
**Italian Journal of Food Safety**

https://www.pagepressjournals.org/index.php/ijfs/index

**eISSN 2239-7132**



***Please cite this article as:***

Piedra V, Usaga J, Redondo-Solano M, et al. **Inhibiting potential of selected lactic acid bacteria isolated from Costa Rican agro-industrial waste against *Salmonella* sp. in yogurt**. *Ital J Food Saf* doi:10.4081/ijfs.2024.12494

*Submitted: 23-03-2024*
*Accepted: 09-09-2024*

# Inhibiting potential of selected lactic acid bacteria isolated from Costa Rican agro-industrial waste against *Salmonella* sp. in yogurt

Valeria Piedra,[1] Jessie Usaga,[2] Mauricio Redondo-Solano,[3] Lidieth Uribe-Lorío,[4] Carol Valenzuela-Martínez,[2,3] Natalia Barboza[1,2]

[1]Food Technology Department, University of Costa Rica, San Pedro; [2]National Center of Food Science and Technology, University of Costa Rica, San Pedro; [3]Research Center for Tropical Diseases and Food Microbiology Research and Training Laboratory, College of Microbiology, University of Costa Rica, San Pedro; [4]Agronomic Research Center, Agronomy Department, University of Costa Rica, San Pedro, Costa Rica.

**Correspondence:** Natalia Barboza, Food Technology Department, University of Costa Rica, San Pedro, Costa Rica.
Tel.: +(506) 2511-7222
E-mail: natalia.barboza@ucr.ac.cr

**Key words:** bioprotective culture, food pathogens, *in vitro* assays.

**Contributions:** approved the final version of the manuscript, and agreed to be accountable for all aspects of the manuscript, and agreed to be accountable for all aspects of the work.

**Conflict of interest:** the authors declare no conflict of interest.

**Ethics approval and consent to participate:** not applicable.

**Funding:** this research was sponsored by the Vicerrectoría de Investigación of the University of Costa Rica, Project number 735-B9-457.

**Availability of data and materials:** data used to support the findings of this study are included within the article.

**Acknowledgements:** this work was supported by the technical assistance of Marcelo Jiménez at the Food Microbiology Laboratory in CITA, UCR.

**Abstract**
This study aimed to characterize lactic acid bacteria (LAB) isolated from Costa Rican agro-industrial waste and explore their bioprotective potential against *Salmonella* in yogurt. A total of 43 LAB isolates were identified using the 16S rRNA region. *In vitro* inhibition of *Salmonella, Listeria monocytogenes, Staphylococcus aureus,* and *Escherichia coli* was determined. 15 of the 43 isolates showed a good to strong antimicrobial effect against at least two pathogens. 14 selected isolates were evaluated for antibiotic resistance, gelatinase, and hemolytic activity. The bioprotective effect of the most promising strain, *Lactiplantibacillus pentosus*, was assessed against *Salmonella* sp. during yogurt fermentation. All the isolates were resistant to vancomycin and showed variable degrees of susceptibility to other antibiotics. All of the isolates were negative for gelatinase, and 5 isolates had no hemolytic activity. A significant inhibitory effect of *L. pentosus*_58(6)-2I ($p<0.05$) against *Salmonella* during fermentation was found, but pathogen reduction was limited to 0.611 log CFU/mL.

**Introduction**
In Costa Rica, more than 6.3 billion tons of organic waste are generated in the primary economic sector alone (Miranda-Durán *et al*., 2020), underscoring the urgent need for innovative waste management strategies. Agro-industrial waste is any substance or object that the holder discards or intends or is required to discard, considering residue as everything that is not the final (main) product of the process (Okino Delgado *et al*., 2015).
The isolation of lactic acid bacteria (LAB) from agro-industrial waste could be a feasible option to obtain microorganisms adapted to local conditions. Recent research (de Melo Pereira *et al*., 2018; Todorov *et al*., 2023) has shown that bacteria isolated from sources other than the gastrointestinal tract such as strains from local foods, traditional drinks, fruits, fermented process, and agroindustry waste (Santos *et al*., 2016; Wu *et al*., 2021; Amenu *et al*., 2024; Prihanto *et al*., 2024; Taboada *et al*., 2024) could be an option to obtain isolates with probiotic potential. Bioprotective potential is a desired feature that can offer an additional safety barrier against pathogenic microorganisms in addition to the thermal treatments used by the food industry.
The use of LAB in fermented products can contribute to preventing foodborne diseases (Martin-Garcia *et al*., 2023). Some members of the genera *Lactobacillus* and *Bifidobacterium* are characterized by the production of organic acids, specifically lactic and acetic acids, and some strains have been studied to prevent the growth of pathogenic bacteria such as *Salmonella* (Motahari *et al.*, 2017).
*Salmonella* spp. is one of the most frequent bacterial etiological agents of foodborne diseases in the European Union and the United States (EFSA and ECDC, 2021; Williams *et al.,* 2023). It is transmitted by the fecal-oral route, either directly or through food. Milk and milk derivative products have been implicated in the transmission of *Salmonella,* mostly due to the use of raw or inadequately pasteurized milk or contaminated after pasteurization (Olsen *et al*., 2004; Singh *et al*., 2018). A survival of *S.* Typhimurium for 23 days and *S.* Typhi during 16 days in a refrigerated (4°C) Egyptian yogurt has been previously reported (El-Gazzar and Marth*,* 1992).
Yogurt presents unfavorable conditions for the growth of *Salmonella*; however, a research study shows a maximum specific growth rate of *Salmonella* during yogurt fermentation that ranged from 0.26 to 0.38 for *S. Enteritidis* and from 0.50 to 0.56 log CFU/g/h for *S. Typhimurium* (Savran *et al*., 2018a). Moreover, it has been confirmed that *S. Enteriditis* is able to survive longer during yogurt storage when temperatures are low (*e.g*., 304 h at 4 °C, 60 h at 25 °C) (Savran *et al.,* 2018b). The use of contaminated raw milk or the incorrect application of hygiene practices could be a source of contamination (Kumbhar *et al*., 2009). Despite only one outbreak of salmonellosis in yogurt has been reported associated with cross contamination due to an open, blood-stained yogurt pot stored beneath a rack of raw lamb (Evans *et al.*, 1995), recent data show the presence of *Salmonella* in raw milk, yogurt, and other dairy products (Asfaw *et al*., 2023).
This research aimed to characterize LAB isolated from Costa Rican agro-industrial residuals and explore the bioprotective potential of a selected one against *Salmonella* during yogurt fermentation.

