CARBON DIOXIDE PACKAGING AS A MEANS OF CONTROLLING THE SPOILAGE FLORA OF DFD MEAT

I. ERICHSEN, G. MOLIN & B.-M. MÖLLER

Swedish Meat Research Institute, Box 504, S-244 00 Kävlinge, Sweden

INTRODUCTION

The packaging of DFD meat (Dark, Firm, Dry meat) under vacuum has been shown to reduce shelf life and cause discolouration of the meat due to the development of high numbers of <u>Pseudomonas putrefaciens and/or Enterobacteriaceae</u> (Nicol et al., 1976, Taylor & Shaw, 1977, Petterson & Gibbs, 1977, Bem et al., 1976, Newton & Gill, 1980).

Considering the fact that the frequency of DFD meat in Swedish beef carcasses on an average is about 6-8%, the technical and practical implications of the short shelf life of DFD beef is considerable.

Gas packaging of DFD beef in pure CO₂ has been shown to control the microflora of the meat, i.e., lactic acid bacteria increase and microorganisms more deteriorative for the meat quality decrease (Erichsen & Molin, 1981). This effect may be utilized to prolong the shelf life of refrigerated DFD beef.

The aim of the present study was to get further proof that packaging in pure CO_2 is a suitable method to increase the microbiological shelf life of refrigerated DFD beef. This was done by studying the microbial flora of normal pH beef and of DFD beef after storage in CO_2 and in vacuum packages.

MATERIAL AND METHODS

Experimental design

Four muscles of beef (Longissimus dorsi) with a pH of 5.5 and an equal number of the same type of muscle with a pH of 6.6 were selected for the experiments. Half of the material had been electrically stimulated by the low voltage method (Rudèrus & Fabiansson, 1981).

The beef muscles were cut into halves and each half wrapped in laminated plastics of saran-laquered poly with low gas permeability $(O_2=10 \text{ cm}^3/\text{cm}^2 - 24 \text{ hrs})$, $CO_2=10 \text{ cm}^3/\text{cm}^2 - 24 \text{ hrs})$. Four packages of DFD beef and four packages of normal pH beef were vacuum drawn (1 kPa) and the corresponding numbers of packages were filled with lOO% CO₂. The headspace in the gas-filled packages was about 10 litres. All samples were stored at 4°C for 34 days.

Microbiological sampling

The microbiological sampling was carried out according to Enfors et al. (1979). Samples for bacteriological examination were taken from all the muscles before packaging and from all the packages after storage. Using conventional dilution procedures viable counts were obtained from the suspensions on Plate Count Agar (PCA, Oxoid), Vilett-Red-Bile-Dextrose-Agar (VRBD, Oxoid) MRS-agar (deMan et al., 1960) and on Triple-Sugar-Iron-Agar (TSI, Difco).

^The PCA plates were incubated at 28°C for 3 days, the VRBD plates at 37°C for 24 hrs., the MRS plates at 30°C for 5 days and the TSI plates at ambient temperatures for 5 days in N₂ atmosphere.

Classification of isolates

Identification tests were carried out on microorganisms isolated from the fresh beef Samples and from samples stored under vacuum and in CO₂ atmosphere. The isolates were Picked from countable PCA plates used for the aerobic count. Twenty colonies were randomly Selected from each plate and a total of 480 colonies were isolated of which 160 repre-Sented the initial flora from the two types of beef.

The classification of the PCA isolates was performed according to Enfors et al. (1979) and Blickstad et al. (1981) except for Enterobacteriaceae which were classified by the system Micro-ID (General Diagnostics).

Gas analysis

^Before the plastic bags were opened for microbiological sampling a layer of silicon rubber was glued to each one of them. Through this layer a gas-tight syringe was inserted and 0.5 ml gas was withdrawn and analysed for CO_2 and oxygen. The vacuum-packaged

samples were first filled with 100 ml of helium to create sufficient gaseous volume to facilitate sampling of the contents. A gas chromatograph (Varian 920) fitted with Porpak Q and a molecular Sieve 5A column were used for CO_2 and oxygen.

Two samples were taken from each bag and the mean values of the analyses were determined.

RESULTS

Table 1 shows the increase of the bacterial counts on the different types of beef during storage.

No differences were found in bacterial numbers or bacterial types present on electrically stimulated and non-stimulated samples of beef during storage under vacuum and in pure CO_2 atmosphere. The values presented are therefore the mean values from bacterial examinations of both electrically stimulated and non-stimulated beef samples.

It can be seen that the total flora was higher on DFD beef than on normal beef in both packaging systems after storage for 34 days at 4°C. Even the count of <u>Enterobacteriaceae</u> on VRBD plates was higher on DFD beef than on normal beef. There was, however, a striking difference in the growth of <u>Enterobacteriaceae</u> in the two packaging systems. In 100% CO₂ atmosphere <u>Enterobacteriaceae</u> were clearly retarded as compared to vacuum-packaged samples both on DFD and of normal pH beef.

