Testing commercial biopreservative against spoilage microorganisms in MAP packed Ricotta fresca cheese

Questa è la versione Post print del seguente articolo:

Original

Testing commercial biopreservative against spoilage microorganisms in MAP packed Ricotta fresca cheese / Spanu, Carlo; Scarano, Christian; Piras, Francesca; Spanu, V.; Pala, C.; Casti, D.; Lamon, S.; Cossu, F.; Ibba, M.; Nieddu, G.; DE SANTIS, Enrico Pietro Luigi. - In: FOOD MICROBIOLOGY. - ISSN 0740-0020. - 66:(2017), pp. 72-76. [10.1016/j.fm.2017.04.008]

Availability: This version is available at: 11388/174731 since: 2022-05-25T15:12:12Z

Publisher:

Published DOI:10.1016/j.fm.2017.04.008

Terms of use:

Chiunque può accedere liberamente al full text dei lavori resi disponibili come "Open Access".

Publisher copyright

note finali coverpage

(Article begins on next page)

#### 1 Short Communication

# Testing commercial biopreservative against spoilage microorganisms in MAP packed Ricotta *fresca* cheese.

4 C. Spanu<sup>\*1</sup>, C. Scarano<sup>1</sup>, F. Piras<sup>1</sup>, V. Spanu<sup>1</sup>, C. Pala<sup>1</sup>, D. Casti<sup>1</sup>, S. Lamon<sup>1</sup>, F. Cossu<sup>1</sup>, M. Ibba<sup>1</sup>,

5 G. Nieddu<sup>2</sup>, E. P. L. De Santis<sup>1</sup>

<sup>6</sup> <sup>1</sup>Department of Veterinary Medicine, University of Sassari, Via Vienna 2, 07100, Sassari, Italy

<sup>7</sup> <sup>2</sup>Cooperativa Allevatori Ovini Formaggi Soc. Coop. Agricola, Loc. "Perda Lada" Fenosu, 09170,

8 Oristano, Italy

\*Corresponding author. Tel.: +39 079 229447; fax.: +39 079 229458. *E-Mail address*:

10 cspanu@uniss.it (C. Spanu); Via Vienna 2, 07100, Sassari, Italy.

#### 12 Abstract

Ricotta *fresca* cheese is susceptible to secondary contamination and is able to support the growth of pathogens or spoilage psychotrophic bacteria during storage. The aim of the present study was to evaluate which among three commercial biopreservatives was suitable to be used to control the growth of spoilage microrganisms in sheep's milk MAP ricotta fresca cheese. 144 Ricotta fresca cheese samples were inoculated either with the bioprotective culture Lyofast FPR 2 (including Enterococcus faecium, Lactobacillus plantarum e Lactobacillus rhamnosus) or Lyofast CNBAL (Carnobacterium spp) or the fermentate FERM 430D. Not inoculated control and experimental ricotta were MAP packed and stored at 4°C. Triplicate samples were analyzed after 5 h and 7, 14 and 21 days after inoculation for total bacterial count, mesophilic lactic acid bacteria, Enterobacteriaceae, Pseudomonas spp, Listeria monocytogenes, moulds and yeasts. Carnobacterium spp reduced the concentration of Pseudomonas spp and Enterobacteriaceae of at least 1  $\log_{10}$  at the end of the shelf-life. Therefore, *Carnobacterium* spp was selected as the culture of choice to conduct a challenge study against *Pseudomonas* spp.

Keywords: Carnobacterium spp.; protective cultures; Pseudomonas spp; ricotta; MAP.

#### **1. Introduction**

*Ricotta fresca* is a traditional whey cheese produced by heat coagulation of sheep's milk whey. In Sardinia (Italy) it is generally manufactured from the whey remaining after the production of hard semi-cooked cheeses (Pecorino Romano PDO and Pecorino Sardo PDO). The industrial production follows the traditional batch production process (Pala et al., 2016). Ricotta fresca intended for large-scale retail are commercialized in modified atmosphere packaging (MAP), under refrigeration temperature, with a shelf life determined by Food Business Operators up to 21 days. The batch production process exposes *Ricotta fresca* to post-process contamination originating from the dairy plant environment (Greenwood et al., 1991). Due to its naturally poor competitive microflora (Pintado et al., 2002), to its composition, inherent physical and chemical properties and the absence of preservatives, *Ricotta fresca* is an excellent substrate for the growth of pathogens or spoilage psychotropic bacteria during refrigerated storage (De Santis and Mazzette, 2002). The use of bio preservatives (i.e. nisin, other bacteriocins, fermentates or bioprotective cultures) alone or combined with other treatments, have been proposed to preserve the quality and safety of dairy products and other foods (Sobrino-López & Martín-Belloso, 2008; Elsser-Gravesen, & Elsser-Gravesen, 2013). Shelf life extension of whey cheeses using bio preservatives have been previously tested against Listeria monocytogenes (Davies et al., 1997; Samelis et al., 2003; Martins et al., 2010). However, to date no available studies investigated the use of biopreservatives against psychotropic spoilage microorganism in sheep ricotta cheese. The present study was conducted as a preliminary investigation to assess the potential use of biopreservatives to control the growth of spoilage microorganism during refrigerated storage of MAP ricotta fresca. The main objective was to select which among two commercial bioprotective cultures and a fermentate was suitable to be used for a 

