JAAFR INTERNATIONAL RESEARCH JOURNAL
JOURNAL OF ADVANCE AND FUTURE RESEARCH
JAAFR.ORG | ISSN : 2984-889X
An International Open Access, Peer-reviewed, Refereed Journal

Analytical Techniques for Detection of Food Adulteration: A Comprehensive Review

Mr.J Marimuthu, Mr.P Logesh, Dr.V.S Saravanan.,Dr. M. Jambulingam*

Department of pharmaceutical analysis, The Erode College of Pharmacy, Erode-638112, The Tamilnadu Dr M.G.R. Medical University, Chennai.

*Corresponding author

Dr. M. Jambulingam

Email: marimuthu22122001@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

Food adulteration is a global public-health concern that compromises consumer safety, reduces nutritional value, and causes significant economic losses. The intentional or unintentional addition of inferior, harmful, or non-permitted substances into food products has increased due to high market demand, supply-chain complexity, and inadequate regulatory oversight. Detecting adulterants requires **reliable analytical methods** capable of identifying contaminants at trace levels with high specificity, sensitivity, and accuracy.

This review provides a comprehensive overview of **classical, contemporary, and advanced analytical techniques** used for the detection of food adulteration. Traditional methods such as physical evaluation, chemical spot tests, titrimetry, and gravimetry remain useful for rapid screening but often lack precision for complex adulterants. Instrumental techniques—including **UV–Visible spectroscopy, FTIR, HPLC, GC–MS, LC–MS/MS, ICP-MS, AAS, NMR, and chromatographic fingerprinting**—offer robust quantitative and qualitative analysis across a wide range of food matrices.

Emerging technologies such as **biosensors, DNA barcoding, Raman spectroscopy, hyperspectral imaging, metabolomics, and nanotechnology-based systems** enable rapid, on-site, and non-destructive detection of multiple adulterants simultaneously. Additionally, global food safety frameworks such as **FSSAI (India), Codex Alimentarius, and ISO standards** establish regulatory limits and guide analytical validation. By comparing traditional and modern methods, this review highlights their advantages, limitations, applications, and suitability for routine quality control. Future research opportunities include **portable multi-sensor systems, machine learning–integrated spectroscopy, blockchain-enabled traceability, and high-throughput screening tools.** Overall, this comprehensive review emphasizes the need for continuous development and adoption of advanced analytical strategies to ensure food authenticity and consumer safety.

KEYWORDS

Food adulteration; Analytical techniques; Chromatography; Spectroscopy; HPLC; GC-MS; FTIR; Food safety; Biosensors; FSSAI; Quality control; Authentication.

1. INTRODUCTION

Food adulteration is defined as the **deliberate or accidental addition of non-permitted, inferior, or harmful substances** into food products with the intention of economic gain or due to poor manufacturing practices. It affects a wide variety of foods, including milk, edible oils, spices, cereals, pulses, fruits, vegetables, beverages, honey, meat products, and processed foods. According to global food safety authorities, more than 25–30% of food products in developing countries are adulterated, posing serious health hazards such as metabolic disorders, toxicity, gastrointestinal diseases, carcinogenicity, and long-term organ damage.

In India, the **Food Safety and Standards Authority of India (FSSAI)** plays a major role in monitoring food quality, yet adulteration remains prevalent due to a massive food supply chain and limited rapid testing facilities. Common adulterants such as water, starch, detergents, urea, synthetic colors, mineral oil, melamine, argemone oil, artificial sweeteners, and pesticide residues often mimic the appearance and physicochemical properties of genuine food components. Therefore, highly sensitive and reliable analytical techniques are required for accurate detection.

The analytical evaluation of adulterated food involves a multi-step approach: sample collection, sample preparation, screening, confirmatory testing, quantification, and regulatory compliance. Classical methods such as chemical tests are still widely used due to simplicity and low cost; however, **modern instrumental techniques** provide higher sensitivity, specificity, and reproducibility. They enable the detection of trace-level contaminants, structurally similar compounds, and complex mixtures.

Advancements in spectroscopy, chromatography, mass spectrometry, molecular biology, and sensor technologies have revolutionized food authentication. Furthermore, rapid methods such as portable spectrometers, biosensors, and imaging systems allow real-time testing at markets, manufacturing units, and inspection checkpoints.

This review provides a detailed examination of all major analytical techniques—traditional, instrumental, and emerging—used for detecting food adulteration.

2. TYPES OF FOOD ADULTERATION

Food adulteration can be categorized into several types based on intent, method, and nature of the adulterant.

2.1 Intentional Adulteration

This includes deliberate addition of cheaper, inferior, or harmful substances to increase profit margins.

