A COMPARATIVE STUDY ON THE QUALITY OF PLAIN AND PROBIOTIC YOGHURT

Ekbal Mohamed Adel Ibrahim

Department of Food Control, Fac. of Vet. Med., Benha University

ABSTRACT

A total of 40 random samples of plain and probiotic yoghurt (20 of each) were collected from different markets in Kaliobia governorate to evaluate their quality. The sensory characteristic score of probiotic yoghurt (91.69± 7. 86) was significantly better than plain one (77.91 ± 8.16). The chemical examination indicated that the average values of pH and titratable acidity were 3.63 ± 0.07 & 0.91 ± 0.07 for plain yoghurt and 4.29 ± 0.05 & 0.72 ± 0.06 for probiotic yoghurt. On the other hand, the bacterial counts in the examined plain and probiotic yoghurt samples were $1.35 \times 10^4 \pm 0.22 \times 10^4 \pm 0.22 \times 10^4 \pm 0.22 \times 10^4 \pm 0.22 \times 10^{10}$ 10^4 and 2.12x10³ ± 0.39 x 10³/g for aerobic spore formers count, 4.78 $x 10^2 \pm 0.61 x 10^2$ and 1.31 x $10^2 \pm$ 0.17×10² /g for B.cereus count, 2.01 x $10^3 \pm 0.34$ x 10^3 and 4.73 x $10^2 \pm 0.52 \times 10^2$ /g for staphylococci count and 7.24 x 10² \pm 1.83 x 10² and 2.58 x 10² \pm 0.41 x 10^2 /g for coliform, respectively. Furthermore, В. cereus, Β. circulans, B.coagulans, B.licheniformis. B.macerans. **B.stearothermophilus** and Β. S. subtilis. aureus and S. epidermidis as well as micrococci were isolated from both plain and probiotic yoghurt with varying percentages. However. Enteropathogenic Escherichia coli

(EEC) were isolated from 5% of plain yoghurt samples and serologically identified as O_{26} : K_{60} (B₆) and O_{128} : K_{67} (B₁₂). In contrast, all examined samples of probiotic yoghurt were free from E.E.coli. According to sensory, chemical and bacteriological results, probiotic yoghurt appeared to be better and more safe for human consumption as compared with plain one.

INTRODUCTION

Yoghurt is the best known of allcultured milk products and the most popular almost allover the world. A high-quality yoghurt with the required flavour. aroma. viscositv and appearance can be adopted by carefully choose of milk, adequate milk standardization, use of good quality stabilizers, efficient heat treatment of yoghurt mix, use of active non-contaminated starter culture, adequate incubation with good storage conditions as well as good hygienic measures during processing, storage and marketing of yoghurt (Tamime & Robinson, 1985 and Tetra Pak, 1995).

The typical starter culture for plain yoghurt are *Streptococcus salivarius subsp. thermophilus* and *Lactobacillus delbrueckii subsp. bulgaricus* which added in a ratio of (1:1) to produce an ideal titratable

Alex. J. Vet. , Med.

75

acidity around 0.65- 0.70% following by cooling at 5°C to be fit for consumption up to 2 weeks (*ES*, *1990 and Jay et al.*, *2005*).

Bifidobacteria, Lactobacillus acidophilus and some enterococci species are the most potential probiotics used. They can grow in association with other typical yoghurt culture for their successful growth and doing the best role (Dave and shah, 1998 and Fooks et al., 1999). Foods containing probiotic are known as "Functional Foods" that have live active probiotic microorganisms which produce their healthy benefits over its normal nutritional value and being similar in appearance to patterns conventional food (FAO/WHO, 2001; Kwak and Jukes, 2000 and Saxelin et al., 2003).

Healthy effects attributed to consumption of probiotic food are; alleviation of lactose maldigestion, reduction of serum cholesterol level, prevention and treatment of some intestinal and urogenital infections and alleviation of constipation as well as increasing the immune response (Cathy, 1995 a & b; Gardiner et al., 2002; Hui, 1993 and WHO, 1995).

Owing to the great healthy benefits as well as the nutritional value of plain and probity yoghurt, the evaluation of their quality at market level is essential. The evaluation was planned out to include sensory, chemical and bacteriological examination during their sale.

MATERIAL AND METHODS

Fourty samples of plain and probiotic yoghurt (20 of each) were randomly collected from various markets in

Alex. J. Vet. , Med.

