



Aerococcus sp., a promising genus as a source of anti-Salmonella bioprotective agents for the dairy industry revealed by a miniaturised screening method

Alexandra Besnard, Nathalie Desmasures, Alexandre Voisin-Anastasie, Lillian Gréau, Virginie Lelièvre, Jean-Michel Bré, Marion Dalmasso, Margot Schlusshuber

► To cite this version:

Alexandra Besnard, Nathalie Desmasures, Alexandre Voisin-Anastasie, Lillian Gréau, Virginie Lelièvre, et al.. Aerococcus sp., a promising genus as a source of anti-Salmonella bioprotective agents for the dairy industry revealed by a miniaturised screening method. International Dairy Journal, 2021, 116, pp.104949. 10.1016/j.idairyj.2020.104949 . hal-03204430

HAL Id: hal-03204430

<https://normandie-univ.hal.science/hal-03204430v1>

Submitted on 3 Feb 2023

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.



Distributed under a Creative Commons Attribution - NonCommercial 4.0 International License

***Aerococcus* sp., a promising genus as a source of anti-*Salmonella* bioprotective agents for the dairy industry revealed by a miniaturised screening method**

Alexandra Besnard^{a,b}, Nathalie Desmasures^a, Alexandre Voisin-Anastasia^a, Lillian Gréau^a,
Virginie Lelièvre^a, Jean-Michel Bré^a, Marion Dalmasso^a, Margot Schlusshuber^{a*}

^a Normandie Univ, UNICAEN, UNIROUEN, ABTE, 14000 Caen, France

^b Gillot SAS, 612020 Saint-Hilaire de Briouze, France

*Corresponding author. Tel.: +33 2 31 56 57 82

E-mail address: margot.schlusshuber@unicaen.fr (M. Schlusshuber)

ABSTRACT

Biopreservation is a promising technology for insuring safety of food. This study evaluated the anti-*Salmonella* potential of 1450 dairy isolates from 54 genera, in conditions mimicking dairy matrices, to find new bioprotective strains. Among the screened isolates, 6.4% exhibited an antagonistic activity towards at least one of the two *Salmonella* Mbandaka and Montevideo reference strains. *Lactococcus* sp. generated the highest number of bioprotective candidates, followed by *Aerococcus* sp. from which seven isolates were able to inhibit at least 80% of 20 *Salmonella* strains in milk synthetic medium, and/or in cheese synthetic medium. Inhibition by *Aerococcus* sp. was characterised by the production of hydrogen peroxide (30 to 100 mg L⁻¹) and acetic acid (0.25 to 0.34 g L⁻¹). *Aerococcus* sp. appears to be a new promising source of bioprotective agents against *Salmonella* in dairy matrices, along with the well-described *Lactococcus* genus.

1. Introduction

In Europe, ~ 500,000 tons of raw milk cheeses are produced each year (IDF, 2016). The use of raw milk leads to undeniable advantages for milk producers, cheese makers, as well as for consumers. Because raw milk cheeses are high added value products, the price of the raw milk collected to produce them is also higher than that of raw milk destined to the production of pasteurised products (Casabianca & Jeanneaux, 2020). The organoleptic qualities of raw milk cheeses are also recognised to be stronger than for processed cheeses thanks to an abundant native microbiota (Montel et al., 2014). However, raw milk cheeses, mainly semi-soft and semi-hard cheeses, are more susceptible to the presence and growth of some bacterial pathogens and can be potential vehicles for food-borne outbreaks. Regarding the latter issue among the zoonotic pathogens that the dairy industry must face, the most recorded are pathogenic *Campylobacter* sp., *Escherichia coli*, *Listeria monocytogenes*, *Salmonella enterica* and enterotoxin-producing *Staphylococcus aureus* (Jourdan-da Silva et al., 2018).

Salmonella is one of the food-borne pathogens responsible for the highest number of human cases. It was associated in 2018 in Europe to 1581 food-borne outbreaks that were reported by the EFSA (EFSA, 2019) leading to 11,581 human cases. In foods and animals, *Salmonella* Enteritidis, *Salmonella* Typhimurium, monophasic *Salmonella* Typhimurium, *Salmonella* Infantis and *Salmonella* Derby are the most encountered serovars in Europe. These serovars are also considered to be the most reported in human cases (EFSA, 2019), but their occurrence is country-dependent, food-dependent, and tends to fluctuate over time.

Preventing the occurrence of *Salmonella* in raw milk cheeses is of utmost importance for sanitary and economic reasons. On farms, diverse sanitary measures can be implemented to reduce the risk of *Salmonella* contamination during milking. Nevertheless, these preventive

practices are not always effective enough, and complementary approaches have to be used (Schlsselhuber et al., unpublished).

Among such approaches, biopreservation has received an increased interest over the last decade. Biopreservation has been defined as the use of natural microflora and/or their antimicrobial compounds to extend food shelf-life and enhance food safety (Stiles, 1996). Using microorganisms (whether they originate or not from the natural microflora) and their products to preserve food has been practiced in many areas (Ross, Morgan, & Hill, 2002). The microflora of most fermented foods is mainly composed of lactic acid bacteria (LAB). LAB are known for their high biopreservation potential and are generally recognised as safe for human. These bacteria are able to produce a large variety of antimicrobial substances such as organic acids, hydrogen peroxide, biosurfactants (Sharma, 2016) and bacteriocins (Gálvez, Abriouel, López, & Omar, 2007). When used as bioprotective cultures, they can contribute to a number of ways to control pathogens (Ben Said, Gaudreau, Dallaire, Tessier, & Fliss, 2019) and to extend the shelf-life of fermented foods (Leyva Salas et al., 2017).

Microorganisms other than LAB can also be used for biopreservation. One strain of *Brevibacterium linens*, a bacterial species commonly used for cheese ripening, was shown to have a protective effect against *Listeria* sp. in red smear cheese (Eppert, Valdés-Stauber, Götz, Busse, & Scherer, 1997) and predicted bacteriocin biosynthesis genes were present in most of the *Brevibacterium* strains previously investigated (Pham et al., 2017). In soft cheese, a *Staphylococcus equorum* strain was able to inhibit *Listeria monocytogenes* growth by producing a bacteriostatic substance (Carnio et al., 2000). Staphylococcal bacteriocins can also be used to control *Staphylococcus aureus* in cheese (Miceli de Farias, dos Santos Nascimento, Cabral da Silva Santos, & de Freire Bastos, 2019). In addition to bacteria, yeasts isolated from smear ripened cheeses can also have an inhibitory action against pathogens like

89 *L. monocytogenes* (Dieuleveux, Van Der Pyl, Chataud, & Gueguen, 1998; Goerges, Aigner,
90 Silakowski, & Scherer, 2006).

91 To select antagonistic bacterial isolates, screening methods can be employed such as
92 the commonly used agar diffusion assay (Abraham et al., 1941). This method allows to detect
93 the inhibition due to acidification (in unbuffered medium) and/or to the production of non-
94 specific (e.g., hydrogen peroxide) and specific (e.g., bacteriocin) inhibitory compounds.
95 Despite the common use of this method, it cannot be applied when using opaque media.
96 Therefore, classical nutrient agar media are often used, but their composition do not reproduce
97 the composition of complex food matrices such as dairy products.

