

Article

Evaluation of Antimicrobial Interventions against *E. coli* O157:H7 on the Surface of Raw Beef to Reduce Bacterial Translocation During Blade Tenderization

Peter M. Muriana ^{1,2*}, Jackie Eager ², Brent Wellings ², Brad Morgan ², Jake Nelson ¹, and Kalpana Kushwaha ^{1,2}.

¹ Robert M. Kerr Food & Agricultural Products Center, Oklahoma State University, Stillwater, OK 74078-6055; peter.muriana@okstate.edu; jake.nelson@okstate.edu; kalpana@okstate.edu.

² Department of Animal Sciences, Oklahoma State University; brad.morgan@pfgc.com; jackie.eager@okstate.edu; brent.wellings@okstate.edu.

* Correspondence: peter.muriana@okstate.edu; Tel.: +01-405-744-5563

Abstract: The USDA-FSIS considers mechanically-tenderized beef as ‘non-intact’ and a food safety concern because of the potential for translocation of surface *E. coli* O157:H7 into the interior of the meat that may be cooked ‘rare or medium-rare’ and consumed. We evaluated 14 potential spray interventions on *E. coli* O157:H7-inoculated lean beef wafers (~10⁶ CFU/cm², n=80) passing through a spray system (18 sec dwell time, ~40 PSI) integrated into the front end of a Ross TC-700MC tenderizer. Inoculated and processed beef wafers were stomached with D/E neutralizing broth and plated immediately, or were held in refrigerated storage for 1-, 7-, or 14 days prior to microbial plating. Seven antimicrobials that showed better performance in preliminary screening on beef wafers were selected for further testing on beef subprimals in conjunction with blade tenderization. Boneless top sirloin beef subprimals were inoculated at ~2 × 10⁴ CFU/cm² with a four-strain cocktail of *Escherichia coli* O157:H7 and passed once, lean side up, through an integrated spray system and blade tenderizer. Core samples obtained from each subprimal were examined for the presence/absence of *E. coli* O157:H7. Absence of *E. coli* O157:H7 translocated into core samples correlated with the ability of the antimicrobials to reduce bacterial levels on the surface of beef prior to blade tenderization.

Keywords: *E. coli* O157:H7; non-intact beef; mechanical tenderization; blade tenderization; antimicrobial interventions; translocation.

1. Introduction

Beef is a desirable food staple in the United States and consumer expectations for product quality, consistency, and tenderness have always been a high priority by the U.S. beef industry [1]. In complying with these priorities, numerous approaches have been implemented in order to make beef a more palatable and an enjoyable consumer experience. These include methods to provide proper feed rations such as grain-fed cattle that produce better marbling than grass-fed cattle [2]. However, during the grain shortage of 1974, the number of grass fed cattle increased and researchers turned to mechanical methods of tenderization to enhance the palatability of finished beef products. Studies have shown that mechanical tenderization does result in the improvement of meat tenderness [3-7] and it has been estimated that over 90% of hotel, restaurant, and institutional operations use blade tenderization [8].

Safety concerns for *E. coli* O157:H7, a major shigatoxin-producing serotype associated with raw beef products, have been heightened since a major outbreak in 1994 resulting in 732 illnesses and 4 deaths from the consumption of insufficiently cooked ground beef, a 'non-intact' beef product [9]. The USDA-FSIS then declared *E. coli* O157:H7 as an 'adulterant' in raw ground beef and on beef carcasses [10]. In 2011, the USDA-FSIS proposed 6 additional 'non-O157' STEC serotypes as adulterants in beef (O26, O45, O103, O111, O121, and O145) for which testing was implemented in 2012 [11]. According to the USDA-FSIS, 'intact' beef is a 'cut of whole muscle(s) that has not been injected, mechanically tenderized or reconstructed' [12] and therefore mechanically tenderized beef products have been placed in a category considered to be 'non-intact' beef. One of the first concerns with the safety of non-intact beef was brought forth from research performed at Kansas State University [13] whereby they identified that blade tenderization of *E. coli* O157:H7 surface-inoculated beef steaks could lead to internalization of 3-4% of the surface bacteria (i.e., translocation) and that cooking to lower internal temperatures may not sufficiently eliminate the translocated bacteria. In 2001, the issue of potential risk from mechanically-tenderized beef products was brought to the attention of USDA-FSIS and the National Advisory Committee for the Microbiological Criteria for Foods (NACMCF) both recommended further studies on this topic [12]. Since then, there have been several outbreaks of *E. coli* O157:H7 attributed to mechanically-tenderized beef [14,15] and USDA-FSIS has been besieged by consumer interest groups demanding that mechanically-tenderized beef products should be labelled as such because 'consumers deserve to know if the beef they are eating has been processed this way'. In spite of resistance from the beef industry, the USDA-FSIS has recently issued a final rule on the labelling of mechanically tenderized beef whereby the name 'mechanically-tenderized' must appear as part of the name of the beef product [16]. Studies have been conducted to examine various issues in regards to mechanical tenderization, including the 'translocation' of *E. coli* O157:H7 to the interior meat when subject to mechanical tenderization [17], survival of *E. coli* in tenderized beef [18], and what happens to translocated O157 and non-O157 STEC *E. coli* when such steaks are subjected to heating on a grill [19,20].

