

Enterobacteriaceae in food safety with an emphasis on raw milk and meat

K. G. Mladenović^{1,2}, M.Ž. Grujović^{1,2}, M. Kiš³, S. Furmeg³, V. Jaki Tkalec³, O. D. Stefanović¹, S. D. Kocić-Tanackov⁴

¹University of Kragujevac, Faculty of Science, Department of Biology and Ecology, Radoja Domanovića 12, 34000 Kragujevac, Republic of Serbia

²University of Kragujevac, Institute for Information Technologies, Department of Science, Jovana Cvijica bb, 34000 Kragujevac, Republic of Serbia

³Croatian Veterinary Institute, Veterinary Institute Križevci, Laboratory for Food and Feed Microbiology, Zakmardijeva 10, 48260 Križevci, Croatia

⁴University in Novi Sad, Faculty of Technology, Cara Lazara 1, 21000 Novi Sad, Republic of Serbia

*Correspondence: Katarina G. Mladenović, University of Kragujevac, Faculty of Science, Department of Biology and Ecology, Radoja Domanović 12, Kragujevac, 34000, Republic of Serbia; e-mail: katarina.mladenovic@pmf.kg.ac.rs

Abstract

There has been a growing interest in traditional dairy (such as raw milk cheeses) and meat products, in recent years. However, these products are suitable, nutrient medium and may be easily contaminated by microorganisms such as *Enterobacteriaceae*. *Enterobacteriaceae* are considered to be the indicator bacteria for microbiological quality of food and hygiene status of a production process. Additionally, the food contaminated by *Enterobacteriaceae* poses a microbiological risk for consumers. In fact, the contamination of raw milk and meat by *Enterobacteriaceae* amid manufacturing may easily occur from various environmental sources and this group of bacteria is frequently detected in dairy and meat products. Therefore, monitoring microbiological quality of the used raw material and maintaining high standards of hygiene in the production process are mandatory for high quality of traditional products and the safety of the potential consumers. The goal of this review is to present the most recent survey on *Enterobacteriaceae* growth, number and distribution in raw milk cheeses and meat, as well as to discuss the sources of contamination and methods of control.

Key points

- *Enterobacteriaceae*: role and importance in milk and meat products, EU legal regulations.
- Dynamics, distribution, and survival of *Enterobacteriaceae* in milk and meat.
- Mechanisms of control of *Enterobacteriaceae* in dairy products.

Keywords: *Enterobacteriaceae*, food contamination, stress adaptation, development controlling

Introduction

Milk and meat are the two basic livestock food products. They provide a rich source of high-quality protein and a variety of important nutrients that are vital for optimal health. Milk and dairy products, as well as meat (red meat and poultry) are considered to be a valuable source of energy, highly digestible proteins of good nutritional quality, saturated and unsaturated lipids, as well as carbohydrates (lactose), vitamins A, D, B-group (mainly thiamin, vitamin B6, and pantothenic acid) and minerals (such as calcium, phosphorus, iron, zinc, copper). Based on the large role of these nutrient products, scope of this manuscript is a comprehensive overview of the role of *Enterobacteriaceae* in milk and meat with reference to their distribution, abundance and product protection measures and legal acts of microbiological safety of food.

Traditional cheeses are dairy products typical of a certain geographic region where the method of production is passed down from generation to generation. The type and quality of traditional cheeses are greatly influenced by the climatic conditions, the type of animal milk, as well as the type and content of animal feeds (grass, herbs, hay, silage) (Motahari et al., 2017). Unlike industrial cheeses, traditional ones are usually produced on a farm or in small dairies that use unpasteurized (raw milk) or low heat-treated milk (below the temperature of pasteurization) inoculated with various starter combinations. The cheeses produced in this way are recognized for their diversity and characteristic sensory properties. The lack of pasteurization step in cheese production preserves the indigenous microbial communities (Montel et al. 2014). Cheese production and development of cheese flavor is a complex process which is composed of both volatile and non-volatile fractions, which originate from milk fat,

55 protein, and carbohydrate. The process of cheese ripening has been reviewed extensively including the difference in
56 sensory profile between the raw milk cheeses and the pasteurized milk cheeses. It is concluded that the diverse
57 indigenous microbiota is responsible for the specific sensory properties of raw milk cheeses, as well as for more
58 intense flavor than the flavor of pasteurized milk cheeses (Chambers et al. 2010). Cheeses are comprised of diverse,
59 wild microbiota which evolves in a successional process of cheese production. Microbiological monitoring has
60 demonstrated that raw milk cheeses could be associated with several genera of *Enterobacteriaceae* family, including
61 *Escherichia coli* species, that are recognized as indicators of the hygiene in the production process. Some species
62 and strains are pathogens that have been clearly implicated in foodborne illness (Metz et al. 2020). Therefore, their
63 detection, as well as permitted number is stipulated in legal regulations for the microbiological safety of food.

64 Meat and meat products are the first choice of animal proteins in the human diet and their consumption is
65 continuously increasing worldwide. As one of the most perishable foods, raw meat, due to its chemical composition,
66 favors microbial growth to unacceptable levels contributing significantly to meat deterioration or spoilage. The
67 presence of many microorganisms in raw meat leads to changes that make it unappealing and unsuitable for human
68 consumption (Dave and Ghaly 2011; Doulgeraki et al. 2012). Drying and fermentation, as one of the oldest methods
69 of meat preservation, extend the shelf life of meats giving the final product distinctive properties such as
70 microbiological safety, flavor, and palatability (Settanni and Moschetti 2014). *Enterobacteriaceae* are very common
71 in fresh and frozen beef, pork and chicken meat (Gwida et al. 2014; Jansen et al. 2018) but could also be found in
72 the traditional fermented meat products (Castano et al. 2002; Talon et al. 2007). The incidence and number of
73 *Enterobacteriaceae* in raw meat and fermented meat products are effective indicators of hygiene and quality,
74 particularly in relation to contamination of fecal origin.

75 The family *Enterobacteriaceae* comprises a heterogenous group of Gram - negative, facultative anaerobic,
76 non-spore forming, rod-shaped bacteria. Some members of the *Enterobacteriaceae* possess the ability to ferment
77 lactose producing acid and gas. These are collectively termed coliform bacteria and are frequently used as (faecal)
78 indicator organisms by the food and water industry.

79 Members of the *Enterobacteriaceae* are widely distributed. Although strains of some species are harmless
80 commensals, others are important human and animal pathogens. Their importance is increasing since the natural
81 habitat of many members of *Enterobacteriaceae* family is located in the intestinal tract of animals. Thus,
82 *Enterobacteriaceae* have been used for a long time as indicator organisms in the food industry. While testing the
83 microbiological quality, the *Enterobacteriaceae* number and presence of coliforms/*E. coli* are used as effective
84 parameters to assess the poor hygiene status and possible failure of a manufacturing process (Halkman and Halkman
85 2014).

86 This family includes several important foodborne pathogens such as toxin-producing *Salmonella* spp. or
87 *Shigella* spp. In addition, despite the fact that most strains of *E. coli* are harmless commensals, several serotypes of
88 *E. coli* produce toxins and they are considered to be pathogenic. The most significant for food is *E. coli* O157:H7,
89 which has become one of the most important foodborne pathogens (Baylis et al. 2011). The resistance of the
90 *Enterobacteriaceae* to various antibiotics is a major problem of current medicine (Rock and Donnenberg 2014).

91 Based on the above mentioned, the aim of this paper is to review the literature on importance of the
92 *Enterobacteriaceae* for food safety associated with two basic types of food, traditional cheese product made from
93 raw milk, and traditional meat products.

94 **Legal acts of microbiological safety of food**

96 The European Commission provides the microbiological criteria that represent guidance on the acceptability of
97 foodstuffs and their manufacturing processes. Preventative actions, such as the application of Good Hygiene and
98 Manufacturing Practices (GHP, GMP) and the Hazard Analysis Critical Control Point (HACCP) principles
99 contribute to achieving food safety.

100 In the context of the European Legislation, two different types of microbiological criteria for foodstuffs are
101 established by Regulation No. 2073/2005, namely process hygiene criteria and food safety criteria (EC 2005). As a
102 measure of process hygiene, requirements are established for the cattle, sheep, goats, horses, and pig carcasses, in
103 terms of aerobic colony count and levels of *Enterobacteriaceae*. Process hygiene criteria are indicators of the
104 acceptable functioning of the HACCP system during the slaughter, dressing, and production process. For milk and
105 dairy products, process hygiene criterion applies to *Enterobacteriaceae* in pasteurized milk, other pasteurized liquid
106 dairy products, milk powder, whey powder, and ice-cream. Requirements are also established for cheeses made from
107 milk or whey that has undergone heat treatment in terms of *E. coli* levels. The process hygiene criteria set indicative
108 contamination values above which corrective actions are required to implement HACCP systems in the production
109 place. When a food safety criterion for the absence of *Salmonella* in different categories of dairy and meat products

110 are not met, the batch of food in question should be withdrawn from or not placed on the market (EC 2005).
111 Regulation No. 2073/2005 harmonized the microbiological food safety and process hygiene criteria for foodstuffs in
112 the European Union. However, many member states of the European Union have established their national
113 legislation that oversees microbiological process hygiene criteria in stricter terms than EU 2073/2005.