## Materials and Methods

### *Isolation of lactic acid bacteria from agro-industrial waste*

Agro-industrial wastes were collected from Costa Rican companies that produce value-added products from coffee, pineapple, orange, coffee, cocoa, and carrot (Table 1 and *Supplementary Table 1*). The colonies of LAB for each agro-industrial waste were obtained according to Wu *et al.* (2021). Selected colonies were identified by Gram staining and morphology. The cultures were preserved as glycerol stocks (20% v/v) at -80°C until examination.

### *DNA extraction and polymerase chain reaction amplification*

LAB were grown in De Man, Rogosa, and Sharpe agar (MRS) culture medium (Thermo Scientific™ Oxoid™, MA, USA) for 22 ± 2 h at 35.0 ± 0.5 °C. Using a miniprep extraction protocol (Birnboim and Doly, 1979), total nucleic acids were extracted from each isolate. The primer pair 27F/1492R was used to obtain a 1.5-kb fragment of the 16S rRNA gene (Edwards *et al.*, 1989). Polymerase chain reaction was conducted according to Wu *et al*. (2021).

### *Antimicrobial activity of lactic acid bacteria isolates against foodborne pathogens*

A modified methodology of the overlay assay (Hütt *et al*., 2006; Soleimani *et al*., 2010) was used to evaluate the *in vitro* antagonistic capacity of the LAB isolates against *Salmonella, L. monocytogenes*, *S. aureus,* and *E. coli*. Microorganisms used in the study included five *L. monocytogenes* strains (ATCC 19116 and wild strains isolated from meat products), five *Salmonella* isolates (*Salmonella* Typhimurium, *Salmonella* Typhi, and three wild isolates of an undefined serotype); all of them isolated from clinical samples, *E. coli* ATCC 25922 and *S. aureus* ATCC 25923. Pathogens were provided by the bacteriology collection of the Food Microbiology Research and Training Laboratory from the Faculty of Microbiology at the University of Costa Rica. In the case of *Salmonella* or *L. monocytogenes*, a cocktail suspension was used to inoculate. Before the experiments, the plates were incubated at 35.0±0.5°C for 24±2 h in MRS (Thermo Scientific™ Oxoid™, MA, USA) or Tryptic Soy Broth (TSB) (Thermo Scientific™ Oxoid™, MA, USA), respectively. After incubation, each LAB isolate was inoculated in a straight line 7 cm long and 0.5 cm from the edge, using MRS agar. The plates were incubated under capnophilic conditions at 35.0±0.5°C for 24±2 h. Before, 5 mL of Brain Heart Infusion agar (Thermo Scientific™ Oxoid™, MA, USA) was added. After solidification, a cocktail suspension prepared with the overnight cultures of each pathogen was added. The Petri dishes were incubated at 35.0±0.5°C for 24±2 h under aerobic conditions and they were examined for the presence of an antagonistic interaction between each LAB isolate and the pathogens. Antagonistic effect was visualized as a clear inhibition zone around the line of each LAB. Clear zones were measured (Pan *et al.,* 2009; Wu *et al.,* 2021; Duche *et al.,* 2023) and the isolates were classified according to the size of the inhibition zone. The 14 isolates showing the strongest inhibition halo against the pathogens were selected for safety testing.

### *Safety assays*

*Antibiotic resistance*

Antibiotic resistance of the LAB isolates was evaluated. A total of nine antibiotics of the main classes were used (Table 2). Each isolate was grown in MRS broth (Thermo Scientific™ Oxoid™, MA, USA) incubated at 35.0±0.5°C for 24±2 h and they were swabbed on Mueller-Hinton agar (Thermo Scientific™ Oxoid™, MA, USA) using a sterile cotton swab. Disks, impregnated with each antibiotic, were placed on the agar plates that were incubated at 35.0±0.5ºC for 24±2 h in capnophilic conditions. Diameter of the inhibition zones was measured after incubation and interpreted according to the standards established by the Clinical and Laboratory Standard Institute (Sharma *et al*., 2016). Experiments were performed in duplicate.