successive validation study. The selection of the biopreservative to be used was based on the adaptation to *ricotta fresca* substrate and on the reduction of psychotropic microorganism's growth.

3 2. Materials and methods

#### 4 2.1. Biopreservatives

The protective cultures and the fermentate were selected, among available products on the market, based on the proven activity against spoilage and pathogen microorganisms, their ability to grow at refrigeration temperature and the low development of acidity and aroma in the product. Of the two commercial protective cultures tested, one was Lyofast FPR 2 (Clerici-Sacco Group, Como, Italy) consisting of Enterococcus faecium, Lactobacillus plantarum and Lactobacillus rhamnosus in the ratio 1:1:1 with an optimum growth temperature of 37 °C. The second was Lyofast CNBAL (Clerici-Sacco Group, Como, Italy) consisting of a selected strain of Carnobacterium spp producing bacteriocins with an optimum growth temperature between 25-45 °C. The fermentate, the microbial fermentation complex FERM 430D (Danisco), like other fermented products has a complex and undefined composition.

*2.2. Samples* 

144 Ricotta fresca cheese samples were randomly selected from 3 different batches (48 from each batch), manufactured in a local industrial sheep cheese making plant. The day after production ricotta fresca samples were packed in rigid polypropylene trays sealed with lidding films and transported refrigerated to the laboratory. Culture one samples (FRP) were ricotta fresca treated with Lyofast FPR 2, culture two samples (CNBAL) were ricotta fresca treated with Lyofast CNBAL and Fermentate samples (FERM) were ricotta *fresca* treated with FERM 430D. Blank samples (BS) were untreated ricotta fresca. According to manufactures instruction protective cultures were individually diluted in distilled water to a final concentration of 10<sup>6</sup> cfu mL<sup>-1</sup> while the fermentate was resuspended in distilled water in order of 0.5-1% of the samples weight. Then 2.5 mL of Lyofast FPR 2 and Lyofast CNBAL were sprayed respectively on the surface of FPR and CNBAL samples and 4 mL of FERM 430D final suspension distributed on the surface of FERM samples. After the inoculum all Ricotta fresca cheese samples were repacked in MAP (30% CO2 and 70% N<sub>2</sub>) using the FP Basic Sec tray sealer (Ilpra, Vigevano, Italy). 2.3. Microbiological profile intrinsic properties and composition analysis For each batch, triplicate samples of ricotta *fresca* were analyzed for the determination of microbiological profile, intrinsic properties and composition 5 h ( $T_0$ ), 7, 14 and 21 days ( $T_7$ ,  $T_{14}$ , 191 81  $T_{21}$ ) after the addition of the biopreservatives. Microbiological analysis were conducted for the enumeration of aerobic mesophilic bacteria (ISO 4833:2003), for the enumeration of mesophilic lactic acid bacteria (ISO 15214: 1998), for the enumeration of Pseudomonas spp (ISO/TS 11059:2009), for the detection and enumeration of Enterobacteriaceae (ISO 21528-1:2004) and for the enumeration of yeast and molds (ISO 6611/IDF094:2004). Detection and enumeration of Listeria monocytogenes was also conducted (ISO 11290-1: 1996, ISO 11290-2:1998). Samples inoculated with Lyofast CNBAL at T<sub>0</sub> were also analyzed for the enumeration of Carnobacterium 206 88 spp using MRS modified by increasing the pH to 8.5, omitting acetate, and substituting glucose for 210 90 sucrose (Hammes et al., 1992). 2.4. Intrinsic properties, composition and headspace gas analysis PH and aw were measured using pH meter GLP22 (Crison Instruments SA, Barcelona, Spain) and water activity meter Aqualab 4TE (Decagon, Pullman, WA, USA) respectively. Fat, moisture, protein and total solids were analyzed using a near infrared transmittance (NIT) compositional analyzer (FOSS, Eden Prairie, MN, USA). The composition of the headspace gas mixture was conducted on ricotta *fresca* samples on the sealed packages prior to other analysis. Measure of 223 96 combined residual O<sub>2</sub>% and CO<sub>2</sub>% were obtained piercing the lid using a sterile needle connected 225 97 to the Dansensor gas analyser (PBI Dansensor, Ringsted, Denmark). 

