

Document downloaded from:

<http://hdl.handle.net/10251/194870>

This paper must be cited as:

Giraldo, J.; Igualada, C.; Cabizza, R.; Althaus, RL.; Beltrán Martínez, MC. (2022). Transfer of antibiotics from goat's milk to rennet curd and whey fractions during cheese-making. *Food Chemistry*. 392:1-7. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foodchem.2022.133218>



The final publication is available at

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foodchem.2022.133218>

Copyright Elsevier

Additional Information

1 Short communication

2 **Transfer of antibiotics from goat's milk to rennet curd and**  
3 **whey fractions during cheese-making**

4 **Jennifer Giraldo<sup>a,\*</sup>, Carmen Igualada<sup>b</sup>, Roberto Cabizza<sup>c</sup>, Rafael Althaus<sup>d</sup>, María**  
5 **Carmen Beltrán<sup>a</sup>**

6 <sup>a</sup>Instituto de Ciencia y Tecnología Animal, Universitat Politècnica de València, Camino  
7 de Vera s/n, Valencia 46022, Spain

8 <sup>b</sup>Laboratorio de Salud Pública de Valencia-FISABIO, Avda. de Catalunya 21, Valencia  
9 46020, Spain

10 <sup>c</sup>Dipartimento di Agraria, Università degli Studi di Sassari, Viale Italia 39, Sassari 07100,  
11 Italy

12 <sup>d</sup>Facultad de Ciencias Veterinarias, Universidad Nacional del Litoral, R.P.L. Kreder,  
13 Esperanza 3080, Argentina

14

15 \*Corresponding author at: Instituto de Ciencia y Tecnología Animal, Universitat  
16 Politècnica de València, Camino de Vera s/n, Valencia 46022, Spain (J. G).

17 *E-mail addresses:* [jengigme@etsia.upv.es](mailto:jengigme@etsia.upv.es) (J. G).

18

19 **Abstract**

20 The transfer of 35 antibiotics from milk to curd and whey was evaluated. Cheeses were  
21 produced at laboratory scale, from antibiotic-free goat's milk spiked with different  
22 antibiotic concentrations between 0.25 and 4 times the Maximum Residue Limits  
23 established in milk. Drug concentrations in milk, curd and whey were analysed by  
24 UHPLC-HRMS. Results indicated that most antibiotics were mainly transferred from  
25 milk to whey (up to 85.9 %), with retention percentages in the curd lower than 50%,  
26 except for ceftiofur (59.7%) and dicloxacillin (52.8%). In most cases, drug distribution  
27 was unaffected by the antibiotic concentration in milk and correlated significantly to the  
28 drug lipophilicity (Log P) for  $\beta$ -lactams ( $R^2= 0.54$ ) and sulfonamides ( $R^2= 0.62$ ). When  
29 drug ionization was considered (Log D), improved correlation coefficients were obtained  
30 for macrolides ( $R^2 = 0.98$ ). However, other factors besides the drug solubility should be  
31 considered to explain and predict the partitioning of antibiotics during cheese-making.

32 **Keywords:** rennet curd; whey; antibiotics; partitioning; UHPLC-HRMS

33

## 34 **1. Introduction**

35 Antibiotics are commonly used to treat and prevent mastitis and other infectious diseases  
36 in dairy livestock. However, improperly applied, antibiotic therapy could lead to the  
37 presence of drug residues in milk, posing a risk to consumer health mainly related to the  
38 development of multi-drug resistant bacteria (World Health Organization, 2019).

39 To protect consumers, the European Union established Maximum Residues Limits  
40 (MRLs) for pharmacologically active substances in foodstuffs of animal origin, including  
41 milk (Commission Regulation (EU) No 37/2010) and the implementation of national  
42 residue monitoring plans (Council Directive 96/23/EC). However, no limits have been set  
43 for dairy products and consumers might be exposed to significant amounts of antibiotics,  
44 even higher than those indicated for milk, in concentrated products like cheeses (Cabizza  
45 et al., 2017; Cabizza et al., 2018; Gajda, Nowacka-Kozak, Gbylik-Sikorska, & Posyniak,  
46 2018; Quintanilla, Beltrán, Molina, Escriche, & Molina, 2019a).