*Gelatinase and hemolytic activity*

The LAB isolates were grown on MRS agar (Thermo Scientific™ Oxoid™, MA, USA) at 35.0±0.5ºC for 48±2 h. For the gelatinase test, one colony from each isolate was inoculated into nutritive gelatin tubes and incubated for 7 days at 35.0±0.5 ºC. Every 48±2 h, tubes were placed in an ice bath for 15±2 min and observed for gelatin hydrolysis. Isolates were considered gelatinase negative if the gel remained solid after 7 days of incubation, or positive if there was hydrolysis (Klamm, 2019). The experiment was performed in duplicate. *S. aureus* ATCC 25923 and *E. coli* ATCC 25922 were used as positive controls, and an uninoculated tube as a negative control.

For the hemolysis test, 0.5 McFarland standard suspension was prepared for each isolate in 0.1% sterile peptone water. The suspensions were streaked as pure cultures on Columbia agar with 7% sheep blood and incubated at 35°C for 48 h (Maasjost *et al*., 2019). Color changes in zones on the blood agar indicated hemolytic activity: green zone (α-hemolysis), light zone (β-hemolysis), and no color change (γ- hemolysis). Two replicates were performed. *S. aureus* ATCC 25923 was used as a positive control (Aziz *et al*., 2021).

***Bioprotective effect of Lactiplantibacillus pentosus against Salmonella sp. in yogurt***

*Pathogen inoculation*

Five *Salmonella* strains (*S. enterica* serovar Typhimurium 93, *S. enterica* 750, *S. enterica* 80, and *Salmonella* DA36) were grown individually in TSB at 35.0±0.5ºC for 24±2 h. Stationary phase cultures were then mixed in equal proportions. From the initial *Salmonella* sp. cocktail decimal dilutions were made to obtain a population of 7 log CFU/mL. Finally, 1 mL was inoculated into 1 L of yogurt targeting an initial pathogen population of 4 log CFU/mL.

*Lactiplantibacillus pentosus inoculation*

*L. pentosus*_58(6)-2I was grown for 24 h in MRS broth at 35±0.5ºC. The inoculum was added to the yogurt (20 mL for 2 L of product) for an initial population of 6-7 log CFU/mL.

*Yogurt manufacture and inoculation*

A formulation of 95% skim milk and 5% skim milk powder was used. The mixture was pasteurized at 90±2ºC for 10 min and then cooled to 43-44 ºC. The commercial culture Yo-Fle (CHRHANSEN, Hørsholm, Denmark), (*Streptococcus thermophilus* and *Lactobacillus bulgaricus),* was added in the amount recommended by the supplier. The yogurt was divided into four portions and used in the following treatments: i) uninoculated yogurt; ii) yogurt inoculated with the *Salmonella* sp. Cocktail; iii) yogurt supplemented with 6 log CFU/mL of *L. pentosus*_58(6)-2I; and iv) yogurt supplemented with 6 log CFU/mL of *L. pentosus*_58(6)-2I and *Salmonella* sp. All treatments were incubated at 41 ºC in 8 oz containers until a pH of approximately 4.5 was reached. The assay was performed in triplicate.

***Microbiological analysis***

Treatments were sampled hourly during 6 h of fermentation. Decimal dilutions of each sample were made in 0.1% phosphate saline solution (PSA). LAB counts [including *L. pentosus*_58(6)-2I] were performed with the 3M Petrifilm method whereas *Salmonella* sp. was quantified on xylose-lysine/deoxycholate agar (Thermo Scientific™ Oxoid™, MA, USA) using the spread plate technique. Plates were incubated at 35 ºC for 48±3 h. The yogurt pH was monitored in the four treatments to observe the effects of *Salmonella* sp. or *L. pentosus*_58(6)-2I on the acidification curve during fermentation. The pH of the uninoculated yogurt, and of the yogurt with added *L. pentosus* was measured every 30 min using a HI2002-01 edge pH meter (Hanna Instruments, Woonsocket, RI, USA) equipped with a HI10530 electrode (Hanna Instruments, Woonsocket, RI, USA). The pH of the treatments inoculated with *Salmonella* spp. was measured every hour. The uninoculated yogurt's moisture, ash, protein and sodium contents were determined using standard AOAC International

methods (AOAC International, 2012). Fat content was determined in yogurt as previously described (Carpenter *et al*., 1993), and carbohydrate content was determined by calculation.

***Statistical analysis***

An analysis of variance (ANOVA) was performed to determine differences between the growth or death curves (log CFU/mL) at time 0 and 6 h of *L. pentosus*_58(6)-2I and *Salmonella* sp. in the yogurt treatments. ANOVA was also performed for the acidification curves (pH values at time 0 and 6 h). A significance level of 5% was established, with values of $p<0.05$ considered significant. When significant differences were identified, an honestly significant difference (HSD)-Tukey multiple comparison of means test was performed to determine the difference between treatments.

