Study of growth potential of *Listeria monocytogenes* in low fat salami: an innovative Italian meat product
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Abstract

In the last years, consequently to EC Regulation no. 1924/2006 on nutrition and health claims made on foods, some Italian food businesses operators (FBOs) leaders in the meat sector, invested in research to develop innovative products such as low fat salami, containing up to 30% less fat than the traditional one. For FBOs it is essential to demonstrate for each production process whether the substrate allows the growth of *L. monocytogenes* and whether *L. monocytogenes* could reach or exceed the limit of 100 cfu g⁻¹ at the end of the shelf life, as stated by EC Regulation no. 2073/2005. In the present study, the growth potential of *L. monocytogenes* during the shelf life of low fat salami packed in modified atmosphere was evaluated. The results show that the product is unable to support the growth of pathogen, even if the storage temperature is between 8 and 12°C.

Introduction

According to EC Regulation No. 1924/2006 (European Commission, 2006b) on nutrition and health claims made on foods, the food business operators (FBOs) must deliver health-oriented goods to the consumer. Following this regulation, some Italian company’s leader in the meat sector invested to design innovative products: this is the case of *low fat Salami*, a cured salami that contains up to 30% less fat than the traditional one. The low fat Salami is a dry sausage traditionally manufactured using raw pork (meat and fat), salt and spices. It relies on a decrease of pH and water activity (a_w) duringfermentation and drying both for its quality and safety attributes. Foodborne pathogens, such as *Listeria monocytogenes*, may contaminate these products through raw meat, ingredients or processing equipment, and/or through post-processing contamination (Barbuti and Parolari, 2002). In fact, *L. monocytogenes* may survive or grow in products across a wide range of pH and a_w, even in the presence of nitrite and nitrate salts, and at refrigeration temperatures; they may also persist on contaminated surfaces of processing plants for long periods of time (Peccio et al., 2003; EUCL, 2008). The slicing operation is one of the steps in preparing sliced ready-to-eat (RTE) meat products such as ham, salami, bologna, and other restructured meat available in the supermarket refrigerated food section. Slicing is an important stage to check for *L. monocytogenes* contamination, since it is the last processing step, without further thermal treatment, before consumption (Lin et al., 2006). Recently, particular attention has been paid in checking for *L. monocytogenes* in RTE meat products, such as salami, as a consequence of several listeriosis outbreaks that have occurred due to the consumption of these products (European Commission, 2005). After the publication of EC Regulation No. 2073/2005 amended by EC Regulation No. 1441/2007 (European Commission, 2005, 2007) the tolerance level of 100 cfu g⁻¹ in some RTE meat products, including salami and fermented sausages, was introduced. Thus, for the first time, RTE foods were legislatively distinguished into those that support the growth of *L. monocytogenes* and those that do not support the growth of *L. monocytogenes*. Products with pH 4.4 or a_w 0.92, products with pH 5.0 and a_w 0.94 and products with a shelf-life of less than five days are automatically considered to belong to the category of RTE foods that do not support the growth of *L. monocytogenes*. The regulation also states that other categories of products can also belong to this category, subject to scientific justification. However, one of the limit is represented by the difficulty to find these studies both in literature or documents which actually are comparable with the product under study. For these reasons, the present study aims at evaluating the growth potential of *L. monocytogenes* during the shelf life of low fat salami, sliced and packed in modified atmosphere. This paper proposes to be a useful scientific tool for food manufacturers for produce RTE meat products with similar characteristics, to demonstrate whether their product supports the growth of *L. monocytogenes* or not, according to EC Regulation No. 2073/2005 (European Commission, 2005).