47 Additionally, antibiotics present in milk are also released into the whey fraction during  
48 cheese-making (Giraldo, Althaus, Beltrán, & Molina, 2017) leading to negative effects  
49 on humans, animals, and the environment, given the food and agricultural applications of  
50 this by-product (Fresno, Darmanin, López, Camacho, & Álvarez, 2015; Prazeres,  
51 Carvalho, & Rivas, 2012). Scientific literature data on the partitioning of antibiotics  
52 during milk processing is limited, and mainly focused on a reduced number of veterinary  
53 drugs. Some of these research suggest that drug lipophilicity could explain the behaviour  
54 of diverse veterinary substances and be used to predict their distribution into the different  
55 milk matrices (Hakk et al., 2016; Lupton, Shappell, Shelver, & Hakk, 2018; Shappell, et  
56 al., 2017). However, to understand better the partitioning of antibiotics in curd and milk  
57 whey, and to evaluate its potential impact on consumer health, a higher number of  
58 substances belonging to different antibiotic groups should be considered. Therefore, the

59 aim of this study was to evaluate the transfer of numerous antibiotics from goat's milk to  
60 rennet curd and whey during cheese-making, and their connection to the lipophilicity of  
61 such substances.

## 62 **2. Material and methods**

### 63 *2.1. Experimental procedure*

64 Experimental cheeses were produced at laboratory scale, in triplicate, using antibiotic-  
65 free goat's milk spiked with five different concentrations of 35 antibiotics ranging from  
66 0.25 to 4 times the MRL established for such substances in milk. Milk, rennet curd and  
67 whey fractions were analysed using Orbitrap Exactive™ analyser to investigate the  
68 partitioning of antibiotics in different dairy matrices, and their relation to the lipophilicity  
69 of the neutral (Log P) and ionizable forms (Log D) of such substances.

### 70 *2.2. Antibiotics and spiked milk samples*

71 Table 1 presents the commercial references and the range of concentrations of the  
72 antibiotics, as well as the 4 internal standards used in this study. For each of them, a stock  
73 solution was prepared in methanol at a concentration ranging from 250 to 1500 µg/mL,  
74 which was stored at -20°C for further use.

75 Goat's milk for cheese production was spiked at different drug concentrations from  
76 working solutions containing simultaneously the considered antibiotic substances, which  
77 were daily prepared by diluting conveniently the standard stock solutions that had been  
78 made previously.

### 79 *2.3. Cheese-making process*

80 Raw milk was daily obtained from the experimental herd of Murciano-Granadina goats  
81 of the Universitat Politècnica de València (Valencia, Spain) and analysed for chemical  
82 composition by MilkoScan 6000 (Foss, Hillerød, Denmark), somatic cell count by

83 Fossomatic 5000 (Foss), total bacterial count by Bactoscan FC (Foss) and pH by a  
84 conventional pH-meter (Basic 20, Crison, Barcelona, Spain).

85 The chemical composition (g/100 g) of goat's milk used for cheese-making had an  
86 average (mean  $\pm$  SD) total solids content of  $8.98 \pm 0.06$ , fat  $5.32 \pm 0.37$ , lactose  $4.63 \pm$   
87  $0.04$  and protein  $3.62 \pm 0.06$ . The somatic cell count and total bacterial count reached  
88  $5.86 \log \text{ cells/mL}$  and  $4.34 \log \text{ cfu/mL}$ , respectively, and the average pH value was  $6.86$   
89  $\pm 0.05$ .

90 Curd and whey samples were obtained from a laboratory scale cheese-making procedure  
91 according to Giraldo et al. (2017). Thus, raw milk ( $40 \pm 0.5 \text{ g}$ ) was heated at  $33 \pm 1^\circ\text{C}$  in  
92 a water bath and curdled using animal rennet (1:10000. Suministros Arroyo, Santander,  
93 Spain) in 50 mL conical centrifuge tubes. After coagulation (30 min at  $33^\circ\text{C}$ ), the curd  
94 was cut and heated for 15 min at  $35 \pm 1^\circ\text{C}$ , being mixed with a scraper. Then, the tubes  
95 were centrifuged at 3000 rpm for 10 min, and the whey separated using a metallic tea  
96 strainer.

97 Milk, curd, and whey fractions were accurately weighed to apply a mass balance to  
98 calculate the partitioning of antibiotics through a cheese-making procedure.

#### 99 *2.4. Analysis of antibiotic residues in dairy matrices*

100 Antibiotic concentrations in milk, curd and whey samples were measured in duplicate, by  
101 UHPLC-HRMS, according to Igualada, Giraldo, Font, & Yusà (2021). Antibiotics were  
102 quantified by matrix-matched calibration curves using isotopic internal standards (Table  
103 1), except for macrolides and lincosamides, which were quantified by external calibration.  
104 Sample treatment involved a liquid-liquid extraction (LLE) using acetate buffer  $0.2 \text{ mol/L}$   
105 at pH 5.2 and acetonitrile (20/80, v/v), followed by C18 dispersive Solid Phase Extraction  
106 (dSPE).