This study focuses on the use of an integrated tenderizer-spray system to examine various antimicrobials to inhibit *E. coli* O157:H7 on the surface of lean beef wafers to mimic the surface of intact beef prior to blade tenderization. The better performing antimicrobials were then used again in actual blade tenderization experiments to compare with data recovered from beef core samples after blade tenderization to determine if translocation to beef interiors can be reduced by antimicrobial spray interventions. Validated interventions using antimicrobials that are proven to reduce the surface incidence of *E. coli* O157:H7 and other STECs may mitigate health risks from internalized pathogens due to mechanical tenderization.

2. Materials and Methods

2.1. Bacterial strains.

A four strain 'cocktail' of *E. coli* O157:H7 (ATCC 43890, ATCC 43894, ATCC 43895, ATCC 35150) was used. These strains were outbreak isolates associated with beef and variants were recovered that were resistant to gentamycin (10 µg/ml; Sigma-Aldrich, St. Louis, MO) and rifamycin (10 µg/ml; MP Biomedicals LLC., Solon, OH) by passage on media containing these antibiotics (in succession). The plating of constitutively-resistant strains on non-harsh media containing the antibiotics allows their selective recovery from indigenous background flora on non-sterile meat samples. Stock strains were cultured separately in Difco™ tryptic soy broth (TSB; Becton, Dickinson & Company, Sparks, MD) at

37°C for 18-20 hours, then mixed in equal proportions to obtain a mixed-strain cocktail in a 50 ml centrifuge tube, and diluted to the appropriate use level in 0.1% buffered peptone water (PBW) to achieve the desired CFU/cm² using 0.1 ml inoculum in a 2-in diam circle (lean beef wafers or beef subprimals).

2.2. Biosafety BSL-2 laboratory precautions.

These experiments took place in a Biosafety Level 2 (BSL-2) pathogen processing facility in Oklahoma State University's Robert M. Kerr Food and Ag Products Center (Stillwater, OK). Protocols for experiments, pathogen use, personnel protection, and post-process sanitation were examined and approved by an institutional biosafety committee (IBC) within the university compliance office. Individuals were required to wear adequate personnel protection equipment (PPE) including work overalls, boots, a long-sleeve boot-length disposable Tyvec outer garment, gloves, surgical mask, and a face splash shield (Figure 1). The facility room where wet processing occurred using *E. coli* O157:H7 was sanitized afterwards by hot water spray, followed by hypochlorite spray, and the room air was then saturated with quaternary ammonium chloride (Bi-quat) fog misted into the air by a pressurized canister. Select areas in the work area were then swab-tested for our specific antibiotic-resistant *E. coli* O157:H7 strains before the room was again available for use.

2.3. Processing lean beef wafers and beef cores.

Top butt beef subprimals (IMPS #184) were acquired from a local wholesale distributor and 'caps' were removed. The beef subprimals were processed using a coring device comprised of an electric hand drill fitted with a 2-inch diameter drill bit manufactured from stainless steel pipe (Figure 2). The drill and bit were used to obtain beef cores that were used for making lean beef wafers (Figures 1, 2). Lean beef wafers were made by tempering beef cores for 1 hr at -26°C to firm them up, and then sliced on a Bizerba (Bizerba GmbH and Co. KG, Balingen, Germany) slicer to a thickness of .64 cm to create lean wafers of 5.1-cm (2-in) diameter (20.25 cm²); alternatively, lean beef wafers were obtained by slicing beef subprimals to desired thickness as large sheets on a slicer, and then manually coring individual wafers in cookie-cutter fashion.