The lactic acid count was higher on beef packaged in ${\rm CO}_2$ atmosphere than on beef packaged in vacuum and somewhat higher in normal pH beef than on DFD beef.

In normal beef the lactic acid count seemed equal to the total count while the count on DFD beef was lower in both packaging systems. Vacuum-packaged samples were all spoilt with strong off-odours after storage for 34 days at 4° C. Normal beef showed no discolouration while a greenish discolouration was observed in connection with DFD beef. In these samples high concentrations of H₂S-producing microorganisms were observed (Table 1). Samples of both normal beef and DFD beef in CO₂ atmosphere had retained their normal red colour and did not produce any off-odours during the storage period. In CO₂-packaged beef samples H₂S-producing microorganisms had also developed but not to the same extent and no discolouration was evident after storage.

On normal beef samples ${\rm H}_2{\rm S}\mbox{-}{\rm producing}$ bacteria did not develop in any of the packaging systems.

The CO_2 and the oxygen content of each package was determined after the termination of the storage period. Table 1 shows that the CO_2 content in the vacuum-packaged samples of normal beef had increased during storage and reached almost the same concentration as in the CO_2 -packaged samples. The final oxygen concentration was higher in the vacuum-packaged samples than in the CO_2 -packaged samples.

The composition of the microflora of normal and DFD beef after storage in vacuum and in CO₂ atmosphere is shown in Table 2. On vacuum-packaged beef the microflora was composed mainly of <u>Hafnia alvei</u> and lactic acid bacteria. The major differences between DFD beef and normal pH beef were: the higher level of <u>Hafnia alvei</u>, the lower level of <u>Lactobacillus spp</u> and the presence <u>Erysiphelothrix-like</u> organisms, <u>Yersinia enterocolitica</u> and Brochothrix thermosphacta.

On the CO₂-packaged beef the predominance of <u>Lactobacillus</u> spp on both types of beef was stronger than on the vacuum packaged beef.

DISCUSSION

The initial microbiological load on beef used in the present study was relatively high (Table 1). Consequently, the test conditions for the CO_2 packaging technique were unfavourable and the total viable count at the termination of the storage period was of the same magnitude in both the vacuum packages and in the CO_2 packages. In spite of this fact both normal and DFD beef packaged in CO_2 had a normal visual appearance and produced no off-odours while all the vacuum-packaged beef samples were spoilt.

The good quality status of the CO₂-packaged beef, therefore, seems to be due to the fact that the CO₂-packaged beef developed a less deleterious microflora than the vacuum-packaged beef. From Table 2 it can be seen that the lactic acid bacteria strongly dominates in samples stored in CO₂ while in vacuum-stored samples also <u>Enterobacteriaceae</u> had developed high numbers, especially in DFD beef.

The short shelf life of vacuum-packaged DFD beef has been attributed to the growth of <u>Enterobacteriaceae</u> and to <u>Pseudomonas</u> (<u>Alteromonas</u>) <u>putrefaciens</u> (Patterson & Gibbs, 1977, <u>Newton & Gill</u>, 1980). However, <u>P. putrefaciens</u> was not isolated in the present study, only <u>Enterobacteriaceae</u>, with <u>H. alvei</u> as the major species (Table 2). <u>H. alvei</u> is known to be able to produce H₂S and cause discolouration and off-odours in meat (Hanna et al., 1979). In the present study therefore, <u>H. alvei</u> seems to be the organism mainly responsible for the spoilage of the vacuum-packaged DFD beef.

T

ata

T

pb

D

R

B

D

BT4J

E

E

CI CI

ET

m J H

RI LI J It could be argued whether the lack of growth of <u>H. alvei</u> in CO_2 packaged beef is due to an inhibition of this organism by CO_2 or whether it is due to a stimulatory effect on the growth of <u>Lactobacillus</u> resulting in turn in an inhibition of <u>H. alvei</u> due to antagonistic effects of Lactobacillus. Possibly both effects are at work.

The present study strongly supports the earlier findings by Erichsen & Molin, (1981) that packaging of DFD beef in a gas atmosphere of pure CO₂ will give the beef a good micro-biological shelf life. The method can therefore be recommended for wholesale packaging of DFD beef.

REFERENCES

Bem, Z., Hechelmann, H. & Leïstner, L. (1976) Mikrobiologie des DFD Fleisches. Die Fleischwirtschaft, 7, 985-987.

Blickstad, E., Enfors, S.-O. & Molin, G. (1981) The effect of hyperbaric carbon dioxide pressure on the microbial flora of pork stored at 4 and 15°C. Journal of Applied Bacteriology (in press).

Enfors, S.-O., Molin, G. & Ternström, A. (1979) Effect of packaging under carbon dioxide, nitrogen or air on the microbial flora of pork stored at 4°C. Journal of Applied Bacteriology, 47, 197-208.

Erichsen, I. & Molin, G. (1981) The microbial flora of normal and high pH beef stored at 4°C in different gas environments.

