

1           **CARACTERÍSTICAS MICROBIOLÓGICAS DE SUSHIS ADQUIRIDOS EM**  
2           **ESTABELECIMENTOS QUE COMERCIALIZAM COMIDA JAPONESA.**

3           **MICROBIOLOGICAL CHARACTERISTICS OF SUSHI ACQUIRED IN**  
4           **ESTABLISHMENTS THAT SELL JAPANESE FOOD.**

5           **R. A. SATO<sup>1</sup>; O. D. ROSSI JUNIOR<sup>1</sup>; K. P. BÜRGER<sup>1</sup>; P. M. ÉVORA<sup>1</sup>**

6           <sup>1</sup>**Universidade Estadual Paulista – UNESP - Câmpus de Jaboticabal.**

7                           **rafaelsato.vet@gmail.com**  
8

9   **Resumo** – Com crescimento do consumo da comida japonesa no Brasil surge a preocupação  
10 com doenças de origem alimentar, relacionadas à ingestão do pescado cru e erros de  
11 manipulação desse tipo de alimentos. Diante dessa realidade, esse trabalho avaliou a  
12 qualidade microbiológica de sushis adquiridos em 15 restaurantes especializados em comida  
13 japonesa e 15 restaurantes não especializados da região de Ribeirão Preto – SP, quantificando  
14 microrganismos mesófilos, psicrotróficos, coliformes termotolerantes, *Staphylococcus* spp. e  
15 *S. aureus*, *Escherichia coli*; e presença da *Salmonella* sp. e do *Vibrio parahaemolyticus*. As  
16 populações de microrganismos heterotróficos mesófilos e psicrotróficos variaram de 10<sup>2</sup> a 10<sup>7</sup>  
17 UFC.g<sup>-1</sup> e 10<sup>2</sup> a 10<sup>9</sup> UFC.g<sup>-1</sup>, respectivamente. Todas as amostras analisadas apresentaram  
18 *Staphylococcus* sp., com populações variando de 10<sup>2</sup> a 10<sup>5</sup> UFC.g<sup>-1</sup>, sendo que 23,3% foram  
19 caracterizados como *Staphylococcus* coagulase positivo e 13,3% apresentaram valores de  
20 populações acima do limite estabelecido pela legislação vigente para pescado cru. Foram  
21 encontrados coliformes termotolerantes 60,0% das amostras e 33,3% das estavam acima do  
22 limite estabelecido. As presenças de *Staphylococcus aureus* e *Escherichia coli* foram  
23 identificadas em 16,7% e 30,0% das amostras, respectivamente. *Salmonella* spp. e *Vibrio*  
24 *parahaemolyticus* não foram isoladas nesse trabalho. Não houve diferença na qualidade  
25 microbiológica de sushis oferecidos pelos dois tipos de estabelecimentos. O sushi é um  
26 alimento com potencial de veiculação de doenças de origem alimentar. As amostras fora do  
27 padrão refletem a necessidade de treinar adequadamente os manipuladores de alimento.

28 **Palavras-chaves:** *Escherichia coli*. Microbiologia. Salmão. *Staphylococcus aureus*. Sushi.

29

30 **Abstract** - Food quality control refers to all and any action aimed at improving good practice  
31 in hygiene procedures and food handling. Therefore, there is a continuous need to obtain data,  
32 study and monitor the production and marketing in the food industry, thus producing a "safe  
33 food", free from any contamination that may cause damage to the consumer's health. Given  
34 this need, this study evaluated the microbiological quality of sushi bought in 15 restaurants  
35 specialized in Japanese food and 15 non-specialized restaurants from the region of Ribeirão  
36 Preto - SP. The populations of heterotrophic mesophiles and psychrotrophic microorganisms  
37 ranged from  $3,9 \times 10^2$  to  $1,7 \times 10^7$ CFU.g<sup>-1</sup> and  $7,5 \times 10^2$  to  $1,4 \times 10^9$ CFU.g<sup>-1</sup>, respectively. All  
38 samples presented *Staphylococcus* sp., with populations ranging from  $2,0 \times 10^2$  to  $3,8 \times$   
39  $10^5$ CFU.g<sup>-1</sup>, where 23,3% were classified as positive coagulase *Staphylococcus* and 13.3%  
40 had population values above the established limit. Total and thermotolerant coliforms were  
41 found in 83,3% and 60,0% of the samples, respectively, and 33,3% of them were above the  
42 established thermotolerant coliform limit. The presence of *Staphylococcus aureus* and  
43 *Escherichia coli* were identified in 16,7% and 30,0% of the samples, respectively. *Salmonella*  
44 sp. and *Vibrio parahaemolyticus* were not isolated in this research. There was no difference in  
45 the microbiological quality of sushi offered by the two types of establishments.

