



UNIVERSITÀ
DEGLI STUDI
DI UDINE

Università degli studi di Udine

Use of bio-protective cultures to improve the shelf-life and the sensorial characteristics of commercial hamburgers

Original

Availability:

This version is available <http://hdl.handle.net/11390/1085980> since 2020-02-27T21:11:55Z

Publisher:

Published

DOI:10.1016/j.lwt.2015.02.022

Terms of use:

The institutional repository of the University of Udine (<http://air.uniud.it>) is provided by ARIC services. The aim is to enable open access to all the world.

Publisher copyright

(Article begins on next page)

Use of bio-protective cultures to improve the shelf-life and the sensorial characteristics of commercial hamburgers

Giuseppe Comi^a, Erica Tirloni^b, Debbie Adyanto^a, Marisa Manzano^a, Lucilla Iacumina^{*}

^aDepartment of Food Science, University of Udine, Via Sondrio 2/A, 33100 Udine, Italy.

^bDepartment of Health, Animal Science and Food Safety, Università degli Studi di Milano, via Celoria 10, 20133, Milano, Italy

*Corresponding author:

Lucilla Iacumin

Dipartimento di Scienze degli Alimenti, Università degli Studi di Udine

Via Sondrio 2/A

33100 Udine, Italy

e-mail: lucilla.iacumin@uniud.it

Phone: +39 0432 558126

Fax: +39 0432 558130.

26 **Abstract**

27

28 The use of mixtures of bio-protective cultures, like *Lactobacillus sakei* subsp.
29 *carnosus*/*Lactobacillus sakei* + *Staphylococcus xylosus* (1/1 ratio), *Lactococcus lactis* spp.
30 *lactis*/*Lactobacillus sakei* + *Staphylococcus xylosus* (1/1 ratio), and *Lactobacillus sakei* subsp.
31 *carnosus*/*Lactobacillus sakei* + *Staphylococcus xylosus* (1/2 ratio), inoculated in beef hamburger
32 packaged in modified atmosphere and stored at 4 ± 2 °C, determined a better microbiological and
33 chemical-physical quality of the products. In particular, they inhibited the growth of *B.*
34 *thermosphacta* resulting in no white slime on the products as well as they determined a low
35 concentration of total volatile basic nitrogen (TVB-N). Moreover, the bio-protective cultures
36 influenced the flavour and the odour of the hamburgers. For this reason, the shelf life of the
37 products added with starter cultures could be extended up to 12 days.

38

39

40 **Keywords:** Hamburger, bio-protective cultures, shelf life.

41

42

43

44

45

46

47

48

49

50

51

1. Introduction

Muscle meat from healthy animals (Nychas et al., 2008) is usually free of microorganisms but is susceptible to microbial contamination by both pathogenic and spoilage bacteria, even up to the moment of cooking and consumption (Andritsos et al., 2012; Papadopoulou et al., 2011; Papadopoulou et al., 2012). The potential source of contamination depends on the condition of the animals before, during and after slaughter and the transportation, by marketing and consumer handling of the meat. Microorganisms such as *Pseudomonas* spp., *Brochothrix thermosphacta*, *Shewanella putrefaciens*, coagulase-negative cocci and *Enterobacteriaceae* can cause spoilage (Papadopoulou et al., 2012; Nychas et al., 2008; Xu et al., 2010; Russo et al., 2006). Contamination can also be caused by psychrotrophic and pathogenic species such as *Staphylococcus aureus*, *Listeria monocytogenes*, *Clostridium perfringens*, *Campylobacter jejuni* and *Yersinia enterocolitica* and by enteropathogenic bacteria such as *Escherichia coli* and *Salmonella* spp. (Nastasijevic et al., 2009; Cloak et al., 2001; Stock & Stolle, 2001). Minced meat used for hamburger production, in particular, is a potentially hazardous substrate for bacterial growth and has a very short shelf life (Andritsos et al., 2012). The storage temperature and the packaging may influence the microbial quality of minced meat (von Holy & Holzappel, 1988), as well as the effect of the type of retail outlet sampled and the season of analysis (Andritsos et al., 2012). It is well documented that *Pseudomonas* spp. dominates the microbial population of meat stored under aerobic conditions, while *B. thermosphacta* becomes the main spoilage microorganism for meat packaged in modified atmosphere (MAP) (Russo et al., 2006). *Enterobacteriaceae* and lactic acid bacteria (LAB) also contribute with *B. thermosphacta* to the spoilage of minced meat packaged in air, under vacuum or in MAP (Papadopoulou et al., 2012; Xu et al., 2010). The use of MAP, which contains oxygen and carbon dioxide, is intended to preserve and increase the shelf life of hamburgers. During refrigerated storage, the presence of high concentrations of oxygen (40-80%) causes the transformation of myoglobin into oxymyoglobin, a process that results in the bright red colour of meat (Lambert et al., 1991). The