114

115 **Contamination of raw milk cheeses and meat by *Enterobacteriaceae***

116 Lack of personal hygiene amongst food handlers in retail is one of the most reported practices contributing to food-
117 borne illness. Despite an increased awareness of safe food handling practices and a food handler receiving food
118 hygiene training, in a study by Lues and Van Tonder (2007), *Enterobacteriaceae* were present on 44% of food
119 handler's hands and on 16% of aprons. *Klebsiella* spp. were found to be the most abundant species found on the
120 hand swabs of meat sellers, followed by genera *Citrobacter*, *Raoultella* and *Escherichia coli* (Gwida et al. 2014).

121

122 *Raw milk cheeses*

123 Many countries use *E. coli* and coliforms as indicators of sanitary quality of food and have set limits for cheeses,
124 including raw milk cheeses (Metz et al. 2020). Milk is a suitable medium for the growth of various microorganisms
125 since its rich in nutrients, contains high moisture, and has an initially neutral pH. Their rapid growth, particularly at
126 high ambient temperatures, may lead to the change of the liquid composition of milk, as well as to the change in
127 manufacturing dairy products. As Chege and Ndungu (2016) summarized, the raw milk could be a subject of
128 contamination at different points through the whole chain process and from different sources. In general,
129 microorganisms (bacteria, yeasts, and moulds) can contaminate raw milk in two ways. The first way is an
130 endogenous contamination where the milk is contaminated by a direct transfer from the unhealthy animal (systemic
131 infection, mastitis). The second way is an exogenous contamination, where the milk is contaminated while or after
132 milking by the feces, the exterior of the udder and teats, the skin, the environment, the equipment, etc. However, the
133 contamination of cheeses is possible during entire production process, not just during milking.

134 Raw milk can be contaminated in several ways. If the equipment for milking, processing and storage is not
135 properly maintained and clean, milk contamination can occur. After the muse, everything should be well cleaned
136 because even the smallest amount of milk can be a source of nutrients for bacteria from the fam. *Enterobacteriaceae*.
137 The water used for cleaning should be of good quality, because it can also be a source of coliform bacteria that can
138 contaminate milk. Persons involved in milk production should pay attention to the hygiene of clothing and hands,
139 and the hygiene of milking equipment. Caution is also recommended during milking, processing, and storage, as
140 milk contamination can occur at every step (Freitas et al. 2013). Raw milk and dairy products should be subjected to
141 appropriate hygienic conditions, which can prevent spoilage and/or growth of foodborne pathogens.

142

143 *Meat and meat products*

144 The three main mechanisms for meat and meat products spoilage (after slaughtering, amid processing, and storage)
145 imply the growth of microorganisms, lipid oxidation, and autolytic enzymatic spoilage. According to Dave and
146 Ghaly (2011), the change of pH, formation of slime, structural components degradation, off odors, and appearance
147 changes in meat is induced by microbial growth. When conditions favor their growth, some members of the fam.
148 *Enterobacteriaceae* establish an important spoilage group in meat (Doulgeraki et al. 2011). They cause green
149 discoloration of meat products as well as the production of putrescine and cadaverine, diamines of foul odor
150 (Doulgeraki et al. 2011; Gwida et al. 2014).

151 According to Reiche et al. (2019), the quality of raw meat is seriously affected by conditions during the
152 process of slaughtering animals. Bacteria from the fam. *Enterobacteriaceae* represent normal and healthy parts of
153 the intestinal microbiota of animals. Therefore, they are present and can be spread by cross-contamination. Meat
154 processing conditions, such as poor operating techniques and low levels of hygiene in facilities, can lead to meat
155 loss, reduced meat quality and meat spoilage. Therefore, prevention of contamination after slaughter, during cutting
156 and processing of meat, is a key measure that can contaminate meat.

157 Dry fermented sausages are a good substrate for the survival and even growth of certain pathogens, such as
158 *E. coli*, *S. tiphimurium* and *L. monocytogenes*. *Clostridium botulinum* and *Toxoplasma gondii* have also been
159 identified as potential microbial risks for consumers of this type of product. Pathogenic microorganisms can be
160 entered by cross-contamination from meat processing equipment or personnel involved in meat processing or retail.
161 Conditions during meat processing and pathogen characteristics determine the ability of pathogens to grow and
162 survive and to determine possible pathogen removal strategies to ensure the microbiological quality of the food
163 (Holck et al., 2017).

164 Schwaiger et al. (2012) in their study showed a lower prevalence of *Salmonella* spp. in chicken drumsticks from the
165 slaughterhouse (14%) than in retail samples (21%) which can be explained by the ability of salmonella to reproduce
166 at low temperatures. Furthermore, the high frequency of *E. coli*-positive chicken and pork samples. *E. coli*, indicates
167 that fecal contamination in the middle of the slaughter process. *Enterobacter*, *Citrobacter*, and *Klebsiella* were the
168 most detected Enterobacteriaceae from slaughterhouse samples (Schwaiger et al. 2012). The study by Carney et al.
169 (2006) performed in a beef slaughterhouse in Ireland confirmed the presence of *E. coli* O157 in 2.4% of beef
170 samples, 3.0% of carcasses and 3.0% of head meat samples, indicating the need for stricter control measures to
171 reduce the spread of pathogens in slaughterhouses.

172 173 **Growth and distribution of Enterobacteriaceae**

174 Bacterial growth in foods follows the normal pattern for bacterial growth. The lag phase may have a variable
175 duration in a food. This depends on the properties of the contaminating bacterial species and the food. The
176 mandatory time needs to the population density reach a significant level in each food product depends on the amount
177 of the initial inoculum and the rate of growth during the exponential phase. The rate of bacterial growth during the
178 exponential phase depends on the temperature, the nutrient value of the food, and other growth conditions.

179 180 *Raw milk cheeses*

181 The growth and survival of *Enterobacteriaceae* in raw milk cheeses have been studied. In general, the highest
182 number of *Enterobacteriaceae* was found throughout the first week of ripening. Afterwards the number decreased
183 with time of ripening at a variable rate depending on the strain, growth conditions and on the physico-chemical
184 characteristics of cheese. Generally, the growth of bacteria depended on external factors (environmental parameters)
185 and the internal characteristics of the food products (pH, a_w , temperature, etc.).

186 According to Mladenović et al. (2018a; 2018b), *K. oxytoca*, *K. pneumoniae*, *Klebsiella ornithinolytica* and
187 *E. coli* were the most dominant species in raw milk cheese, at first stage of ripening. Trnčić et al. (2016) indicated
188 that the milk type used in cheese production was also significantly associated with detection of coliforms. Metz et al.
189 (2020) indicated that *E. coli* and coliforms are detected in different types of raw milk but usually at <100 CFU/ml or
190 not found at all. They also noticed that indicators which were present in raw milk, during cheese-making, would
191 frequently increase in numbers, but their levels declined with decreasing of pH. A quick initial acidification is the
192 most important factor in reducing coliform loads and preventing defects such as early blowing in cheese (Sheehan,
193 2011). Trnčić et al. (2016) indicated between the 47 tested cheese samples with pH <5.0, only two were positive for
194 coliforms. They also indicated that water activity was significantly associated with detection of coliforms. None of
195 the 20 cheese samples with water activity <0.932 were positive for coliforms. However, among all mentioned
196 factors, water activity seems to be the only factor that determines the concentration at which coliforms are present.
197 Except for fresh cheeses, indicator levels are further reduced by 2–3 log₁₀ CFU/g or more, amid the ripening
198 process. As a result of ripening and pH decreasing, indicator levels in final cheese products are often low and within
199 the limits of <10 or <100 CFU/g (Metz et al. 2020). De Pasquale et al. (2014) demonstrated that raw milk cheeses
200 made using good quality raw milk, under hygienic conditions and properly aged, should have not contained high
201 levels of indicator bacteria in the final product.

202 Yoon et al. (2016) described that the native microbiota of raw milk was made from many bacterial genera,
203 but the most dominant were lactic acid bacteria (LAB) and members from *Enterobacteriaceae* family. As a result of
204 the presence of native microbiota, raw milk cheeses exhibit higher amounts of volatile compounds such as
205 carboxylic acids, alcohols and esters compared to pasteurized milk cheeses, which also affect the dynamic of growth
206 of *Enterobacteriaceae* (Ocak et al. 2015). In addition, milk pasteurization, low pH and low water activity
207 significantly contribute to lower prevalence of coliforms in cheese.

