MICROBIAL BEHAVIOR OF FRESH SAUSAGES CONTAINIG SHEEP OR GOAT MEAT tion

J. ZAPATA, V. MATOS, F. TELES, Z. GUEDES and M. VASCONCELOS ean

J/g) ^{Departamento de Techolo Fortaleza, Ceará, Brasil.} Departamento de Tecnologia de Alimentos, Universidade Federal do Ceará, Caixa Postal 12168 Forta SUMMARY

A study to evaluate the bacterial content of fresh sausages manufactured with pork fat and sheep or goat meat and stored for 30 days at 5 °C was conducted. Meats were used to formulate Sausages containing two levels of pork fat (16% and 27%) and two sodium nitrite concentrations ppm and 100 ppm). Sausages stuffed into natural casings and packaged into nylon/poly-Live ^{eth}ylene film with vacuum (76 cm Hg) or without vacuum. Mesophiles, psycrophiles, coliforms, §. aureus and bacteria from genera Salmonella, Clostridium and Yersinia were searched for on r_{aW} meat and on sausages with 0, 15 and 30 days storage.

Results indicated initial levels of mesophilic bacteria of about 10⁴ CFU/g in sheep and goat ^{raw} meat and 10² MPN/g coliforms in goat raw meat. After 15 days storage sausages packaged Without vacuum had increased mesophiles, coliforms and <u>S</u>. <u>aureus</u> bacteria to levels of 10⁵ $f^{FU/g}$, 10^2 NPN/g and 10^2 CFU/g respectively, and psycrophiles to 10^6 to 10^7 CFU/g.

After 30 days storage without vacuum sheep sausages presented abnoxious adours and faded d^{in colours} and goat sausages reached levels of about 10⁷ CFU/g, 10² MPN/g, 10⁷ CFU/g and 10³ CFU/g for mesophilic, coliforms psycrophiles and <u>S</u>. <u>aureus</u>, respectively.

Storage with vacuum packaging kept levels of bacteria in both sheep and goat sausages around 10^5 CFU/g, 10^2 MPN/g, 10^5 CFU/g and 10 CFU/g for mesophiles, coliforms, psycrophiles and <u>S</u>. ppl. dureus, respectively, to the and of the 30 days storage period.

Sausage fat content seemed not to affect the growth of bacteria in this stydy. Although no Organisms from the genera <u>Salmonella</u>, <u>Crostridium</u> or <u>Yersinia</u> were found in this experiment neal ^{Sod}ium nitrite (100 ppm) did not inhibit <u>S</u>. <u>aureus</u> growth in sheep or goat sausages.

INTRODUCTION iol.

For many years sheeps and goats have been reared in Northeast Brasil as an extensive farming activity mainly for milk and skin production and with limmitted attention to the eating 94. Auality of meat. For this reason mutton and goat meats from older animals are considered solution and eventually to the presence of ed⁵ ^{Somehow} objectionable due to strong flavour, poor texture and eventually to the presence of Obnoxious odours.

The manufacturing of sausages containing pork fat and lean meat from lamb and goat has been ^{Considered} an alternative way to make available meat from older animals to a larger segment of the local population. Therefore it is important that, other than the organoleptic charac teristics of the product, the microbiological condition of these types of sausages can be D. Rssessed.

The present study was designed to evaluate the presence of pathogenic and putrefactive back b^acteria on fresh goat and sheep sausages stored under refrigeration for a 30 days period.

end MATERIAL AND METHODS

Eight types of sausages were formulated with sheep or goat meat as to contain 16% or 27% Pork fat (A and B), 0 ppm or 100 ppm sodium nitrite (C and D), cure and spices. The meat used L In this trial was a composite of the lean partes of recently slaughtered animals.

Tail ^{sausages} were packaged under vacuum (cm Hg) or without vacuum and stored for 30 days at S 9C. Fresh sausages were analysed for proximal composition soon after preparation. Microbial exami $e^{i\theta} e_{x_{amination}}$ was performed on the lean meat and on sausages after 0, 15 and 30 days storage (T₀, T₁, T₂).

