# Microbiological monitoring of raw milk and yoghurt samples collected from El-Beida city

(Received: 10.07. 2008; Accepted: 19.07.2008)

# Eman M. El-Diasty and R. M. El- Kaseh

Faculty of Veterinary Medicine, Omar El-Mokhtar University, Libya.

#### **ABSTRACT**

A total of 80 raw milk and yoghurt samples were randomly collected from different farms and retail markets of different sanitation levels and examined mycologically and bacteriologically at El-Beida city in Libya. Moulds and yeasts were detected in 80 and 50 % of raw milk and yoghurt samples, respectively, with respective mean values of  $4.3 \times 10^5 \pm 2.5 \times 10^5$  and  $2.1 \times 10^4 \pm 1.9 \times 10^4$ . Aspergillus spp., Cladosporium spp., Mucor spp., Curvularia spp., Penicillium spp., Geotricum spp., Candida spp., Rhodotorula spp., Torulopsis spp. and Saccharomyces spp. could be isolated from both raw milk and yoghurt. Five samples of 40 raw milk once were positive for AFM<sub>1</sub> with the mean value of 5 ppb. While in yoghurt samples, AFM<sub>1</sub> were detected with mean value of 2.2 ppb among 3 samples of 40. Total counts of aerobic bacteria of examined raw milk and yoghurt samples were  $6.1 \times 10^5 \pm 5.5 \times 10^5$  and  $6.5 \times 10^5 \pm 6.0 \times 10^5$ , respectively. While the mean coliform counts/ml were  $7.0 \times 10^6 \pm 5.0 \times 10^6$  and  $6.0 \times 10^3 \pm 4.0 \times 10^3$  for raw milk and yoghurt, respectively. Enterobacteriaceae counts/ml of raw milk and yoghurt samples were  $2.6 \times 10^6 \pm 5.5 \times 10^5$  and  $1.5 \times 10^4 \pm 1.2 \times 10^4$ . The economic and public health situation of isolated fungi as well as the control measures for improving the quality of raw milk and milk products were discussed.

Keywords: Microbes, raw milk, yoghurt.

### INTRODUCTION

resh milk and its products have made a major contibution to infants and adults diet in all countries all over the world. Mould growth on dairy products is quite common. Up to the recent decades, this was considered to be a rather technological than a hygienic problem. Since the discovery of mycotoxins, it has become apparent that some of moulds growing on milk products constitute a health hazared for the consumers if they can produce mycotoxins (Pitt and Hocking, 1997). Likewise, moulds and their mycotoxins are considered as a potentially major threat to public health and continue to have an

extensive impact on the walfare of human and animal populations. Mycotoxins may contaminate dairy products by moulds growing on these products or by the carry-over of mycotoxins occuring in animal feedstuffs ingested by dairy cattle (Egmond, 1983).

Mould contamination not only causes deterioration of food and feeds can adversly affect the health of humans and animals as well since they are capable of producing toxic Metabolites known as mycotoxins causing cases of food poisoning and liver cancer in human (Mossel, 1982; Foster *et al.*, 1983).

Fungi influence the biochemical characters and flavour of the product and its appearance is commercially be undesirable

and often result in down grading of the product.

Coliforms are considered as normal flora of intestinal tract of human and animals. They have been used as indicator organisms for bacteriological quality of milk and its products (I.C.M.S.F. 1986). Enterobacteriace count is always taken as a definite index of fecal contamination of milk and its products, besides the possible presence of enteric pathogens which may consititute health hazards to the consumers. The most important index of microbiological quality is total bacterial counts, coliforms, yeasts and moulds and detection of specific pathogens and their toxins as recorded by Kwee *et al.* (1986).

The present work introduces necessary information on the hygienic situation of a number of raw milk and yoghurt samples taken from various sources in El- Beida city, Libya. This encompassed the enumeration of total moulds and yeasts, coliforms, Enterobacteriaceae and total aerobes, besides the detection of aflatoxins  $M_1$  and  $B_1$ .

#### MATERIALS AND METHODS

#### Collection of samples

A total of 80 random samples representing (40) and yoghurt (40) were collected from different shopkeepers in Elbeida city in Libya for microbiological evaluation and mycotoxin detection.

### Preparation of samples

Raw milk samples were subjected to Storch's test (Lampert 1975) to exclude samples proved to be heat treated. Also collected samples were subjected to Wynter Blyth test for detection of inhibitory substances. Yoghurt samples were thoroughly mixed before beging emulsified in diluent solution.

