# EUROPEAN MEETING

RNO. CZECHOSLOVAKIA

AUGUST 26th - 31st 1968

SECTION

A 6

G.A. Gardner & J. Patton

Ulster Curers' Association, 2 Greenwood Avenue, Belfast 4.

## Variations in the Composition of the Flora on a Wiltshire Cured Bacon Side.

The microbial association of any food is dependent on numerous physical and chemical influences. These vary between and even within a single product. The physical, chemical and microbiological principles of Wiltshire bacon Production have been reviewed by Gibbons (1953). The most numerous bacteria on sides of bacon are micrococci (e.g. Garrard & Lochhead, 1939; Ingram, 1952). Other 'organisms <sup>Such</sup> as <u>Clostridium</u>, <u>Streptococcus</u>, <u>Enterobacteriaceae</u>, and <u>Alcaligenes</u> are less frequently found (Ingram & Hobbs, 1954).

In the production of bacon the whole sides after immersion in a curing brine are matured either in a stack or on a rail for 7 - 14 days at <u>ca.</u>  $4^{\circ}$ C. This period of maturation permits the drainage of excess brine from the side and also ensures the even distribution of curing salts.

The work reported in this paper was carried out to determine the numbers and types of bacteria on a bacon side after the maturation period. Three areas of the side were examined: the singed rind, the unsinged rind, and the cut muscle surface. The latter two areas are those recognised by the factory personnel as the positions where bacterial ' slime production can be first noted.

### Methods and materials

Bacon sides. Bacon sides were obtained from 3 factories (X, Y and Z). The sides were matured in a stack for 9 and 8 days in factories X and Y respectively. Those from factory Z had been suspended from a rail for 7 days in the maturation cellar.

<u>Samples.</u> Samples of 10 sq.cm. from three areas were taken from each side, using a metal template and sterile instruments. The areas sampled were: (i) the skin from the outside of the hind leg (singed rind), (ii) the skin from the fold underneath the foreleg (usinged rind) and (iii) the cut surface of the gracilis muscle (meat).

Enumeration of bacteria. Samples for analysis were transported to the laboratory in bottles containing steril<sup>e</sup> sand. To each was added 10 ml of sterile 0,1 % (W/v) pepto<sup>-</sup> ne water and the bottles were shaken vigorously on a mechanical shaker for 3 min. Serial dilutions were prepared in the same diluent. Aliquots of 0,1 ml were spread on the surface of plates by the technique of Davis & Bell (1959). The melium used for samples from factory X was the basal medium of Gardner (1966) with the addition of 4 % (W/v) NaCl; other samples were plated out on the same medium, in which the level of glycerol was reduced to 0,5 % (W/v)  $g^{\mu}$ to which 1 % (W/v) glukose was added. Colonies were enumerated after 4 days' incubation at 22°C.

<u>Classification of isolates.</u> After counting, each plate was divided into eight sectors and all the colonies on a number of sectors were picked off to give, where possible, <u>ca</u>. 30 isolates/sample. Purified cultures were classified by the methods shown in Table 1. Yeasts were identified solely on the morphology of Gram-steined preparations. Table 1.

Classification of bacon bacteria

Gram reaction	Morphology	Catalase	Method of classification
-	Rods	+	Harrigan & McCance (1966)
+	Cocci	+	Anaerobic acid production from glucose: + <u>Staphylo-</u> coccus, - <u>Microccoccus</u> (Baird-Parker, 1966)
+	Rods or cocco bacilli	)	Lactic acid bacteria
+	Pleomorphic rods	+	Coryneform bacteria
+	Rods	+	For <u>Microbacterium</u> <u>thermosphactum</u> (Gardner, 1966)

## Results

The numbers and types of becteria on the bacon sides matured in a stack are shown in Tables 2 and 3 and for those matured in a hanging position in Table 4. Within one treatment there was a great variation in the number of bacteria/sq.cm.; in a few cases there was a difference of a factor of x200. Therefore because of the small number of samples, the figures only give a general indication of the level of contamination. In general the numbers on the unsinged sites were higher than the singed sites, and both were higher than the meat site. The overall degree of contamination was higher in the sides examined from factory 2.

Micrococcus was the prelominant genus in the singed rind samples. In the stacked sides <u>Acinetobacter</u> spp. were also isolated. In factory Y they accounted for 10 % of the flora.

