



HAL
open science

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 CC BY-NC 4.0 - Attribution - Non-commercial use - International License

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

3

4

5

6

7

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

10

11

12

13

14

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

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

17

18

19

20

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

22 *E-mail address*: margot.schuesselhuber@unicaen.fr (M. Schlüsselhuber)

23

24

25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39

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.

40 1. Introduction

41

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

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

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

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

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

79 Microorganisms other than LAB can also be used for biopreservation. One strain of
80 *Brevibacterium linens*, a bacterial species commonly used for cheese ripening, was shown to
81 have a protective effect against *Listeria* sp. in red smear cheese (Eppert, Valdés-Stauber,
82 Götz, Busse, & Scherer, 1997) and predicted bacteriocin biosynthesis genes were present in
83 most of the *Brevibacterium* strains previously investigated (Pham et al., 2017). In soft cheese,
84 a *Staphylococcus equorum* strain was able to inhibit *Listeria monocytogenes* growth by
85 producing a bacteriostatic substance (Carnio et al., 2000). Staphylococcal bacteriocins can
86 also be used to control *Staphylococcus aureus* in cheese (Miceli de Farias, dos Santos
87 Nascimento, Cabral da Silva Santos, & de Freire Bastos, 2019). In addition to bacteria, yeasts
88 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.

104

105 **2. Materials and methods**

106

107 *2.1. Microbial strains and growth conditions*

108

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*

114 CIP 104.583, were initially used as primary targets for a pre-screening procedure. Then, ten *S.*
115 Mbandaka and ten *S.* Montevideo strains, isolated from various farms in Normandy (France)
116 were further used for screening assays (Table 1). All the strains were routinely stored in 15%
117 glycerol at $-80\text{ }^{\circ}\text{C}$.

118 *Salmonella* strains were grown at $30\text{ }^{\circ}\text{C}$ for 24 h in Luria Bertani (LB) broth pH 7.5
119 made with 10 g L^{-1} casein pancreatic peptone (Biokar), 5 g L^{-1} yeast extract (Biokar) and 10 g
120 L^{-1} NaCl (Fisher). A total of 1,450 bacterial and yeast isolates from the UCMA collection
121 (Université de Caen Normandie, France), collected between 1978 and 2016 in dairy
122 environments from the Normandy region, were screened for inhibitory activities towards
123 *Salmonella* strains. All the screened isolates were routinely grown in brain heart infusion pH
124 7.4 (BHI, Conda), for 24 h at $30\text{ }^{\circ}\text{C}$ in Deepwell® from one colony. This medium was chosen
125 as it allows growth of most microbial groups investigated in this study, including Gram
126 positive and Gram negative bacteria, and yeasts.

127

128 2.2. *Development of a miniaturised method to screen microbial isolates for anti-* 129 *Salmonella activities*

130

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

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

146 Microtitre plates containing inoculated BHI agar and milk agar were then incubated at
147 30 °C for 24 h, and those containing inoculated cheese agar were incubated at 15 °C for 48 h.
148 After incubation, the resultant growth was killed by UV irradiation (0.124 J cm⁻²) for 15 min
149 (Daly et al., 2010). In each well, a 70 µL overlay of soft LB agar (0.8% agar) inoculated with
150 an overnight culture of *Salmonella* was added (final concentration of 10⁶ cfu mL⁻¹). All the
151 plates were incubated at 30 °C for 24 h (Fig. 1).

152 After the 24h-incubation step, *Salmonella* viability was revealed using a blue-dye
153 resazurin test. Resazurin dye was prepared extemporaneously in phosphate sodium buffer (pH
154 7.4) at a concentration of 0.05% (w/v) and sterilised using PES filter (0.22 µm pore size). In
155 each well, 20 µL of resazurin solution were deposited onto the agar surface. After 5 min at
156 room temperature, the coloration of the entire upper layer in each well was recorded and
157 compared with a positive control (*Salmonella* growth in LB agar) and a negative control
158 (sterile LB agar overlay). A pink colour revealed the viability of *Salmonella* whereas a blue
159 colour indicated its inhibition (Fig. 1). All the microbial isolates showing an antagonistic
160 activity (blue coloration of the well) were tested in duplicate to confirm the inhibition of
161 *Salmonella*.