### Microbiological examinations

The prepared samples were subjected to:

- 1- Aerobic plate count (APC) using standared plate agar (A.P.H.A., 1992).
- 2- Coliforms content (A.P.H.A. 1985).
- 3- Enterobacterial count (I.C.M.S.F. 1986).
- 4- Mould and yeast counts according to Frisvad and Filtenborg, (1989). All mould isolates were identified according to the key of Pitt and Hoching, (1997) while yeast isolates were identified according to Kriger van Rij, (1984).
- 5- Detection of aflatoxin M<sub>1</sub> residues in raw milk and yoghurt as well as determination of aflatoxin B<sub>1</sub> in yoghurt. The mycotoxin residues were estimated according to the technique recommended by AOAC (1980).

#### RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Results given in Table (1) revealed that moulds and yeasts could be isolated from 80 % of the examined raw milk samples. The lowest counts was  $3 \times 10^2$  cfu ml<sup>-1</sup>, with a mean value of  $4.3 \times 10^5 \pm 2.5 \times 10^5$ . Nearly similar findings were reported by Skrinjar *et al.* (1983) and Saubios et *al.* (1991). the obtained results indicated poor hygiene during handling which might lead to technological problems during processing.

Moulds and yeasts were isolated from 50 % of the yoghurt samples Table (1). The minimum Count/ ml. were  $1.5 \times 10^2 \pm 1.9 \times 10^4$ . The obtained results agree, to a certain extent, with those reported by Varabioff (1983) & Lalas and Mantes (1984). Lower counts were reported by Jordano – Salina (1984).

The presence of yeasts and moulds in a relatively high counts in examined yoghurt

samples may indicate inefficient pre-heating process during manufacturing, using unsatisfactory sterilized plastic cups in packing or inefficient chilling on storage (Saudi *et al.*, 1989).

Species of Aspergillus, Cladosporium, Mucor, Curvularia, Penicillium, Pacilomyces and Geotrichium could be isolated in varying percentages from both examined raw milk and yoghurt samples (Table 2). Many authors obtained the same results (Sharma et al. 1993 and Jodral et al., 1991).

Mould and yeast contamination not only causes deterioration of food and feed but also can adversely affect the health of humans. Moreover, fungi influence the biochemical characters and flavour of the product and its appearance is commercially undesirable and often result in down grading of the product.

Results presented in Table (3) indicate that five samples of raw milk (12.5 % of all) were found to be contaminated with aflatoxin  $M_1$  in concentrations of 4 and 6 ppb.This finding comes in agreement with the results reported by El-Sayed *et al.* (2001) and Jalon *et al.* (1994) who found that the level of aflatoxin  $M_1$  in milk was below the permissible limit (10 ug/kg). High levels of aflatoxin  $M_1$  (0.03 and 3.13 ng/ml) were estimated by Elgerbi *et al.* (2004) and Karaioannoglou *et al.* (1989) who recorded high levels AFM<sub>1</sub> (100 – 130 ug/Kg).

On the other hand aflatoxin M<sub>1</sub> residue could be detected in 3 samples of yoghurt at a level ranging from 0.5 - 3 ppb. The results for yoghurt nearly similar with these findings reported by Mohamed (1999) and Polzhafer (1977). Low levels of aflatoxins M<sub>1</sub> were obtained by Galvano *et al.* (1998) in yoghurt samples examined during 1995 in four large Italian cities while high levels were recorded by Hassan (1999).

Aerobic bacterial counts ranged from 5.0 X 10<sup>4</sup> to 2.2 X 10<sup>6</sup> cfu ml<sup>-1</sup> with a mean value

of  $6.0 \times 10^5 \pm 5.5 \times 10^5$  and  $2.0 \times 10^2$  to  $9.0 \times 10^6$  cfu ml<sup>-1</sup> with a mean value  $6.5 \times 10^5 \pm 6.0 \times 10^5$  cfu ml<sup>-1</sup> for raw milk and yoghurt samples respectively (Table 4).

Similar findings were reported by Hanaa, (1999), but in contrudication with those of Desmasures, *et al.* (1997). The aerobic bacterial load showed that milk produced was of good microbiological guality (≤20000 / ml.). High aerobic bacterial load in raw milk and yoghurt may be attributed to inadequate hygienic measurs in production or inadequate processing recontamination.

In most foods, the total bacterial count is often, an indiction for the sanitary quality, safety and utility of foods. It may reflects the conditions under which the product is manufactured such as contamination of raw materials and ingredients, the effectivenees of processing and the sanitary conditions of equipment and utensils at the processing plants (I.C.M.S.F., 1986).