107 For a chromatographic analysis, an Accela liquid chromatography UHPLC system  
108 (ThermoFisher Scientific, Bremen, Germany) equipped with a Kinetex C18 XB column  
109 (50 x 3.00 mm, 2.6  $\mu$ m) (Phenomenex, Madrid, Spain) was applied. The chromatographic  
110 conditions were the following: an injection volume of 10  $\mu$ L, a flow rate of 400  $\mu$ L/min  
111 and the temperature of column reaching 25°C. Separations carried out using a binary  
112 gradient that combined 0.1% formic acid aqueous solution and methanol containing 0.1  
113 % formic acid as mobile phase.

114 The Orbitrap Exactive<sup>TM</sup> analyser (ThermoFisher Scientific, Bremen, Germany) was  
115 equipped with a heated electrospray ionization interface (HESI-II) and operated in  
116 positive and negative mode within the mass range of 80-1,200 m/z. The data acquisition  
117 was executed in full scan mode (65-500 Da) at a resolving power of 50000 FWHM with  
118 5 ppm of mass tolerance, by using the ThermoFisher Scientific's Xcalibur 2.1.0 software.

#### 119 *2.5. Statistical analysis*

120 Drug concentration ratios between curd and whey fractions ([curd]/[whey]) were  
121 calculated to evaluate the partitioning of antibiotics during cheese-making. Normalized  
122 drug distribution rates, expressed as percentage, were also determined by applying a mass  
123 balance.

124 Experimental data were analysed using Statgraphics Centurion XVII software (StatPoint  
125 Technologies, Inc., Warrenton, VA). To investigate the effect of the antibiotic  
126 concentration and the experimental replicate on drugs distribution, a one-way ANOVA  
127 test was performed. Tukey's multiple-comparison test was used for paired comparison of  
128 average treatments and the level of significance was determined at  $p < 0.05$ .

129 The partition (Log P) and the distribution (Log D) coefficients of the antibiotics were  
130 considered to evaluate the relation between drug lipophilicity and drug partitioning (Log  
131 [curd]/[whey]) during cheese-making by applying a lineal regression model. Log D

132 values at goat's milk pH used in this study (pH= 6.86) were calculated using Log P and  
133 pKa values reported in Table 1, according to the equations specified by Hakk et al. (2016)  
134 for acidic and basic substances:  $\text{Log } D_{\text{acid}} = \text{Log } P + \text{Log} [1 / (1 + 10^{\text{pH}-\text{pKa}})]$  and  $\text{Log}$   
135  $D_{\text{base}} = \text{Log } P + \text{Log} [1 / (1 + 10^{\text{pKa}-\text{pH}})]$ .

136 As the percentage of moisture (or included whey) can vary between cheeses, the antibiotic  
137 existence in the dry curd fraction (0% moisture) was used for the calculation of the  
138 logarithm of the concentration ratios (Log 0% [curd]/[whey]). Antibiotic concentration in  
139 the dry curd fraction was calculated according to Shappell et al. (2017), by subtracting  
140 the whey-entrained drug amounts in the wet curd, considering that the interstitial whey  
141 of the wet curd and the separated whey fraction had the same antibiotic concentration.

142 A Principal Components Analysis (PCA) was carried out to detect potential connection  
143 among variables and the antibiotic groups considered.

### 144 **3. Results and discussion**

#### 145 *3.1. Drug distribution between curd and whey*

146 As shown in Fig. 1., antibiotics found in milk were mainly released into the whey fraction  
147 (up to 85.9%) during the drainage of the experimental cheeses. Thus, in general, the  
148 percentage of antibiotics retained in the curd fraction was lower than 50% in all cases,  
149 except for ceftiofur (59.7%) and dicloxacillin (52.8%) and very variable between drugs.  
150 Similar curd retention percentages to those obtained in this study, were reported by  
151 Shapell et al. (2017) for oxytetracycline (15%), erythromycin (22%) and  
152 sulfadimethoxine (28%), when assessing the transfer of different veterinary drugs from  
153 skim milk to whey and curd fractions. Only in the case of benzylpenicillin (12%) was the  
154 result half of that shown in this experiment. In a similar study, Lupton et al. (2018)  
155 reported a higher retention rate close to 50% for ciprofloxacin.



156 In general, the [curd]/[whey] ratios (Table 2) were drug-dose independent ( $p > 0.05$ ) and  
157 lower than one for most of the antibiotics considered, as such substances were mainly  
158 released into the whey, reaching higher concentrations than those found in the curd  
159 fraction. However, some antibiotics including most  $\beta$ -lactams, tilmicosin, danofloxacin,  
160 ciprofloxacin, sulfadimethoxine, sulfaquinoxaline and tetracyclines were more  
161 concentrated in the rennet curd matrix, showing concentrations higher than those obtained  
162 for the whey fraction. And, in some cases (oxacillin, cefoperazone, cloxacillin, nafcillin,  
163 dicloxacillin, desfuroylceftiofur, and ceftiofur) being between 1.7 and 3.3 times higher  
164 than drug concentration initially present in milk.