46 **Keywords:** *Escherichia coli*. Microbiology. Salmon; *Staphylococcus aureus*. Sushi.

47

## INTRODUCTION

48 The gastronomic sector in Brazil offers a wide variety of cuisine and is responsible for  
49 generating many direct jobs in the country. Within this sector, "sushi bars", "fast-foods" and  
50 restaurants specialized in Japanese food have been highlighted by the growth in the number of  
51 establishments that offer this type of service. This growth is due to the popularization of  
52 Japanese food, which currently has the "status" of being healthy and nutritious, therefore  
53 conquering new adepts.

54 The traditional Japanese cuisine is worldwide known for the habit of consuming raw  
55 or *in natura* fish. However, from the Public Health's point of view, the *in natura* ingredient  
56 generates a concern related to foodborne diseases.

57 Foodborne diseases occur when an individual ingests food contaminated with infectious  
58 or toxic agents that enter the body. Among the potentially pathogenic microorganisms that  
59 can be transmitted through raw fish, we can mention *Aeromonas sp.*, *Escherichia coli*,  
60 *Salmonella sp.*, *Pseudomonas sp.*, *Staphylococcus aureus*, *Vibrio cholerae* and *Vibrio*  
61 *parahaemolyticus*.

62 Given the growth in Japanese food consumption, combined with food contamination  
63 risks during production, storage and sale, there is a preoccupation with the quality of products  
64 sold in specialized and non-specialized stores.

65 Thus, the present study aimed to evaluate the microbiological characteristics of sushi  
66 sold in restaurants specialized in Japanese food and in non-specialized establishments, by  
67 quantifying the presence of mesophilic and psychrotrophic microorganisms; total and  
68 thermotolerant coliforms; *Staphylococcus sp.* and *S. aureus*; *Escherichia coli*; *Vibrio*  
69 *parahaemolyticus* and *Salmonella spp.*, and to compare the results with pre-established  
70 quality parameters for raw fish from the current legislation.

## 71 MATERIAL AND METHODS

72 The study was performed on 30 samples of *in natura* sushi consisting of seasoned rice  
73 and salmon (*Salmo salar*), which may present other ingredients such as algae, sauces and  
74 vegetables, preserved refrigerated. Samples were collected from fifteen restaurants specialized  
75 in Japanese food and fifteen non-specialized commercial establishments, and a sample was  
76 acquired from each location.

77 The specialized establishments were characterized as restaurants that only work with  
78 Japanese cuisine, usually offering the customer the service of "all you can eat", "a la carte" or

79 "self-service" per kilo. The non-specialized establishments category included ordinary  
80 restaurants (fast foods, self-services, steakhouses, etc.) that daily offer customers traditional  
81 Brazilian food, but also incorporate other types of cuisine, including Japanese, into the menu.

82 The samples were collected from the cities Jaboticabal - SP, Ribeirão Preto - SP and  
83 Monte Alto - SP. The quantities of sushi acquired varied according to the "menu" offered by  
84 the chosen establishment. When the establishment offered the option to sell by weight,  
85 approximately 400g of sushi were weighed for purchase. All samples were packed in the  
86 ordinary form of sale to the consumer.

87 Immediately after purchase the samples were conditioned in isothermal boxes,  
88 containing blocks of ice, and taken to the Laboratory of Microbiological Analysis of Animal-  
89 derived Food and Water of the Department of Preventive Veterinary Medicine and Animal  
90 Reproduction of the FCAV / Unesp, where they were submitted to quantification of  
91 mesophilic and psychrotrophic microorganisms, thermotolerant coliforms, *Staphylococcus* sp.  
92 and *aureus*, *Escherichia coli* and presence of *Vibrio parahaemolyticus* and *Salmonella* sp..  
93 The methodologies described in the American Public Health Association (APHA, 2001) were  
94 used for the analyzes.

## 95 **RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

96 The results obtained, especially of the microbial groups predicted by the legislation,  
97 were compared with parameters pre-established by Resolution - RDC N°. 12, of January 2,  
98 2001, for raw and similar fish (BRASIL, 2001).

99 Table 1 shows the distribution of the *in natura* sushi samples according to the  
100 exponential of the populations of heterotrophic mesophilic microorganisms, classified  
101 according to the type of establishment where the sushi was acquired.