208 209 *Meat and meat products*

210 Members of the Enterobacteriaceae family are often found on freshly cut meat (Doulgeraki et al. 2011;
211 Jansen et al. 2018). Various treatments for raw meat, such as preservative addition, storage temperature, vacuum,
212 and modified atmosphere packaging (MAP), can affect the survival and growth of microorganisms that can cause
213 food spoilage (Doulgeraki et al. 2012). Several authors have reported the appearance of many members of the
214 Enterobacteriaceae family on raw poultry, beef, and pork (Kožačinski et al. 2006; Gvida et al. 2014; Jansen et al.
215 2018).

216 Globalization, international trade, and an increasing flow of goods and people enable foodborne zoonotic
217 and multi-resistant bacteria to spread worldwide. An interesting study on the safety and quality of fresh poultry meat
218 and fresh pork filets imported on the European market at border inspection post Hamburg harbor showed that *E. coli*

219 was the most frequent microbial contamination detected on poultry in 67% and on pork in 50% of all samples. The
220 33 isolates were confirmed as extended-spectrum β -lactamase producing *E. coli*. The most likely source of these
221 zoonotic pathogens in imported food is improper personal hygiene amid meat handling and processing accompanied
222 by poor storage conditions during transport (Jansen et al. 2018). The order *Enterobacteriales* contains species such as
223 *Serratia* spp. (Yersiniaceae) and *Proteus* spp. (Morganellaceae) that can be found together with members of the
224 Enterobacteriaceae family. While *Serratia proteamaculans* and *Serratia liquefaciens* frequently constitute the
225 community of fresh meat, *Citrobacter freundii* (Enterobacteriaceae) and *Proteus vulgaris* were recovered from
226 minced beef stored aerobically and under MAP, respectively (Doulgeraki et al. 2011). *S. liquefaciens* has been found
227 as predominant *Enterobacteriales* in raw meat stored in different atmospheres at the retail level. A psychrotolerant *H.*
228 *alvei* is very often detected in minced beef stored in MAP at 5-10 °C (Doulgeraki et al. 2011; Kilonzo-Nthenge et al.
229 2012).

230 The hygienic condition of fermented meat products that do not receive any thermal treatment is regulated
231 only by the fermentation and drying process they undergo. The *Enterobacteriaceae* found in minced meat, as a raw
232 material for the preparation of sausage mass, mostly derives from the animal tissue, working environment, the tools
233 used for the cutting up and mincing the meat. During the mincing of the meat potential microbial contamination is
234 more widely distributed by the liberated meat juices, as an ideal substrate for microbial growth (Castano et al. 2002;
235 Talon et al. 2007). It has been established that the *Enterobacteriaceae* count in the artisanal Spanish sausages has
236 not been completely reduced after fermentation and ripening process, unlike in the industrial sausages. Moreover, in
237 the artisanal sausage, only three species of *Enterobacteriaceae* were isolated during ripening, while their variety in
238 the industrial sausage was much higher, with *E. coli* and *H. alvei* isolated in higher proportion, followed by *S.*
239 *liquefaciens* and *Salmonella choleraesuis* (Castano et al. 2002). Factors that favor the growth of *Enterobacteriaceae*
240 during meat fermentation include a high initial water activity and high pH values, low concentration of fermentable
241 carbohydrates, low number of lactic acid bacteria in fresh sausage mixture, low levels of nitrite as the curing agent
242 and high ripening temperatures. Therefore, in order to control the population of *Enterobacteriaceae* during the
243 production of traditional fermented meat products, the addition of curing agents, sugars and starter cultures is
244 recommended accompanied by better control of the conditions during processing (Talon et al. 2007; Settanni and
245 Moschetti 2014).

246 ***Enterobacteriaceae* in dairy and meat products as reservoirs of virulence and antimicrobial resistance genes**

247 In addition to the role of indicators of unsanitary conditions in food production, some members of the fam.
248 *Enterobacteriaceae* have emerged as potential opportunistic pathogens (Ntuli et al. 2016). Several important
249 virulence genes have been found in fam. Enterobacteriaceae including thermolabile toxin (LT), thermostable toxin
250 (STa and STb), shiga-like toxin (Stk1 and Stk2), binding and deletion (Eae) and also rmpA (mucoid phenotype
251 regulator), vabG (lipopolysaccharides), kfu (iron intake), magA (mucus viscosity), fimH (fimbriae) and uge
252 (lipopolysaccharides), which were detected in *Klebsiella pneumoniae* (Jian-li et al. 2017). In addition, antibiotic
253 resistance genes encoding AmpC enzymes in Enterobacteriaceae are both chromosomally and plasmid-mediated
254 which increases its potential for lateral transfer. Antimicrobial resistance has recently been discovered (Khari et al.
255 2016) in bacteria isolated from dairy products such as *E. coli* and *Salmonella* spp. (Bread et al. 2015).

256 *Resistance to antibiotics*

257 Antibiotics are often used in animals with the aim of preventing and treating diseases, as well as increasing growth
258 and development (Murphy et al. 2016). The administration of antibiotics can affect the food industry because
259 antibiotic-resistant microorganisms from animals can be transferred to food products (Rolain 2013). There is also an
260 indirect risk of horizontal transmission of resistance genes to pathogenic microorganisms at various points along the
261 food chain (Capita et al. 2013; 2020).

262 Multidrug resistance is often associated with *E. coli* and *S. enterica*, which are considered the most
263 common foodborne pathogens. According to Chauhan et al. (2013) and Fakruddin et al. (2014) described
264 multiresistant *K. pneumoniae* from raw milk samples. Multiresistant such as *Enterobacter*, *Citrobacter* and
265 *Klebsiella* have also been described by Fakruddin et al. (2014) in various food samples, including milk powder.
266 Schwaiger et al. (2012) and Uzeh et al. (2021) described the occurrence of multiresistant strains in members of the
267 genera *Enterobacter*, *Serratia*, *Klebsiella* and *Citrobacter*, with more frequent resistance in chicken meat. Capita et
268 al. (2020) described the emergence of multiresistant enterobacteria isolated from red meat and poultry.

269 The ability to produce extended-spectrum β -lactamase (ESBL) by fam. Enterobacteriaceae is the factor of
270 most concern to the scientific community (Tekiner and Ozpinar 2016). ESBL inhibitors are widely used to treat
271 bacterial infections, especially gram-negative bacteria. *E. coli* and *K. pneumoniae* are the most common ESBL (Saito
272 2012).

274 et al. 2010). ESBL production can confer resistance to many classes of antibiotics. Foods with certain characteristics
275 may facilitate the spread of ESBL bacteria. For example, Calbo et al. (2011) described the transmission of an ESBL-
276 producing *K. pneumoniae* strain by food consumption at a health facility.

277 278 *Biofilm production*

279 Biofilms present on equipment surfaces in the food industry have been identified as the cause foodborne diseases
280 (Capita et al. 2020). Bacteria in biofilms show resistance to various environmental stresses, thus encouraging their
281 longevity and increasing the risk of food contamination (Mladenović et al. (2018a; 2018b). Biofilms are the
282 dominant mode of community of microorganisms in nature (Diez-Garcia et al. 2012) .

283 The formation of biofilms on milk processing equipment occurs very quickly. Milk is rich in nutrients,
284 especially calcium, which favors the formation of biofilm (Flint et al. 2015). A study conducted by Cherif-Antar et
285 al. (2016) indicated the presence of biofilm producers *Enterobacteriaceae* (*K. pneumoniae*, *Serratia marcescens* and
286 *Enterobacter* spp.) on stainless steel pipe surfaces in milk processing plants. According to Malek et al. (2012),
287 enterobacteria may be resistant to cleaning products which must be taken into account. Malek et al. (2012) proved
288 the presence of *Enterobacter* sp. after disinfection. Mladenović et al. (2018a; 2018b) indicated the ability of
289 members of the genera *Serratia* and *Klebsiella* isolated from raw milk cheese to produce biofilm.

290 Resistance to disinfectants and the great potential for transmission of bacteria from biofilms to meat
291 products by direct contact, is one of the biggest concerns in the industries (Wang 2019). Currently, in the meat
292 industry, pathogens on animal skins are considered to be the main source of carcass contamination during
293 processing. Strains *E coli* O157: H7 and STEC O157: H7, as well as *Salmonella* spp. and *L. monocytogenes* isolated
294 from various meat products, have the ability to create a biofilm (Wang 2019). In most cases, antibiotic resistance is
295 higher among biofilm-producing strains than among non-biofilm-producing strains (Saha et al. 2018; Capita et al.
296 2020).

297 298 **Adaptive ability of *Enterobacteriaceae* to environmental conditions**

299 Members of the *Enterobacteriaceae* family are widely distributed and adapted to various environmental conditions.
300 This means that it is imminent that some members of the *Enterobacteriaceae* family will enter the food chain
301 (Baylis et al. 2011). They possess the extreme ability to adapt. They grow in the pH range between 3.8 and 9. To
302 control acid tolerance of microorganisms (enterobacteria) in foods, the prevention of organisms from becoming
303 acid-adapted is crucial. If the acidification process of a food product is performed slowly, enterobacteria present in
304 the food product will become adapted to the gradual reduction in pH. Therefore, they will be unaffected by the final
305 pH value of the food product and survive longer in the acidic foods (Alvarez-Ordóñez et al. 2015).