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

165

166 2.3. Identification of the inhibition mechanisms of selected antagonist isolates

167

168 2.3.1. Detection of anti-*Salmonella* compounds in cell-free supernatants of antagonistic 169 isolates

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

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

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

187 applied to CFS, i.e., non-treated, neutralised, neutralised treated with catalase, and neutralised
188 treated with pronase. The CFS pH was neutralised to pH 7 with 6 N NaOH. The neutralised
189 CFS were treated with catalase (100 mg.mL⁻¹, Sigma) at 30 °C for 30 min, or pronase (100
190 mg.mL⁻¹, Serva) at 37 °C for 2 h. One hundred microlitres of treated (neutralised, catalase-
191 treated, or pronase-treated) or non-treated CFS were mixed with 100 µL *S. Mbandaka* CIP
192 105.859 LB culture, into microplate wells, reaching a final *Salmonella* concentration of
193 2.5×10⁶ cfu mL⁻¹. The microplates were incubated at 30 °C for 24 h. After incubation,
194 *Salmonella* inhibition was evaluated by comparing OD_{600nm} in control wells (*S. Mbandaka*
195 without CFS) and in assay wells containing both *S. Mbandaka* and CFS. Inhibition was
196 expressed by the OD_{600nm} ratio between assay and control. Non-treated CFS were considered
197 active against *Salmonella* when at least 80% inhibition were observed. The activity of treated
198 CFS was assessed in triplicate by comparing with the activity of non-treated CFS.

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

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

207

208 2.3.2. *Detection and quantification of major organic acids by high performance liquid* 209 *chromatography*

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

212 7.8 × 300 mm (Sepax). Elution was performed in an isocratic mode for 30 min using 5 mM
213 H₂SO₄ buffer as mobile phase and monitored at 210 nm. Active CFS of selected strains grown
214 in MSM medium were two fold diluted with mobile phase before injection of 10 µL. For
215 quantification of lactic and acetic acids in each CFS, acid standards were injected in
216 concentrations ranging from 2 mM to 64 mM (Sigma). Several standards of organic acids were
217 also injected at 64 mM to compare elution time with produced molecules in active CFS: citric
218 (Panreac), fumaric (Acros), formic (Sigma), butyric (Fluka), benzoic (Panreac), succinic
219 (Sigma) and phenyllactic acids (Sigma).

220

221 3. Results

222

223 3.1. Antagonistic activities of microbial isolates towards two *Salmonella* reference strains

224

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

232 Among the 1450 isolates, 93 (6.4%) were able to inhibit at least one *Salmonella*
233 reference strain in BHI. Seventy-three (5%) isolates inhibited *S.* Mbandaka CIP 105.859
234 whereas 55 (3.85%) inhibited *S.* Montevideo CIP 104.583 strain in this medium. Thirty-five
235 (2.4%) isolates inhibited both *Salmonella* strains in these conditions.

236 In milk medium, 119 isolates (8.2%) inhibited *S. Mbandaka* CIP 105.859 and 135
237 (9.3%) inhibited *S. Montevideo* CIP 104.583. In this medium, 61 isolates (4.2%) displayed an
238 antagonistic activity against the two *Salmonella* strains.

239 In cheese medium, results were similar to those obtained in milk medium. A total of
240 118 (8.1%) isolates were active against *S. Mbandaka* CIP 105.859 and 132 (9.1%) against *S.*
241 *Montevideo* CIP 104.583 (Table 2). Forty-four isolates (3%) inhibited both *Salmonella*
242 strains. Antagonistic isolates were different depending on the medium and on the *Salmonella*
243 strains.

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

253

254 3.2. *Screening of selected isolates against 20 Salmonella strains originating from dairy*
255 *environments.*

256

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

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

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

270

271 3.2.1. Inhibition mechanisms of the active isolates in milk and cheese media

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

285 All the active CFS, which pH ranged between 4.5 and 6.5, lost their inhibitory activity
286 against the pathogen after pH neutralisation except for the four *Aerococcus* isolates.
287 According to these results, the inhibition mechanism of these isolates could be related to the
288 production of organic acids combined with a pH effect. For the four *Aerococcus* sp. UCMA
289 5972, UCMA 18036, UCMA 18039 and UCMA 6078 strains, CFS was still active with
290 pronase treatment, but not with catalase treatment. This suggest that the anti-*Salmonella*
291 activity was mainly due to the production of hydrogen peroxide. This production was
292 confirmed by H₂O₂ Dosatest® strips, with quantities produced ranging from 30 to 100 mg L⁻¹
293 depending on the supernatant. After pronase treatment, all neutralised CFS kept their
294 inhibitory activity. Therefore, none of the antagonistic activities were related to the presence
295 of proteinaceous compounds such as bacteriocins. A drop-collapse assay was performed on
296 non-treated CFS to reveal the production of biosurfactants. None of the strains appeared to
297 produce such molecules.