The results in Table (5) showed that the Coliforms were detected in 100 % of raw milk samples and 10 % of yoghurt samples. The coliform counts ranged from 2.0 X  $10^2$  to 3.0 X  $10^7$  MPN ml<sup>-1</sup> with the of mean 7.0 X  $10^6 \pm 5.0$  X  $10^6$  and from 1.0 X  $10^2$  to 4.6 X  $10^4$  MPN ml<sup>-1</sup> with the mean of 6.0 x  $10^3 \pm 4.0$  X  $10^3$  MPN ml<sup>-1</sup> of the examined raw milk and yoghurt samples, respectively .

These results agreed, to a certain extent, with Hanaa (1999); Jayarao and Wang (1999) who reported that coliforms were detected in 62.3 % of milk samples and their counts ranged from 0 to 4.7 log<sub>10</sub> cfu/ml with the mean of 3.4 log<sub>10</sub> cfu/ml. Lower values were reported by Desmasures *et al.* (1997) .The presence of coliforms in raw foods is generally regarded as direct contamination of foods with fecal material. Coliform bacteria can also gain access directly into milk when cows with subclinical coliform mastitis are milked and have been shown to increase the coliform

counts of milk. Also, several studies have shown that pathogenic E. coli comprise a very small percentage of the total E. coli present in raw milk (Jayarao and Wang, 1999). Coliforms are considered as normal flora of the intestinal tract of human and animals. They have been used as indicator organisms for bacteriological quality of milk and its products (I.C.M. S.F., 1986). Enteropathogenic Escherichia coli has been incriminated as a potential food poisoning agent and is associated with infantile diarrhoea gastroenteritis in adults.

Result given in Table (6) reveal that enterobacteria could be detected in 100 % of raw milk samples and 25 % of yoghurt samples. The counts ranged from 7.0 X  $10^3$  to 1.1 x  $10^7$  cfu ml<sup>-1</sup> with the mean of 2.6 X  $10^6 \pm 5.5$ X  $10^5$  cfu ml<sup>-1</sup> in raw milk sample and in case of yoghurt samples counts ranged from 5.0 X  $10^2$  to 5.0 X  $10^4$  cfu ml<sup>-1</sup> with the mean 1.5 X  $10^4 \pm 1.2$  x $10^4$  cfu ml<sup>-1</sup>, this result is agreement with Hanaa, (1999).

It is concluded that strict hygienic measures should be applied during production, processing and distribution of milk and its products to avoid contamination. Periodical inspection must be done by specialists on the dairy farms to minimize milk contamination with different types of yeast and moulds. The milk obtained from dairy animals fed on feedstuffs contaminated with aflatoxin B<sub>1</sub> must be rejected. Efficient cleaning and sanitiziation of farm dairy utensiles must be done to improve the quality of raw milk and consequently the related dairy products. Monitoring programs should be more extensive with a particular attention in monitring aflatoxin in milk and milk products. The milk and milk products should be kept under refrigeration and the practice of display at room temperature should be discouraged. Periodical examination of animal feedstuffs for aflatoxin B<sub>1</sub> deems unavoidable and exclude those proved be highly contaminated.

Table (1): Statistical analysis of results of mould and yeast counts of examine samples.

Time of avancined	No. of examined	Positive	samples	C			
Type of examined samples	samples	No.	%	Min.	Max.	Mean	± SE
Raw milk	40	32	80	$3X\ 10^2$	1X10 <sup>6</sup>	4.3X10 <sup>5</sup>	±2.5X10 <sup>5</sup>
Yoghurt	40	20	50	$1.5 \times 10^5$	$3.8 \times 10^5$	$2.1 \times 10^4$	$\pm 1.9 \text{X} 10^4$

Table (2): Incidence of isolated moulds and yeasts in examined raw milk and yoghurt samples.

	Raw	milk	Yoghurt		
Isolates	No.of		No.of		
	isolates	%	isolates	%	
Moulds:					
1- Aspergillus					
*A .flavus	5	12.5	0	0	
* A. Niger	10	25	2	5	
*A. Terrus	2	5	0	0	
2- Cladosporium spp.					
*C. herbarum	8	20	0	0	
*C. $sphaerospermum$	7	17.5	3	7.5	
3- Mucor sp.	10	25	6	15	
4- Curvularia spp.	2	2.5	0	0	
5- Penicillum spp.					
P. corylophilum Dierckx	6	15	2	5	
P. implicatum Biourge	3	7.5	0	0	
6- Paecilomyces sp.	5	12.5	0	0	
7- Geotricum	9	22.5	1	2.5	
Yeast:					
1- Candida spp.					
• C. parapsilosis	20	50	8	20	
• C. tropicalis	6	15	0	0	
• C. Krusei	2	5	0	0	
2- Rhodotorula spp.	20	50	9	22.5	
3- Torulopsis spp.	5	12.5	1	2.5	
4- Saccharomyces spp.	15	37.5	10	2.5	
$\tau$ - succentromyces $spp$ .	13	22	10	23	

Table (3): Incidence and levels of mycotoxins (ppb) determined in raw milk and yoghurt.

