

Carnobacterium divergens – a dominating bacterium of pork meat juice

 Gabriele Rieder¹, Linda Krisch¹, Harald Fischer², Maria Kaufmann², Adolf Maringer² & Silja Wessler¹
¹Division of Microbiology, Department of Molecular Biology, University of Salzburg, Salzburg, Austria; and ²Sony DADC Austria AG, Anif, Austria

Correspondence: Gabriele Rieder, Division of Microbiology, Department of Molecular Biology, University of Salzburg, Billrothstrasse 11, 5020 Salzburg, Austria.
Tel.: +43 662 8044 7211;
fax: +43 662 8044 7209;
e-mail: gabriele.rieder@sbg.ac.at

Received 23 December 2011; revised 20 April 2012; accepted 23 April 2012.

DOI: 10.1111/j.1574-6968.2012.02584.x

Editor: Wolfgang Kneifel

Keywords

Carnobacterium divergens; hygiene; meat juice; microbiota; pork meat.

Abstract

Nonspoiled food that nevertheless contains bacterial pathogens constitutes a much more serious health problem than spoiled food, as the consumer is not warned beforehand. However, data on the diversity of bacterial species in meat juice are rare. To study the bacterial load of fresh pork from ten different distributors, we applied a combination of the conventional culture-based and molecular methods for detecting and quantifying the microbial spectrum of fresh pork meat juice samples. Altogether, we identified 23 bacterial species of ten different families analyzed by 16S rRNA gene sequencing. The majority of isolates were belonging to the typical spoilage bacterial population of lactic acid bacteria (LAB), *Enterococcaceae*, and *Pseudomonadaceae*. Several additional isolates were identified as *Staphylococcus* spp. and *Bacillus* spp. originating from human and animal skin and other environmental niches including plants, soil, and water. *Carnobacterium divergens*, a LAB contributing to the spoilage of raw meat even at refrigeration temperature, was the most frequently isolated species in our study (5/10) with a bacterial load of 10^3 – 10^7 CFU mL⁻¹. In several of the analyzed pork meat juice samples, two bacterial faecal indicators, *Serratia grimesii* and *Serratia proteamaculans*, were identified together with another opportunistic food-borne pathogen, *Staphylococcus equorum*. Our data reveal a high bacterial load of fresh pork meat supporting the potential health risk of meat juice for the end consumer even under refrigerated conditions.

Introduction

Raw meat is a 'land of plenty' for most of the bacteria species transferred to this ecological niche – it is an aquatic environment rich in nutrients. Therefore, it is one of the most perishable foods that potentially contain animal-derived pathogenic bacteria (zoonotic agents); thus, it constitutes a potential risk factor for spreading pathogens in its environment. During the last two decades, several studies investigated the spoilage microbiota of refrigerated fresh and vacuum-packaged (VP) meat under diverse modified atmosphere conditions (MAP) to determine appropriate preservation methods (Shaw & Harding, 1984; McMullen & Stiles, 1993; Borch *et al.*, 1996; Sakala *et al.*, 2002; Holley *et al.*, 2004; Ercolini *et al.*, 2006, 2011; Nychas *et al.*, 2008; Schirmer *et al.*, 2009; Doulgeraki *et al.*, 2010; Jiang *et al.*, 2010; Pennacchia *et al.*, 2011). The main focus was set on the improvement of the shelf life of food products by trying to establish other bacterial

genus such as lactic acid bacteria (LAB) to compete and displace contaminations by food-borne pathogens and spoilage microflora such as *Enterobacteriaceae* and *Pseudomonadaceae* (Yildirim & Johnson, 1998; Metaxopoulos *et al.*, 2002; Budde *et al.*, 2003; Jacobsen *et al.*, 2003), whereas species of the latter family, which are strict aerobic bacteria, showed a delay of growth under MAP conditions (Jimenez *et al.*, 1997; Viana *et al.*, 2005; Alp & Aksu, 2010). In contrast, most species belonging to the LAB group multiply even under VP conditions but do not initially damage the quality of the meat product as recently affirmed by studies with *Carnobacterium maltaromaticum* (Jones, 2004; Casaburi *et al.*, 2011; Pennacchia *et al.*, 2011). *Pseudomonas* spp. and *Serratia* spp. are metabolizing the abundant nutrient sources, for example, carbohydrates, amino acids, and lipids to end products that spoil the food product; thus, it becomes sensory undesirable for the customer to purchase because of color change, off-odors, and also slime production – a definite

Table 1. Properties of the ten meat samples

Sample no.	Location of purchase	Designation	Packaging	Volume of meat juice (mL)	Total colony count (CFU mL ⁻¹)
I	Supermarket	Pork fillet	In air	0.3	5 × 10 ⁶
II	Butcher shop	Pork fillet	In air	12	1.9 × 10 ⁸
III	Butcher shop	Pork fillet	In air	20	7.7 × 10 ⁵
IV	Supermarket	Pork fillet	In air	1	1.2 × 10 ⁶
V	Supermarket	Pork fillet	In air	0.5	8.2 × 10 ⁴
VI	Supermarket	Pork fillet	Vacuum	20	5 × 10 ⁷
VII	Butcher shop	Pork fillet	In air	0.2	2 × 10 ⁷
VIII	Supermarket	Pork fillet	Vacuum	15	1.5 × 10 ⁴
IX	Supermarket	Pork loin	In air	0.1	3.4 × 10 ⁴
X	Supermarket	Pork loin	In air	0.05	3.5 × 10 ⁴

impairment of the meat quality (Labadie, 1999; Gram *et al.*, 2002; Jay *et al.*, 2003; Koutsoumanis *et al.*, 2006).

