Inactivation of Escherichia coli 0157:H7, Salmonellae, and Campylobacter jejuni in Raw Ground Beef by Gamma Irradiation

M. ROCELLE S. CLAVERO, J. DAVID MONK, LARRY R. BEUCHAT,* MICHAEL P. DOYLE, AND ROBERT E. BRACKETT

> Center for Food Safety and Quality Enhancement and Department of Food Science and Technology, University of Georgia, Griffin, Georgia 30223-1797

> > Received 7 February 1994/Accepted 5 April 1994

aw ground beef patties inoculated with stationary-phase cells of *Escherichia coli* 0157:H7, salmonellae, or coli

aw ground beef patties inoculated with stationary-phase cells for Escherichia coli 0157:H7, salmonellae, or α Campylobacter jejuni were subjected to gamma irradiation (α) treatment, with doses ranging from α to α , α kGy. The influence of two levels of fat (8 to 14% [low fat] and 27 to 28% [high fat]) and temperature (frozen $[-17$ to -15°C and refrigerated [3 to 5°C]) on the inactivation of each pathogen by irradiation was investigated. In ascending order of irradiation resistance, the D_{10} values ranged from 0.175 to 0.235 kGy (C. jejuni), from 0.241 to 0.307 kGy (E. coli O157:H7), and from 0.618 to 0.800 kGy (salmonellae). Statistical j uni), from 0.241 to 0.307 kGy (E. coli O157:H1), and from 0.010 kGy (salmonellae). Statistical sta nalysis revealed that E. coli 0157:H7 had a significantly (P < 0.05) higher D_{10} value when irradiated at -17
\ -15°C than when irradiated at 3 to 5°C. Regardless of the temperature during irradiation, the level of fat to -15° C than when irradiated at 3 to 5°C. Regardless of the temperature during irradiation, the level of fat did not have a significant effect on the D_{10} value. Salmonellae behaved like *E. coli* O157:H7 in lowtemperature did not have a significant effect when the pathogen was irradiated in high-fat ground beef. Significantly higher D_{10} values were calculated for C. jejuni irradiated in frozen than in refrigerated low-fat beef. C. jejuni was more resistant to irradiation in low-fat beef than in high-fat beef when treatment was at -17 beef. C. jejuni was more resistant to irradiation in low-fat beef than in high-fat beef when treatment was at -17 $t = 15$ °C. Regardless of the fat level and temperature during inactivation, these pathogens were ingitive sensitive to ϵ_0 in ϵ_0 in ϵ_0 in ϵ_0 is ϵ_0 in ϵ_0 in ϵ_0 in ϵ_0 is ϵ_0 in ϵ_0 in $\$ gamma irradiation. An applied dose of 2.5 kgy would be sufficient to kill 10 $^{\circ}$. Coli 0157.117, 103 ' samon-trace, and higher there is a statement of α salmonellation of particles would be sufficient the second thr and 1010. C. jejuni, resulting in a mgu probability of complete inactivation of populations much inglice than those occasionally present in ground beef patties.

Gamma irradiation has been used as a method of preserving foods in several countries, including Belgium, France, Japan, and the Netherlands (12). The process involves exposing the food to a specific dose of ionizing irradiation from, for example, ${}^{60}Co$, a radioisotope of cobalt (21). Irradiation is known to initiate a chain of events leading to the impairment of structural or metabolic functions, such as fragmentation of DNA and the eventual death of microbial cells $(4, 15)$, thus improving the microbiological quality of foods by reducing the number of spoilage and pathogenic microorganisms. Unlike thermal inactivation, irradiation at low doses does not significantly alter the sensory quality of foods (17) . In 1985, the U.S. Food and Drug Administration approved the use of irradiation (1.0 kGy) to control Trichinella spiralis in pork (7) . The use of 3.0 kGy for poultry, largely to eliminate salmonellae, was authorized in 1990 (8). Current regulations, however, do not permit irradiation treatment to preserve beef.

Due to recent outbreaks of foodborne illness associated with the ingestion of undercooked ground beef containing *Esche* $richia coli$ O157:H7, there has been renewed interest in the use of ionizing irradiation to ensure the microbiological safety of foods. Studies have shown that irradiation can be an effective means of controlling human pathogens such as salmonellae (26), Campylobacter jejuni (13) , E. coli O157:H7 (24), Listeria monocytogenes (11) and, at much higher doses, Clostridium botulinum (2) in poultry. The efficacy of irradiation treatment in eliminating potential pathogens in vacuum-packaged fresh beef cuts (16) and ground beef (27) has also been reported.

Several factors influence the resistance of microorganisms to inactivation by irradiation. Examples include the chemical inactivation by indication by include the chemical theoretical the chemical conductation. Examples include the chemical conductation \mathbf{r} composition and the physical state of the suspending medium (14), the temperature during irradiation, water activity (6), and the physiological state of the cells (19) . Anellis et al. (1) reported that the D_{10} value of *Streptococcus faecium* increased from 0.09 to 0.38 kGy when the temperature during irradiation treatment was reduced from 5 to -196° C. Proteinaceous substances can also provide a protective effect against irradiation (5), and the presence of α , β -unsaturated carbonyl compounds in meat can sensitize bacterial cells to irradiation (18). Bacterial cells lyophilized in ground beef are reported to be less resistant to irradiation than cells lyophilized in a culture medium (14) .

