualization of SERS substrate for pesticide analysis based on Au nanoparticles grafted on dendritic α -Fe₂O₃. *Nanoscale* 5, 11193–11199. <https://doi.org/10.1039/c3nr03671e>
- Thevenot, D., Toth, K., Durst, R., Wilson, G., Thevenot, D., Toth, K., Durst, R., Wilson, G., 2001. Electrochemical biosensors : recommended definitions and classification To cite this version : Technical report Electrochemical biosensors : recommended definitions and. *Biosens. Bioelectron.* 16, 121–131. <https://doi.org/10.1081/AL-100103209>
- Turner, A.D., Goya, A.B., 2016. Comparison of four rapid test kits for the detection of okadaic acid-group toxins in bivalve shellfish from Argentina. *Food Control* 59, 829–840. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foodcont.2015.07.005>
- Venkataraman, A., Yang, K., Irizarry, J., Mackiewicz, M., Mita, P., Kuang, Z., Xue, L., Ghosh, D., Liu, S., Ramos, P., Hu, S., Kain, D.B., Keegan, S., Saul, R., Colantonio, S., Zhang, H., Pauli-Behn, F., Song, G., Albino, E., Asencio, L., Ramos, L., Lugo, L., Morell, G., Rivera, J., Ruiz, K., Almodovar, R., Nazario, L., Murphy, K., Vargas, I., Rivera-Pacheco, Z.A., Rosa, C., Vargas, M., McDade, J., Clark, B.S., Yoo, S., Khambadkone, S.G., De Melo, J., Stevanovic, M., Jiang, L., Li, Y., Yap, W.Y., Jones, B., Tandon, A., Campbell, E., Montelione, G.T., Anderson, S., Myers, R.M., Boeke, J.D., Fenyö, D., Whiteley, G., Bader, J.S., Pino, I., Eichinger, D.J., Zhu, H., Blackshaw, S., 2018. A toolbox of immunoprecipitation-grade monoclonal antibodies to human transcription factors. *Nat. Methods* 15, 330–338. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nmeth.4632>
- Wang, X., Zhou, X., Ouyang, Z., 2016. Direct Analysis of Nonvolatile Chemical Compounds on Surfaces Using a Hand-Held Mass Spectrometer with Synchronized Discharge Ionization Function. *Anal. Chem.* 88, 826–831. <https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.analchem.5b03356>
- Whitesides, G.M., 2013. Cool, or simple and cheap? Why not both? *Lab Chip* 11, 11–13. <https://doi.org/10.1039/c2lc60109a>
- Wu, W., Zhao, S., Mao, Y., Fang, Z., Lu, X., Zeng, L., 2015. A sensitive lateral flow biosensor for Escherichia coli O157: H7 detection based on aptamer mediated strand displacement amplification. *Anal. Chim. Acta* 861, 62–68. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.aca.2014.12.041>
- Xing, C., Liu, L., Song, S., Feng, M., Kuang, H., Xu, C., 2015. Ultrasensitive immunochromatographic assay for the simultaneous detection of five chemicals in drinking water. *Biosens. Bioelectron.* 66, 445–453. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bios.2014.12.004>
- Xiong, Y., Pei, K., Wu, Y., Duan, H., Lai, W., Xiong, Y., 2018. Plasmonic ELISA based on enzyme-assisted etching of Au nanorods for the highly sensitive detection of aflatoxin B1 in corn samples. *Sensors Actuators B Chem.* 267, 320–327. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.snb.2018.04.027>

Xu, Y., Correa, E., Goodacre, R., 2013. Integrating multiple analytical platforms and chemometrics for comprehensive metabolic profiling: Application to meat spoilage detection. *Anal. Bioanal. Chem.* 405, 5063–5074. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00216-013-6884-3>

Yang, T., Guo, X., Wang, H., Fu, S., Yu, J., Wen, Y., Yang, H., 2014. Au dotted magnetic network nanostructure and its application for on-site monitoring femtomolar level pesticide. *Small* 10, 1325–1331. <https://doi.org/10.1002/sml.201302604>