Materials and Methods

Salami samples

Low fat salami is an Hungarian style salami, made by minced pork meat and fat, supplemented with nitrite and nitrate salt (0.03%, resulting in 150 ppm sodium nitrite and 150 ppm potassium nitrate) (European Commission, 2006a), lyophilised microbial cultures of *Staphylococcus xylosus* and *Lactobacillus sakei* at a concentration of 10⁶ cfu g⁻¹, sodium chloride (3%), a mixture of dextrose and sucrose (1.3%), ascorbic acid, and flavouring. The diameter of low fat salami is ca. 18 cm, while the length is ca. 40 cm, the initial weight is approximately 4.7 kg. The ripening of salami is carried out at 15°C for 20 days, to obtain a weight loss of 0.9 kg. At the end of the process low fat salami is sliced and ca. 100 g of product are tray-packed in modified atmosphere (30% CO₂ and 70% N₂). To simulate *L. monocytogenes* post-process contamination, three batches, obtained from a commercial processing plant, were used for this trial. Each batch was formed by 42 trays of sliced salami, packed in modified atmosphere.

Bacterial cultures and inoculum preparation

A multi-strain cocktail of *L. monocytogenes* (ATCC® 19115™, Lm46113 and Lm168619 from the Istituto Zootecnico e di Microbiologia della Lombardia...
Lombardi e dell’Emilia Romagna collection), was used in these experiments. Each stock cultures were kept frozen (-80°C) in Brain Heart Infusion (BHI; Oxoid, Basingstoke, UK) supplemented with 20% glycerol, and were regenerated by transferring into BHI and incubating at 37°C for 24 h. Aliquots of the activated cultures were transferred into a plastic tube (EuroClone, Milano, Italy) containing BHI and incubated at 8°C for 18-20 h. The cultures were combined in equal quantity from each of the three strains at the same concentration (ca. 7 log cfu g⁻¹). The multi-strain cocktail was centrifuged for 60 min at 4°C, 4000 rpm and the supernatant fluids were immediately drawn off and discarded. The pellet was washed with sterile physiological solution (H₂O with 0.9% NaCl), centrifuged as previously described, re-suspended in sterile physiological solution and appropriately diluted. Counts were confirmed by serial decimal dilution and inoculation in Agar Listeria Ottoviani Agosti (ALOA; Microbiol Diagnostic, Cagliari, Italy) plates incubated at 37°C for 24-48 h.

Surface inoculation of sliced salami

The trays of sliced salami were aseptically opened and the slices were inoculated on the top surface with 1% v/v of the multi-strain cocktail of L. monocytogenes to a final concentration of ca. 1.5-2 log cfu g⁻¹ (contaminated samples) or with 1% v/v of the sterile physiological solution (control samples). The inoculum was distributed over the entire surface with a sterile L-shaped plastic cell spreader (Incofar, Modena, Italy). The trays were placed into a laminar-flow hood and kept for 5 min at room temperature (22±2°C) to allow the bacteria to stick on the slices. The slices were then re-packed into sterile polyethylene bags in modified atmosphere (30%CO₂, 70%N₂) using S100-Tecnovac equipment (Tecnovac, Grassobbio, BG, Italy).

Storage condition and sampling time

The manufacturer has defined for the product a shelf life of 90 days. The packages of sliced salami were stored at 8°C for 7 days, and at 12°C for the remaining storage time (83 days) (EUCRL, 2008). All analyses were carried out with three technical replicates for each batch (N=3 batch; n=3 replicates per sampling time). Microbiological analysis was conducted for each batch using triplicate samples and duplicate plating of each dilution. Microbiological analyses were performed at 0, 15, 30, 45, 60, 75 and 90 days. Physical and chemical analyses were carried out at day 0, just after the inoculum, and at day 90, the end of the storage time.

Microbiological and physicochemical analysis

For microbial analyses, the slices (100 g) were transferred into plastic one-chamber filter stomacher bags (NEOMED, London, UK) and homogenised 1.3 (wtv) in sterile peptone water (PW) (CONDA, Madrid, Spain) for 3 min in a Stomacher 400 blender (Seward Medical, London, UK). Decimal dilutions in sterile PW were prepared from each bag. A quantitative analysis for L. monocytogenes enumeration was performed according to ISO 11290-2 (ISO, 1998). The pathogen plate count was performed also on control samples at time zero, to verify the natural meat contamination level. For the enumeration of lactic acid bacteria on control samples, the appropriate dilution was poured plating (1 mL) in de Man, Rogosa and Sharpe agar (MRS; Microbiol Diagnostic) and incubating in micro-aerophilic condition at 30°C for 48-72 h.

