

Surface Contamination of Camel Carcasses

A.M. Al -Dughaym and N. A. Yassien

College of Veterinary Medicine and Animal Resources,
King Faisal University, P.O. Box 1757, Al-Ahsa 31982,
Saudi Arabia.

ABSTRACT:

The surface contamination of camel carcasses was studied. Areas of 10 cm² each from the surface of twenty five camel carcasses were swabbed before skinning, after skinning and after preparation and stamping.

The aerobic plate count, enterobacteriaceae count, *Staph. aureus* count, Coliforms (MPN), Fecal coliforms (MPN), *E. coli* (MPN) were determined as well as isolation and identification of salmonellae.

The mean values of aerobic plate count were 4 x 10⁸, 5x10³, 6.2x10⁶ CFU/cm². While for enterobacteriaceae count were 6.6x10⁵, 8.2x10² and 6.2x10⁴ CFU/cm². In case of coliforms (MPN) were 6.3x10⁵, 3.1x10² and 5.8x10⁴ bacteria/cm² on the surface of camel carcasses before skinning, after skinning and after preparation and stamping. While fecal coliforms (MPN) and *E. coli* (MPN)/cm² were 2.6x10³, 6.3x10 and 8.1x10² and 8.3x10, <3 and 2.3x10² bacteria/cm², respectively. In case of *Staph. aureus* counts were 7.2x10⁵, 8.2x10² and 5.6x10⁴ bacteria/cm² on the surface of camel carcasses during the three stages.

Citrobacter freundii, *Enterobacter aerogenes*, *Enterobacter cloacae*, *Enterobacter sakazaki*, *E. coli*, *Klebsiella pneumoniae*, *Proteus mirabilis*, *Proteus vulgaris*, *Morganella morganii*, *Salmonella enteritidis* and *Salmonella typhimurium* were be isolated from the examined camel carcasses.

Public health significance of bacterial contamination of camel carcasses was discussed and suggestive measures for improvement of the microbial quality of camel carcasses were mentioned.

INTRODUCTION:

A high standard of hygiene and adequate control measures are particularly important in abattoirs. It has been found that outbreaks of food-borne diseases can be prevented by constant supervision of these establishment and by checking the sanitary condition, of the surface and equipment in constant contact with meat (Yassien, 1992).

The external contamination of meat constitutes a constant problem in most developing countries in the abattoir itself where there are many of potential sources of infection by microorganisms (Lawrie, 1979).

The microbial surface contamination of carcasses has been repeatedly reported to have a significant effect on the meat shelf life. Moreover, contaminants may also include pathogens which can penetrate into the meat (Elmossalami & Wassef, 1971).

It was established that the hide of the animal and water used to wash the carcasses were main sources of both mesophilic and psychrotrophic microorganisms on carcasses (Nottingham et al. 1974 and Samaha & Draz, 1993).

Elmossalami (1988) recorded an aerobic plate count of 2×10^4 CFU/cm² on shoulder and 4×10^3 CFU/cm² on thigh of cattle after preparation while enterobacteriaceae count proved to be 3×10^2 and 8×10^2 CFU/cm² on shoulder and thigh, respectively. Coliforms were detected in 45, 85 and 90% of shoulders after skinning, preparation and after preparation and stamping, respectively.

Hamdy (1989) reported that the mean aerobic plate count on the surface of camel carcasses were 1.5×10^8 , 9.6×10^3 and 7.2×10^5 CFU/cm² before skinning, after skinning and after preparation and stamping respectively. While the mean enterobacteriaceae counts were 1.2×10^5 , 4.8×10^2 and 8.8×10^3 CFU/cm² before skinning, after skinning and after preparation and stamping, respectively.

Mira (1989) reported that the mean values of aerobic plate count/cm² on the shoulder were 6×10^4 , 10^6 and 2×10^4 after skinning, evisceration and after 24 hours chilling respectively. The enterobacteriaceae counts were 2×10^4 , 2×10^5 and 2×10^4 CFU/cm² but the coliforms counts were 19, 21 and 26 bacteria/cm² on the shoulder after skinning, evisceration and 24 hours chilling, respectively.

Samaha and Draz (1993) examined 75 swabs from the surface of cattle carcasses after evisceration. The mean total bacterial, enterobacteriaceae, coliforms, enterococci and *Staph. aureus* counts were 5.4×10^3 , 8.9×10^3 , 4.8×10^3 , 2.3×10^3 and 8×10^2 CFU/10 cm² of cattle carcasses surfaces inside the slaughter halls at Alexandria city, Egypt.

The present study was undertaken to determine the bacteriological status of camel carcass surfaces at Al-Ahsa abattoir.

MATERIALS AND METHODS:

Seventy five swabs were taken from the surface of fore quarter of camel carcasses at Al-Ahsa abattoir.