98 The aim of this study was to select microbial isolates exhibiting inhibitory activity
99 towards *Salmonella*, through the production of chemical compounds, in conditions
100 encountered during semi-soft cheese making process. A new miniaturised screening method
101 was designed and used to screen a collection of dairy microbial isolates. The most promising
102 bioprotective strains were identified, and the mechanisms involved in their activity were
103 investigated.

105 **2. Materials and methods**

107 *2.1. Microbial strains and growth conditions*

109 This study is part of a project targeting serovars encountered specifically in Normandy
110 region. The most encountered serovars in Normandy in 2012–2017 were *Salmonella enterica*
111 subsp. *enterica* serovar Mbandaka (hereinafter referred to as *S. Mbandaka*) and *S. enterica*
112 subsp. *enterica* serovar Montevideo (hereinafter referred to as *S. Montevideo*). Two reference
113 strains from the Institut Pasteur (Paris, France), *S. Mbandaka* CIP 105.859 and *S. Montevideo*

CIP 104.583, were initially used as primary targets for a pre-screening procedure. Then, ten *S.* Mbandaka and ten *S.* Montevideo strains, isolated from various farms in Normandy (France) were further used for screening assays (Table 1). All the strains were routinely stored in 15% glycerol at -80°C .

Salmonella strains were grown at 30°C for 24 h in Luria Bertani (LB) broth pH 7.5 made with 10 g L^{-1} casein pancreatic peptone (Biokar), 5 g L^{-1} yeast extract (Biokar) and 10 g L^{-1} NaCl (Fisher). A total of 1,450 bacterial and yeast isolates from the UCMA collection (Université de Caen Normandie, France), collected between 1978 and 2016 in dairy environments from the Normandy region, were screened for inhibitory activities towards *Salmonella* strains. All the screened isolates were routinely grown in brain heart infusion pH 7.4 (BHI, Conda), for 24 h at 30°C in Deepwell® from one colony. This medium was chosen as it allows growth of most microbial groups investigated in this study, including Gram positive and Gram negative bacteria, and yeasts.

2.2. *Development of a miniaturised method to screen microbial isolates for anti-Salmonella activities*

A miniaturised method based on the agar diffusion plate method was developed in 96-well microtiter plates (Fig. 1). The screened microbial isolates were cultivated in Deepwell® plates in conditions mentioned above. After incubation, a replicator was used to transfer a few microliters ($2\text{--}3\text{ }\mu\text{L}$) from the Deepwell® plate cultures onto the surface of the agar media used as the first layer in 96-well microtitre plates (agar layer of about $100\text{ }\mu\text{L}$). Three different media were used as first layer: BHI agar (commonly used in literature for bacterial screening, as recommended by the Clinical and Laboratory Standards Institute (CLSI, 2004) milk agar, or cheese agar. The two later were used to mimic the nutritional and physicochemical

conditions encountered during two processing steps in the manufacture of semi-soft cheese. Milk agar pH 6.3 was used to mimic the end of the milk maturation step, just before renneting, and was composed of 100 g L⁻¹ of skim milk powder (Difco) and 12 g L⁻¹ of bacteriological agar (Conda). Cheese agar was used to mimic cheese ripening and was prepared as previously described by (Guichard & Bonnarme, 2005) using 2.4% NaCl, 60% of unsalted Camembert cheese curd and 1.7% agar (Biokar). To allow the growth of acid-sensitive isolates, particularly belonging to the *Actinobacteria* class, pH was adjusted to 6.8.

Microtitre plates containing inoculated BHI agar and milk agar were then incubated at 30 °C for 24 h, and those containing inoculated cheese agar were incubated at 15 °C for 48 h. After incubation, the resultant growth was killed by UV irradiation (0.124 J cm⁻²) for 15 min (Daly et al., 2010). In each well, a 70 µL overlay of soft LB agar (0.8% agar) inoculated with an overnight culture of *Salmonella* was added (final concentration of 10⁶ cfu mL⁻¹). All the plates were incubated at 30 °C for 24 h (Fig. 1).

After the 24h-incubation step, *Salmonella* viability was revealed using a blue-dye resazurin test. Resazurin dye was prepared extemporaneously in phosphate sodium buffer (pH 7.4) at a concentration of 0.05% (w/v) and sterilised using PES filter (0.22 µm pore size). In each well, 20 µL of resazurin solution were deposited onto the agar surface. After 5 min at room temperature, the coloration of the entire upper layer in each well was recorded and compared with a positive control (*Salmonella* growth in LB agar) and a negative control (sterile LB agar overlay). A pink colour revealed the viability of *Salmonella* whereas a blue colour indicated its inhibition (Fig. 1). All the microbial isolates showing an antagonistic activity (blue coloration of the well) were tested in duplicate to confirm the inhibition of *Salmonella*.

All the isolates were tested for their activity against the two *Salmonella* reference strains. The isolates inhibiting of one or both reference strains were then tested, in duplicate, against twenty *Salmonella* field strains (Table 1).

2.3. Identification of the inhibition mechanisms of selected antagonist isolates

2.3.1. Detection of anti-*Salmonella* compounds in cell-free supernatants of antagonistic isolates

The isolates exhibiting antagonistic activity towards at least 16 of the 20 (80%) *Salmonella* strains (Table 1) were selected to investigate the mechanisms of inhibition. This arbitrary inhibition threshold of 80% was intended to select the isolates with the widest spectrum of inhibitory activity towards *Salmonella*.

Liquid cheese synthetic medium (CSM, pH 6.8) was prepared as previously described (Mansour, Beckerich, & Bonnarme, 2008). Liquid milk synthetic medium (MSM, pH 6.3) was prepared from CSM with modifications: lactose and sodium lactate concentrations were adjusted to 48.5 g L⁻¹ and 1 g L⁻¹, respectively. Isolates were grown in 5 mL of media from one colony for 72 h at 150 rpm at either 30 °C (MSM) or 15 °C (CSM). Cells from 5 mL of culture were pelleted by centrifugation at 4150 × g for 10 min at room temperature, and the cell-free supernatants (CFS) were obtained by filtering through 0.22 µm PES filters (Nalgene) and then stored at -20 °C until use. *Salmonella* Mbandaka CIP 105.859 was cultured in 5 mL of LB from one colony and incubated 24 h at 37°C. *Salmonella* concentration was then adjusted at 5×10⁶ cfu mL⁻¹ in LB broth twice concentrated.

CFS were tested against *S. Mbandaka* CIP 105.859 to assess the contribution to the detected anti-*Salmonella* activities of the potential production of organic acids, hydrogen peroxide, proteinaceous compounds and biosurfactants. Four treatment conditions were

applied to CFS, i.e., non-treated, neutralised, neutralised treated with catalase, and neutralised treated with pronase. The CFS pH was neutralised to pH 7 with 6 N NaOH. The neutralised CFS were treated with catalase (100 mg.mL⁻¹, Sigma) at 30 °C for 30 min, or pronase (100 mg.mL⁻¹, Serva) at 37 °C for 2 h. One hundred microlitres of treated (neutralised, catalase-treated, or pronase-treated) or non-treated CFS were mixed with 100 µL *S. Mbandaka* CIP 105.859 LB culture, into microplate wells, reaching a final *Salmonella* concentration of 2.5×10⁶ cfu mL⁻¹. The microplates were incubated at 30 °C for 24 h. After incubation, *Salmonella* inhibition was evaluated by comparing OD_{600nm} in control wells (*S. Mbandaka* without CFS) and in assay wells containing both *S. Mbandaka* and CFS. Inhibition was expressed by the OD_{600nm} ratio between assay and control. Non-treated CFS were considered active against *Salmonella* when at least 80% inhibition were observed. The activity of treated CFS was assessed in triplicate by comparing with the activity of non-treated CFS.