To date, irradiation inactivation studies with pathogenic bacteria have been largely done with small, laboratory-scale irradiators. Realizing that microbial response to irradiation can be influenced by intrinsic and extrinsic factors, we determined the independent and interacting effects of fat content in raw ground beef and of temperature on rates of inactivation of $E.$ coli O157:H7, salmonellae, and $C.$ jejuni. To the extent possible, the investigation was done under commercial beef processing and irradiation treatment conditions, in order to obtain information with the greatest potential for practical obtain in the greater industry \mathbf{r} is positive potential for practical for practical for practical for practical for practical for \mathbf{r} $\frac{1}{2}$

MATERIALS AND METHODS
Determination of growth curves for test pathogens. Bacteria in the stationary phase of growth were used as inocula for ground beef. Hence, studies were initially done to determine growth curves for all strains (serovars) of test pathogens.

 $E.$ coli O157:H7 strains used were CA1 (raw ground beef isolate), E0019 (calf feces isolate), 505B (beef isolate), 932 h uman feces isolate), and 204P (pork isolate). Each strain was ultured individually in tryptic sov broth, pH 7.3 (Difco, cultured individually in tryptic soy broth, pH α 7.3 (Difformation α

^{*} Corresponding author. Phone: (404) 412-4740. Fax: (404) 229-

Detroit, Mich.), at 37°C. Cultures were transferred by loop at 24-h intervals, twice in 10 ml of tryptic soy broth in screw-cap test tubes (16 by 150 mm) and a third time in 50 ml of tryptic soy broth in a 250 -ml Erlenmeyer flask. Samples (1.0 ml) were withdrawn from cultures at 4-h intervals over a 32-h incubation period at 37° C. Serial dilutions (1:10) in sterile 0.1% peptone $(pH 7.0)$ were prepared, and appropriate dilutions (0.1 ml) were surface spread in duplicate on tryptic soy agar (Difco). Colonies were counted after 24 to 48 h of incubation at 37° C.

Salmonella serovars used were USDA SB-1 (Salmonella dublin, raw chicken isolate), obtained from Stan Bailey, USDA-ARS Russell Research Center, Athens, Ga.; CDC-2550-71 (S. dublin, cow isolate), obtained from the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, Atlanta, Ga.; D1439 (Salmonella enteritidis, human feces isolate), obtained from James Dickson, Iowa State University, Ames; and ST (Salmonella typhimurium, cow isolate) and S11 (S. typhimurium, human feces isolate), from our laboratory stock culture collection. Two serovars each of S. dublin and S. typhimurium were examined because of their high incidence among bovine isolates. Each serovar was individually cultured by the procedure described above for E . coli $O157$:H7.

The strains of C. jejuni used were D484 (beef isolate) and EDL2 (cow feces isolate), obtained from the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, and CR01, A74C, and SP92 (chicken isolates), obtained from Norman Stern, USDA-ARS Russell Research Center. Each strain was individually cultured in brucella broth (BB), pH 7.0 (Difco), supplemented with ferrous sulfate (F) $(0.5 \text{ g liter}^{-1})$, sodium bisulfite (B) $(0.2 \text{ g}$ f (iter⁻¹), and pyruvic acid (P) (0.5 g liter⁻¹) (BB-FBP). Three consecutive 24-h transfers using loop inocula were made in 10 ml of BB-FBP in screw-cap test tubes (16 by 150 mm). A fourth 24-h transfer of 0.1 ml was made in 100 ml of BB-FBP in a 250-ml Erlenmeyer flask. All tubes and flasks were incubated at 42°C under a microaerophilic atmosphere (5% oxygen, 10% $CO₂$, and 85% nitrogen). Samples (1.0 ml) were withdrawn from cultures at 4-h intervals over a 32-h incubation period. Serial dilutions $(1:10)$ in 0.1 M potassium phosphate-buffered saline (PBS), pH 7.2, were prepared and surface plated (0.1 ml) in duplicate on brucella agar (Difco) supplemented with FBP. Plates were incubated at 42° C under a microaerophilic atmosphere, and colonies were counted after 30 to 48 h.

Preparation of inocula for ground beef. Strains (serovars) of each test pathogen were cultured according to the procedure described for the growth curve analyses. Cultures were grown for 29 to 31 h to obtain cells in the stationary phase of growth. Cells from E. coli O157:H7 and Salmonella cultures were collected by centrifugation $(5,000 \times g, 20 \text{ min})$ at 21^oC, whereas cells from C. jejuni cultures were harvested at 5° C. Pellets were resuspended in sterile 0.1% peptone (E. coli $O157:H7$ and salmonellae) or 0.1 M potassium PBS solution, pH 7.2 (C. jejuni). Suspensions of cells of each test pathogen were combined in a mixture (80 ml) containing approximately equal populations of each strain (serovar). ϵ quar populations of each strain (serovar).