Moisture and ashes were determined according to the procedure described by INSTITUTO ADOLFO Moisture and ashes were determined according to the procedure described by final solution of the A.O.A.C. (1980) to the A.O.A.C. (1980) to the A.O.A.C. (1980)

Twenty five grams of lean meat or sausage were blended with 225 ml buffered saline for two minutes to prepare a 10^{-1} dilution, acoording to I.C.M.S.F. (1978). Further dilutions of this were used for the following analysis: mesophilic and psycrophilic organisms according to FLANARA (1981), coliforms, <u>S. aureus</u> and <u>Salmonella</u> according to I.C.M.S.F. (1978), sulfur reducing <u>Clostridia</u> according to FAE (1985) and <u>Y. enterocolitica</u> by the methods of WARNEKEN <u>et al.</u> (1987) and RUGAI <u>et al.</u> (1968). All results were expressed as colony forming units per gram sample (CFU/g) except for coliforms which were expressed as most probably number of cells per gram sample (MPN/g).

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Results in Table 1 indicate that goat meat sausages had slightly higher values of fat $(2^{5^{\frac{5}{2}}})$ and 15%, average) than sheep sausages (23% and 13%, average). This is probably due to a I higher content of fat in goat lean meat than in sheep lean meat. Moisture content tended to variate in the sausages accordingly to the fat content, as expected. Sheep sausages. Lean sheep meat indicated a relatively high initial contamination with meso I philic bacteria (4.4 × 104 cmu(z)) and the sector of the secto philic bacteria (4.4 x 10⁴ CFU/g), low levels of psycrophiles (75 CFU/g) and absence of coling forms and <u>S</u>. <u>aureus</u> (Table 2). After sausage preparation and before the storing period (T_0) however, the presence of faecal coliforms and <u>S</u>. <u>aureus</u> were detected in the product (Table 2) R indicating contamination during the handling and blending procedures of sausage manufacturing. Storing of the sausage without vacuum packaging allowed the microbial examination just to the Wi 15th day of storage (Table 2) when they developed objectionable colours and odours probably due to the proliferation of mesophilic $(10^3 \text{ to } 10^7 \text{ CFU/g})$ and/or psycrophilic $(10^5 \text{ to } 10^7 \text{ CFU/g})$ CFU/g) bacteria. Similar levels of microbial growth were reached by vacuum packaged sausages after 30 days of storage (Table 2). Sodium nitrite (sausages C and D) showed limmited effect on <u>S</u>. <u>aureus</u> growth which reached levels of 10^2 CFC/g in the sausages packaged without vaccub Te and 10 CF/g in the ones with vacuum (Table 2).

<u>Goat sausages</u>. Lean goat meat indicated relatively high initial levels of both mesophilic and psycrophilic bacteria (about 10^4 CFU/g, Table 3) and also presence of coliform bacteria (2) MPN/g). After 30 days storage sausages packaged without vacuum (Table 3) reached levels of mesophilic and/or psycrophilic bacteria of 10^7 CFU/g, aproximately. Vacuum packagin, however kept the level of these bacteria in the range of 10^5 CFU/g to the end of the 30 days storage period (Table 3). Coliform bacteria in sausages packaged with vacuum or without vacuum was kept relatively low (10 to 100 MPN/g) during the storage period (Table 3). <u>S. aureus</u> contamination was detected in the sausages packaged without vacuum (Table 3) soon after manufacture (T_o). The level of this microrganism increased throughout the 30 days storage period to levels of about 10^3 CFU/g. <u>S. aureus</u> was not detected in the sausages stored with vacuum.

The presence of bacteria from the genera <u>Salmonella</u>, <u>Clostridium</u> or <u>Yersinia</u> was not detected in any type of sausage analysed in this study.

CONCLUSION

Sausages containing goat meat were slightly higher in fat content than those containing sheet meat. However, this difference did not affect the level of microrganisms in the products durith the refrigerated (5 °C) 30 days storage period.

Raw meat from sheep and goat used for sausages manufacture had rather high levels of mesophili and/or psucrophilic bacteria.

The presence of faecal coliforms and <u>S</u>. <u>aureus</u> in the sausages soon after manufacture $sugges^{i}$ that ingredients as well as handling procedures have to be carefully checked at the processine room level.

