Biosensor for the detection of *Listeria monocytogenes*: Emerging trends

Dharmendra Kumar Soni^{a,#}, Rafiq Ahmad^b and Suresh Kumar Dubey^a

^aDepartment of Botany, Institute of Science, Banaras Hindu University, Varanasi 221005, India

^bSensors Lab, Electrical Engineering Program, Computer, Electrical and Mathematical Science and Engineering Division, King Abdullah University of Science and Technology (KAUST), Thuwal 23955-6900, Kingdom of Saudi Arabia

Running Title: Biosensor for detection of *L. monocytogenes*

*Corresponding authors. *E-mail address:* skdubey@bhu.ac.in (skdubey);
dharmendrabiotech85@gmail.com (dksoni)

[#]Present address: MIMS-Laboratory for Molecular Infection Medicine Sweden, Department of Molecular Biology, Umeå University, SE-901 87 Umeå, Sweden

Word count: 7261

ABSTRACT

The early detection of *Listeria monocytogenes* (*L. monocytogenes*) and understanding the disease burden is of paramount interest. The failure to detect pathogenic bacteria in the food industry may have terrible consequences, and poses deleterious effects on human health. Therefore, integration of methods to detect and trace the route of pathogens along the entire food supply network might facilitate elucidation of the main contamination sources. Recent research interest has been oriented towards the development of rapid and affordable pathogen detection tools/techniques. An innovative and new approach like biosensors, has been quite promising in revealing the foodborne pathogens. In spite of the existing knowledge, advanced research is still needed, to substantiate the expeditious nature and sensitivity of biosensors for rapid and *in situ* analysis of foodborne pathogens. This review summarizes recent developments in optical, piezoelectric, cell-based and electrochemical biosensors for *Listeria* sp. detection in clinical diagnostics, food analysis, and environmental monitoring, and also lists their drawbacks and advantages.

KEYWORDS: *Listeria monocytogenes*; optical biosensors; piezoelectric biosensors; cell-based biosensors; electrochemical biosensors

Introduction

Foodborne diseases are delineated by high incidence and low mortality rates. Bacteria such as *Staphylococcus aureus*, *Escherichia coli*, *Salmonella enterica* serovar Typhimurium, *L. monocytogenes*, *Campylobacter jejuni*, *Clostridium perfringens*, *Yersinia enterocolitica*, etc. are some of the foodborne pathogens. In case of *L. monocytogenes*, the causative agent of listeriosis, the situation is different with low incidence ranging from 0.1 to 11.3 per 1,00,000, and high hospitalization (90 %) and mortality (20-30 %) rates (EFSA, 2015; Soni et al., 2015a; WHO SEARO, 2017). Recently, it has been adjudged as the life-threatening pathogen, especially in the high-risk population groups such as pregnant women, neonates, elderly and immunocompromised people leading to abortion, stillbirth, septicemia, meningitis, and meningoencephalitis (Soni & Dubey, 2014; WHO, 2017).

L. monocytogenes is ubiquitous in the environment due to its ability to survive against a wide range of pH and salt concentrations and low-temperature conditions (Soni et al., 2015b; Soni et al., 2017). Human population is consistently exposed to *L. monocytogenes* as it frequently contaminates raw produce, and cross-contaminates other food items (Pouillot et al., 2016). Numerous outbreaks of listeriosis have been reported in countries like USA, Japan, New Zealand, Germany, France, England, and other European countries (Warriner & Namvar, 2009). In 2014, several countries reported increasing incidence of human listeriosis and the highest annual number of deaths since 2009 (EFSA, 2015). The increasing incidences undoubtedly, are due to modifications in surveillance programs, enhanced coverage of disease and changes in the consumption behavior. The minimal infectious dose for listeriosis is reported to be at least 100 colony-forming units (cfu) per gram of food (Buchanan et al., 2017). However, most countries have a zero-tolerance policy towards the presence of *L. monocytogenes* in ready to eat foods due

to the possible hazards caused by the pathogen (Jadhav et al., 2012). Therefore, detection of the pathogen even in low numbers in different environmental as well as food samples using rapid, accurate and reliable techniques, has become the necessity. Appropriate detection plan will certainly help in environmental monitoring with necessary examination and implementation strategies to prevent potential contamination of the product by *L. monocytogenes*. This will not only help restrict the spread of listeriosis, provide the effective control measures, but also minimize the unnecessary recalls of food products.

The extensive research in recent decades has given insights into the various methodologies adopted for *L. monocytogenes* detection. The gold standard method for identification of *Listeria* sp. is based on colony morphology, sugar fermentation, and hemolytic properties. However, these culture-based methods are lengthy (require up to 5-7 days), and may not be appropriate to test foods with short shelf life (Chen et al., 2004; Yang et al., 2005; Jadhav et al., 2012; Datta et al., 2013). These traditional methods are therefore not appropriate for food industries where a more rapid testing procedures to detect the pathogen from stressed conditions, is required (Bhunia, 2014). Longer time required for media and plate preparations, colony counting and biochemical characterization of the isolated colonies, prohibit the use of these methods in food industries where time and cost are the issues (Bhunia, 2014). Consequently, more rapid procedures based on antibodies such as an enzyme linked immunosorbent assay (ELISA), flow cytometry, matrix-assisted laser desorption/ionization (MALDI) and molecular-based techniques (DNA hybridization, polymerase chain reaction (PCR), and microarray) were developed (Ingianni et al., 2001; Volokov et al., 2002; Palumbo et al., 2003; Sergeev et al., 2004; Chemboro et al., 2005; Berrada et al., 2006; O'Grady et al., 2008; Soni et al., 2013; Soni et al., 2014; Soni et al., 2015c). The quantity of sample required for detection, amount of the waste

produced, availability of pure antigens, long enrichment time, and the use of expensive chemicals as well as the need for specialized equipments, limit their use in food industries. Further, these approaches are limited to their use in industry owing to major challenges in sample preparation, recovery and revival of bacteria from stress, biofilm, and other environmental stresses (Bhunia, 2014). In-depth reviews of the aforementioned methods for *Listeria* detection are available (Allerberger, 2003; Gasanov et al., 2005; Liu, 2006; Churchill et al., 2006; Zunabovic et al., 2011; Jadhav et al., 2012; Bhunia, 2014). Recent advancements the biosensors for detection of *L. monocytogenes* require a critical assessment of the present state-of-the art.

Biosensors have the potential to provide fast, direct and on-site analysis/detection of the pathogen that enables rapid monitoring of significant control points during food processing. The high accuracy and sensitivity of biosensing techniques is the key to its increasing applications in environmental monitoring, clinical diagnostics, food quality control, etc. The opportunities for biosensors in bacterial detection are wide open, especially in clinical diagnostics as well as in food industry for the real-time estimation of contamination. Therefore, the aim of the present review is to give a detailed and systematic description of the utility of various available biosensors designed for the accurate and quick *L. monocytogenes* detection. An overview of the current advancements in biosensing tools that use optical, piezoelectric, cell-based, and electrochemical biosensors for the detection of *L. monocytogenes*, has been described. Further, a section on future research requirements is included in order for accomplishing the broad laboratory definition of *L. monocytogenes* detection.

Biosensors for *L. monocytogenes* detection

The detection of *L. monocytogenes* is of utmost importance primarily for the food industry, water and environment quality control, and public health. Recently, biosensors are being used for

pathogen detection. In this technology, biological receptors are combined with physical or chemical transducers, and thus it represents a unique tool with the greater potential for rapid, online and real-time detection of biological agents. The basic model for the utility of biosensors involves pathogen detection from food, humans, animals and also, the samples from environmental sources (Figure 1). Biosensor consists of a biomolecule (e.g., tissue, microorganism, cell receptors, organelles, antibodies, nucleic acids, enzymes, etc.), biologically derived molecule (e.g., engineered proteins, recombinant antibodies, aptamers, etc.) or the biomimic (e.g., combinatorial ligands, synthetic catalysts, imprinted polymers, etc.) which interact with the target analyte, and the signal obtained indicates presence of a specific analyte in a given sample. The most frequently used signals include electrochemical, optical (UV, bioluminescence, fluorescence, etc.), thermometric, piezoelectric, magnetic and micromechanical transducers. For the detection of *L. monocytogenes*, various types of biosensors have been developed till date. Figure 2 shows the schematic representation of the various types of biosensors, classified on the basis of their biological elements and transducers. In the following section, optical, piezoelectric, cell-based, and electrochemical biosensors are reviewed in detail owing to their wide applicability for the detection of *L. monocytogenes*.

Optical biosensors

The optical biosensors are analytical device, able to sense the interaction between optical field and the biorecognition elements. The optical transducers enable direct (label-free) detection of bacteria. These sensors can detect even the small alterations in the refractive index or thickness that results from binding of cells to receptors immobilized on the transducer surface. Optical biosensors are sub-categorized based on reflection, refraction, resonance, dispersion, phosphorescence, infrared absorption, Raman scattering, fluorescence, and chemiluminescence.

Surface plasmon resonance (SPR), fluorescence, microfluidic and electrochemiluminescence (ECL) based optical biosensors are used for the detection of *L. monocytogenes*. Table 1 summarizes various studies on optical biosensors for the detection of *L. monocytogenes*.