Traditional analyses of the bacterial flora of meat and meat products in the past have primarily concentrated on cultivation on selective plates for LAB, *Pseudomonas* spp., and *Enterobacteriaceae* (Blixt & Borch, 2002; Jiang *et al.*, 2010; Pennacchia *et al.*, 2011). The isolation and phenotypic identification of the bacterial species are time-consuming and can be restricted by limiting biochemical differentiation options. Recently, molecular techniques such as PCR-based rapid species identification have been established using genus or species-specific DNA probes or primers for studying food spoilage processes (Muyzer *et al.*, 1993; Macian *et al.*, 2004; Rachman *et al.*, 2004; Fontana *et al.*, 2006; Liu *et al.*, 2010; Ercolini *et al.*, 2011). Ercolini *et al.* stated that the use of both culture-based and molecular methods has been shown to enhance the detection of microbial diversity in foods (Ercolini, 2004; Pennacchia *et al.*, 2011).

In general, bacteria prefer to adhere to surface structures, colonizing the meat surface, because an attachment by glycocalyx formation could be shown (Ercolini *et al.*, 2006). Nevertheless, some of the bacteria are planktonic and grow in the meat juice, which is an exudate of the stored meat. Especially, the bacterial load of meat juices is harboring a potential safety hazard for the consumer when handling meat juice in an unhygienic manner, for example, in the consumer's home where, in the refrigerator or on a cutting board, meat juice spillage does not become noticeable and, therefore, harbors a considerable health risk by cross-contamination (de Jong *et al.*, 2008). However, a reliable and comprehensive study of bacterial contamination of pork meat juice is still pending. Our study could have industrial implications, exploring a method to grade the bacterial contamination of the meat by a package integrated sensor which is only in contact with the meat juice. To determine the range of bacterial species and the bacterial load common in the juice of refrigerated pork meat, we applied the combination of both the conventional cultivation as well as a molecular technique.

Material and methods

Meat samples

From different supermarkets or butcher shops, a total of ten portions of fresh pork meat fillet or loin (about 500 g each) were purchased by local distributors at the same day. Most of the samples were from an open counter, only two were vacuum wrapped. The open meat samples were transferred to a sterile plastic bag and together with the vacuum wrapped ones immediately stored in a fridge at +4 °C. After 6 h, the accumulated meat juices were collected into a sterile tube (Table 1).

Bacterial growth conditions and colony counts

Of each meat juice, a sterile 1 : 10 dilution series with PBS solution (0.8% NaCl, 0.144% Na₂HPO₄, 0.024% KH₂PO₄, 0.02% KCl, pH 7.4) were prepared and 100 µL of the appropriate dilutions spread on GCF agar plates (GC agar base; Remel, Wien, Austria) containing 5% fetal calf serum (FCS) in three replicates. After 72 h of incubation at 37 °C, the obtained colonies were counted and used for isolating different bacterial species. The colony-forming units (CFU) per mL were calculated as mean value of triplicates.

Isolation and differentiation of bacterial colonies

Of each countable (25–250 colonies) plate, up to seven single macroscopically different bacterial colonies were purified by subcultivation on GCF agar plates. To minimize repeated sequencing of the same strain macroscopically, similar colonies were screened by Gram staining, cell morphology, and quick enzyme tests such as catalase (4% H₂O₂), coagulase (Staphaurex-Plus; Remel, Dartford, UK), oxidase (BBL-Oxidase-DrySlide, Becton Dickinson), and urease reaction (urea broth; Oxoid, Wesel, Germany). Gram staining was performed using a single colony of a

purified bacterial culture on GCF agar plates applying AxonGram solutions (Axonlab, Austria) according to the manufacturer's instructions. The stained slides were analyzed with a Leica Microscope at 1000× magnification. Pure bacterial clones were stored at $-80\text{ }^{\circ}\text{C}$.

DNA isolation

Bacterial genome DNA was isolated by applying DNA Mini and Blood Mini Kit from Qiagen (Hilden, Germany). Freshly subcultured single colonies were harvested with sterile wooden stick cotton swaps and resuspended in PBS. After centrifugation, the pellet was lysed in lysis buffer containing proteinase K provided by the manufacturer. In case of Gram-positive bacteria, lysozyme (20 mg mL^{-1}) was added as recommended by the manufacturer. In brief, the bacterial DNA was isolated by adhering to silicate in mini columns and eluted with water after washing with an ethanol-containing solution. The DNA concentration was measured with a Nanodrop photometric apparatus (Peqlab, Erlangen, Germany).

PCR amplification and product purification

Purified bacterial genomic DNA was used to amplify a fragment of 1500 bp of the 16S rRNA gene by polymerase chain reaction (PCR) with the forward primer 8F 5'-AGAGTTTGATCTGGCTCAG-3' (Galkiewicz & Kellogg, 2008) and reverse primer DG74 5'-AGGAGGTGATCC AACCGCA-3' (Greisen *et al.*, 1994) (Eurofins, Ebersberg, Germany). The PCR (25 μL) contained 1 U Dream Taq DNA Polymerase (Fermentas, St. Leon-Roth, Germany), 1× Dream Taq Buffer, 0.5 mM dNTPs, 0.15 μM forward and reverse primer, and 30–50 ng genomic DNA. The PCR mixture was subjected to an initial denaturation step of 5 min at $95\text{ }^{\circ}\text{C}$, followed by 35 cycles of denaturation for 30 s at $95\text{ }^{\circ}\text{C}$, annealing for 30 s at $52\text{ }^{\circ}\text{C}$, and extension of 2 min at $72\text{ }^{\circ}\text{C}$, and a final extension of 10 min at $72\text{ }^{\circ}\text{C}$ in a Peltier Thermal Cycler PTC-200 (BioRad, Vienna, Austria). The amplification product was visualized by agarose gel electrophoresis (1% agarose in 1× TAE-buffer (40 mM Tris, 20 mM sodium acetate, 1 mM EDTA, pH 8.0)). Midori green (Fermentas) stained DNA bands (1.5 kb) were excised under a 360-nm UV light box and purified with the NucleoSpin Extract II Kit (Macherey-Nagel, Dueren, Germany).