**Results**

At least 10 different species of LAB were identified from the agro-industrial wastes (Table 1 and *Supplementary Table 1*). Out of 43 isolates obtained from culture, 17 showed some degree of antagonistic activity against at least one of the tested pathogens. However, just 14 isolates were selected for further trials based on their antimicrobial effect against at least two pathogens (inhibition diameter larger than 6 mm). The only exception was *L. argentoratensis*_79(4)-2C (Table 1).

For antibiotic resistance, all the selected LABs were resistant to vancomycin. *L. paracasei* subsp. *tolerans* strains were susceptible to tetracycline but they were resistant to streptomycin, chloramphenicol, erythromycin and penicillin whereas the isolates *L. plantarum*_17-(4D), *L. plantarum* subsp. *plantarum*_71-6(2F), *L. argentoratensis*_57(7)-1H, and *L. argentoratensis*_79(4)-2C were resistant to ciprofloxacin (Table 2).

In the case of hemolytic and gelatinase activity, *L. paracasei* subsp. *tolerans* (2A2-B, IA2P, II-CI-C Y 11-C1-B) and *L. casei* ATCC 393 did not produce beta hemolysis and were negative for gelatinase activity (Table 3).

***Biopreservative effect of Lactobacillus pentosus during yogurt processing***

Based on the previous results, *L. pentosus*_58(6)-2I was selected as a potential biopreservative for yogurt. The nutritional profile of the yogurt used is summarized in Table 4. *Supplementary Figure 1* shows the pH of the four yogurt treatments during fermentation. The acidification curves were consistent with the profile provided by the reference starter culture after 6 h of fermentation at 41°C. There were no significant differences among treatments ($p=0.338$).

Total LAB counts differed significantly ($p=0.010$) among three of the treatments (yogurt inoculated with *L. pentosus* and *Salmonella* sp., yogurt inoculated with *Salmonella* spp., and uninoculated yogurt) after 6 h of fermentation. Specifically, there were differences in bacterial counts after 6 h of fermentation, between yogurt inoculated with *L. pentosus* and *Salmonella* sp. and yogurt with *Salmonella* sp. ($p=0.008$) (*Supplementary Figure 2*). However, these two treatments did not differ from the control (uninoculated sample) ($p=0.538$ and $p=0.108$, respectively). As expected, the initial LAB population was higher in yogurt inoculated with *L. pentosus* and *Salmonella* sp. than in yogurt inoculated with *Salmonella*. However, the LAB population stabilized after 2 h of fermentation and remained constant until the end of the process. This was consistent with the acidification curves since the pH values did not change with the addition of *L. pentosus* (*Supplementary Figure 1*).

*Salmonella* sp. survival in yogurt inoculated with *L. pentosus*_58(6)-2I was significantly lower ($p=0.019$) compared to the control (*Supplementary Figure 3*). However, the HSD-Tukey test did not show differences between pathogen populations at times 0 and 6 in either of the treatments ($p=0.331$ and $p=1.00$, respectively), and differences between the two treatments at time 6 h were not significant ($p<0.05$). There was a pathogen reduction of 0.611 log CFU/g in the treatment with *L. pentosus*_58(6)-2I and 0.017 log CFU/g in the negative control. The *Salmonella* population increased during the initial stage of fermentation (after 2 h of fermentation in the positive control and after 3 h in the negative control). However, after a longer period of fermentation, this population decreased, especially in the presence of *L. pentosus*_58(6)-2I.

**Discussion and Conclusions**

*L. paracasei* frequently exhibits broad-spectrum antimicrobial activity with simultaneous inhibitory effects against *L. monocytogenes*, *E. coli*, *S. aureus,* and *Salmonella* (Akpinar and Yerkliyaka, 2021), that is related with the production of antimicrobial compounds such as organic acids, bacteriocins and exopolysaccharides (Amini *et al.*, 2022). The antagonistic activity of *L. argentoratensis* is closely related to *L. plantarum* and it was recently classified as a new species (McFrederick *et al.,* 2018). Literature about the antimicrobial capacity of this species is relatively scarce; however, some studies have confirmed the antimicrobial capacity of some isolates against Gram positive and Gram negative bacteria (Siangpro *et al*., 2023). Recent advances in whole genome sequencing of *L. argentoratensis* are providing insights about the potential of this species as a biocontrol agent (Syrokou *et al*., 2021).

Vancomycin resistance found in this research was similar to previous reports (Guo, 2017). This resistance is intrinsic in nature and is given by the vanX gene which codes for the dipeptide ligase enzyme (Ddi) (Guo, 2017; Zhang *et al.*, 2018), and transfer to foodborne pathogens is not expected (Álvarez and Poce, 2018). LAB normally have more than 70% resistance to amynoglicosides (gentamicin and streptomycin) and ciprofloxacin, and low resistance to penicillin, tetracycline and chloramphenicol. Variability in antibiotic resistance among species may be related to intrinsic traits. For example, more than 68% of Lactobacillus species are resistant to ciprofloxacin due to the gyrA gene. The tet(M) and erm(B) genes of *L. paracasei* confer resistance to tetracycline and erythromycin (Guo *et al*., 2017).