- 3. Results and discussion

#### 3.1. Microbiological profile

242<sup>102</sup> *Ricotta fresca cheese* total bacterial count in control samples at  $T_0$  was  $< 3 \log_{10}$  cfu g<sup>-1</sup> and <sub>244</sub> 103 increased after 21 days of refrigerated storage above 7 log<sub>10</sub> cfu g<sup>-1</sup> while the mesophilic lactic acid bacteria were below the detection limit at  $T_0$  and ca 5 log<sub>10</sub> cfu g<sup>-1</sup> at  $T_{21}$ . During refrigerated 246 104 storage a significant increase (P < 0.01) of spoilage microorganisms to level as high as 6 log<sub>10</sub> and 8 248 105 log<sub>10</sub> was observed for *Enterobacteriaceae* and *Pseudomonas* spp, respectively. Yeast and molds 250 106 252 107 were occasionally reported, with maximum values around 4  $log_{10}$  at  $T_{21}$ . The complete <sup>254</sup> 108 microbiological profile with mean counts (log<sub>10</sub> cfu g<sup>-1</sup>;  $\bar{x} \pm$  SD) over time is reported in table 1. L. <sup>256</sup> 257 **109** monocytogenes was never detected on either blank samples and ricotta inoculated with 259<sup>110</sup> biopreservatives. Carnobacterium spp.  $\log_{10}$  counts were  $6.28 \pm 0.35$  at T<sub>0</sub>,  $6.64 \pm 1.56$  at T<sub>7</sub>,  $8.03 \pm$ 0.39 at T<sub>14</sub> and 8.59  $\pm$  0.47 at T<sub>21</sub> showing a significant increase after T<sub>14</sub> (P< 0.05). 261 **111** 262 263 112 3.2. Physico-chemical characteristics and MAP gas composition 264 In blank samples the pH showed a slight decrease over time, from 6.67 at  $T_0$  to 6.52 at  $T_{21}$  (P<0.05) 265 113 266 while no significant difference was observed in the aw. In blank samples the O<sub>2</sub> content in the 267 114 268 <sup>269</sup>115 headspace increased from the initial level of 0.87% up to 1.80% at T<sub>7</sub>, to decrease again as low as 270 <sup>271</sup> 116 0.42 at  $T_{21}$ . Instead, the CO<sub>2</sub> content decreased from  $T_0$  to  $T_{21}$  respectively from 13.05% to 6.78%. 272 <sup>273</sup> 274</sub>117 Intrinsic properties, composition and gas composition in the headspace ( $\bar{x} \pm SD$ ) during the 275 276 **118** refrigerated storage are reported in table 2.

#### 4. Discussion

*Ricotta fresca cheese* as consequence of high temperature applied during manufacturing has poor 282121 283 284 122 competing microbiota, which reflects on the growth of psychotropic microorganisms such as 285 <sup>286</sup>123 Pseudomonas spp., Enterobacteriaceae, Listeria monocytogenes, B. cereus and Arcobacter spp (De 287 <sup>288</sup>124 Santis and Mazzette, 2002; De Santis et al. 2008; Ibba et al., 2013; Scarano et al.; 2014; Spanu et 289 290 125 al., 2016). However, a large part of Ricotta cheese microflora at the end of the shelf-life is 291