Sequencing and identification of the species

The sequencing of both strands of the amplified 16S rRNA gene was run by Eurofins sending 150 ng of the purified PCR product. The quality of the obtained sequence was checked by screening the chromatogram of

each read. The complete sequence was then compared to the DNA databases using the program BLAST (<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov>). Sequence alignments with the highest score were investigated for identifying the bacterial strain by specific 16S rRNA gene sequence.

Results

Total bacterial count of meat juice samples

The total bacterial count of each pork meat juice sample is summarized in Table 1 ranging from 10^4 to 10^8 CFU mL^{-1} after 6 h storage at $4\text{ }^{\circ}\text{C}$. Only 30% of the analyzed samples reached a bacterial load between 10^7 and 10^8 CFU mL^{-1} . The results did not reveal any differences between the bacterial count of juice from VP pork meat and in air stored ones. In general, up to seven macroscopically different colonies were observed on the agar plates. These single colonies were differentiated by size, color, and shape as well as by rapid enzymatic assays such as oxidase, catalase, coagulase, and urease and Gram staining. Following this procedure, out of each meat juice sample between three and seven different bacterial colonies could be purified for further analyses.

Identification of the bacterial spectrum in pork meat juice

All together, 52 colonies were successfully purified, genomic DNA isolated, and applied for 16S rRNA gene amplification by PCR. Both strands of the eluted PCR product were sequenced and the obtained consensus sequence addressed to a BLAST search. In a preliminary experiment, 12 macroscopically different colonies were isolated and purified in duplicates. The BLAST results of these sequenced 16S rRNA genes revealed in 75% an identical identification of the species. In three cases, further exclusion criteria had to be applied such as Gram staining, bacterial shape, and rapid enzymatic tests to determine the bacterial species (data not shown). In one case of such a duplicate isolation, the sequence of two different *Serratia* spp. (*S. grimesii* and *S. liquefaciens*) was listed with an equal BLAST score value. Further, differentiation of these two Gram-negative bacteria species was not addressed because the usual applied exclusion criteria were not sufficient. Altogether, 23 different bacterial species were identified in juice samples of fresh pork meat (Table 2). The distribution of Gram-positive and Gram-negative species was more or less equal, whereas approximately 50% of these species did not belong to the taxonomy families of *Enterobacteriaceae*, *Pseudomonadaceae*, and LAB. Most of the other families belong to the Gram-positive species of skin flora and environmental

Table 2. List of identified bacterial species of all pork meat juice samples sorted by its taxonomic family and typical ecological niche named

Taxonomy (family)	Isolated species	Ecological niche	Accession no.	% Identity [query coverage/ max. identity]	References
<i>Bacillaceae</i>	<i>Bacillus amyloliquefaciens</i>	Plants	GU125630.1	100/99	Arguelles-Arias et al. (2009)
	<i>Bacillus subtilis</i>	Soil	GU994112.1	100/99	Ali et al. (2012)
<i>Carnobacteriaceae</i>	<i>Carnobacterium divergens</i>	Skin, mucosa	HQ259724.1	99/100	Leisner et al. (2007)
	<i>Carnobacterium gallinarum</i>	Fish, meat	AJ387905.1	100/99	Leisner et al. (2007)
<i>Enterobacteriaceae</i>	<i>Pectobacterium carotovorum</i> (<i>Erwinia carotovorum</i>)	Plant pathogen	FJ527481.1	100/100	Terta et al. (2010)
	<i>Serratia grimesii</i>	Faecal pollution	DQ991163.1	100/100	Ashelford et al. (2002)
	<i>Serratia liquefaciens</i>	Soil, plants, water, nosocomial infection	HQ335000.1	99/99	Ashelford et al. (2002)
	<i>Serratia proteamaculans</i>	Faecal pollution	AJ233435.1	100/100	Ashelford et al. (2002)
	<i>Yersinia ruckeri</i>	Fish (pathogen)	HQ222844.1	100/99	Wortberg et al. (2012)
<i>Flavobacteriaceae</i>	<i>Kaistella flava</i>	Soil	AM421015.1	100/98	Gargiulo et al. (2008)
<i>Lactobacillaceae</i>	<i>Lactobacillus sakei</i>	Skin, mucosa	HQ992696.1	100/99	Chiaromonte et al. (2010)
<i>Micrococcaceae</i>	<i>Kocuria rhizophila</i>	Soil, surface water	FR682683.1	100/99	Lecomte et al. (2011)
	<i>Rothia amarae</i>	Soil and water, sludge of foul water	FR682692.1	100/98	Fan et al. (2002)
<i>Moraxellaceae</i>	<i>Enhydrobacter</i> sp.	Water	FN377702.1	99/99	Srinivas et al. (2009)
<i>Pseudomonadaceae</i>	<i>Pseudomonas fluorescens</i>	Soil, water	EU434349.1	99/99	Bodilis et al. (2006)
	<i>Pseudomonas synxantha</i>	Soil, rhizosphere	GQ900609.1	100/99	Wechter et al. (2002)
<i>Shewanellaceae</i>	<i>Shewanella putrefaciens</i>	Marine fish	AB057660.1	99/99	Tryfinopoulou et al. (2007)
<i>Staphylococcaceae</i>	<i>Macrococcus caseolyticus</i>	Animal skin	AP009484.1	100/99	Tsubakishita et al. (2010)
	<i>Staphylococcus epidermidis</i>	Skin of human and animals	HM209751.1	100/99	Nagase et al. (2002)
	<i>Staphylococcus equorum</i>	Skin of human and animals	FR691468.1	99/99	Novakova et al. (2006)
	<i>Staphylococcus pasteurii</i>	Skin of human and animals, food	AB269765.1	100/99	Chesneau et al. (1993)
	<i>Staphylococcus succinus</i>	Skin of human and animals, cheese	HQ018602.1	99/100	Novakova et al. (2006)
	<i>Staphylococcus xylosum</i>	Skin of human and animals	GQ222240.1	99/100	Dordet-Frisoni et al. (2007)

bacteria such as *Staphylococcaceae* and *Bacillaceae*, respectively.