Zhang, G., Zhu, C., Huang, Y., Yan, J., Chen, A., 2018. A lateral flow strip based aptasensor for detection of Ochratoxin a in corn samples. *Molecules* 23, 1–12. <https://doi.org/10.3390/molecules23020291>

Zhao, H., Ji, X., Wang, B., Wang, N., Li, X., Ni, R., Ren, J., 2015. An ultra-sensitive acetylcholinesterase biosensor based on reduced graphene oxide-Au nanoparticles- β -cyclodextrin/Prussian blue-chitosan nanocomposites for organophosphorus pesticides detection. *Biosens. Bioelectron.* 65, 23–30. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bios.2014.10.007>

SUPPLEMENTARY MATERIAL (2.2-2.4)

Search terms, Definitions and Website construction

2.2 Search criteria to collect literature

TEST encompasses comprehensive information both for analytical sensors reported in the scientific literature as well as commercial products for the detection of pesticides, mycotoxins, aquatic toxins and food pathogens in a range of food matrices. The wealth of knowledge was generated based on two separate approaches. Concerning the academic literature, the Scopus database was exploited to extract the most relevant information about each category. This insured all articles were derived from peer reviewed articles. A general keyword structure was used, which combined the analyte type, portability capability, quantification and the most common food matrices in each case. In detail, the following keyword searches were used to investigate the literature:

- (i) Pesticides: (("pesticides") AND ("portable" OR "instrument" OR "sensor" OR "device" OR "platform") AND ("sensing" OR "testing" OR "analysis" OR "detection" OR "measurement" OR "monitoring") AND ("food" OR "fruit" OR "vegetables"))
- (ii) Aquatic toxins: (("toxin") AND ("portable" OR "instrument" OR "sensor" OR "device" OR "platform") AND ("sensing" OR "testing" OR "analysis" OR "detection" OR "measurement" OR "monitoring") AND ("shellfish" OR "water" OR "fish"))
- (iii) Mycotoxins: ((("mycotoxin") AND ("portable" OR "instrument" OR "sensor" OR "device" OR "platform") AND ("sensing" OR "testing" OR "analysis" OR "detection" OR "measurement" OR "monitoring") AND ("food" OR "cereals" OR "milk")))
- (iv) Pathogens/Spoilage organisms: (("pathogen" OR "spoilage") AND ("portable" OR "instrument" OR "sensor" OR "device" OR "platform") AND ("sensing" OR "testing" OR "analysis" OR "detection" OR "measurement" OR "monitoring") AND ("food" OR "dairy" OR "milk"))

All abstracts (1215) (253 AqT, 255 PST, MyT 203, MRO 505) were analysed for relevance and all selected articles were comprehensively analysed. Since the TEST tree aims to be thorough but condensed only articles in the final tree that met the following criteria have been included:

- a. original research from 2013 up to 2017 emphasizing the state of the art
- b. published in peer reviewed journals
- c. cited at least twice indicating interest among peers or be published less than 6 months
- d. written in English

Finally, cross referencing was performed to further search for relevant articles that the keyword search may not have revealed. In total 633 detection methods (186 for pesticides, 158 for pathogens, 39 for spoilage organisms, 110 for myco- and 135 for aquatic–toxins) were reported in over 600 articles.

Regarding commercial products, the review process was more difficult as most of the information was not published in scientific journals beyond early stage prototypes, if at all. Thus the search was based on using cross referencing, a recent review discussing many commercial available sensors ¹ and manual Google searches using a large variety of keywords. Finally, 309 commercially available sensors were identified. Thus, a grand total of 942 detection methods were used to construct the TEST platform.

2.3 Definitions of the TEST criteria to classify sensors

The TEST classification system is based on 4 consecutive criteria:

1. Expertise needed

An expert is defined as a scientist or technician having the necessary knowledge to work in the lab and/or evaluate results, while a non-expert is an individual without any lab-expertise that can follow a simple protocol similar to a recipe and cannot evaluate the result without the use of an automated reader or by a colour change.