Surface plasmon resonance (SPR)-based biosensors

SPR-based optical technique produces signals for the altered refractive index in close proximity of the sensor surface due to bindings between analyte and ligand (Figure 3). Koubova et al. (2001) reported successful detection of *L. monocytogenes* at concentrations of 10^6 /mL using the SPR-based optical sensor on the conventional Kretschmann prism arrangement. A BIA3000 detector based on SPR method was used to detect *L. monocytogenes* cells in solution by Leonard et al. (2004). In this technique, *L. monocytogenes* cells were incubated (30 min) with anti-*L. monocytogenes* polyclonal rabbit antibody, followed by the removal of dead cells and the bound antibodies using centrifugation to permit rapid detection of 1×10^5 *L. monocytogenes* cells/mL. Taylor et al. (2006) reported a multi-channel SPR sensor for the quantitative and simultaneous detection of four different bacteria. The limit of detection (LOD) of the reported biosensor was 3.5×10^3 cfu/mL for *L. monocytogenes*. Whole cells of *L. monocytogenes* were detected by SPR based sensor by Nanduri et al. (2007). They obtained a higher LOD of 2×10^6 cfu/mL. In the study conducted by Poltronieri et al. (2009), SPR immunosensors with a gold electrode bound to anti-bacterial antibodies were used. They found that the biosensor could detect 10^2 - 10^6 cfu/mL of *L. monocytogenes* cells on introducing a gold-labelled secondary antibody. With this, the suitability of SPR biosensors in pathogen detection from water, vegetable, and environmental samples, was established (Leonard et al., 2004; Poltronieri et al., 2009). Schmelcher et al. (2010) used differently labelled reporter CBDs of *Listeria* phage endolysins for detection and differential staining of different *Listeria* strains. The principle involved isolation of *Listeria* cells from milk and soft cheese using endolysin magnetic concentration and separation steps. This was

followed by plating of the cells on an oxford agar (incubated overnight), after which colonies were differentiated with fluorescently labelled endolysins and their subsequent detection by fluorescence microscopy in less than 15 min. Recently, Marusov et al. (2012) utilized grating-coupled SPR imaging to detect the microbes. In this method a gold-coated sensor chip has been used to couple collimated incident light with surface plasmons that permits the use of disposable biosensor chips. The compact microarray sensor chips utilize antibodies or other specific capture molecules to detect multiple analytes. Especially, a low LOD of 10^6 cfu/mL was obtained for *Listeria*. The SPR biosensor is limited by the penetration depth (approximately 100-500 nm) of evanescent field and also the change in refractive index and bacterial cell size.

Using *L. monocytogenes* reactive monoclonal antibody (C11E9) Lathrop et al. (2003) fabricated a resonant mirror biosensor to detect its all the serotypes. However, at higher concentration (10^8 cells/mL) the biosensor could not able to detect *L. monocytogenes* cells. With the help of *L. monocytogenes* serotype 1/2a cells as the immonogen, Hearty et al. (2006) produced a panel of hybridomas, which was enhanced by preparing cells in *Listeria* enrichment broth. An ELISA-based format and SPR biosensor was used to evaluate the monoclonal antibody. This method could identify *L. monocytogenes* at concentrations more than or equal to 1.0×10^7 cells/mL. In spite of such developments, future studies seem imperative to improve the sensor's sensitivity through newer immobilization processes, and development of portable systems.

Fiber optic based biosensors

Fiber optic biosensors use a tapered fiber of either silica or polystyrene to transmit and receive light signals. These biosensors utilize a sandwich immunoassay system where the captured antibody is attached to the fiber by avidin-biotin interaction or simple adsorption. Tims et al. (2001) reported detection of *L. monocytogenes* in low concentrations (≤ 10 cfu/mL) within 20 h

using evanescent wave, and concluded that the enrichment methods allowed higher antigen expression, and thus increased sensitivity. After enrichment, the detection of *L. monocytogenes* took only 20-45 min. Further study was carried out to detect *L. monocytogenes* in both naturally and artificially contaminated (with 10 to 1,000 cfu/g) food stuffs like hot dog or bologna. For this purpose, to capture *Listeria* cells on the fiber, Geng et al. (2004) used polystyrene fiber wave guides via a biotin-streptavidin reaction. The pathogen was detected in less than 24 h. An antibody-aptamer functionalized fiber-optic biosensor using Aptamer-A8, specific for internalin A (an invasin protein of *L. monocytogenes*) in combination with the antibody, was developed by Ohk et al. (2010) for specific detection of *L. monocytogenes* in food products. This method selectively detected pathogenic *Listeria* at concentrations approximately 10^3 cfu/mL both in pure cultures as well as in groups of bacteria, and has the potential to detect *L. monocytogenes* cells from ready-to-eat meat products such as sliced beef, chicken and turkey using an initial inoculation of 10^2 cfu/25 g following 18 h of enrichment. However, several factors such as the nature of antigen, quality of antibody, food component, resident microflora, sample enrichment, fiber variations, background liquid media, and the non-specific binding to non-target analytes, can affect the overall signal.

Fluorescence resonance energy transfer (FRET)-based biosensor

FRET-based biosensor is a device involving the radiation-less energy transfer from a "donor" to the "acceptor" fluorophore. FRET technology enables quantitative analysis of biomolecular dynamics in terms of interactions between protein-DNA, protein-protein, including protein conformational changes. The utilization of FRET-based biosensors has been extended to monitoring the cellular dynamics not only in heterogeneous cell populations, but also at the single-cell level. Ko & Grant (2003) developed a FRET-based method to detect *Listeria*. The

antibodies and proteins A and G were labelled with a FRET fluorophore pair, and then, the presence of specific antigens was detected in solutions utilizing spectrofluorometry. The results indicated LOD to be 2.0 µg/mL for *Listeria* antigens. Despite their diverse applications, FRET-based sensors face challenges pertaining to the increased need for higher fluorescence resolutions and improved specificity of FRET biosensors. The FRET-based technologies have significant utility in clinical diagnosis; however, the FRET reagents are expensive.

Scatterometer-based biosensors

The non-invasive optical forward-scattering system called ‘scatterometer’ is based on differences in refractive indices and size, relative to the arrangement of bacterial cells in colonies on semi-solid agar surface as it generates different forward-scattering patterns. Banada et al. (2007) exploited the known differences in their phenotypic characters for the identification of *L. monocytogenes* from other *Listeria* species. They described a model of scattering patterns and elucidated radial spokes and rings seen in the scattering images of *L. monocytogenes*. They achieved detection and differentiation of *L. monocytogenes* and other *Listeria* colonies grown on agar within 5-10 min with 91-100 % accuracy. In another study, Banada et al. (2009) used a similar method for label-free detection of multiple bacterial pathogens with an accuracy of 90-99% in samples derived from food or infected animals. They detected *L. monocytogenes* at levels as low as 1 cfu/25 g in different samples i.e. hotdog, tomato, and chicken. Huang et al. (2015) reported an ultrasensitive detection of *L. monocytogenes* using light scattering immunoassay. They utilized homogeneous gold nanoparticles which bind to the antigen epitopes present on *L. monocytogenes* surface. Under optimized conditions, they reported low LOD (3.5×10^1 cfu/mL) in 0.01 M phosphate-buffered saline. However, the major challenge to use optical scattering technology for bacterial detection in suspension is that the liquid culture may also carry other

microorganisms. For instance, culture may not be pure, and the arrangement of cells may vary (in chains or clusters). The orientation and distances between cells changes with time. Therefore, an averaging approach to account the relative orientation and movement is needed.

Microfluidic-based biosensors

Microfluidic-based biosensors are gaining momentum in this field of research as they provide an integrated platform to regulate the fluidic transport via micron-sized channels. In conventional microfluidic systems, an aqueous solution is used for immobilizing target species and concentrating the sample solution. The concentrated solution improves sensitivity of the probe, so also the LOD. To concentrate samples in a microfluidic channel, various methods like physical entrapment based on microstructure or microfilters, dielectrophoresis (DEP), and magnetic or polymeric beads are frequently employed. Bhattacharya et al. (2008) designed a microfluidic system to utilize dielectrophoretic force in combination with the flow of fluid to diverge all the cells into a small sensing channel for on-chip PCR using interdigitated microelectrodes. The results demonstrated a three-fold rise in the signal through the pre-concentration step. The sensor detected as few as 60 cells of *L. monocytogenes* V7 in less than 90 min even in the presence of other bacterial strains, and the application of DEP enhanced detection from 10^6 to 10^4 cfu/mL (Bhattacharya et al., 2008). However, this technique has certain limitations i.e., the higher cost and complexities in the fabrication of glass and silicon micro devices, which are not reusable and even if re-usable, difficult to maintain them sterile. Taitt et al. (2004) developed a portable multi-array biosensor for different analyte in complex samples. They used a novel fluidic cube module for the initial sample loading that allowed rapid detection of multiple unrelated targets without significant sample preparation. During *L. monocytogenes*

detection, LOD of 2.4×10^4 cfu/mL obtained, falls within the favorable detection range of any sensor.