102 In the Brazilian legislation there is no defined limit on the acceptable number of  
103 mesophilic microorganisms, so a comparison was made with values cited in the literature.

104 According to ICMSF (2009), the population of mesophilic microorganisms found in a food is  
105 one of the indicators of its quality, and should not exceed  $10^6\text{CFU.g}^{-1}$ . A high population of  
106 these microorganisms may indicate excessive contamination of the raw material or during  
107 preparation, as well as inadequate cleaning and sanitation conditions. Thus, 20% of the  
108 analyzed samples presented values above this limit, indicating failures or lack of good  
109 manipulation practices in these products. Errors in the conservation process and transport also  
110 contribute to increase the populations of these microorganisms.

111 Considering mesophilic microorganisms, Gilbert et al. (2000) presented a grading scale  
112 for the quality of raw marine fish food where products with populations under  $10^3\text{CFU.g}^{-1}$  are  
113 considered suitable for consumption, between  $10^3$  and  $10^4\text{CFU.g}^{-1}$  are satisfactory and above  
114  $10^4\text{CFU.g}^{-1}$  are considered unsatisfactory. Taking into account this classification, it can be  
115 stated that 73,3% of the samples collected in this research correspond to products considered  
116 unsatisfactory for commercialization.

117 Table 2 shows the distribution of the *in natura* sushi samples according to the  
118 exponential of the populations of heterotrophic psychrotrophic microorganisms, classified  
119 according to the type of establishment where the sushi was acquired.

120 In Brazilian legislation, there is also no defined limit regarding the acceptable number  
121 of psychrotrophic microorganisms. According to the ICMSF (2009) the limit for populations  
122 of psychrotrophic microorganisms in food is  $10^7\text{CFU.g}^{-1}$ . Taking into account this parameter,  
123 it can be stated that 13.3% of the samples collected correspond to unsatisfactory products for  
124 commercialization.

125 According to Reinbold (1983), aerobic psychrotrophic microorganisms population  
126 evaluates the deterioration degree of refrigerated food. Considering that for psychrotrophic  
127 microorganisms values above  $10^4\text{CFU.g}^{-1}$  are relatively high, and that sushi is a food with

128 high deterioration potential (being prepared manually and presenting raw fish as an  
129 ingredient), 83,3% of the samples would not have a long shelf-life under refrigeration.

130 Table 3 refers to the distribution of *in natura* sushi samples according to the exponential  
131 population of *Staphylococcus* sp.

132 Among the 30 analyzed samples all presented *Staphylococcus* sp., as observed in  
133 Table 3. Bacteria of this genus are part of the normal human skin microbiota, and food  
134 contamination may occur during handling, especially when protective equipment and  
135 appropriate forms of asepsis are not used. Sushi is a food that by tradition is handmade,  
136 making it a product with high potential of contamination with this microorganism.

137 Table 4 presents the results of coagulase positive staphylococci populations in the *in*  
138 *natura* sushi samples, distributed according to the type of establishments in which they were  
139 acquired, and the samples in which the presence of *Staphylococcus aureus* was confirmed.

140 Coagulase positive *Staphylococcus* was present in 7 of the 30 samples analyzed, totaling  
141 23,3% of the samples (Table 4). The production of coagulase is an important characteristic  
142 used in the identification of *S. aureus*, therefore, the Brazilian legislation indicates the  
143 research of this enzyme for the characterization of this microorganism in food. Of these 7  
144 samples, only 4 had population values above  $5,0 \times 10^3 \text{CFU.g}^{-1}$ , the maximum limit  
145 established by the legislation. Consequently, 13,3% of the total samples analyzed would be  
146 unsatisfactory for consumption.

147 *S. aureus* has worldwide distribution, and it is estimated that is found on the skin and in  
148 the nose of about 25% of healthy people and animals (CDC, 2017). According to Franco and  
149 Landgraf (2003), this microorganism is frequently associated with outbreaks of foodborne  
150 diseases. The presence of *S. aureus* (Table 4) was confirmed in 5 samples: 1, 4 and 10 from  
151 the specialized establishments group, and only in samples 1 and 12 from the non-specialized  
152 establishments group. Thus, the presence of *Staphylococcus aureus* was confirmed in 16,7%

153 of the total samples analyzed. According to Silva Junior (2001), the research of this bacterium  
154 in food allows to evaluate the hygienic sanitary quality during its manipulation and  
155 preparation. Therefore, the positive samples found represent a risk to Public Health, reflecting  
156 the need to improve the production process of sushi, as well as to train the manipulators of  
157 this food to perform their tasks correctly.