Product	Type of toxin	Positive samples		Range ( ppb )	Mean positive	
		No.	%		( ppb)	
Raw milk	$AFM_1$	5	12.5	4 - 6	5	
Yoghurt	$AFM_1$	3	7.5	0.5 - 3	2.2	
	$AFB_1$	ND	ND	ND	<u>ND</u>	

ND = not detectable

Table (4): Statistical analysis of results of Aerobic bacterial counts (  $cfu\ ml^{-1}$ ) of examined samples.

No. of examined		Positive samples		Counts ( cfu ml <sup>-1</sup> )			
	sample	No.	%	Min.	Max.	Mean	± S.E
Raw milk	40	40	100	$5.0 \times 10^4$	$2.2X10^{6}$	$6.1 \times 10^5$	$\pm 5.5 \times 10^5$
Yoghurt	40	15	37.5	$2.0 \times 10^{2}$	9.0X10 <sup>6</sup>	6.5X10 <sup>5</sup>	± 6.0X10 <sup>5</sup>

Table (5): Statistical analysis of results of Coliform counts (MPN/ml) of examind samples.

Product	No. of examined	Positive	esamples	Min.	Max.	Mean	± S.E.
	sample -	No.	%	_			
Raw milk	40	40	100	$2.0X10^{2}$	$3.0 \times 10^7$	$7.0 \times 10^6$	$\pm 5.0 \times 10^6$
Yoghurt	40	4	10	$1.0X10^{2}$	$4.6X10^4$	$6.0 \times 10^3$	$\pm 4.0 \times 10^3$

Tabl(6): Statistical analysis of results of Enterobacteria counts (cfu ml of examined samples.

Product	No. of examined	Positive	e samples	Min.	Max.	Mean	± S.E.
	samples	No.	%	_			
Raw milk	40	40	100	$7.0 \times 10^3$	$1.1X10^{7}$	$2.6X\ 10^6$	$\pm 5.5 \times 10^5$
Yoghurt	40	10	25	$5.0X10^2$	5.0X10 <sup>4</sup>	1.5X 10 <sup>4</sup>	$\pm 1.2 X 10^4$

# REFERENCES

(APHA) American Public Health Association (1992). "Compendium of methods for the microbiological examination of food." 3<sup>rd</sup> Ed. Amirican Public Health Association, Speck, M.L., Washington, D.

(APHA)American Public Health Association (1985)." Standards Methods for the examination of Dairy Products. 15<sup>th</sup> Ed. New York.

**A.O.A.C.**(1980): Official Methods of Analysis (AOAC). Chapt. 26. Natural Poisons, 13<sup>th</sup> Ed. Assoc. Off. Anal Chem., Washington, D.C.Sections 26.001- 26.132.

**Desmasures, N.; Bazin, F. And Gueguen, M.** (1997) .Microbiological composition of raw milk from selected farms in the Camembert region of Normandy. J. of Appl. Microbiol. ,83: 53 – 58.

**Egmond, H.P. Van (1983)**. Mycotoxins in dairy products. Food Chemistry International Journal, 11: 289 – 307.

**Elgerbi,A.M.; Aidoo,K.E.; Candlish, A.A.G.** and Tester, R.F.(2004). Occurrence of aflatoxin M<sub>1</sub> in randomly selected North african milk and cheese samples. Food Additives and Contaminats 21(6): 592-597.

El-Sayed, A. M. Abdalla; Neamat- Allah, A. A. and Soher, E. A. (2001). Situation of

mycotoxins in milk, dairy products and human milk in Egypt.  $1^{\rm st}$  Cong.of Food Hygiene & Human Health, 6-8 February 2001. Dept. Of Food Hygiene, Fac. Vet. Med., Assiut, Egypt. Pp 151-164.

Frisvad, J.C. and Filtenborg, O. (1989). Terverticillate Penicillin: chemiotaxonomy and mycotoxin production. Mycologia 81: 837-861.

Foster, G. M.; Nelson, F. E.; Speck, M.L.; Doetsch, R.N. and Olson, J.C. (1983). Dairy Microbiology Ridgview Publ. Co., California.

Galvano, F.; Galofaro, V.; De Angelis, M.; Bognanno, M. and Galvans, G. (1998). Survey of the occurrence of aflatoxin M<sub>1</sub> in dairy products marketed in Italy. J. Food protection. 61 (6): 738 – 741.