Electrochemiluminescence (ECL)-based biosensors

ECL is also referred to as electrogenerated chemiluminescence based on the electron-transfer reaction on the electrode surface with suitable luminophore and co-reactant. This method is versatile due to its wide range of applications. ECL in combination with the magnetic beads, can be considered as the important and powerful tool for clinical applications, food and water testing, and the detection of biological threats. Long et al. (2011) proposed a method using HRCA (hyper branching rolling circle amplification) combined with the magnetic bead-based ECL for the detection of *hly* gene in *L. monocytogenes*. Through this approach, as low as 10 aM synthetic *hly* gene targets and ~ 0.0002 ng/ μ L of genomic DNA from *L. monocytogenes*, could be detected. Zhu et al. (2015) constructed Fe₃O₄/Vancomycin (Van)/PEG magnetic nano-carrier for efficient sample enrichment and *in situ* nucleic acid preparation of pathogenic *L. monocytogenes* for subsequent gene sensing (Figure 4). The results showed better dispersibility and biocompatibility for PEG modified Van Fe₃O₄ nanocarrier than PEG-free nanocarrier. Using designed nanocarrier, 90 % *L. monocytogenes* were efficiently captured from the complex sample matrices within 30 min. The ECL-based highly sensitive gene-sensing assay showed 10 cfu/mL LOD. In another recent report, Yang et al. (2017) also utilized magnetic beads to detect *L. monocytogenes* using ECL detection method. However, to overcome the problem of lower amounts of pathogens in the complex natural environments, they enriched the bacteria using vancomycin (Van) modified magnetic nanoprobe (MNPs) (Figure 5a). In brief, they utilized direct modified Van-MNPs and brush-like MNPs. The brush-like MNPs were constructed using poly-L-lysine (PLL) and amino-modified magnetic beads, followed by coupling of PEG (amine-PEG5000-COOH) to

the amine sites of PLL and Van conjugation to the carboxyl of PEG (Figure 5b). The integrated enriched Van-PEG-PLL-MNP nano-platform with ECL resulted in the high enrichment (>94%) efficiency, rapid detection time (within 20 min), accurate detection of *L. monocytogenes* at levels as low as 10 cfu/mL, and satisfactory specificity (Figure 5c-e). This approach could detect even a low bacterial concentration level (10^2 cfu/mL), and hence, it holds a great potential for pathogen detection in clinical samples with low bacterial population.

Piezoelectric (PZ) biosensors

PZ biosensors are very attractive, and the principle involved, enables their utilization in direct label-free detection of bacteria. This technology offers a real-time output simple to use, and quite cost-effective. The general practice is coating the surface of PZ sensor with the selective binding substance (for example, antibodies), which then is placed in a solution containing bacteria. The bacteria bind to the antibodies thus increasing the crystal mass while proportionately decreasing the resonance oscillation frequency. PZ immunosensor was developed for *L. monocytogenes* detection (Jacobs et al., 1995). Vaughan et al. (2001) reported a quartz crystal microbalance immunosensor using self-assembled monolayer (SAM) for the detection of *L. monocytogenes*. In solution, it detected 1×10^7 cells/mL. The sensor could be reused 10-times without any detection loss, and also, cuts down the cost. This is an important aspect regarding sensors since PZ crystals are not cheap enough to justify their disposal following a single assay. Additionally, this would sometimes save the expensive reagents. Sharma & Mutharasan (2013) detected *L. monocytogenes* in milk samples using asymmetrically anchored PZ cantilever sensor and a commercially available antibody. Detection of *L. monocytogenes* (10^2 /mL) was achieved by incorporating a third antibody-binding step. However, the main drawback of PZ biosensor is the immobilization of antibodies that bind via amine groups (likely to their Fab sites), and thus

inhibit antigen binding. Table 1 summarizes studies by various research groups for the detection of *L. monocytogenes* using PZ biosensors.

Cell-based biosensors

Cells and their components have been adopted in the evolution of biosensors and biochips. Cell organelles are utilized as bioreceptors, which represent the unique system to be exploited in future. Among the many biosensing elements, mammalian tissue slices or *in vitro* cultured mammalian cells are widely employed as bioreceptors. Curtis et al. (2008) developed a mast cell-based biosensor to detect *L. monocytogenes*. They used Rat Basophilic Leukemia mast cells and created an IgE chimeric protein by fusing the Fc region of the IgE antibody to CD14 that acted as the receptor for lipopolysaccharides. The designed chimeric protein binds with *L. monocytogenes* and IgE receptors on the mast cells, which then detects the presence of bacteria. A mammalian cell-based biosensor was developed, wherein, the B-lymphocyte Ped-2E9 cell line embedded in a collagen/gel matrix served as the sensing element. This was tested for the detection of *L. monocytogenes* and its toxin (listeriolysin O) from the artificially inoculated food samples (Banerjee et al., 2008; Banerjee & Bhunia, 2010). Such a unique sensor differentiated between pathogens and non-pathogens based on their cytotoxicity. In artificially inoculated food and beverages, it yielded a detection limit of 10^2 - 10^4 cfu/g. Also, the biosensor could detect the toxin even in very small quantity (10-40 ng). However, the problems faced with such devices, are analytical strategies, batch-to-batch reproducibility, and the lack of selective placement of biological cells on the sensing sites. A summary of studies on cell-based biosensors for the detection of *L. monocytogenes* is shown in Table 1.

Electrochemical biosensors

Electrochemical biosensors use a bio-electrode to convert the biological events to measurable electronic signals. Due to the presence of specific recognition elements in the bio-recognition layer, such biosensor have advantages over the optical-based ones as the former could be operated in turbid media, offer comparable sensitivity, and are more amenable to miniaturization. Modern electro-analytical techniques have shown very low LODs (typically 10^{-9} M) achievable in small sample volumes (1-20 mL). Furthermore, on-line control is feasible due to the continuous response of the electrode system with the added advantage of simple and cheaper equipment required for electrochemical analysis contrary to other analytical techniques. A schematic outline of the typical electrochemical biosensor cell is shown in Figure 6. It consists of reference, counter, and working electrodes, which are dipped into buffer containing the analyte. Three methods (i.e. amperometric, potentiometric and impedimetric) are used for the analyte detection using electrochemical biosensors.

Amperometric based biosensors

Amperometric biosensors are used to investigate the electrochemical reactions at a constant potential while measuring the current change. The analyte concentration in solution is proportional to the current response of biosensors. Amperometric biosensors have the advantage of being highly sensitive, rapid, and inexpensive. Such systems have a linear concentration dependence compared to the logarithmic relationship in potentiometric systems. In recent years, a number of amperometric biosensors have been developed for the detection of *L. monocytogenes*. These are classified on basis of the difference in the use of biological elements. Table 1 shows the list of various amperometric biosensors used for the detection of *L. monocytogenes*.

Amperometric based immuno biosensors

Quantitative detection of analyte in solution can be performed using the amperometric based immuno biosensors which utilize antigens and antibodies to form an immunocomplex on the blocking layer coated electrode surface. A novel liposome-based amperometric biosensor was described by Kim et al. (1995) for the detection of haemolytic microorganisms. The potential of this approach was illustrated for the detection of various strains (*L. monocytogenes*, *L. welshimeri* and *E. coli*) with the bacterial concentrations in the range of 4.7×10^6 - 2.4×10^9 cfu/mL. Susmel et al. (2003) demonstrated the feasibility of one-step, specific, label-less, quantitative detection of *L. monocytogenes* based on the measurement of the diffusion of a redox probe using screen-printed gold electrodes and thiol-based SAM for immobilization of antibodies on the electrode surface. Nanomaterials/nanowires have unique semi-conductive properties, and are ultrasensitive for single molecule sensing which extends their importance in impedimetric biosensing technologies. An optimized amperometric immune-biosensing strip utilizing gold nanoparticles-modified carbon electrodes devised by Davis et al. (2013), could detect *L. monocytogenes* contamination in food samples. The sensor had a LOD of 2 log cfu/mL (or cfu/g), while the screen-printed carbon electrode (SPCE) strip could detect as little as one bacterial cell, with in the approximate time of 1 h for the accurate detection of any contaminations. Cheng et al. (2014) reported detection of *L. monocytogenes* in concentrations ranging between 10^2 and 10^6 cfu/mL in milk samples by SAM-modified gold electrodes in a direct sandwich format with horseradish peroxidase (HRP). In another sandwich flow through immunoassay, Chemburu et al. (2005) fabricated biosensors using highly dispersed carbon particles that could detect pathogenic cells by antibodies immobilized onto the activated carbon particles labeled with HRP conjugated antibodies. They detected *L. monocytogenes* in milk and chicken extract samples with LOD of 10 cells/mL.

366 ***Amperometric based DNA biosensors***

367 Amperometric DNA biosensors detect the current change in DNA hybridization between the
368 target analyte and the probe on the electrode surface. Ligaj et al. (2003) described an
369 electrochemical genosensor using carbon paste electrode and daunomycin for the amperometric
370 detection of listeriolysin (*hlyA*) gene of *L. monocytogenes* by square-wave voltammetry. It was
371 shown that the indicators applied, could be very useful in the detection of hybridization.
372 Farabullini et al. (2007) described detection of *L. monocytogenes* by the disposable
373 electrochemical and low density genosensor array. A screen-printed array of gold electrode used,
374 was modified using thiol-tethered oligonucleotide probes (*inlA*). They could detect *L.*
375 *monocytogenes* at nanomolar levels in less than 1 h without any cross-interference. Gao et al.
376 (2010) described the electrochemical indicator toluidine blue for DNA electrochemical
377 biosensors with different redox behavior on ssDNA and dsDNA modified electrodes. The
378 electrochemical DNA biosensor was effectively applied for the detection of specific sequences of
379 *actA* gene from *L. monocytogenes* with the dynamic range of 1.0×10^{-7} to 8.0×10^{-5} M. Wu et al.
380 (2010) reported a new hybridization biosensor for electrochemical detection of PCR
381 amplification products of LLO toxin gene in food products and the organism without labelling
382 the target DNA. The hybridization reaction on the electrode surface was evidenced by cyclic
383 voltammetric analysis using $[\text{Co}(\text{phen})_3](\text{ClO}_4)_3$ as the indicator. There was a significant increase
384 in the peak current in cyclic voltammeter following hybridization of the immobilized ssDNA
385 with the PCR amplification products in the solution. Sun et al. (2012) described electrochemical
386 DNA biosensors by electrodeposition methods for the preparation of GR and nano-gold to
387 fabricate Au/GR nanocomposite film-modified CILE. Under optimal conditions, specific *L.*
388 *monocytogenes hly* ssDNA sequences could be detected by measuring the differential pulse

voltammetric response of methylene blue molecules accumulated on dsDNA. The linear concentration range achieved was 1.0×10^{-12} to 1.0×10^{-6} mol/L with the LOD of 2.9×10^{-13} mol/L. The PCR product of *hly* gene samples extracted from the deteriorated fish was also detected satisfactorily.