Journal of Food Protection (in press).

Hanna, M.O., Smith, G.C., Hall, L.C. & Vanderzant, C. (1979) Role of Hafnia alvei and a Lactobacillus species in the spoilage of vacuum-packaged strip loin steaks. Journal of Food Protection 42, 569-571.

deMan, J.C., Rogosa, M. & Sharpe, M.E. (1960) A medium for the cultivation of lactobacilli. Journal of Applied Bacteriology, 23, 130-138.

Newton, K.G. & Gill, C.O. (1980) Control of spoilage in vacuum packaged dark firm dry (DFD) meat. Journal Food Technology <u>15</u>, 227-234.

Nicol, D.J., Shaw, M.K. & Ledward, D.A. (1970) ^HYdrogen sulphide production by bacteria and sulfmyoglobin formation in prepacked chilled beef. Applied Bacteriology 19, (6), 937-939.

Patterson, J.T. & Gibbs, P.A. (1977) Incidence and spoilage potential of isolates from vacuum packaged meat of high pH value. Journal of Applied Bacteriology <u>43</u>, 25-38.

Rudérus, H. & Fabiansson, S. (1981) Research on low voltage electrical stimulation of beef carcasses in Sweden. Ann. Technol. agric. (in press).

Table 1.

Microbial counts on normal beef and DFD beef stored at 4° C in vacuum and in CO₂ atmosphere. Gas composition in the packages at the time of opening is also given.

Initia Normal	DFD	Vac Normal	DFD	CO Normal	2 DFD
5.6	5.7	7.5	8.4	7.4	8.3
3.5	2.6	6.9	6.4	7.5	7.0
2.6	1.8	6.5	7.6	4.0	4.3
0.9	2.3	1.2	6.4	1.1	4.2
red	red	red	green	red	red
no	no	yes	yes	no	no
-	-	93	-	94	98
-	-	1.3	-	0.6	0.3
5.6	6.6	5.4	6.4	5.4	6.1
	Initia Normal 5.6 3.5 2.6 0.9 red no - - 5.6	Initial Normal DFD 5.6 5.7 3.5 2.6 2.6 1.8 0.9 2.3 red red no no - - - - - - 5.6 6.6	Initial Normal DFD Vac Normal 5.6 5.7 7.5 3.5 2.6 6.9 2.6 1.8 6.5 0.9 2.3 1.2 red red red no no yes - - 93 - - 1.3 5.6 6.6 5.4	Initial Normal DFD Vacuum Normal DFD 5.6 5.7 7.5 8.4 3.5 2.6 6.9 6.4 2.6 1.8 6.5 7.6 0.9 2.3 1.2 6.4 red red red green no no yes yes - - 93 - - - 1.3 - 5.6 6.6 5.4 6.4	Initial Normal DFD Vacuum Normal DFD Normal CO Normal 5.6 5.7 7.5 8.4 7.4 3.5 2.6 6.9 6.4 7.5 2.6 1.8 6.5 7.6 4.0 0.9 2.3 1.2 6.4 1.1 red red red green red no no yes yes no - - 93 - 94 - - 1.3 - 0.6 5.6 6.6 5.4 6.4 5.4

Table 2

Organisms	Percent	Organisms	in vacuum-packa	d and CC	2-packed beef samp	oles
	Initially Normal DFD		Vac Normal	CO ₂ Normal	CO2 Normal DFD	
Lactobacillus spp. (homofermentative)	-	-	61	10	93	84
Brochothrix thermosphacta	6	-	-	6	-	6
Erysipelothrix - like	-	-	1	14	-	6
Staphylococcus spp.	14	15		-	1	-
Streptococcus spp.	-	-	-	1		-
Enterobacter agglomerans	1	-	-	-	-	-
-"- <u>sakazakii</u>	1	1	-	-		-
Hafnia alvei			36	49	-	-
Serratia rubidea 2				4		1-1-1-1
-"- liguefaciens		-	- 10 - 10 - 10 - 10 - 10 - 10 - 10 - 10	1.		
Yersinia enterocolitica	-		전 그 것 같은 동	9		1
Proteus morganii	-	-		-	1	- 1 E
Acinetobacter calcoaceticus	13	6	-	-		
coryneforms	38	64	1000	1	3	-
Flavobacterium spp.	6	4	1	1	2	-
Micrococcus spp.	-	-	-	-		3
Moraxella spp.	1	1		-		-
Pseudomonas "bovis" ³	18	9		-	in the last	5
-"- fluorescens	1	-	1.1.1.1.1.1.1	1 · · · ·		-
-"- fragi	1	-		-		-
Vibrionaceae	-	-	-	3		-
Total aerobic count (log number/cm ²)	5.6	5.7	7.5	8.4	7.4	8.3

1 Lactic acid bacteria according to the defination of Orla-Jensen (1919)

2 Enterobacteriaceae

3 New species suggested by Molin & Ternström (1981)