

USES OF ACETIC AND LACTIC ACIDS TO CONTROL THE MICROBIAL LOAD ON LAMB CARCASSES

A Thesis

Presented to the Graduate School
Faculty of Veterinary Medicine, Alexandria University

In Partial fulfillment of the
Requirements for the Degree

Of

Ph.D. of Veterinary Sciences

In

Meat Hygiene

By

Ghada Mahrous Ibrahim

2006

استخدامات حمض اللاكتيك و الخليك للسيطرة
على الكم الميكروبي الموجود على ذبائح الضأن

رسالة علمية

مقدمة إلى الدراسات العليا بكلية الطب البيطرى - جامعة الإسكندرية
إستيفاء للدراسات المقررة للحصول على درجة

دكتور الفلسفة فى العلوم الطبية البيطرية

فى

الرقابة الصحية على اللحوم و منتجاتها

مقدمة من

ط.ب./ غادة محروس إبراهيم

2006

Advisors' Committee

Prof. Dr. Mohamed Mohamed Mousa

Professor of Meat Hygiene

Faculty of Veterinary Medicine

Alexandria University

لجنة الإشراف

الأستاذ الدكتور / محمد محمد موسى
أستاذ الرقابة الصحية على اللحوم و منتجاتها
كلية الطب البيطرى
جامعة الأسكندرية

USES OF ACETIC AND LACTIC ACIDS TO CONTROL THE MICROBIAL LOAD ON LAMB CARCASSES

Presented By

Ghada Mahrous Ibrahim

For the Degree of

Ph.D. Veterinary Sciences

In

Meat Hygiene

Examiner's Committee:

Approved

Prof. Dr. Al-Said Abou-Zeid Al-Daly

Professor of Meat Hygiene, Head of Food Control
Department, Faculty of Veterinary Medicine,
Zagazig University

Prof. Dr. Ibrahim Abd-El-Tawab Samaha

Professor of Meat Hygiene, Faculty of Veterinary
Medicine, Alexandria University

Prof. Dr. Mohamed Mohamed Mousa

Professor of Meat Hygiene, Faculty of Veterinary
Medicine, Alexandria University (Supervisor)

5/11/ 2006

استخدامات حمض اللاكتيك و الخليك للسيطرة
على الكم الميكروبي الموجود على ذبائح الضأن

مقدمة من

ط.ب./ غادة محروس إبراهيم

للحصول على درجة

دكتور الفلسفة فى العلوم الطبية البيطرية

الرقابة الصحية على اللحوم و منتجاتها

موافقون

لجنة الحكم و المناقشة

الأستاذ الدكتور/ السعيد أبو زيد الدالى

أستاذ الرقابة الصحية على اللحوم و منتجاتها - رئيس قسم الرقابة
الصحية على الأغذية - كلية الطب البيطرى - جامعة الزقازيق

الأستاذ الدكتور/ إبراهيم عبد التواب سماعة

أستاذ الرقابة الصحية على اللحوم و منتجاتها - كلية الطب البيطرى
- جامعة الأسكندرية

الأستاذ الدكتور/ محمد محمد موسى

أستاذ الرقابة الصحية على اللحوم و منتجاتها - كلية الطب البيطرى
- جامعة الأسكندرية (مشرفاً)

التاريخ 5 / 11 / 2006

بِسْمِ اللَّهِ الرَّحْمَنِ الرَّحِيمِ

وَمَا أُوتِيتُمْ مِنَ
الْعِلْمِ إِلَّا قَلِيلًا

صدق الله العظيم

سورة الإسراء الآية رقم 85

"The Angels Spread Their Wings (out of satisfaction about what he/she does) for the Figure who is seeking Knowledge"

I dedicate my work for those who ask for Knowledge and ask Allah for his reward...



ACKNOWLEDGMENT

*First of all, my deepest thanks to our merciful **GOD**, who gives me the power and chance to fulfill this work*

*My deepest gratitude and heartily thanks to **Prof. Dr. Mohamed M. Mousa**, Professor of Meat Hygiene, Faculty of Veterinary Medicine, Alexandria University for his stimulating supervision, valuable and continuous share, interest and encouragement.*