The development of enzyme based biosensors has been of particular interest due to the commercial availability of enzymes, and the large signal amplifications resulting from the substrate turnover. Some of the commonly used enzymes include alkaline phosphatase, HRP, glucose oxidase, glucose dehydrogenase, soyabean peroxidase and bilirubin oxidase. The process involved chemical coupling of enzymes to the target or reporter DNA strand or via avidin (or streptavidin, neutravidin)-biotin binding. A simple capture- based assay involving gold electrode modified with a SAM of cysteamine, cross-linked with redox polymer [Os (2,2'-bipyridine)₂(polyvinylimidazole)₁₀Cl]^{+/2+} as the recognition surface and the probe sequence of DNA, was used to detect the specific target sequence of DNA (designed from *ssrA* gene of *L. monocytogenes*) (Kavanagh & Leech, 2006). The results were displayed as the linear increase in the current response with respect to the concentration of target DNA in the range of 10^{-9} to 10^{-6} M with a LOD of ~ 1.4 fM in a 7 μ L droplet (corresponding to 0.2 nM of target DNA). An enzyme-amplified amperometric DNA hybridization assay was proposed by Hajdukiewicz et al. (2010), wherein all the immobilization and detection steps were carried out in the solution phase applying the detection platform in a microfluidic flow system. In this assay, an amine-terminated ssDNA (designed for binding of the *ssrA* gene sequence of *L. monocytogenes*) bound within carboxymethylated dextran (CMD) films coupled to graphite surfaces possessing grafted arylamine and solution-phase ferrocene methanol (which mediates oxidase for glucose oxidation) was used. The signal produced was measured by cyclic voltammetry and constant potential

amperometry, which scales the biotin-complementary DNA concentration (2.5×10^{-6} M to 3×10^{-7} M) with a LOD of 0.2 nM in 500 μ L sample. Liebana et al. (2016) reported utilization of silica based magnetic particles for electrochemical magneto-genosensing of *L. monocytogenes*. This method was based for the detection of the tagged amplified DNA obtained using single-tagging PCR with a set of specific primer *prfA* (217 bp) tagged with biotin. For the first time, Liebana et al. (2016) combined PCR amplification with electrochemical magneto-genosensing using silica-MPs as the platform. The DNA immobilization and PCR assay within 3 h, could detect 0.13 ng/ μ L *L. monocytogenes*. The amperometric methods are limited by the potential interference in the response that generated false current values.

Potentiometric biosensors

Potentiometric biosensors sense the change in ionic concentrations in ion-selective electrodes sensitive to the analyte. As potentiometric assays rely on recording the potential/pH variations, such biosensors are more suitable for food, clinical or environmental samples analysis. The analytical signal obtained, indicates concentration variations of an ionic species. Potentiometric biosensors were developed by combining a biorecognition element (essentially an enzyme) with a transducer that senses variations in the number of protons (or other ions). The analytical signal then is logarithmically correlated with the analyte concentration. Ding et al. (2014) reported a label-free potentiometric aptasensor based on the polycation-sensitive electrode for the detection of *L. monocytogenes* in an aquatic environment with the LOD of 10 cfu/mL. In this technique, an aptamer binds specifically to internalin A, and target-binding event prevents the aptamer from electrostatically interacting with the protamine.

Impedimetric biosensors

Electrochemical impedance spectroscopy (EIS) is the powerful tool for characterization of electrochemical systems. The fundamental principle involved in any of the impedance methods, is the application of a small amplitude sinusoidal excitation signal to the system before measuring the response. To detect *L. monocytogenes*, several researchers used impedimetric biosensors, which can be classified further on the basis of the biological elements used. The sub-categories of this biosensor have been described in detail below. Table 1 lists a summary of published work on the use of impedimetric biosensors in *Listeria* detection.

Impedimetric based microfluidic biosensors

Impedimetric based microfluidic method involves measurement of changes in the electrical impedance induced by bacterial growth in a culture medium or a reaction solution. The viable cells could be differentiated from the dead ones by the presence of ionic metabolites reflected as the change in impedance. This method is rapid, and has the potential to detect bacterial growth within 24 h. A modified version of the technique known as “Impedance microbiology on-a-chip” was demonstrated by Gomez-Sjoberg et al. (2005) for the detection of microbial metabolism. In this innovative approach, a technique called “DEP” was incorporated into the chip so that the bacterial cells in diluted samples were concentrated to a very small volume. The LOD achieved was 1 h in the sample with the starting concentration of 10^4 cfu/mL, while the major challenge was the confinement or capture of cells into a small volume. Koo et al. (2009) utilized heat shock protein 60 (Hsp60) as the novel molecular recognition element on streptavidin-coated silicon dioxide surface to fabricate a microfluidic chip for selective detection of pathogenic *Listeria*. Compared to other monoclonal antibody (i.e. C11E9 and E-cadherin), Hsp60 could detect pathogenic *Listeria* with high specificity. A newer approach for the detection of *Listeria* species was developed by Chen et al. (2016) integrating electrochemical impedance with urease catalysis

with the microfluidics in spiked lettuce sample. A LOD of 1.6×10^2 cfu/mL in ~1 h was obtained using this method.

Impedimetric based immuno biosensors

In impedimetric immuno biosensors, the electron transfer resistance change is monitored as the antigens and antibodies form immunocomplex on the blocking layer coated electrode surface. The first discovery of immuno biosensors involved development of label-less immunosensors for the detection of a cell-surface protein (InlB) on *L. monocytogenes* by Tully et al. (2008). The methodology was to fabricate sensors with PANI (polyaniline) by electropolymerization of planar SPCE to synthesize a conductive substrate. Using site-specific immobilization, the polyclonal anti-InlB antibody was subsequently incorporated into the PANI layer using the biotin-avidin system. A LOD of 4.1 pg/mL was achieved for InlB. Previous studies reported exploitation of SAMs to enhance the biosensor performance. SAMs are structure-oriented layers containing the functional groups well ordered at the monolayer liquid interface. These functional groups control the orientation of SAMs during their binding with the biological components. Later, a TiO₂ nanowire bundle microelectrode-based impedimetric immunosensor was developed by Wang et al. (2008) for the rapid and sensitive detection of *L. monocytogenes*. The bacterial count was displayed as the change in impedance caused by the nanowire-antibody-bacteria complex with a LOD of 10^2 cfu/mL for *L. monocytogenes* within 1 h. Radhakrishnan et al. (2013) used mouse monoclonal antibody immobilized onto gold electrode for the detection of *Listeria* in ideal solutions and filtered tomato extracts. A sensitivity of $0.825 \text{ kWcm}^2/(\text{cfu/mL})$ and $1.129 \text{ kWcm}^2/(\text{cfu/mL})$ and the LOD of 5 cfu/mL and 4 cfu/mL, respectively, was obtained using this method. Chai et al. (2014) fabricated impedimetric-based immunosensor on an aluminum oxide layer insulated aluminum surface after immobilizing anti-*L. monocytogenes*

antibody. The resistance of impedance decreased linearly with the increasing concentration of *L. monocytogenes* in the range of 1.3 to 4.3 log cfu/mL. Antimicrobial peptides were utilized as the selective probes by Etayash et al. (2014) for label-free and real-time detection of foodborne pathogens i.e. *L. monocytogenes*, *L. innocua*, *Enterococcus faecalis* and *Staphylococcus aureus*. They used antilisterial, antimicrobial peptides from class IIa bacteriocins for selectivity, and the new generation of impedance array analyzer operating at very low frequencies. The fabricated LeuA functionalized impedance microelectrodes with each cell having five microelectrodes (Figure 7A), were attached with the microfluidic chamber with three separate cells (Figure 7B). The impedance microelectrode showed remarkable response to bacterial samples compared to the blank and the control sensors, as shown (Figure 7C), and calibrated the binding curve parameter (Figure 7D). This biosensor platform detected the closely related bacterial strains, especially *L. monocytogenes* at very low concentrations (10^3 cfu/mL). Further, Chen et al. (2015) combined immunomagnetic separation and urease catalysis to develop impedance biosensor for detection of *L. monocytogenes* using an antibody immobilization-free interdigitated array microelectrode. The technique was reported to detect as low as 300 cells of *Listeria* in both, the pure cultures and the spiked lettuce samples. In another study, Wang et al. (2017) used immunomagnetic nanoparticles, urease, and screen-printed interdigitated electrodes for pathogen detection in spiked lettuce sample. They reported a LOD of 1.6×10^3 cfu/mL within 3 h with the mean recovery of 98.2%. The major advantage of the technique was that it could detect the presence of *L. monocytogenes* without any significant interference from other foodborne pathogens.