carbon dioxide (20-30%) in MAP inhibits the growth of aerobic spoilage and pathogenic bacteria (Zakrys et al., 2009). The presence of oxygen maintains the attractive appearance of the burgers for a few days (Paleari et al., 2004; Scanga et al., 2000), but the burger colour eventually darkens due to the growth of aerobic bacteria (Zhao & Wells, 1994). Generally, high concentrations of CO₂, used in MAP, inhibits the growth of microorganisms, but higher concentrations are necessary to prevent the growth of aerobic spoilage bacteria (Paleari et al., 2004). This however results in a corresponding reduction in O₂ concentrations (< 60%) that further may lead to a loss of the bright red colour of meat (Paleari et al., 2004). For these reasons a proper balance of the two gasses is needed. Commercial hamburgers packaged in MAP and stored at refrigeration temperature have a shelf life of 7 days, as based on the expiry date assigned by the producers. Recently, combinations of hygienic quality control and protective technology have been used to improve and extend the shelf life of meat and meat products by limiting the growth of spoilage and pathogenic bacteria. Among the main protective technologies, bio-protective cultures are of particular concern (Comi et al., 2011; Vasilopoulos et al., 2010). Aim of this study was the evaluation of different mixtures of bio-protective cultures to improve the microbiological quality, the physical-chemical parameters and sensory attributes of beef hamburgers in order to extend their shelf life in MAP.

2. Materials and Methods

2.1. Sample preparation, storage condition and sampling methods

Meat cut from different anatomical parts of adult cattle were ground, mixed and divided into 4 batches of 50 kg each. The first batch, representing lot 1, was formed into patties, directly packaged and used as control. The other batches were inoculated with a mixture of LAB and coagulase-negative, catalase-positive cocci (CNCPC) at a final concentration of 10⁵ CFU/g of product before

104 being formed into patties. Lot 2 was inoculated with a mix of *Lactobacillus sakei* subsp.
105 *carneus*/*Lactobacillus sakei* + *Staphylococcus xylosus* at a ratio of 1/1. Lot 3 was inoculated with
106 *Lactococcus lactis* ssp. *lactis*/*Lactobacillus sakei* + *Staphylococcus xylosus* at a ratio of 1/1. Lot 4
107 was inoculated with *Lactobacillus sakei* subsp. *carneus*/*Lactobacillus sakei* + *Staphylococcus*
108 *xylosus* at a ratio of 1/2. The burgers were packed in MAP, consisting of 70% O₂ and 30% CO₂, and
109 placed inside 15 x 10 x 3 cm rectangular trays of 200 µm in thickness made of PET/PE/EVOH/PE
110 ANTIFOG - EVOH. The trays were laminated with a top film consisting of APET/PE/EVOH/PE.
111 The packaged burgers were stored at 4 ± 2 °C for 12 days in artificial light. At 0, 6, 9 and 12 days,
112 10 boxes were collected for microbiological, and physical-chemical analyses. All analyses were
113 conducted in duplicate on three replicates at each sampling point.

114

115 2.2. Bacterial strains, preparation and inoculation of hamburgers

116

117 *Lactobacillus sakei*, *Lactobacillus sakei* subsp. *carneus*, *Lactococcus lactis* ssp. *lactis* and
118 *Staphylococcus xylosus* used in this experiment were obtained from the Italy branch supplier of Chr.
119 Hansen, Denmark. The lyophilised cultures were resuspended in peptone water [0.1% sodium
120 chloride and 0.7% peptone (Oxoid, Italy)] and left for 1 h at room temperature to rehydrate.
121 Subsequently, appropriate dilutions were made, and 1 ml of each dilution was placed in MRS agar
122 (de Man-Rogosa-Sharpe agar, pH 6.2, Oxoid, Italy) and incubated at 30°C for 48-72 h in a
123 microaerophilic conditions (gas pack anaerobic system, BBL, Becton Dickinson, USA). A
124 suspension of 10⁷ CFU/ml was used to directly inoculate the ground meat (hamburgers), and the
125 final bacterial cell concentration was approximately 10⁵ CFU/g hamburger.