For the rapid screening of biosurfactant production, non-treated CFS were subjected to a drop-collapse assay (Walter, Sylatk, & Hausmann, 2010). Briefly, 5 µL of non-treated CFS were mixed with 1 µL of methylene blue to improve visualisation before a drop assay onto a hydrophobic surface (Parafilm®). The stability of the drop was checked and compared with a negative control (sterile medium). If CFS contains biosurfactants, the drop spreads because the interfacial tension between the drop and the hydrophobic surface is reduced.

Hydrogen peroxide production in active non-treated CFS was quantified using H₂O₂ Dosatest strip® (0 to 100 mg mL⁻¹, VWR).

2.3.2. *Detection and quantification of major organic acids by high performance liquid chromatography*

Reverse phase HPLC (Waters Alliance HPLC system with 2695 pump and 2998 PDA detector) was performed at 0.6 mL min⁻¹ and 40 °C on a Carbomix HNP5 8% cross-linking

7.8 × 300 mm (Sepax). Elution was performed in an isocratic mode for 30 min using 5 mM H₂SO₄ buffer as mobile phase and monitored at 210 nm. Active CFS of selected strains grown in MSM medium were two fold diluted with mobile phase before injection of 10 µL. For quantification of lactic and acetic acids in each CFS, acid standards were injected in concentrations ranging from 2 mM to 64 mM (Sigma). Several standards of organic acids were also injected at 64 mM to compare elution time with produced molecules in active CFS: citric (Panreac), fumaric (Acros), formic (Sigma), butyric (Fluka), benzoic (Panreac), succinic (Sigma) and phenyllactic acids (Sigma).

3. Results

3.1. Antagonistic activities of microbial isolates towards two *Salmonella* reference strains

The miniaturised screening method developed in the current study was used to assess the anti-*Salmonella* activity of 1450 isolates against two reference *Salmonella* strains, *S.* Mbandaka CIP 105.859 and *S.* Montevideo CIP 104.583, in BHI, milk agar and cheese agar (Table 2). This method was validated using strains previously screened using agar diffusion assays and showing antagonism, through production of chemical compound, toward one *Salmonella* strain used in this study. Around one-third of the screened isolates belonged to the *Lactococcus* genus.

Among the 1450 isolates, 93 (6.4%) were able to inhibit at least one *Salmonella* reference strain in BHI. Seventy-three (5%) isolates inhibited *S.* Mbandaka CIP 105.859 whereas 55 (3.85%) inhibited *S.* Montevideo CIP 104.583 strain in this medium. Thirty-five (2.4%) isolates inhibited both *Salmonella* strains in these conditions.

In milk medium, 119 isolates (8.2%) inhibited *S. Mbandaka* CIP 105.859 and 135 (9.3%) inhibited *S. Montevideo* CIP 104.583. In this medium, 61 isolates (4.2%) displayed an antagonistic activity against the two *Salmonella* strains.

In cheese medium, results were similar to those obtained in milk medium. A total of 118 (8.1%) isolates were active against *S. Mbandaka* CIP 105.859 and 132 (9.1%) against *S. Montevideo* CIP 104.583 (Table 2). Forty-four isolates (3%) inhibited both *Salmonella* strains. Antagonistic isolates were different depending on the medium and on the *Salmonella* strains.

As shown in Table 2, isolates displaying an anti-*Salmonella* activity belonged predominantly to the *Lactococcus* genus, followed by, in descending order, *Aerococcus* sp., *Lactobacillus* sp., and *Leuconostoc* sp. Some antagonistic isolates were also found among other bacterial genera, including *Alcaligenes* sp., *Brachybacterium* sp., *Hafnia* sp., *Pseudomonas* sp., *Raoultella* sp., *Staphylococcus* sp., and *Weissella* sp., and among yeasts (*Candida* sp. and *Yarrowia* sp.). The genus *Aerococcus* was associated with a noticeable inhibitory activity towards *Salmonella* strains, since more than half of the isolates were active (Table 2). Over the 31 screened *Aerococcus* strain, 29 (93%) were able to inhibit at least one *Salmonella* strain in at least one medium.

3.2. Screening of selected isolates against 20 *Salmonella* strains originating from dairy environments.

Based on the previous results, 49 isolates were selected according to their taxonomic affiliation and their inhibitory activity towards the reference *Salmonella* strains in either milk agar or cheese agar (Table 3). They were screened using the miniaturised method with milk

medium and cheese medium against twenty *Salmonella* isolates collected from farms' environment (Table 1).

Thirty-one out of the 49 isolates inhibited at least 16 out of the 20 *Salmonella* strains in one or in both media (Table 3). Among them, three *Lactococcus* sp., two *Aerococcus* sp., one *Alcaligenes* sp., one *Leuconostoc* sp., and one *Raoultella* sp. isolates displayed inhibition only in milk medium. Eleven isolates (six *Lactococcus* sp., three *Aerococcus* sp., one *Pseudomonas* sp., and one *Streptococcus* sp.) inhibited *Salmonella* strains only in cheese medium. Ten *Lactococcus* sp., and two *Aerococcus* sp. isolates were active in both milk and cheese media. None of the tested field *Salmonella* strains was resistant to all the screened isolates.

3.2.1. Inhibition mechanisms of the active isolates in milk and cheese media

The 49 isolates selected on the previous step were grown either in MSM, CSM or both media (according to their previous activities through the miniaturised method in milk medium, cheese medium or both) to test CFS activities against *S. Mbandaka* CIP 105.859. Similar results were obtained for both *Salmonella* strains so only the results obtained for *S. Mbandaka* CIP 105.859 strain are shown (Table 3). After 24 h incubation, the ratio between OD₆₀₀ obtained from *Salmonella* grown in the presence of CFS and OD₆₀₀ obtained in pure culture was calculated. CFS activity was considered as inhibitory toward *Salmonella* strain when values ≤ 0.20 (corresponding to 80% inhibition) were obtained. Twenty CFS were tested in MSM, and among them, seventeen non-treated CFS inhibited the reference strain, with at least 80% of inhibition. All the tested *Aerococcus* strains (n = 4) were active against both *Salmonella* strains. After CFS neutralisation, only these *Aerococcus* strains still inhibited *Salmonella* growth (96–99% of inhibition). None of the CFS inhibited *Salmonella* growth in CSM (data not shown).

All the active CFS, which pH ranged between 4.5 and 6.5, lost their inhibitory activity against the pathogen after pH neutralisation except for the four *Aerococcus* isolates. According to these results, the inhibition mechanism of these isolates could be related to the production of organic acids combined with a pH effect. For the four *Aerococcus* sp. UCMA 5972, UCMA 18036, UCMA 18039 and UCMA 6078 strains, CFS was still active with pronase treatment, but not with catalase treatment. This suggest that the anti-*Salmonella* activity was mainly due to the production of hydrogen peroxide. This production was confirmed by H₂O₂ Dosatest® strips, with quantities produced ranging from 30 to 100 mg L⁻¹ depending on the supernatant. After pronase treatment, all neutralised CFS kept their inhibitory activity. Therefore, none of the antagonistic activities were related to the presence of proteinaceous compounds such as bacteriocins. A drop-collapse assay was performed on non-treated CFS to reveal the production of biosurfactants. None of the strains appeared to produce such molecules.