Physical and chemical analyses were carried out at the beginning and at the end of shelf life on control samples. The pH values were measured using a HI 223 Calibration check™ Microprocessor pH meter (Hanna Instrument, Smithfield, RI, USA) equipped with a Gel-Glass electrode (Hamilton, Switzerland). Water activity (aᵃ) was measured at 25°C with the aᵃ recorder AquaLab, series 3, Model TE (Decagon Devices Inc., Pullman, WA, USA) in accordance with ISO/FDIS 21807 (ISO/FDIS, 2004).

Statistical analysis

Counting results were expressed as colony forming unit (cfu) per gram. Microbial counts were reported in terms of log cfu g⁻¹. The individual means and standard deviations of microbial counts and physicochemical values were determined from the average of three samples at each sampling time for each batch. The data were statistically analysed using R statistical software version 2.7.0 (R Development Core Team, 2008). The differences between mean values were detected by the LSD Tukey’s test and evaluations were based on a confidence interval of 95%.

To determine the growth potential of L. monocytogenes it is recommended to calculate the difference between the median concentrations at the end of shelf life (day 90) and the median concentration at the beginning of the shelf life (day 0), in three replicates, for three batches (EUCRL, 2008).

Results

To evaluate the intrinsic properties of low fat salami, for all three batches, pH and aᵃ were measured (Table 1) in control samples. At the beginning of the shelf life, the average values of pH and aᵃ in sliced salami was 5.00±0.10 (range 4.82-5.11) and 0.945±0.005 (range 0.936-0.951) respectively. At the end of the shelf life, no statistical difference (P>0.05) was observed for pH average. The aᵃ decreased (P<0.05) to 0.939±0.003 (range 0.935-0.949) at the end of shelf life.

To evaluate the background microbiota, the populations of lactic acid bacteria during the shelf life were investigated (Table 2). The average of lactic acid bacteria count decreased (P<0.05) from 7.85±0.20 log cfu g⁻¹ (range 7.44-8.14 log cfu g⁻¹) to 7.43±0.15 log cfu g⁻¹ (range 7.17-7.6) during the shelf life of sliced salami stored at low temperatures. Direct plating of control samples revealed L. monocytogenes absence (<0.47 log cfu g⁻¹) (data not shown).

The averages of pathogen count, in contaminated samples, are shown in Table 2. During the shelf life of sliced salami, L. monocytogenes artificially inoculated had decreased to below the level of detection (<0.47 log cfu g⁻¹). At day 0 the median concentration of L. monocytogenes was 1.77 log cfu g⁻¹ (range 1.77-1.83 log cfu g⁻¹), 1.38 log cfu g⁻¹ (range 1.25-1.68 log cfu g⁻¹) and 1.65 log cfu g⁻¹ (range 1.51-1.77 log cfu g⁻¹) for batch 1, 2 and 3 respectively. The standard deviations between the three results at day 0 was less than 0.3 log cfu g⁻¹.