126

127 2.3. Microbiological analysis

128

129 The Total Viable Count (TVC) was enumerated onto Plate Count Agar (Oxoid, Italy) that was
130 incubated at 30°C for 48-72 h; LABs were grown in De Man Rogosa Sharpe (MRS) agar (Oxoid,
131 Italy), incubated in microaerophilic conditions at 42°C for 48 h; yeasts and moulds were grown on
132 Malt Agar (MA) (Oxoid, Italy), incubated at 25°C for 72-96 h; *Escherichia coli* was grown in Violet
133 Red Bile Agar (VRBGA) (Oxoid, Italy), incubated at 44°C for 24 h; Coagulase positive
134 staphylococci were grown on Baird-Parker agar medium (BP) (Oxoid, Italy), supplemented with
135 egg yolk tellurite emulsion (Oxoid, Italy) and incubated at 35°C for 24-48 h after confirmation with
136 a coagulase test. *Brochothrix thermosphacta* was enumerated in streptomycin-sulfate-thallous
137 acetate-cycloheximide agar (SSTAA, Oxoid, Italy) with selective supplement SR 151 (Oxoid,
138 Italy), following incubation at 22°C for 48-96 h. Sulphite-reducing clostridia were quantified in
139 Differential Reinforced Clostridia Medium (DRCM) (VWR, USA), incubated at 37°C for 24-48 h
140 in an anaerobic jar with an anaerobic kit (gas pack anaerobic system, BBL, Becton Dickinson,
141 USA). *Campylobacter jejuni*, *Campylobacter coli* (ISO 10272), *Salmonella* spp. (ISO 6579),
142 *Listeria monocytogenes* (ISO 11290-1), and *Yersinia enterocolitica* (ISO 10273) were detected
143 according to the recommended methods for the microbiological analysis of foods (Lombardy
144 Region – Official Bulletin of the Lombardy Region, 4th Suppl. Extraordinary No. 24, June 17th
145 1995 and methods OM 7/12/93).

146

147 2.4. pH measurements

148

149 The pH value was measured in 10 different positions for each product using a pH meter (Basic 20,
150 Crison Instruments, Spain). The pH values were measured from the product directly by inserting a
151 pH meter probe into the sample.

152

153 2.5. Total Volatile Basic Nitrogen (TVB-N) measurements

154

155 The total volatile basic nitrogen (TVB-N) was evaluated by the method proposed by Pearson
156 (1973).

157

158 *2.6. Colour measurements*

159

160 The colour was measured using a Minolta Chromameter CR-200 and the CIE Lab system. After
161 calibration with standard white tiles, the Chromameter was positioned perpendicular to the patty
162 surface, and 10 different positions were evaluated for each sample immediately after the package
163 was opened. The evaluated parameters were L^* , a^* and b^* . L^* describes the white intensity or
164 brightness, with values ranging from 0 (black) to 100 (white). The a^* value describes the redness
165 ($a^* > 0$), and b^* describes the yellowness ($b^* > 0$). The final value was expressed as the respective
166 average of ten measurements.

167

168 *2.7. Sensory analysis*

169

170 Sensory analyses were performed by 12 non-professional panellists. Cooked burgers from 4 lots,
171 containing each 10 packages, were evaluated. The panellists were asked to identify the products in
172 descending order from the best to the worst, taking into account the following parameters: odour
173 (fermented, rancid), taste (sweet, sour, fresh, pungent, meat-taste, rancid) and flavour (ammonia,
174 sweet, sour, bitter) (Vàlková et al., 2007; Baublis, et al., 2005).

175

176 *2.8. Statistical analysis*

177

178 The values of the various parameters were compared using a one-way analysis of variance. The
179 averages were compared with the Tukey's honest significant test using the StatGraphics software
180 package from Statistical Graphics (Rockville, Maryland).

181 3. Results and discussion

182
183 The results of the microbiological analyses and the pH determination of the different batches are
184 shown Table 1.

185 The inoculation level of LAB (lot 2, 3 and 4) was at T0 between 4.82 and 5.01 log CFU/g. These
186 level rapidly increased, regardless of the presence of 70% O₂ in the MAP, reaching after 6 days
187 loads between 6.16 and 7.65 Log CFU/g and after 9 and 12 days respectively loads between 7.68
188 and 8.88 Log CFU/g and loads between 8.05 and 8.90 Log CFU/g, respectively.

189 Considering the control lot 1, the initial LAB was almost 4 log CFU/g, in agreement with those
190 obtained by previous authors (Paleari, et al., 2004). However, the concentration of LAB increased.
191 Considering TVC, at T0, lot 1 (5.90 ± 0.15 Log CFU/g) and lot 2 (5.90 ± 0.55 Log CFU/g) resulted to
192 have significantly lower loads if compared to lot 3 (6.60 ± 0.11 Log CFU/g) and lot 4 (7.00 ± 0.05
193 Log CFU/g). The higher TVC found in lot 3 and 4 is not related to the starter inoculation, as this
194 was added to the meat at 5 log CFU/g but probably to the variability of the raw material. These
195 values differed from those obtained by other authors for minced meat marketed in Italy: Paleari et
196 al., (2004) observed TVC values lower than 5 log CFU/g in ground meat, increasing up to 8 and 9
197 log CFU/g, despite the presence of CO₂ in MAP at the end of the storage period. The same results
198 were obtained by Andritsos et al., (2012) in minced pork prepared at retail stores in Greece: in that
199 case, the psychrotrophic microorganisms, i.e., *B. thermosphacta* and *Pseudomonas* spp. mainly
200 composed the initial microflora. *Pseudomonas* spp., generally have an advantageous growth rate in
201 the presence of an aerobic atmosphere and became the main spoilage microorganisms at the
202 refrigerated temperature. Their growth is ususally followed by *B. thermosphacta* and LAB growth,
203 and together, these microorganisms represent the main species responsible for the reduced shelf life
204 of minced meat in aerobic conditions (Kammenou et al., 2004; Koutsoumanis et al., 2012).
205 *B. thermosphacta*, the typical psychotropic microorganism responsible for the spoilage of meat
206 products and refrigerated meat products grew in all the hamburgers. In the control products (lot 1)