- Adding water to milk
- Mixing papaya seeds with black pepper
- Adding artificial colors to spices
- Substituting ghee with *vanaspati* (vegetable shortening)

2.2 Unintentional Adulteration

This occurs accidentally due to improper handling, poor hygiene, environmental contamination, or inadequate storage.

- Pesticide residues on fruits and vegetables
- Heavy metals in water and grains
- Microbial contamination

2.3 Metallic Adulteration

Occurs when metals such as lead, arsenic, mercury, tin, copper, and iron contaminate food. Analytical techniques like **AAS and ICP-MS** are used for detection.

2.4 Biological & Microbial Adulteration

Involves contamination by microorganisms (*Salmonella*, *E. coli*, fungi), parasites, or biological matter. Rapid microbiological testing and **PCR techniques** are used for detection.

2.5 Packaging Adulteration

Occurs when toxic chemicals leach into food from plastic containers, printed inks, adhesives, or low-grade packaging materials. **FTIR and GC-MS** help identify leached compounds.

2.6 Economically Motivated Adulteration (EMA)

A global concern where manufacturers intentionally substitute food components for economic gain. Examples include **melamine in milk** and **sugar syrups in honey**. EMA requires highly sensitive analytical techniques.

3. CLASSICAL ANALYTICAL TECHNIQUES

Classical chemical techniques remain essential for rapid screening due to low cost, simplicity, and suitability for field testing.

3.1 Physical Evaluation Techniques

These methods provide preliminary screening based on appearance, texture, density, and sensory characteristics.

- **Visual Inspection:** Used for detecting extraneous matter (e.g., stones, filth, artificial color patches).
- **Solubility Tests:** Used to detect chalk powder in flour or artificial colors in spices.
- **Float Test:** Used to detect lightweight adulterants (e.g., papaya seeds).
- **Density & Specific Gravity:** Useful in detecting oil adulteration (e.g., mixing *vanaspati* with pure ghee).

3.2 Chemical (Wet Chemistry) Tests

These tests involve reagents that produce characteristic color changes or precipitates.

Test Application Indicator Reaction

Iodine Test Starch adulteration in milk/ghee Blue-black color

Metanil Yellow Test Synthetic color in turmeric/dal Pink color with HCl

Urea Test Urea in milk Bromothymol blue turns blue

Argemone Oil Test Argemone oil Reddish brown color with Nitric acid

Vanaspati in Ghee Substitution of ghee

These classical tests are widely used by FSSAI as rapid screening methods in field laboratories.

3.3 Titrimetric Methods

Titrations determine the presence of acids, bases, salts, and peroxides.

Peroxide Value (PV): Measures oxidation in oils and fats; high PV indicates rancidity or adulteration.

Acid Value (AV): Indicates free fatty acid content; high AV suggests poor quality or adulterated oils.

Saponification Value: Helps identify oil substitution (e.g., coconut oil vs. Blend).

3.4 Gravimetric Techniques

Involve the measurement of weight before and after precipitation, drying, or extraction.

Ash Value: High ash indicates impurities such as sand or dirt.

Moisture Content: Excess moisture indicates dilution or microbial contamination.

Fat Extraction (Soxhlet Method): Used for quantitative analysis of fat content in various foods.

Gravimetric methods provide reliable quantitative data but require time and controlled laboratory conditions.

4. INSTRUMENTAL ANALYTICAL TECHNIQUES

Instrumental methods offer high sensitivity, specificity, precision, and reproducibility for detecting trace-level adulterants.

4.1 Spectroscopic Techniques

4.1.1 UV–Visible Spectroscopy

Principle: Measures absorbance of UV or visible light.

Applications: Detection of synthetic colors in spices and beverages; quantification of melamine in milk.

Advantages: Simple, rapid, and economical.

4.1.2 Fourier-Transform Infrared Spectroscopy (FTIR)

Principle: Functional groups absorb IR radiation, producing a unique "fingerprint" spectrum.

Applications: Detection of adulterated ghee with vanaspati; authentication of honey (detecting sugar syrups); detection of melamine.

Advantages: Non-destructive, minimal sample preparation, fast.

4.1.3 Near-Infrared Spectroscopy (NIR)

Principle: Measures absorbance of near-infrared radiation by molecular vibrations.

Applications: Detection of water adulteration in milk; differentiation of pure vs. Adulterated honey; analysis of fat and protein content.

Advantages: Non-destructive, instant results, portable devices available.

4.1.4 Atomic Absorption Spectroscopy (AAS)

Applications: Detection of heavy metal contamination (Lead, arsenic, cadmium, mercury).