Table 1. Average of pH and aᵃ values of salami sliced at the beginning (day 0) and at the end (day 90) of the shelf life. Values are mean±standard deviation of three replicates samples for each batch.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>Shelf life (days)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>pH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Batch 1</td>
<td>4.87±0.04</td>
<td>4.87±0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Batch 2</td>
<td>5.09±0.02</td>
<td>5.14±0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Batch 3</td>
<td>5.05±0.05</td>
<td>5.00±0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aᵃ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Batch 1</td>
<td>0.939±0.005</td>
<td>0.944±0.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Batch 2</td>
<td>0.947±0.001</td>
<td>0.936±0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Batch 3</td>
<td>0.950±0.001</td>
<td>0.949±0.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Means with different lowercase letters within a column for each parameter are significantly different (P<0.05); A,Bmeans with different uppercase letters within a row for each parameter are significantly different (P<0.05).
Table 2. Average of lactic acid bacteria and \textit{L. monocytogenes} counts of sliced salami during the shelf life. Values are means log cfu g\(^{-1}\)±standard deviation of three replicates samples for each batch.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organism (log cfu g(^{-1}))</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>15</th>
<th>30</th>
<th>45</th>
<th>60</th>
<th>75</th>
<th>90</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lab</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Batch 1</td>
<td>7.91±0.11(^{aA})</td>
<td>7.22±0.15(^{aA})</td>
<td>7.63±0.22(^{aA})</td>
<td>7.44±0.15(^{aA})</td>
<td>7.19±0.30(^{aA})</td>
<td>7.38±0.22(^{aA})</td>
<td>7.34±0.12(^{aA})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Batch 2</td>
<td>7.84±0.14(^{aA})</td>
<td>7.78±0.29(^{aA})</td>
<td>7.60±0.09(^{aA})</td>
<td>7.36±0.30(^{aA})</td>
<td>7.54±0.37(^{aA})</td>
<td>8.06±0.06(^{aA})</td>
<td>7.54±0.05(^{aA})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Batch 3</td>
<td>7.81±0.35(^{aA})</td>
<td>7.58±0.15(^{aA})</td>
<td>7.04±0.21(^{aA})</td>
<td>7.35±0.60(^{aA})</td>
<td>7.46±0.08(^{aA})</td>
<td>7.10±0.33(^{aA})</td>
<td>7.42±0.21(^{aA})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lm</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Batch 1</td>
<td>1.79±0.03(^{aA})</td>
<td>1.54±0.20(^{aA})</td>
<td>1.20±0.08(^{aA})</td>
<td>1.07±0.00(^{aA})</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td>ND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Batch 2</td>
<td>1.44±0.22(^{aA})</td>
<td>1.31±0.21(^{aA})</td>
<td>1.46±0.09(^{aA})</td>
<td>1.68±0.06(^{aA})</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td>ND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Batch 3</td>
<td>1.04±0.15(^{aA})</td>
<td>1.47±0.09(^{aA})</td>
<td>1.39±0.22(^{aA})</td>
<td>0.97±0.17(^{aA})</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td>ND</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Lab, lactic acid bacteria; Lm, \textit{L. monocytogenes}; ND, not detected by either direct plating. \(^{a}\)Means with different lowercase letters within a column for each organism are significantly different (P<0.05); \(^{A}\)-\(^{C}\)means with different uppercase letters within a row for each organism are significantly different (P<0.05).

Discussion

The prevalence and level of \textit{L. monocytogenes} in RTE meat products, in which can survive for long periods are well documented (Gianfranceschi et al., 2006). In agreement with Vorst et al. (2006) post-processing manipulation, such as slicing and packaging of RTE meat products can enable cross-contamination and serve as a vector for the spread of pathogenic bacteria. Thus, to evaluate the growth potential of \textit{L. monocytogenes} in low fat salami, a microbiological challenge test was carried out. A mixed inoculum of at least three strains is issued in standard microbial challenge protocol (EUCRL, 2008).

By comparing the results obtained from the analysis of the three batches, an interbatch variability of the physicochemical properties should be noted (Table 1). At the beginning of the shelf life, the physicochemical properties of batch 1 were statistically different from those of batches 2 and 3; this can be explained by the heterogeneity of the food products: differences in the intrinsic factors of the food product are inevitable. However, no difference was detected in the concentration of LAB and \textit{L. monocytogenes} measured in the same batches at the beginning of shelf life (Table 2).

The results illustrate the importance of analysing various replicates per batch and of using several batches per product, in order to establish the inherent variability in growth potential linked to the product and its processing or storage conditions, as recommended by Annex II on challenge testing of EC Regulation 2073/2005 (European Commission, 2005) and in agreement with Vermeulen et al. (2011).