3.2.2. Assessment of organic acids involved in *Aerococcus* anti-*Salmonella* activity

Due to the anti-*Salmonella* activity of their CFS, the production of organic acids by *Aerococcus* strains was studied. After 72 h of incubation in MSM, the four *Aerococcus* active CFS (Table 3) were collected and analysed using HPLC with UV detection at 210 nm. Chromatograms of *Aerococcus* CFS were compared with chromatograms of sterile MSM. No production of lactic acid was observed, while acetic acid was produced at concentration ranging from 0.23 to 0.34 g L⁻¹, depending on the strain. Additionally, an unknown molecule was produced and eluted at 9.1 min. However, none of organic acids standards injected were found to correspond (data not shown).

4. Discussion

Classic nutritive media such as MRS, M17, and BHI agar are well-used for spot-on-lawn assays to detect microbial antagonistic activities. BHI agar has the advantage to allow the growth of a large panel of microorganisms thanks to its nutrient-rich composition. For LAB-only screening, MRS agar is commonly used. These non-opaque media are easy to use but their composition is far from that of real matrices encountered during dairy food making processes. It is known that antimicrobial activities revealed when using classic nutritive media can be lost in real dairy matrix conditions.

In this study, a new screening method was developed and applied for the detection of microbial antagonistic activities towards pathogenic bacteria using dairy-like media. The method developed has the advantage of using conditions mimicking semi-soft cheese making process, from milk maturation to cheese ripening steps, in terms of nutritional content for microorganisms, pH and temperature. It also has the advantage of overcoming difficulties associated to opacity of dairy-like media. The method was also designed to manage a large number of isolates in 96-well microplates, therefore cell concentrations of the isolates to be screened were not adjusted when inoculating the first agar layer. The consequence is that the cellular levels of the screened dairy isolates in microplate wells may vary depending on the microbial species or strains investigated, and on the trials. As the anti-*Salmonella* activity of the isolates was confirmed in a second experiment, it was considered as a minor drawback of our method. Additionally, strains belonging to 18 different genera, including fastidious ones (e.g., *Lactobacillus* sp), showed inhibitory activities with this method, suggesting that it was of broad use. Mainly members of the *Actinobacteria* class were not detected as active in this experiment, but some of them exhibited activity toward a *S. Newport* strain (data not shown).

Over the 1450 microbial isolates tested in the current study, most of them were LAB (1004 out of 1450) and especially of the *Lactococcus* genus (37%). Interestingly, a higher

number of antagonistic strains were found in “milk” and “cheese” agar compared with classical BHI agar. It appeared that the physicochemical properties of milk and cheese media (e.g., lower pH, and concentrations of citrate, free fatty acids and minerals) were more suitable for revealing the production of inhibitory molecules by this bacterial group. This was consistent with the study of Matevosyan, Bazukyan, and Trchounian (2019a), where LAB antibacterial activities were more important in milk agar than in classic medium such as MRS. Another study showed that calcium and magnesium ions in combination were involved in the increase in LAB antibacterial activity (Matevosyan et al., 2019a). Besides compositions, microbial antagonistic activities are also highly dependent on culture conditions (Matevosyan, Bazukyan, & Trchounian, 2019b). For example, activities of antimicrobial substances were shown significantly influenced by temperature, NaCl and glucose concentrations (Rohmatussolihat, Lisdiyanti, Yopi, Widyastuti, & Sukara, 2018). This corroborates the importance of using media as close as possible to the food matrix for the selection of bioprotective agents that may then still be active when applied to real food processes.

The screening performed against 20 field *Salmonella* strains from different serovars, in the same conditions as those used with the two *Salmonella* reference strains, showed that *Lactococcus* and *Aerococcus* were the major antagonistic genera. None of the 20 field *Salmonella* were resistant to all of the 31 tested isolates. Most isolates were not able to inhibit all *Salmonella* strains in our conditions whatever the serovar. This indicates that the inhibitory activities of the screened isolates were strain-dependent.

LAB, especially *Lactococcus*, *Lactobacillus* and *Leuconostoc*, are well-known for their antagonistic activities against pathogens (El Kheir et al., 2018; Lindgren & Dobrogosz, 1990) and were confirmed as such in this study. Additionally, some isolates belonging to the *Enterococcus*, *Pediococcus*, *Streptococcus* and *Weissella* genera exhibited a predictable inhibitory activity. The anti-*Salmonella* activity of a large proportion of LAB isolates

belonging to the *Aerococcus* genus was more surprising, as published reports on the antimicrobial potential of this genus are scarce to our knowledge. Although the four investigated *Aerococcus* strains had a similar behaviour toward the *Salmonella* strains, they were probably not clones because they originated from different substrates (air versus raw milk) and from different farms.

CFS were investigated to decipher the mechanisms involved in *Salmonella* inhibition. An inhibitory activity was associated to CFS from isolates grown in MSM, whereas none was found for CFS from CSM. This could be explained by several factors leading to a limited growth of the tested strains and/or to a lower production of inhibitory molecules in CSM than in MSM. Indeed, CSM was incubated at 15 °C whereas MSM was incubated at 30 °C, and CSM had a pH of 6.8 pH whereas MSM pH was of 6.3. The lactose concentration in CSM was of 20 g L⁻¹ compared with 48.5 g L⁻¹ in MSM, and lactic acid concentration was of 18 g L⁻¹ in CSM and of 1 g L⁻¹ in MSM. This could have impacted the growth of the tested microbial isolates.

It is well documented that most of the LAB inhibition activities are notably related to the production of organic acids, mostly lactic acid (Liu, 2003) but also acetic acid, phenyllactic acid (Gerez et al., 2013) and other organic acids (Garnier, Torres, Font de Valdez, & Rollán, 2020). Many primary substrates for organic acid production are found in dairy matrices: carbohydrates, amino acids (Stiles, 1996), and unsaturated free fatty acids through epoxide and hydroperoxide formation (Molimard & Spinnler, 1996). In this study, all the *Lactococcus* sp. tested showed an important production of lactic acid and produced also acetic acid, as reported in other studies (Özcelik, Kuley, & Özogul, 2016; Røssland, Langsrud, Granum, & Sørhaug, 2005).

Interestingly, *Aerococcus* strains were not associated with the production of lactic acid. Mechanisms of action were different for the four *Aerococcus* strains mainly

investigated in the current study, compared with the other LAB strains. Indeed, the *Aerococcus* antagonist activity seemed to be related, at least in part, to the production of organic acids (acetic acid) and hydrogen peroxide. This is consistent with a previous study showing a production of hydrogen peroxide by this genera (Stepanskyi et al., 2017). In the *Aerococcus* genus, the decarboxylation of pyruvate due to the action of a pyruvate oxidase allows the formation of hydrogen peroxide through the reduction of dioxygen in *Aerococcus viridans* (Yanze Kontchou & Blondeau, 1990). The enzyme glycerophosphate-oxidase (GPO), isolated from *A. viridans*, also contributes to the formation of hydrogen peroxide (Streitenberger, López-Mas, Sánchez-Ferrer, & García-Carmona, 2001). This enzyme has been described in other LAB genera such as: *Leuconostoc* (Emi, Kojima, & Ando, 1984), *Pediococcus* (Šůchová, Demnerová, Bond, & Králová, 1992) and *Streptococcus* (Esders & Michrina, 1979). In this study, the concentration of hydrogen peroxide recorded in CFS ranged between 30 and 100 mg L⁻¹. Such concentrations are similar and potentially higher than those recorded for strains belonging to *Lactobacillus acidophilus*, and which ranged between 1.7 and 50 mg L⁻¹ (Hertzberger et al., 2014; Strus, Brzywczy-Włoch, Gosiewski, Kochan, & Heczko, 2006).