306 The members of the *Enterobacteriaceae* family are psychotropic, mesophilic, and thermotolerant bacteria.
307 Most of them, including foodborne pathogens, are mesophilic. An optimum growth temperature of 37 °C is common
308 for *Enterobacteriaceae* of fecal origin (Baylis et al. 2011; Mladenović et al. 2018c; Mladenović et al. 2019d).

309 The best water activity (a_w) for the growth of *Enterobacteriaceae* is above 0.95, with a minimum a_w to 0.94
310 as to the amount of water required. Thus, foods with a higher water activity provide optimal conditions for growth.
311 This applies particularly to food such as fresh meat and fish, fresh fruits, vegetables, and milk, with a_w values of
312 0.98 or above. According to Abdulkarim et al. (2009), higher salinity has an inhibitory effect on the growth and
313 development of enterobacteria.

314 One of the ways in which bacteria adapt to environmental conditions is to form a biofilm. Milk possesses
315 characteristics that may promote biofilm production on surfaces. Its composition is rich in lipids, proteins, and
316 certain divalent cations, e.g., calcium, which favors the formation of biofilm (Teh et al. 2014). Biofilm formation is
317 influenced by environmental factors. They can stimulate or inhibit biofilm formation. For example, the higher salt
318 concentration in cheese inhibits the biofilm formation of *Enterobacteriaceae* (Mladenović et al. 2018c; Mladenović
319 et al. 2019d).

320 Maintaining the quality of fermented sausages consists of several strategies: lowering the pH by fermenting
321 sugar into mostly lactic acid, reducing water activity by salting, drying by evaporating water, inhibiting the growth
322 of aerobic bacteria by creating an anaerobic environment, inhibiting microbial growth by adding nitrates or nitrites
323 and inhibiting surface growth by smoking or adding specific molds (Holck et al., 2017). Exposure to stress can cause
324 varying degrees of cell damage or injury depending on the intensity of stress and the physiological state of
325 individual cells (Alvarez-Ordóñez et al. 2015). Some members of the *Enterobacteriaceae* family may develop
326 resistance to extreme processing conditions. Bacteria can also respond to adverse conditions through so-called stress
327 tolerance responses. These responses include both structural and physiological modifications in the bacterial cell.

328 They are mediated by complex genetic regulatory mechanisms (Alvarez-Ordóñez et al. 2015). The main aspects of
329 the adaptive response are given in Table 1.

330

331 **Mechanisms for controlling the number of *Enterobacteriaceae* in dairy and meat products**

332

333 *Raw milk cheeses*

334 Pasteurization is one of the methods used to standardize microbial composition and improve the microbial safety of
335 milk (Montel et al. 2014). Proponents of pasteurization argue that it is precisely the warming of milk that leads to
336 less frequent occurrence of pathogenic species in milk (Montel et al. 2014), and afterward in the cheese (Brooks et
337 al. 2012). On the other hand, proponents of traditional cheeses made from fresh unpasteurized milk, discuss about
338 preserving microbial indigenous cheese communities. Their arguments include the great diversity of microbial
339 species combined with a certain method of production. Cheese diversity, sensory properties, as well as the low risk
340 of developing pathogens are based on this (Montel et al. 2014).

341 Microfiltration is an alternative to pasteurization. Microfiltration involves filtering milk through
342 membranes that contain pores of certain dimensions that retain microorganisms, and a sterile filtrate leads to
343 obtaining sterile milk (Fox et al. 2000). In this way, unwanted microorganisms are removed, and the physico-
344 chemical composition of the milk is preserved. By eliminating the autochthonous microbiota, the original taste of
345 the cheese is changed.

346 In cheese manufacturing, the activity of lactic acid bacteria (LAB) may be used as food preservative and
347 contribute to the quality of cheese. Frequently established interaction between the *Enterobacteriaceae* and LAB is
348 antagonistic. LAB prevent the multiplication of enterobacteria, by applying several control mechanisms. First, the
349 antagonistic activity of LAB could be related to the fact that they compete for nutrients (Gopal et al. 2001). Also, the
350 ability of LAB to produce antimicrobial compounds is well known, e.g., lowland production (*Lactococcus lactis*)
351 (Biscola et al. 2013). Due to the large fermentative capacity of LAB, metabolic products, especially produced acids
352 such as acetic, formic, and lactic acids may be considered as potential inhibitors. Indirectly, decreasing the pH value,
353 the produced acids inhibit the growth of undesirable bacteria (Nuraida 2015).

354

355 *Meat and meat products*

356 Nowadays meat preservation methods became necessary due to the long-distance transportation and meat storage in
357 retail and supermarkets. The basic aim of preservation methods is to extend the shelf life of meat by inhibiting the
358 microbial spoilage, including the growth of *Enterobacteriaceae*. Low temperature methods of storage help to inhibit
359 or completely stop bacterial growth in the meat chill chain. However, freezing rate can significantly affect the
360 quality of frozen meat, with only 60% of the viable microbial population that dies at low temperatures, while the
361 remaining population gradually increases during frozen storage (Dave and Ghaly 2011). Foodborne pathogens from
362 the *Enterobacteriaceae* group, *Salmonella* spp. and *E. coli* are frequently associated with chilled and frozen raw
363 meats, poultry, and their products (Kožačinski et al. 2006; Jansen et al. 2018). Antimicrobial preservatives
364 (chlorides, nitrates, sulfites, and organic acids) are often used in reducing microbial proliferation amid slaughtering,
365 transportation, processing, and storage (Dave and Ghaly 2011). Sallam and Samejima (2004) found that the use of
366 sodium chloride in combination with sodium lactate reduced the *Enterobacteriaceae* count, maintained the chemical
367 quality, and extended the shelf life of ground beef during refrigerated storage. Organic acids have demonstrated
368 antimicrobial activities against many pathogenic organisms such as *Salmonella* spp. and *E. coli* O157:H7, due to
369 their abilities to reduce pH level of meat (Smulders et al. 2013). However, they should not be used as a substitute for
370 poor processing conditions or to cover up an already spoiled meat product (Dave and Ghaly 2011).

371 Since the procedures throughout meat cutting and processing cannot guarantee the absence of microbial
372 contamination in the raw materials, the addition of acidifying starter cultures to the minced meat, curing salts and
373 decrease of water activity can improve the sanitary condition of traditional fermented meat products (Castano et al.
374 2002; Settanni and Moschetti 2014). In meat products, the most widely used starter cultures are lactic acid bacteria
375 that produce several compounds with antimicrobial action. Casquete et al. (2012) demonstrated the inhibitory effect
376 of starter culture made up of autochthonous strains of *Pediococcus acidilactici* and *Staphylococcus vitulinus* on
377 enterobacteria in a traditional Iberian dry sausage. In the traditional Romanian dry sausage, the decrease of
378 *Enterobacteriaceae* throughout the ripening period is explained by the low pH value, due to the inclusion of
379 *Lactobacillus acidophilus* on the starter culture (Ciuciu Simion et al. 2014).

380

381 *New techniques for controlling microorganisms in foods*

382 *Cold plasma technology*

383 The science and technology of cold plasma are being researched and introduced as one of the methods for
384 preserving foodstuffs in the food sector. Plasma technology is considered as a modern non-conventional technique
385 (Bourke et al. 2018). As a novel technology, cold plasma is a technique used for sterilization of sensitive materials
386 like food. For years cold plasma processing has been viewed as useful for microbial inactivation while maintaining
387 quality of fresh produce. Overall application of cold plasma for microbial destruction on different food substrates
388 like fruits, meat products, cheese etc. was considered (Thirumdas et al. 2014).

389 390 *High pressure*

391 High pressure processing is a food pasteurization technique that leads to the inactivation of microorganisms at room
392 temperature, followed by minimizing the loss of sensory and nutritional components of the food. This process
393 preserves the original color, flavor and nutritional content of food since smaller molecules (pigments, vitamins,
394 volatile compounds, etc.) are less affected by high pressure (Huang et al. 2014). However, Vanlint et al. (2012)
395 examined the potential for high hydrostatic pressure (HHP) resistance development among strains of *E. coli*,
396 *Shigella flexneri*, *Salmonella* Typhimurium, *Salmonella* Enteritidis, *Yersinia enterocolitica*. They reported that
397 extreme HHP resistance was observed only in some *E. coli* strains, which is probably due to specific genetic
398 predisposition. Therefore, it is important to combine two or more techniques for controlling microorganisms in
399 foods, due to their high adaptive ability.