Equally been Naw ground (2.36 min) . fat (8.2 to 13.9%) and high fat (26.8 to 27.1%), was obtained from a commercial beef processor and stored at -18° C at the Center for Food Safety and Quality Enhancement until used. Storage time did not exceed 5 weeks. Prior to inoculation with a five-strain mixture of each test pathogen, ground beef was thawed at 1 to 3° C over a 2-day period.

Fat and moisture contents (percent) of ground beef were measured using a CEM Fat and Moisture Analyzer (CEM Corp., Matthews, N.C.). Protein content was estimated from the nitrogen content, determined by the Kjeldahl method, by using a conversion factor of 6.25 (29).

Inoculation and preparation of beef patties. Five-strain (serovar) mixtures of each pathogen were tested in separate experiments. Cell suspensions (40 ml) were inoculated into 3,100 g of low- or high-fat ground beef (2 to 4° C). After thorough hand mixing (hands were protected with latex gloves). of the inoculated ground beef, patties (100 g) (9.5 by 1.2 cm) were prepared with a home-style hamburger press (M. E. Heuck Co., Cincinnati, Ohio). Individual patties were placed in polyethylene stomacher bags, heat sealed, and labeled. Individual packages were placed in a freezer $(-16^{\circ}C)$ or refrigerator $(4^{\circ}C)$ within 40 min after inoculation of the test pathogen.

Handling of inoculated beef before irradiation. After 20 to 22 h at freezing or refrigeration temperature, patties were packed in styrofoam containers (Liafoam, Baltimore, Md.) and placed in insulated coolers (Rubbermaid, Gott Corp., Winfield, Kan.). Separate coolers were used for frozen and refrigerated patties. To maintain the temperature of the patties during transport, Polar packs (-18°C) (Midlands Chemical Co., Omaha, Neb.) were placed between styrofoam containers. The coolers were sealed, transported to Vindicator, Inc., Mulberry, Fla., and placed in a freezer $(-17$ to -15° C) or refrigerator (3 to 5° C). The time elapsed between removal of patties from frozen or refrigerated storage at the Center for Food Safety and Quality Enhancement and arrival at Vindicator, Inc. was 5 to 6 h.

Irradiation treatment. Eight ground beef patties (two lowfat frozen, two low-fat refrigerated, two high-fat frozen, and two high-fat refrigerated) were placed in a cardboard box $(21.5$ by $21.\overline{5}$ by 4.0 cm). Patties from each of the four treatment combinations (two fat levels and two temperatures) were placed on the bottom of the box. A sheet of cardboard (21.2 by 21.2 cm) was placed on top of the patties, and an additional four patties were placed on top in such a way that when a low-fat frozen patty was at the bottom, a high-fat refrigerated patty was on the top. Three boxes fitted with lids were prepared. Each box constituted one replicate. Gammachrome YR dosimeters (Harwell Laboratory, Atomic Energy Authority, United Kingdom) were placed in a central position on the top external side of the lids of boxes representing replicates 1 and 2 and on the bottom external side of a third box (replicate 3) to determine the actual dose absorbed by the patties. The three stacked boxes were centered on top of a 10-cm-thick styrofoam block placed on a turntable $(2.3$ rpm) approximately styroloam block placed on a turntable $(z, 3$ 1pm) approximately $z\bar{z}$ can from the \sim to magnation source. The patties were exposed to gamma irradiation at the desired doses of 0.5, 1.0, 1.5, 2.0, 2.5, and 3.0 kGy. Twenty-four unirradiated ground beef patties (three replicates of eight [two low-fat frozen, two low-fat refrigerated, two high-fat frozen, and two high-fat refrigerated]), subjected to the same storage, transport, and handling conditions as the irradiated patties, served as the control (0 irradiation dose). Actual doses applied are listed in Table 1. $\frac{1 \text{a}}{1 \text{b}}$

 \sum_{1} uniform application of treatment, they are not suitable for treating commercial-size lots of ground beef. All irradiation
treatments were therefore done at a facility (Vindicator, Inc.) treatments were therefore done at a facinty (vindicator, file.) with a commercial-size \sim Co Gamma beam \sim \sim magnator (Nordion International Inc., Kanata, Ontario, Canada). The dosimetry system used and the equipment for measuring the dose absorbed by beef patties were calibrated according to national standards established by the National Institute of Standards and Technology. Determination of the density of the boxes of patties was a part of this standard procedure.