Quantification of isolated bacterial spectrum in pork meat juice

To quantify the bacterial species with the three highest bacterial loads of each meat juice sample, it was necessary to retrace the identified species to its macroscopic colony appearance on GCF agar plates. For that, all taken single colonies were initially numbered on the agar plate; thus, after identification of the bacterial species, a correlation to its colony appearance was possible. Because digital pictures were taken of all important agar plates, the bacterial load could be quantified by counting equally appearing colonies and calculating the approximate CFU mL⁻¹. In parallel, the total bacterial count of each meat juice sam-

ple was also determined (Table 3). The most frequently isolated species were as expected LAB (Leisner et al., 2007), followed by species from the genera *Enterobacteriaceae*, *Pseudomonadaceae*, as well as some other environmental bacteria. In half of the sample of the LAB, *Carnobacterium divergens* revealed highest prevalence (Table 4). Other typical and most frequently isolated species from meat juice were *Serratia* spp., *Pseudomonas* spp., *Kocuria rhizophila*, *Staphylococcus equorum*, and *Lactobacillus sakei*. The logarithmic values of the highest frequent species in pork meat juice ranged from 10³ up to 10⁷ CFU mL⁻¹. These values were individually assessed in relation to the total bacterial amount. In general, the amount of the most frequent species isolated of each juice sample revealed a maximal difference of one logarithmic step regarding the total bacterial load of this sample (Table 3).

Table 3. Macroscopic characterization of isolated bacteria with the highest frequency (CFU mL⁻¹) within each of the 10 meat juice samples in relation to total CFU

No. of strain	Isolated species	Taxonomy (order – family)	Gram staining	Bacterial shape	Bacterial count of isolated species* (CFU mL ⁻¹)	Total bacterial count (CFU mL ⁻¹)
I-A	<i>Carnobacterium divergens</i>	Lactobacillales – Carnobacteriaceae	+	Coccioid rods	10 ⁶	5 × 10 ⁶
I-B	<i>Staphylococcus equorum</i>	Bacillales – Staphylococcaceae	+	Staphylococci	10 ³	
I-G	<i>Pseudomonas fluorescens</i>	Pseudomonadales – Pseudomonadaceae	–	Rods	10 ⁴	
II-D	<i>Kocuria rhizophila</i>	Actinomycetales – Micrococcaceae	+	Cocci	10 ⁷	1.9 × 10 ⁸
III-A	<i>Carnobacterium divergens</i>	Lactobacillales – Carnobacteriaceae	+	Coccioid rods	10 ⁵	7.7 × 10 ⁵
III-D	<i>Pseudomonas fluorescens</i>	Pseudomonadales – Pseudomonadaceae	–	Rods	10 ⁴	
IV-A	<i>Carnobacterium divergens</i>	Lactobacillales – Carnobacteriaceae	+	Coccioid rods	10 ⁵	1.2 × 10 ⁶
V-A	<i>Kocuria rhizophila</i>	Actinomycetales – Micrococcaceae	+	Cocci (tetrad)	10 ⁴	8.2 × 10 ⁴
V-B	<i>Staphylococcus equorum</i>	Bacillales – Staphylococcaceae	+	Staphylococci	10 ⁴	
V-C	<i>Serratia proteamaculans</i>	Enterobacteriales – Enterobacteriaceae	–	Rods	10 ⁴	
VI-A	<i>Serratia proteamaculans</i>	Enterobacteriales – Enterobacteriaceae	–	Rods	10 ⁶	5 × 10 ⁷
VII-A	<i>Carnobacterium divergens</i>	Lactobacillales – Carnobacteriaceae	+	Coccioid rods	10 ⁷	2 × 10 ⁷
VIII-A	<i>Pectobacterium carotovorum</i>	Enterobacteriales – Enterobacteriaceae	–	Rods	10 ³	1.5 × 10 ⁴
VIII-B	<i>Pseudomonas synxantha</i>	Pseudomonadales – Pseudomonadaceae	–	Rods	10 ³	
VIII-C	<i>Carnobacterium divergens</i>	Lactobacillales – Carnobacteriaceae	+	Coccioid rods	10 ³	
IX-E	<i>Pseudomonas</i> sp.	Pseudomonadales – Pseudomonadaceae	–	Rods	10 ⁴	3.4 × 10 ⁴
X-A	<i>Kocuria</i> sp.	Actinomycetales – Micrococcaceae	+	Cocci (tetrad)	10 ³	3.5 × 10 ⁴

*These are approximate bacterial count values in CFU mL⁻¹, calculated by counting equally appearing colonies.