2.4. Antimicrobial spray and blade tenderization system.

A TC-700MC tenderizer (Ross Industries, Midland, VA) equipped with a Dosatron (Clearwater, FL) multi-nozzle custom-built spray system, with 3 nozzles spraying from above the conveyor belt, 2 from the sides, and 5 nozzles from below the belt (Figure 1) was used for application of antimicrobial test solutions and non-lethal water control spray streams to the inoculated lean beef wafers (phase 1) and beef subprimals (phase 2). The two blade tenderizing heads were removed from the Ross tenderizer when spray treating inoculated lean beef wafers, since no actual tenderization was taking place, and then replaced when spray intervention of inoculated beef subprimals was being performed in conjunction with blade tenderization. Each of the 2 blade heads consisted of 7 rows that each contained 32 stainless steel blades (3 mm wide); the 14 rows of 32 blades contained in the 2 blade heads were positioned crosswise across the conveyor belt. The belt advanced in 3.6-cm increments with the blades penetrating the subprimals after each advancement. Each subprimal was penetrated by both sets of blades during its 18-second dwell time, and it was determined that the system made 32 blade penetrations per 6.5 cm² (~1 in²). The custom-built spray nozzles sprayed each antimicrobial and control treatment (water) at a maximum rate of 1.5 gallons per minute with 40 pounds per in²

(psi) pressure. A restrictor valve was present could reduce the spray rate by approximately half if needed.

2.5. Antimicrobial solutions – Phase 1 (lean beef wafers).

Fourteen antimicrobials were evaluated in this study at levels recommended by the manufacturer's or distributor's technical representatives: disodium metasilicate (AvGard-XP; Danisco A/S, Copenhagen, Denmark), cetylpyridinium chloride (Cecure; Safe Foods Corp, Little Rock, Arkansas), copper sulfate pentahydrate (Preserv; Envirogreen Global Solutions, Miami, Florida), sodium chlorite/citric acid/sodium hydroxide (Stabilized Na Chlorite; Alliance Analytical Laboratories Inc., Coopersville, MI), peroxyacetic acid (Perasan; Enviro Tech Chemical Services Inc, Modesto, CA), lauric arginate with peroxyacetic acid (CytoGuard Plus (CytoGuard; A&B Ingredients, Fairfield, NJ), acidified sodium chlorite (XG-940; Dan Mar Co., Arlington, Texas), sodium chlorite and citric acid (acidified sodium chlorite; Crimson Chemicals, Fort Worth, Texas), lactic and citric acid (BeefXide; Birko Corporation, Henderson, Colorado), hydroxypropanoic acid (Lactic Acid FCC 88%; Archer Daniels Midland Company, Decatur, Illinois), hydrochloric and citric acid (Syntrx 3300; Synergy Technologies Inc., Shreveport, Louisiana), buffered sulfuric acid (AFTEC 3000; Advanced Food Technologies, LLC, Shreveport, LA), hydrochloric and citric acid (Citrilow; Safe Foods Corp, Little Rock, Arkansas), and hydrobromic acid (HB2; Enviro Tech Chemical Services, Modesto, CA). The active ingredient concentrations were listed if available, otherwise the application strength of the diluted product solution that was received is given since some formulations were nondisclosed for proprietary purposes by respective manufacturers (Table 1). The pH for each particular antimicrobial used is also presented (Table 1).