Handling of inoculated beef after irradiation. Immediately after gamma irradiation treatment, individual packages of beef patties were labeled with the dose applied and were returned

Pathogen	Actual dose for ground-beef patties after application of desired dose (kGy):						
	0.5	1.0		2.0	2.5	3.0	
E. coli Q157:H7	0.401(0.007)	0.605(0.025)	0.975(0.119)	1.307(0.089)	1.971(0.081)	2.165(0.276)	
Salmonellae	0.400(0.008)	0.663(0.043)	0.983(0.089)	1.327(0.139)	1.799 (0.174)	2.201(0.223)	
C. jejuni	0.412(0.007)	0.709(0.028)	1.099 (0.042)	1.569(0.062)	2.082(0.053)	2.410(0.076)	

TABLE 1. Desired and actual (absorbed) gamma irradiation doses for ground beef patties inoculated with test pathogens^a

a Actual doses are the average of three replication. Values in parentheses indicates

to frozen (-17 to -14 °C) or refrigerated (2 to 5°C) storage at the Vindicator facility. After all treatments were administered, the patties were packed in styrofoam boxes and coolers in a manner identical to that described above. The coolers were transported back to the Center for Food Safety and Quality Enhancement within 6 h and were held frozen or refrigerated for 12 to 14 h. Frozen (-17 to -14° C) patties were thawed at 21 to 23°C (1 to 2 h) in preparation for microbiological analysis. Refrigerated $(4^{\circ}C)$ patties were subjected to microbiological analysis without any adjustment in temperature.

Microbiological analyses. Viable populations of cells in 29to 31-h cultures of each strain (serovar) of test pathogen, as well as populations in the cell suspensions of five-strain $(s$ erovar) mixtures, were determined. Each ground beef patty (100 g) inoculated with E . coli O157:H7 or salmonellae was combined with sterile 0.1% peptone water (200 ml) at 21 to 23 $^{\circ}$ C; 0.1 M potassium PBS (pH 7.2) was used as a diluent for enumerating viable cells of \tilde{C} . jejuni in each patty. Uninoculated (control) samples were also analyzed for the presence of each test pathogen. Beef and diluent were pummelled at medium speed in a Stomacher 400 Laboratory Blender (Teckman, Cincinnati, Ohio) for 1 min. Serial dilutions (1:10, 0.1 ml) were prepared and surface plated in duplicate on an appropriate enumeration medium. Populations of mesophilic aerobic bacteria in uninoculated ground beef were also determined.

 $E.$ coli O157:H7. Appropriate serial dilutions (0.1 ml) of pummelled beef and peptone diluent were surface plated on sorbitol MacConkey agar (pH 7.1) (Unipath-Oxoid U.S., Columbia, Md.) supplemented with 4-methylumbelliferyl-B-Dglucuronide (MUG) (0.2 g liter⁻¹). The MUG reagent was added to heat-sterilized (121°C, 15 min), molten (47 to 50°C) sorbitol MacConkey agar. Colonies typical of E. coli O157:H7 s_{c} (sorbitol-negative, MUG-negative) were counted after incubation at 37° C for 20 to 22 h. Randomly selected colonies were confirmed as $E.$ coli O157:H7 by microscopic examination and by the API-20E miniaturized diagnostic kits (Analytab Division. Sherwood Medical, Plainview, N.Y.), the E . coli O157 latex agglutination assay (Unipath-Oxoid U.S.), and the Bacto $E.$ coli antiserum H7 assay (Difco).

Salmonellae. Diluted, pummelled samples (0.1 ml) were surface plated on bismuth sulfite agar (pH 7.6) (Difco). Plates were incubated at 37°C for 48 h, and colonies typical of Salmonella spp. were counted. Random presumptive colonies were confirmed by microscopic examination and by appropriate biochemical tests (9).

 C . jejuni. Diluted samples (0.1 ml) were surface plated on BB-FBP agar supplemented with 50 ml of defibrinated horse blood (Lampire Biologicals, Pipersville, Pa.), $0.33 \mu g$ of cefoperazone (Cefobid, Pfizer, Inc., New York, N.Y.) ml⁻¹ and 200 µg of cycloheximide (Sigma, St. Louis, Mo.) ml⁻¹. Sterile defibrinated horse blood and antibiotics were added to 950 ml of heat-sterilized (121°C, 15 min), cooled (50°C) basal medium before the molten agar was dispensed into plates. Colonies which formed on plates incubated at 42°C under a microaerophilic atmosphere between 24 and 36 h were counted and recorded as presumptive *C. jejuni*. Randomly selected colonies were confirmed by microscopic examination and by appropriate biochemical tests (22).

Mesophilic aerobic microorganisms. Uninoculated ground beef (100 g) was combined with 200 ml of 0.1% peptone, pummelled at medium speed with a stomacher for 1 min, and surface plated $(0.1 \text{-} \text{ml} \text{ amounts})$ in duplicate on plate count agar (Difco). Plates were incubated at 30° C for 48 h before colonies were counted.

Statistical analysis. Each treatment combination, i.e., pathogen, fat level, irradiation temperature, and irradiation dose, was done in triplicate. Two patties per treatment combination were analyzed, and microbiological analyses were done in duplicate. The number of survivors of each pathogen after gamma irradiation treatment, expressed as log_{10} CFU/g of beef, was plotted against the irradiation dose. A regression line was fitted to sets of data by using the regression procedure of the SAS statistical package (20) . For each pathogen, six regression lines were generated for each patty, replicate, and treatment combination. In those instances where inactivation curves were characterized by tailing (salmonellae and C . *iejuni*), regression lines were also fitted to data points that did not contribute to tailing. Regression coefficients, slopes, and 95% confidence limits were determined for all regression lines.