158 Table 5 refers to the distribution of *in natura* sushi samples according to the exponential  
159 of thermotolerant coliforms (MPN.g<sup>-1</sup>).

160 Thermotolerant coliforms are bacteria that indicate fecal contamination and possible  
161 pathogenic enterobacteria presence, and it is also used in food's sanitary evaluation due to the  
162 low cost of research of these microorganisms (JAY, 2005). For thermotolerant coliforms, in  
163 Table 5, it was verified that 33,3% of the samples presented values above 10<sup>2</sup>MPN. g<sup>-1</sup>, the  
164 maximum limit established by the legislation for similar foods. Therefore, these samples  
165 would be considered unacceptable for consumption, showing that in some stage of the  
166 production chain process of these sushi there were failures related to good hygiene practices,  
167 which might have been during handling or obtaining of the raw material.

168 Table 6 shows the samples in which *Escherichia coli* populations and thermotolerant  
169 coliform populations were identified, according to the type of establishment in which they  
170 were collected.

171 In Table 6, it is possible to observe the presence of *E. coli* in samples 1, 8 and 14 of  
172 the specialized establishments group and in samples 1, 2, 5, 10, 11 and 14 of the non-  
173 specialized establishments group, with populations ranging from 0,15 x 10 to  
174 7,5 x 10MPN.g<sup>-1</sup> totaling 9 samples from the 30 analyzed (30,0%). Several strains of this  
175 microorganism are pathogenic to humans and the presence of *E. coli* in a food confirms fecal  
176 contamination (FRANCO and LANDGRAF, 2003). Thus, 30,0% of the sushi analyzed

177 presented fecal residues in some phase of the manipulation, storage or obtaining of the raw  
178 material. Franco and Landgraf (2003) recommend that food should not present *E. coli*.

179 Table 7 presents, in summary, the arithmetic means and standard deviations of the  
180 populations of heterotrophic mesophilic and heterotrophic psychrotrophic microorganisms,  
181 *Staphylococcus* sp., total coliforms and thermotolerant coliforms, distributed according to the  
182 type of establishment where the samples were collected.

183 The Student t test was applied to the values of the microorganism populations specified  
184 in Table 7, and from the statistical point of view there were no significant differences between  
185 the means of these populations ( $p > 0,05$ ).

186 At the beginning of this study, it was expected that there were significant differences  
187 between the results obtained in the two groups of restaurants studied. Specialized restaurants  
188 work only with Japanese cuisine, and many advertise strict hygiene measures during the  
189 preparation of the sushi, as well as the efficiency, quality, tradition and expertise of their  
190 "sushimen". These employees are mandatorily trained in workshops to learn how to prepare  
191 good quality sushi. Non-specialized restaurants, however, work with various types of cuisine  
192 and although they require good cooks, they don't train the staff for good sanitary practices  
193 during their service.

194 However, the results obtained at the end of this study showed that there were no  
195 differences in the quality of the sushi offered to the consumer by the two types of restaurants.  
196 Although all the samples analyzed presented excellent visual appearance when collected, the  
197 high amounts of heterotrophic mesophilic and psychrotrophic microorganisms, and relatively  
198 high populations of total and thermotolerant coliforms reflect inadequate hygienic and  
199 sanitary conditions during preparation, handling, or even low-quality raw material used by the  
200 commercial establishments. This diagnosis demonstrates the deficiency of the governmental

201 inspection agencies that should be controlling the quality of these products, as well as the lack  
202 of training and qualification of food professionals.

203 Another important factor observed in this study was the presence of *Staphylococcus*  
204 *aureus* and *Escherichia coli*. These microorganisms are important for Public Health because,  
205 under ideal conditions for their multiplication, they can cause severe illnesses, being able to  
206 affect great part of consumers.

207 *Vibrio parahaemolyticus* and microorganisms of the *Salmonella* genus were not found  
208 in any of the analyzed samples. Therefore, all samples were kept within the established  
209 standard, which is defined by absence of *Salmonella* spp. in 25.0 g of the food and a  
210 maximum limit of  $10^3$ MPN.g<sup>-1</sup> for *V. parahaemolyticus* in dishes that contain raw fish  
211 (BRASIL, 2001).