Discussion

In this study, we investigated the microbiota and the bacterial load of pork meat juice. The pork fillet or loin was purchased by different distributors. In general, we were looking for refrigerated samples dated before expiration. The analysis was performed 6 h after the purchase, a time point mimicking the situation of a final customer buying a portion of pork meat for a meal at the same day. Meat juice handled in the kitchen might easily cross-contaminate other food items such as salad that is consumed raw. A transfer of bacteria via kitchen tools and especially cutting boards is easily imaginable. In such cases, the composition of the bacterial flora of the meat juice represents a potential hazard that could lead to food poisoning even under chilled conditions. Applying a combination of a

culture-dependent analysis with a molecular method to characterize the microbial population present in meat juice, a broad range of bacteria could be identified. By means of 16S rRNA gene sequences, 23 different bacterial species of 10 different taxonomic families were depicted. The most frequently isolated bacteria species from pork meat juice were belonging to the families of *Enterobacteriaceae*, *Pseudomonadaceae*, and LAB. As demonstrated in several former studies, bacteria of these genera are assigned as typical spoilage flora (Borch *et al.*, 1996; Gill, 1996; Gram *et al.*, 2002; Jay *et al.*, 2003; Ercolini *et al.*, 2006; Koutsoumanis *et al.*, 2006) including *C. divergens*, *Pseudomonas* spp., and *Serratia* spp. The nonmotile, Gram-positive LAB, *C. divergens*, is a psychrotrophic and microaerophilic but oxygen-tolerating bacterium that is weakly acidotolerant (Leisner *et al.*, 2007), a predominant

bacterium in industrial foods, frequently associated with the spoilage of refrigerated meat and fish products (Borch et al., 1996; Barakat et al., 2000; Cailliez-Grimal et al., 2005). However, it could be shown that *C. divergens* is only dominantly present in fresh meat products, but absent in spoiled products (Jones, 2004; Chenoll et al., 2007). This contradiction is addressed in the literature (Laursen et al., 2005; Leisner et al., 2007); thus, *C. divergens* has not always been considered as important in terms of spoilage potential, indeed the potential of species belonging to the Carnobacterium genus as spoilage agents is not always clear-cut. There are studies that even propose *C. divergens* as biopreservative agent (Spanggaard et al., 2001; Laursen et al., 2005; Ringo et al., 2007; Kim & Austin, 2008). Several studies were focusing on the shift of the microbiota during the process of meat deterioration (Borch et al., 1996; Gram et al., 2002; Ercolini et al., 2006; Schirmer et al., 2009). A shift from aerobic Gram-negative *Pseudomonas* spp. to Gram-positive LAB was observed during this process of pork meat spoilage (Schirmer et al., 2009; Jiang et al., 2010).

Other studies have revealed a LAB-dominating microbiota, including *Lactobacillus* spp. and *Leuconostoc* spp. in spoiled meat products (Borch et al., 1996; Bjorkroth & Korkeala, 1997; Bjorkroth et al., 2000; Santos et al., 2005; Chenoll et al., 2007), indicating an overgrowth of the fresh meat dominating *Carnobacterium* spp. by other LAB during storage (Jones, 2004; Chenoll et al., 2007). But at the time of packaging, the concentration of these LAB were below the detection threshold of culturing methods of bacteria. This could be a plausible explanation why we did not dominantly isolate species of the genera *Lactobacillaceae*. In contrast to earlier observations, where *L. sakei* was mainly detected in psychrotrophic bacterial flora of vacuum-packed meat and meat products (Hugas, 1998; Jiang et al., 2010), we have isolated *L. sakei* in our study out of in air-packaged fresh meat juice samples but not out of juice samples of VP meat. The literature is controversial about the benefit of LAB in raw meat. In one respect, these bacteria are discussed as causative agents of meat deterioration (Borch et al., 1996; Labadie, 1999; Koutsoumanis et al., 2006), and on the other hand, several studies have shown the importance of LAB in the

microbiota of fresh meat (Hastings et al., 1994; Gill, 1996). There it is supposed that LAB compete with other spoilage-related bacteria only in fresh meat under VP or MAP by releasing metabolites such as organic acids (e.g. lactate) and bacteriocins, thus preventing the growth of spoilage bacteria and, therefore, increasing the shelf life of the fresh meat and meat products.

Our data reveal *C. divergens* as a dominating bacterium in fresh pork meat juice, whereas under continuous storage, Ercolini et al. demonstrated some species of the genus *Pseudomonas* as dominating active bacterial contributors to spoilage under aerobic conditions and even at refrigeration temperatures (Labadie, 1999; Ercolini et al., 2006, 2011; Koutsoumanis et al., 2006). In our study, *Pseudomonas fluorescens* were detected in 4/10 pork meat juice samples at moderate concentrations, supporting this observation. Besides other species, Pennacchia et al. (2011) detected in meat samples at time point zero following bacteria: *Pseudomonas* spp., *C. divergens*, and *Serratia* spp. For detecting these species, they and others (Ercolini et al., 2006) were combining culture-based and molecular approaches such as PCR-denaturing gradient gel electrophoresis (DGGE) based on 16S rRNA gene amplification and pyrosequencing to enhance the understanding of the populations of spoilage bacteria. Because above-mentioned molecular methods are widely exploited for the characterization of fermented foods (Ercolini, 2004; Casaburi et al., 2011), it is only in some cases optimized to monitor the microbiota and its changes during storage in meat (Ercolini et al., 2006; Fontana et al., 2006; Diez et al., 2008). Therefore, we used the benefits of combining two methods, culturing and 16S rRNA gene sequencing of the isolated bacteria, to enhance the detection of microbial diversity in foods. Because fresh meat is easily contaminated by the slaughtering process, thus serving as substrate for different spoilage and pathogenic bacteria, it harbors a nonnegligible health risk for all end consumers. The question arose whether our identified meat juice microbiota of 23 bacterial species from ten different taxonomic families contains food poisoning-related bacteria and opportunistic bacterial pathogens. Typical food poisoning bacteria identified from meat products such as *Salmonella* spp., enteropathogenic *Escherichia coli*,

Table 4. Prevalence of most frequent isolated bacteria species in 10 pork meat juice samples