400 401 *Natural preservatives*

402 Some chemical preservatives such as sodium benzoate, potassium sorbate and nitrites, have been used commercially
403 to conserve food (fruit juices, dairy products, meat, and meat products, etc.) from contamination by spoilage
404 microorganisms. However, the usage of chemical preservatives has initiated some health issues. Therefore, the
405 recent trend is towards the use of natural antimicrobials, such as plant antimicrobials, in food preservation. Spices
406 and herbs are used in food since the ancient time, not only for flavoring but also for the preservation. The
407 antimicrobial properties of plants are associated to their secondary metabolites such as phenylpropanoids, terpenes,
408 flavonoids, and anthocyanins. Nowadays, it is proved the efficacy of plant products and various compounds isolated
409 from the plants are used (Dhiman and Aggarwal 2019).

410 *Bacteriocins*

411 Bacteriocins are naturally synthesized peptides that produce bacteriostatic or bactericidal effects on other bacteria.
412 The use of bacteriocins in natural preservation is an essential strategy to increase food safety due to its minimal
413 impact on the nutritional and sensory properties of food products. Low pH and bacteriocins from Gram-positive
414 bacteria (mainly lactic acid bacteria) that are presented in food may play an important role in natural food
415 preservations. Furthermore, bacteriocins combined with natural food preservatives containing plant essential oils,
416 with high pressure processing (HPP), temperature etc. represent a future perspective in preservations of food
417 (Prudêncio et al. 2015).

418 419 **Conclusion**

420 Bacteria from the *Enterobacteriaceae* family are present in our environment, and we inevitably encounter them.
421 They are an effective indicator of meat and dairy product quality and hygiene throughout the production process.
422 Hygienic and sanitary preventive measures include protecting the food from direct or indirect contamination,
423 applying personal hygiene practices, preserving the food in appropriate places and temperatures, proper storage.
424 However, *Enterobacteriaceae* represents a part of frequently detected microbiota in cheeses made from fresh,
425 unpasteurized milk which defines the final organoleptic characteristics of the resulting product. Therefore, it is
426 recommended that fermented food made from raw milk or meat is manufactured with the addition of autochthonous
427 microorganisms in order to preserve the original texture, taste and aroma of traditional products, as well as to avoid
428 risks to consumers' health and their exposure to potentially pathogenic bacteria and their toxins.

429 Considering the pathogenic properties of many members of the *Enterobacteriaceae* family and their high
430 prevalence in dairy and meat products, strict observance of hygiene policies and systematical monitoring of
431 *Enterobacteriaceae* at all stages of food production plays a crucial role in ensuring food safety and controlling the
432 transmission of pathogenic foodborne bacteria to humans.

433
434
435
436
437

438 **Declarations**

439 **Funding**

440 This work was supported by the Serbian Ministry of Education, Science and Technological Development (No. 451-
441 03-9/2021-14/200122).

442 **Author contributions**

443 K. G. Mladenović, M. Ž. Grujović have idea for the article and represented literature of enterobacteria and raw milk
444 chesses; M. Kiš, S. Furneg, V. Jaki Tkalec were represented literature of enterobacteria in meat products; O. D.
445 Stefanović and S. Kocić-Tanackov were represented a legal act and mechanism of control the enterobacteria and
446 critically revised the manuscript. All authors read and approved the final manuscript.

447 **Consent for Publication**

448 All the authors have read the manuscript and have approved this submission.

449 **Compliance with ethical standards**

450 This article does not contain any studies with human participants or animals performed by any of the authors.

451 **Conflicts of interest**

452 The authors declare that they have no conflicts of interest with the current work or its publication.

453

454 **References**

455 Abdulkarim SM, Fatimah AB, Anderson JG (2009) Effect of salt concentrations on the growth of heat-stressed and
456 unstressed *Escherichia coli*. *J Food Agric Environ* 7:51–54.

457 Alvarez-Ordóñez A, Broussolle V, Colin P, Nguyen-The C, Prieto M (2015) The adaptive response of bacterial
458 food-borne pathogens in the environment, host and food: Implications for food safety. *International Journal of Food*
459 *Microbiology* 213: 99–109. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijfoodmicro.2015.06.004>.

460 Álvarez-Ordóñez A, Fernández A, Bernardo A, López M (2010b) Arginine and lysine decarboxylases and the acid
461 tolerance response of *Salmonella* Typhimurium. *Int J Food Microbiol* 136:278–282
462 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijfoodmicro.2009.09.024>.

463 Alvarez-Ordóñez A, Fernández A, López M, Arenas R, Bernardo A (2008) Modifications in membrane fatty acid
464 composition of *Salmonella* Typhimurium in response to growth conditions and their effect on heat resistance. *Int J*
465 *Food Microbiol* 123: 212–219. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijfoodmicro.2008.01.015>.

466 Álvarez-Ordóñez A, Halisch J, Prieto M (2010a) Changes in fourier transform infrared spectra of *Salmonella*
467 *enterica* serovars Typhimurium and Enteritidis after adaptation to stressful growth conditions. *Int J Food Microbiol*
468 142, 97–105. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijfoodmicro.2010.06.008>.

469 Annous BA, Becker LA, Bayles DO, Labeda DP, Wilkinson BJ (1997) Critical role of anteiso-C15:0 fatty acid in
470 the growth of *Listeria monocytogenes* at low temperatures. *Appl Environ Microbiol* 63:3887–3894.
471 <https://doi.org/10.1128/aem.63.10.3887-3894.1997>.

472 Audia JP, Webb CC, Foster JW (2001) Breaking through the acid barrier: an orchestrated response to proton stress
473 by enteric bacteria. *Int. J. Med. Microbiol* 291: 97–106. <https://doi.org/10.1078/1438-4221-00106>

474 Baylis C, Uyttendaele M, Joosten H, Davies A (2011) The Enterobacteriaceae and their significance to the food
475 industry. *ILSI Europe Report Series, Belgium*. 1–48.

476 Beales N (2004) Adaptation of microorganisms to cold temperatures, weak acid preservatives, low pH, and osmotic
477 stress: A Review. *Comprehensive Reviews in Food Science and Food Safety*, 3(1): 1-20.
478 <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1541-4337.2004.tb00057.x>

479 Bearson SMD, Bearson BL, Rasmussen MA (2006) Identification of *Salmonella enterica* serovar Typhimurium
480 genes important for survival in the swine gastric environment. *Appl Environ Microbiol* 72: 2829–2836
481 <https://doi.org/10.1128/AEM.72.4.2829-2836.2006>.

482 Berry ED, Foegeding PM (1997) Cold temperature adaptation and growth of microorganisms. *J Food Prot* 60:1583–
483 1594. <https://doi.org/10.4315/0362-028X-60.12.1583>.

484 Beuvier E, Berthaud K, Cegarra S, Dasen A, Pochet S, Buchin S, Duboz G (1997) Ripening and quality of Swiss-
485 type cheese made from raw, pasteurized or microfiltered milk. *Int Dairy J* 7:311–323.
486 [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0958-6946\(97\)00015-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0958-6946(97)00015-0)

487 Biscola V, Todorov SD, Capuano VSC, Abriouel H, Gálvez A, Franco BDGM (2013) Isolation and characterization
488 of a nisin-like bacteriocin produced by a *Lactococcus lactis* strain isolated from charqui, a Brazilian fermented,
489 salted and dried meat product. *Meat Sci* 93: 607–613. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.meatsci.2012.11.021>

490 Bourke P, Ziuzina D, Boehm D, Cullen PJ, Keener KM (2018) The potential of cold plasma for safe and sustainable
491 food production. *Tren Biotechnol* 36: 615–626. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tibtech.2017.11.001>

492 Brooks JC, Martinez B, Stratton J, Bianchini A, Krokstrom R, Hutkins R (2012) Survey of raw milk cheeses for
493 microbiological quality and prevalence of foodborne pathogens. *Food Microbiol* 31: 154–158. [https://doi.org/](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.fm.2012.03.013)
494 10.1016/j.fm.2012.03.013

495 Calbo E, Freixas N, Xercavins M, Riera M, Nicolás C, Monistrol O, Solé Mdel M, Sala MR, Vila J, Garau J (2011)
496 Foodborne nosocomial outbreak of SHV1 and CTX-M-15-producing *Klebsiella pneumoniae*: epidemiology and
497 control. *Clin Infect Dis* 52:743–9. [https://doi.org/](https://doi.org/10.1093/cid/ciq238) 10.1093/cid/ciq238

498 Capita R, Alonso-Calleja C (2013) Antibiotic-resistant bacteria: a challenge for the food industry. *Crit Rev Food Sci*
499 *Nutr* 53:11–48. [https://doi.org/](https://doi.org/10.1080/10408398.2010.519837) 10.1080/10408398.2010.519837

500 Capita R, Castaño-Arriba A, Rodríguez-Melcón C, Iglesias G, Poeta P, Alonso-Calleja C (2020) Diversity, Antibiotic
501 Resistance, and Biofilm-Forming Ability of Enterobacteria Isolated from Red Meat and Poultry
502 Preparations. *Microorganisms* 8:1226. <https://doi.org/10.3390/microorganisms8081226>