292 293

297 <sup>298</sup> 299 126 generally represented by *Pseudomonas* spp, that could exert a competitive activity against other 300 127 species, including pathogens (Pala et al., 2016). As the improvement of the hygiene management 301 302 <sub>303</sub> 128 procedures is a measure that could only reduce the level of initial contamination, the use of bio 304 preservatives to compete with contaminants is an interesting perspective in Ricotta cheese. The 305 129 306 fermentate showed no activity against the growth of microbiota in ricotta during refrigerated 307 130 308 storage. In fact, total bacterial counts, LAB, Enterobacteriaceae, Pseudomonas spp., yeast and 309 131 310 311 132 molds showed no significant differences between blank samples and samples inoculated with 312 <sup>313</sup>133 FERM. The higher counts at  $T_0$  of mesophilic LAB (ca 5  $log_{10}$ ) in *Ricotta fresca cheese* samples 314 <sup>315</sup> 316</sub>134 inoculated with FRP as compared to control samples and ricotta inoculated with the other bio 317 318 **135** preservatives was expected. FRP cultures demonstrated, despite the refrigeration, a slight increase 319 <sub>320</sub> 136 during storage (ca 1 log<sub>10</sub>). However, FRP showed no control against *Enterobacteriaceae* and 321 *Pseudomonas* spp which, at the end of the storage, were ca 1  $\log_{10}$  higher respect to blank samples. <sub>322</sub> 137 323 In ricotta samples inoculated with CNBAL mesophilic LAB counts were always lower as compared 324138 325 to the other samples. This result could be explained with the fact that for the isolation and 326139 327 328 140 cultivation of LAB the De Man, Rogosa and Sharpe (MRS) agar is generally used, in which it has 329 <sup>330</sup>141 been observed that most of the *Carnobacterium* spp are not able to growth (Hammes et al., 1992). 331 <sup>332</sup>142 This could lead to a significant underestimation of its concentration in foods. In the present study 333 <sup>334</sup> 335 **143** Carnobacterium spp showed a good adaptive response to the experimental condition of inoculum 336 337 144 and storage, showing an increase in its mean counts of approximately of  $2 \log_{10}$  from T<sub>0</sub> to T<sub>21</sub>. The 338 competitive activity of CNBAL was effective in reducing Pseudomonas spp and <sub>339</sub> 145 340 *Enterobacteriaceae* at the end of the shelf-life of at least  $1 \log_{10}$ . However, it should be noticed that 341 146 342 the effect of CNBAL was greater after 14 days were the difference with blank samples was 343 147 344 respectively of 2 log<sub>10</sub> for *Pseudomonas* and almost 3 log10 for *Enterobacteriaceae*. It is worth to 345148 346 <sup>347</sup> 149 note that the growth of Carnobacterium spp did not lowered Ricotta fresca pH, which may have had 348 <sup>349</sup> 150 an impact of the sensory characteristics. The possible adoption of CLAB as protective culture 350 6

351

296

352

355

requires the determination of the changes in the sensory profile of *Ricotta fresca*. However, sensory analysis could not be performed in the present research since the level of *Pseudomonas* spp contamination at  $T_{14}$  was already as high as 6 log<sub>10</sub>, compatible with alteration of the product, and yet beyond the acceptability of consumers.

The gas mixture chosen for MAP packaging of ricotta *fresca* (30% CO<sub>2</sub> and 70% O<sub>2</sub>) is the composition generally used in sardinian industrial cheesemaking plants. As previously demonstrated (Pala *et al.*, 2016), the concentration of CO<sub>2</sub> in the head space at T<sub>0</sub> differs from the level used during packaging, as a result of gas solving in the product, while the further reduction during the successive storage is attributable to gas permeability of packaging materials used. Instead, the reduction of O<sub>2</sub>% during storage is associated with the growth of aerobic mesophilic microorganisms.

#### 162 5. Conclusion

The present study was specifically designed to provide preliminary information on the possible use of biopresarvatives to control the growth of psychotropic spoilage microorganism's in MAP packaged ricotta fresca. Since no information was previously available on the adaptation of biopreservatives on sheep's milk ricotta *fresca*, the primary objective of the study was to select among three commercial products which one was suitable as biopreservative. *Carnobacterium* spp. inoculated on the finished product showed a good adaptation to grow in ricotta *fresca* and promising results in controlling spoilage microorganisms. However, the present investigation was conducted on naturally contaminated ricotta samples. Therefore, CNBAL was the protective culture of choice to conduct a challenge test specifically designed to assess the effect of *Carnobacterium* spp against *Pseudomonas* spp.

- 04173 Acknowledgements
- 412
- 413

414
415
<sup>416</sup> 174
417
418
419 175
420
421 176
422
423 <b>177</b>
424
425 178
426
427 179
428
<sup>429</sup> 180
430
<sup>431</sup> 181
432
433 182
434
435
436 183
437
<sub>438</sub> 184
439
440 <b>18</b> 5
441
442 186
443
444 187
445
<sup>446</sup> 188
447
<sup>448</sup> 189
449
<sup>450</sup> 190
451
452
453 171
454
455 192
456
457 193
458
459 <b>19</b> 4
460
461 195
462
463 <b>196</b>
464
<sup>465</sup> 197
466
<sup>467</sup> 198
468
469

This work was funded by "Programma di Sviluppo Rurale Sardegna 2007-2013 Misura 124 Cooperazione per lo Sviluppo di Nuovi Prodotti, Processi e Tecnologie nei Settori Agricolo Alimentare e in quello Forestale -project ID: H78F13000050007. The authors are grateful to all the members of the joint dairy industry consortium "Associazione Temporanea di Scopo - Aziende casearie Riunite" for their cooperation in the research.