76

Kaliobya governorate to compare between their sensory, chemical and bacteriological quality.

1. Sensory evaluation:

The sensory evaluation of yoghurt samples was adopted by well trained 9 panelists from Food Control Department, Faculty of Veterinary Medicine, Benha University. The sensory scores were carried out as that recommended by *Tamime and Robinson (1985)*.

2. Chemical examination:-

2.1. Determination of pH (pearson, 1981):-

The pH values were measured by using pH meter (C.D. 2026, Fischer model, Germany).

2.2. Determination of Titratable acidity:-

Titratable acidity of yoghurt samples was carried out according to *Kosikowski and Mistry (1997).*

3. Bacteriological examination:-

3.1. Preparation of the samples:-

Yoghurt containers were opened aseptically and 10g of each sample were homogenated with 90 ml sterile saline where tenth fold serial dilutions were prepared (**BSI**, 1984).

3.2. Enumeration and identification of aerobic spore formers:-

Aerobic spore formers count was essayed according to *Harrigan and Macane (1976)* by surface plating on Dextrose Tryptone agar medium. Suspected colonies were picked up and subcultured on nutrient agar slopes for further identification.

A COMPARATIVE STUDY ON THE QUALITY OF PLAIN AND PROBIOTIC YOGHURT

3.3 Enumeration and identification of *Bacillus cereus*:-

The method adopted by *Holbrook* and Anderson (1980) was performed by using *B. cereus* selective agar medium.

3.4. Enumeration and identification of *Staphylococcus aureus*:-

Staphylococcus aureus count was determined by the technique recommended by *ICMSF (1986)* using Baired Parker agar medium.

3.5. Enumeration of coliforms (MPN):-

Three replicate MacConkey broth tubes were applied for enumeration of coliform bacteria according to the method adopted by **APHA (1992).**

3.6. Screening of E. coli:-

The technique recommended by APHA (1992) was carried out using MacConkey broth and Eosin Methylene Blue (EMB). The suspected green metallic colonies were identified biochemically and seriologically according to Krieg and Holt (1984). Antisera used for typing of E-coli were coli test sera Poly I, coli test sera Poly II and Bacto E.coli antisera.

4. Statistical analysis:-

The obtained results were statistically evaluated by student t. test according to *Feldman et al. (2003).*

RESULTS

Table (1) Mean values of sensory characteristics of the examined samples of plain and probiotic yoghurt (n=20).

Type of samp	oles	Plain yoghurt	Probiotic yoghurt
Sensory Character	Final Score	$Mean \pm S.E$	Mean \pm S.E
Flavor	45	36.21 ± 4.15	42.30 ± 5.25
Body & Texture	30	23.97 ± 3.07	28.12 ± 2.79
Acidity	10	6.13 ± 0.83	9.04 ± 1.15
Appearance	10	7.72 ± 0.90	8.28 ± 0.81
Container & Closure	5	3.88 ± 0.49	3.95 ± 0.57
Overall score	100	77.91 ± 8.16	91.69 ± 7.86

77

Alex. J. Vet. , Med.

Type of samples	Plain yoghurt			Probiotic yoghurt			
Acidity indices	Min	Max	Mean± S.E	Min	Max	Mean ± S.E	
pН	3.35	4.42	3.63 ± 0.07	3.84	4.71	$4.29\pm0.05*$	
Titratable acidity %	0.61	1.40	0.91 ± 0.07	0.55	1.03	$0.72 \pm 0.06**$	

Table	(2)	statistical	analytical	results	of	acidit	y in	dices	of	the
exami	ned	samples of	plain and	probiotic	yog	ghurt (r	n=20).		

*Significant differences (p < 0.05) ** high significant differences (p< 0.01)

Type of samples		Plain yoghurt					Probiotic yoghurt			
	posi sam	itive ples				positive samples			Max	
Bacterial group	No	%	Min	Max	Mean±S.E		%	Min		Mean ± S.E
Aerobic sporeformers count	12	60	4X10 ²	3.2X10 ⁴	1.35X10 ⁴ ± 0.22X 10 ⁴	7	35	1X10 ²	7X10 ³	2.12X10 ³ ±0.39X10 ³ *
<i>B.cereus</i> count	8	40	2X10	1.5X 10 ³	4.78X10 ² ± 0.61X10 ²	3	15	1X10	9X10 ²	1.31X10 ² ± 0.17X 10 ²
Staphylococci count	14	70	1X10 ²	4.8X 10 ³	2.01X10 ³ ± 0.34X 10 ³	6	30	1X10 ²	1.1X1 0 ³	4.73X10 ² ± 0.52X 10 ²
Coliform count (MPN)	9	45	4X10	1. 1X 10 ³	7.24X 10 ² ± 1.83X 10 ²	4	20	1X10	7X10 ²	2.58X10 ² ± 0.41X 10 ²

Table (3) Bacteriological aspects of the examined samples of plain and probiotic yoghurt (n=20).