503 Carney E, O'Brien SB, Sheridan JJ, McDowell DA, Blair IS, Duffy G (2006) Prevalence and level of *Escherichia*
504 *coli* O157 on beef trimmings, carcasses and boned head meat at a beef slaughter plant, *Food Microbiol* 23: 52–59.
505 [https://doi.org/](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.fm.2004.12.001) 10.1016/j.fm.2004.12.001

506 Casquete R, Benito MJ, Martín A, Ruiz-Moyano S, Pérez-Nevado F, Córdoba MG (2012) Comparison of the effects
507 of a commercial and an autochthonous *Pediococcus acidilactici* and *Staphylococcus vitulus* starter culture on the
508 sensory and safety properties of a traditional Iberian dry-fermented sausage “salchichón”. *Int J Food Sci Technol*
509 47:1011–1019. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2621.2011.02935.x>

510 Castano A, Garcia Fontan MC, Fresno JM, Tornadijo ME, Carballo J (2002) Survival of *Enterobacteriaceae* during
511 processing of *Chorizo de cebolla*, a Spanish fermented sausage. *Food Control* 13: 107–115. [https://doi.org/](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0956-7135(01)00089-5)
512 10.1016/S0956-7135(01)00089-5

513 Chambers DH, Esteve E, Retiveau A (2010) Effect of milk pasteurization on flavor properties of seven
514 commercially available French cheese types. *J Sen Studies* 25: 494–511. [https://doi.org/](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1745-459X.2010.00282.x)
515 10.1111/j.1745-459X.2010.00282.x

516 Chauhan S, Farooq U, Singh V, Kumar A (2013) Determination of prevalence and antibacterial activity of ESBL
517 (Extended Spectrum Beta-lactamases) producing *Klebsiella* species isolated from raw milk of Doon Valley in India.
518 *Int J Pharm Biol Sci* 4: 417–423. <https://doi.org/10.1.1.643.279>

519 Chege P, Ndungu Z (2016) Analysis of contamination points of milk through the whole value chain process and the
520 quality of milk products in the dairy industry, in: *Food Quality Control*, Chapter 1. pp. 3–13.

521 Cherif-Antar A, Moussa-Boudjemâa B, Didouh S, Medjahdi K, Mayo B, Flórez AB (2016) Diversity and biofilm-
522 forming capability of bacteria recovered from stainless steel pipes of a milk-processing dairy plant. *Dairy Sci*
523 *Technol* 96: 27–38. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s13594-015-0235-4>

524 Ciuciu Simion AM, Vizireanu C, Alexe P, Franco I, Carballo J (2014) Effect of the use of selected starter cultures
525 on some quality, safety and sensorial properties of Dacia sausage, a traditional Romanian dry-sausage variety. *Food*
526 *Control* 35: 123–131. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foodcont.2013.06.047>

527 Commission Regulation (EC) No 2073/2005 - Microbiological criteria for foodstuffs.

528 Dave D, Ghaly AE (2011) Meat spoilage mechanisms and preservation techniques: A critical review. *American J*
529 *Agricult Biol Sci* 6: 486–510. [https://doi.org/](https://doi.org/10.3844/ajabssp.2011.486.510) 10.3844/ajabssp.2011.486.510

530 de Jonge R, Ritmeester WS, van Leusden FM (2003) Adaptive responses of *Salmonella enterica* serovar
531 Typhimurium DT104 and other *S. Typhimurium* strains and *Escherichia coli* O157 to low pH environments. *J Appl*
532 *Microbiol* 94: 625–632. <https://doi.org/10.1046/j.1365-2672.2003.01875.x>

533 De Pasquale I, Calasso M, Mancini L, Ercolini D, La Storia A, Angelis M de, Di Cagno R, Gobetti M (2014)
534 Causal relationship between microbial ecology dynamics and proteolysis during manufacture and ripening of
535 protected designation of origin (PDO) cheese Canestrato Pugliese. *Appl Environ Microbiol* 80: 4085–4094.
536 <https://doi.org/10.1128/AEM.00757-14>

537 Dhiman R, Aggarwal NK (2019) Efficacy of plant antimicrobials as preservative in food, in: *Food preservation and*
538 *waste exploitation*. <https://doi.org/10.5772/intechopen.83440>.

539 Díez-García M, Capita R, Alonso-Calleja C (2012) Influence of serotype on the growth kinetics and the ability to
540 form biofilms of *Salmonella* isolates from poultry. *Food Microbiol* 31:173–80. [https://doi.org/](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.fm.2012.03.012)
541 10.1016/j.fm.2012.03.012

542 Doulgeraki AI, Ercolini D, Villani F, Nychas GJE (2012) Spoilage microbiota associated to the storage of raw meat
543 in different conditions. *Int J Food Microbiol* 157: 130–141. [https://doi.org/](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijfoodmicro.2012.05.020) 10.1016/j.ijfoodmicro.2012.05.020

544 Doulgeraki AI, Paramithiotis S, Nychas GJE (2011) Characterization of the *Enterobacteriaceae* community that
545 developed during storage of minced beef under aerobic or modified atmosphere packaging conditions. *Int J Food*
546 *Microbiol* 145: 77–83. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijfoodmicro.2010.11.030>

547 Etchegaray JP, Inouye M (1999) CspA, CspB and CspG major cold shock proteins of *E. coli* are induced at low
548 temperatures under conditions that completely block protein synthesis. *J Bacteriol* 181:1827–1830. 1999.
549 <https://doi.org/10.1128/JB.181.6.1827-1830.1999>.

550 Fakruddin Md, Rahaman M, Ahmed M M, Hoque M (2014) Antimicrobial resistance and virulence factors of
551 Enterobacteriaceae isolated from food samples of Bangladesh. *Int J Microbiol Immunol Res* 3: 12–18.

552 Flint S, Jamaludin NM, Somerton B, Palmer J, Brooks J (2015) The effect of milk composition on the development
553 of biofilms, in *Biofilms in the Dairy Industry*, eds Teh KH, Flint S, Brooks J, Knight G. (Chichester: John Wiley &
554 Sons) 36–48. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/9781118876282.ch3>

555 Foster JW (2000) Microbial responses to acid stress. In: Storz, G., Hengge-Aronis, R. (Eds.), *Bacterial Stress*
556 *Responses*. ASM Press, Washington, pp. 99–115

557 Fox PF, McSweeney PLH, Cogan TM, Guinee TP (2000) Bacteriology of cheese milk, in: *Fundamentals of Cheese*
558 *Science*, Springer Science & Business Media, pp. 45–47.

559 Freitas R, Brito MA, Nero LA, De Carvalho AF (2013) Microbiological safety of Minas Frescal Cheese (MFC) and
560 tracking the contamination of *Escherichia coli* and *Staphylococcus aureus* in MFC processing. *Foodborne*
561 *Pathogens Dis* 10: 951–955. <https://doi.org/10.1089/fpd.2013.1525>

562 Galinski EA (1995) Osmoadaptation of bacteria. *Adv Microbiol Phys* 37:273–328. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0065-](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0065-2911(08)60148-4)
563 [2911\(08\)60148-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0065-2911(08)60148-4)

564 Gopal PK, Prasad J, Smart J, Gill HS (2001) *In vitro* adherence properties of *Lactobacillus rhamnosus* DR20 and
565 *Bifidobacterium lactis* DR10 strains and their antagonistic activity against enterotoxigenic *Escherichia coli*. *Int J*
566 *Food Microbiol* 67: 207–216. [https://doi.org/10.1016/s0168-1605\(01\)00440-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/s0168-1605(01)00440-8)

567 Gutierrez C, Abee T, Booth IR (1995) Physiology of the osmotic stress response in microorganisms. *Int J Food*
568 *Microbiol* 28:233–244. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0168-1605\(95\)00059-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/0168-1605(95)00059-3).

569 Gwida M, Hotzel H, Geue L, Tomaso H (2014) Occurrence of Enterobacteriaceae in raw meat and in human
570 samples from Egyptian retail sellers. *Int Scholarly Res Notices* 565671. <https://doi.org/10.1155/2014/565671>

571 Halkman HBD, Halkman AK (2014) Indicator organisms, in: C.A. Batt, M.L. Tortorello (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of*
572 *food microbiology* (second edition) NY, USA.