Isolated species	Taxonomy (order – family)	Colony count (CFU mL ⁻¹)	Prevalence in 10 samples
<i>Carnobacterium divergens</i>	Lactobacillales – Carnobacteriaceae	10 ³ –10 ⁷	5
<i>Pseudomonas fluorescens</i>	Pseudomonadales – Pseudomonadaceae	10 ³ –10 ⁴	4
<i>Serratia proteamaculans</i>	Enterobacteriales – Enterobacteriaceae	10 ³ –10 ⁶	3
<i>Kocuria rhizophila</i>	Actinomycetales – Micrococcaceae	10 ³ –10 ⁷	3
<i>Lactobacillus sakei</i>	Lactobacillales – Lactobacillaceae	10 ⁵ –10 ⁶	2
<i>Staphylococcus equorum</i>	Bacillales – Staphylococcaceae	10 ³ –10 ⁴	2

Shigella spp., *Yersinia enterocolitica*, *Listeria monocytogenes*, and *Staphylococcus aureus* (Kajikazawa, *et al.*, 2007) have not been detected in our samples, possibly because in fresh meat juice, these species, if any are present, might be in very low concentrations. Besides *S. grimesii* and *Serratia proteamaculans* (Kajikazawa, *et al.*, 2007), a further opportunistic food-borne pathogen, *S. equorum*, residing the skin of human and animals, was detected in our meat juice samples. Depending on handling, these observations support the hazardous potential of meat juice for the end consumer. In general, the striking analogy of the microbiota of meat with meat juice offers useful opportunities for detecting the bacterial load and diversity by industrial implementation; for example, developing a package integrated sensor grading the bacterial contamination of meat juice.

Acknowledgements

We thank Melisa Heber, TN, USA for critical editing of the manuscript.

References

- Ali N, Dashti N, Al-Mailem D, Eliyas M & Radwan S (2012) Indigenous soil bacteria with the combined potential for hydrocarbon consumption and heavy metal resistance. *Environ Sci Pollut Res Int* **19**: 812–820.
- Alp E & Aksu MI (2010) Effects of water extract of *Urtica dioica* L. and modified atmosphere packaging on the shelf life of ground beef. *Meat Sci* **86**: 468–473.
- Arguelles-Arias A, Ongena M, Halimi B, Lara Y, Brans A, Joris B & Fickers P (2009) *Bacillus amyloliquefaciens* GA1 as a source of potent antibiotics and other secondary metabolites for biocontrol of plant pathogens. *Microb Cell Fact* **8**: 63.
- Ashelford KE, Fry JC, Bailey MJ & Day MJ (2002) Characterization of *Serratia* isolates from soil, ecological implications and transfer of *Serratia proteamaculans* subsp. *quinovora* Grimont *et al.* 1983 to *Serratia quinivorans* *corrig.*, sp. nov. *Int J Syst Evol Microbiol* **52**: 2281–2289.
- Barakat RK, Griffiths MW & Harris LJ (2000) Isolation and characterization of *Carnobacterium*, *Lactococcus*, and *Enterococcus* spp. from cooked, modified atmosphere packaged, refrigerated, poultry meat. *Int J Food Microbiol* **62**: 83–94.
- Bjorkroth KJ & Korkeala HJ (1997) Use of rRNA gene restriction patterns to evaluate lactic acid bacterium contamination of vacuum-packaged sliced cooked whole-meat product in a meat processing plant. *Appl Environ Microbiol* **63**: 448–453.
- Bjorkroth KJ, Geisen R, Schillinger U *et al.* (2000) Characterization of *Leuconostoc gasicomitatum* sp. nov., associated with spoiled raw tomato-marinated broiler meat strips packaged under modified-atmosphere conditions. *Appl Environ Microbiol* **66**: 3764–3772.
- Blixt Y & Borch E (2002) Comparison of shelf life of vacuum-packed pork and beef. *Meat Sci* **60**: 371–378.
- Bodilis J, Hedde M, Orange N & Barray S (2006) OprF polymorphism as a marker of ecological niche in *Pseudomonas*. *Environ Microbiol* **8**: 1544–1551.
- Borch E, Kant-Muermans ML & Blixt Y (1996) Bacterial spoilage of meat and cured meat products. *Int J Food Microbiol* **33**: 103–120.
- Budde BB, Hornbaek T, Jacobsen T, Barkholt V & Koch AG (2003) *Leuconostoc carnosum* 4010 has the potential for use as a protective culture for vacuum-packed meats: culture isolation, bacteriocin identification, and meat application experiments. *Int J Food Microbiol* **83**: 171–184.
- Cailliez-Grimal C, Miguindou-Mabiala R, Leseine M, Revol-Junelles AM & Milliere JB (2005) Quantitative polymerase chain reaction used for the rapid detection of *Carnobacterium* species from French soft cheeses. *FEMS Microbiol Lett* **250**: 163–169.
- Casaburi A, Nasi A, Ferrocino I, Di Monaco R, Mauriello G, Villani F & Ercolini D (2011) Spoilage-related activity of *Carnobacterium maltaromaticum* strains in air-stored and vacuum-packed meat. *Appl Environ Microbiol* **77**: 7382–7393.
- Chenoll E, Macian MC, Elizaquivel P & Aznar R (2007) Lactic acid bacteria associated with vacuum-packed cooked meat product spoilage: population analysis by rDNA-based methods. *J Appl Microbiol* **102**: 498–508.
- Chesneau O, Morvan A, Grimont F, Labischinski H & el Solh N (1993) *Staphylococcus pasteurii* sp. nov., isolated from human, animal, and food specimens. *Int J Syst Bacteriol* **43**: 237–244.
- Chiaromonte F, Anglade P, Baraige F, Gratadoux JJ, Langella P, Champomier-Verges MC & Zagorec M (2010) Analysis of *Lactobacillus sakei* mutants selected after adaptation to the gastrointestinal tracts of axenic mice. *Appl Environ Microbiol* **76**: 2932–2939.
- de Jong AE, Verhoeff-Bakkenes L, Nauta MJ & de Jonge R (2008) Cross-contamination in the kitchen: effect of hygiene measures. *J Appl Microbiol* **105**: 615–624.
- Diez AM, Urso R, Rantsiou K, Jaime I, Rovira J & Cocolin L (2008) Spoilage of blood sausages morcilla de Burgos treated with high hydrostatic pressure. *Int J Food Microbiol* **123**: 246–253.
- Dordet-Frisoni E, Dorchie G, De Araujo C, Talon R & Leroy S (2007) Genomic diversity in *Staphylococcus xylosum*. *Appl Environ Microbiol* **73**: 7199–7209.
- Doulgeraki AI, Paramithiotis S, Kagkli DM & Nychas GJ (2010) Lactic acid bacteria population dynamics during minced beef storage under aerobic or modified atmosphere packaging conditions. *Food Microbiol* **27**: 1028–1034.
- Ercolini D (2004) PCR-DGGE fingerprinting: novel strategies for detection of microbes in food. *J Microbiol Methods* **56**: 297–314.
- Ercolini D, Russo F, Torrieri E, Masi P & Villani F (2006) Changes in the spoilage-related microbiota of beef during