* Significant differences (p < 0.05)

Alex. J. Vet. , Med.

.

78

Type of samples	Plain yoghurt		Probiotic yoghurt		
Identified bacteria	Νο	%	No	%	
B.cereus	8	40	3	15	
B.circulans	-	-	2	10	
B.coagulans	2	10	-	-	
B.licheniformis	7	35	3	5	
B.macerans	1	5	-	-	
B.stearothemophilus	3	15	-	-	
B.subtilis	4	20	1	5	

Table (4) Incidence of aerobic spore forming bacteria in the examined samples of plain and probiotic yoghurt (n=20)

Table (5) Incidence of Gram positive staphylococci in the examined samples of plain and probiotic yoghurt (n=20)

Type of samples	Plain y	oghurt	Probiotic yoghurt		
Gram + ve cocci	No	%	No	%	
Staph.aureus	3	15	-	-	
Staph.epidermidis	7	35	2	10	
Micrococci	12	60	5	25	

79

Alex. J. Vet. , Med.

Ekbal Mohamed Adel Ibrahim

Table (6) Incidence and serotyping of Enterpathogenic <i>E.coli</i> in t	he
examined samples of plain and probiotic yoghurt (n=20).	

Type of samples	Plain y	oghurt	Probiotic	: yoghurt	Strain characteristic
	No	%	No %		
E.coli serotypes					
O ₂₆ : K ₆₀ (B ₆)	1	5	-	-	EHEC
O ₁₂₈ : K ₆₇ (B ₁₂)	1	5	-	-	ETEC
Total	2	10	-	-	

EHEC= Enterohaemorhagic E.coli

DISCUSSION

Quality can be judged by subjective and objective tests. The subjective tests include; odour, taste and texture. While, objective tests include; chemical, physical and the microbial aspects (*Hayes, 1992*).

Table (1) pointed out that the overall mean scores for sensory evaluation of the examined plain and probiotic yoghurt samples were 77.91 ± 8.16 and 91.69 ± 7.86 , respectively.

The current results come in accordance with those reported by *Mohamed (1990)* and *EL-Shibiny et al. (2005)* who mentioned that both plain and probiotic yoghurts were very acceptable with good sensory characteristics prevalid for 10 days when stored in refrigerator.

A good yoghurt should have a clean mild acid, walnutty to delicate flavour and smooth homogenous body texture with no free whey **(Savello&**

80

Alex. J. Vet. , Med.

ETEC= Enterotoxigenic *E.coli*

Dargan 1995 and Kosikowski & Mistry, 1997). In addition, the yoghurt container should be clean, sound, free from any leakers and tightly closed by well sealed lid. All ingredients, expirey date and nutritional value should be labeled clearly on it (Vaclavik and Christian, 1998).

In this respect, all examined samples of probiotic yoghurt had higher sensory characteristic scores as compared with those of plain yoghurt. In other words, probiotic strains was significantly improved the flavour, texture as well as acidification of yoghurt to be acceptable for consumer.

Inspection of table (2) indicated that the pH ranged from 3.35 to 4.42 with a mean value of 3.63 ± 0.07 for plain yoghurt and 3.84 to 4.71 with a mean value of 4.29 \pm 0.05 for probiotic yoghurt.

A COMPARATIVE STUDY ON THE QUALITY OF PLAIN AND PROBIOTIC YOGHURT

Nearly similar pH values were recorded by *Abdel All (1997).* While, higher results were obtained by *Neamah (2006).*

The pH 4.73 is considered the minimum pH value that sustained successful probiotic microbial numbers *(EL-Shibiny et al., 2005).*

The ideal pH value should be 3.5-4.5 at the end of fermentation period at which the yoghurt curd formed *(Kosikowski and Mistry, 1997).* As a result, Yoghurt acts as safe food where many spoilage and pathogenic microorganisms can't grow under such condition *(ICMSF, 1986 and Zambou et al, 2004).*

The titratable acidity ranged from 0.61 to 1.40 with an average of 0.91 \pm 0.07 for plain yoghurt and 0.55 to 1.03 with an average of 0.72 \pm 0.06 for probiotic yoghurt samples (table, 2).