The swabs were taken from the surface (shoulder) of twenty five carcasses before skinning, after skinning and after preparation and stamping.

10 cm² areas were swabbed using sterile cotton tampon and a metal template. Ringer's solution was used as rinsing and diluent fluid (ICMSF, 1978).

Aerobic plate count was applied using the drop technique recommended by the ICMSF (1978).

Enterobacteriaceae count was applied using violet red bile glucose agar (Gork, 1976).

Identification of enterobacteriaceae was done using API 20 E (Bio Merieux sa 69280 Marcy Etoile, France).

Coliforms most probable number (MPN), Fecal Coliforms (MPN) and *E. coli* (MPN) were applied according to the technique recommended by the ICMSF (1978).

Enumeration of coagulase positive *Staph. aureus* was applied using Baird-Parker medium (Thatcher & Clark, 1978). In addition trials were carried out for detection of Salmonella according to the technique recommended by Flowers et al. (1992).

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION:

From the results given in Table (1) it is evident that the mean aerobic plate counts on the surface of camel carcasses were 4x10⁸, 5x10³, 6.2x10⁶/cm² before skinning, after skinning and after preparation and stamping respectively. Nearly similar findings were recorded by Hamdy, 1989 while lower values were recorded on cattle carcasses by Elmossalami, 1988, Mira, 1989 and Samaha and Draz 1993. This may be attributed to the hygienic status adopted inside the slaughter halls. However, total viable

count has always been used as indicator to the hygienic condition inside the slaughter halls. The aerobic plate count is of great significance for judging of the hygienic conditions under which the meat was produced. It gives a good idea about the keeping quality of meat (Miskimin et al. 1976).

Etzel (1973) stated that the keeping quality of meat persisted till the count reached 3×10^7 bacteria/cm² while Sovandia (1962) found that changes in odour could be noticed when the count reached 107 bacteria/cm².

Concerning the mean value of enterobacteriaceae count on the camel carcasses, they were 6.6×10^5 , 8.2×10^2 and 6.2×10^4 CFU/cm² before skinning, after skinning and after preparation and stamping respectively. Similar finding was reported by Hamdy 1989; while lower results were obtained by Elmoosalami (1988) and Samaha and Draz (1993). The presence of enterobacteriaceae indicates presence of toxigenic bacterial contamination in food which is a public health hazard (ICMSF, 1978).

The results presented in Table (1) indicated that the mean values of *Staph. aureus* count were 7.2×10^5 , 8.2×10^2 and 5.6×10^4 CFU/cm² before skinning, after skinning and after preparation and stamping of carcasses, respectively. Nearly similar findings were obtained by Hafez, (1995) on cattle carcasses, but higher counts than that were obtained by Hamdy (1989) on camel carcasses.

It has been reported by many investigators (Meyer, 1975; Niskanen & Normal, 1979; and Eley, 1992) that when the count of coagulase positive staphylococci reached 105 bacteria/g of product, it is sufficient to cause toxicosis to consumer.

The presence of *Staph. aureus* on food articles points to a possible contamination from the skin, mouth, nose of food-handlers. The inadequately cleaned equipment may be a source of contamination (ICMSF, 1978).

From the results displayed in Table (1) it is evident that the mean value of coliforms, fecal coliforms and *E. coli* (MPN) were 6.3×10^5 , 2.6×10^3 and

8.3x10⁶ bacteria/cm² before skinning and 3.1x10², 6.3x10³ and <3 bacteria/cm² after skinning and 5.8x10⁴, 8.1x10² and 2.3x10² bacteria/cm² after preparation and stamping of camel carcasses. Lower finding was reported by Samaha and Draz (1993).

Tables (2) and (3) reveals the types and incidence of enterobacteriaceae isolated from examined samples of camel carcasses surfaces during the three stages which were: *Citrobacter freundii*, *Enterobacter aerogenes*, *Enterobacter cloacae*, *Enterobacter sakazakii*, *E. coli* (O26; K60 (B6), O55; K59 (B5), O111, K58 (B4), O119; K69; (B14) *Serratia liquefaciens*, *Klebsiella pneumoniae*, *Proteus mirabilis*, *Proteus vulgaris*, *Morganella morganii*, *Salmonella enteritidis* and *Salmonella typhimurium*. The same organisms were isolated by many authors with different percentages (Hamdy, 1989; Mira, 1989; and Samaha and Draz, 1993).

The public Health importance of enteropathogenic *E.coli* has been emphasized by many authors as it has been implicated in cases of gastroenteritis in man, epidemic diarrhea in infants, sporadic summer diarrhea in children (Krieg and Holt (1984) and Eley (1992). This organism has also been the most frequent cause of cystitis, pyelitis, pyelonephritis, appendicitis and peritonitis (Pyatkin and Krivoshein, 1980).

