

## Assessment of bacterial quality of raw meat samples (carabeef, chevon, pork and poultry) from retail meat outlets and local slaughter houses of Agra Region, India.

VK Singh, Udit Jain, JK Yadav and Basanti Bist

Department of Veterinary Public Health, College of Veterinary Science, DUVASU Mathura

### Abstract

A total of 120 raw meat samples, 30 each from carabeef, chevon, pork and poultry were assessed for microbiological load i.e. Standard plate count (SPC), Coliform count (CC) and Staphylococcal count (SC). Mean values of SPC ( $\log_{10}$ cfu/g) were found to be  $7.03 \pm 0.07$  for carabeef,  $6.96 \pm 0.78$  for chevon,  $6.86 \pm 0.02$  for pork and  $6.75 \pm 0.04$  for poultry meat. Mean values of Coliform count (CC) ( $\log_{10}$ cfu/g) were found to be  $3.04 \pm 0.08$  for carabeef,  $3.93 \pm 0.14$  for chevon,  $3.40 \pm 0.10$  for pork and  $3.82 \pm 0.12$  for poultry. Mean values of Staphylococcus count (SC) ( $\log_{10}$ cfu/g) were found to be  $3.90 \pm 0.12$  for carabeef,  $3.84 \pm 0.12$  for chevon,  $2.81 \pm 0.11$  for pork and  $3.35 \pm 0.10$  for poultry. The findings of this study revealed that hygienic quality was poor in case of the fresh meats sold at markets of Agra region.

**Keywords:** Microbiological quality, market meat, retail outlets, local slaughter-houses.

\*Corresponding author

Udit Jain

E-mail: [druditjain@hotmail.com](mailto:druditjain@hotmail.com)

Received: 15/03/2014

Revised: 29/03/2014

Accepted: 29/03/2014

### Introduction

Meat is an excellent source of high quality protein, fat, carbohydrate, vitamins and minerals and is delicious, palatable and easily digestible food item. This entire nutritional requirement can be met easily and efficiently if reasonable amount of meat is included in the diet. There are a number of diseases of bacterial, viral, rickettsial, mycotic and parasitic origin which may be transmitted from meat to humans like Salmonellosis, Staphylococcosis, Tuberculosis, Campylobacteriosis, Listeriosis, Colibacillosis, Pasteurellosis, NCD, Avian flu and *E. coli* specially Vero toxic *E. coli* (VTEC)/Shiga toxins producing *E. coli* (STEC) etc.

A microbial check must be carried out on regular basis and meat hygiene practices are necessary for public health point of view with objectives to ensure supply of disease free meat to the consumers, to check the spread of disease among meat consumers, to trace the source of disease by proper examination of animals before slaughter and the meat after slaughter, to check the spread of diseases which have a definite life cycle, to promote the honest butchers and retailers, to promote the trade of quality meat and meat products across the country that confirms to the international standards and eliminating the risk of rejections of foreign consignments of meat.

To study the meat and meat product regarding their microbial contamination in different types of

meats is of great public health significance. As it is a well known fact that the microbial population that comes in contact with meat during the production, processing, transportation and distribution, presents a challenging menace to meat industry and poses problems of infection, spoilage and intoxications (Ramasastry *et al.*, 1999; Dhanze *et al.*, 2012).

### Materials and Methods

A total of 120 meat samples (Table 1), were collected aseptically with the help of sterilized scalpel and B.P blade and the meat samples were transported in (sterilized or UV irradiated) polythene bags in the morning immediately after slaughter of animals from the retail meat outlets and unorganized slaughter houses. The period of collection of samples was from July 2011 to March 2012. The samples collected were processed immediately after being brought to the VPH laboratory under sterile conditions on ice for bacteriological examination i.e. evaluation of bacterial contamination. Parameters were taken for assessment of bacteriological contamination was Standard Plate Count (SPC), Coliform Count (CC), Staphylococcus Count (SC).

Samples were processed on the lines advocated by Cruickshank *et al.* (1975) and Gracey (1985). Meat homogenate was prepared according to ICMSF (1986). 25 gm of meat samples was homogenized with 225 ml of peptone dilution fluid (0.1 % peptone water, pH. 7.0,

sterilized at 121°C for 15 minutes), which provided a dilution of  $10^{-1}$ , using sterile pipette 1 ml of prepared homogenate was transferred to 9 ml peptone dilution blank to get the dilution of  $10^{-2}$ . Ten fold serial dilutions were prepared as  $10^{-3}$ ,  $10^{-4}$ ,  $10^{-5}$ ,  $10^{-6}$ ,  $10^{-7}$  by transferring 1ml of aliquot from diluted tube to dilution blank.