#### References

- 1. Pala, C., Scarano, C., Venusti, M., Sardo, D., Casti, D., Cossu, F., Lamon, S., Spanu, V., Ibba, M., Marras, M., Paba, A., & De Santis E.P.L. (2016). Shelf-life evaluation of sheep's ricotta fresca cheese in modified atmosphere packaging. Italian Journal of Food Safety, 5(3), 134-139.
- 2. Greenwood, M.H., Roberts, D., Burden, P. (1991). The occurrence of Listeria species in milk and dairy products: a national survey in England and Wales. International Journal of Food Microbiology 12, 197-206.

## 3. Pintado, M. E., Macedo, A. C., Malcata, F. X., Macedo, A. C., & Malcata, F. X. (2001). Review: Technology, chemistry and microbiology of whey cheeses. Food Science and Technology International, 7, 105–116.

- 4. De Santis, E.P.L., & Mazzette, R. (2002). La ricotta un substrato ideale. Caseus, 7, 42-44.
- 5. Sobrino-López, A., & Martín-Belloso, O. (2008). Use of nisin and other bacteriocins for preservation of dairy products. International Dairy Journal, 18(4), 329-343.
- 6. De Santis, E. P., Foddai, A., Virdis, S., Marongiu, P., Pilo, A. L., & Scarano, C. (2008). Toxin gene pattern in Bacillus cereus group strains isolated from sheep ricotta cheese. Veterinary research communications, 32, 323-326.
  - 7. Elsser-Gravesen, D., & Elsser-Gravesen, A. (2013). Biopreservatives. In Biotechnology of Food and Feed Additives (pp. 29-49). Springer Berlin Heidelberg.
- 470
- 471

473	
474	
<sup>475</sup> 476	8. Ibba, M., Cossu, F., Spanu, V., Virdis, S., Spanu, C., Scarano, C., & De Santis, E. P. (2013).
477 478 <b>200</b>	Listeria monocytogenes contamination in dairy plants: evaluation of Listeria monocytogenes
479 480 <b>201</b>	environmental contamination in two cheese-making plants using sheeps milk. Italian Journal
481 482 <b>202</b>	of Food Safety, 2(2), 31.
403 484 <b>203</b> 485	9. Martins, J. T., Cerqueira, M. A., Souza, B. W., Carmo Avides, M. D., & Vicente, A. A.
486 <b>204</b> 487	(2010). Shelf life extension of ricotta cheese using coatings of galactomannans from
<sup>488</sup> 205 489	nonconventional sources incorporating nisin against Listeria monocytogenes. Journal of
<sup>490</sup> 206 491	Agricultural and Food Chemistry, 58(3), 1884-1891.
<sup>492</sup> 493 <b>207</b>	10. Davies, E.A., Bevis, H.E., & Delves-Broughton, J. (1997). The use of the bacteriocin, nisin,
494 495 <b>208</b>	as a preservative in ricotta-type cheeses to control the food-borne pathogen Listeria
496 497 <b>209</b>	monocytogenes. Letters in applied microbiology, 24(5), 343.
499 499 <b>210</b>	11. Samelis, J., Kakouri, A., Rogga, K. J., Savvaidis, I. N., & Kontominas, M. G. (2003). Nisin
501 <b>211</b> 502	treatments to control Listeria monocytogenes post-processing contamination on Anthotyros,
503 <b>212</b> 504	a traditional Greek whey cheese, stored at 4 C in vacuum packages. Food Microbiology,
505 <b>213</b> 506	20(6), 661-669.
<sup>507</sup> 214 508	12. Spanu, C., Scarano, C., Spanu, V., Pala, C., Casti, D., Lamon, S., Cossu, F., Ibba, M.,
<sup>509</sup> 215 510	Nieddu, G., & De Santis, E.P.L. (2016). Occurrence and behavior of Bacillus cereus in
511 512 <b>216</b>	naturally contaminated ricotta salata cheese during refrigerated storage. Food microbiology,
513 514 <b>217</b>	58, 135-138.
516 516 517	13. Hammes, W.P., N. Weiss, and W. Holzapfel. 1992. The genera Lactobacillus and
518 <b>219</b>	Carnobacterium, in The prokaryotes – A Handbook on the Biology of Bacteria:
520 <b>220</b> 521	Ecophysiology, Isolation, Identification, Application, vol. 2, 2 <sup>nd</sup> edn (eds A. Balows, H. G.
522 <b>221</b> 523	Trüper, M. Dworkin, W. Harder, and KH. Schleifer), Springer Verlag, New York, p. 1535-
<sup>524</sup> 222 525	1594.
526	
527 528	
529	9
530	