The titratable acidity of yoghurt acts as indicator for the activity of starter culture in which the ideal curd is formed and should be followed by controlled cooling to avoid excess acidity (*Robinson & Tamime, 1993*).

In general, both pH and titratable acidity are of great concern to judge the yoghurt quality. Therefore, selection criteria of ideal starter culture of fermented milks that produce suitable acidification with acceptable flavour and texture for consumer is wanted (Dako et al., 1995 and Lee et al., 1990).

Contributing to bacteriological examination, the results in table(3) declared that 60% and 35% of examined plain and probiotic yoghurt samples were contaminated with

Alex. J. Vet. , Med.

aerobic sporeformers with average counts of 1.35 x $10^4 \pm 0.22 \times 10^4$ /g and 2.12 x $10^3 \pm 0.39 \times 10^3$ /g, respectively.

The mean values of *B. cereus* counts were $4.78 \times 10^2 \pm 0.61 \times 10^2$ /g and $1.31 \times 10^2 \pm 0.17 \times 10^2$ for plain and probiotic yoghurt samples, respectively.

Lactic acid bacteria (LAB) showed marked inhibition against spore forming bacteria as the pH decreased. They can inhibit the growth of *B. cereus* and obviously depressed its spore germination (*Driessen & Stadhouders, 1982* and Sultan, et al., 1988).

In England, *B. cereus* was found to be the most frequently spore former that responsible for spoilage of most dairy products (*Davies, 1975*).

The mean coliform counts were 7.24 x $10^2 \pm 1.83 \times 10^2$ /g for plain yoghurt and 2.58 x $10^2 \pm 0.41 \times 10^2$ /g for probiotic yoghurt samples (table, 3).

High counts of coliform give an indication about the unsatisfactory sanitary conditions under which the yoghurt was manufactured and stored (*EI-Etriby et al., 1997; Hosny, 2002 and Neamah, 2006).*

In this respect coliforms couldn't survive the normal yoghurt acidity due to the inhibitory effect of LAB starter culture (*Mohmed & Younis* 1990).

Incidence of aerobic spore forming bacteria isolated from the examined samples of plain and probiotic yoghurt is shown in table (4). Accurately, *B. cereus* (40%), *B. coagulans* (10%), *B. licheniformis*

Vol. 27, No. 1, June 2008 (75-86)

81

(35%), B. macerans (5%), B. stearothermophilus (15%) and B. subtilis (20%) were isolated from the examined plain yoghurt samples. However, B.cereus B. circulans, B.licheniformis and B. subtilis were isolated from 15, 10, 5 and 5% of the examined samples of probiotic yoghurt.

These findings indicate that probiotic strains had great destructive effects on aerobic spore forming bacteria either qualitatively or quantitatively.

Presence of heat resistant Bacillus species may attributed to their introduction into milk supplies from various sources including water, soil, tanks, pumps, pipelines and/or processing equipments (Meer et al., 1991).Some strains of Bacillus species especially B. cereus was food recognized poisoning as pathogen and can produce diarrhoegenic toxin (Griffiths, 1990 and Eley, 1996).

Results given in table (5) proved that *S.epidermidis* (35% & 10%) and micrococci (60% & 25%) were isolated from examined samples of plain and probiotic yoghurt, respectively.

In contrast, *S. aureus* was isolated only from 15% of examined plain yoghurt samples. While, all probiotic yoghurt samples were free from such organism.

Accurately, 70% and 30% of examined plain and probiotic yoghurt samples were contaminated by staphylococci with average counts of 2.01 x $10^3 \pm 0.34$ x $10^3/g$ and $4.73x10^2 \pm 0.52 \times 10^2/g$, respectively (table 3).

Similar results were recorded by *EL-Shafei et al. (2002) and Dabiza et al. (2005).*

Lactic acid bacteria metabolites (organic acids, hydrogen peroxide, diacetly, bacteriocins and bactericidal protein) have antimicrobial activity against food borne pathogens especially *S. aureus* and *B.cereus* as well as they can control some food spoilage organisms (*Holzapfel et al.*, 1995; Stiles, 1996; Sharaf et al., 1997; Bayàzyt and Yýlsay, 2000;Du Toit et al., 2000 and Navarro et al., 2000).