165 Fig. 2A. shows the PCA-biplot of the correlation coefficients among the variables  
166 considered as arranged by the position of antibiotics on each principal component (PC)  
167 axis. The two PCs accounted for 49.48 % and 36.47 % of the variance, respectively. As  
168 shown in Fig. 2A., Log P and Log 0% [curd]/[whey] were the most important variables  
169 for the formation of PC1, that was negatively correlated to the pKa of the antibiotics.  
170 Instead, pKa was the most important variable for PC2, being negatively correlated to the  
171 Log 0% [curd]/[whey].

172 Regarding to antibiotic groups (Fig. 2B.), macrolides and quinolones were correlated to  
173 the drug lipophilicity (Log D and Log P) while sulfonamides and tetracyclines were more  
174 correlated to the variable pKa.

### 175 *3.2. Empirical modelling of drug distribution between curd and whey fractions*

176 To explain the partitioning of the different antibiotic groups the Log 0% [curd]/[whey]  
177 ratio was calculated for plotting with the drug lipophilicity (Log P) and lipophilicity plus  
178 ionization (Log D). All data were used (fifteen distribution ratios per drug obtained from  
179 three replicates for each of the five concentrations assessed) in the lineal regression  
180 analysis for those antibiotics with available Log P and pKa values ( $n = 30$ ). As drug

181 distribution was dose independent for most antibiotics, the average Log 0% [curd]/[whey]  
182 was employed in the statistical analyses. For the exceptions (Table 2), the slope resulting  
183 from plotting the antibiotic concentration retained in the curd with respect to that released  
184 into the whey for each of the 5 concentrations that were considered.

185 As shown in Fig. 3, drug distribution between curd and whey fractions during cheese-  
186 making was significantly correlated to the drug lipophilicity (Log P) for  $\beta$ -lactams ( $R^2=$   
187 0.54,  $p= 0.0245$ ) and sulfonamides ( $R^2= 0.62$ ,  $p= 0.0117$ ). When ionization of the  
188 molecules at the pH of the medium (6.86) was considered (Log D), an improved  
189 correlation was obtained for macrolides and lincosamides ( $R^2= 0.98$ ,  $p= 0.0074$ ).  
190 However, for quinolones ( $R^2= 0.80$ ,  $p= 0.1076$ ) and tetracyclines ( $R^2= 0.89$ ,  $p= 0.0570$ )  
191 correlations did not become statistically significant and the results were inconclusive.

192 Moreover, quinolones and ionized forms of tetracyclines showed an inverse tendency to  
193 that observed in the other drug families (Fig. 3.), with ciprofloxacin and chlortetracycline,  
194 having the lowest lipophilicity values in their respective groups of antibiotics, being  
195 among the drugs more concentrated in the curd matrix (Table 2), with retention  
196 percentages of 31.9 % and 37.2 %, respectively (Fig. 1.). The high affinity of  
197 ciprofloxacin (Lupton et al., 2018; Pápai et al., 2010) and chlortetracycline (Dantas et al.,  
198 2020) to binding to curd proteins and to form insoluble quelates with metal ions like  
199 calcium present in milk could explain the different behaviour of these antibiotics.

200 These results suggest that factors other than lipophilicity of the antibiotics as well as milk  
201 composition, or the cheese-making process itself (heat treatments, pH, maturation time,  
202 etc.) should be considered to better explain and predict the transfer of antibiotics from  
203 milk to rennet-curd cheeses. Thus, as reported by Quintanilla et al. (2019a, 2019b) when  
204 assessing the transfer of antibiotic from goat's milk to rennet curd cheeses, the percentage  
205 of  $\beta$ -lactams retained in the ripened cheese manufacture (8.4-16.4 %) differs significantly

206 to those obtained for the same substances in the fresh cheese production (58.4– 75.2 %).  
207 On the contrary, the retention of oxytetracycline was higher in the ripened cheese (68 %)  
208 than in the fresh cheese (37.5 %).

#### 209 **4. Conclusions**

210 Results herein indicate that antibiotics present in milk are transferred mostly from milk  
211 to whey during cheese-making, which could carry damaging implications for humans,  
212 animals, and the environment. In addition, the lower amounts of antibiotics transferred  
213 from milk to curd could achieve, in some cases, higher concentrations than those indicated  
214 for milk, with negative consequences for public health. In general, drug distribution was  
215 not affected by the antibiotic concentration initially present in milk, and significantly  
216 related to the drug lipophilicity for some antibiotic groups, for which the resulting  
217 distribution models could be a useful tool to predict the partitioning of such substances  
218 during cheese-making.