For the production of fresh meat of good microbiological quality, the recommended international codex of hygienic practice for fresh meat and for ante-and post mortem inspection of slaughter animals (Codex, 1976) should be followed. The most important practice that should be taken in consideration in camels slaughtering in Al-Ahsa abattoir are cleaning of dirty camels before slaughter, skinning camels while being on the rail, separation of carcasses from each other and avoid contact between the external surface of the hide and carcasses. Hygienic measures must be adequate to prevent spread of contamination via hands, knives, saws, equipment and clothing. Aerial contamination must be minimized by avoiding excessive manipulation of hides inside the abattoir.

REFERENCE:

- 1 - Codex (Codex Alimentarius Commission) (1976). Recommended International Codex of Hygiene practice for Fresh Meat, for Ante-Mortem and Post-Mortem Inspection of Slaughter Animals. CAC/RCP 11-1976 and CAC/RCP 12-1976. FAO, Rome. Congress *U.S. Congress) 1968. Wholesome meat Act. Superintendent of Documents Washington, DC.
- 2 - Eley, A.R. (1992). Microbial Food Poisoning. Champan & Hall, 2-6 Boundary Roul, London, England.
- 3 - Elmoossalami, E. and Wassef, N. (1971). Penetration of some microorganisms in meat. Zbl. Vet. Med. B. 18, 329.
- 4 - Elmoossalam, M. (1988). Surface bacteria of slaughtered cattle in modern abattoir. M.V.Sc. Fac. Vet. Cairo Univ.
- 5 - Etzel, M. (1973). Versuche zur objektiverung der keimzahl-abestmung bei der BU, Zuggleish eine untersuchung Zur Verbesserung der Bedingung bein probenversand. Vet. med. Diss. F.U. Berlin.
- 6 - Flowers, R.S., Jean-Yves DصAoust; Anderwa, W.H. and Bailey, J.S. (1992). Solmonella, chapter 25, Compendium of methods for microbiological examination of food. Vandezant, C. and Splittoesser, D. (Eds), 3rd ed. American Public Health Association, Washington, DC, USA.
- 7 - Gork, F.P. (1976). Uber die ursachen von aqualitats mangien beitiiefroren fertiggerichten auf fleischbasis in der fluggast. Cited after Elmoossalami, M. (1988).
- 8 - Hafez, A.E. (1995). Sanitary evaluation of mutton surfaces and contact equipment in meat sale shops at El-Zentan Region, Libya. Zag. Vet. J. 23 (5), 85-89.
- 9 - Hamdy, M. (1989). Surface contaminants of slaughtered camels. Zag. Vet. J. 17 (3), 291-302.
- 10 -I.C.M.S.F. (1978). International Commission of Microbiological Specifications for Foods. Microorganisms in Foods I. Their significance and enumeration 2nd ed. Univ. of Toronto Press. Toronto and Buffalo, Canada.
- 11 -Krieg, N.R. and Holt, J.G. (1984). Bergeyص manual of systematic bacteriology. Vol. I, Williams and Wilkins, Baltimore, USA.

- 12 -Lawrie, R.A. (1979). Meat Science : 3rd Ed., Pregamon Press, Oxford, UK.
- 13 -Meyer, S. (1975). Properties of staphylococci isolated from cows milk from the point of milk evaluation. *Milchwissenschaft* 30(10), 607.
- 14 -Mira, E.K. (1989). Hygienic status of beef produced in new Cairo abattoir. M.V.Sc. Thesis. Fac. Vet. Med. Cairo Univ.
- 15 -Miskimin, D., Berkowitz, K., Solberg, M., Riha, W., Franke, W., Buchanan, R. and O'Leary, V. (1976). Relationship between indicator organisms and specific pathogens in potentially hazardous foods. *J. Food Sic.* 41, 1001.
- 16 -Niskanen, A. and Normal, E. (1979). Effect of starter culture on staphylococcal enterotoxin and thermonuclease production in dry sausage. *Appl Environ. Microbiol.* 31, 11.
- 17 -Nottingham, P., Penney, N. and Harrison, J. (1974). Microbiology of beef processing, 1 -Beef Dressing Hygiene, *N.Z.J. Agric Rec.* 17, 79.
- 18 -Pyatkin, K. and Krivoshein, Y. (1980). Microbiology with Virology and Immunology, 2nd Ed. MIR Publ. Moscow.
- 19 -Samaha, I.A. and Draz, A.A. (1993). Air and water as sources of bacterial contamination of beef carcasses. *Alex. J. Vet. Sci.* 9(2), 83-88.
- 20 -Sovandia, M. (1962). Bietrag zur Bakteriologie des vorverpackten frischfleisches. *Fleischwirtschaft* 42, 310.
- 21 -Thatcher, F.S. and Clark, D.S. (1978). ICMSF, Microorganisms in Food I, Academic Press, New York, USA.
- 22 -Yassien, N. (1992). Enteropathogenic E.coli in a food serving establishment. *Fleischwirtsch.* 72(5), 757-758.