An unknown molecule eluted at 9.1 min, and which was not produced by the other tested strains, could be related to the observed inhibition. The identification and assessment of the potential anti-*Salmonella* activity of this molecule remain to be performed.

The *Aerococcus* genus is composed of eight species: *Aerococcus christensenii*, *Aerococcus sanguinicola*, *Aerococcus suis*, *Aerococcus urinae*, *Aerococcus urinaehominis*, *Aerococcus viridans*, *Aerococcus urinaeequi* and *Aerococcus vaginalis* (Tohno et al., 2014). Some species of this genus, such as *A. viridans*, appear to be strongly associated to dairy environments. They have been found in air, soil, and dairy environments (Ruoff, 2011). *Aerococcus* genus has frequently been detected as a dominant flora in raw milk samples

collected on Normandy dairy farms (Mallet, 2012). *Aerococcaceae* was also the major taxon found in milk and air dust samples collected on farms located in Okayama and Hiroshima (Japan) using automatic milking systems (Wu et al., 2019). In sixteen French farms, the *Aerococcus* genus was also found in milk, ambient air, air from the milking area, dust and on teat skin (Vacheyrou, 2011).

In another study, the bacterial diversity of cows' teat skin was investigated. Among the major phylum encountered (Firmicutes) *Aerococcus* sp., and especially *A. viridans*, were found (Verdier-Metz et al., 2012). The microbial diversity in bovine faeces was also investigated to evaluate their importance as microorganisms' source (Kagkli, Vancanneyt, Hill, Vandamme, & Cogan, 2007). *Aerococcus viridans* was identified in 62 of the 76 samples collected from one farm, and accounted for 83% of the total isolates.

The *Aerococcus* genus has been detected in raw goat milk and in Pélardon cheese, a raw goat milk cheese (Penland et al., 2018). In Mexican cheeses, *Aerococcus* sp. was found in high proportion in Cotija (a Mexican handcrafted product made from raw cow milk) and Adobera-de-mesa cheeses (Murugesan et al., 2018). In Cotija cheese, this bacterium was detected at the surface and in the core of the product (Chombo-Morales, Kirchmayr, Gschaedler, Lugo-Cervantes, & Villanueva-Rodríguez, 2016). In this study all strains belonged to *Aerococcus urinaeequi*.

Among *Aerococcus* species, some are known to be involved in rare human clinical cases, especially *A. urinae* and *A. sanguinicola*, associated to urinary tract infections. However, regarding species described in milk and cheese (*A. viridans/urinaeequi*), no case of contamination and no clinical case linked to the consumption of dairy products have been reported so far.

Because of the anti-*Salmonella* activity of *Aerococcus* strains and their natural presence in dairy products, this genus appears to be an unexpected promising candidate to

control *Salmonella* in dairy products. Further investigations will be conducted to determine if the production of hydrogen peroxide can potentially affect the growth of dairy starter cultures.

5. Conclusions

In this study, we developed a new agar-based screening method allowing the detection of microbial antagonistic activities against *Salmonella* in dairy-like opaque media. It allows the screening of a large number of isolates at the same time. Starting from microbial cultures grown in Deepwell®, this screening method can be used to inoculate simultaneously diverse opaque media incubated in different conditions, mimicking various physicochemical and nutritional conditions encountered during the processing steps of a food matrix. This is of particular interest for the dairy industry, as this method allows a screening adapted to different steps of cheese making processes. This method may also be transferred for the screening of microbial isolates against other pathogens than *Salmonella*.

While some isolates were able to inhibit all the tested *Salmonella* strains, the inhibition potential was found, as expected, to be essentially strain-dependent. Combinations of antagonistic isolates with various mechanisms of anti-*Salmonella* actions should be considered for insuring a protection from the beginning to the end of the cheese making process. Associations of strains displaying different inhibition mechanisms could bring a larger spectra of *Salmonella* inhibition and prevent the emergence of resistance mechanisms from the pathogens.

From this study, the *Aerococcus* genus, and especially *Aerococcus urinaeequi*, seems to be a promising source of bioprotective strains to be used in addition to dairy starters. Compared with other LAB genera, little is known about *Aerococcus*, and especially about *Aerococcus* species encountered in dairy environments. Therefore, further investigations

dealing with antibiotic resistance, the production of biogenic amines and the presence of virulence factors need to be evaluated before further consideration of their use as protective cultures.

Acknowledgements

This work is part of the CESam project, co-funded by Normandy County Council and the European Union in the framework of the ERDF-ESF operational programme 2014-2020. It was also supported by a CIFRE grant from the “Association Nationale de la Recherche Technique”, and got the VALORIAL label.

References

- Abraham, E. P., Chain, E., Fletcher, C. M., Gardner, A. D., Heatley, N. G., Jennings, M. A. et al. (1941). Further observations on penicillin. *Lancet*, 238, 177–189.
- Ben Said, L., Gaudreau, H., Dallaire, L., Tessier, M., & Fliss, I. (2019). Bioprotective culture: A new generation of food additives for the preservation of food quality and safety. *Industrial Biotechnology*, 15, 138–147.
- Carnio, M. C., Hölzel, A., Rudolf, M., Henle, T., Jung, G., & Scherer, S. (2000). The macrocyclic peptide antibiotic micrococcin P1 is secreted by the food-borne bacterium *Staphylococcus equorum* WS 2733 and inhibits *Listeria monocytogenes* on soft cheese. *Applied and Environmental Microbiology*, 66, 2378–2384.
- Casabianca, F., & Jeanneaux, P. (2020). Le lait cru: créateur de valeurs ajoutées et partagées ? Colloq. Fromag. Au Lait Cru Entre Risques Bénéfices Divers. Au Cœur Débat CNAOL, INAO.

485 Chombo-Morales, P., Kirchmayr, M., Gschaedler, A., Lugo-Cervantes, E., & Villanueva-
 486 Rodríguez, S. (2016). Effects of controlling ripening conditions on the dynamics of the
 487 native microbial population of Mexican artisanal Cotija cheese assessed by PCR-
 488 DGGE. *LWT - Food Science & Technology*, 65, 1153–1161.

489 CLSI. 2004. *Quality control for commercially prepared microbiological culture media* (3rd
 490 edn.). Wayne, PA, USA Clinical and Laboratory Standards Institute.

491 Daly, K. M., Upton, M., Sandiford, S. K., Draper, L. A., Wescombe, P. A., Jack, R. W., et al.
 492 (2010). Production of the Bsa lantibiotic by community-acquired *Staphylococcus*
 493 *aureus* strains. *Journal of Bacteriology*, 192, 1131–1142.

494 Dieuleveux, V., Van Der Pyl, D., Chataud, J., & Gueguen, M. (1998). Purification and
 495 characterization of anti-*Listeria* compounds produced by *Geotrichum candidum*.
 496 *Applied and Environmental Microbiology*, 64, 800–803.

497 EFSA. (2019). *The European Union One Health 2018 Zoonoses report*.
 498 doi:<https://doi.org/10.2903/j.efsa.2019.5926>.