Bacteria that produce total hemolysis in agar may contribute to anemia, inflammation, and edema, mostly due to decreased iron availability (Rastogi *et al*., 2021). Therefore, non-hemolytic LAB strains are considered safer for food applications. Some isolates from this study were classified as partial-hemolytic strains; however, this trait is normal in *Lactobacillus* and it is attributed to the generation of hydrogen peroxide (Aziz *et al.,* 2021). Also, no gelatinase activity was found in *Lactobacillus* (Aziz *et al*., 2021) due to its low capacity to hydrolyze tissue components. This feature supports that LAB strains are safe for food applications (Hashem *et al.,* 2020).

The pathogen reduction observed in this study in the presence of *L. pentosus*_58(6)-2I was greater than the decrease in *Salmonella* sp. due to the effect of low pH reported by Savran *et al.* (2018a). Other mechanisms not studied here that may explain the pathogen reduction include the synthesis of biosurfactant compounds, bacteriocins, and hydrogen peroxide, which have *in vitro* inhibitory effects against *Salmonella* sp. (Liu *et al.,* 2018). Moreover, the bioprotective effect of *L. pentosus* against *Salmonella* sp. was demonstrated by Motahari *et al.* (2017) using another *L. pentosus* strain. Further analyses are required to elucidate the causes behind the greater decrease in *Salmonella* spp. in the presence of *L. pentosus*_58(6)-2I.

The effect of a higher load of *L. pentosus*_58(6)-2I on *Salmonella* sp. survival during yogurt fermentation should be tested. If effective, this approach may be suitable if the sensorial properties of yogurt and acidification curves are not affected, and consumer acceptance is not compromised. *L. pentosus*_58(6)-2I should also be evaluated in other foods such as dairy products and fermented meats.

Likewise, other properties should be assessed to identify bacteria with probiotic potential. According to Todorov *et al*. (2023), evaluation under simulated gastrointestinal tract conditions, antagonism against pathogens, resistance to enzymes, presence of transferable antibiotic resistance genes, ability to reduce pathogen adhesion to surfaces, removal of cholesterol from surfaces, as well as taking into account the evaluation of the shelf life of foods and their sensory characteristics, are some characteristics that should be considered when evaluating the properties of new isolates.

**References**


Akpinar A, Yerlikaya O, 2021. Some potential beneficial properties of Lacticaseibacillus paracasei subsp. paracasei and Leuconostoc mesenteroides strains originating from raw milk and kefir grains. J Food Process Preserv 45:e15986.

Álvarez-Cisneros YM, Ponce-Alquicira E, 2018. Antibiotic resistance in lactic acid bacteria. In: Kumar Y, ed. Antimicrobial resistance-a global threat. IntechOpen, London, UK

Amenu D, Bacha K, 2024. Antagonistic effects of lactic acid bacteria isolated from Ethiopian traditional fermented foods and beverages against foodborne pathogens. Probiotics Antimicrob Proteins. doi: 10.1007/s12602-024-10231-5.

Amini E, Salimi F, Imanparast S, Mansour FN, 2022. Isolation and characterization of exopolysaccharide derived from Lacticaseibacillus paracasei AS20 (1) with probiotic potential and evaluation of its antibacterial activity. Lett Appl Microbiol 75:967-81.

AOAC International, 2012. Official methods of analysis of AOAC International, 19th ed. AOAC International, Gaithersburg, MD, USA.

Asfaw T, Genetu D, Shenkute D, Shenkutie TT, Amare YE, Habteweld HA, Yitayew B, 2023. Pathogenic bacteria and their antibiotic resistance patterns in milk, yoghurt and milk contact surfaces in debre berhan town, Ethiopia. Infect Drug Resist 16:4297-309.

Aziz G, Tariq M, Zaidi AH, 2021. Mining indigenous honeybee gut microbiota for Lactobacillus with probiotic potential. Microbiol 167:001032.

Birnboim HC, Doly J, 1979. A rapid alkaline extraction procedure for screening recombinant plasmid DNA. Nucleic Acids Res 7:1513-23.

Carpenter DE, Ngeh-Ngwainbi J, Lee S, 1993. Lipid analysis, p. 85–104. In: Sullivan DM, Carpenter DE, eds. Methods of analysis for nutrition labeling. AOAC International, Arlington, VA, USA.

de Melo Pereira GV, de Oliveira Coelho B, Júnior AIM, Thomaz-Soccol V, Soccol CR, 2018. How to select a probiotic? A review and update of methods and criteria. Biotechnol Adv 36:2060-76.

Duche RT, Singh A, Wandhare AG, Sangwan V, Sihag MK, Nwagu TN, Panwar H, Ezeogu LI, 2023. Antibiotic resistance in potential probiotic lactic acid bacteria of fermented foods and human origin from Nigeria. BMC Microbiol 23:142.

Edwards U, Rogall T, Blöcker H, Emde M, Böttger EC, 1989. Isolation and direct complete nucleotide determination of entire genes. Characterization of a gene coding for 16S ribosomal RNA. Nucleic Acids Res 17:7843-53.

EFSA, ECDC, 2021. The European Union one health 2019 zoonoses report. EFSA J 19:6406.

El-Gazzar FE, Marth EH, 1992. Salmonellae, salmonellosis, and dairy foods: a review. J Dairy Sci 75:2327-43.