219 However, it would be of great interest to include other aspects related to the physico-  
220 chemical properties of the veterinary drugs, the milk nature, or the different cheese-  
221 making conditions, in order to achieve a more accurate predicting equations allowing to  
222 define the potential risk of finding certain antibiotics in curd and whey fractions, and thus,  
223 evaluating the associated consequences for public and animal health, and the  
224 environment.

225 **Credit authorship contribution statement**

226 **Jennifer Giraldo:** data curation, formal analysis, investigation, methodology, resources,  
227 software, validation, writing original draft preparation, writing-review and editing.

228 **Carmen Igualada:** methodology, software, supervision, validation. **Roberto Cabizza:**

229 formal analysis, investigation, resources, writing original draft preparation, writing-

230 review and editing. **Rafael Althaus:** conceptualization, data curation, supervision. **María**

231 **Carmen Beltrán:** conceptualization, data curation, investigation, supervision, writing

232 original draft preparation, writing-review and editing.

233 **Declaration of Competing Interest**

234 The authors declare that they have no known competing financial interests or personal

235 relationships that could have appeared to influence the work reported in this paper.

236 **Acknowledgements**

237 This work was supported by the Ministry of Science and Innovation (Madrid. Spain) (No.

238 AGL-2013-45147-R).

239 **References**

- 240 Cabizza, R., Rubattu, N., Salis, S., Pes, M., Comunian, R., Paba, A., ... Urgeghe, P. P.  
241 (2017). Transfer of oxytetracycline from ovine spiked milk to whey and cheese.  
242 *International Dairy Journal*, 70, 12-17.  
243 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.idairyj.2016.12.002>.
- 244 Cabizza, R., Rubattu, N., Salis, S., Pes, M., Comunian, R., Paba, A., ... Urgeghe, P. P.  
245 (2018). Impact of a thermisation treatment on oxytetracycline spiked ovine milk:  
246 Fate of the molecule and technological implications. *LWT- Food Science and*  
247 *Technology*, 96, 236-243. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lwt.2018.05.026>.
- 248 Dantas, M.D.A., Silva, M.M., Silva, O.N., Franco, O.L., Fensterseifer, I.C.M., Tenório,  
249 H.A., Santos, J.C.C. (2020). Interactions of tetracyclines with milk allergenic protein  
250 (casein): a molecular and biological approach. *Journal of Biomolecular Structure*  
251 *and Dynamics*, 38(18), 5389-5400. <https://doi:10.1080/07391102.2019.1702587>.
- 252 Fresno, M., Darmanin, N., López, E., Camacho, M. E., & Álvarez, S. (2015). Utilización  
253 del lactosuero como bebida en el ganado caprino. *Agencia de Información y Control*  
254 *Alimentarios*, 6, 144-149.
- 255 Gajda, A., Nowacka-Kozak, E., Gbylik-Sikorska, M., & Posyniak, A. (2018).  
256 Tetracycline antibiotics transfer from contaminated milk to dairy products and the  
257 effect of the skimming step and pasteurisation process on residue concentrations.  
258 *Food Additives & Contaminants: Part A*, 35 (1), 66-76.  
259 <http://doi.org/10.1080/19440049.2017.1397773>.
- 260 Giraldo, J., Althaus, R. L., Beltrán, M. C., & Molina, M. P. (2017). Antimicrobial activity  
261 in cheese whey as an indicator of antibiotic drug transfer from goat milk.  
262 *International Dairy Journal*, 69, 40-44.  
263 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.idairyj.2017.02.003>.

264 Hakk, H., Shappell, N. W., Lupton, S. J., Shelver, W. L., Fanaselle, W., Oryang, D., ...  
265 Van Doren, J. M. (2016). Distribution of animal drugs between skim milk and milk  
266 fat fractions in spiked whole milk. *Journal of Agricultural and Food Chemistry*, 64,  
267 326-335. <https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.jafc.5b04726>.

268 Igualada, C., Giraldo, J., Font, G., & Yusà, V. (2021). Validation of a multi-residue  
269 method by UHPLC-HRMS for antibiotics screening in milk, fresh cheese, and  
270 whey. *Journal of Food Composition and Analysis*. (in press).