My appreciation goes to all members of the Department of Food Hygiene, Faculty of Veterinary Medicine, Alexandria University for their unfailing help and the facilities they provided during the study.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
ACKNOWLEDGEMENT	I
TABLE OF CONTENTS	II
LIST OF TABLES	IV
LIST OF FIGURES	V
 1.0 INTRODUCTION	 1
 2.0 REVIEW OF LITERATURE	 3
 3.0 MATERIAL AND METHODS	 20
Collection of samples	20
Preparation of samples	20
Measurement of pH	20
Microbial Examination	20
Bacteriological Examination	20
Determination of total aerobic bacterial count	20
Determination of psychrophilic bacteria	20
Total Enterobacteriaceae count	20
Estimation of Coliforms	21
Detection of Salmonellae	21
Biochemical identification of Enterobacteriaceae and Salmonellae	21
Determination of <i>Staphylococcus aureus</i>	22
Identification of <i>Staphylococcus aureus</i>	22
Total mould and yeast count	23
Identification of mould	23
 4.0 RESULTS	 24
 5.0 DISCUSSION	 51
Measurement of pH	51
The total aerobic bacterial count	51

Total psychrophilic bacterial count	52
Total Coliform count	53
Total Enterobacteriaceae count	54
Salmonella count	55
<i>Staphylococcus aureus</i> count	55
Total Mould and Yeast count	56
Proteolytic and lipolytic bacterial count	57
The hygienic and economic importance of studied organisms	57
6.0 CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS	59
7.0 SUMMARY	60
8.0 REFERENCES	63
ARABIC SUMMARY	

LIST OF TABLES

	PAGE
Table (1): Means and standard errors of pH of examined lamb carcasses	24
Table (2): Statistical analytical results of means of total aerobic bacterial count (cfu/g) of examined lamb carcasses before and after application of acid treatments	25
Table (3): Reduction percentage in total aerobic bacterial count of examined lamb carcasses	26
Table (4): Statistical analytical results of mean of total psychrophilic bacterial count (cfu/g) of examined lamb carcasses before and after application of acid treatments	28
Table (5): Reduction percentage in total psychrophilic bacterial count of examined lamb carcasses	29
Table (6): Statistical analytical results of mean of total coliform count (MPN/g) of examined lamb carcasses before and after application of acid treatments	31
Table (7): Reduction percentage in total coliform count of examined lamb carcasses	32
Table (8): Statistical analytical results of mean of total Enterobacteriaceae count (cfu/g) of examined lamb carcasses before and after application of acid treatments	34
Table (9): Reduction percentage in Enterobacteriaceae count of examined lamb carcasses	35
Table (10): Statistical analytical results of mean of Salmonella count (cfu/g) of examined lamb carcasses before and after application of acid treatments	37
Table (11): Reduction percentage in Salmonella count of examined lamb carcasses	38
Table (12): Statistical analytical results of mean of <i>Staphylococcus aureus</i> count (cfu/g) of examined lamb carcasses before and after application of acid treatments	40
Table (13): Reduction percentage in <i>Staphylococcus aureus</i> count of examined lamb carcasses	41
Table (14): Statistical analytical results of mean of total yeast and mould count (cfu/g) of examined lamb carcasses before and after application of acid treatments	43
Table (15): Reduction percentage in yeast and mould count of examined lamb carcasses	44
Table (16): Statistical analytical results of total proteolytic and lipolytic counts (cfu/g) of examined lamb carcasses	46
Table (17): Incidence of identified Enterobacteriaceae isolated from examined samples of lamb carcasses	48
Table (18): Incidence of identified Salmonella enteritidis isolated from examined samples of lamb carcasses	49
Table (19): Incidence of identified <i>Staphylococcus aureus</i> isolated from examined samples of lamb carcasses	49
Table (20): Incidence of identified moulds isolated from examined samples of lamb carcasses	50

LIST OF FIGURES

	PAGE
Fig. (1): Reduction percentage in total aerobic bacterial count of examined lamb carcasses due to acid treatments	27
Fig. (2): Reduction percentage in total psychrophilic bacterial count of examined lamb carcasses due to acid treatments	30
Fig. (3): Reduction percentage in total coliform count of examined lamb carcasses due to acid treatments	33
Fig. (4): Reduction percentage in total Enterobacteriaceae count of examined lamb carcasses due to acid treatments	36
Fig. (5): Reduction percentage in Salmonella count of examined lamb carcasses due to acid treatments	39
Fig. (6): Reduction percentage in Staphylococcus aureus count of examined lamb carcasses due to acid treatments	42
Fig. (7): Reduction percentage in total yeast and mould count of examined lamb carcasses due to acid treatments	45
Fig. (8): Reduction percentage in total proteolytic and lipolytic counts of examined lamb carcasses due to acid treatments	47

1.0 INTRODUCTION

Meat is an important vehicle for food-borne disease such as salmonellosis and campylobacteriosis. Lactic acid decontamination (LAD) of fresh meat surfaces can be used as a part of hazard analysis and critical control point (HACCP) schemes to reduce the number of pathogens on freshly slaughtered meat carcasses. Lactic acid is suitable for this purpose because it is a natural constituent of meat and a substance generally recognized as safe.