573 Hleba L, Petrová J, Kántor A, Čuboň J, & Kačániová M (2015) Antibiotic resistance in Enterobacteriaceae strains
574 isolated from chicken and milk samples. *J Microbiol Biotechnol Food Sci* 4: 19-22.
575 <https://doi.org/10.15414/jmbfs.2015.4.special1.19-22>

576 Holck A, Axelsson L, Anette McLeod A, Rode TM, and Even Heir E. Health and Safety Considerations of
577 Fermented Sausages. *Journal of Food Quality*, Volume 2017, 25 pages. <https://doi.org/10.1155/2017/9753894>

578 Huang HW, Lung HM, Yang BB, Wang CY (2014) Responses of microorganisms to high hydrostatic pressure
579 processing. *Food Control* 40: 250–259. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foodcont.2013.12.007>

580 Jansen W, Woudstra S, Muller A, Grabowski N, Schoo G, Gerulat B, Klein G, Kehrenberg C (2018) The safety and
581 quality of pork and poultry meat imports for the common European market received at border inspection post
582 Hamburg Harbour between 2014 and 2015, *Plos One*. 13: e0192550. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0192550>

583 Jian-li W, Yuan-yuan S, Shou-yu G, Fei-fei D, Jia-yu Y, Xue-hua W, Yong-feng Z, Shi-jin J, Zhi-jing X (2017)
584 Serotype and virulence genes of *Klebsiella pneumoniae* isolated from mink and its pathogenesis in mice and mink.
585 *Scientific Reports* 7: 1-7. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1038/s41598-017-17681-8>.

586 Jones PG, Inouye M (1994) Microreview: the cold shock response—a hot topic. *Mol Microbiol* 11:811–818.
587 <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2958.1994.tb00359.x>

588 Jones PG, Vanbogelen RA, Neidhart FC (1987) Induction of proteins in response to low temperature in *Escherichia*
589 *coli*. *J Bacteriol* 169:2092–5. <https://doi.org/10.1128/jb.169.5.2092-2095.1987>.

590 Khari FIM, Karunakaran R, Rosli R, Tay ST (2016) Genotypic and phenotypic detection of AmpC β-lactamases in
591 Enterobacter spp. Isolated from a teaching hospital in Malaysia. *PLoS One* 11: 1-12.
592 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0150643>.

593 Kieboom J, Abee T (2006) Arginine-dependent acid resistance in *Salmonella enterica* serovar Typhimurium. *J*
594 *Bacteriol* 188: 5650–5653 <https://doi.org/10.1128/JB.00323-06>.

595 Kilonzo-Nthenge A, Rotich E, Nahashon SN (2012) Evaluation of drug-resistant *Enterobacteriaceae* in retail
596 poultry and beef. *Poultry science Association* 1098–1107.

597 Kozačinski L, Hadžiosmanović M, Zdolec N (2006) Microbiological quality of poultry meat on the Croatian market,
598 *Veterinarski arhiv* 76: 305–313.

599 Lelivelt MJ, Kawula TH (1995) Hsc66, an Hsp70 homolog in *Escherichia coli* is induced by cold shock but not by
600 heat shock. *J Bacteriol* 177:4900–4907. <https://doi.org/10.1128/jb.177.17.4900-4907.1995>.

601 Lues JFR, Van Tonder I (2007) The occurrence of indicator bacteria on hands and aprons of food handlers in the
602 delicatessen sections of a retail group. *Food Control* 18: 326–332. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foodcont.2005.10.010>
603 Malek F, Moussa-Boudjemâa B, Khaouani-Yousfi F, Kalai A, Kihel M (2012) Microflora of biofilm on Algerian
604 dairy processing lines: an approach to improve microbial quality of pasteurized milk. *Afr J Microbiol Res* 6: 3836–
605 3844. <http://dx.doi.org/10.5897/AJMR11.1120>
606 McAfee AJ, McSorley EM, Cuskelly GJ, Moss BW, Wallace JM, Bonham MP, Fearon AM (2010) Red meat
607 consumption: An overview of the risks and benefits. *Meat Sci* 84:1–3. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.meatsci.2009.08.029>
608 Metz M, Sheehan J, Feng PCH (2020) Use of indicator bacteria for monitoring sanitary quality of raw milk cheeses
609 – A literature review. *Food Microbiol* 85: 103283. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.fm.2019.103283>
610 Mladenović K, Muruzović M, Čomić Lj (2018a) The effects of environmental factors on planktonic growth and
612 biofilm formation of *Serratia odorifera* and *Serratia marcescens* isolated from traditionally made cheese. *Acta*
613 *Alimentaria* 47: 370–378. <https://doi.org/10.1556/066.2018.47.3.13>
614 Mladenović K, Muruzović M, Čomić Lj (2018c) *Escherichia coli* identification and isolation from traditional
615 cheese produced in Southeastern Serbia. *J Food Safety* 38: 1–6. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jfs.12477>
616 Mladenović K, Muruzović M, Vasić S, Čomić Lj (2018b) The symbiotic effect of temperature and sugars on the
617 planktonic growth and biofilm formation of *Klebsiella* spp. isolated from traditionally made cheese. *Romanian*
618 *Biotechnol Lett* 24: 400–407. <https://doi.org/10.25083/rbl/24.3/400.406>
619 Mladenović K, Muruzović M, Žugić Petrović T, Stefanović O, Čomić Lj (2018d) Isolation and identification of
620 Enterobacteriaceae from traditional Serbian cheese and their physiological characteristics. *J Food Safety* 38: 1–9.
621 <https://doi.org/10.1111/jfs.12387>
622 Montel M, Buchinb S, Mallet A, Delbes-Paus C, Vuittond DA, Desmases N, Berthier F, (2014) Traditional
623 cheeses: Rich and diverse microbiota with associated benefits. *Int J Food Microbiol* 177: 136–154. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijfoodmicro.2014.02.019>
624 Motahari, P., Mirdamadi, S., & Kianirad, M. (2017). Safety evaluation and antimicrobial properties of *Lactobacillus*
625 *pentosus* 22C isolated from traditional yogurt. *Journal of Food Measurement and Characterization*, 11, 972-978.
626 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11694-017-9471-z>.
627 Murphy CP, Fajt VR, Scott HM, Foster MJ, Wickwire P, McEwen SA (2016) Scoping review to identify potential
628 non-antimicrobial interventions to mitigate antimicrobial resistance in commensal enteric bacteria in North
629 American cattle production systems. *Epidemiol Infect* 144:1–18. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0950268815000722>
630 Nakagawa T, Fujimoto Y, Uchino M, Miyaji T, Takano, K and Tomizuka N (2003) Isolation and characterization of
632 psychrophiles producing cold-active β -galactosidase. *Lett Appl Microbiol* 37:154–7. <https://doi.org/10.1046/j.1472-765x.2003.01369.x>.
633 Ntuli V, Njage PMK, Buys EM (2016) Characterization of *Escherichia coli* and other Enterobacteriaceae in
634 producer-distributor bulk milk. *J Dairy Science* 99: 9534-9549. <http://dx.doi.org/10.3168/jds.2016-11403>.
635 Nuraida L (2015) A review: Health promoting lactic acid bacteria in traditional Indonesian fermented foods, *Food*
636 *Sci. Human Welln.* 4: 47–55. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.fshw.2015.06.001>
637 Nychas GJE, Skandamis PN, Tassou CC, Koutsoumanis KP (2008) Meat spoilage during distribution. *Meat Science*
638 78: 77–89. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.meatsci.2007.06.020>
639 Ocak E, Javidipour I, Tuncurk Y (2015) Volatile compounds of Van Herby cheeses produced with raw and
640 pasteurized milks from different species. *J Food Sci Technol* 52: 4315–4323. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13197-014-1458-8>
641 Phillips LE, Humphrey TJ, Lappin-Scott HM (1998) Chilling invokes different morphologies in two *Salmonella*
642 *enteritidis* PT4 strains. *J Appl Microbiol* 84:820–826. <https://doi.org/10.1046/j.1365-2672.1998.00417.x>.
643 Prudêncio CV, Teresinha dos Santos M, Dantas Vanetti CM (2015) Strategies for the use of bacteriocins in Gram-
644 negative bacteria: relevance in food microbiology. *J Food Sci Technol* 52: 5408–5417.
645 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13197-014-1666-2>
646 Reiche AM, Oberson JL, Silacci P, Messadene-Chelali J, Hess HD, Dohme-Meier F, Dufey PA, Terlouw EMC
647 (2019) Pre-slaughter stress and horn status influence physiology and meat quality of young bulls. *Meat Sci* 158:
648 107892. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.meatsci.2019.107892>
649 Rock C, Donnenberg MS (2014) Human Pathogenic Enterobacteriaceae, in: Reference Module in Biomedical
650 Sciences. <https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-12-801238-3.00136-7>
651 Rolain JM (2013) Food and human gut as reservoirs of transferable antibiotic resistance encoding genes. *Front*
652 *Microbiol* 4:173. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fmicb.2013.00173>
653
654

655 Russell NJ (1984) Mechanisms of thermal adaption in bacteria: blueprints for survival. Trends Biochem Sci 9:108–
656 112. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1541-4337.2004.tb00057.x>

657 Russell NJ, Evans RI, terSteege PF, Hellemons J, Verheul A, Abee T (1995) Membranes as a target for stress
658 adaption. Int J Food Microbiol 28:255–261. . [https://doi.org/10.1016/0168-1605\(95\)00061-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/0168-1605(95)00061-5).