212 Vallandro (2010), at the end of his work, reported that the most probable source of  
213 contamination by *Salmonella* spp. and *Vibrio parahaemolyticus* in salmon sashimi (*Salmo*  
214 *salar*) is the place of fish breeding and/or capture. The fact that the raw material used by the  
215 restaurants have well-known origin and are imported from inspected establishments probably  
216 contributed to the absence of these microorganisms. As all samples analyzed in this study  
217 were necessarily consisted of salmon, the same conclusion can be adopted to explain the  
218 absence of these pathogens. It is important to note that sushi, unlike sashimi, is a food  
219 composed of several ingredients. Thus, contamination by *Salmonella* spp. could also occur  
220 through eggs, sauces, cheeses, vegetables and other varieties of components used for their  
221 preparation.

222 Regarding *Vibrio parahaemolyticus*, Vallandro (2010), presents a hypothesis that the  
223 absence of this microorganism in sashimi can be related to the fact that the salmon consumed  
224 in Brazil is bred in cold waters, mainly in Chile. According to Forsythe (2002) and quoted by  
225 Vallandro (2010), it is probable that this characteristic contributes to the low occurrence of

226 the bacterium or its low presence in the fish, since *V. parahaemolyticus* is normally present in  
227 quantities greater than  $10^3 \text{CFU.g}^{-1}$  in fish and seafood proceeding from warm waters. In  
228 addition, the salmon consumed is transported frozen to Brazil, which is also adverse to the  
229 bacteria survival, according to Cook and Ruple (1992) and quoted by Vallandro (2010).

230 Table 8 presents a summary of the non-standard samples for coagulase positive  
231 *Staphylococcus* and thermotolerant coliforms, distributed according to the type of  
232 establishment where the samples were acquired.

233 Fisher's exact test was applied between the groups of specialized and non-specialized  
234 establishments, comparing the standard and non-standard samples for coagulase positive  
235 *Staphylococcus* and thermotolerant coliforms. As results, there were no statistically  
236 significant differences between the two groups of establishments ( $p > 0,05$ ), therefore, there  
237 were no differences in the frequencies found between the standard and non-standard samples  
238 for the two types of establishments, concerning the microorganisms.

239 At the end of this work, it was verified that the total of non-standard samples were 11  
240 (36,6%). The chi-square test was applied between the groups of specialized and non-  
241 specialized establishments, comparing the standard and non-standard samples. As a result,  
242 there was no statistically significant difference between the groups of establishments ( $\chi^2 < \chi^2_c$   
243  $= 0,05$ ), therefore, the frequencies found between the standard and non-standard samples for  
244 the 2 types of restaurants were the same.

## 245 CONCLUSIONS

246 The results of this work suggest that sushi can potentially cause foodborne diseases  
247 since microbiological isolation and biochemical confirmations of the agents *Staphylococcus*  
248 *aureus* and *Escherichia coli* were possible. These data, added to the amount of non-standard  
249 samples found, reflect the need to invest in the training of food handlers in order to raise  
250 awareness of how and why to produce food with good hygienic sanitary quality.

251 The present study also demonstrates the importance of continuing, and deepening the  
252 studies on the subject. Japanese food has gained prominence in Brazil, and sushi is a much  
253 manipulated food that has several ingredients, one of them being raw material. Therefore,  
254 there is a need to study the entire sushi production chain to identify the critical points and  
255 seek solutions aiming at the production of a healthy and safe food for the society.

## 256 ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

257 The authors are grateful to the São Paulo Research Foundation (FAPESP) for financial  
258 support (#2011/ 14368-4).

## 259 REFERENCES

260 APHA. American Public Health Association. Committee on Microbiological for Foods.  
261 **Compendium of methods for the microbiological examination of foods.** 4. ed.  
262 Washington, 2001. 676 p.

263  
264 BRASIL. Agência Nacional de Vigilância Sanitária. **Resolução – RDC nº12, de 2 de janeiro**  
265 **de 2001.** Disponível em:  
266 <[http://portal.anvisa.gov.br/documents/33880/2568070/RDC\\_12\\_2001.pdf/15ffddf6-3767-](http://portal.anvisa.gov.br/documents/33880/2568070/RDC_12_2001.pdf/15ffddf6-3767-4527-bfac-740a0400829b)  
267 [4527-bfac-740a0400829b](http://portal.anvisa.gov.br/documents/33880/2568070/RDC_12_2001.pdf/15ffddf6-3767-4527-bfac-740a0400829b)>. Acesso em: 20 out. 2012.