Advantages: Highly sensitive; essential for safety monitoring.

4.1.5 Inductively Coupled Plasma Mass Spectrometry (ICP-MS)

Applications: Ultra-trace detection of heavy metals and toxic elements in virtually all food matrices (baby food, fruits, water).

Advantages: Detects elements at ppb–ppt levels (extremely sensitive); simultaneous multi-element analysis.

4.2 Chromatographic Techniques

4.2.1 High-Performance Liquid Chromatography (HPLC)

Applications: Quantification of synthetic dyes and non-permitted sweeteners; identification of melamine; analysis of preservatives and pesticide residues.

Advantages: High accuracy, quantitative analysis, suitable for complex foods.

4.2.2 Gas Chromatography (GC) and GC–MS

Applications: Identification of adulterated edible oils (fatty acid profile); authentication of honey (sugar syrups); analysis of pesticide residues and volatile compounds.

Advantages: High resolution, excellent for volatile adulterants.

4.2.3 Liquid Chromatography–Mass Spectrometry (LC-MS/MS)

Applications: Ultra-sensitive detection of antibiotic residues in milk; analysis of food toxins and chemical contaminants (dyes, preservatives).

Advantages: Extremely sensitive, can detect multiple adulterants in one run.

4.3 Molecular Biology Techniques

4.3.1 Polymerase Chain Reaction (PCR)

Applications: Meat species identification (pork/beef adulteration); detection of microorganisms; identifying plant adulterants in spices.

Advantages: High specificity, suitable for trace contaminants.

4.3.2 DNA Barcoding

Applications: Authentication of honey and spices; identification of fish and meat species substitution.

5. MODERN RAPID TESTING TECHNIQUES

These tools allow on-site testing, minimal sample preparation, and near-instant results.

5.1 Biosensors

Principle: Combine a biological element (e.g., enzyme, antibody, DNA) with a transducer for quick detection.

Applications: Rapid detection of melamine, pesticide residues, and pathogens (E. Coli, Salmonella).

Advantages: Highly sensitive, rapid results, portable devices available.

5.2 Lab-on-a-Chip (Microfluidics)

Description: Miniaturized devices integrating sampling, reaction, separation, and detection.

Applications: On-site detection of milk adulteration; rapid pesticide testing.

Advantages: Small sample volume, fast analysis (minutes), suitable for field testing.

5.3 Surface-Enhanced Raman Spectroscopy (SERS)

Description: A highly sensitive variant of Raman spectroscopy utilizing nanomaterials.

Applications: Trace detection of toxins, food dyes, and illegal preservatives.

5.4 Metabolomics and Chemometrics

Description: Advanced statistical tools to analyze complex food matrices and chemical fingerprints.

Applications: Honey authentication; differentiation of pure and adulterated oils; coffee/tea adulteration studies.

6. REGULATORY FRAMEWORKS AND STANDARDS

6.1 Food Safety and Standards Authority of India (FSSAI)

Key Aspects: Enforces FSS Regulations (2011), operates National Food Testing Laboratories (NFLs), publishes analysis manuals, and sets Maximum Residue Limits (MRLs).

Approved Methods: Physical tests, chemical analysis, Chromatography (HPLC, GC), Spectroscopy (AAS, ICP-MS), and Microbiological tests.

6.2 Codex Alimentarius (WHO/FAO)

Role: Global standard-setting body ensuring food safety and international trade; defines adulterants and establishes uniform analytical methods.

6.3 International Organization for Standardization (ISO)

Role: Develops standard test methods for food analysis (e.g., ISO 22000 for safety management; ISO 17025 for lab accreditation).

7. CHALLENGES IN FOOD ADULTERATION DETECTION

Complex Food Matrices: Multiple food components interfere with analysis.

Trace-Level Adulterants: Require ultra-sensitive, often complex, methods.

Emerging Adulteration Techniques: Fraudsters constantly introduce new chemical and biological adulterants.

Lack of Standardized Databases: Spectral libraries and fingerprints can vary between labs.

Limited Resources in Rural Areas: Access to advanced testing labs is often restricted.

8. FUTURE PROSPECTS

Future trends will focus on automation, digitalization, and portable tools:

AI-assisted Spectroscopy: Machine learning–integrated FTIR, NIR, and Raman spectrometers.

Digital Traceability: Blockchain traceability from farm to consumer.

Portable Sensors: Nanotechnology-based sensors and smartphone-integrated tools for field testing.

High-throughput Analysis: High-throughput DNA sequencing for complex food matrices.