271 Lupton, S. J., Shappell, N. W., Shelver, W. L., & Hakk, H. (2018). Distribution of Spiked  
272 Drugs between Milk Fat, Skim Milk, Whey, Curd, and Milk Protein Fractions:  
273 Expansion of Partitioning Models. *Journal of Agricultural and Food Chemistry*, 66  
274 (1), 306-314. <https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.jafc.7b04463>.

275 Pápai, K., Budai, M., Ludányi, K., Antal, I. & Klebovich, I. (2010). In vitro food–drug  
276 interaction study: Which milk component has a decreasing effect on the  
277 bioavailability of ciprofloxacin?. *Journal of Pharmaceutical and Biomedical*  
278 *Analysis*, 52, 37–42. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jpba.2009.12.003>.

279 Prazeres, A. R., Carvalho, F., & Rivas, J. (2012). Cheese whey management: a review.  
280 *Journal of Environmental Management*, 110, 48-68.  
281 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvman.2012.05.018>.

282 Quintanilla, P., Beltrán, M. C., Molina, A., Escriche, I., & Molina, M. P. (2019a).  
283 Characteristics of ripened Tronchón cheese from raw goat’s milk containing legally  
284 admissible amounts of antibiotics. *Journal of Dairy Science*, 102(4), 2941-2953.  
285 <https://doi.org/10.3168/jds.2018-15532>.

286 Quintanilla, P., Doménech, E., Escriche, I., Beltrán, M. C., & Molina, M. P. (2019b).  
287 Food safety margin assessment of antibiotics: pasteurized goat’s milk and fresh

288 cheese. *Journal of Food Protection*, 82(9), 1553-1559.  
289 <https://doi.org/10.4315/0362-028X.JFP-18-434>.

290 Shappell, N. W., Shelver, W. L., Lupton, S. J., Fanaselle, W., Van Doren, J. M., & Hakk,  
291 H. (2017). Distribution of animal drugs among curd, whey, and milk protein  
292 fractions in spiked skim milk and whey. *Journal of Agricultural and Food*  
293 *Chemistry*, 65, 938-949. <https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.jafc.6b04258>.

294 Chemspider. (2021). Retrieved from <http://www.chemspider.com/>. Accessed December  
295 1, 2021.

296 DrugBank. (2021). Retrieved from <http://www.drugbank.ca/> . Accessed December 1,  
297 2021.

298 World Health Organization. (2019) *No time to wait: securing the future from drug-*  
299 *resistant infections*. Retrieved from <http://www.euro.who.in/> . Accessed December  
300 1, 2021.

301 Commission Regulation (EU) No 37/2010 of 22 December 2009, L.15/1-72.  
302 Council Directive 96/23/EC of 29 April 1996 on measures to monitor certain substances  
303 and residues thereof in live animals and animal products and repealing Directives  
304 85/358/EEC and 86/469/EEC and Decisions 89/187/EEC and 91/664/EEC (OJ L  
305 125, 23.5.1996, pp. 10-32).

306

307  
308  
309

**Table 1.**

Antibiotics used to evaluate the partitioning of antibiotics during the cheese-making process.