Micrococcus remained the predominant genus on the unsinged rind samples from factory X, but <u>Acinetobacter</u> spp. were

51

more frequently isolated from sides from factories Y and Z. In this site the flora was found to be more diverse in the sides of factory Y.

Micrococcus spp. also predominated on the muscle samples, but to a lesser extent. <u>Acinetobacter</u> spp. were isolated from most sides, and other organisms such as <u>Vibrio</u> spp., coryneform bacteria and lactic acid bacteria were more frequently found.

## Discussion

The average levels of contamination of the three sites examined in the present study ranged from <u>ca</u>.  $10^4-10^6$ /sq. cm. Using an excision method of sampling, Gibbons (1940) reported mean counts on the pleural membrane of sides on receipt from the factory of  $10^{4+2}-10^{4+5}$ /sq.cm. After 10 -12 days' storage at 1,1°C these mean counts had rised to  $10^{5+18}-10^{6+94}$ /sq.cm. Gibbons found large variations in counts of particular sites at any one time, e.g. the difference between the maximum and minimum loads on sides as received from the factory were log 3,0 (i.e. 1000x) per sq.cm., whereas after 10 - 12 days at 1,1°C this had increased to <u>ca</u>. log 5,0 (100,000x) per sq.cm.

These variations may result from differences in the flore, different types of Growth of the same organism, or variability in the method of detection (Gibbons, 1940). Garrard & Lochhead (1939) found that sides which were highly contaminated before going into cure remained contaminated after maturation. Therefore variation in levels of contamination brought about by slaughter and butchery operations would be reflected in the bacon. Different practices at each factory would contribute to this. In most maturation cellars temperature is controlled, but variations between factories do exist. The relative humidity can vary within and between different factories. The results from factory Z suggest that the overall level of contamination of bacon sides is higher. This is not due to a difference in the method of maturation, as some of our unpublished data has shown that statistically there is no significant difference between the rates of growth of bacteria on bacon sides matured in a stack or in a hanging position over a period of 7 days at 4°C. In addition, the types of bacteria isolate: from sides from factory Y were more diverse than the two other factories examined.

Tofte Jespersen & Riemann (1958) demonstrated that the bacterial load on the rind was greater than that from the meat of a bacon side. After 7 days' maturation at  $5^{\circ}C$ count on nutrient agar containing 4 % NaCl were <u>ca</u>.  $10^{5}/\text{sq.cm.}$  for the rind and <u>ca</u>.  $10^{4}/\text{sq.cm.}$  for the meat. Ingram (1960) reported that bacon immediately out of cure carried a surface lond of  $10^{4}-10^{5}/\text{sq.cm.}$ , which increased more than tenfold during a week of maturation at  $4^{\circ}$ . Counts on the skin were on average higher than counts from the <u>longissimus dorsi</u> at both times.

Counts on the bacon sides in the present study, although Variable, are of the same order as those reported by ther Workers. The bacterial contamination of the meat site tended to be lower than either the singed or unsinged rind, thus confirming the observations of Tofte Jespersen & Riemann (1958) and Ingram (1960). Of all the sites this Would probably have the least opportunity for outside contamination. The unsinged rind had on average the highest levels of contamination. This is probably due to the fact that most of the organisms on the skin of the pig are killed in the singeing process. The area of unsinged rind, underneath the foreleg, tends to be less well scraped during the slaughter operation.

It is now well established that micrococci are the predominant bacteria on matured Wiltshire bacon (Garrard & Lochhead, 1)39; Brooks, Haines, Moran & Pace, 1940; Ingram, 1952, 1960). The present work has shown this to be valid for both the rind and meat surfaces of a bacon side. However, there does appear to be an increase on the meat site of a proportion of Gram-negative organisms, such as <u>Acinetobacter</u> spp. and <u>Vibrio</u> spp.

Tofte Jespersen & Riemann (1958) found that, on a nutrien agar with 4 % NaCl, cocci predominated on the rind side at most stages during a maturation period of 14 days at 5 . However, on the meat side rods became predominant after 7 days at this temperature. Kitchell (1958) using a 10 % NaCl medium found 42 % Gram-positive bacteria on the skin and 63 % Gram-positive bacteria on the muscle of bacon after 14 days' maturation. Tofte Jespersen & Rieman (1958) obtained higher counts from bacon using a brine agar (20 % NaCl) on both the rind and meat of bacon after curing. Rod shaped bacteria predominated in the meat. whereas both cocci and rods were of the same order on the rind except after 7 days when rods appeared to out number the cocci. Gibbons (1940) found that the highest counts of bacon samples were obtained on media with 3 - 6 % NaCl Occasionally counts equal to or higher than those on 4 % NaCl were obtained on 10 % NaCl. It is difficult to assest these results accurately because of the different media used and also the isolates were not classified.