The physicochemical and microbiological properties of sliced salami investigated in this study are in agreement with those obtained by other authors (Aquilanti et al., 2007) in similar products. Otherwise, the physicochemical properties of salami (pH 5.00±0.10 and \(a_w\) 0.945±0.005) are not sufficient to justify the pathogen inactivation. In fact, it is already proved that \textit{L. monocytogenes} is able to survive in environments with pH and \(a_w\) values lower than those found in this study (Ross et al., 2000). Many studies show that the inactivation of \textit{L. monocytogenes} could be explained by different factors, such as reductions of pH (Cole et al., 1990) and \(a_w\) (Glass and Doyle, 1991; Sabatakou et al., 2001), addition of nitrite (Nyachuba et al., 2007; Koukou et al., 2009) and packaging in modified atmosphere (MAP) (Marshall et al., 1992; Sarheimer et al., 2004). Even the indigenous microbiota of RTE meat products could affect the behaviour of \textit{L. monocytogenes} (Devlieghere et al., 2001; Mellefont and Ross, 2007). In agreement with this study, low level of \textit{L. monocytogenes} is inactivated in presence of high concentration of lactic acid bacteria (Corna et al., 2011). Therefore, even the use of \textit{Lactobacillus sakei} strain as a starter culture in fermented sausages (such as in low fat salami) increased the inactivation of \textit{L. monocytogenes}, as Drosinos et al. (2006) reported. Otherwise, following the hurdle technology concept, the present study demonstrates that the combination of all these factors is crucial and needed for food stability and safety (Leistner, 2000).

Considering the results of the present study it is possible to establish that sliced low fat salami belongs to the category of RTE foods unable to support the growth of \textit{L. monocytogenes} in compliance with the EC Regulation No. 2073/2005 (European Commission, 2005). In fact, even if the values of pH and \(a_w\) and the storage temperature (8-12°C) of low fat salami would allow the development of \textit{L. monocytogenes}, this does not occur. This result indicates that the high concentration of lactic acid bacteria at the time of contamination (manipulation post-process) and the modified atmosphere packaging combine to inhibit the development of \textit{L. monocytogenes}, even if the EC Regulation No. 2073/2005 (European Commission, 2005) considers only the parameters pH and \(a_w\) to determine if the product is able or unable to support the growth of the pathogen. In literature there are several papers that assess the growth potential of \textit{L. monocytogenes} in fresh sauces for pasta (Grassi et al., 2013), mixed salads (Skalina and Nikolajeva, 2010) and vegetables (Sant’Anna et al., 2012), while studies conducted during the shelf life of Italian salami are not reported.

Conclusions

Collection and analysis of industry surveys and challenge studies will help to identify risk factors for contamination, and the impact of generic formulations on limiting the growth of \textit{L. monocytogenes} in both traditional and proposed new RTE foods. Any information arising from challenge studies is encouraged for the industry use as whole, but especially for the smaller industry or artisanal producers. More food surveys and challenge studies are encouraged by regional/national authorities through government. This may be particularly important for artisanal products that have little or no challenge study data. The larger food companies conduct most challenge studies, and usually claim that the information is confidential; one reason is that the formulation would have to be declared. One approach would be to declare the food tested to be anonymous and perhaps reference classes of product rather than specific product items. Since food safety is seen as a non-competitive aspect of food production, industry representatives should explore ways with international bodies such as the FAO, so that their research and survey data can be put in the public domain in a way that is
useful to other manufacturers and governments but does not compromise privacy issues and legal obligations (Luber et al., 2011). Then, the presented data are currently needed, given the lack of similar information in the literature and could be considered as guidance for producers willing to perform challenge tests on their products. In fact, our findings are a useful tool for FBOs that produce RTE similar to validate the shelf life against L. monocytogenes according to Reg 2073/2005.
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