D

Vaccum packaging produced sausages with lower levels of microrganisms than those package without vacuum.

 t^{WO} Sodium nitrite (100 ppm) did not inhibit <u>S</u>. <u>aureus</u> growth in sausages contaminated with this

^{to} ^Bacteria belonging to genera <u>Salmonella</u>, <u>Clostridium</u> or <u>Yersinia</u> were not detected in the f^{ul} sausages analysed in this study.

its REFERENCES of

0

A.O.A.C. Association of Official Analytical Chemists. 1980 "Official Methods of Analysis of the Association of Official Analytical Chemists", 20th ed. Association of official Analy tical Chemists, Washington, 1018 p.

F.A.E. Fundação para Alimentação Escolar. 1985. "Métodos para Análise Microbiológico. Alimen tação Escolar: Controle de Qualidade". Fundação para Alimentação Escolar, Brasília, 39 p. 258

³ I.C.M.S.F. International Comission of Microbiological Specification for Food. organisms in Foods: Their Significance and Methods of Enumeration". International Comis-sion of Microbiological Specification for Foods, Academic Press, Inc., New York, 434 p. fed "Micro-

INSTITUTO ADOLFO LUTZ. 1976. "Normas Analíticas do Instituto Adolfo Lutz. Métodos Químicos e 250 Físicos para Análise de Alimentos", 2ª ed., São Paulo, 533 p.

2) RUGAL, E., ARAŬJO, A. 1968. Meio de cultura para identificação presuntiva de bacilos intesti nais gram-negativos. Rev. Inst. Adolfo Lutz, 28 79 - 83.

WERNEKEN, M.B., NUNES M.P., NOLETO, A.L.S. 1987. Incidence of Yersinia species in meat samples Purchased in Rio de Janeiro, Brasil, J. Food Protec., 50(7), 578 - 579. 10

an (2) 0 ŗĭ 196

st

res) oct

Table 1. - Proximate composition (%) of fresh coarse sausages formulated using lamb or goat

8-	Composition (%)						
sausage	Moisture	Protein	Fat	Ash			
Lamb Meat							
A							
P	63.1 ± 2.8	16.8 ± 0.6	16.0 ± 2.8	2.3 ± 0.2			
5	55.2 ± 3.7	13.7 ± 2.4	26.6 ± 0.3	2.7 ± 0.0			
c	62.3 ± 2.1	16.0 ± 1.1	14.7 ± 2.2	2.5 ± 0.1			
d	56.4 ± 0.1	14.1 ± 1.8	24.9 ± 0.4	2.5 ± 0.1			
Soat meat							
A							
B	65.5 ± 0.7	14.8 ± 2.1	13.3 ± 0.5	2.7 ± 0.1			
0	58.0 ± 1.5	12.5 ± 1.6	24.4 ± 0.5	2.5 ± 0.3			
D	66.5 ± 0.2	15.5 ± 1.4	13.4 ± 1.4	2.6 ± 0.1			
	59.1 ± 1.0	14.0 ± 2.7	21.3 ± 0.9	2.7 ± 0.1			

B = high fat/No nitrite

C = low fat/nitrite

D = high fat/nitrite

Table 2. - Microbial counts in raw sheep meat and in sausages manufactured with sheep meat and stored at 5 °C for 30 days.

		Pac	Packaging with vacuum						
Analysed samples		Mesophil. CFU/g	Coliforms NMP/g	Psycroph. CFU/g	<u>S</u> . <u>aureus</u> CFU/g	Mesophil. CFU/g	Coliforms NMP/g	Psycroph. CFU/g	<u>S</u> . <u>aureus</u> CFU/g
Raw	Meat	4.4×10^{4}	absence	7.5×10^{1}	absence	4.4 x 10 ⁴	absence	7.5×10^{1}	absence
A	TO	7.0×10^{4}	2.3×10^{1}	6.0×10^3	1.0×10^{1}	1.1 x 10 ⁵	4.3×10^{1}	1.4×10^{5}	absence
	т1	3.0 x 10 ⁵	3.0×10^2	3.0×10^{5}	1.0×10^{1}	1.5×10^{5}	1.1×10^{1}	1.5×10^{5}	1.1×10^{-1}
	т2					2.4×10^{5}	4.3×10^{1}	2.4×10^{5}	7.0 x 10 ¹
в	To	1.0 x 10 ⁵	2.1 x 10 ¹	8.0 x 10 ³	absence	3.0×10^4	4.3 x 10 ¹	3.0×10^3	absence
	T ₁	9.0×10^3	2.4×10^{2}	1.0 x 10 ⁵	absence	3.4×10^{5}	2.4×10^{2}	2.5×10^5	1.1 × 10 ⁻
	T ₂					3.0×10^{7}	4.6×10^2	3.0×10^{7}	1.7 × 10'
С	To	1.0×10^{3}	9.3×10^{1}	1.0×10^{3}	absence	1.5×10^4	2.4×10^{2}	1.5×10^4	absence
	T ₁	2.2×10^{7}	3.0×10^2	2.0×10^{7}	1.0×10^{2}	3.4×10^{4}	9.3 x 10^{1}	3.0×10^4	1.0 × 10
	т2					2.5 x 10 ⁵	9.8 x 10^{1}	1.5×10^5	1.7 × 10
D	To	1.0×10^{3}	2.4×10^{2}	1.0×10^{3}	absence	2.3 x 10 ⁴	2.4×10^2	4.0×10^4	absence
	T ₁	1.0×10^{4}	2.4×10^{2}	2.0 x 10 ⁶	1.0×10^{2}	1.8×10^{2}	3.0×10^{1}	1.0×10^{5}	absence
	T ₂					1.4×10^{5}	9.3 x 10 ¹	1.1 x 10 ⁵	3.4 × 10*