207 this microorganism grew constantly from 2.40 Log CFU/g at the beginning of the trial reaching the
208 level of 4.47 at T12. In lot 2 and 3 a significantly lower increase was revealed, if compare to lot 1
209 attesting an increase from T0 to T12 of 0.68 and 1.37 log CFU/g respectively; in any case the loads
210 never overcame the level of 4 Log CFU/g for the whole period. Considering lot 4, a very limited
211 increased was observe from T0 till the end of the trial (0.38 Log CFU/g). As a matter of fact, the
212 bio-protective cultures partially inhibited the growth of *B. thermosphacta*. Similar results have also
213 been obtained in different products by other authors (Andritsos et al., 2012; Papadopoulou et al.,
214 2012).

215 The initial yeast concentration was between 1.7 and 2.5 log CFU/g. Lot 3 appeared initially to be
216 the less contaminated by yeast but increased 1 log CFU/g by day 12, becoming the most
217 contaminated; in any case it never overcame the level of 3.1 Log CFU/g. The yeast counts for lots
218 1, 2, and 4 remained constant over 12 days.

219 *Clostridium* H₂S producers, *Staphylococcus aureus* and *Escherichia coli* were below the threshold
220 limit of the detection method (1 log CFU/g), while classical meat pathogens such as *Salmonella*
221 spp., *Listeria monocytogenes*, *Campylobacter* spp. and *Yersinia enterocolitica* were absent in 25 g
222 foer the whole period. The absence of *L. monocytogenes* and *Salmonella* spp. seems unexpected
223 because it is estimated that at least 10% of fresh meat is contaminated with *L. monocytogenes* and
224 approximately 6-20% of meat is contaminated with *Salmonella* spp. despite the application of strict
225 microbiological hygienic controls (Cloak et al., 2001; Stock & Stolle, 2001). In fact, our data were
226 different from those obtained by other authors: Marino et al., (1995), found that the presence of
227 *Escherichia coli* exceeded the limit imposed by the current EEC Regulation 2073/2005
228 (Anonymous, 2005) in some of the analysed samples. The same results were obtained by Adritsos
229 et al., (2012). However, the absence of *S. aureus* and *Clostridium* H₂S+ producers observed, was in
230 agreement with the findings by Marino et al., (1995); *S. aureus*, in particular is often associated
231 with human contamination due to poor hygienic conditions during handling of the product (Adritsos
232 et al., 2012).

233 The results of the pH and total volatile basic nitrogen (TVB-N) are reported in Table 1. Lots
234 inoculated with bio-protective cultures showed a lower starting pH if compared to lot 1 and
235 demonstrated a constant decrease of the pH during the whole period.

236 Considering the TVB-N, in lot 1 significantly higher increase over time was observed, overcoming
237 the limit of 30 mg nitrogen/100 g, suggested for fishery products by Commission Decision
238 95/149/EC from 8 March 1995, from T9. Lots 2, 3, and 4 never overcame this limit up to 12 days of
239 storage. It is plausible that competition caused by the bio-protective starters slowed and/or inhibited
240 the spoilage and consequently reduced the production of TVB-N.

241 Table 2 shows the results of the colour evaluation using the L*, a* and b* parameters at days 0, 6, 9
242 and 12. No significant differences were observed between lot 1 and the other lots. Until day 12, the
243 L*, a* and b* parameters were similar between the lots. As expected, there were no significant
244 colour changes in the hamburgers from all lots after 12 days of storage. During this time, the
245 hamburgers discoloured due to the oxidation of myoglobin caused by the presence of oxygen in the
246 MAP. However, visual analysis determined that the colour of the hamburgers in lots 3 and 4 was
247 more attractive than that of lots 1 and 2 at day 12. Table 4 describes the hamburgers colours at day
248 0 and 12.