Table 1: Total number of samples collected for assessment of bacterial contamination.

| Sl. No | Type of meat | Sample Number |
|--------|--------------|---------------|
| 1.     | Carabeef     | 30            |
| 2.     | Chevon       | 30            |
| 3.     | Pork         | 30            |
| 4.     | Poultry      | 30            |
| Total  |              | 120           |

Standard plate count, Coliform count and Staphylococcus count was performed as per the lines advocated by Cruickshank *et al.* (1975) and APHA (1992).

## Results and Discussion

In the present study 120 meat samples were processed to assess the quantitative contamination by standard plate count (SPC), coliform count (CC) and staphylococcal count (SC). All the values of enumeration have been expressed in terms of  $\log_{10}$ . Mean values of standard plate count (SPC) ( $\log_{10}$ cfu/g) were found  $7.03 \pm 0.07$  for carabeef,  $6.96 \pm 0.78$  for chevon,  $6.86 \pm 0.02$  for Pork and  $6.75 \pm 0.04$  for poultry meat. The level of contamination of carabeef, chevon and pork was almost similar i.e. near the  $10^7$  (unacceptable limit of meat) indicating poor hygienic quality of meat. Only SPC count of poultry meat was satisfactory i.e. below the upper limit ( $10^6$ cfu/g) as per BIS. There was significant difference of SPC value for carabeef, chevon, pork and poultry meat (Table 2). From mean values of SPC we can say that highest contamination was in carabeef meat and lowest in poultry meat. The level of contamination of coliforms was much higher in chevon and poultry than pork and carabeef. In Chevon, mean values of coliform count were recorded highest (3.93), whereas mean values of carabeef were recorded lowest (3.04). For pork and poultry meat, the mean values were recorded in between 3.39 and 3.82 respectively. The range for staphylococcus count (cfu/g) were found to be 2.49-5.25 for carabeef, 2.59-5.14 for chevon, 2.20- 4.08 for Pork and 2.59 -5.00 for poultry meat.

Overall SPC finding of meats from retail outlets is higher when compared to ISI Standard of  $1 \times 10^7$

(cfu/g) for meat indicating that meat are of poor quality. There was significant difference of SPC values for carabeef, chevon, pork and poultry meat (Table 3). The present SPC count values were almost similar to the findings record by Inthvang *et al.* (2006) who stated aerobic plate count of fresh pork which varied in between 4.4-5.3 ( $\log_{10}$  cfu/g). Mukhopadhyay *et al.* (2009) reported his findings of aerobic plate count of fresh chevon which varied in between 5.931 to 10.94 ( $\log_{10}$  cfu/g). Dhanze *et al.* (2012) reported that quality of meat sold in the market of palampur valley is poor and recommend for improvement in hygienic conditions during production, processing and storage of meat and meat products.

Lambey *et al.* (2010) conducted study on raw meat samples of goats and pigs from local markets of Mathura City to assess the bacteriological quality of chevon and pork. The mean of  $\log_{10}$  standard plate count was 7.78 cfu/g and 7.03 cfu/g respectively for goat and pig meat which was higher to our findings. The other workers who reported findings of SPC for meat were Murthy (1976), John (1978).

Mean values of Coliform count ( $\log_{10}$ cfu/g) were found  $3.93 \pm 0.14$  for Chevon,  $3.82 \pm 0.12$  for Poultry,  $3.40 \pm 0.10$  for Pork and  $3.04 \pm 0.08$  for Carabeef. The level of contamination of coliforms was much higher in chevon and poultry than pork and carabeef. Nervy *et al.* (2011) reported Coliform count (CC) below the upper limit i.e. 1.83  $\log_{10}$ cfu/g. Similarly heavy coliform count of meat samples was reported by Uzeh *et al.* (2006), Okonko *et al.*, (2010), Javadi and Safarmashaei (2011). The coliform count of carabeef, chevon, pork and poultry meat varied significantly in Chevon (highest coliform count mean values of 3.93), where as lowest values were recorded in meat of carabeef (mean values of 3.04 and for pork and poultry meat mean values were in between 3.39 and 3.82 respectively).