The irradiation resistance of each pathogen subjected to each treatment combination was assessed by calculating the D_{10} values obtained by taking the negative reciprocal of the slope for each regression line. This procedure yielded six D_{10} values for each pathogen. D_{10} values were then compared by using a general linear model (20), and differences between mean D_{10} values were determined using Duncan's multiple range test. An analysis of variance was also conducted to determine if D_{10} values were affected by the omission of datum points responsible for the tailing or shouldering of the inactivation curves.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Chemical composition and microbiological quality of raw ground beef. The fat, protein, and moisture contents of ground beef used in experiments involving each test pathogen are

TABLE 2. Fat, protein, and moisture contents of ground beef before inoculation with test pathogens

	Level of fat		Component $(\%)$	
Pathogen		Fat	Protein	Moisture
E. coli Q157:H7	Low	13.9	18.0	67.3
	High	27.1	15.2	56.3
Salmonellae	Low	12.5	18.5	68.0
	High	27.5	15.2	55.2
C. jejuni	Low	8.2	19.3	70.3
	High	26.8	16.0	56.0

^a Five-strain mixture.

 b Populations of aerobic mesophilic microorganisms in ground beef were determined before inoculation with test pathogens. Populations of pathogens</sup> exermined before inoculation with test pathogens. Populations of pathogens were determined within 10 min after inoculating 3,100 g of ground beef with 40 $\frac{1}{10}$ motion.

listed in Table 2. The amount of fat ranged from 8.2 to 13.9% in low-fat beef and from 26.8 to 27.5% in high-fat beef. Although the effectiveness of ionizing doses of gamma irradiation to inactivate pathogenic bacteria could be influenced by the levels of protein and moisture, only the influence of two substantially different levels of fat, in low- and high-fat products, was investigated. Urbain (28), however, suggested that in aqueous environments the lethal effect of irradiation increases because more free radicals are produced. Proteins and carbohydrates tend to have a protective effect as they compete with bacteria for interaction with free radicals produced during hydrolysis of water. Further studies would have to be conducted to determine their influence on the irradiation inactivation of microorganisms. valion of microorganisms.

required on acroone, μ ations of all in the matter mesophilic mesophilic microorganisms in unit, μ is μ in the unit of μ $\frac{1}{2}$ counts ranged from To $\frac{1}{2}$ to $\frac{1}{2}$ colors colonic colonic

FIG. 1. Growth curves for 5 strains (serovars) of E. coli O157:H7, \cdots . Growth curves for \mathcal{F}_1 strains (see our \mathcal{F}_2) of E. coli \mathcal{F}_2

FIG. 2. Irradiation inactivation curves for E. coli O157:H7 inoculated in high-fat frozen, high-fat refrigerated, low-fat frozen, and low-fat refrigerated ground beef. Shaded areas indicate 95% confidence limits. low-fact refrigeration-fact refrigeration between \mathcal{S}_1 shaded areas indicate 95% confidential \mathcal{S}_2

beef generally contained lower populations of aerobic mesophiles than did high-fat ground beef. Regardless of the fat content, however, the ground beef used in this study had lower aerobic, mesophilic counts than ground beef sold in retail stores (10). Freshly prepared commercial ground beef has been reported to contain aerobic mesophiles between $10^{4.51}$ and $10^{6.48}$ CFU/g. None of the test pathogens was detected in uninoculated ground beef. and 106-48 CHU/g. None of the test pathogens was detected in the test pathogens was detected in \mathcal{L}

unive analyses. bacterial cells have been shown to influence their response to

FIG. 3. Irradiation inactivation curves for salmonellae inoculated
in high-fat frozen, high-fat refrigerated, low-fat frozen, and low-fat refrigerated ground beef. Shaded areas indicate 95% confidence limits. i frozen, j frozen, and low-fat frozen, and low-fat frozen, and low-fat j

high-fat frozen, high-fat refrigerated, low-fat frozen, and low-fat high-fat frozen, high-fat refrigerated, low-fat frozen, and low-fat refrigerated ground beef. Shaded areas indicate 95% confidence limits.

ionizing radiation. Stapleton (19) reported that the irradiation resistance of *E. coli* is highest during the lag phase of growth, decreases during the logarithmic phase, and increases again during the stationary phase of growth. Although bacterial cells in the logarithmic growth phase are generally more sensitive to stress than are stationary-phase cells, there are some exceptions. Lambert and Maxcy (13) reported that the irradiation resistance of C. jejuni cells was not affected by age. In any case, it was desirable to know the growth phase of cells used to inoculate ground beef. Growth curves for E . coli O157:H7, salmonellae, and C. jejuni are shown in Fig. 1. After 29 to 31 h, all cultures were in a stationary phase of growth. E. coli O157:H7 and salmonellae reached the stationary phase within 8 h, whereas 16 to 20 h was required for *C. jejuni*.