Antibiotics	Reference	Log P	pKa	EU-MRL (µg/kg)	Concentration ranges (µg/kg)
<i>β-lactams</i>					
Ampicillin	59349 <sup>a</sup>	1.35	3.24	4	1, 2, 4, 8, 16
Benzylpenicillin	46609 <sup>a</sup>	1.67	3.53	4	1, 2, 4, 8, 16
Cloxacillin	46140 <sup>a</sup>	2.53	3.75	30	7.5, 15, 30, 60, 120
Dicloxacillin	46182 <sup>a</sup>	3.02	3.75	30	7.5, 15, 30, 60, 120
Nafcillin	32071 <sup>a</sup>	3.52	3.31	30	7.5, 15, 30, 60, 120
Oxacillin	46589 <sup>a</sup>	2.05	3.75	30	7.5, 15, 30, 60, 120
Cefalexin	33989 <sup>a</sup>	0.65	3.26	100	25, 50, 100, 200, 400
Cefoperazone	32426 <sup>a</sup>	1.43	3.19	50	12.5, 25, 50, 100, 200
Ceftiofur	34001 <sup>a</sup>	2.05	2.83	100	25, 50, 100, 200, 400
Desfuroylceftiofur	D289980 <sup>b</sup>	-	-	100	25, 50, 100, 200, 400
Penicillin G-D7*	32985 <sup>a</sup>	-	-	-	100
<i>Macrolides</i> **					
Erythromycin	46256 <sup>a</sup>	2.83	8.38	40	10, 20, 40, 80, 160
Spiramycin	46745 <sup>a</sup>	3.06	9.33	200	50, 100, 200, 400, 800
Neo Spiramycin	N390040 <sup>b</sup>	-	-	200	50, 100, 200, 400, 800
Tilmicosin	33864 <sup>a</sup>	4.95	10.16	50	12.5, 25, 50, 100, 200
<i>Lincosamides</i> **					
Lincomycin	15443869 <sup>c</sup>	0.91	7.97	150	37.5, 75, 150, 300,
<i>Quinolones</i>					
Danofloxacin	33700 <sup>a</sup>	1.20	5.65	30	7.5, 15, 30, 60, 120
Enrofloxacin	33699 <sup>a</sup>	1.88	5.69	100	25, 50, 100, 200, 400
Ciprofloxacin	33434 <sup>a</sup>	0.65	5.76	100	25, 50, 100, 200, 400
Flumequine	45735 <sup>a</sup>	2.41	6.00	50	12.5, 25, 50, 100, 200
Norfloxacin-D5*	CH001 <sup>d</sup>	-	-	-	100
<i>Sulfonamides</i>					
Sulfacetamide	46770 <sup>a</sup>	0.07	4.30	100	25, 50, 100, 200, 400
Sulfadiazine	35033 <sup>a</sup>	-0.12	6.99	100	25, 50, 100, 200, 400
Sulfadimethoxine	46794 <sup>a</sup>	1.48	6.91	100	25, 50, 100, 200, 400
Sulfamerazine	46826 <sup>a</sup>	0.34	6.99	100	25, 50, 100, 200, 400
Sulfamethazine	46802 <sup>a</sup>	0.80	6.99	100	25, 50, 100, 200, 400
Sulfamethoxypyridazine	46858 <sup>a</sup>	0.32	6.84	100	25, 50, 100, 200, 400
Sulfapyridine	31738 <sup>a</sup>	0.03	6.24	100	25, 50, 100, 200, 400
Sulfaquinoxaline	45662 <sup>a</sup>	1.30	6.79	100	25, 50, 100, 200, 400
Sulfathiazole	46902 <sup>a</sup>	0.05	6.93	100	25, 50, 100, 200, 400
Sulfadimethoxine-D6*	SA001 <sup>d</sup>	-	-	-	100
<i>Tetracyclines</i>					
Chlortetracycline	C4881 <sup>a</sup>	-0.53	9.04	100	25, 50, 100, 200, 400
4-epi-Chlortetracycline	268231000 <sup>e</sup>	-	-	100	25, 50, 100, 200, 400
Doxycycline	33429 <sup>a</sup>	-0.54	8.33	100	25, 50, 100, 200, 400
Oxytetracycline	46598 <sup>a</sup>	-1.50	7.41	100	25, 50, 100, 200, 400
4-epi-Oxytetracycline	257711000 <sup>e</sup>	-	-	100	25, 50, 100, 200, 400
Tetracycline	31741 <sup>a</sup>	-0.62	8.24	100	25, 50, 100, 200, 400
4-epi-Tetracycline	233121000 <sup>e</sup>	-	-	100	25, 50, 100, 200, 400
Demeclocycline*	46161 <sup>a</sup>	-	-	-	100

310 Log P: partition coefficient from [www.chemspider.com](http://www.chemspider.com), using the ADC Lab-predicted values, and pKa values  
311 from [www.drugbank.ca](http://www.drugbank.ca), accessed on October 2021; EU-MRL: European Union-Maximum Residue Limit fixed  
312 in milk (European Union, 2010). \*Isotopically labelled Internal Standard (IS). \*\*External calibration (without IS).  
313 <sup>a</sup>Sigma-Aldrich Química, S.L. (Madrid, Spain); <sup>b</sup>Toronto Research Chemicals, Inc. (Toronto, Canada);  
314 <sup>c</sup>Honeywel Riedel-de-Haën, A.G. (Seelze, Germany); <sup>d</sup>WITEGA Laboratorien Berlin-Adlershof GmbH. (Berlin,  
315 Germany); <sup>e</sup>Acros Organics B.V.B.A. (Geel, Belgium). Data missing (-): not found in the literature.



316  
317  
318

**Table 2.**  
Antibiotic concentration ratios between rennet curd and whey fractions according to the drug levels in milk used for cheese production.