268  
269 CDC. **Center for Disease Control and Prevention. Staphylococcal Food Poisoning .** 2015.  
270 Disponível em: <<https://www.cdc.gov/foodsafety/diseases/staphylococcal.html>>. Acesso em:  
271 29 abr. 2017.

272  
273 FRANCO, B. D. G. M.; LANDGRAF, M. **Microbiologia de alimentos.** São Paulo: Atheneu,  
274 2003. 182 p.

275  
276 GILBERT, R. J.; LOUVOIS, J.; DONOVAN, T.; LITTLE, C.; NYE, K.; RIBEIRO, C. D.;  
277 RICHARDS, J.; ROBERTS, D.; BOLTON, F. J. Guidelines for the microbiological quality of  
278 some ready-to-eat foods samples at the point of sale. **Communicable Disease Public Health,**  
279 London, v. 3, n. 3, p. 163-167, 2000.

280 ICMSF. International Commission on Microbiological Specifications for Foods.  
281 **Microorganismos em alimentos.** Edição 8. São Paulo: Blucher, 2009. 536p

282  
283  
284 JAY, J. M. **Microbiologia de alimentos.** 6. ed. Porto Alegre: Artmed, 2005. 712 p.

285  
286 REINBOLD, G.W. Indicator organisms in dairy products. **Food Technology,** Chicago, v. 37,  
287 n. 6, p. 111-113, 1983.

288  
289 SILVA JUNIOR, E. A. **Manual higiênico sanitário de alimentos.** 4. ed. São Paulo: Varela,  
290 2001. p. 477.

291  
 292  
 293  
 294  
 295  
 296  
 297  
 298  
 299  
 300  
 301  
 302  
 303  
 304  
 305  
 306  
 307  
 308  
 309  
 310  
 311  
 312  
 313

VALLANDRO, M. J. **Avaliação da qualidade microbiológica de sashimis a base de salmão, preparados em restaurantes especializados em culinária japonesa na cidade de Porto Alegre - RS.** 2010. 67 f. Dissertação (Mestrado em Ciências Veterinárias na área de Bacteriologia) - Universidade do Rio Grande do Sul, Porto Alegre, 2010.

VALLANDRO, M. J.; CAMPOS, T.; PAIM, D.; CARDOSO, M.; KINDLEIN, L. Avaliação da qualidade microbiológica de sashimis à base de salmão, preparados em restaurantes especializados em culinária japonesa. **Revista do Instituto Adolfo Lutz**, São Paulo, v. 70, n. 2, p. 144-150, 2011.

**Table 1.** Exponential distribution of mesophilic heterotrophic microorganisms populations. (Jaboticabal, Ribeirão Preto and Monte Alto - SP, 2011 and 2012).

| Exponential of mesophilic microorganisms (CFU.g <sup>-1</sup> ) | Number of samples (%) |                   | Total (%)         |
|---|-----------------------|-------------------|-------------------|
|   | specialized           | Nonspecialized    |                   |
| 10 <sup>2</sup>   | 2 (13.3)              | 0 (0.0)           | 2 (6.7)           |
| 10 <sup>3</sup>   | 2 (13.3)              | 4 (26.7)          | 6 (20.0)          |
| 10 <sup>4</sup>   | 5 (33.3)              | 3 (20.0)          | 8 (26.7)          |
| 10 <sup>5</sup>   | 2 (13.3)              | 6 (40.0)          | 8 (26.7)          |
| 10 <sup>6</sup>   | 2 (13.3)              | 1 (6.7)           | 3 (10.0)          |
| 10 <sup>7</sup>   | 2 (13.3)              | 1 (6.7)           | 3 (10.0)          |
| <b>Total of samples</b>   | <b>15 (100.0)</b>     | <b>15 (100.0)</b> | <b>30 (100.0)</b> |

**Table 2.** Exponential distribution of psychrotrophic heterotrophic microorganisms populations. (Jaboticabal, Ribeirão Preto and Monte Alto - SP, 2011 and 2012).