Impedimetric based enzyme biosensors

The impedimetric method is mainly for enzyme-based impedimetric biosensors, which analyze the enzyme mediated reactions. Bacteriophages recognize and bind to specific receptors on the host bacteria using their tail proteins. Endolysins from the bacteriophage infecting *Listeria* are peptidoglycan hydrolases that mediate bacterial lysis at the end of phage multiplication cycle. The CBDs (cell wall binding domains) from *L. monocytogenes* phage endolysins Ply118 and Ply500 specifically recognize and bind to the *Listeria* cell wall. A biosensor was developed using the CBD of bacteriophage-encoded peptidoglycan hydrolases (endolysin) immobilized on a gold SPE (screen printed electrode), and the subsequent EIS analysis for the rapid and specific detection of *Listeria* cells (Tolba et al., 2012). The electrode system was used to capture and detect *Listeria* from pure cultures and 2% artificially contaminated milk as well as with the LOD of 1.1×10^4 and 10^5 cfu/mL. Reyes-De-Corcuera et al. (2005) fabricated amperometric exogenous time-temperature integrator based biosensor using glucose oxidase. They detected *L. monocytogenes* through pasteurization. This method is advantageous i.e. simple to prepare, rapid in response, inexpensive, and can detect different microorganisms by changing the enzyme and substrate. However, there are some drawbacks of this method such as larger volume of time-temperature integrator, difficult to recover for rapid assay, and requires long preparations for analysis.

Impedimetric based DNA biosensors

A DNA sensor based on EIS detection is the device that transduces changes in the interfacial properties between the electrode and the electrolyte to an electrical signal. These changes are mainly induced by DNA hybridization, conformational changes, or any damage to the DNA. Most of the DNA sensors comprise a target DNA labelled with a fluorophore, magnetic beads, or an enzyme for its detection. On the contrary, the EIS detection based DNA sensors are label-free

and, therefore, have the advantage of low cost, simplicity, and the ease of miniaturization. A recent study reported a genosensor based on *hlyA* gene probe and glassy carbon electrode modified with platinum nanomaterials dispersed in a chitosan matrix for the detection of *L. monocytogenes* in milk samples with a wide detection range from 1×10^{-12} M to 1×10^{-4} M (Kashish et al., 2015a). Furthermore, in another study, a label-free genosensor based on the *hlyA* gene probe and the conducting polymer poly-5-carboxy indole with the LOD of 10^{-13} M was established for the detection of *L. monocytogenes* (Kashish et al., 2015b). These investigators suggested the utility of this technique in early diagnosis of listeriosis both in clinical and environmental samples. In a recent report, Sharma et al. (2017) developed a protocol based on the hybridization of natural DNA, and explored the hybridization events involving genomic DNA extracted from *L. monocytogenes* through a compact magnetic tunneling junction (MTJ)-based biosensing apparatus. In this study, they designed the portable biosensor setup based on MTJ platform to detect *L. monocytogenes* (Figure 8A-C). The SEM image of MTJ based biosensing device comprised 12 sensor arrays with a common ground contact at low and high resolutions (Figure 8D). The optical images of the sensors taken before and after the experiments, showed that the beads were immobilized on top of the sensors (Figure 8E). The magnetoresistive response curve of a sensor measured along the sensing direction (magnetic field applied parallel to the shorter side of the junction area) showed a 45% MR ratio and a low-field sensitivity of 13.6%/mT (Figure 8F). They detected *Listeria* using *Listeria* target DNA at concentrations ranging from 1 μ M to 1 mM (Figure 8H and 8I). The experimental results showed that MTJ-based platform could detect concentrations of DNA extracted from *Listeria* with high sensitivity (below the nanomolar range).

Conclusions and future prospects

548 Conventional enrichment and identification methods of *L. monocytogenes* are proven to be
549 highly sensitive. However, due to the multi-step processing of samples, they are slow for
550 practical applications. For that reason, biosensor-based methods are needed for the accurate and
551 quick detection. Among the several biosensors used for the detection of *L. monocytogenes*,
552 optical methods conceivably provide better sensitivity over the electrochemical ones, but the
553 method is limited by its cost and the complexity of performance. The impedimetric biosensors
554 find their wide applications in bacterial detection as they integrate biological recognition
555 technology with the impedance. Moreover, the technique has several other advantages in being
556 label-free thus simplifying the assembly process, are cost-effective and rapid with a detection
557 time of usually less than 30 min. In addition, they reach the lower LODs than SPR and ELISA.
558 There lies a wider scope for commercialization of impedimetric biosensors for the detection of
559 pathogenic bacteria, and can be achieved by improved stability, reduced volume, and increased
560 sensitivity at low cost.

561 Despite all these efforts, there is a need for substantial improvement in the development of
562 biosensors to overcome the inherent technical shortcomings, reduce the number of false positive
563 results as well as to channelize their performance on a wider scale. Commercialization of
564 biosensors is a matter of debate since routine applications of the technique need to be checked
565 for their reliability, robustness, and reproducibility in bacterial detection. The potential of
566 biosensors could be increased particularly if these could be designed with specific characteristics
567 such as specificity to distinguish the target bacteria in a multi-organism matrix, the sensitivity for
568 direct on-line bacterial detection without pre-enrichment, adaptability for multiple analyte
569 detections, and the rapidity to give real-time results. One other most important aspect, is the
570 presence of relatively simple and inexpensive configurations of a biosensor. It is believed that in

the near future, fully automated biosensors with analytical systems based on the combination of a multi-sensor technology with the artificial neural network or with other analytical and discriminative mathematical methods, could be designed. This advanced technique then is expected to have certain advantages such as quick results, simple to operate, modest equipment requirements, high specificity and sensitivity, and cost and energy efficiency. This, in turn, would facilitate environmental monitoring and clinical diagnosis of the disease and also to control infection at an early stage.

As discussed before, the biosensing techniques effectively detect pathogens in a variety of samples. However, these do not offer the insight for complexities of the pathogen at the molecular level. Many omics approaches have been used for the detection of pathogenic and non-pathogenic *L. monocytogenes* (Singh et al., 2011; Beale et al., 2014; Tatituri et al., 2015; Jadhav et al., 2015; Ojima-Kato et al., 2016; Martinović et al., 2016; Cheng et al., 2016). These observations provide information related to pathogen's ability to overcome a diverse range of environmental regimes (e.g., salt concentrations, pH, temperature, etc.), close association between the pathogens, and also the molecular level complexities (Fratamico, 2008; Stasiewicz et al., 2015; Donaldson et al., 2015). With the advancement of omics-based research (metabolomics, lipidomics and proteomics), the prospects of advanced biosensor design are numerous and potentially ground breaking in terms of innovation and technology development. Yet, the identification of novel biomarkers or the understanding of the *Listeria* metabolome, lipidome or proteome is least explored. However, few investigators have used proteome-based approach for detection of *L. monocytogenes* in diverse environment (Mazzeo et al., 2006, Jadhav et al., 2014). These are the tools that can thrust biosensor development further, and constitute a significant proportion of the future prospects. The information generated by such innovative high

throughput technologies would in turn, solve the questions on reducing microbial food safety hazards. It is imperative to facilitate the use of such advanced tools by food industries as the information generated, hold promise for the development of novel strategies to combat food infections and their prevention. It is hoped that future investigations will open newer opportunities to discriminate bacteria in environmental monitoring, clinical and diagnostic laboratories, and also food-related industries. It is, therefore, expected that miniaturization and introduction of newer high throughput technologies such as lower detection limits, reduced sample and solvent amounts, and shortened analysis time, would certainly be a boon to safeguard the human health against microbial pathogens.

Acknowledgements

This article is based on the Ph.D. thesis of one of the authors (DKS). The authors would like to express their gratitude to Editor and reviewers of the paper for their constructive suggestions. We are also thankful to coordinator DST-FIST, Botany, and ISLS- I.Sc, BHU, for facilities.

Declaration of interest

Authors have no conflict of interest.

References

- Allerberger F, (2003). *Listeria*: growth, phenotypic differentiation and molecular microbiology. FEMS Immunol Med Microbiol 35:183-9.
- Banada PP, Guo S, Bayraktar B, et al. (2007). Optical forward-scattering for detection of *Listeria monocytogenes* and other *Listeria* species. Biosens Bioelectron 22:1664-71.
- Banada PP, Huff K, Bae E, et al. (2009). Label-free detection of multiple bacterial pathogens using light-scattering sensor. Biosens Bioelectron 24:1685-92.

616 Banerjee P, Lenz D, Robinson JP, et al. (2008). A novel and simple cell-based detection system
 617 with a collagen-encapsulated B-lymphocyte cell line as a biosensor for rapid detection of
 618 pathogens and toxins. Lab Invest 88:196-206.

619 Banerjee P, Bhunia AK, (2010). Cell-based biosensor for rapid screening of pathogens and
 620 toxins. Biosens Bioelectron 26:99-106.

621 Beale DJ, Morrison PD, Palombo EA, (2014). Detection of listeria in milk using non-targeted
 622 metabolic profiling of *Listeria monocytogenes*: A proof-of-concept application. Food
 623 Control 42:343-6.