499 El Kheir, S. M., Cherrat, L., Awussi, A. A., Ramia, N. E., Taha, S., Rahman, A., et al. (2018).
 500 High-throughput identification of candidate strains for biopreservation by using
 501 bioluminescent *Listeria monocytogenes*. *Frontiers in Microbiology*, 9, Article 1883.

502 Emi, S., Kojima, Y., & Ando, M. (1984). *Process for producing α -glycerophosphate oxidase*.
 503 US Patent No. US4463095A.

504 Eppert, I., Valdés-Stauber, N., Götz, H., Busse, M., & Scherer, S. (1997). Growth reduction
 505 of *Listeria* spp. caused by undefined industrial red smear cheese cultures and
 506 bacteriocin-producing *Brevibacterium lines* as evaluated in situ on soft cheese.
 507 *Applied and Environmental Microbiology*, 63, 4812–4817.

508 Esders, T. W., & Michrina, C. A. (1979). Purification and properties of L-alpha-
 509 glycerophosphate oxidase from *Streptococcus faecium* ATCC 12755. *Journal of*

510 *Biological Chemistry*, 254, 2710–2715.

511 Gálvez, A., Abriouel, H., López, R. L., & Omar, N. B. (2007). Bacteriocin-based strategies
512 for food biopreservation. *International Journal of Food Microbiology*, 120, 51–70.

513 Garnier, L., Penland, M., Thierry, A., Maillard, M.-B., Jardin, J., Coton, M., et al. (2020).
514 Antifungal activity of fermented dairy ingredients: Identification of antifungal
515 compounds. *International Journal of Food Microbiology*, 322, Article 108574.

516 Gerez, C.L., Torres, M. J., Font de Valdez, G., & Rollán, G. (2013). Control of spoilage fungi
517 by lactic acid bacteria. *Biological Control*, 64, 231–237.

518 Goerges, S., Aigner, U., Silakowski, B., & Scherer, S. (2006). Inhibition of *Listeria*
519 *monocytogenes* by food-borne yeasts. *Applied and Environmental Microbiology*, 72,
520 313–318.

521 Guichard, H., & Bonnarne, P. (2005). Development and validation of a plate technique for
522 screening of microorganisms that produce volatile sulfur compounds. *Anal. of*
523 *Biochemistry*, 338, 299–305.

524 Hertzberger, R., Arents, J., Dekker, H. L., Pridmore, R. D., Gysler, C., Kleerebezem, M., et
525 al. (2014). H₂O₂ production in species of the *Lactobacillus acidophilus* group: a
526 central role for a novel NADH-dependent flavin reductase. *Applied and*
527 *Environmental Microbiology*, 80, 2229–2239.

528 IDF. (2016). *IDF factsheet - Raw milk cheeses*. Brussels, Belgium: International Dairy
529 Federation

530 Jourdan-da Silva, N., Fabre, L., Robinson, E., Fournet, N., Nisavanh, A., Bruyand, M., et al.
531 (2018). Ongoing nationwide outbreak of *Salmonella* Agona associated with
532 internationally distributed infant milk products, France, December 2017.
533 *Eurosurveillance*, 23, Article 852.

534 Kagkli, D. M., Vancanneyt, M., Hill, C., Vandamme, P., & Cogan, T. M. (2007).

535 *Enterococcus* and *Lactobacillus* contamination of raw milk in a farm dairy
536 environment. *International Journal of Food Microbiology*, 114, 243–251.

537 Leyva Salas, M., Mounier, J., Valence, F., Coton, M., Thierry, A., & Coton, E. (2017).
538 Antifungal microbial agents for food biopreservation. A review. *Microorganisms*, 5,
539 Article 37.

540 Lindgren, S. E., & Dobrogosz, W. J. (1990). Antagonistic activities of lactic acid bacteria in
541 food and feed fermentations. *FEMS Microbiological Reviews*, 7, 149–163.

542 Liu, S.-Q. (2003). Practical implications of lactate and pyruvate metabolism by lactic acid
543 bacteria in food and beverage fermentations. *International Journal of Food*
544 *Microbiology*, 83, 115–131.

545 Mallet, A. (2012). *Diversité microbienne des laits crus : états des lieux, réservoirs et*
546 *expression en transformation fromagère: exemple de Camembert de Normandie*.
547 Thèse. Caen, France: Université de Caen.

548 Mansour, S., Beckerich, J. M., & Bonnarne, P. (2008). Lactate and amino acid catabolism in
549 the cheese-ripening yeast *Yarrowia lipolytica*. *Applied and Environmental*
550 *Microbiology*, 74, 6505–6512.

551 Matevosyan, L., Bazukyan, I., & Trchounian, A. (2019a). Comparative analysis of the effect
552 of Ca and Mg ions on antibacterial activity of lactic acid bacteria isolates and their
553 associations depending on cultivation conditions. *AMB Express*, 9, Article 32.

554 Matevosyan, L., Bazukyan, I., & Trchounian, A. (2019b). Antifungal and antibacterial effects
555 of newly created lactic acid bacteria associations depending on cultivation media and
556 duration of cultivation. *BMC Microbiology*, 19, Article 102.

557 Miceli de Farias, F., dos Santos Nascimento, J., Cabral da Silva Santos, O., & de Freire
558 Bastos, do C. M.. (2019). Study of the effectiveness of staphylococcins in
559 biopreservation of Minas fresh (Frescal) cheese with a reduced sodium content.

560 *International Journal of Food Microbiology*, 304, 19–31.

561 Molimard, P., & Spinnler, H. E. (1996). Compounds involved in the flavor of surface mold-
 562 ripened cheeses: Origins and properties. *Journal of Dairy Science*, 79, 169–184.

563 Montel, M.-C., Buchin, S., Mallet, A., Delbes-Paus, C., Vuitton, D. A., Desmasures, N., et al.
 564 (2014). Traditional cheeses: Rich and diverse microbiota with associated benefits.
 565 *International Journal of Food Microbiology*, 177, 136–154.

566 Murugesan, S., Reyes-Mata, M. P., Nirmalkar, K., Chavez-Carbajal, A., Juárez-Hernández, J.
 567 I., Torres-Gómez, R. E. et al. (2018). Profiling of bacterial and fungal communities of
 568 Mexican cheeses by high throughput DNA sequencing. *Food Research International*,
 569 113, 371–381.

570 Özcelik, S., Kuley, E., & Özogul, F. (2016). Formation of lactic, acetic, succinic, propionic,
 571 formic and butyric acid by lactic acid bacteria. *LWT - Food Science & Technology*, 73,
 572 536–542.

573 Penland, M., Coton, M., Mounier, J., Parayre, S., Coton, E., Falentin, H., et al. (2018).
 574 *Microbial diversity of Pélardon, an artisanal raw goat milk cheese*. Congrès national
 575 de la Société Française de Microbiologie (SFM; p.age np 14).

576 Pham, N.-P., Layec, S., Dugat-Bony, E., Vidal, M., Irlinger, F., & Monnet, C. (2017).
 577 Comparative genomic analysis of *Brevibacterium* strains: insights into key genetic
 578 determinants involved in adaptation to the cheese habitat. *BMC Genomics*, 18, Article
 579 955.

580 Rohmatussolihat, R., Lisdiyanti, P., Yopi, Y., Widyastuti, Y., & Sukara, E. (2018). Medium
 581 optimization for antimicrobial production by newly screened lactic acid bacteria.
 582 *Annales Bogorienses*, 22, 1–11.