The coliform count under present study is greater than that of permissible count of  $1 \times 10^2$  for meat samples (BIS). Similar heavy coliform counts of meat samples were reported by Tiwari *et al.* (2002). A study was conducted of raw meat samples of goats and pigs from local markets of Mathura City to assess the bacteriological quality of chevon and pork. The mean of  $\log_{10}$  of total coliform count was 4.29  $\log_{10}$  cfu/g and 4.15 cfu/g respectively for goat and pig meat which was slightly higher than our findings (Lambey *et al.*, 2010).

Mean values of Staphylococcus count ( $\log_{10}$ cfu/g) were found,  $3.90 \pm 0.12$  for cara beef,  $3.84 \pm 0.12$  for chevon,  $3.35 \pm 0.10$  for poultry and  $2.81 \pm 0.11$  for pork. These counts were equal or less than reported by previous workers (Uzeh *et al.*, 2006;

Table 2: Showing Mean and Range of Standard plate count (SPC), Coliform count (CC) and Staphylococcus count (SC) in terms of log values ( $\log_{10}$ cfu/g).

| Sources  | Attributes | SPC                     | CC                      | SC                      | P+value |
|----------|------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|---------|
| Carabeef | Mean+SE    | 7.03 <sup>b</sup> ±0.07 | 3.04 <sup>a</sup> ±0.08 | 3.90 <sup>c</sup> ±0.12 | 0.00    |
|          | Range      | 6.49-8.32               | 2.54-4.46               | 2.49-5.25               |         |
|          | N          | 30                      | 30                      | 30                      |         |
| Chevon   | Mean+SE    | 6.96 <sup>b</sup> ±0.78 | 3.93 <sup>c</sup> ±0.14 | 3.84 <sup>c</sup> ±0.12 | 0.00    |
|          | Range      | 6.57-8.38               | 2.61-5.32               | 2.59-5.14               |         |
|          | N          | 30                      | 30                      | 30                      |         |
| Pork     | Mean+SE    | 6.86 <sup>b</sup> ±0.03 | 3.40 <sup>b</sup> ±0.10 | 2.81 <sup>a</sup> ±0.11 | 0.00    |
|          | Range      | 6.53-7.45               | 2.44-4.44               | 2.20-4.08               |         |
|          | N          | 30                      | 30                      | 30                      |         |
| Poultry  | Mean+SE    | 6.75 <sup>a</sup> ±0.04 | 3.82 <sup>b</sup> ±0.12 | 3.35 <sup>b</sup> ±0.10 | 0.00    |
|          | Range      | 6.49-7.36               | 2.90-5.18               | 2.59-5.00               |         |
|          | N          | 30                      | 30                      | 30                      |         |

Values with different superscript within the column are different significantly from each other.

Table 3: Showing Analysis of variance (ANOVA) for Standard plate count (SPC), Coliform count (CC), and Staphylococcus count (SC).

|                            |                | Sum of Squares | Df  | Mean Square | F      | Sig. |
|----------------------------|----------------|----------------|-----|-------------|--------|------|
| Coliform count (CC)        | Between Groups | 15.097         | 3   | 5.032       | 13.329 | .000 |
|                            | Within Groups  | 43.797         | 116 | .378        |        |      |
|                            | Total          | 58.894         | 119 |             |        |      |
| Staphylo-ccus count (SC)   | Between Groups | 23.135         | 3   | 7.712       | 19.583 | .000 |
|                            | Within Groups  | 45.678         | 116 | .394        |        |      |
|                            | Total          | 68.813         | 119 |             |        |      |
| Standard Plate Count (SPC) | Between Groups | 1.308          | 3   | .436        | 4.512  | .005 |
|                            | Within Groups  | 11.205         | 116 | .097        |        |      |
|                            | Total          | 12.513         | 119 |             |        |      |

Himanshu, 2003; Tiwari *et al.*, 2002; Rathod *et al.*, 2004). The higher counts were recorded by Javadi and Safarmashaei (2011).

The Staphylococcus count recorded in the present study was higher than the count reported by Seriven and Singh (1986). Similar findings have also been reported by (Adinarayanan *et al.*, 1984; Bachil, 1985; Tiwari *et al.*, 2002).