624 Berrada H, Soriano JM, Picó Y, et al. (2006). Quantification of *Listeria monocytogenes* in salads
 625 by real time quantitative PCR. Int J Food Microbiol 107:202-6.

626 Bhattacharya S, Salamat S, Morisette D, et al. (2008). PCR-based detection in a micro-fabricated
 627 platform. Lab Chip 8:1130-6.

628 Bhunia AK, 2014. One day to one hour: how quickly can foodborne pathogens be detected?
 629 Future Microbiol 9:935-46.

630 Buchanan RL, Gorris LGM, Hayman MM, et al. (2017) A review of *Listeria monocytogenes*: An
 631 update on outbreaks, virulence, dose-response, ecology, and risk assessments. Food
 632 Control 75:1-13.

633 Chai C, Lee J, Oh SW, et al. (2014). Impedimetric characterization of adsorption of *Listeria*
 634 *monocytogenes* on the surface of an aluminum-based immunosensor. J Food Sci
 635 79:E2266-71.

636 Chen Q, Lin J, Gan C, et al. (2015). A sensitive impedance biosensor based on immunomagnetic
 637 separation and urease catalysis for rapid detection of *Listeria monocytogenes* using an
 638 immobilization-free interdigitated array microelectrode. Biosens Bioelectron 74:504-11.

639 Chen Q, Wang D, Cai G, et al. (2016). Fast and sensitive detection of foodborne pathogen using
640 electrochemical impedance analysis, urease catalysis and microfluidics. *Biosens*
641 *Bioelectron* 86:770-6.

642 Chen WT, Hendrickson RL, Huang CP, et al. (2004). Mechanistic study of membrane
643 concentration and recovery of *Listeria monocytogenes*. *Biotechnol Bioeng* 89:263-73.

644 Cheng C, Peng Y, Bai J, et al. (2014). Rapid detection of *Listeria monocytogenes* in milk by self-
645 assembled electrochemical immunosensor. *Sensor Actuat B-Chem* 190:900-6.

646 Cheng K, Chui H, Domish L, et al. (2016). Recent development of mass spectrometry and
647 proteomics applications in identification and typing of bacteria. *Proteomics Clin Appl*
648 10:346-57.

649 Chemburu S, Wilkins E, Abdel-Hamid I, (2005). Detection of pathogenic bacteria in food
650 samples using highly-dispersed carbon particles. *Biosens Bioelectron* 21:491-9.

651 Churchill RLT, Lee H, Hall C, (2006). Detection of *Listeria monocytogenes* and the toxin
652 listeriolysin O in food. *J Microbiol Meth* 64:141-70.

653 Curtis T, Naal RMZG, Batt C, et al. (2008). Development of a mast cell-based biosensor.
654 *Biosens Bioelectron* 23:1024-31.

655 Datta AR, Laksanalamai P, Solomotis M, (2013). Recent development in molecular sub-typing
656 of *Listeria monocytogenes*. *Food Addit Contam A* 30:1437-45.

657 Davis D, Guo X, Musavi L, et al. (2013). Gold nanoparticle-modified carbon electrode biosensor
658 for the detection of *Listeria monocytogenes*. *Ind Biotechnol* 9:31-6.

659 Ding J, Lei J, Ma X, et al. (2014). Potentiometric aptasensing of *Listeria monocytogenes* using
660 protamine as an indicator. *Anal Chem* 86:9412-6.

661 Donaldson JR, Hercik K, Rai AN, et al. (2015). *Listeria* and-omics approaches for understanding
 662 its biology. *Food safety: Emerging issues, technologies and systems* 135-58.
 663 Etayash H, Jiang K, Thundat T, et al. (2014). Impedimetric detection of pathogenic gram-
 664 positive bacteria using an antimicrobial peptide from Class IIa bacteriocins. *Anal Chem*
 665 86:1693-700.
 666 [EFSA] European Food Safety Authority and the European Centre for Disease Prevention and
 667 Control. (2015). *EFSA Journal* 13:4329.
 668 Farabullini F, Lucarelli F, Palchetti I, et al. (2007). Disposable electrochemical genosensor for
 669 the simultaneous analysis of different bacterial food contaminants. *Biosens Bioelectron*
 670 22:1544-9.
 671 Fratamico PM, (2008). The application of "omics" technologies for food safety research.
 672 *Foodborne Pathog Dis* 5:369-70.
 673 Gao HW, Qin P, Lin C, et al. (2010). Electrochemical DNA biosensor for the detection of
 674 *Listeria monocytogenes* using toluidine blue as a hybridization indicator. *J Iran Chem*
 675 *Soc* 7:119-27.
 676 Gasanov U, Hughes D, Hansbro PM, (2005). Methods for the isolation and identification of
 677 *Listeria spp.* and *Listeria monocytogenes*: a review. *FEMS Microbiol Rev* 29:851-75.
 678 Geng T, Morgan MT, Bhunia AK, (2004). Detection of low levels of *Listeria monocytogenes*
 679 cells by using a fiber-optic immunosensor. *Appl Environ Microbiol* 70:6138-46.
 680 Gomez-Sjoberg R, Morissette DT, Bashir R, (2005). Impedance microbiology-on-a-chip:
 681 Microfluidic bioprocessor for rapid detection of bacterial metabolism. *J*
 682 *Microelectromech Syst* 14:829-38.

683 Hajdukiewicz J, Boland S, Kavanagh P, et al. (2010). An enzyme-amplified amperometric DNA
 684 hybridisation assay using DNA immobilised in a carboxymethylated dextran film
 685 anchored to a graphite surface. *Biosens Bioelectron* 25:1037-42.

686 Hearty S, Leonard P, Quinn J, et al. (2006). Production, characterisation and potential
 687 application of a novel monoclonal antibody for rapid identification of virulent *Listeria*
 688 *monocytogenes*. *J Microbiol Met* 66:294-312.

689 Huang X, Xu Z, Mao Y, et al. (2015). Gold nanoparticle-based dynamic light scattering
 690 immunoassay for ultrasensitive detection of *Listeria monocytogenes* in lettuces. *Biosens*
 691 *Bioelectron* 66:184-90.

692 Ingianni A, Floris M, Palomba P, et al. (2001). Rapid detection of *Listeria monocytogenes* in
 693 foods, by a combination of PCR and DNA probe. *Mol Cell Probes* 15:275-80.

694 Jacobs MB, Cater RM, Lubrano GJ, et al. (1995). A piezoelectric biosensor for *Listeria*
 695 *monocytogenes*. *Am Lab* 27:26-8.

696 Jadhav S, Bhavne M, Palombo EA, (2012). Methods used for the detection and subtyping of
 697 *Listeria monocytogenes*. *J Microbiol Meth* 88, 327-341.

698 Jadhav S, Seviar D, Bhavne M, et al. (2014). Detection of *Listeria monocytogenes* from selective
 699 enrichment broth using MALDI-TOF mass spectrometry. *J Proteomics* 97:100-106.

700 Jadhav S, Gulati V, Fox EM, et al. (2015). Rapid identification and source-tracking of *Listeria*
 701 *monocytogenes* using MALDI-TOF mass spectrometry. *Int J Food Microbiol* 202:1-9.

702 Kashish, Soni DK, Prakash R, et al. (2015a). Label-free impedimetric detection of *Listeria*
 703 *monocytogenes* based on poly-5-carboxy indole modified ssDNA probe. *J Biotechnol*
 704 200:70-6.

705 Kashish, Gupta S, Dubey SK, et al. (2015b). Genosensor based on a nanostructured, platinum-
 706 modified glassy carbon electrode for *Listeria* detection. Anal Methods 7:2616-22.

707 Kavanagh P, Leech D, (2006). Redox polymer and probe DNA tethered to gold electrodes for
 708 enzyme-amplified amperometric detection of DNA hybridization. Anal Chem 78:2710-6.

709 Kim HJ, Bennetto HP, Halablab MA, (1995). A novel liposome-based electrochemical biosensor
 710 for the detection of haemolytic microorganisms. Biotechnol Tech 9:389-94.

711 Ko S, Grant SA, (2003). Development of novel FRET method for detection of *Listeria* or
 712 *Salmonella*. Sensor Actuat B-Chem 96:372-8.

713 Koo OK, Liu YS, Shuaib S, et al. (2009). Targeted capture of pathogenic bacteria using a
 714 mammalian cell receptor coupled with dielectrophoresis on a biochip. Anal Chem
 715 81:3094-101.

716 Koubova V, Brynda E, Karasova L, et al. (2001). Detection of foodborne pathogens using
 717 surface plasmon resonance biosensors. Sensor Actuat B-Chem 74:100-5.

718 Lathrop AA, Jaradat ZW, Haley T, et al. (2003). Characterization and application of a *Listeria*
 719 *monocytogenes* reactive monoclonal antibody C11E9 in a resonant mirror biosensor. J
 720 Immunol Methods 281:119-28.

721 Leonard P, Hearty S, Quinn J, et al. (2004). A generic approach for the detection of whole
 722 *Listeria monocytogenes* cells in contaminated samples using surface plasmon resonance.
 723 Biosens Bioelectron 19:1331-5.

724 Liebana S, Brandao D, Cortes P, et al. (2016). Electrochemical genosensing of *Salmonella*,
 725 *Listeria* and *Escherichia coli* on silica magnetic particles. Anal Chim Acta 904:1-9.