Populations of pathogens in the inocula and in ground beef immediately after inoculation are listed in Table 3. All inocula contained more than 10⁹ CFU/ml. Slight decreases in populations of viable cells would be expected to occur during holding times between inoculation and irradiation $(43 \text{ to } 45 \text{ h})$ and between irradiation and analysis (24 to 25 h). To minimize any effect of transport or handling conditions, control patties $\frac{1}{2}$ $\sum_{i=1}^{n}$

transport and handling conditions as patties treated with amma irradiation.
C

Gamma irradiation inactivation curves. Irradiation inactivation curves were obtained for E . *coli* O157:H7 (Fig. 2), salmonellae, (Fig. 3), and *C. jejuni* (Fig. 4) subjected to all combinations of test parameters, i.e., low- and high-fat beef combinations of test parameters, i.e., low- and ingilate beef $\frac{1}{2}$ is $\frac{1}{2}$ to $\frac{1}{2}$ and 3 to 3°C. Shaded areas in these figures indicate 95% confidence limits. Regression coefficients for all treatments were high (\geq 0.989). Regardless of test parameters, a reduction in population with increasing irradia p_{max} a reduction in population with increasing irradiation doses was observed. Tailing of inactivation curves was observed for salmonellae subjected to all combinations of test parameters and for *C. jejuni* in high-fat refrigerated ground beef, as indicated by the dashed lines in Fig. 3 and 4, respectively. Tailing of curves may have been due to differences in the irradiation resistance of test cells. A mutant strain of S. typhimurium LT2 exhibiting resistance to irradiation has been reported by Davis and Sinskey (3). Slight differences in the physiological age of cells or the distribution of cells in the physiological age of cells of the distribution of cells in ground beef may also have contributed to tailing of inactiva-

tion curves.
 D_{10} values (kGy) for the three pathogens in low- and high-fat frozen and refrigerated ground beef are listed in Table 4. Values were calculated for inactivation curves with and without tailing. Statistical analysis revealed that there was no significant difference ($P \le 0.05$) in the D_{10} values obtained for the two types of curves. D_{10} values for the pathogens ranged from 0.241 to 0.307 kGy for E. coli O157:H7, from 0.621 to $f(x) = 800 \text{ kGy for all non-elles and from } 0.175 \text{ to } 0.235 \text{ kGy for } C$ $\frac{1}{2}$ for salmonelist, and from $\frac{1}{2}$ to $\frac{1}{2}$ for C.

Our study indicates that D_{10} values for pathogens in frozen ground beef were generally higher than those calculated for refrigerated beef. Regardless of the fat level, significantly ($P \leq$ 0.05) higher D_{10} values were observed for E. coli O157:H7 when irradiated at -17 to -15° C than when irradiated at 3 to 5° C. A similar effect of temperature was reported by Thayer et al. (26). D_{10} values for E. coli O157:H7 in mechanically deboned chicken irradiated at 5 and -5° C were 0.26 kGy and 0.42 kGy, respectively. The protective effect of low temperature may be attributed to the suppression of indirect debilitating effects of reactive intermediates, primarily \cdot OH radicals resulting from water hydrolysis. Freezing immobilizes water molecules, and as a consequence, the diffusion of free radicals is restricted (4) .

At a given irradiation temperature, the level of fat did not have a significant effect on D_{10} values for E. coli O157:H7. Thayer and Boyd (24) also observed that large variations in the fat contents and the protein contents of mechanically deboned hicken meat and finely ground lean beef did not alter the chicken meat and finely ground lean beef did not alter the

TABLE 4. D_{10} values of pathogenic bacteria in low- and high-fat ground beef["]

	D_{10} values (kGy) of bacteria in:					
Pathogen		Low-fat beef		High-fat beef		
	Frozen	Refrigerated	Frozen	Refrigerated		
E. coli O157:H7	0.307 a (0.015)	0.241 b (0.012)	0.305 a (0.023)	0.251 b (0.028)		
Salmonellae						
With tailing	0.800 a (0.054)	$0.624 \text{ c} (0.089)$	0.745 ab (0.057)	0.661 bc (0.031)		
Without tailing	0.756 a (0.057)	0.621 b(0.027)	0.675 ab (0.060)	0.618 b (0.028)		
C. jejuni						
With tailing	0.235 a (0.017)	0.175c(0.005)	0.207 b (0.016)	0.199 bc (0.017)		
Without tailing	0.235 a (0.017)	0.175 c (0.005)	0.207 b(0.016)	0.178c(0.017)		

TABLE 5. Populations of pathogens that would theoretically be
killed in ground beef by treatment with gamma irradiation^a

	Population (log_{10} CFU/g) killed by:					
Pathogen	0.5 kGy	$1.0\ \mathrm{kGy}$	$1.5\ \mathrm{kGy}$	$2.0\ \mathrm{kGy}$	2.5 kGy	
E. coli O157:H7 Salmonellae C. jejuni	1.64 0.62 2.13	3.26 1.25 4.26	4.89 1.88 6.38	6.51 2.50 8.51	8.14 3.13 10.64	

" Calculated on the basis of the highest D_{10} value for each pathogen (Table 4). Population killed (theoretical value) = dose $\div D_{10}$ value.

sensitivity of E. coli O157:H7 to gamma irradiation. The D_{10} value of E. coli O157:H7 in ground beef at 5°C was reported to be 0.27 kGy.