249 Considering microbial and TVB-N results, hamburgers were acceptable for up to 12 days of storage
250 at 4 ± 2 °C.

251 The sensory analysis supported this conclusion. Table 3 shows that the bio-protective cultures
252 improved the sensory attributes of the hamburgers. Hamburgers with bio-protective cultures did not
253 present odours, flavours or sticky white slime that are indicative of spoilage. In contrast, a sticky
254 white slime was observed in some hamburgers from lots 1 and 2. In lot 2, this may have been due to
255 the rapid growth of the bio-protective cultures, as the concentration of LAB (9 log CFU/g) was
256 significantly higher than in the other lots ($p < 0.05$). The panellists preferred the taste of the
257 hamburgers from lots 3 and 4, which contained bio-protective inoculations of *Lactococcus lactis*
258 spp. *lactis*/*Lactobacillus sakei* + *Staphylococcus xylosus* (ratio of 1/1) and *Lactobacillus sakei*

259 subsp. *carnosus*/*Lactobacillus sakei* + *Staphylococcus xylosus* (ratio of 1/2), respectively. These
260 microorganisms seemed to have improved the sensory quality of the hamburgers and inhibited the
261 growth of autochthonous bacteria (Table 1).

262 Oxidation of meat pigments was not observed in the four lots of hamburgers regardless of the
263 presence of bio-protective cultures. However, these findings are beneficial for the elimination of
264 slimes, discolouration and browning caused by autochthonous LAB.

265

266 **4. Conclusions**

267 Bio-protective cultures, used as mixed cultures of *Lactobacillus sakei* subsp.
268 *carnosus*/*Lactobacillus sakei* + *Staphylococcus xylosus* (1/1 ratio), *Lactococcus lactis* spp.
269 *lactis*/*Lactobacillus sakei* + *Staphylococcus xylosus* (1/1 ratio), and *Lactobacillus sakei* subsp.
270 *carnosus*/*Lactobacillus sakei* + *Staphylococcus xylosus* (1/2 ratio), could be employed as bio-
271 protective cultures for beef hamburger. These cultures inhibited the growth of *Brochothrix*
272 *thermosphacta*, determining an improvement of the microbial and organoleptic qualities of the
273 meat. Bio-protective cultures, which inhibited the spoilage bacteria, were able to reduce the TVB-N
274 to values below 30 mg nitrogen/100 g. The sensory traits of the hamburgers were positively
275 influenced by the presence of the bio-protective cultures, as the odours, flavours, and the sticky
276 white slime, that are indicative of deterioration, were not observed in the inoculated samples. The
277 bio-protective cultures evaluated in this study can potentially extend the shelf life up to 12 days and
278 improve the sensory properties of hamburger meat.

279

280 **References**

281

282 Andritsos, N. D., Mataragas, M., Mavrou, E., Stamatiou, A., & Drosinos, E. H. (2012). The
283 microbial condition of minced pork prepared a retail stores in Athens, Greece. *Meat Science*,
284 91, 486-489.

285 Anonymous (2005). Commission Regulation (EC) 2073/2005 of 15/11/2005 on microbiological
 286 criteria for foodstuffs. Official Journal of Europe Union, L 338, 1-26, 22/12/2005.

287 Baublis, R. T., Meullenet, J. F., Sawyer, J. T., Mehaffey, J. M. & Saha A. (2005). Pump rate and
 288 cooked temperature effects on pork loin instrumental, sensory descriptive and consumer rated
 289 characteristics. *Meat Science*, 72, 741-750.

290 Cloak, O. M., Duffy, G., Sheridan, J. J., Blair, I. S., & McDowell, D. A. (2001). A survey on the
 291 incidence of *Campylobacter* spp. and the development of a surface adhesion polymerase
 292 chain reaction (SA-PCR) assay for the detection of *Campylobacter jejuni* in retail meat
 293 products. *Food Microbiology*, 18(3), 287-298.

294 Comi, G., Ottaviani, S., Patthey, C., Mitri, E., Menardi, G., Andyanto, D., & Iacumin, L. (2011).
 295 Quality improving of cooked ham slices packaged in MAP. *Ingegneria Alimentare*, 6, 14-
 296 16. ^[1]_{SEP}

297 Cvijovic, M., Djukic, D., Mandic, L., Acamovic-Djokovic, G., & Pesakovic, M. (2010).
 298 Composition of antimicrobial activity of essential oils of some medical and spice plants.
 299 *Chemistry Natural Compounds*, 46(3) , 481-483.

300 Dainty, R. H. (1996). Chemical/biochemical detection spoilage. *International Journal Food*
 301 *Microbiology*, 33, 19-34.

302 Desmarchelier, P., Fegan, N., Smale, N. & Small, A. (2007). Managing safety and quality through
 303 the red meat chain. *Meat Science*, 77, 28-35.