532	
533	
534 535 535	14. Scarano, C., Giacometti, F., Manfreda, G., Lucchi, A., Pes, E., Spanu, C., De Santis, E.P.L.,
536 537 <b>22</b> 4	& Serraino, A. (2014). Arcobacter butzleri in sheep ricotta cheese at retail and related
538 539 <b>225</b>	sources of contamination in an industrial dairy plant. Applied and environmental
540 541 <b>226</b>	microbiology, 80(22), 7036-7041.
542 543	
544	
545 546	
547	
548	
549	
550 551	
552	
553	
554	
555	
557	
558	
559	
560	
561	
563	
564	
565	
566 567	
568	
569	
570	
571	
573	
574	
575	
576	
578	
579	
580	
581	
ວŏ∠ 583	
584	
585	
586	
587 588	10
589	
590	

Parameters	unit	T <sub>0</sub>	Τ <sub>7</sub>	T <sub>14</sub>	T <sub>21</sub>
Aerobic mesophilic bacteria	BS	$2.72 \pm 0.44^{a} (n = 9/9)$	$4.90 \pm 1.36^{\rm b} \ (n = 9/9)$	$6.01 \pm 0.56^{\circ} (n = 9/9)$	$6.90 \pm 0.86^{d}$ ( $n = 9/9$
	CNBAL	$3.18 \pm 1.95^{a} (n = 9/9)$	$6.53 \pm 0.85^{\text{b}} (n = 9/9)$	$6.87 \pm 1.13^{\rm b} (n = 9/9)$	$8.87 \pm 0.38^{\circ}$ ( $n = 9/9$
	FRP2	$5.11 \pm 0.62^{a} (n = 9/9)$	$6.63 \pm 0.91^{\rm b} \ (n = 9/9)$	$7.35 \pm 0.51^{\circ} (n = 9/9)$	$7.85 \pm 0.22^{\circ}$ ( $n = 9/2$
	FERM	$2.91 \pm 0.51^{a} (n = 9/9)$	$5.21 \pm 1.05^{\text{b}} (n = 9/9)$	$6.11 \pm 0.82^{\circ} (n = 9/9)$	$6.92 \pm 0.51^{d} (n = 9/2)$
mesophilic lactic acid bacteria	BS	ND	$3.55 \pm 0.49^{a} (n = 9/9)$	$4.33 \pm 0.71^{\rm b} (n = 9/9)$	$4.92 \pm 0.67^{\rm b}$ ( $n = 9/2$
	CNBAL	$2.13 \pm 0.76^{a} (n = 4/9)$	$3.30 \pm 0.93^{\text{b}} (n = 9/9)$	$3.76 \pm 0.62^{\rm b} (n = 9/9)$	$3.32 \pm 0.60^{\text{b}}$ ( $n = 9/2$
	FRP2	$5.01 \pm 0.72^{a} (n = 9/9)$	$5.35 \pm 0.78^{ab} (n = 9/9)$	$5.16 \pm 0.44^{\rm a}$ ( <i>n</i> = 9/9)	$5.77 \pm 0.40^{\rm b}$ ( $n = 9/2$
	FERM	$1.52 \pm 0.24^{a} (n = 3/9)$	$2.86 \pm 0.05^{ab} (n = 2/9)$	$4.05 \pm 0.68^{\rm b} \ (n = 7/9)$	$4.58 \pm 1.68^{\text{b}}$ ( <i>n</i> = 7/
	BS	$2.20 \pm 1.02^{a} (n = 4/9)$	$4.05 \pm 0.86^{\text{b}} (n = 5/9)$	$4.43 \pm 0.99^{\text{b}} (n = 7/9)$	$5.34 \pm 0.97^{\text{b}}$ ( <i>n</i> = 8/
	CNBAL	ND	$1.95 \pm 0.00^{ab} (n = 1/9)$	$1.77 \pm 1.15^{a} (n = 6/9)$	$3.90 \pm 0.42^{\rm b}$ ( $n = 5/$
Enterobacteriacae	FRP2	$2.03 \pm 0.00^{a} (n = 2/9)$	$3.79 \pm 0.67^{\rm b} \ (n = 9/9)$	$5.41 \pm 0.75^{\circ} (n = 9/9)$	$6.29 \pm 0.47^{\rm d}$ (n = 9/
	FERM	$3.79 \pm 1.24^{a} (n = 4/9)$	$3.21 \pm 0.82^{a} (n = 6/9)$	$4.24 \pm 0.91^{a} (n = 6/9)$	$5.84 \pm 0.59^{\text{b}}$ ( <i>n</i> = 7/
Pseudomonas spp	BS	$2.64 \pm 0.59^{a} (n = 5/9)$	$4.89 \pm 1.21^{\rm b} (n = 9/9)$	$6.52 \pm 0.99^{\circ} (n = 9/9)$	$6.83 \pm 0.91^{\circ} (n = 9/$
	CNBAL	$2.43 \pm 0.18^{a} (n = 4/9)$	$2.59 \pm 0.67^{a} (n = 9/9)$	$4.59 \pm 0.65^{\rm b} \ (n = 9/9)$	$5.27 \pm 0.64^{\text{b}}$ ( <i>n</i> = 9/
	FRP2	$2.53 \pm 0.51^{a} (n = 5/9)$	$5.89 \pm 0.64^{\rm b} \ (n = 9/9)$	$6.81 \pm 0.82^{\circ} (n = 9/9)$	$7.01 \pm 0.53^{\circ}$ ( $n = 9/$
	FERM	$2.69 \pm 0.27^{a} (n = 6/9)$	$5.02 \pm 0.81^{\text{b}} (n = 9/9)$	$6.33 \pm 0.94^{\circ} (n = 9/9)$	$7.26 \pm 0.31^{d}$ ( <i>n</i> = 9/
Yeast and molds	BS	ND	$2.78 \pm 0.40^{a} (n = 4/9)$	$3.62 \pm 0.33^{\text{b}} (n = 3/9)$	$3.43 \pm 0.76^{ab}$ ( <i>n</i> = 5.10)
	CNBAL	$2.36 \pm 0.10^{a} (n = 3/9)$	$2.15 \pm 0.21^{a} (n = 2/9)$	$3.00 \pm 0.00^{\rm b} \ (n = 1/9)$	ND
	FRP2	$2.00 \pm 0.00^{a} (n = 1/9)$	$3.01 \pm 0.49^{ab} (n = 3/9)$	$3.52 \pm 0.38^{\text{b}} (n = 5/9)$	$3.64 \pm 0.73^{\text{b}}$ ( <i>n</i> = 3/
	FERM	ND	$3.97 \pm 0.42^{a} (n = 3/9)$	$3.88 \pm 0.68^{a}$ ( <i>n</i> = 9/9)	$3.19 \pm 1.14^{a}$ ( <i>n</i> = 8/
BS indicates blank sample units	used as negative	e control; C1, C2 and FERM	indicates samples units inocu	ulated respectively with prote	ective culture CNBAL a