Salmonellae behaved like E . coli O157:H7 in low-fat beef, but temperature did not have a significant effect on the D_{10} value when the pathogen was in high-fat beef. D_{10} values for salmonellae were 2.4- to 2.6-fold higher than D_{10} values for E. coli O157:H7. D_{10} values for Salmonella spp. have been reported to range from 0.38 to 0.77 kGy at 2° C in mechanically deboned chicken (25), whereas a D_{10} value of 0.57 kGy has been observed for the pathogen in ground beef treated at 18 to 20° C (23). At any given temperature, during irradiation, the level of fat did not significantly influence D_{10} values for salmonellae.

Significantly higher D_{10} values were calculated for C. jejuni in frozen than in refrigerated high-fat beef. The D_{10} values for C. jejuni suspended in high-fat ground beef, however, were lower than those suspended in low-fat beef. A D_{10} value of 0.19 kGy at 0 to 5°C was reported for C. jejuni in ground turkey (x) at 0 to 5°C was reported for \mathcal{C} . (x) is (x) in ground turkey was reported for \mathcal{C} .

The order of sensitivity of test pathogens to gamma irradiation was C. jejuni > E. coli O157:H7 > salmonellae. This order was not influenced by the fat level or by the temperature. of ground beef during irradiation treatment. These differences in irradiation resistance may be attributed to such factors as cell size and the structural arrangement of the DNA within the cell. According to Diehl (4), different species or strains of the same species may require different doses to achieve the same degree of inactivation. Furthermore, C . jejuni is particularly sensitive to changes in environmental stress, which may include ionizing irradiation.

On the basis of the highest D_{10} values for each pathogen (Table 4), populations which would theoretically be killed in ground beef subjected to gamma irradiation doses of 0.5, 1.0, 1.5, 2.0, and 2.5 kGy were calculated (Table 5). Depending upon populations of pathogens anticipated to be present in ground beef and the desired probability of completely inactivating these populations, the necessary gamma irradiation dose can be theoretically selected. An applied dose of 2.5 kGy would be sufficient to kill $10^{8.1}$ E. coli O157:H7, $10^{3.1}$ salmonellae, and $10^{10.6}$ C. jejuni. Since such populations are considerably greater than those occasionally found in ground beef, the application of 2.5 kGy would, with a high probability, result in complete inactivation of these pathogens.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We thank the American Meat Institute, Washington, D.C., for financially supporting this investigation.

Appreciation is also expressed to Vindicator, Inc., Mulberry, Fla., for irradiating ground beef and to Brenda Nail, Kimberly Hortz, Usama Abdul-Raouf, and Jerry Davis for their technical assistance at the Center for Food Safety and Quality Enhancement.