- refrigerated storage under different packaging conditions. *Appl Environ Microbiol* **72**: 4663–4671.
- Ercolini D, Ferrocino I, Nasi A *et al.* (2011) Monitoring of microbial metabolites and bacterial diversity in beef stored under different packaging conditions. *Appl Environ Microbiol* **77**: 7372–7381.
- Fan Y, Jin Z, Tong J *et al.* (2002) *Rothia amarae* sp. nov., from sludge of a foul water sewer. *Int J Syst Evol Microbiol* **52**: 2257–2260.
- Fontana C, Cocconcelli PS & Vignolo G (2006) Direct molecular approach to monitoring bacterial colonization on vacuum-packaged beef. *Appl Environ Microbiol* **72**: 5618–5622.
- Galkiewicz JP & Kellogg CA (2008) Cross-kingdom amplification using bacteria-specific primers: complications for studies of coral microbial ecology. *Appl Environ Microbiol* **74**: 7828–7831.
- Gargiulo V, De Castro C, Lanzetta R *et al.* (2008) Structural elucidation of the capsular polysaccharide isolated from *Kaistella flava*. *Carbohydr Res* **343**: 2401–2405.
- Gill CO (1996) Extending the storage life of raw chilled meats. *Meat Sci* **43S1**: 99–109.
- Gram L, Ravn L, Rasch M, Bruhn JB, Christensen AB & Givskov M (2002) Food spoilage–interactions between food spoilage bacteria. *Int J Food Microbiol* **78**: 79–97.
- Greisen K, Loeffelholz M, Purohit A & Leong D (1994) PCR primers and probes for the 16S rRNA gene of most species of pathogenic bacteria, including bacteria found in cerebrospinal fluid. *J Clin Microbiol* **32**: 335–351.
- Hastings JW, Stiles ME & von Holy A (1994) Bacteriocins of leuconostocs isolated from meat. *Int J Food Microbiol* **24**: 75–81.
- Holley RA, Peirson MD, Lam J & Tan KB (2004) Microbial profiles of commercial, vacuum-packaged, fresh pork of normal or short storage life. *Int J Food Microbiol* **97**: 53–62.
- Hugas M (1998) Bacteriocinogenic lactic acid bacteria for the biopreservation of meat and meat products. *Meat Sci* **49S1**: S139–S150.
- Jacobsen T, Budde BB & Koch AG (2003) Application of *Leuconostoc carnosum* for biopreservation of cooked meat products. *J Appl Microbiol* **95**: 242–249.
- Jay JM, Vilai JP & Hughes ME (2003) Profile and activity of the bacterial biota of ground beef held from freshness to spoilage at 5–7 degrees C. *Int J Food Microbiol* **81**: 105–111.
- Jiang Y, Gao F, Xu XL, Su Y, Ye KP & Zhou GH (2010) Changes in the bacterial communities of vacuum-packaged pork during chilled storage analyzed by PCR-DGGE. *Meat Sci* **86**: 889–895.
- Jimenez SM, Salsi MS, Tiburzi MC, Rafaghelli RC, Tessi MA & Coutaz VR (1997) Spoilage microflora in fresh chicken breast stored at 4 degrees C: influence of packaging methods. *J Appl Microbiol* **83**: 613–618.
- Jones RJ (2004) Observations on the succession dynamics of lactic acid bacteria populations in chill-stored vacuum-packaged beef. *Int J Food Microbiol* **90**: 273–282.
- Kim DH & Austin B (2008) Characterization of probiotic carnobacteria isolated from rainbow trout (*Oncorhynchus mykiss*) intestine. *Lett Appl Microbiol* **47**: 141–147.
- Koutsoumanis K, Stamatiou A, Skandamis P & Nychas GJ (2006) Development of a microbial model for the combined effect of temperature and pH on spoilage of ground meat, and validation of the model under dynamic temperature conditions. *Appl Environ Microbiol* **72**: 124–134.
- Labadie J (1999) Consequences of packaging on bacterial growth. Meat is an ecological niche. *Meat Sci* **52**: 299–305.
- Laursen BG, Bay L, Cleenwerck I, Vancanneyt M, Swings J, Dalgaard P & Leisner JJ (2005) *Carnobacterium divergens* and *Carnobacterium maltaromaticum* as spoilers or protective cultures in meat and seafood: phenotypic and genotypic characterization. *Syst Appl Microbiol* **28**: 151–164.
- Lecomte J, St-Arnaud M & Hijri M (2011) Isolation and identification of soil bacteria growing at the expense of arbuscular mycorrhizal fungi. *FEMS Microbiol Lett* **317**: 43–51.
- Leisner JJ, Laursen BG, Prevost H, Drider D & Dalgaard P (2007) *Carnobacterium*: positive and negative effects in the environment and in foods. *FEMS Microbiol Rev* **31**: 592–613.
- Liu F, Wang D, Du L, Zhu Y & Xu W (2010) Diversity of the predominant spoilage bacteria in water-boiled salted duck during storage. *J Food Sci* **75**: M317–M321.
- Macian MC, Chenoll E & Aznar R (2004) Simultaneous detection of *Carnobacterium* and *Leuconostoc* in meat products by multiplex PCR. *J Appl Microbiol* **97**: 384–394.
- McMullen LM & Stiles ME (1993) Microbial ecology of fresh pork stored under modified atmosphere at -1, 4.4 and 10 degrees C. *Int J Food Microbiol* **18**: 1–14.
- Metaxopoulos J, Mataragas M & Drosinos EH (2002) Microbial interaction in cooked cured meat products under vacuum or modified atmosphere at 4 degrees C. *J Appl Microbiol* **93**: 363–373.
- Muyzer G, de Waal EC & Uitterlinden AG (1993) Profiling of complex microbial populations by denaturing gradient gel electrophoresis analysis of polymerase chain reaction-amplified genes coding for 16S rRNA. *Appl Environ Microbiol* **59**: 695–700.
- Nagase N, Sasaki A, Yamashita K, Shimizu A, Wakita Y, Kitai S & Kawano J (2002) Isolation and species distribution of staphylococci from animal and human skin. *J Vet Med Sci* **64**: 245–250.
- Novakova D, Sedlacek I, Pantucek R, Stetina V, Svec P & Petras P (2006) *Staphylococcus equorum* and *Staphylococcus succinus* isolated from human clinical specimens. *J Med Microbiol* **55**: 523–528.
- Nychas GJ, Skandamis PN, Tassou CC & Koutsoumanis KP (2008) Meat spoilage during distribution. *Meat Sci* **78**: 77–89.
- Pennacchia C, Ercolini D & Villani F (2011) Spoilage-related microbiota associated with chilled beef stored in air or vacuum pack. *Food Microbiol* **28**: 84–93.
- Rachman C, Kabadjova P, Valcheva R, Prevost H & Dousset X (2004) Identification of *Carnobacterium* species by