659 Saha S, Devi KM, Damrolien S, Devi KS, Krossnunpuii KT (2018) Biofilm production and its correlation with
660 antibiotic resistance pattern among clinical isolates of *Pseudomonas aeruginosa* in a tertiary care hospital in north-
661 East India. Int J Adv Med 5: 964–968. <https://doi.org/10.18203/2349-3933.ijam201813129>.

662 Saito R, Koyano S, Nagai R, Okamura N, Moriya K, Koike K (2010) Evaluation of a chromogenic agar medium for
663 the detection of extended-spectrum β -lactamase-producing Enterobacteriaceae. Lett Appl Microbiol 51:704–6.
664 <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1472-765x.2010.02945.x>

665 Sallam KI, Samejima K (2004) Microbiological and chemical quality of ground beef treated with sodium lactate and
666 sodium chloride during refrigerated storage, Lebenson Wiss Technol. 37: 865–871.
667 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lwt.2004.04.003>

668 Schwaiger K, Huther S, Holzel C, Kampf P, Bauer J (2012) Prevalence of antibiotic-resistant enterobacteriaceae
669 isolated from chicken and pork meat purchased at the slaughterhouse and at retail in Bavaria, Germany. Int J Food
670 Microbiol 154: 206–211. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijfoodmicro.2011.12.014>

671 Schwaiger K, Huther S, Hölzel C, Kämpf P, Bauer J (2012) Prevalence of antibiotic-resistant enterobacteriaceae
672 isolated from chicken and pork meat purchased at the slaughterhouse and at retail in Bavaria, Germany. Int J Food
673 Microbiol 154:206-211. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijfoodmicro.2011.12.014>.

674 Settanni L, Moschetti G (2014) New trends in technology and identity of traditional dairy and fermented meat
675 production processes. Trends Food Sci Technol 37: 51–58. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tifs.2014.02.006>

676 Sheehan J (2011) Cheese: Avoidance of gas blowing, in: J.W. Fuquay, P.F. Fox, P.L.H. McSweeney (Eds.),
677 Encyclopedia of Dairy Sciences (2nd), Academic Press, San Diego, CA, pp. 661–666.

678 Smulders FJM, Paulsen P, Vali S, Wanda S (2013) Effectiveness of a polyamide film releasing lactic acid on the
679 growth of *E. coli* O157:H7, *Enterobacteriaceae* and Total Aerobic Count on vacuum-packed beef. Meat Sci 95:160–
680 165. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.meatsci.2013.04.058>

681 Talon R, Leroy S, Lebert I (2007) Microbial ecosystems of traditional fermented meat products: The importance of
682 indigenous straters. Meat Sci 77: 55–62. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.meatsci.2007.04.023>

683 Teh KH, Flint S, Palmer J, Andrewes P, Bremer P, Lindsay D (2014) Biofilm – An unrecognised source of spoilage
684 enzymes in dairy products? Int Dairy J 34:32–40. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.idairyj.2013.07.002>

685 Tekiner İH, Özpinar H (2016) Occurrence and characteristics of extended spectrum beta lactamases producing
686 Enterobacteriaceae from foods of animal origin. Braz J Microbiol 47:444–51. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bjm.2015.11.034>

687

688 Thirumdas R, Sarangapani C, Annapure US (2014) Cold Plasma: A novel Non-Thermal Technology for Food
689 Processing. Food Biophy 10: 1–11. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11483-014-9382-z>

690 Trmčić A, Chauhan K, Kent DJ, Ralyea RD, Martin NH, Boor KJ, Wiedmann M (2016) Coliform detection in
691 cheese is associated with specific cheese characteristics, but no association was found with pathogen detection. J
692 Dairy Sci 99: 6105–6120. <https://doi.org/10.3168/jds.2016-11112>.

693 Uzeh RE, Adewumi F, Odumosu BT (2021) Antibiotic resistance and plasmid analysis of Enterobacteriaceae
694 isolated from retail meat in Lagos Nigeria. One Health Outlook 3, 10 <https://doi.org/10.1186/s42522-021-00042-x>

695 Vanlint D, Rutten N, Michiels CW, Aertsen A (2012) Emergence and stability of high-pressure resistance in
696 different food-borne pathogens. Appl Environ Microbiol 78: 3234–3241. <https://doi.org/10.1128/AEM.00030-12>

697 Wang N, Yamanaka K, Inouye M (1999) CspI, the ninth member of the CspA family of *Escherichia coli*, is induced
698 upon cold shock. J Bacteriol 181:1603–1609. <https://doi.org/10.1128/JB.181.5.1603-1609.1999>.

699 Wang Rong (2019) Biofilms and Meat Safety: A Mini-Review. J Food Protect 82: 120–127. <https://doi.org/10.4315/0362-028x.jfp-18-311>

700

701 Yoon Y, Lee S, Choi K (2016) Microbial benefits and risks of raw milk cheese, Food Control 63: 201–215.
702 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foodcont.2015.11.013>

703

704

705

706

707

708

709

Table 1. The major aspects in the adaptive response of some members from *Enterobacteriaceae* family

Adaptation	Mechanisms	Mode of action	Model microorganisms	References
The acid stress response	Homeostatic systems	Keep intracellular pH relatively constant at pH 7.6 to 7.8, even as external pH changes during growth, restoring the internal pH to neutrality	<i>S. Typhimurium</i> , <i>E. coli</i>	Foster (2000); Kieboom and Abee (2006); Alvarez-Ordóñez et al. (2010b)
	Acid shock proteins (e.g., RpoS)	Cellular regulation, molecular chaperoning, energy metabolism, transcription, translation, synthesis of fimbriae, regulation of the cellular envelopes, colonization, and virulence	<i>S. Typhimurium</i> , <i>E. coli</i>	Audia et al. (2001); Bearson et al. (2006)
	Membrane fluidity (membrane adaptation)	Effect on membrane fatty acid composition (decrease in the unsaturated to saturated fatty acid ratio and in the relative concentration of octadecenoic (oleic or vaccenic) acids, with a concomitant increase in the content in cyclic fatty acids	<i>S. Typhimurium</i> , <i>E. coli</i> , <i>Yersinia enterocolitica</i>	de Jonge et al. (2003); Alvarez-Ordóñez et al. (2008, 2010a); Beales (2004)
	Other mechanisms	Chilled temperatures for <i>S. enteritidis</i> in low pH conditions	<i>S. enteritidis</i>	Phillips et al. (1998); Beales (2004)
High salt stress response (increasing the osmotic pressure by lowering <i>aw</i> by drying, salting, or sugaring)	Osmoregulation - The bacteria raise their internal solute levels (compatible solutes), resulting in an increase in internal osmotic pressure and restoration of turgor pressure	As the bacterium loses water, cytoplasmic level of K ⁺ increases. This triggers enzymes, such as glutamate dehydrogenase to form glutamate from a ketoglutamate. As the glutamate levels increase, water starts to re-enter the cell and growth resumes	<i>E. coli</i> , <i>Salmonella</i> spp.	Galinski (1995); Beales (2004)
	Gene expression	Expression of the <i>kdp</i> gene (codes for the high-affinity potassium uptake system Kdp) - This results in an uptake of potassium, which can last until the turgor is restored	<i>E. coli</i>	Gutierrez et al. (1995); Beales (2004)
Low temperature stress response	Cell membranes response - changes in fatty acid composition	An increase in the amount and/or kind of branched fatty acids, a reduction in the proportion of cyclic fatty acids and thus an increase in mono-unsaturated straight chain fatty acids	<i>Salmonella</i> spp.	Russell (1984); Russell et al. (1995); Beales (2004)

	The effect of C _{15:0} on physical properties and on maintaining a fluid, liquid-crystalline state of the membrane lipids	<i>E. coli</i> , <i>Y. enterocolitica</i>	Y. Annous et al. (1997); Beales (2004)
Cell membranes response - synthesize elevated levels of enzymes	Production of cold adapted enzymes such as β -galactosidase	Some psychrophiles	Nakagawa et al. (2003); Beales (2004)
Gene expression: the cold shock response	Protein RecA - Role in recombination and the induction of the SOS response Hsc66 (70-kDa heat shock protein) – The response thought act as a molecular chaperone in the cold shock response. Ensure the conformation of proteins and refolding of denatured proteins occurs correctly CspA (70 amino acid protein encoded by the <i>cspA</i> gene) - It has a high induction level, increasing 200-fold after a reduction from 37 °C to 10 °C. CspA is a transcriptional regulator, which recognizes gene promoters and switches them on, thus producing cold shock proteins Cold shock inducible CspB and CspG -The temperature dependence of CspB and CspG induction is restricted to low temperature ranges Cold shock inducible CspI – may bind to RNA and single-stranded (ss)DNA.	<i>E. coli</i>	Berry and Foegeding (1997); Beales (2004) Lelivelt and Kawula (1995); Beales (2004) Jones et al. (1987), Jones and Inouye (1994); Beales (2004) Etchegaray and Inouye (1999); Beales (2004) Wang et al. (1999); Beales (2004)

712
713
714
715