583 Ross, R. P., Morgan, S., & Hill, C. (2002). Preservation and fermentation: past, present and
 584 future. *International Journal of Food Microbiology*, 79, 3–16.

585 Røssland, E., Langsrud, T., Granum, P. E., & Sørhaug, T. (2005). Production of antimicrobial
586 metabolites by strains of *Lactobacillus* or *Lactococcus* co-cultured with *Bacillus*
587 *cereus* in milk. *International Journal of Food Microbiology*, 98, 193–200.

588 Ruoff, K. L. (2011). *Aerococcus*, *Abiotrophia*, and other aerobic catalase-negative, Gram-
589 positive cocci. In J. Jorgensen, M. Pfaller, K. Carroll, G. Funke, M. Landry, S Richter,
590 et al. (Eds.), *Manual of clinical microbiology* (10th edn., pp. 365–376). Washington,
591 DC, USA: ASM Press.

592 Sharma, D. (2016). *Biosurfactant in food*. Berlin, Germany: Springer.

593 Stepanskyi, D., Kremenchutsky, G., Chuyko, V., Koshova, I., Khomiak, O., & Krushynska,
594 T. (2017). Hydrogen peroxide production activity and adhesive properties of
595 aerococci, isolated in women. *Annals of the Mechnikov Institute*, 2, 53–56.

596 Stiles, M. E. (1996). Biopreservation by lactic acid bacteria. *Antonie Van Leeuwenhoek*, 70,
597 331–345.

598 Streitenberger, S., López-Mas, J., Sánchez-Ferrer, A., & García-Carmona, F. (2001). Highly
599 efficient *Aerococcus viridans* L- α -glycerophosphate oxidase production in the
600 presence of H₂O₂-decomposing agent: purification and kinetic characterization.
601 *Applied Microbiology and Biotechnology*, 57, 329–333.

602 Strus, M., Brzychczy-Włoch, M., Gosiewski, T., Kochan, P., & Heczko, P. B. (2006). The in
603 vitro effect of hydrogen peroxide on vaginal microbial communities. *FEMS*
604 *Immunology and Medical Microbiology*, 48, 56–63.

605 Šůchová, M., Demnerová, K., Bond, K., & Králová, B. (1992). Production of l- α -
606 glycerophosphate oxidase by lactic acid bacteria. *Enzyme & Microbial Technology*,
607 14, 917–922.

608 Tohno, M., Kitahara, M., Matsuyama, S., Kimura, K., Ohkuma, M., & Tajima, K. (2014).
609 *Aerococcus vaginalis* sp. nov., isolated from the vaginal mucosa of a beef cow, and

emended descriptions of *Aerococcus suis*, *Aerococcus viridans*, *Aerococcus*
urinaeequi, *Aerococcus urinaehominis*, *Aerococcus urinae*, *Aerococcus christensenii*
and *Aerococcus sanguinicola*. *International Journal of Systematic and Evolutionary*
Microbiology, 64, 1229–1236.

Vacheyrou, M. (2011). *Cultivable microbial communities in raw cow milk and potential*
transfers from stables of sixteen French farms.
[https://reader.elsevier.com/reader/sd/pii/S0168160511001139?token=49998D16A356](https://reader.elsevier.com/reader/sd/pii/S0168160511001139?token=49998D16A356926F254C806C4EAD7CD33FA720C518B666B3B9C7CB91093A9D16B2762E44278FC06392177D342B4DE1DF)
926F254C806C4EAD7CD33FA720C518B666B3B9C7CB91093A9D16B2762E4427
8FC06392177D342B4DE1DF. Accessed December 12, 2019.

Verdier-Metz, I., Gagne, G., Bornes, S., Monsallier, F., Veisseire, P., Delbès-Paus, C., et al.
(2012). Cow teat skin, a potential source of diverse microbial populations for cheese
production. *Applied and Environmental Microbiology*, 78, 326–333.

Walter, V., Syltatk, C., & Hausmann, R. (2010). Screening concepts for the isolation of
biosurfactant producing microorganisms. In R. Sen (Ed.), *Advances in experimental*
medicine and biology (Vol. 672, pp. 1–13). New York, NY, USA: Springer.

Wu, H., Nguyen, Q. D., Tran, T. T. M., Tang, M. T., Tsuruta, T., & Nishino, N. (2019).
Rumen fluid, feces, milk, water, feed, airborne dust, and bedding microbiota in dairy
farms managed by automatic milking systems. *Animal Science Journal*, 90, 445–452.

Yanze Kontchou, C., & Blondeau, R. (1990). Isolation and characterization of hydrogen
peroxide producing *Aerococcus* sp. from soil samples. *FEMS Microbiology Letters*,
68, 323–328.

Figure legend

Fig. 1. Miniaturised screening method developed in the current study; the cylinder represents one well of a 96-well microplate.




Figure 1

Table 1

Salmonella enterica ssp. *enterica* strains used in this study.

Serotype	Strain number	Origin
Mbandaka	UCMA 17913	Milk
	UCMA 19835	Manure
	UCMA 19837	Raw milk
	UCMA 19842	Raw milk
	UCMA 19851	Plastic around fodder
	UCMA 19892	Faeces
	UCMA 19906	Feeding area
	UCMA 19909	Raw milk
	UCMA 19917	Raw milk
	UCMA 20264	Milk
	CIP 105.859	Faeces
Montevideo	UCMA 19832	Raw milk
	UCMA 19834	Manure
	UCMA 19840	Water
	UCMA 19867	Faeces
	UCMA 19870	Puddle
	UCMA 19876	Feeding mix
	UCMA 19889	Faeces
	UCMA 19904	Tractor wheel
	UCMA 20260	Raw milk
	UCMA 20266	Milk
	CIP 104.583	Monkey

Table 2Antagonistic activities of the 1450 screened dairy isolates towards two *Salmonella* reference strains. ^a

Presumed genus	Number of screened isolates	Number (%) of antagonistic isolates					
		<i>Salmonella</i> Mbandaka CIP 105.859			<i>Salmonella</i> Montevideo CIP 104.583		
		BHI	Milk	Cheese	BHI	Milk	Cheese
<i>Aerococcus</i>	31	19 (61.3)	17 (54.8)	20 (64.5)	14 (45.2)	19 (61.2)	18 (58.1)
<i>Alcaligenes</i>	3	1 (33.3)	1 (33.3)	0	2 (66.6)	1 (33.3)	0
<i>Candida</i>	9	6 (66)	1 (11.1)	0	3 (33.3)	1 (11.1)	0
<i>Enterococcus</i>	30	1 (3.3)	4 (13.3)	3 (10)	0	7 (23.3)	8 (26.6)
<i>Geotrichum</i>	4	2 (50)	0	2 (50)	2 (50)	0	0
<i>Hafnia</i>	8	1 (12.5)	0	0	1 (12.5)	0	0
<i>Kluyveromyces</i>	9	2 (22.2)	0	1 (11.1)	2 (22.2)	0	0
<i>Lactobacillus</i>	322	4 (1.2)	14 (4.3)	9 (2.7)	3 (0.93)	11 (3.4)	8 (2.4)
<i>Lactococcus</i>	536	19 (3.5)	57 (10.6)	59 (11)	12 (2.2)	70 (13.1)	66 (12.3)
<i>Leuconostoc</i>	102	1 (0.9)	14 (13.7)	16 (15.6)	0	8 (7.8)	20 (19.6)
<i>Pediococcus</i>	3	1 (33.3)	1 (33.3)	1 (33.3)	1 (33.3)	1 (33.3)	1 (33.3)
<i>Pichia</i>	3	0	0	0	0	1 (33.3)	0
<i>Pseudomonas</i>	34	3 (8.8)	4 (11.7)	1 (2.9)	2 (5.8)	2 (5.8)	1 (2.9)
<i>Raoultella</i>	4	2 (50)	1 (25)	0	0	1 (25)	0
<i>Staphylococcus</i>	96	4 (4.1)	0	1 (1.1)	4 (4.1)	2 (2.1)	3 (3.3)
<i>Streptococcus</i>	10	1 (10)	1 (10)	1 (10)	0	3 (30)	1 (10)
<i>Weissella</i>	8	0	0	1 (12.5)	1 (12.5)	0	2 (25)
<i>Yarrowia</i>	3	1 (33.3)	1 (33.3)	0	1 (33.3)	1 (33.3)	0
No identification	66	5 (7.5)	3 (4.5)	3 (4.5)	7 (10.6)	7 (10.6)	4 (6.1)
Other isolates	169	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total isolates	1450	73 (5.0)	119 (8.2)	118 (8.1)	55 (3.8)	135 (9.3)	132 (9.1)