298

299 3.2.2. Assessment of organic acids involved in *Aerococcus* anti-*Salmonella* activity

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

308

309 4. Discussion

310

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

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

333 Over the 1450 microbial isolates tested in the current study, most of them were LAB
334 (1004 out of 1450) and especially of the *Lactococcus* genus (37%). Interestingly, a higher

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

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

355 LAB, especially *Lactococcus*, *Lactobacillus* and *Leuconostoc*, are well-known for
356 their antagonistic activities against pathogens (El Kheir et al., 2018; Lindgren & Dobrogosz,
357 1990) and were confirmed as such in this study. Additionally, some isolates belonging to the
358 *Enterococcus*, *Pediococcus*, *Streptococcus* and *Weissella* genera exhibited a predictable
359 inhibitory activity. The anti-*Salmonella* activity of a large proportion of LAB isolates

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

437

438 **5. Conclusions**

439

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

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

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

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

463

464 **Acknowledgements**

465

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

470

471 **References**

472

473 Abraham, E. P., Chain, E., Fletcher, C. M., Gardner, A. D., Heatley, N. G., Jennings, M. A. et
474 al. (1941). Further observations on penicillin. *Lancet*, 238, 177–189.

475 Ben Said, L., Gaudreau, H., Dallaire, L., Tessier, M., & Fliss, I. (2019). Bioprotective culture:
476 A new generation of food additives for the preservation of food quality and safety.
477 *Industrial Biotechnology*, 15, 138–147.

478 Carnio, M. C., Hölzel, A., Rudolf, M., Henle, T., Jung, G., & Scherer, S. (2000). The
479 macrocyclic peptide antibiotic micrococcin P1 is secreted by the food-borne bacterium
480 *Staphylococcus equorum* WS 2733 and inhibits *Listeria monocytogenes* on soft
481 cheese. *Applied and Environmental Microbiology*, 66, 2378–2384.

482 Casabianca, F., & Jeanneaux, P. (2020). Le lait cru: créateur de valeurs ajoutées et partagées ?
483 Colloq. Fromag. Au Lait Cru Entre Risques Bénéfices Divers. Au Cœur Débat
484 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., & Bonnarme, 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., Brzywczy-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

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

614 Vacheyrou, M. (2011). *Cultivable microbial communities in raw cow milk and potential*
615 *transfers from stables of sixteen French farms*.
616 [https://reader.elsevier.com/reader/sd/pii/S0168160511001139?token=49998D16A356](https://reader.elsevier.com/reader/sd/pii/S0168160511001139?token=49998D16A356926F254C806C4EAD7CD33FA720C518B666B3B9C7CB91093A9D16B2762E44278FC06392177D342B4DE1DF)
617 [926F254C806C4EAD7CD33FA720C518B666B3B9C7CB91093A9D16B2762E4427](https://reader.elsevier.com/reader/sd/pii/S0168160511001139?token=49998D16A356926F254C806C4EAD7CD33FA720C518B666B3B9C7CB91093A9D16B2762E44278FC06392177D342B4DE1DF)
618 [8FC06392177D342B4DE1DF](https://reader.elsevier.com/reader/sd/pii/S0168160511001139?token=49998D16A356926F254C806C4EAD7CD33FA720C518B666B3B9C7CB91093A9D16B2762E44278FC06392177D342B4DE1DF). Accessed December 12, 2019.

619 Verdier-Metz, I., Gagne, G., Bornes, S., Monsallier, F., Veisseire, P., Delbès-Paus, C., et al.
620 (2012). Cow teat skin, a potential source of diverse microbial populations for cheese
621 production. *Applied and Environmental Microbiology*, 78, 326–333.

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

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

628 Yanze Kontchou, C., & Blondeau, R. (1990). Isolation and characterization of hydrogen
629 peroxide producing *Aerococcus* sp. from soil samples. *FEMS Microbiology Letters*,
630 68, 323–328.

631

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)

^aOther 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.