 $T_0 = 0$ day storage; $T_1 = 15$ days storage; $T_2 = 30$ days storage

TABLE 3.- Microbial counts in goat raw meat and in sausages manufactured with goat meat stored at 5 °C for 30 days.

and

		Packaging without vacuum			Packaging with vacuum				
Ana	lysed	Mesophil. CFU/g	Coliforms NMP/g	Psycroph. CFU/g	<u>S</u> . <u>aureus</u> CFU/g	Mesophil. CFU/g	Coliforms NMP/g	Psycroph. CFU/g	S. aureu CFU/g
Raw	Meat	5.0 x 10 ⁴	2.8 x 1.0 ¹	1.0×10^4	absence	5.0×10^4	2.8 x 10 ¹	ND	absence
A	To	5.0×10^{4}	2.1×10^{1}	2.8×10^{3}	absence	4.0×10^{4}	2.1×10^{1}	ND	absence
	T ₁	8.0×10^{5}	2.4×10^{2}	4.0×10^{5}	2.0×10^{2}	3.0×10^{5}	2.4×10^{2}	2.0×10^4	absence
	T ₂	3.0×10^{7}	4.6×10^2	3.0×10^{7}	2.0×10^{3}	3.0×10^{5}	9.3×10^{1}	3.0×10^4	absence
в	To	4.0×10^{4}	2.3×10^{1}	1.0×10^{1}	absence	1.3×10^{5}	2.3×10^{1}	ND	absence
	T ₁	3.0 x 10 ⁵	3.9×10^{2}	3.0×10^{5}	1.0×10^{2}	2.4×10^{5}	1.2×10^{2}	3.0×10^{3}	absence
	T ₂	7.0×10^{7}	7.1×10^2	2.0×10^{7}	1.8 x 10 ³	3.0 x 10 ⁵	2.1×10^{2}	3.0 x 10 ⁵	absence
с	To	3.0 x 10 ³	4.6×10^{2}	2.4×10^4	absence	6.0×10^4	6.4×10^2	ND	absence
	т1	1.0×10^{7}	2.4×10^{2}	1.5×10^{7}	1.0×10^{3}	1.0×10^{5}	7.5×10^{1}	1.5×10^{3}	absence
	T ₂	3.0×10^{7}	4.6×10^2	3.0×10^{7}	1.5×10^{3}	2.0 x 10 ⁵	1.2×10^2	2.0×10^4	absence
D	т _о	4.0×10^{3}	2.8 x 10 ¹	1.5×10^3	absence	2.0 x 10 ⁵	2.3 x 10 ¹	ND	absence
	T1	1.0 x 10 ⁵	4.6×10^{2}	2.4×10^4	1.5×10^{2}	3.0×10^{5}	3.0×10^{1}	1.0×10^{4}	absence
	T ₂	1.0×10^{7}	4.6×10^{2}	3.0×10^{7}	1.0×10^{3}	3.0×10^{5}	4.3×10^{1}	1.6×10^{5}	absence

 $T_0 = 0$ day storage; $T_1 = 15$ days storage; $T_2 = 30$ days storage. ND = not determined.