^a Other isolates were: *Acinetobacter* (7), *Arthrobacter* (17), *Brachybacterium* (3), *Brevibacillus* (1), *Brevibacterium* (12), *Carnobacterium* (6), *Corynebacterium* (23), *Cryptococcus* (1), *Curtobacterium* (1), *Cutaneotrichosporon* (1), *Debaryomyces* (2), *Dietzia* (1), *Escherichia* (1), *Ewingella* (1), *Exiguobacterium* (1), *Galactomyces* (2), *Gordonia* (1), *Halomonas* (1), *Jeotgalicoccus* (9), *Kocuria* (10), *Leifsonia* (2), *Leucobacter* (8), *Macroccoccus* (11), *Microbacterium* (13), *Microcaccaceae* (4), *Micrococcus* (3), *Obesumbacterium* (2), *Ochrobactrum* (3), *Pantoea* (1), *Pseudoclavibacter* (2), *Psychrobacter* (8), *Renibacterium* (1), *Rhodococcus* (4), *Rothia* (2), *Stenotrophomonas* (5), and *Trichosporon* (1).

Table 3

Dairy isolates exhibiting inhibitory activity towards field *Salmonella* strains in milk medium and/or cheese medium and characterisation of the inhibition mechanism associated to cell-free supernatant from MSM cultures. ^a

UCMASt rain number	Identity	Percentage of field <i>Salmonella</i> isolates inhibited		Selected isolate	<i>Salmonella</i> Mbandaka growth inhibition (%) by cell- free supernatant			
		Milk	Cheese		Non-treated	Neutralised	Catalase- treated	Pronase- treated
1676	<i>Leuconostoc citreum</i>	90	25	Yes	99	0	0	0
3915	<i>Raoultella planticola</i>	95	35	Yes	99	0	0	0
4132	<i>Alcaligenes faecalis</i>	95	0	Yes	0	0	0	0
4441	<i>Lactococcus lactis</i>	80	30	Yes	61	0	0	0
5972	<i>Aerococcus urinaeequi</i>	85	20	Yes	99	97	0	99
13205	<i>Lactococcus lactis</i>	90	75	Yes	98	0	0	0
18022	<i>Lactococcus lactis</i>	85	40	Yes	99	0	0	0
18039	<i>Aerococcus urinaeequi</i>	85	65	Yes	99	98	0	99
1049	<i>Lactococcus lactis</i>	75	80	Yes	-	-	-	-
1495	<i>Lactococcus lactis</i>	30	90	Yes	-	-	-	-
4512	<i>Lactococcus raffinolactis</i>	45	85	Yes	-	-	-	-
6472	<i>Lactococcus lactis</i>	55	90	Yes	-	-	-	-
6731	<i>Aerococcus urinaeequi</i>	40	90	Yes	-	-	-	-
6761	<i>Aerococcus urinaeequi</i>	30	95	Yes	-	-	-	-
7402	<i>Pseudomonas lundensis</i>	55	100	Yes	-	-	-	-
9110	<i>Lactococcus lactis</i>	5	85	Yes	-	-	-	-
18010	<i>Aerococcus urinaeequi</i>	70	85	Yes	-	-	-	-
21104	<i>Lactococcus raffinolactis</i>	60	85	Yes	-	-	-	-
21105	<i>Streptococcus parauberis</i>	15	100	Yes	-	-	-	-
6078	<i>Aerococcus urinaeequi</i>	85	95	Yes	98	98	0	99
1151	<i>Lactococcus lactis</i>	80	100	Yes	100	0	0	0
1044	<i>Lactococcus lactis</i>	100	100	Yes	98	0	0	0
1053	<i>Lactococcus lactis</i>	95	90	Yes	99	0	0	0
1068	<i>Lactococcus lactis</i>	90	90	Yes	99	0	0	0
1594	<i>Lactococcus lactis</i>	80	90	Yes	99	0	0	0
4571	<i>Lactococcus lactis</i>	90	95	Yes	80	0	0	0
6360	<i>Lactococcus lactis</i>	85	80	Yes	99	0	0	0
8483	<i>Lactococcus lactis</i>	95	95	Yes	99	0	0	0
8501	<i>Lactococcus lactis</i>	90	100	Yes	99	0	0	0
9863	<i>Lactococcus lactis</i>	90	95	Yes	68	0	0	0
18036	<i>Aerococcus urinaeequi</i>	90	85	Yes	99	99	0	99
3066	<i>Lactobacillus plantarum</i>	0	0	No	-	-	-	-
4459	<i>Leuconostoc mesenteroides</i>	60	60	No	-	-	-	-
4460	<i>Leuconostoc mesenteroides</i>	60	55	No	-	-	-	-
4514	<i>Staphylococcus xylosus</i>	35	45	No	-	-	-	-
4515	<i>Weissella hellenica</i>	55	10	No	-	-	-	-
4546	<i>Leuconostoc mesenteroides</i>	35	25	No	-	-	-	-
4935	<i>Lactococcus lactis</i>	0	75	No	-	-	-	-
5042	<i>Lactococcus lactis</i>	5	40	No	-	-	-	-
5744	<i>Aerococcus urinaeequi</i>	75	65	No	-	-	-	-
7340	<i>Lactococcus lactis</i>	75	55	No	-	-	-	-
11210	<i>Yarrowia lipolytica</i>	0	15	No	-	-	-	-
11417	<i>Candida anglica</i>	25	0	No	-	-	-	-
12627	<i>Raoultella planticola</i>	65	15	No	-	-	-	-
12716	<i>Hafnia alvei</i>	5	0	No	-	-	-	-
18046	<i>Aerococcus urinaeequi</i>	50	55	No	-	-	-	-
21106	<i>Enterococcus faecalis</i>	35	15	No	-	-	-	-
21107	<i>Lactococcus lactis</i>	75	75	No	-	-	-	-
21108	<i>Streptococcus gallolyticus</i>	40	20	No	-	-	-	-

^a Isolate selected when able to inhibit at least 80% of field *Salmonella* strains - Non tested condition.