Evans MR, Salmon RL, Nehaul LM, Mably S, Wafford L, Nolan-Farrell MZ., Gardner D, Ribeiro CD, 1999. An outbreak of Salmonella Typhimurium DT170 associated with kebab meat and yoghurt relish. Epidemiol Infect 122:377-83.

Guo H, Pan L, Li L, Lu J, Kwok L, Menghe B, Zang H, Zhang, W, 2017. Characterization of antibiotic resistance genes from Lactobacillus isolated from traditional dairy products. J Food Sci 82:724-30.

Hashem Y, Abdelrahman K, Aziz R, 2021. Phenotype–genotype correlations and distribution of key virulence factors in Enterococcus faecalis isolated from patients with urinary tract infections. Infect Drug 14:1713-23.

Hütt P, Shchepetova J, Loivukene K, Kullisaar T, Mikelsaar M, 2006. Antagonistic activity of probiotic lactobacilli and bifidobacteria against entero- and uropathogens. J Appl Microbiol 100:1324-32.

Klamm L, 2019. Klamm's microbiology laboratory manual. Division of molecular biology and biochemistry. University of Missouri-Kansas City. Available from: https://hdl.handle.net/10355/69341.

Kumbhar SB, Ghosh JS, Samudre SP, 2009. Microbiological analysis of pathogenic organisms in indigenous fermented milk products. Adv J Food Sci Technol 1:35-8.
Liu J, Gu Z, Lu W, Hu D, Zhao X, Huang H, Zhang H, Zhao J, Chen W, 2018. Multiple mechanisms applied by Lactobacillus pentosus AT6 to mute the lethal effects of Salmonella in a mouse model. Food Funct 9:2787-95.
Maasjost J, Lüschow D, Kleine A, Hafez HM, Mühldorfer K, 2019. Presence of virulence genes in Enterococcus species isolated from meat turkeys in Germany does not correlate with chicken embryo lethality. BioMed Res Int 2019:6147695.
Martin-Garcia A, Riu-Aumatell M, Lopez-Tamames E, 2023. Influence of process parameters on sourdough microbiota, physical properties and sensory profile. Food Rev Int 39:334-48.
McFrederick QS, Vuong HQ, Rothman JA, 2018. Lactobacillus micheneri sp. nov., Lactobacillus timberlakei sp. nov. and Lactobacillus quenuiae sp. nov., lactic acid bacteria isolated from wild bees and flowers. Int J Syst Evol Microbiol 68:1879-84.
Miranda-Durán S, Porras-Reyes L, Schmidt-Durán A, 2020. Evaluation of agro-industrial residues produced in Costa Rica for a low-cost culture medium using Bacillus subtilis 168. Tecnol Marcha 33:15-25.
Motahari P, Mirdamadi S, Kianirad M, 2017. Safety evaluation and antimicrobial properties of Lactobacillus pentosus 22C isolated from traditional yogurt. J Food Meas Charac 11:972-8.
Okino Delgado CH, Fleuri LF, 2015. Orange and mango by-products: Agro-industrial waste as source of bioactive compounds and botanical versus commercial description - a review. Food Rev Int 32:1-14.
Olsen SJ, Ying M, Davis MF, Deasy M, Holland B, Iampietro L, Baysinger M, Sassano F, Polk L, Gormley B, Hung MJ, Pilot K, Orsini M, Van Duyne S, Rankin S, Sobel J, 2004. Multidrug-resistant Salmonella Typhimurium infection from milk contaminated after pasteurization. Emerg Infect Dis 10:932.
Pan X, Chen F, Wu T, Tang H, Zhao Z, 2009. The acid, bile tolerance and antimicrobial property of Lactobacillus acidophilus NIT. Food Control 20:598-602.
Prihanto AA, Umam NI, Bangun JD, 2024. Unveiling the secrets of Indonesian fermented fish: characteristics of lactic acid bacteria, roles, and potential in product development. Food Biosci 61:104629.
Rastogi S, Mittal V, Singh A, 2021. Selection of potential probiotic bacteria from exclusively breastfed infant faeces with antagonistic activity against multidrug-resistant ESKAPE pathogens. Probiotics Antimicrob Proteins 13:739-50.
Santos TT, Ornellas RMS, Arcucio LB, Oliveira MM, Nicoli JR, Dias CV, Trovatti AP, Vinderola CG. 2016. Characterization of lactobacilli strains derived from cocoa fermentation in the south of Bahia for the development of probiotic cultures. LWT 73:259-66.
Savran D, Pérez F, Halkman AK, 2018a. Modeling the survival of Salmonella Enteritidis and Salmonella Typhimurium during the fermentation of yogurt. Food Sci Technol Int 24:110-6.
Savran D, Pérez F, Halkman AK, 2018b. Modelling survival of Salmonella Enteritidis during storage of yoghurt at different temperatures. Int J Food Microbiol 271:67-76.
Sharma P, Tomar SK, Sangwan V, Goswami P, Singh R, 2016. Antibiotic resistance of Lactobacillus sp. Isolated from commercial probiotic preparations. J Food Saf 36:38-51.
Siangpro N, Chuakrut S, Sirimanapong W, Tanasupawat S, Phongsopitanun W, Meksiriporn B, Boonnorat J, Sarin S, Kucharoenphaibul S, Jutakanoke R, 2023. Lactiplantibacillus argentoratensis and Candida tropicalis isolated from the gastrointestinal tract of fish exhibited inhibitory effects against pathogenic bacteria of Nile tilapia. Vet Sci 10:129.
Singh P, Singh RV, Gupta B, Tripathi SS, Tomar KS, Jain S, Sahni YP, 2018. Prevalence study of Salmonella spp. in milk and milk products. Asian J Dairy Food Res 37:7-12.
Soleimani NA, Kermanshahi RK, Yakhchali B, Sattari TN, 2010. Antagonistic activity of probiotic lactobacilli against Staphylococcus aureus isolated from bovine mastitis. Afr J Microbiol Res 4:2169-73.