2. Method portability

A fully portable method should be pocket size, light enough and easy to carry e.g. strips, lateral flows, LOC devices. On the other hand, a sensor that can be used for in-field screening but needs a backpack or a car for transit, was considered as semi-portable. This group included portable Raman spectrometers, portable mass spectrometers and some EC sensors. The final class are non-portable methods which require bulky lab based instruments such as mass spectrometers, large biosensors and benchtop spectrophotometers.

3. Quantification capability

There will always be debate regarding which methods are capable to quantify a target analyte or pathogen in a food matrix in a reliable manner since strict legislative limits are often set and regulated for food contaminants. Although several sensors claimed to be able to fully quantify their targets with remarkable limits of detection (LODs), the provided sensitivity was evaluated only in buffers or solutions without considering any potential matrix effect. On the other hand, excellent sensitivity and a wide linear range in the food matrix was noticed only for chromatographic based methods in the case of PST, AqT and MyT detection setting them as the only fully quantitative class of method for those targets in the TEST platform. For MRO detection only bacterial plating was considered as an exact measure to truly quantitate CFUs. Moreover, these methods were used throughout the analysed articles to confirm analytical performance of novel devices showing that chromatography combined with any type of detector and bacterial plating are generally considered as reference techniques. All other quantitative methods which have an element of uncertainty regarding trueness, and thus only yield an approximation of the amount of the substance, are called semi-quantitative. Such uncertainty can be caused by various factors such as specificity of an antibody or other similar chemical structures, matrix effects or non-specific absorption. Such sensors are typically biosensors although other systems such as qPCR, iPCR, SERS, mid-infrared spectroscopy (MIR) and quantitative sequencing equally fall within this

group. Finally, all sensors which provide binary reflection of the presence or absence of a compound or pathogen or reflection of presence set to a threshold level or LOD, are classified as qualitative.

Multiplexing

The capability of a sensor/method to simultaneously detect and identify different analytes during the same analytical cycle.

Apart from these criteria, which form the basis of the TEST classification system, additional information is included for both the scientific literature and commercial sensor reports stressing the usefulness of the TEST database. For the sensor/method reported in the scientific literature the following information is provided:

- i. the analytes and matrix in which detection can occur
- ii. the analytical method and type of detection method used
- iii. the reported LODs converted in ng/g or ng/mL (for all target groups except PAT) enabling sensitivity comparisons. For PAT CFU/ml was used instead.
- iv. the year of publication and
- v. the country of origin of the work. If authors are from different countries all countries are listed in the table

Similarly, for commercial sensors:

- i. commercial name of the test kit and manufacturer
- ii. analytes and matrix in which detection occurs
- iii. reported LOD, when provided
- iv. assay duration and detection method
- v. Internet site address of the kit and YouTube link (if available).

These tables, which form the backbone of the TEST platform, can be found as supplementary excel sheets for all target groups (supplementary tables 1 to 8).

2.4 The TEST website construction

The website consists of two portions: a web browser program that displays the web graphical user interface (GUI) to the end-users and processes user interactions, and a backend program that collects web requests from the browser program, handles the operation, e.g., retrieves data, and sends it back to the browser program. In the web browser program, React framework ² was used to provide dynamic GUI and efficient handling of user interactions. The framework sends RESTful requests ³ to the backend server in order to retrieve static files such as images, JavaScript, and Cascading Style Sheets (CSS) files necessary for the browser program. In the server, these requests are reverse-proxied by using the Apache Web Application to acquire static files or to the backend program to handle the data processing. The backend program was developed based on the Flask ⁴ framework and the MongoDB was selected as the database.

References

1. Bahadir, E. B. & Sezgintürk, M. K. Applications of commercial biosensors in clinical, food, environmental, and biothreat/biowarfare analyses. *Anal. Biochem.* **478**, 107–120 (2015).
2. Alex Banks, E. P. *Functional Web Development with React and Redux*. (O'Reilly Media, 2017).
3. Leonard Richardson, S. R. *RESTful Web Services*. (O'Reilly Media, 2008).
4. Grinberg, M. *Flask Web Development*. (O'Reilly Media, 2014).