Tabel (4) : The effect of Hasawi Rice Hull inclusion in the grower diet on production traits of S. C. White Leghorn layers during 26 weeks of laying

Variation	FI	TEG	FC	EW	HD	WLIV	CLIV	SPG	HU	WT20	W36	WG
Among periods	NS	**	**	NS	**	NS	**	NS	**	*	NS	NS
G1 (5-8 weeks)	127.4	24.0 ^a	3.29 ^a	55.5	70.1 ^b	99.8	94.7 ^a	1.09	100.2 ^a	1301 ^b	1626	325
G2 (5-10 weeks)	125.2	24.8 ^{ab}	3.09 ^b	55.9	73.1 ^a	99.7	97.1 ^b	1.09	99.5 ^b	348 ^a	1662	313
G3 (5-12 weeks)	126.9	25.7 ^b	3.11 ^b	55.7	74.4 ^a	99.8	99.0 ^c	1.09	99.5 ^b	1319 ^b	1641	322
P>F	0.1900	0.0009	0.0209	0.5875	0.0091	0.5009	0.0001	0.5387	0.0081	0.8911	0.5193	0.9177
Among levels of rice hull, %	**	**	*	*	**	NS	**	NS	*	**	**	NS
0	129.1 ^a	25.7 ^a	3.16 ^{ab}	55.8 ^{ab}	74.4 ^a	99.9	97.6 ^a	1.09	99.9 ^{ab}	1378 ^a	1702 ^a	325
15	130.4 ^a	24.6 ^a	3.30 ^a	56.3 ^a	71.4 ^{ab}	99.9	97.3 ^a	1.09	100.0 ^a	1344 ^a	1639 ^{ab}	295
30	124.5 ^b	25.5 ^a	3.07 ^b	55.6 ^{ab}	74.7 ^a	99.6	97.2 ^a	1.09	99.8 ^{ab}	1338 ^a	1641 ^{ab}	303
50	122.0 ^b	23.5 ^b	3.13 ^{ab}	55.1 ^b	69.7 ^b	99.6	95.8 ^b	1.09	99.3 ^b	1232 ^b	1589 ^b	357
P>F	0.0001	0.0002	0.0827	0.0565	0.0046	0.0792	0.0424	0.2106	0.0812	0.0001	0.0239	0.2542
Period X levels	**	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	*	NS	**	NA	NA	NA

FI : Feed intake, gm/b/d; TEG: Total number of eggs produced by the hen per period; FC : Feed conversion, Kg/Kg; EW : Egg weight, gm; HD : Hen-day egg production; WLIV: Weekly livability, %; CLIV: Cumulative livability, %; SPG: Specific gravity of the eggs; HU: Haugh unit (Albumin height)

WT20: Bird's weight at 20 weeks of age; WG6: Bird's weight at 36 weeks of age; WG : Weight gain of the birds

** Significant, P<0.01; * Significant, P<0.05; NS Not significant, P>0.05; NA Not applicable

Tabel (2) : Enterobacteriaceae isolated from the examined samples

Organisms	A		B		C	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
<i>Citrobacte freundii</i>	3	12	0	0	8	32
<i>Enterobacter aerogenes</i>	2	8	2	8	4	16
<i>Enterobacter cloacae</i>	1	4	0	0	3	12
<i>Enterobacter sakazakii</i>	0	0	0	0	5	20
<i>E. coli</i>	2	8	0	0	5	20
<i>Serratia liquefaciens</i>	6	24	3	12	7	28
<i>Klebsiella pneumoniae</i>	2	8	0	0	4	16
<i>Proteus mirabilis</i>	4	16	0	0	5	20
<i>Proteus vulgaris</i>	3	12	1	4	4	16
<i>Morganella morganii</i>	1	4	0	0	3	12
<i>Salmonella enteritidis</i>	0	0	0	0	2	8
<i>Salmonella typhimurium</i>	0	0	0	0	1	4

Tabel (3) : Serotypes of isoalted *E. coli*

Serotypes	A		C	
	No.	%	No.	%
O26 : K60 (B6)	1	4	1	4
O55 : K59 (B5)	0	0	2	8
O111 : K58 (B4)	1	4	0	0
O119 : K69 (B14)	0	0	2	8

-

:

.

:

/ x , x x

/ x , x , x ,

x , x , x ,

x , /

x , > x , / x , x ,

.

/ x , x , x ,

.

.