Ingram (1960) found that the flora of matured bacon consisted of micrococci plus a roughly similar number of lactobacilli and a smaller proportion of Gram-negative rods. The latter accounted for 4 - 79 % of the flora of the <u>l. dorsi</u> samples and 0, 1 - 20 % of the skin samples of bacon sides after 7 days' maturation.

Slime on the muscle of refrigerated bacon can contain 50<sup>7</sup> lactobacilli, 33 % <u>Micrococcus</u>, 10 % <u>Enterobacteriaceae</u> and 7 % M. <u>thermosphactum</u> (Gardner, unpublished data).

The microbiological effect of salt in a food probably depends on osmotic withdrawal of water. This will be reflected in the water activity of the food. A brine Concentration in bacon exceeding about 5 % will exclude the normal pork spoilage flora, <u>Pseudomonas</u>, but permit the growth of the <u>Micrococcus</u> (Ingram & Kitchell, 1967). On the basis of a<sub>w</sub> it could be postulated that the <sup>Ausculature</sup> of bacon would have a higher value than the skin and thus explain the apparent increasing importance of <u>Acinetobacter</u> spp. and <u>Vibrio</u> spp. in the flora.

Gibbons & Rose (1950) found with cured <u>pseas</u> muscle that at pH of 5,7 the flora was almost entirely composed of deasts, whereas at pH 6,3 the flora was predominantly micrococci. Kitchell & Ingram (1965) demonstrated that the <u>ante-mortem</u> feeding of sugar to pigs resulted in a lowering of the pH of the musculature. There were fewer bacteria on the muscles of bacon from pigs treated in this manner, but there was no difference in the loads from the skin. These authors also concluded that there may be factors other than pH which affect the numbers and types of microorganisms on bacon sides.

However, factors such as level of NaCl  $(a_w)$ , amount of NO<sub>2</sub>, pH (i.e. the physical and chemical characteristics of the environment) would have to be measured in order to obtain a better understanding of the microbial ecology of Wiltshire cured bacon.

#### References

- Baird-Parker A.C. (1966). Methods for classifying staphylococci and micrococci in Identification Methods for Microbiologists, Par A. Ed.B.M. Gibbs & F.A. Skinner. London: Academic Press. P. 59.
- Brooks J., Haines R.B., Moran T. & PaceJ. (1940). The function of nitrate, nitrite and bacteria in the curing of bacon and hams. <u>Spec. Rep. Fd. Invest. Bd.</u> <u>Lond.</u> No. 49.
- Davis J.G. & Bell J.S. (1959). A 'drop technique' for colony counts in microbiology. <u>Lab. Prac.</u> 8, 58.
- Gardner G.A. (1966). A selective medium for the enumeration of <u>Microbacterium thermosphactum</u> in meat and meat products. J. appl. Bact. 29, 455.
- Gerrard E.H. & Lochhead A.G. (1939). A study of bacteria contaminating sides for wiltshire bacon with special consideration of their behaviour in concentrated salt solutions. <u>Canad. J. Res.</u>, <u>17</u>, 45.
- Gibbons N.E. (1940). Canadian Wiltshire bacon. VI. Quantitative bacteriological studies on product. <u>Canad</u>. J. Res., 18, 202.
- Gibbons N.E. & Rose D. (1950). Effect of ante-mortem treatment of pigs on the quality of Wiltshire bacon-Canad. J. Res., 28, 438.
- Gibbons N.S. (1953). Wiltshire bacon. Adv. in Fd. Res., 4, 1.
- Harrigan W.F. & McCance M.E. (1966). Laboratory Methods in Microbiology. London: Academic Press. P. 199.
- Ingram M. (1952). Internal bacterial taints ('Bone-taint' or 'Souring) of cured pork legs. J. Hyg., 50, 165.
- Ingram M. (1960). Bacterial multiplication in packed Wiltshire bacon. J. appl. Bact., 23, 206.

Ingram M. & Hobbs B.C. (1954). The bacteriology of "pasteurized" canned hams. <u>J.R. sanit. Inst.</u>, <u>74</u>, 1151.