Antibiotics	Equivalent drug concentration in raw milk					SE
	0.25 EU-MRL	0.50 EU-MRL	1 EU-MRL	2 EU-MRL	4 EU-MRL	
<i>β-lactams</i>						
Ampicillin	0.6340	0.6499	0.6579	0.8380	0.8640	0.1082
Benzylpenicillin	-	0.6974 <sup>a</sup>	0.8364 <sup>ab</sup>	1.0593 <sup>bc</sup>	1.1460 <sup>c</sup>	0.0607
Cloxacillin	3.1627	1.6863	1.8479	1.7777	1.6846	0.6066
Dicloxacillin	-	2.5481	2.9804	2.7347	2.9666	0.3770
Nafcillin	-	1.6329	2.2341	1.8727	1.9095	0.2525
Oxacillin	1.4387	1.1847	1.4818	1.3743	1.3889	0.1596
Cefalexin	0.7704	0.9543	0.7373	0.8573	0.7221	0.1304
Cefoperazone	-	1.5672	1.6351	1.8369	1.4601	0.3251
Ceftiofur	3.8501	3.2923	3.3410	3.6693	3.5616	0.5586
Desfuroylceftiofur	-	1.6020	2.0521	2.7207	2.7902	0.5348
<i>Macrolides</i>						
Erythromycin	-	0.8097	1.1361	1.2325	0.9941	0.1088
Spiramycin	0.8422	0.8148	0.9012	0.9147	0.9480	0.0589
Neo Spiramycin	0.7184	0.7840	0.9213	0.9043	0.9721	0.0595
Tilmicosin	1.1266	1.1830	1.2521	1.3548	1.1803	0.1909
<i>Lincosamides</i>						
Lincomycin	0.6766	0.6680	0.7381	0.7918	0.7910	0.0639
<i>Quinolones</i>						
Danofloxacin	2.5954 <sup>b</sup>	1.2345 <sup>a</sup>	1.2068 <sup>a</sup>	1.1124 <sup>a</sup>	1.1553 <sup>a</sup>	0.2465
Enrofloxacin	0.8959	0.8527	1.0855	1.0248	1.1022	0.2066
Ciprofloxacin	1.2683	1.0753	1.1289	1.0148	1.0692	0.0856
Flumequine	0.3696 <sup>a</sup>	0.7651 <sup>ab</sup>	1.0662 <sup>b</sup>	0.8552 <sup>ab</sup>	0.9024 <sup>ab</sup>	0.1554
<i>Sulfonamides</i>						
Sulfacetamide	-	0.4520	0.4128	0.4422	0.3648	0.1157
Sulfadiazine	0.5404	0.6128	0.6780	0.6203	0.5927	0.0740
Sulfadimethoxine	1.7401	1.2173	1.1633	1.0826	1.0199	0.2259
Sulfamerazine	0.4975	0.6832	0.7816	0.7308	0.6572	0.1218
Sulfamethazine	0.9658	0.9318	0.9264	0.8483	0.8507	0.0791
Sulfamethoxypyridazine	0.6928	0.8510	0.9242	0.8086	0.7942	0.1222
Sulfapyridine	0.8481	0.7887	0.8623	0.8501	0.7817	0.1081
Sulfaquinolaxaline	2.2027	1.7707	1.7819	1.6665	1.5317	0.3497
Sulfathiazole	-	0.5976	1.2442	1.2599	1.1072	0.2029
<i>Tetracyclines</i>						
Chlortetracycline	-	1.6501	1.6978	1.3602	1.0789	0.2581
4-epi-Chlortetracycline	0.7270	0.5099	0.5121	0.4279	0.3425	0.2094
Doxycycline	0.4109	0.4258	0.4477	0.4173	0.3146	0.0977
Oxytetracycline	0.3539	0.3730	0.3628	0.3145	0.2312	0.0548
4-epi-Oxytetracycline	-	1.0272	1.2235	1.2023	0.8467	0.2299
Tetracycline	0.7623	0.7121	0.7774	0.6970	0.6341	0.1636
4-epi-Tetracycline	-	0.7735	0.7784	0.7044	0.5581	0.1016

319 EU-MRL: European Union-Maximum Residue Limit fixed in milk (European Union, 2010). SE: Standard Error.  
320 Data missing: (-): drugs with CCβ out of evaluated concentration range for some of the three matrices (milk, cheese,  
321 whey) considered. <sup>a, b, c</sup>: different letters in the same row indicate significant differences ( $p < 0.05$ ).

322 **Figure captions**

323 **Fig. 1.** Normalized percentages of antibiotics retained in the rennet curd fraction and  
324 released into the whey during cheese-making.

325 **Fig. 2. (a)** PCA-biplot of the main components from the PCA analysis; **(b)** Diagram of  
326 dispersion for antibiotics (n= 30) according to PCA components.

327 **Fig. 3.** Relation between the logarithm of antibiotic concentration in curd (0% moisture)  
328 to whey ratio and partition (Log P) and distribution coefficients (Log D) for  $\beta$ -lactams **(a,**  
329 **b)**; macrolides and lincosamides **(c, d)**; quinolones **(e, f)**; sulfonamides **(g, h)**; and  
330 tetracyclines **(i, j)**.