Table 1. Microbiological profile (log<sub>10</sub> cfu g<sup>-1</sup>;  $\bar{x} \pm SD$ ) of ricotta fresca by time (days after) and sample type.

69	1
----	---

<sup>692</sup>234 Table 2. Intrinsic properties and composition ( $\bar{x} \pm SD$ ) of Ricotta *fresca* cheese at different testing times.

Parameters	sample unit	T <sub>0</sub>	$T_7$	$T_{14}$	T <sub>21</sub>
pH	BS	$6.67 \pm 0.1^{a}$	$6.58\pm0.05^{bc}$	$6.61\pm0.07^{ab}$	$6.52 \pm 0.11^{\circ}$
	CNBAL	$6.66 \pm 0.12^{a}$	$6.66 \pm 0.11^{a}$	$6.66\pm0.09^{ab}$	$6.54\pm0.04^{\circ}$
	FRP2	$6.67\pm0.06^{a}$	$6.59\pm0.05^{\rm b}$	$6.55\pm0.07^{b}$	6.31 ±0.07°
	FERM	$6.68 \pm 0.10^{a}$	$6.56\pm0.04^{bc}$	$6.60\pm0.08^{ab}$	$6.49 \pm 0.14^{\circ}$
a <sub>w</sub>	BS	$0.990\pm0.003^{a}$	$0.996 \pm 0.006^{\rm a}$	$0.993 \pm 0.006^{a}$	$0.993 \pm 0.006^{a}$
	CNBAL	$0.991 \pm 0.005^{a}$	$0.989\pm0.008^{\mathrm{a}}$	$0.986 \pm 0.001^{a}$	$0.985 \pm 0.001^{a}$
	FRP2	$0.995\pm0.004^{\mathrm{a}}$	$0.995 \pm 0.001^{\mathrm{a}}$	$0.997 \pm 0.001^{a}$	$0.997 \pm 0.002^{a}$
	FERM	$0.994\pm0.003^{\mathrm{a}}$	$0.994 \pm 0.001^{a}$	$0.992 \pm 0.005^{a}$	$0.993 \pm 0.008^{a}$
	BS	$71.23 \pm 3.52^{a}$	$73.37 \pm 2.10^{a}$	$73.56 \pm 2.08^{a}$	$74.70 \pm 0.91^{a}$
	CNBAL	$72.02\pm3.38^{\mathrm{a}}$	$71.97 \pm 3.82^{a}$	$71.20 \pm 3.92^{a}$	$71.68 \pm 2.91^{a}$
Moisture (%)	FRP2	$77.43 \pm 3.11^{a}$	$73.27 \pm 2.83^{a}$	$74.35 \pm 3.54^{a}$	$72.22 \pm 2.09^{a}$
	FERM	$74.26 \pm 2.74^{a}$	$74.61 \pm 0.83^{a}$	$74.13 \pm 2.01^{a}$	$73.46 \pm 1.29^{a}$
Fat (%)	BS	$18.13 \pm 5.80^{a}$	$14.31 \pm 2.31^{a}$	$13.30 \pm 2.60^{a}$	$14.66 \pm 2.96^{a}$
	CNBAL	$18.03\pm4.48^{\mathrm{a}}$	$17.48 \pm 4.46^{a}$	$17.15 \pm 3.95^{a}$	$17.49 \pm 4.46^{a}$
	FRP2	$11.03 \pm 2.59^{a}$	$17.15 \pm 1.16^{\circ}$	$13.09 \pm 2.98^{\mathrm{ab}}$	$15.11 \pm 1.08^{bc}$
	FERM	$13.78 \pm 1.62^{a}$	$12.43 \pm 2.10^{a}$	$13.59 \pm 1.88^{a}$	$14.67 \pm 2.53^{a}$
Protein (%)	BS	$9.81\pm0.78^{\rm a}$	$9.97 \pm 1.04^{a}$	$10.23 \pm 1.36^{a}$	$8.94 \pm 2.61^{a}$