Preservation of foods has long employed a combination of factors in which acids have played an important role (*Knochel and Gould, 1995*).

Other acids including acetic, fumaric, propionic and lactic, are often added to foods to prevent or delay the growth of pathogenic or spoilage bacteria. The inhibitory effect of acids on microbial growth has long been used to preserve foods from spoilage. While much of the effect can be accounted for by pH, it is well known that different organic acids vary considerably in their inhibitory effects (*Podolak et al., 1996*).

It is of considerable interest to efficiently use the combined effects of several factors that impose barriers to the growth of microbes. Whatever different organisms have demonstrated different ranking for the inhibitory effects of organic acids (*Chirife and Favetto, 1992* and *Matsuda et al., 1994*).

Acetic acid acts as a preservative and commonly known as vinegar, has effective antimicrobial capabilities due to its ability to lower the pH and cause instability of bacterial cell membranes. (*Luck and Jager, 1998*).

The external contamination of meat constitutes a constant problem in meat developing countries where the abattoir itself there are large numbers of potential sources of contamination by microorganisms (*Davis et al., 2000*).

Organic acids as antimicrobial agent for surface treatment of fresh meat have been used to prevent the growth of bacteria during chill storage (*ICMSF, 1980*). Similarly, in Europe it is considered a harmless constituent (*Lueck, 1980*). This widely acknowledged absence of acute and chronic toxicity has led to the choice of lactic acid as decontaminating agent in food industry. Data are available on the potency of lactic acid sprays as carcass decontaminants for lamb and beef carcasses (*Fatema-Ali, 2001*).

When cross contamination occurs, it is recommended that effective trimming be conducted to reduce visible contamination combined with a decontaminating lactic acid spray (*Prasai et al., 1995*).

Moreover, the application of treatments to the same surface has been found to give greater reductions of bacterial numbers than any of the treatments alone (*Graves Delmore et al., 1998*). Lactic and acetic acids are generally recognized as safe food additives (*Anon, 1982*).

It is generally recognized that the microbiological effects of decontaminating treatments must be regarded as trivial when the numbers of bacteria recovered before and after a treatment do not differ by at least 0.5 log unit (*Jarvis, 1989*).

Organic acids were more effective as decontamination than many other techniques or compounds. In beef-processing facilities, both lactic acid and acetic acids are extensively used as a part of meat decontamination procedures (*Gorman et al., 1997*).

Dickson and Anderson (1992) concluded that a decontamination step during the slaughtering process can reduce contamination and possibly contribute to improvement of shelf-life and safety and should be an essential part of the slaughtering/dressing process. In general, washing and sanitizing agents have been effective in reducing bacterial populations and presence of pathogens on carcasses.

Organic acids are typically applied as a rinse to the entire surface of the carcass. Acetic and lactic acids have been most widely accepted as carcass decontamination rinses. Additionally, it has become widely accepted that the effectiveness of organic acids is best achieved shortly after hide removal, when the carcass is still warm (*Castillo et al., 2002*).

Numerous studies have reported on the effects of organic acids on general bacterial populations as well as certain pathogenic organisms (*Snijders et al., 1985; Dickson and Anderson, 1992; Hardin et al., 1995; Dorsa, 1996* and *Castillo et al. 2001*).

The globalization of the economy has resulted in meat and meat products being shipped over ever increasing distances to reach foreign markets. This has created a demand for efficient packaging concepts and technologies which will guarantee that products remain safe and wholesome over long periods of time. Significant progress has already been made in this respect by changing the gaseous environment at the product surface, in a way that hinders the growth of pathogenic or spoilage bacteria. Although the use of organic acid washes does not offer a "magic bullet" for the meat in eliminating pathogenic hazards, acid washes are effective in reducing the initial microbial load on the carcass. This reduction makes acid washing an effective critical control point in reducing microorganisms on the carcass.

An effective and inexpensive way to reduce the growth of pathogens on carcasses is the application of organic acids after the final trim wash. Two examples of commonly used organic acids are lactic acid and acetic acid.

The object of the current research was to evaluate the effectiveness of acetic and lactic acids on microbial loads and characteristics of lamb carcasses treated. Consumer demand for a safe meat supply obviates the need for antimicrobial measures in the manufacturing process. So, the present study was planned to throw light on the uses of acetic and lactic acids to control the microbial load on lamb carcasses.