Syrokou MK, Paramithiotis S, Skandamis PN, Drosinos EH, Bosnea L, Mataragas M, 2021. High-quality draft genome sequence data of six Lactiplantibacillus plantarum subsp. argentoratensis strains isolated from various Greek wheat sourdoughs. Data Brief 37:107172.

Taboada NV, Alléndez G, Villalba I, López Alzogaray S, Nazareno MA, 2024. Selection of indigenous lactic acid bacteria strains to enhance the functional properties of fermented Opuntia sp. fruit juices. ACS Food Sci Technol 4:1030-8.

Todorov SD, Weeks R, Khosravi-Darani K., Chikindas ML, 2023. Exploration and understanding of beneficial properties of lactic acid bacteria: 10 years of experience in applied food biotechnology. Appl Food Biotechnol 11:e1.

Williams EN, Van Doren JM, Leonard CL, Datta AR, 2023. Prevalence of Listeria monocytogenes, Salmonella spp., Shiga toxin-producing Escherichia coli, and Campylobacter spp. in raw milk in the United States between 2000 and 2019: a systematic review and meta-analysis. J Food Prot 86:100014.

Wu JWFW, Redondo-Solano M, Uribe L, WingChing-Jones R, Usaga J, Barboza N, 2021. First characterization of the probiotic potential of lactic acid bacteria isolated from Costa Rican pineapple silages. PeerJ 9:e12437.

Zhang S, Oh J, Alexander L, Ozcam M, van Pijkeren J, 2018. d-Alanyl-d-alanine ligase as a broad-host-range counterselection marker in vancomycin-resistant lactic acid bacteria. J Bacteriol 200:e00607-17.

Online supplementary material

Supplementary Table 1. Inhibition halo of *Salmonella enterica*, *Listeria monocytogenes, Staphylococcus aureus* 29213 and *Escherichia coli* 25922 grown on culture media pre-inoculated with different lactic acid bacteria strains isolated from agro-industrial waste.

Supplementary Figure 1. pH values during fermentation of yogurt subjected to different inoculation treatments (means, error bars show the standard deviation for n=3).

Supplementary Figure 2. Lactic acid bacteria count during fermentation of yogurt subjected to different inoculation treatments (means, error bars show the standard deviation for n=3).

Supplementary Figure 3. *Salmonella* sp. counts during fermentation of yogurt subjected to different inoculation treatments (means, error bars show the standard deviation for n=3).

**Table 1. Inhibition halo of *Salmonella enterica*, *Listeria monocytogenes*, *Staphylococcus aureus* 29213 and *Escherichia coli* 25922 grown on culture media pre-inoculated with selected LAB strains isolated from agro-industrial waste.**

| | | | Halo | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **LAB strain** | **GenBank code** | **Isolation source** | ***Salmonella*** | ***L. monocytogenes*** | ***S. aureus*** | ***E. coli*** |
| *Lacticaseibacillus paracasei* subsp. *tolerans*_2A2-B | ON763280 | MFC of coffee effluent | +++ | +++ | +++ | +++ |
| *Lacticaseibacillus paracasei* subsp. *tolerans*_ IA2-P | ON763283 | MFC of coffee effluent | +++ | +++ | +++ | +++ |
| *Lacticaseibacillus paracasei* subsp. *tolerans*_1-C1 | ON763284 | MFC of coffee effluent | +++ | +++ | +++ | +++ |
| *Lacticaseibacillus paracasei subsp. tolerans*_11-CI-C | ON763282 | MFC of coffee effluent | +++ | +++ | +++ | +++ |
| *Lacticaseibacillus paracasei* subsp. *tolerans*_11-C2-C | ON763287 | MFC of coffee effluent | +++ | +++ | + | ++ |
| *Lacticaseibacillus paracasei* subsp. *tolerans*_11-C1-B | ON763286 | MFC of coffee effluent | +++ | +++ | ++ | +++ |
| *Lacticaseibacillus paracasei* subsp. *tolerans*_I-C2 | ON763285 | MFC of coffee effluent | +++ | +++ | +++ | +++ |
| *Leuconostoc pseudomesenteroides*_17-(2D) | ON763309 | Coffee brush | ++ | + | +++ | +++ |
| *Lactiplantibacillus plantarum*_17-(4D) | ON763301 | Coffee brush | +++ | +++ | ++ | +++ |
| *Lactobacillus plantarum* subsp. *plantarum*_71-6(2F) | ON763308 | Orange waste residuals | +++ | +++ | +++ | + |
| *Lactiplantibacillus argentoratensis*_57(7)-1H | ON763326 | Trinitario cocoa | +++ | ++ | +++ | + |
| *Lactiplantibacillus pentosus*_58(6)-2I | ON763304 | Trinitario cocoa | +++ | + | + | + |
| *Lactiplantibacillus pentosus*_58(6)-1I | ON763303 | Trinitario cocoa | +++ | ++ | ++ | ++ |
| *Lactiplantibacillusargentoratensis*_79(4)-2C | ON763328 | Trinitario cocoa | ++ | ++ | ++ | + |

+ Inhibition zone 0- 3 mm in diameter (weak), ++ inhibition zone 3- 6 mm in diameter (good), +++ inhibition zone larger than 6 mm in diameter (strong). MFC=microbial fuel cells.