## Conclusion

The findings of this study revealed that the quality of meat sold in the market of Agra region is poor and need improvement in hygienic conditions during production, processing and storage of meat for retail sale. It is suggested that the raw meat should be handled with appropriate hygienic measures and continuous microbial monitoring to safeguard the health of consumers.

## References

- Adinarayanan CL, Upadhyaya SN, Saxena VB and Mathew TV (1984). Microbial quality of goat meat in Nagpur market. *Indian Journal of Microbiology*, 24: 193-195.

- APHA (1992). In: Compendium of methods for the microbial examination of foods. Speck, M.L.(Ed.). American Public Health Association, Washington, DC.
- Bachhil VN (1985). Studies on the hygienic standards at fresh and frozen meats. *Indian Journal of Public Health*, 29: 3-7.
- Cruickshank R, Duguid JP, Marmion BP and Swain RHA (1975). Medical Microbiology 12<sup>th</sup> Edn. Vol II Churchill Living Stone. Edinburg, London.
- Dhanze H, Khurana SK and Mane BG (2012). Microbiological quality of eggs, chicken and chevon sold in market of Palampur, H.P. *Journal of Veterinary Public Health*, 10(1): 53-55.
- Gracey JF (1985). Thortons Meat Hygiene, 7<sup>th</sup> Edn.(E.L.B.S) William Clowes Ltd ., Beccles and London.
- Himanshu (2003) Studies on bacterial profile of goat, pig and poultry meat and its public health significance. *M.V.Sc thesis submitted to DUVASU Mathura (UP), India.*
- ICMSF (1978). Micro-organism in food, their significance and method of enumeration. 2<sup>nd</sup> Edn. of International Commission on microbiological specification of food. *The International Association of Microbiological Societies, University of Toronto Press.*
- Inthavong P, Srikitjakarn L, Kyule M, Zessin KH, Baumann M, Douangngeun B and Fries R (2006). A cross-sectional study was conducted to determine microbial contamination of pig carcasses at a slaughterhouse in Vientiane, capital of Lao People Democratic Republic (Lao PDR Correspondence : Dr Lertrak Srikitjakarn, Faculty of Veterinary Medicine, Chiang Mai University , Chiang Mai, 50100, Thailand), 37(6): 1237-1241.
- Javadi A and Safarmashaei S (2011). Study of *Enterobacteriaceae* contamination level in premises of poultry slaughterhouse with HACCP System. *Journal of Animal and Veterinary Advances*, 10(16): 2163-2166.
- John LS (1978). Microbiological evaluation of retail ground beef in Izmir, Turkey. *Journal of Food Protection*, 4: 104-106.
- Lambey HS, Verma AK, Jain U, Mahima and Bist B (2010). Bacteriological quality of chevon and pork in Mathura City U.P (India). *Journal of Veterinary Public Health*, 7(2): 141-143.
- Mukhopadhyay HK, Pillai RM, Pal UK and Ajay VJ (2009). Microbial quality of fresh chevon and beef in retail outlets of Pondicherry. *Tamilnadu Journal of Veterinary and Animal Sciences*, 5(1): 33-36.
- Murthy TRK (1976). Surface microbial contamination of sheep and goat in slaughterhouses and retail shops. *18<sup>th</sup> Annual Conference, Association of Microbiologist of India*, Dec. 21-23,1976.
- Okonko IO, Ukut IOE, Ikpoh IS, Nkang AO, Udeze AO, Babalola TA, Mejeha OK, Fajobi EA (2010). Assessment of bacteriological quality of fresh meats sold in calabar metropolis, Nigeria. *EJEAFChe*, 9(1): 89-100.
- Ramasasthy P, Rao RM and Mrunalini M (1999). Bacterial profile of frozen meat. *Indian Veterinary Journal*, 76: 409-411.
- Seriven FM and Singh R (1986). Comparison of the microbial population of retail beef and pork. *Meat Science*, 18:173-180.
- Tiwari AK, Singh SP and Kumar A (2002). Microbiological status of buffalo meat slaughter houses and retail outlets. *Journal of Food Science and Technology*, 39(1): 79-81.
- Uzeh RE Ohenhen and Adeniji OO (2006). Bacterial Contamination of Tsire-Suya, a Nigerian Meat Product. *Pakistan Journal of Nutrition*, 5(5): 458-460.