Hassan, S. Abdel-Wahab (1999). Mycological studies on milk and some milk products. Ph.D Thesis. Fac. Vet. Med. Zagazig Univ.

ICMSF (International Commission on Microbiological Specification for Food, (1986). Microbial Ecology of Foods, Vol. 1 - 2. University of Toronto Press, Toronto.

Jalon, M.; Urieta, I.; Pablo, B. And Macho, M. (1994). Monitoring of milk and milk products by aflatoxin  $M_1$  in the Basque

- Autonmus region . Alimentaria ,31(250): 25-29. Dairy Sci. Abst., 57(5): 2859.
- **Jayarao,B.M. and Wang, L.** (1999). A study on the prevalence of gram- negatine bacteria in bulk tank milk .J. Dairy Sci. ,Vol.82(12); 2620-2624.
- Jodral, M.; Salmeron, J.; Fernadez, C.; Carrido, M. and Jordano, R. (1991). Influence of evaluation of the pH on contaminating mycoflora of heat-treated fermented milk. Scienzae-Tecnica-Lattiero-Casearia Italy, 42 (3): 161 170.
- Jordano- Salina, R. (1984). Yoghurt contamination with yeasts and molds. Archivos de Zootecnia (1984), 33 (125): 97-103. Dairy Sci.,47, 918 (1984).
- Karaioannoglou, p.; Montis, A.; Koufidis, D.; Koidis, P. and Trianta, F. (1989). Occurrence of aflatoxin M<sub>1</sub> in raw and pasteurized milk and in feta, teleme cheese samp- les. Milchwissenschaft, 44 (14): 746 748.
- **Kriger van Rij, N.J.W.** (1984). The Yeasts: A taxonomic study. 3<sup>rd</sup> Ed. Amsterdam, Elsevier, p. 345.
- Kwee, W.S.; Dommett, T.W.; Giles, J.E.; Roberts, R. and Smith, R.A.D. (1986). Microbiological paramters during powdered milk manufacture. Aust.J. Dairy Technol., 41-3.
- -Lalas, M. And Mantes, A. (1984). Microbiological quality of yoghurt. Ellenike Kteni- atrike, 26 (4):211- 121.
- **Lampert, L.M.** (1975). Modern Dairy Product 3<sup>rd</sup> Ed. Chemical Publishing Company. Inc. New York, U.S.A.
- Mohamed, A. Salwa. (1999). Studies on mycotoxins in milk and some dairy products. Ph. D. Thesis. Fac. of Vet. Med., Cairo Univ.
- **Mossel, D.A.A.** (1982). Microbiology of Foods 3<sup>rd</sup> Ed. The University of Utrecht., The Netherlands., ISBN.

- **Pitt,J.I. and Hocking , A.D.** ( **1997** ). Fungi and Food Spoilage. 2<sup>nd</sup> Ed. Published by Blackie Academic and Professional .Academic press, New York, London, Toronto, Montreal, Tokyo.
- **Polzhofer, K.** (1977). Determination of aflatoxins in milk and milk products. Z. Lebensmitt- Unters- Fosrsch. 263: 175 177.
- Saudi, A.M.; El-Essawy, H.A. and Hafez, N.M. (1989). Aspects on the microbiological quality of yoghurt plastic containers. Vet. Med. J. Giza, 37(3): 397-406.
- Saubios, A.; Basillco and Simonetta, A. (1991). Microbiological qualtiy of raw milk. Incidence of arobic and anaerobic sporeforming bacteria, yeasts and molds. Revista Argentina de Lactologia, 3 (5): 70 90. Dairy Sci. Abst., 54: 7 (1992).
- Skrinjar, M.; Zakula, R. and Stojanovic, E. (1983). Isolation and determination of molds in raw milk. Mljekarstvo,33: 227 300.
- Sharma, S.D.; Gill, J.P.; Joshi, D.V. and Kwatra, M.S. (1993). Mycoflora of Indian fermented milk product. Indian J. Dairy Sci., 46:(2) 85-87.
- **Varabioff, Y. (1983).** Spoilage organisms in Yoghurt. J. Dairy Products 11(2): 8 12. Dairy Sci. Abst., 46(9) (1984).

# الملغص العربي

# الرصد الميكروبي لبعض عينات العليب الغام والزبادي جمعت من مدينة البيضاء بليبيا

إيمان محمود الدياسطي ' رافع مصطفي الكاسح كلية الطب البيطري جامعة عمر المختار - مدينة البيضاء - ليبيا