726 Ligaj M, Oczkowski T, Jasnowska J, et al. (2003). Electrochemical genosensors for detection of
 727 *L. monocytogenes* and genetically-modified components in food. Pol J Food Nutr Sci
 728 12:61-3.

729 Liu D, (2006). Identification, subtyping and virulence determination of *Listeria monocytogenes*,
 730 an important foodborne pathogen. J Med Microbiol 55:645-59.

731 Long Y, Zhou X, Xing D, (2011). Sensitive and isothermal electrochemiluminescence gene-
 732 sensing of *Listeria monocytogenes* with hyperbranching rolling circle amplification
 733 technology. Biosens Bioelectron 26:2897-904.

734 Martinović T, Andjelković U, Gajdošik MŠ, et al. (2016). Foodborne pathogens and their toxins.
 735 J Proteomics 147:226-35.

736 Marusov G, Sweatt A, Pietrosimone K, et al. (2012). A microarray biosensor for multiplexed
 737 detection of microbes using grating-coupled surface plasmon resonance imaging. Environ
 738 Sci Technol 46:348-59.

739 Mazzeo MF, Sorrentino A, Gaita M, et al. (2006). Matrix-assisted laser desorption ionization-
 740 time of flight mass spectrometry for the discrimination of food-borne microorganisms.
 741 Appl Environ Microbiol 72:1180-89.

742 Nanduri V, Bhunia AK, Tu SI, et al. (2007). SPR biosensor for the detection of *L.*
 743 *monocytogenes* using phage-displayed antibody. Biosens Bioelectron 23:248-52.

744 O'Grady J, Sedano-Balbás S, Maher M, et al. (2008). Rapid real-time PCR detection of *Listeria*
 745 *monocytogenes* in enriched food samples based on the *ssrA* gene, a novel diagnostic
 746 target. Food Microbiol 25:75-84.

747 Ojima-Kato T, Yamamoto N, Takahashi H, et al. (2016). Matrix-assisted laser desorption
 748 ionization-time of flight mass spectrometry (MALDI-TOF MS) can precisely

749 discriminate the lineages of *Listeria monocytogenes* and species of listeria. PLoS ONE
750 11:e0159730.

751 Ohk SH, Koo OK, Sen T, et al. (2010). Antibody-aptamer functionalized fibre-optic biosensor
752 for specific detection of *Listeria monocytogenes* from food. J Appl Microbiol 109:808-
753 17.

754 Palumbo JD, Borucki MK, Mandrell RE, et al. (2003). Serotyping of *Listeria monocytogenes* by
755 enzyme-linked immunosorbent assay and identification of mixedserotype cultures by
756 colony immunoblotting. J Clin Microbiol 41:564-71.

757 Poltronieri P, de Balsi MD, D'Urso OF, (2009). Detection of *Listeria monocytogenes* through
758 real-time PCR and biosensor method. Plant Soil Environ 55:363-9.

759 Pouillot R, Klontz KC, Chen Y, et al. (2016). Infectious dose of *Listeria monocytogenes* in
760 outbreak linked to ice cream, United States, 2015. Emerg Infect Dis 22:2113-9.

761 Radhakrishnan R, Michael M, Rogers S, et al. (2013). Detection of *Listeria monocytogenes* by
762 electrochemical impedance spectroscopy. Electroanalysis 25:2231-7.

763 Reyes-De-Corcuera JI, Cavalieri RP, Powers JR, et al. (2005). Enzyme-electropolymer-based
764 amperometric biosensors: An innovative platform for time-temperature integrators. J
765 Agric Food Chem 53:8866-73.

766 Sergeev N, Distler M, Courtney S, et al. (2004). Multipathogen oligonucleotide microarray for
767 environmental and biodefense applications. Biosens Bioelectron 20:684-98.

768 Schmelcher M, Shabarova T, Eugster MR, et al. (2010). Rapid multiplex detection and
769 differentiation of *Listeria* cells by use of fluorescent phage endolysin cell wall binding
770 domains. Appl Environ Microbiol 76:5745-56.

771 Sharma H, Mutharasan R, (2013). Rapid and sensitive immunodetection of *Listeria*
772 *monocytogenes* in milk using a novel piezoelectric cantilever sensor. Biosens Bioelectron
773 45:158-62.

774 Sharma PP, Albisetti E, Massetti M, et al. (2017). Integrated platform for detecting pathogenic
775 DNA via magnetictunneling junction-based biosensors. Sensor Actuat B-Chem 242:280-
776 7.

777 Singh AK, Ulanov AV, Li Z, et al. (2011). Metabolomes of the psychrotolerant bacterium
778 *Listeria monocytogenes* 10403s grown at 37°C and 8°C. Int J Food Microbiol 148:107-14.

779 Soni DK, Singh RK, Singh DV, et al. (2013). Characterization of *Listeria monocytogenes*
780 isolated from Ganges water, human clinical and milk samples at Varanasi, India. Infect
781 Genet Evol 14:83-91.

782 Soni DK, Singh M, Singh DV, et al. (2014). Virulence and genotypic characterization of *Listeria*
783 *monocytogenes* isolated from vegetable and soil samples. BMC Microbiol 14:241.

784 Soni DK, Dubey SK, (2014). Phylogenetic analysis of the *Listeria monocytogenes* based on
785 sequencing of 16S rRNA and *hlyA* genes. Mol Biol Rep 41:8219-29.

786 Soni DK, Singh KM, Ghosh A, et al. (2015a). Whole-genome sequence of *Listeria*
787 *monocytogenes* strains from clinical and environmental samples from Varanasi, India.
788 Genome Announc 3:e01496-14.

789 Soni DK, Nath A, Dubey SK, (2015b). Evaluation and use of *in-silico* structure based epitope
790 prediction for listeriolysin O of *Listeria monocytogenes*. Indian J Biotechnol 14:160-6.

791 Soni DK, Singh DV, Dubey SK, (2015c). Pregnancy-associated human listeriosis: virulence and
792 genotypic analysis of *Listeria monocytogenes*. J Microbiol 53:653-60.

793 Soni DK, Ghosh A, Chikara SK, et al. (2017). Comparative whole genome analysis of *Listeria*
 794 *monocytogenes* strains reveals least genome diversification irrespective of their niche
 795 specificity. Gene Rep 8:61-8.

796 Stasiewicz MJ, Den Bakker, HC, Wiedmann M, (2015). Genomics tools in microbial food safety.
 797 Curr Opin Food Sci 4:105-10.

798 Sun W, Qi X, Zhang Y, et al. (2012). Electrochemical DNA biosensor for the detection of
 799 *Listeria monocytogenes* with dendritic nanogold and electrochemical reduced graphene
 800 modified carbon ionic liquid electrode. Electrochim Acta 85:145-51.

801 Susmel S, Guilbault GG, O'Sullivan CK, (2003). Demonstration of labelless detection of food
 802 pathogens using electrochemical redox probe and screen printed gold electrodes. Biosens
 803 Bioelectron 18:881-9.

804 Taitt CR, Golden JP, Shubin YS, et al. (2004). A portable array biosensor for detecting multiple
 805 analytes in complex samples. Microb Ecol 47:175-85.

806 Tatituri RVV, Wolf BJ, Brenner MB, et al. (2015). Characterization of polar lipids of *Listeria*
 807 *monocytogenes* by hcd and low-energy cad linear ion-trap mass spectrometry with
 808 electrospray ionization. Anal Bioanal Chem 407:2519-28.

809 Taylor AD, Ladd J, Yu Q, et al. (2006). Quantitative and simultaneous detection of four
 810 foodborne bacterial pathogens with a multi-channel SPR sensor. Biosens Bioelectron
 811 22:752-8.

812 Tims TB, Dickey SS, Demarco DR, et al. (2001). Detection of low levels of *Listeria*
 813 *monocytogenes* within 20 hours using an evanescent wave biosensor. Am Clin Lab
 814 20:28-9.

815 Tolba M, Ahmed MU, Tlili C, et al. (2012). A bacteriophage endolysin-based electrochemical
816 impedance biosensor for the rapid detection of *Listeria* cells. *Analyst* 137:5749-56.

817 Tully E, Higson SP, O’Kennedy R, (2008). The development of a ‘labelless’ immunosensor for
818 the detection of *Listeria monocytogenes* cell surface protein, Internalin B Biosens
819 Bioelectron 23:906-12.

820 Vaughan RD, O’Sullivan CK, Guilbault GG, (2001). Development of a quartz crystal
821 microbalance (QCM) immunosensor for the detection of *Listeria monocytogenes*.
822 Enzyme Microb Tech 29:635-8.

823 Volokhov D, Rasooly A, Chumankov K, et al. (2002). Identification of *Listeria* species by
824 microarray-based assay. *J Clin Microbiol* 40:4720-8.

825 Wang D, Chen Q, Huo H, et al. (2017). Efficient separation and quantitative detection of *Listeria*
826 *monocytogenes* based on screen-printed interdigitated electrode, urease and magnetic
827 nanoparticles. *Food Control* 73:555-61.

828 Wang R, Ruan C, Kanayeva D, et al. (2008). TiO₂ nanowire bundle microelectrode based
829 impedance immunosensor for rapid and sensitive detection of *Listeria monocytogenes*.
830 *Nano Lett* 8:2625-31.