**Table 2. Antibiotic resistance/susceptibility of selected isolates from agro-industrial waste.**

| Isolate | Antibiotic (concentration) | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Amoxicillin with clavulanic acid (30 µg) | Streptomycin (15 µg) | Chloramphenicol (30 µg) | Gentamicin (10 µg) | Erythromycin (15 µg) | Tetracycline (30 µg) | Ciprofloxacin (5 µg) | Vancomycin (30 µg) | Penicillin (10 IU) |
| *L. paracasei* subsp. *tolerans*_2A2-B | S | R | S | S | S | S | S | R | S |
| *L. paracasei* subsp. *tolerans*_IA2-P | S | R | R | S | R | R | S | R | R |
| *L. paracasei* subsp. *tolerans*_1-C1 | S | S | S | S | S | S | S | R | S |
| *L. paracasei* subsp. *tolerans*_II-CI-C | S | R | S | S | S | S | S | R | S |
| *L. paracasei* subsp. *tolerans*_11-C2-C | S | I | S | S | S | S | S | R | S |
| *L. paracasei* subsp. *tolerans*_11-C1-B | S | R | S | S | S | S | S | R | S |
| *L. paracasei* subsp. *tolerans*_I-C2 | S | R | S | S | S | S | S | R | S |
| *L. pseudomesenteroides*_17-(2D) | S | S | S | S | S | S | S | R | S |
| *L. plantarum*_17-(4D) | S | S | S | S | S | S | R | R | S |
| *L. plantarum* subsp. *plantarum*_71-6(2F) | S | S | S | S | S | S | R | R | S |
| *L. argentoratensis*_57(7)-1H | S | S | S | S | S | S | R | R | S |
| *L. pentosus*_58(6)-2I | S | S | S | S | S | S | I | R | S |
| *L. pentosus*_58(6)-1I | S | S | S | S | S | S | S | R | S |
| *L. argentoratensis*_79(4)-2C | S | S | S | S | S | S | R | R | S |
| *L. casei*_ATCC 393 | S | S | R | R | R | R | S | R | S |
| *L. paracasei*_6714 | S | R | S | S | S | S | S | R | S |

S, susceptible; R, resistant; I, intermediate.

**Table 3. Results of hemolytic activity and gelatinase activity to evaluate the probiotic profile of selected lactic acid bacteria isolated from agroindustrial waste.**

| Isolate | Hemolytic | Gelatinase |
|---|---|---|
| *Lacticaseibacillus paracasei* subsp. *tolerans*_2A2-B | γ | Neg |
| *Lacticaseibacillus paracasei* subsp. *tolerans*_IA2-P | γ | Neg |
| *Lacticaseibacillus paracasei* subsp. *tolerans*_1-C1 | α | Neg |
| *Lacticaseibacillus paracasei* subsp. *tolerans*_11-CI-C | γ | Neg |
| *Lacticaseibacillus paracasei* subsp. *tolerans*_11-C2-C | α | Neg |
| *Lacticaseibacillus paracasei* subsp. *tolerans*_11-C1-B | γ | Neg |
| *Lacticaseibacillus paracasei* subsp. *tolerans*_I-C2 | α | Neg |
| *Leuconostoc pseudomesenteroides*_17-(2D) | α | Neg |
| *Lactobacillus plantarum*_17-(4D) | α | Neg |
| *Lactobacillus plantarum* subsp. *plantarum*_71-6(2F) | α | Neg |
| *Lactiplantibacillus argentoratensis*_57(7)-1H | α | Neg |
| *Lactiplantibacillus pentosus*_58(6)-2I | α | Neg |
| *Lactiplantibacillus pentosus*_58(6)-1I | α | Neg |
| *Lactiplantibacillus argentoratensis*_79(4)-2C | α | Neg |
| *Lacticaseibacillus paracasei* ATCC 393 | γ | Neg |
| *Lacticaseibacillus paracasei*_6714 | α | Neg |

Absence of hemolysis (γ), partial hemolysis (α), negative (neg).

**Table 4. Nutritional composition of yogurt.**

| Analysis | Percentage (%) ± SD |
|---|---|
| Moisture | 85.57±0.29 |
| Fat | <0.20±0.00 |
| Protein | 4.95±0.14 |
| Ash | 1.12±0.10 |
| Carbohydrates | 7.32±0.17 |
| Sodium | 74.30±4.98 |
| Total energy value | 218.67±3.21 |
| Energy value | 85.57±0.00 |

Mean values ± standard deviation, $n = 3$.