Fermented dairy products which fortified with bifidobacteria have more metabolites with high concentration of lactic and acetic acids leading to longer keeping quality (Gobbetti et al., 1998 and Abou Dawood, 2002).

Seriological identification of Enteropathogenic *E.coli* "EPEC" isolated from the examined plain yoghurt samples were one strain (5%) of O_{26} : K_{60} (B₆) and one strain (5%) of O_{128} : K_{67} (B₁₂). While, probiotic yoghurt samples were free from Enteropathogenic *E. coil* as shown in table (6).

Escherichia coli O_{26} : K_{60} serovar is belonged to Enterohemorrhagic *E.coli* "EHEC" that associated mainly with bloody diarrhea in human (*Levine, 1987*). While, O_{128} : K_{67} is referred to Enterotoxigenic *E.coli* "ETEC" which produce heat labile and/or heat stable toxins and may exist in feaces of human carriers up to several months (*Cliver, 1990*).

It is of great concern to mention that presence of probiotic strains in the yoghurt leads to complete destruction of all strains of *E.coli* resulting in a safety product for the consumers.

Alex. J. Vet. , Med.

82

A COMPARATIVE STUDY ON THE QUALITY OF PLAIN AND PROBIOTIC YOGHURT

Generally, all examined samples of plain yoghurt were highly contaminated with most bacterial groups than probiotic ones. This evidence may explain the role of probiotic strains which produce a wide range of antimicrobial metabolites against certain spoilage bacteria to gain access in yoghurt.

Finally, the present study allow to conclude that the probiotic yoghurt is preferable than plain one where the probiotic stains have the ability to improve the sensory, chemical and bacteriological profiles of yoghurt in addition to its known health benefits for human being.

REFERENCES

Abdell-All, A.A.A. (1997) Organoleptic inspection and microbiological quality of different types of fermented milks. M.V.Sc Thesis, Fac. of .Vet. Med., Cairo Univ., Egypt.

Abou-Dawood, S.A.I. (2002):Survival of non encapsulated and encapsulated *Bifidobacterium* bifidum in probiotic kareish cheese. Egypt. J. Dairy Sci., 30: 43-52.

APHA, American Public Health Association (1992):Standard methods for the examination of dairy products. 6th Ed., INC. New York.

*Bayazýt, A.A. and Yýlsay, T.Ô. (2000):*Sixth Milk and Milk Products Symposium, Tekirdao/ Turkey, 315-319.

BSI ,British Standards Institution (1981): Microbiological examination

Alex. J. Vet. , Med.

of dairy purposes. BS 4285: Section 2-1.

Cathy, J.S.C. (1995 a): Diarrhea and fermented milk. Danone world Newsetter No. 8,1-14.

*Cathy, J.S.C. (1995 b):*Fermented milks: Effects on the immune system. Danone World Newsetter No. 9, 1-12.

Cliver, D.O. (1990): Food borne diseases. 4th Ed., Academic Press, INC. San Diego, USA.

Dabiza, N.M.A.; Effat, B.A. and Sharaf, O.M. (2005):The antibacterial effect of probiotic bacteria isolated from some dairy products. Egypt. J. Dairy Sci., 33: 49-64.

Dako, E.; EL-Soda, M.; Vuillemard, J.C. and Simard, R.E. (1995): proteolytic properties and amino peptidase activities of lactic acid bacteria. Food Res. Int., 28: 503.

Dave, R.I. and shah, N.P. (1998):Ingredients supplementation effects on viability of propbiotic bacteria in yoghurt. J. Dairy Sci., 81: 2804.

*Davies, F.L. (1975):*Heat resistance of Bacillus species . J. Society Dairy Technol. 28:69.

Driessen, F.M. and Stadhouders, I. (1982):Effect of air on growth of Bacillus cereus during manufacture of stirred yoghurt. In XXI Int. Dairy Cong. Vol. 1, Book 1 (C.F. Dairy Sci. Abst., 45:3881).

Du Toit, M.; Franz, C.M.A.P; Dicks, L.M.T. and Holzapfel, W.H. (2000):Preliminary characterization of bacteriocins produced by

Vol. 27, No. 1, June 2008 (75-86)

83

Enterococcus faecium and *Enterococcus faecalis* isolated from pig faeces. J. Appl. Microbiol. 88:482.