831 Warriner K, Namvar A, (2009). Why is the hysteria with *Listeria*? *Trends Food Sci Technol*
832 20:245-54.

833 [WHO SEARO] World Health Organization Regional Office for South-East Asia. (2017).
834 http://www.searo.who.int/entity/emerging_diseases/Zoonoses_Listeriosis.pdf?ua=1.
835 Accessed on 17 May 2017.

836 [WHO] World Health Organization. (2017). <http://www.who.int/ith/diseases/listeriosis/en/>.
837 Accessed on 17 May 2017.

- Wu LW, Liu QJ, Wu ZW, et al. (2010). Electrochemical detection of toxin gene in *Listeria monocytogenes*. Hereditas (Beijing) 32:512-6.
- Yang L, Banada PP, Liu YS, et al. (2005). Conductivity and pH dual detection of growth profile of healthy and stressed *Listeria monocytogenes*. Biotechnol Bioeng 92:685-94.
- Yang X, Zhou X, Zhu M, et al. (2017). Sensitive detection of *Listeria monocytogenes* based on highly efficient enrichment with vancomycin-conjugated brush-like magnetic nanoplateforms. Biosens Bioelectron 91:238-45.
- Zhu M, Liu W, Liu H, et al. (2015). Construction of Fe₃O₄/Vancomycin/PEG magnetic nanocarrier for highly efficient pathogen enrichment and gene sensing, ACS Appl Mater Interfaces 7:12873-81.
- Zunabovic M, Domig KJ, Kneifel W, (2011). Practical relevance of methodologies for detecting and tracing of *Listeria monocytogenes* in ready-to-eat foods and manufacture environments - a review. LWT-Food Sci Technol 44:351-62.

862 **Table 1.** Performance of various biosensors used for *L. monocytogenes* detection.

Detection technique	Bio-recognition event	Sample type	Analysis time	Detection range/limit	References
Optical biosensors					
SPR	Antigen-antibody	Culture	-	10 ⁶ cells/mL	Koubava et al. (2001)
Fibre-optic	Antigen-antibody	Culture	<20 h	10 cfu/mL	Tims et al. (2001)
FRET	Antigen-antibody	Culture	-	2.0 µg/mL	Ko & Grant (2003)
SPR	Antigen-antibody	Culture	<30 min	1×10 ⁵ cells/mL	Leonard et al. (2004)
Fibre-optic	Antigen-antibody	Hot dog or bologna	<24 h	10-1,000 cfu/g	Geng et al. (2004)
SPR	Antigen-antibody	Culture	-	3.5×10 ³ cfu/mL	Taylor et al. (2006)
Scatterometer	Phenotypic characters	Culture	5-10 min	-	Banada et al. (2007)
Epifluorescence microscope	DNA	Culture	90 min	10 ⁴ -10 ⁶ cfu/mL	Bhattacharya et al. (2008)
SPR	Antigen-antibody	Culture	-	10 ² -10 ⁶ cfu/mL	Poltronieri et al. (2009)
SPR	Bacteriophage endolysin	Mixed culture	<15 min	-	Schmelcher et al. (2010)
Fibre-optic	Antibody-aptamer	Ready-to-eat meat	-	~10 ³ cfu/mL	Ohk et al. (2010)
Electrochemiluminescence	DNA	Culture	5 h	~0.0002 ng/µL	Long et al. (2011)
Piezoelectric biosensors					
QCM	Antigen-antibody	Culture	-	1 × 10 ⁷ cells/mL	Vaughan et al. (2001)
Cantilever	Antigen-antibody	Milk	<1 h	10 ² cfu/mL	Sharma & Mutharasan (2013)
Cell-based biosensor					
Rat Basophilic Leukemia mast cell	Antigen-antibody	Culture	-	1 × 10 ⁻⁷ cells/mL	Curtis et al. (2008)
Ped - 2E9 cell	Cytotoxicity	Culture	3-6 h	24 - 98%	Banerjee et al. (2008)
Ped - 2E9 cell	Cytotoxicity	Food and beverage	4-6 h	10 ² -10 ⁴ cfu/g	Banerjee & Bhunia (2010)

863
864
865
866
867
868
869

Detection technique	Bio-recognition event	Sample type	Analysis time	Detection range/limit	References
Amperometric biosensors					
Immuno	Liposome	Culture	-	-	Kim et al. (1995)
Immuno	Nanowire-antibody-	Culture	-	1000 cells	Susmel et al. (2003)
DNA	bacteria	Culture	-	-	Ligaj et al. (2003)
DNA	DNA-daunomycin	Synthetic oligonucleotide	-	~1.4 fM/7 μ L	Kavanagh & Leech (2006)
DNA	DNA-biotin	Culture	<1 h	5 nM	Farabullini et al. (2007)
DNA	DNA-biotin	Synthetic oligonucleotide	-	1.0×10^{-7} - 8.0×10^{-5} M	Gao et al. (2010)
DNA	DNA-toluidine blue	Synthetic oligonucleotide	-	-	Wu et al. (2010)
DNA	[Co(phen) ₃](ClO ₄) ₃	Food	-	-	Wu et al. (2010)
DNA	DNA-biotin	Synthetic oligonucleotide	-	0.2 nM/500 μ L	Hajdukiewicz et. al. (2010)
DNA	DNA-methylene blue	Deteriorated fish	-	2.9×10^{-13} M/L	Sun et al. (2012)
Immuno	Antigen-antibody	Food	1 h	2 log cfu/g	Davis et al. (2013)
Immuno	Antigen-antibody	Milk	-	10^2 to 10^6 cfu/mL	Cheng et al. (2014)
Impedimetric biosensors					
Microfluidic channel	Microbial metabolism	Culture	1 h	-	Gomez-Sjoberg et al. (2005)
Immuno	Antigen-antibody	Culture	-	4.1 pg/mL	Tully et al. (2008)
Immuno	Nanowire-antibody-	Culture	1 h	10^2 cfu/mL	Wang et al. (2008)
Enzyme	bacteria	Culture	-	1.1×10^4 and 10^5 cfu/mL	Tolba et al. (2012)
Enzyme	Bacteriophage endolysin	Culture and milk	-	-	Tolba et al. (2012)
Immuno	Antigen-antibody	Filtered tomato extract	-	4 cfu/mL	Radhakrishnan et al. (2013)
Immuno	Magnetic nanoparticles-antibody-urease	Spiked lettuce	-	300 cells	Chen et al. (2015)
DNA	DNA-platinum nanomaterials-chitosan matrix	Milk	-	1×10^{-12} M to 1×10^{-4} M	Kashish et al. (2015a)
DNA	DNA-poly-5-carboxy indole	Clinical	-	10^{-13} M	Kashish et al. (2015b)
Microfluidic channel	Modified magnetic nanoparticles-antibody-urease	Spiked lettuce	1 h	1.6×10^2 cfu/mL	Chen et al. (2016)
Immuno	Immunomagnetic nanoparticles-urease-screen-printed electrode	Spiked lettuce	<3 h	1.6×10^3 cfu/mL	Wang et al. (2017)

Figure captions

Figure 1. Schematic representation showing common working design of biosensors for pathogen detection in food, human, animal, and environmental samples.

Figure 2. Types of biosensors used for *L. monocytogenes* detection.

Figure 3. Schematic representation of the geometry and signal transduction mechanism of SPR optical biosensors.

Figure 4. Schematic representation of the integrated bacterial enrichment/gene-sensing system with Fe₃O₄/Van/PEG nanocarrier (Zhu et al., 2015). Reproduced with permission by American Chemical Society.

Figure 5. Schematic representation of the bacteria enrichment using: A) direct Van-MNPs, B) multivalent brush-like magnetic nano-platform, C) gene-sensing of enriched bacteria using ECL, D) ECL signals for PCR products, and E) specificity statistical results (Yang et al., 2017). Reproduce with permission from Elsevier.

Figure 6. Schematic of the typical electrochemical biosensor cell. Analyte detection using three types of transducer (amperometric, potentiometric and impedimetric).

Figure 7. Photograph of the impedance arrays with (A) interdigitated gold microelectrodes (B) attached to a microfluidic chamber, (C) binding curves showing the normalized impedance signals from specific binding of *L. monocytogenes* (10³ cfu/mL) and (D) the corresponding binding curve parameter, (E) Real-time impedimetric response of the peptide sensor to various bacterial species (10³ cfu/mL at 100 Hz) along with (F) the binding curve parameter for impedance sensor responses to the corresponding strains. (Etayash et al., 2014). Reproduced with permission by American Chemical Society.

Figure 8. (A) Optical image of the biosensing setup, (B) schematic of the fabricated sensor array integrated within the microfluidic apparatus, (C) optical image showing sensor chip and microfluidic cell, (D) SEM images of the sensor array, (E) optical image of MTJ sensor before and after the detection of 100 nM target *Listeria* DNA, (F) magnetoresistive response curve of a sensor, (G) detection schematic with magnetic nanoparticles, (H) sensor response from a sensor

functionalized with *Listeria* probe with optical image of the sensor area after bead immobilization (in right panel), and (I) normalized signal from a sensor functionalized with *Listeria* probe (hybridized with 1 nM *Listeria* target DNA). (Sharma et al., 2017). Reproduced with permission from Elsevier.

923 **Figures:**

924

925

926

927

928

Figure 1/8

Figure 2/8

Figure 3/8

Figure 4/8

Figure 5/8

Figure 6/8

Figure 7/8

Figure 8/8