| Exponential of psychrotrophic microorganisms (CFU.g <sup>-1</sup> ) | Number of samples (%) |                   | Total (%)         |
|---|-----------------------|-------------------|-------------------|
|   | specialized           | Non specialized   |                   |
| 10 <sup>2</sup>   | 0 (0.0)               | 1 (6.7)           | 1 (3.3)           |
| 10 <sup>3</sup>   | 2 (13.3)              | 2 (13.3)          | 4 (13.3)          |
| 10 <sup>4</sup>   | 6 (40.0)              | 2 (13.3)          | 8 (26.7)          |
| 10 <sup>5</sup>   | 4 (26.7)              | 4 (26.7)          | 8 (26.7)          |
| 10 <sup>6</sup>   | 1 (6.7)               | 4 (26.7)          | 5 (16.7)          |
| 10 <sup>7</sup>   | 1 (6.7)               | 1 (6.7)           | 2 (6.7)           |
| 10 <sup>8</sup>   | 0 (0.0)               | 1 (6.7)           | 1 (3.3)           |
| 10 <sup>9</sup>   | 1 (6.7)               | 0 (0.0)           | 1 (3.3)           |
| <b>Total of samples</b>   | <b>15 (100.0)</b>     | <b>15 (100.0)</b> | <b>30 (100.0)</b> |

314 **Table 3.** Exponential distribution of *Staphylococcus sp* populations. (Jaboticabal, Ribeirão  
 315 Preto and Monte Alto - SP, 2011 and 2012).

| Exponential of<br><i>Staphylococcus sp</i><br>populations.<br>(CFU.g <sup>-1</sup> ) | Number of samples (%) |                 | Total (%)  |
|--|-----------------------|-----------------|------------|
|  | Specialized           | Non specialized |            |
| 10 <sup>2</sup>  | 2 (13.3)              | 1 (6.7)         | 3 (10.0)   |
| 10 <sup>3</sup>  | 10 (66.7)             | 8 (53.3)        | 18 (60.0)  |
| 10 <sup>4</sup>  | 2 (13.3)              | 5 (33.3)        | 7 (23.3)   |
| 10 <sup>5</sup>  | 1 (6.7)               | 1 (6.7)         | 2 (6.7)    |
| <b>Total of samples</b>  | 15 (100.0)            | 15 (100.0)      | 30 (100.0) |

316  
 317  
 318  
 319  
 320  
 321

**Table 4.** Populations of coagulase positive staphylococci and the samples in which the presence of *Staphylococcus aureus* was confirmed. (Jaboticabal, Ribeirão Preto and Monte Alto - SP, 2011 and 2012).

| Sample number   | Specialized establishments<br>(Pop. CFU.g <sup>-1</sup> ) | Confirmed <i>Staphylococcus aureus</i> |
|---|---|--|
| 1   | 7.5 x 10 <sup>4</sup> *                                   | X                                      |
| 4   | 4.5 x 10 <sup>2</sup>                                     | X                                      |
| 10  | 4.9 x 10 <sup>2</sup>                                     | X                                      |
| <b>non specialized establishments<br/>(Pop. CFU.g<sup>-1</sup>)</b> |   |  |
| 1   | 5.1 x 10 <sup>4</sup> *                                   | X                                      |
| 5   | 7.4 x 10 <sup>2</sup>                                     |  |
| 6   | 5.7 x 10 <sup>3</sup> *                                   |  |
| 12  | 1.2 x 10 <sup>4</sup> *                                   | X                                      |

322 \* Non-standard samples for coagulase positive *Staphylococcus*. Value above 5.0 x 10<sup>3</sup>CFU.g<sup>-1</sup>  
 323 according to RDC N° 12, dated January 2, 2001 (BRASIL, 2001).  
 324

325  
 326  
 327

328 **Table 5.** Exponential distribution of thermotolerant coliform populations (NMP.g<sup>-1</sup>).  
 329 (Jaboticabal, Ribeirão Preto and Monte Alto - SP, 2011 and 2012).

| Exponential of thermotolerant coliforms (MPN.g <sup>-1</sup> ) | Number of samples (%) |                 | Total (%)  |
|--|-----------------------|-----------------|------------|
|  | Specialized           | Non specialized |            |
| absence (< 3.0)  | 8 (53,3)              | 4 (26,7)        | 12 (40,0)  |
| < 10   | 1 (6,7)               | 1 (6,7)         | 2 (6,7)    |
| 10   | 2 (13,3)              | 4 (26,7)        | 6 (20,0)   |
| 10 <sup>2</sup>  | 1 (6,7)               | 5 (33,3)        | 6 (20,0) * |
| 10 <sup>3</sup>  | 1 (6,7)               | 1 (6,7)         | 2 (6,7) *  |
| 10 <sup>4</sup>  | 2 (13,3)              | 0 (0,0)         | 2 (6,7) *  |
| <b>Total of samples</b>  | 15 (100,0)            | 15 (100,0)      | 30 (100,0) |