	CNBAL	$9.38\pm0.45^{\rm a}$	$9.33\pm0.75^{\rm a}$	$9.46\pm0.39^{ab}$	$10.46\pm0.48^{\mathrm{b}}$
	FRP2	$10.05 \pm 0.02^{a}$	$11.15 \pm 1.07^{a}$	$9.99\pm0.73^{\mathrm{a}}$	$10.86 \pm 0.24^{a}$
	FERM	$9.77 \pm 1.50^{a}$	$10.32 \pm 1.37^{a}$	$9.87\pm0.76^{\rm a}$	$10.19 \pm 0.81^{a}$
O <sub>2</sub> %	BS	$0.87 \pm 0.49^{\mathrm{a}}$	$1.80 \pm 1.18^{b}$	$1.05\pm0.82^{a}$	$0.42\pm0.78^{\rm a}$
2	CNBAL	$0.99\pm0.58^{\mathrm{ab}}$	$1.12 \pm 1.65^{b}$	$0.14 \pm 0.17^{ab}$	$0.02 \pm 0.01^{b}$
	FRP2	$0.99 \pm 0.54^{\mathrm{a}}$	$1.89 \pm 1.47^{\mathrm{b}}$	$0.31\pm0.25^{ac}$	$0.004 \pm 0.01^{\circ}$
	FERM	$1.01 \pm 0.63^{a}$	$1.66 \pm 0.32^{b}$	$0.75\pm0.91^{a}$	$0.51\pm0.84^{\mathrm{a}}$
C0 <sub>2</sub> %	BS	$13.05 \pm 2.88^{a}$	$6.20\pm2.09^{\mathrm{b}}$	$5.50\pm2.96^{\mathrm{b}}$	$6.78 \pm 2.89^{b}$
-	CNBAL	$13.55 \pm 2.42^{a}$	$5.50 \pm 2.02^{b}$	$5.00 \pm 2.08^{b}$	$5.18 \pm 1.91^{b}$
	FRP2	$13.68 \pm 2.23^{a}$	$6.96 \pm 1.55^{\circ}$	$7.50 \pm 1.73^{\circ}$	$10.22 \pm 1.72^{b}$
	FFRM	$13\ 24 + 2\ 21^{a}$	$6.47 \pm 2.10^{b}$	$5.79 \pm 2.67^{b}$	$6.98 \pm 4.15^{b}$

732	
733235	BS indicates blank sample units used as negative control: C1. C2 and FERM indicates samples units inoculated respectively with protective culture CNBAL and
734236	FRP2 and the fermentate Means in the same row with different superscripts were significantly different ( $P < 0.05$ )
735 237	
736	
737	
738	
739	
740	
741	
742	
743	
744	
745	
746	
747	
748	
749	
750	
751	
752	
753	
754	
755	
756	
757	
758	
759	
760	
761	
762	
763	
764	
765	
766	
767	
768	14
769	
770	
771	
772	

### Highlights

- Ricotta fresca support psychotrophic microorganism growth during refrigerated storage
- 3 Commercial biopreservatives were tested against spoilage bacteria in ricotta fresca
- Cultures Lyofast FPR 2, Lyofast CNBAL and the fermentate FERM 430D were tested
- Inoculation of Carnobacterium spp protective culture reduced *Pseudomonas* spp growth