ES, **Egyptian Standards** (1990): Yoghurt. No. 1000. Egyptian Organization for Standardization and Quality Control. Ministry of Industry & Technological Development, Egypt.

*El-Etriby H.M.; EL-Dairouty, R.K. and Zaghloul, A.H. (1997):*Physiochemical and bacteriological studies on mango yoghurt manufactured from ultrafiltered milk retentate using gluocono-delta lactone (GDL). Egypt. J. Dairy Sci., 25: 249-365.

*Eley, A.R. (1996):*Microbial food poisoning. 2nd Ed., Chapman and Hall, London.

*El-Shafei; K.; Ibrahim, G.A. and Tawfik, N.F. (2002):*Beneficial uses of locally isolated lactic acid bacteria. Egypt. J. Dairy Sci., 30:15.

*El-Shibiny, S.; Metwally, M.M; Abd EL-Gani, S.; Abd-EL-Fattah, A.M. and Okda, A.Y. (2005):*Manufacture of some probiotic dairy products from ultrafiltered milk retentate. Egypt. J. Dairy Sci., 33: 215-227.

FAO/WHO (2001):Report on Joint FAO/WHO Expert consultation on: Evaluation of health and nutritional properties of Probiotics in food including powder milk with live lactic acid Bacteria. http: //www. Faco.org/es/ESN/Probio/Probio.htm.

Feldman, D.; Ganon, J.; Hoffman, R. and Simpson, J. (2003): The solution for data analysis and presentation graphics. 2nd Ed., Abacus Lancripts, INC., Barkeley CA, USA. *Fooks, L.J.; Fuller, R.adn Gribson, B.R.* (1999):Prebiotics, probiotics and Human gut microbiology. Int. Dairy J., 9:53.

*Gardiner, E.G.; Paul Ross, R.; Kelly, P.M; Stanton, C.; Collins, J.K. and Fitzgerald, G (2002):*Microbiology of therapeutic milks. In: Dairy microbiology hand book. 3rd Ed., Wiely Interscience. A John Wiely & Sons, INC., Publ., New York.

Gobbetti, M.; Carsetti, A.; Smacchi, E.; Zocchetti, A. and DE Angelis, M. (1998):Production of Crescenza cheese by incorporation of Bifidobacteria. J. Dairy Sci., 81: 37.

*Griffiths, M.W. (1990):*Toxin Production by psychrotrophic Bacillus species present in milk. J. Food Prot., 53: 790-792.

Harigan, W. and Macane, M. (1976): Laboratory methods in food and dairy microbiology. 1st Ed., Academic Press, London, UK.

Hayes, P.R. (1992): Food Microbiology and Hygiene. 2nd Ed., Elsevier Sci., Publ. Ltd. Crown House, Linton Road, Barking, Essex IGII 8 JU, England.

Holbrook, R. and Anderson, J. (1980): An improved selective and diagnostic medium for the isolation and identification of *Bacillus cereus* in foods. Canadian J. Microbiol., 26 (7): 753-759.

Holzapfel, W.H.; Geisen, R. and Schillinger, U. (1995):Biological preservation of foods with reference to protective cultures, bacteriocins and food grade enzymes. Int. J. Food Microbiol., 24:343.

Alex. J. Vet. , Med.

84

A COMPARATIVE STUDY ON THE QUALITY OF PLAIN AND PROBIOTIC YOGHURT

Hosny, I.M. (2002): Production of probiotic flavored stirred yoghurt. Minufia J. Agric. Res., 27 (6): 1399-1411.

Hui, Y.H. (1993): Dairy science and technology handbook. 2: Product Manufacturing. Chapter 1: Yoghurt. VCH Publishes, INC., New York.

ICMSF, *International Committee on Microbiological Specifications for Food (1986):*Micro-organisms in foods. 1. Their significance and methods of enumeration. 2nd Ed., university of Toroto Press. Toronto, Buffalo and London.

*Jay, M.J.; Loessner, J.M. and Golden, A.D. (2005):*Modern food microbiology. 7th Ed., Springer Science + Business Media, LLC. New York, NY 10013, USA.

*Kosikowski, F.V. and Mistry, V.V. (1997):*Cheese and fermented milk foods. Vol. I,3rd Ed., Edwards Brothers, INC. Ann Arbor, Michigan. USA.