304 Gill, C. O. (1996): Extending the storage life of meats. *Meat Sci.*, 43, S99-S109.

305 Govaris, A., Solomsakos, N., Pexara, A, & Chatzopoulou, P. S. (2010). The antimicrobial effect of
 306 oregano essential oil, nisin and their combination against *Salmonella enteritidis* in minced
 307 sheep meat during refrigerated storage. *International Journal Food Microbiology*, 137, 175-
 308 180.

309 Koutsoumanis, K. P., Stamatiou, A. P., Drosinos, E. H., & Nychas, G. J. E. (2008). Control of
 310 spoilage microorganisms in minced pork by a shelf-developed modified atmosphere induced
 311 by the respiratory activity of meat microflora. *Food Microbiology*, 25, 915-921.

312 Lambert, A. D., Smith, J. P., & Dodds, K. L. (1991). Shelf-life extension and microbial safety of
 313 fresh meat – A review. *Food Microbiology*, 8, 267-297.

314 Marino, M., Duratti, G., D'Aubert, S. & Comi, G. (1995). Qualità microbiologica di prodotti a base
 315 di carni macinate di diverse specie animali. *Ingegneria Alimentare*, 3, 21-26.

316 Nastasijevic, I., Mitrovic, R. & Buncic, S. (2009): The occurrence of *Escherichia coli* O157 in/on
 317 faeces, carcasses and fresh meats from cattle. *Meat Science*, 82(1), 101-105.

318 Nychas, G. J. E., Skandamis, P. N., Tassou, C. C. & Koutsoumanis, K. P. (2008): Meat spoilage
 319 during distribution. *Meat Science*, 78, 77-89.

320 Paleari, M. A., Bersani, C., Beretta, G., & Parini, M. (2004). Shelf-life di carne bovina macinata e
 321 confezionata in atmosfera protettiva. *Industrie Alimentari*, XLIII, Febbraio, 125-128.

322 Papadopoulou, O. S., Doulgeraki, A. I., Botta, C., Cocolin, L., & Nychas, G. J. E. (2012).
 323 Genotypic characterization of *Brochothrix thermosphacta* isolated during storage of minced
 324 pork under aerobic or modified atmosphere packaging conditions. *Meat Science*, 92, 735-
 325 738.

326 Papadopoulou, O., Panagou, E. Z., Tassou, C. C., & Nychas, G. J. E. (2011). Contribution of
 327 Fourier transform infrared (FTIR) spectroscopy data on the quantitative determination of
 328 minced pork meat spoilage. *Food Research International*, 44, 3264-3271.

329 Paulsen, P., Smulders, F. J. M., Tichy, A., Aydin, A. & Hock, C. (2011). Application of
 330 classification and regression tree analysis (CART) on the microflora of minced meat for
 331 classification according to Reg. (EC) 2073/2005. *Meat Science*, 88, 531-534.

332 Pearson D. (1973). Laboratory Techniques in Food Analysis. Butterworths & Co. (publishers) Ltd,
 333 London.

334 Russo, F., Ercolini, D., Mauriello, G. & Villani, F. (2006). Behaviour of *Brochothrix*
 335 *thermosphacta* in presence of other meat spoilagemicrobial groups. *Food Microbiology*, 23,
 336 797-802.

337 Scanga, J. A., Grona, A. D., Belk, K. E., Sofos, J. N., Belliger, G. R., & Smith, G. C. (2000).
 338 Microbiological contamination of raw beef trimmings and ground beef. *Meat Science*, 56,
 339 145-152.

340 Stock K., & Stolle A. (2001). Incidence of *Salmonella* in Minced Meat Produced in a European
 341 Union–Approved Cutting Plant. *Journal Food Protection*, 64, 9, 1, 1435-1438(4).

342 Vàlková, V., Salàková, A., Buchtová, H., & Tremlovà, B. (2007). Chemical, instrumental and
 343 sensory characteristics of cooked pork ham. *Meat Science*, 77, 608-615.

344 Vasilopoulos, C., De Mey, E., Dewulf, L., Paelinck, H., De Smedt, A., Vandendriessche, F., De
 345 Vuyst, L., & Leroy, F. (2010). Interaction between bacterial isolates from modified-
 346 atmosphere-packaged artisan-type cooked ham in view of the development of a bio-protective
 347 culture. *Food Microbiology*, 27, 1086-1094.

348 Von Holy, A. & Holzapfel, W. H. (1988): The influence of extrinsic factors on the microbiological
 349 spoilage pattern of ground beef. *International Journal Food Microbiology*, 6, 269-280.

350 Xu, Y. Z., Anyogu, A., Ouba, L. I. I., & Sutherland, J. P. (2010). Genotypic chartacterization of
 351 *Brochothrix* spp. Isolated from meat, poultry and fish. *Letters Applied Microbiology*, 51, 245-
 352 251.

353 Zakrys, P. I., O’Sullivan, M. G., Allen, P., & Kerry, J. P. (2009). Consumer acceptability and
 354 physiochemical characteristics of modified atmosphere packed beef steaks. *Meat Science*, 81,
 355 720-725.