330 \* Non-standard samples for thermotolerant coliforms. Value above 10<sup>2</sup> (MPN. g<sup>-1</sup>) according  
 331 to RDC – N°12, of January 2, 2001 (BRASIL, 2001).  
 332

333 **Table 6.** Distribution of the samples in which *Escherichia coli* and thermotolerant coliforms  
 334 were quantified according to the type of commercial establishment.(Jaboticabal, Ribeirão  
 335 Preto and Monte Alto - SP, 2011 and 2012).

| Sample number | thermotolerant coliforms  | <i>Escherichia coli</i> population (Pop. MPN.g <sup>-1</sup> ) |
|---------------|---|--|
|               | population Specialized establishments (Pop. MPN.g <sup>-1</sup> ) |  |
| 1             | 4,6 x 10 <sup>4</sup> *   | 0,75 x 10  |
| 8             | 3,6 x 10  | 0,15 x 10  |
| 14            | 1,2 x 10 <sup>4</sup> *   | 7,5 x 10   |
|               | nonspecialized establishments (Pop. MPN.g <sup>-1</sup> )         |  |
| 1             | 2,1 x 10 <sup>3</sup> *   | 0,39 x 10  |
| 2             | 3,6 x 10 <sup>2</sup> *   | 0,15 x 10  |
| 5             | 3,9 x 10 <sup>2</sup> *   | 0,15 x 10  |
| 10            | 9,1 x 10 <sup>2</sup> *   | 0,2 x 10   |
| 11            | 9,3 x 10  | 0,15 x 10  |
| 14            | 4,3 x 10  | 0,15 x 10  |

336 \* Non-standard samples for thermotolerant coliforms. Value above 10<sup>2</sup> NMP.g<sup>-1</sup> according to  
 337 RDC - N°12, of January 2, 2001 (BRASIL, 2001).

338 **Table 7.** Arithmetic means and standard deviations of the populations of mesophilic and  
 339 psychrotrophic microorganisms, *Staphylococcus sp.*, total coliforms and thermotolerant  
 340 coliforms. (Jaboticabal, Ribeirão Preto and Monte Alto - SP, 2011 and 2012).

| Microorganisms            | Arithmetic means of the populations   |                                       |
|---------------------------|---------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|
|                           | Specialized                           | Non specialized                       |
| Heterotrophic Mesophilic  | $2,0 \times 10^6 \pm 4,6 \times 10^6$ | $1,8 \times 10^6 \pm 4,6 \times 10^6$ |
| Psychrotrophic            | $9,4 \times 10^7 \pm 3,6 \times 10^8$ | $1,1 \times 10^7 \pm 3,3 \times 10^7$ |
| <i>Staphylococcus</i> sp. | $3,5 \times 10^4 \pm 9,8 \times 10^4$ | $3,3 \times 10^4 \pm 6,7 \times 10^4$ |
| Total coliforms           | $1,6 \times 10^4 \pm 3,8 \times 10^4$ | $4,9 \times 10^3 \pm 1,2 \times 10^4$ |
| Thermotolerant coliforms  | $4,0 \times 10^3 \pm 1,2 \times 10^4$ | $2,9 \times 10^2 \pm 5,6 \times 10^2$ |

341 **Table 8.** Non-standard samples for coagulase positive *Staphylococcus* and thermotolerant  
 342 coliforms, according to the parameters established by RDC - N°12, of January 2, 2001 for  
 343 similar foods, distributed according to the type of establishment where they were collected.  
 344

| Microorganisms                                     | Non-standard samples      |                                      | Total (%) |
|--|---------------------------|--------------------------------------|-----------|
|  | Specialized               | Non-specialized                      |           |
| coagulase positive<br><i>Staphylococcus</i> *      | 1 (A1)                    | 3 (A1, A6 e A12)                     | 4 (13.3)  |
| thermotolerant<br>coliforms **                     | 4 (A1, A12, A14 e<br>A15) | 6 (A1, A2, A4, A5,<br>A6 e A10)      | 10 (33.3) |
| Non-standard<br>samples for both<br>microorganisms | 1 (A1)                    | 2 (A1 e A12)                         | 3 (10.0)  |
| Total of non-<br>standard samples                  | 4 (A1, A12, A14 e<br>A15) | 7 (A1, A2, A4, A5,<br>A6, A10 e A12) | 11 (36.6) |

345 \* Value above  $5.0 \times 10^3$  CFU.g<sup>-1</sup>. \*\* Value above  $10^2$  MPN.g<sup>-1</sup>

346