- 1. Anellis, A., D. Berkowitz, and D. Kemper. 1973. Comparative resistance of nonsporogenic bacteria to low-temperature gamma irradiation. Appl. Microbiol. 25:517-523.
- 2. Anellis, A., E. Shattuck, M. Morin, B. Srisara, S. Qvale, D. B. Rowley, and E. W. Ross, Jr. 1977. Cryogenic gamma irradiation of prototype pork and chicken and antagonistic effect between Clostridium botulinum types A and B. Appl. Environ. Microbiol.
34:823-831.
- 3. Davis, R., and A. J. Sinskey. 1973. Radiation-resistant mutants of Salmonella typhimurium LT2: development and characterization. J. Bacteriol. 113:133-144.
- 4. Diehl, J. F. 1990. Biological effects of ionizing radiation, p. 95–136. In J. F. Diehl (ed.), Safety of irradiated foods. Marcel Dekker, Inc.. New York.
- 5. Duggan, D. E., A. W. Anderson, and P. R. Elliker. 1963. Inactivation of the radiation-resistant spoilage bacterium Micrococcus radiodurans. 2. Radiation inactivation rates as influenced by menstruum temperature, preirradiation heat treatment, and certain reducing agents. Appl. Microbiol. 11:413-419.
- Farkas, J. 1989. Microbiological safety of irradiated foods. Int. J. Food Microbiol. 9:1-15.
- $\overline{7}$ Federal Register. 1985. Irradiation in the production, processing and handling of food. Fed. Regist. 50:718-724.
- Federal Register. 1990. Irradiation in the production, processing and handling of food. Fed. Regist. 55:18538-18544.
- Flowers, R. S., J. D'Aoust, W. H. Andrews, and J. S. Salmonella, p. 399–405. In C. Vanderzant and D. F. Splitstoesser (ed.), Compendium of methods for the microbiological examination of foods, 3rd ed. Edwards Bros., Ann Arbor, Mich.
- 10. Harris, L. J., and M. E. Stiles. 1992. Reliability of Escherichia coli counts for vacuum-packaged ground beef. J. Food Prot. 55:266-270.
- 11. Huhtanen, C. N., R. K. Jenkins, and D. W. Thaver. 1989. Gamma radiation sensitivity of Listeria monocytogenes. J. Food Prot. $52:610 - 613$.
- 12. International Atomic Energy Agency. 1991. Facts about food irradiation. International Atomic Energy Agency, Joint Food and Agriculture Organization/International Atomic Energy Agency Division of Atomic Energy in Food and Agriculture, Vienna.
- 13. Lambert, J. D., and R. B. Maxcy. 1984. Effect of gamma irradiation on Campylobacter jejuni. J. Food Sci. 49:665-674.
- 14. Ma, K., and R. B. Maxcy. 1981. Factors influencing radiation resistance of vegetative bacteria and spores associated with radappertization of meat. J. Food Sci. 46:612-616.
- 15. Moseley, B. E. B. 1989. Ionizing radiation: action and repair, p. 43-70. In G. W. Gould (ed.), Mechanism of action of food preservation procedures. Elsevier Applied Science Publishers Ltd., London.
- 16. Niemand, J. G., H. J. Vanderlinde, and W. H. Holzapfel. 1981. Radurization of prime beef cuts. J. Food Prot. 44:677-681.
- 17. Patterson, M. 1988. Sensitivity of bacteria to irradiation on poultry meat under various atmospheres. Lett. Appl. Microbiol. 7:55–58.
18. Schubert. J. 1974. Irradiation of food and food constituents:
- Schubert, J. 1974. Irradiation of food and food constituents: chemicals and hygienic consequences, p. $1-38$. In Improvement of food quality by irradiation. International Atomic Energy Agency, Joint Food and Agriculture Organization/International Atomic Energy Agency Division of Atomic Energy in Food and Agriculture, Vienna.
- 19. Stapleton, G. E. 1955. Variations in the sensitivity of *Escherichia coli* 19. to ionizing radiation during growth cycle. J. Bacteriol. 70:357-362.
20. SAS Institute, Inc. 1987. Statistical analysis system, SAS Institute
- SAS Institute, Inc. 1987. Statistical analysis system. SAS Institute, Inc., Cary, N.C.
- 21. Steele, J. H., and R. E. Engel. 1992. Radiation processing of food. J. Am. Vet. Med. Assoc. 201:1522-1529.
- 22. Stern, N. J., C. M. Patton, M. P. Doyle, C. E. Park, and B. A. McCardell. 1992. Campylobacter, p. 484-488. In C. Vanderzant and D. F. Splittstoesser (ed.), Compendium of methods for the microbiological examination of foods, 3rd ed. Edwards Bros., Ann Arbor, Mich.
- 23. Tarkowski, J. A., R. R. Beumer, and E. H. Kampelmacher. 1984. Low gamma irradiation of raw meat. Int. J. Food Microbiol. 1:25-31.
- 24. Thayer, D. W., and G. Boyd. 1993. Elimination of *Escherichia coli*

- 25. Thayer, D. W., G. Boyd, W. S. Muller, C. A. Lipson, W. C. Hayne, meat. J. Food Sci. 36:833-834.
and S. H. Baer. 1990. Radiation resistance of *Salmonella*. J. Ind. 28. Urbain, W. M. 1986. Biological effects of ionizing
- 26. Thayer, D. W., S. Songprasertchi, and G. Boyd. 1991. Effects of technology series. Academic Press, London.
heat and ionizing radiation on Salmonella typhimurium in mechan-
29. Williams, S. (ed.). 1984. Official methods
- 17.117 in meats by gamma irradiation. Appl. Environ. Micro- 27. Tiwari, N. P., and N. B. Maxcy. 1771. Impact of low doses of σ $\sum_{n=10,300-1034}$ gamma radiation and storage on the microflora of ground red ground red ground red ground red
- and S. H. Bacr. 1990. Radiation resistance of *Salmonella*. J. Ind. 28. Urbain, W. M. 1990. Biological effects of ionizing radiation, p. $\frac{3333-393-390}{2}$ and $\frac{333-393-390}{2}$. For the language of $\frac{33-37}{2}$ and $\frac{33-37}{2}$ for the language of $\frac{33-37}{2}$ for $\frac{33-37}{2}$ for $\frac{33-37}{2}$ for $\frac{33-37}{2}$ for $\frac{33-37}{2}$ for $\frac{33-37}{2}$
	- heat and ionizing radiation on Salmonella typhimurium in mechan- 29. Williams, S. (ed.). 1984. Official methods of analysis, p. 1141. ically deboned chicken meat. J. Food Prot. 54:718-724. Association of Official Analytical Chemists, Washington, D.C.