Krieg, N. and Holt, J. (1984): Bergeys manual of systemic bacteriology. Vol. 1, William & Willkins, Baltimore, USA.

Kwak, N.S. and Jukes, D.J. (2000): Functional foods. Part 2 : The impact on current regulatory terminology. Food Control, 12:109.

Lee, B.H.; Laleye, L.C.; Simard, R.E.; Holly A.; Emmys, D.B. and Giro, R.N. (1990):Influence of homofermentative Lactobacilli on physiochemical and sensory properties of cheddar cheese. J. Food Sci., 55:356.

Levine, M.M. (1987): E.coli that cause diarrhea: enterotoxigenic,

Alex. J. Vet. , Med.

enteropathogenic, enteroinvasive, enterohaemorrhagic and enteroadherent. J. Inf. Dis. 155:377-389

*Meer, R.R.; Baker, J.; Bodyfelt, F.W. and Griffths, M.W. (1991):*Psychrotrphic Bacillus species in fluid milk products: A review. J. Food Protect.; 54 (12): 969-979.

Mohamed, F.O. and Younis, Y.A. (1990):Effect of yoghurt cultures on some pathogenic microorganisms in fermented milks. Egypt. J. Dairy Sci., 18: 369-375.

*Mohamed, S.H.A. (1990):*Studies on lactic acid bacteria in some dairy products. Ph. D. Thesis, Fac. of Agric, Ain- Shams Univ., Egypt.

Navarro, L., Zarazaga, M.; Saenz, J.; Ruiz-larrea, F. and Tarres, C.(2000): Bacteriocin production by lactic bacteria isolated from Rioja red wins. J. Appl. Microbiol., 88: 44.

*Neamah, R.A. (2006):*Studies on the production of some probiotic dairy products. Ph. D. Thesis, Fac. of Agric., Cairo Univ., Egypt.

Pearson, D.(1981): Chemical analysis of food. 8th Ed., Churchill Livingstone, Edhinburgh, London.

Robinson, R.K. and Tamime, A.Y (1993):Manufacture of yoghurt and other fermented milks. Chapter 1. In : Robinson, R.K. (Ed.), Modern, Dairy Technology . Elsevier Sci. Publ., London., and New York.

*Savello, P.A. and Dargan, R.A. (1995):*Improved yoghurt physical properties using ultrafilteration and very high temperature heating. Milchwissenschaft, 50:86.

Vol. 27, No. 1, June 2008 (75-86)

85

Saxelin, M.; Korpela, R. and Mayra-Makinien, A. (2003):Introduction : Classifying functional dairy products. In: "functional dairy Products" Edited by Mattila-Sandholm, T. and Saarela, M. , Wood Head Polishing, Ltd., Cambridage, T. and Saarela, England, pp:17.

Sharaf, O.M; Ibrahim, G.A.; EL-Shafei, K. and Twafik, N.F. (1997):Comparison of antimicrobial activity of bacteriocins form some lactic acid bacteria, propionibacteria and enterococci against food bacterial pathogens. Annals of Agric. Sci., Moshtohor, 35:413.

Stiles, M.E. (1996): Biopreservation by lactic acid bacteria. Antonie Van Leeuwenhoek 70:331.

Sultan, N.U.; Magdoub, M.N.; Roushdy, I.M. and Khalafalla, S.M. (1988):Behavior of Bacillus cereus in yoghurt. Egypt. J. Dairy Sci., 16:9 *Tamime, A.Y. and Robinson, R.K. (1985):*Yoghurt: Science and Technology. 1st Ed., Pergamon Press Ltd., U.K.

*Tetra pak (1995):*Dairy processing hand book. Chapter 11: Cultured milk products. Tetra Pak Processing Systems AB S-221 86 Lund, Sweden.

*Vaclavik, V.A. and Christian, E.W. (1998):*Essentials of food Science. ITp, International Thomson Publ., USA.

WHO, *World Health Organization* (1995a): The treatment of diarrhea: A manual for physicians and other senior health workers.

Zambou, N.F.; EL-Dousouky, Z.; Abd EL-Arazek, S.; Mbiapo, T.F. and EL-Soda, M. (2004): Important technological properties of lactic acid bacteria isolated from milk and traditional dairy products. Egypt. J. Dainy Sci, 32: 201-220

Alex. J. Vet. , Med.

86