9. DISCUSSION

Food adulteration is an increasingly complex issue driven by globalization, economic pressure, and sophisticated fraudulent practices. The analytical techniques reviewed in this article highlight a clear trend: **traditional methods** provide rapid screening, while **modern instrumental and molecular approaches** offer greater accuracy and reliability. Classical tests such as the iodine test for starch, the float test, and basic titrimetry remain useful for preliminary quality assessment—especially in small-scale industries and rural settings. However, their limited specificity and inability to detect trace-level contaminants make them insufficient for confirmatory testing.

Spectroscopic techniques, particularly **FTIR, Raman, and NIR**, have emerged as powerful tools because they are non-destructive, rapid, and require minimal sample preparation. These techniques are highly effective for identifying adulteration in oils, milk, honey, and spices. **Chromatographic methods**—including **HPLC, GC–MS, and LC–MS/MS**—remain the gold standard for accurate quantification and identification of a wide range of adulterants, such as synthetic dyes, preservatives, pesticide residues, and chemical contaminants. These methods offer exceptional sensitivity and precision, making them indispensable in regulatory laboratories.

Molecular biology-based tools such as **PCR, DNA barcoding, and next-generation sequencing** play a critical role in detecting species-level adulteration, particularly in meat, seafood, and high-value spices like saffron and black pepper. These techniques are essential where visual and chemical evaluations fail.

Recent advancements—including **biosensors, hyperspectral imaging, chemometrics, nanotechnology-based sensors, and smartphone-assisted detection**—represent a major shift toward rapid, portable, and real-time analytical testing. These innovations are especially valuable for field inspections, market surveillance, and primary food processing sectors.

Despite these advances, several challenges persist:

- Food matrices are inherently **complex**, making extraction and detection difficult.
- Fraudsters are using increasingly **sophisticated adulterants** designed to mimic authentic food components.
- Lack of **standardized spectral libraries**, limited laboratory infrastructure in developing regions, and the high cost of advanced instrumentation further complicate detection.

To ensure consumer safety and food authenticity, an **integrated approach** is required—combining classical rapid screening methods, confirmatory instrumental techniques, advanced data analytics, and emerging digital tools such as **blockchain traceability** and **AI-driven prediction models**. Continuous innovation, regulatory harmonization, and global collaboration are essential to effectively combat food adulteration.

10. CONCLUSION

Food adulteration remains a major global concern. Analytical techniques are critical for identifying adulterants and ensuring food authenticity. While classical methods offer rapid screening, advanced instrumental techniques—including chromatography, spectroscopy, mass spectrometry, molecular biology tools, and sensor-based systems—provide highly sensitive and specific detection. Emerging technologies such as nanobiosensors, hyperspectral imaging, and AI-assisted platforms are enhancing the speed and accessibility of food authentication. Continuous improvement in analytical science and regulatory integration, driven by bodies like FSSAI, Codex, and ISO, is crucial for achieving a safe and transparent food supply chain.

11.Reference

1. Kumar P, Sharma R. Food adulteration: a global public health concern. Food Control. 2020;118:107–112.
2. Singh A, Chaturvedi P. Analytical approaches for detecting food adulteration. J Food Sci Technol. 2019;56(11):5185–5194.
3. FSSAI. Manual of Methods of Analysis of Foods. Ministry of Health and Family Welfare; 2021.
4. Sharma H, Saxena R. Chemical adulterants in milk and their detection. Int J Dairy Technol. 2019;72(3):321–329.
5. Codex Alimentarius Commission. Food Standards and Guidelines. WHO/FAO; 2019.
6. Gupta S, Jain A. Detection of edible oil adulteration using spectroscopy. Food Chem. 2020;303:125–136.
7. Patel M, Rani S. Microbiological methods in food analysis. Crit Rev Microbiol. 2021;47(2):229–245.
8. Mahato DK, et al. Aflatoxins in food: challenges and detection methods. Toxicon. 2019;158:61–68.
9. Wood R, et al. Quality assurance in food analysis. TrAC Trends Anal Chem. 2018;105:11–23.
10. Li X, Li J. Chromatographic techniques for food fraud detection. J Chromatogr A. 2021;1635:461–470.
11. Santos PM, et al. Milk authenticity using FTIR. Food Chem. 2018;239:52–59.
12. Horwitz W, Latimer GW. AOAC Official Methods of Analysis. AOAC International; 2019.
13. Swamy R, et al. DNA barcoding for meat authentication. Food Control. 2020;113:107–128.
14. Zhang Y, Wang H. Advances in LC-MS for food contaminants. Food Anal Methods. 2018;11:201–215.
15. Tripathi A, Mishra HN. Smartphone-based adulteration detection. Sensors. 2021;21(3):820.
16. Khan M, et al. Raman spectroscopy in food authentication. Comprehensive Rev Food Sci. 2020;19(5):2474–2495.
17. Li S, et al. Hyperspectral imaging for food safety. Innov Food Sci Emerg Technol. 2021;67:102–151.
18. Vasconcelos T, et al. NMR applications in food adulteration. Magn Reson Chem. 2019;57(11):998–1012.
19. Das S, et al. Pesticide residue analysis using GC-MS. J Environ Sci Health B. 2020;55(4):323–331.
20. Karoui R, Blecker C. Fluorescence spectroscopy in dairy authentication. Food Bioprocess Technol. 2019;12:123–142.
21. Kalantari S, et al. HPLC in detection of sugar adulterants. Food Chem. 2018;251:99–105.
22. Alamprese C, et al. Honey fraud detection techniques. Food Chem. 2019;298:125–134.
23. Medrano M, et al. Meat species identification by PCR. Meat Sci. 2018;145:107–115.
24. Reid LM, O'Donnell CP. Near-infrared spectroscopy in food analysis. J Near Infrared Spectrosc. 2020;28(1):1–25.
25. Deepa M, et al. FTIR fingerprinting for spice adulteration. Food Res Int. 2019;119:201–208.
26. Singh AK, et al. Electrochemical biosensors for adulterants. Biosens Bioelectron. 2021;171:112–143.
27. Prieto N, et al. Chemometrics in food authentication. Food Chem. 2019;277:698–708.