- restriction fragment length polymorphism of the 16S-23S rRNA gene intergenic spacer region and species-specific PCR. *Appl Environ Microbiol* **70**: 4468–4477.
- Ringo E, Salinas I, Olsen RE, Nyhaug A, Myklebust R & Mayhew TM (2007) Histological changes in intestine of Atlantic salmon (*Salmo salar* L.) following *in vitro* exposure to pathogenic and probiotic bacterial strains. *Cell Tissue Res* **328**: 109–116.
- Sakala RM, Hayashidani H, Kato Y *et al.* (2002) Change in the composition of the microflora on vacuum-packaged beef during chiller storage. *Int J Food Microbiol* **74**: 87–99.
- Santos EM, Jaime I, Rovira J, Lyhs U, Korkeala H & Bjorkroth J (2005) Characterization and identification of lactic acid bacteria in “morcilla de Burgos”. *Int J Food Microbiol* **97**: 285–296.
- Schirmer BC, Heir E & Langsrud S (2009) Characterization of the bacterial spoilage flora in marinated pork products. *J Appl Microbiol* **106**: 2106–2116.
- Shaw BG & Harding CD (1984) A numerical taxonomic study of lactic acid bacteria from vacuum-packed beef, pork, lamb and bacon. *J Appl Bacteriol* **56**: 25–40.
- Spanggaard B, Huber I, Nielsen J *et al.* (2001) The probiotic potential against vibriosis of the indigenous microflora of rainbow trout. *Environ Microbiol* **3**: 755–765.
- Srinivas TN, Nageswara Rao SS, Vishnu Vardhan Reddy P *et al.* (2009) Bacterial diversity and bioprospecting for cold-active lipases, amylases and proteases, from culturable bacteria of kongsfjorden and Ny-alesund, Svalbard, Arctic. *Curr Microbiol* **59**: 537–547.
- Terta M, Kettani-Halabi M, Ibenyassine K *et al.* (2010) *Arabidopsis thaliana* cells: a model to evaluate the virulence of *Pectobacterium carotovorum*. *Mol Plant Microbe Interact* **23**: 139–143.
- Tryfinopoulou P, Tsakalidou E, Vancanneyt M, Hoste B, Swings J & Nychas GJ (2007) Diversity of *Shewanella* population in fish *Sparus aurata* harvested in the Aegean Sea. *J Appl Microbiol* **103**: 711–721.
- Tsubakishita S, Kuwahara-Arai K, Baba T & Hiramatsu K (2010) Staphylococcal cassette chromosome mec-like element in *Macrococcus caseolyticus*. *Antimicrob Agents Chemother* **54**: 1469–1475.
- Viana ES, Gomide LA & Vanetti MC (2005) Effect of modified atmospheres on microbiological, color and sensory properties of refrigerated pork. *Meat Sci* **71**: 696–705.
- Wechter WP, Begum D, Presting G, Kim JJ, Wing RA & Kluepfel DA (2002) Physical mapping, BAC-end sequence analysis, and marker tagging of the soilborne nematocidal bacterium, *Pseudomonas synxantha* BG33R. *OMICS* **6**: 11–21.
- Wortberg F, Nardy E, Contzen M & Rau J (2012) Identification of *Yersinia ruckeri* from diseased salmonid fish by Fourier transform infrared spectroscopy. *J Fish Dis* **35**: 1–10.
- Yildirim Z & Johnson MG (1998) Detection and characterization of a bacteriocin produced by *Lactococcus lactis* subsp. *cremoris* R isolated from radish. *Lett Appl Microbiol* **26**: 297–304.