356 Zhao, J. & Wells, J. H. (1994). Application of dynamic modified atmosphere packaging system for
 357 fresh red meats. A review. *Journal Muscle Foods*, 5, 299-328.

358

359

360

361

362

363

364

365

Table 1: Microbiological analysis results (log CFU/g), pH, and TVB-N (mg N/100) in hamburgers of the different lots.

369

Table 1: Microbiological analysis results (log CFU/g), pH, and TVB-N (mg N/100) in hamburgers of the different lots.

Days of storage	Parameter	Lot 1 Control	Lot 2 L.c./L.s./S.x.	Lot 3 Lac./L.s./S.x	Lot 4 L.c./L.s./S.x.
0	TVC	5.90 ± 0.15a	5.90 ± 0.55a	6.60 ± 0.11b	7.00 ± 0.05c
	Yeast	2.30 ± 0.22a	2.53 ± 0.32a	1.70 ± 0.25b	2.10 ± 0.14a
	LAB	3.63± 0.26a	4.90 ± 0.55b	4.82 ± 0.26b	5.01 ± 0.40b
	<i>B. thermosphacta</i>	2.40 ± 0.15a	2.90 ± 0.05b	1.70 ± 0.12c	2.00 ± 0.21d
	pH	6.16 ± 0.75a	5.93 ± 0.40b	5.81 ± 0.11c	5.70 ± 0.21c
	TVB-N	16.9 ± 1.5a	15.4 ± 2.5a	15.4 ± 1.3a	15.3 ± 3.3a
	6	TVC	7.43 ± 0.05a	7.40 ± 0.20a	8.05 ± 0.21b
Yeast		2.36 ± 0.22a	2.55 ± 0.50a	1.90 ± 0.30a	2.37 ± 0.10a
LAB		4.44 ± 0.20a	7.65 ± 0.50b	6.97 ± 0.10c	6.16 ± 0.22d
<i>B. thermosphacta</i>		3.30 ± 0.11a	3.39 ± 0.30a	2.86 ± 0.11b	3.39 ± 0.12a
pH		5.68 ± 0.35a	5.59 ± 0.40a	5.47 ± 0.32a	5.31 ± 0.25a
TVB-N		24.5 ± 3.3a	21.5 ± 2.2a	19.2 ± 3.2a	20.2 ± 3.6a
9		TVC	8.80 ± 0.15a	8.40 ± 0.22b	8.85 ± 0.50ab
	Yeast	2.67 ± 0.17a	2.61 ± 0.78ab	1.97 ± 0.23b	2.47 ± 0.30a
	LAB	6.53 ± 0.30a	7.68 ± 0.11b	8.88 ± 0.15c	7.90 ± 0.35a
	<i>B. thermosphacta</i>	4.60 ± 0.51a	3.50 ± 0.40b	2.89 ± 0.30c	2.44 ± 0.45c
	pH	5.88 ± 0.50a	5.98 ± 0.30a	5.64 ± 0.50a	5.64 ± 0.45a
	TVB-N	35.3 ± 4.2a	25.4 ± 3.4b	21.4 ± 3.5b	22.5 ± 3.3b
	12	TVC	8.97 ± 0.11a	8.59 ± 0.51ab	8.63 ± 0.33ab
Yeast		2.50 ± 0.40ab	2.68 ± 0.15a	3.09 ± 0.25b	2.45 ± 0.45a
LAB		7.37 ± 0.15a	8.90 ± 0.40b	8.05 ± 0.17c	8.36 ± 0.30bc
<i>B. thermosphacta</i>		4.47 ± 0.22a	3.58 ± 0.26b	3.07 ± 0.11c	2.38 ± 0.13d
pH		5.98 ± 0.40a	5.78 ± 0.10a	5.46 ± 0.25a	5.47 ± 0.25a
TVBN		43.2 ± 5.1a	28.4 ± 4.3b	24.3 ± 6.3b	25.1 ± 6.3b

Legend: TVC: Total viable count; LAB: Lactic acid bacteria. TVB-N: Total Volatile Basic Nitrogen. Control (Lot 1): no starter; L.c/L.s./S.x (Lot 2): *Lactobacillus sakei* subsp. *carnosus*/*Lactobacillus sakei* + *Staphylococcus xylosus* (1/1 ratio); Lac./L.s./S.x. (Lot 3): *Lactococcus lactis* ssp. *lactis*/*Lactobacillus sakei* + *Staphylococcus xylosus* (1/1 ratio); Lc./L.s./S.x. (Lot 4): *Lactobacillus sakei* subsp. *carnosus*/*Lactobacillus sakei* + *Staphylococcus xylosus* (1/2 ratio). Data represent the means \pm standard deviations of the total samples; Mean with the same letters within a row (following the values) are not significantly differently ($p < 0.05$)

370

371

373

374

375

376

377

378
379
380

381 **Table 2:** Color analysis results of hamburgers treated with bio-protective culture.