.

- Ingram M. & Kitchell A.G. (1967). Salt as a preservative for foods. J. Ed. Technol., 2, 1.
- Kitchell A.G. (1958). The micrococci of pork and bacon and . of bacon curing brines. 2nd Int. Symp. Fd. Microbiol., Cambridge, p. 191. London: H.M.S.O.
- Kitchell A.G. & Ingram M. (1965). The effect on the bacterial flora of Wiltshire bacon of feeding sugar to pigs before slaughter. <u>Proc. 1st Int. Cong. Fd. Sci.</u> <u>Technol.</u>, 2, 105.
- Tofte Jespersen N.J. & Riemann H. (1958). The numbers of salt tolerant bacteria in curing brine and on bacon. 2nd Int. Symp. Fd. Microbiol., Cambridge, P. 177. London: H.M.3.0.

Table 2.

The number and types of bacteria found on wiltshire cured bacon sides which were matured in a stack (factory I)

Site	Total	1.2			Total no. isolates exami-	Incidence (%) of								
	no. of sides exami-	x 104		Micro- coccus		Staphy- lococ- cus		Acineto-Vibrio		Miscel- laneous				
	ned	Min.	Max	Mean	ned		2		3	416	1			84
Singed rind	5	0,78	83,5	20,2	101	88,3	₩¥ (5)	5,7	(2)	2,8	(1)	0	3,2 +	+
Unsinged rind	- 5	1,2	16,5	7,98	99	94,4	(5)	1,6	(1)	4,0	(1)	0	0	
Meat	5	0,03	8,5	2,72	104	64,2	(5)	-		5,9	(4)	19,0 (2)	10,9 +	++

\*\* The figures in parentheses are the number of bacon sides on which the organism was found.

+ Includes M. thermosphactum and yeasts.

++ Includes M. thermosphactum, yeasts, Alcaligenes, Aeromonas and flavobacteria.

Table 3.

The number and types of bacteria found on wiltshire cured bacon sides which were matured in a stack (factory Y)

Site	31.	Count/sq.cm. x 10 <sup>4</sup>			al no. isola- examined	Incidence (%) of							
	al no. of examined					Micrococcus	Staphylo- coccus	Acineto- bacter	Coryneform bacteria	io	Lactic acid bacteria	Miscellane- ous	
	Total des en	Min.	Max.	Mean	Tota tes	Micr	Stap	Acin bact	Corj	Vibrio	Lact bact	Miscous	
Singed	5	0,13	7,7	2,4	107	80,5 (5) жж	0	9,2 (4)	1,6	3,3	0,5	4,6	
unsinged rind	5	0,15	50	15,3	168	64,9 (5)	10,4	10,4	3,1	1,2	1,2	8,8	
Meat	5	0,08	4,35	1,7	141	59,8 (5)	(1)8	13,0	6,9 (3)	2,7	( <sup>3</sup> <sub>2</sub> ) <sup>7</sup>	12,1	

\*\* The figures in parentheses are the number of bacon sides on which the organism was found.

+ Includes Achromabacter, Alcaligenes and Enterobacteriaceae.

++ Includes Achromabacter, yeasts and M. thermosphactum.

- +++ Includes Achromabacter, yeasts, M. thermosphactum adn Enterobacteriaceae.
- 59

Table 4.

The number and types of bacteria found on wiltshire cured bacon sides which were matured in a hanging position (Factory Z)

Site	Total no. Count/sg.cm. of sides s 10				Total no.	Incidence (%) of					
	examined		Max.	Mean	of isola- tes exa- mined	Micro- coccus	Acineto- bacter	Miscel- laneous			
Singed rind	4	0,38	11,4	4,5	100	95,2 (4)*	× O	4,8 +			
Unsinged rind	5	0,66	30,4	13,8	. 119	90,5 (5)	5,8 (3)	3,7 ++			
Reat	5	1,4	23,5	9,1	110	86,0 (5)	9,8 (3)	4,1 +++			

- \*\* The figures in purentheces are the number of bacon sides on which the organism was found.
- + Includes Aeromonas, yeasts and unclassified Gram positive, catalase positive rods.
- ++ Includes <u>Aeromonas</u>, <u>Enterobacteriaceae</u> and unclassified Gram positive, catalase positive rods.
- +++ Includes yeasts, lactic acid bacteria and unclassified Gram positive, catalase positive rods.