28. Lourenco SC, et al. Nanotechnology in food analysis. Food Chem Toxicol. 2020;143:111–560.
29. Moreira M, et al. Coffee adulteration and detection methods. Food Control. 2021;129:108–147.
30. Rejeb S, et al. Blockchain for food traceability. Food Control. 2020;117:107–331.
31. Andrade MJ, Córdoba JJ. Proteomics for food authentication. Compr Rev Food Sci Food Saf. 2019;18(3):764–785.
32. Belete S, et al. Microfluidic devices for on-site testing. Anal Chim Acta. 2021;1151:338–346.
33. Wu L, et al. Melamine detection using biosensors. Sensors Actuators B Chem. 2020;304:127–202.
34. Almeida C, et al. UPLC-MS/MS in mycotoxin analysis. Food Addit Contam. 2019;36(4):647–664.
35. Shukla S, et al. Turmeric adulteration detection. J AOAC Int. 2020;103(5):1311–1320.
36. Nunes C, et al. Authentication of olive oil using spectroscopy. Crit Rev Food Sci Nutr. 2021;61(8):1303–1321.
37. Pereira E, et al. Antioxidant adulteration in foods. Food Res Int. 2018;114:123–133.
38. Sharma S, et al. TLC applications for food analysis. Indian J Chem. 2019;58(2):287–296.
39. Altun O, et al. Fish species substitution and DNA testing. Food Control. 2020;112:107–121.
40. Rajakumar G, et al. ELISA for detecting toxins in foods. Food Chem Toxicol. 2018;113:202–210.
41. Fernandes AM, et al. ICP-MS in heavy metal analysis. Talanta. 2019;195:613–627.
42. Rana A, et al. Quality evaluation of spices using imaging tools. Food Anal Methods. 2020;13:1413–1425.
43. Patel K, et al. Advances in adulteration detection of ghee. J Food Sci Technol. 2018;55:3800–3808.
44. Chakraborty P, et al. Fraud detection in fruit juices. Food Control. 2021;124:107–912.
45. Liang X, et al. MALDI-TOF MS in food authentication. Food Chem. 2020;318:126–479.
46. Ozturk G, et al. Artificial intelligence in food analysis. TrAC Trends Anal Chem. 2021;136:116–204.
47. Luo J, et al. Detection of synthetic dyes in foods. Food Chem. 2019;275:673–681.
48. Li Y, et al. Chloramphenicol detection using LC-MS. J Chromatogr B. 2018;1096:87–98.
49. Pandey R, et al. Mycotoxin detection by biosensors. Biosens Bioelectron. 2019;141:111–120.
50. Costa J, et al. Allergen detection using molecular tools. Food Chem. 2019;277:223–234.
51. FAO/WHO. Food Fraud Prevention Framework. FAO; 2020.
52. Mercolini L, et al. Untargeted metabolomics for food authentication. Food Control. 2021;123:107–933.
53. Shukla P, et al. Pesticide analysis using QuEChERS. Food Chem. 2020;337:127–766.
54. Hussain A, et al. Fluorometry in food authentication. Food Anal Methods. 2020;13:1223–1235.
55. Jha SN. Handbook of Food Analysis Tools. Springer; 2019.