382

		Lot 1	Lot 2	Lot 3	Lot 4
Day	Parameter	Control	L.c./L.s./S.x.	Lac./L.s./S.x	L.c./L.s./S.x.
0	L*	43.20 ± 1.20a	44.12 ± 4.63a	41.89 ± 5.19a	44.99 ± 5.70a
	a*	14.12 ± 1.74a	15.46 ± 1.62a	15.19 ± 3.33a	16.11 ± 0.81a
	b*	5.13 ± 1.97a	5.74 ± 1.35a	6.57 ± 0.34a	5.90 ± 0.28a
6	L*	43.80 ± 0.06a	42.33 ± 1.96a	44.38 ± 0.80a	43.98 ± 0.09a
	a*	16.46 ± 0.57a	14.25 ± 0.12b	16.09 ± 0.87a	15.53 ± 0.85a
	b*	5.46 ± 0.57a	5.25 ± 0.12b	6.09 ± 0.87a	5.53 ± 0.85a
9	L*	45.84 ± 1.14a	44.00 ± 1.48a	45.52 ± 0.56a	45.23 ± 1.73a
	a*	16.08 ± 4.86a	16.26 ± 3.54a	16.88 ± 0.69a	16.00 ± 2.65a
	b*	5.77 ± 0.70a	5.73 ± 0.77a	5.71 ± 1.09a	5.97 ± 0.99a
12	L*	42.78 ± 2.83a	41.82 ± 0.95a	40.41 ± 4.02a	43.57 ± 4.02a
	a*	16.40 ± 2.50a	16.22 ± 1.41a	17.37 ± 1.51a	16.67 ± 1.19a
	b*	5.80 ± 1.30a	6.08 ± 1.42a	6.40 ± 0.19a	5.58 ± 0.83a

383 **Legend:** Index L*, lightness; a*, redness; b*, yellowness; Control (Lot 1): no starter; L.c/L.s./S.x (Lot 2): *Lactobacillus*
384 *sakei* subsp. *carnosus*/*Lactobacillus sakei* + *Staphylococcus xylosus* (1/1 ratio); Lac./L.s./S.x. (Lot 3): *Lactococcus lactis*
385 *ssp. lactis*/*Lactobacillus sakei* + *Staphylococcus xylosus* (1/1 ratio); Lc./L.s./S.x. (Lot 4): *Lactobacillus sakei* subsp.
386 *carnosus*/*Lactobacillus sakei* + *Staphylococcus xylosus* (1/2 ratio). Microbial data log CFU/g. Data represent the means
387 ± standard deviations of the total samples; Mean with the same letters within a row (following the values) are not
388 significantly differently (p < 0.05).
389

390
391
392
393
394
395
396
397

398
399
400

401
402
403
404
405
406

407
408

409

410

411

412

413

414

415

416

417

Table 3: The sensory panel scores of cooked hamburgers.









	Lot 1	Lot 2	Lot 3	Lot 4
Sensory attribute	Control	L.c./L.s./S.x.	Lac./L.s./S.x	L.c./L.s./S.x.
Fermentation	10/12	3/12	4/12	4/12
Rancid	5/12	4/12	3/12	3/12
Sweet	2/12	5/12	5/12	4/12
Pungent	10/12	5/12	5/12	5/12
Meat	3/12	6/12	6/12	9/12
Sour	6/12	6/12	7/12	7/12
Bitter	9/12	6/12	3/12	5/12
Ammonia	12/12	6/12	3/12	4/12
Slimes	7/12	7/12	4/12	5/12
Final scores*	4	3	1	2

*Final scores: the panellists requested to ranked the products within the scale from 1 (excellent) to 4 (worst).
Control (Lot 1): no starter; L.c/L.s./S.x (Lot 2): *Lactobacillus sakei subsp. carnosus*/*Lactobacillus sakei* +
Staphylococcus xylosus (1/1 ratio); Lac./L.s./S.x. (Lot 3): *Lactococcus lactis ssp. lactis*/*Lactobacillus sakei* +
Staphylococcus xylosus (1/1 ratio); Lc./L.s./S.x. (Lot 4): *Lactobacillus sakei subsp. carnosus*/*Lactobacillus sakei* +
Staphylococcus xylosus (1/2 ratio).

418

419 **Table 4.** Pictures of the hamburgers at 0 and 12 days of storage.

420

Day	Control (no starter)	L.c/L.s./S.x ratio 1/1 (Lot 2)	Lac./L.s./S.x ratio 1/1 (Lot 3)	Lc./L.s./S.x. ratio 1/2 (Lot 4)
0				
12				

421

422