Table 1. List of Antimicrobials Used in Phase 1 (inoculated lean beef wafers).			
Product/Trade Name	Active Ingredient(s)	pH	Application Strength
1. AvGard-XP	Disodium metasilicate	13.1	60,000 ppm SMS
2. HB2	Hydrobromic acid	7.5	300 ppm
3. Cecure	Cetylpyridinium chloride	7.0	4,000 ppm
4. Preserv	Copper sulfate pentahydrate	6.8	*30% of concentrate
5. Stabilized Sodium Chlorite	Sodium chlorite, citric acid, sodium hydroxide	6.5	*<1%, <1%, <1% each
6. XG-940	Acidified sodium chlorite	6.5	200 ppm
7. Perasan MP2	Peroxyacetic acid	3.2	220 ppm
8. CytoGuard PLUS	Lauric arginate, peroxyacetic Acid	3.0	5,000 ppm LAE; 220 ppm
9. Acidified Sodium Chlorite	Sodium chlorite acidified with citric acid	2.7	1,100 ppm
10. BeefXide	Lactic acid, citric acid	2.1	*2.4% of concentrate
11. Lactic Acid	Hydroxypropanoic acid	1.9	50,000 ppm
12. Syntrx 3300	HCl, citric acid	1.2	*3% of concentrate
13. AFTEC 3000	Buffered sulfuric acid	1.0	17,500 ppm
14. Citrilow	HCl, citric acid	0.8	*18% of concentrate
*Note: For proprietary reasons the actual concentrations of some solutions have not been disclosed; the 'application strength' listed is the dilution level of the concentrate provided by the manufacturer or approximate level of active.			

2.6. Antimicrobial solutions – Phase 2 (blade tenderization).

Seven of the 14 antimicrobials evaluated in Phase 1 of this study were further examined for a reduction in the translocation of *E. coli* O157:H7 in conjunction with blade tenderization of beef subprimals. The antimicrobials used in Phase 2 were: AvGard-XP, Stabilized sodium chlorite, CytoGuard Plus, Lactic acid, AFTEC 3000, Citrilow, and HB2 and were applied as recommended by the manufacturers (Table 1).

2.7. Inoculation and spray treatment of lean beef wafers.

Lean beef wafers were inoculated with 0.1 mL of $\sim 2 \times 10^8$ cfu/mL (i.e., $\sim 1 \times 10^6$ cfu/cm²) of a multi-strain *E. coli* O157:H7 cocktail while resting in sterile stainless steel trays (Figures 1, 2). After inoculation, the cocktail was spread over the surface of the wafers using a gloved finger. The tray was then covered with aluminum foil and allowed to sit at 3°C for ~ 30 minutes to allow for bacterial attachment. The inoculated lean beef wafers were then subjected to an 18-sec spray treatment for each antimicrobial product ($n=16 \times 4$ post-treatment processing times).

Spray treatment was accommodated by running the samples through the Ross spray-integrated blade tenderizer. Although the TC700M tenderizer had a several gallon reservoir capacity, it was connected to an additional chemical reservoir in an adjoining room via connection through the wall that was outfitted with an automated sensor (Figure 1); as the level in the TC700M reservoir reached a low volume, the pump was triggered and additional solution was pumped into the TC700M reservoir as needed. At the start of each trial, both reservoirs were filled to insure sufficient processing capacity for each antimicrobial trial. After each antimicrobial, the antimicrobial spray reservoir was allowed to run until exhausted of its contents, then rinsed thoroughly with hot water (70°C) in order to ensure that residuals of prior antimicrobials and microbial inocula were eliminated from the chemical reservoir tank and conveyor belt chamber, respectively. Finally, the spray tank reservoir was filled twice, once with hot water and then again with deionized water and each was sprayed into the machine until depleted to remove prior solution from the pump, adjoining lines, and tenderizer reservoir (approximately 2-3 minutes each).

Each spray trial run included three control groups: un-inoculated wafers ($n=8$), inoculated wafers absent spray treatment ($n=8$), and inoculated wafers sprayed with deionized water ($n=8$). Lean beef wafers subjected to these control treatments were processed within 1 hr after spray treatment; controls were processed with each antimicrobial trial run. Four treatment group processing times were devised for the inoculated wafers sprayed with antimicrobials based on the time between spray treatment and final plating (~ 1 hr, and 1-, 7-, and 14 days). Lean wafers were placed inoculated side up on the blade tenderizer conveyor belt and subjected to an 18-sec dwell (spray) time. The spray nozzles expelled each particular antimicrobial and water control treatment at a rate of 5.68 L per minute. Wafers were then collected from the opposite end of the blade tenderizer machine and placed on absorbent pads in stainless steel trays, and then into sterile, filter-lined stomacher bags (Nasco Whirl-Pak®). The same process was conducted for the water treatment and un-inoculated controls subjected to antimicrobial spray treatment. Samples retrieved from the blade tenderizer were then placed into sterile stomacher filter bags (Nasco; Figure 1). One portion of wafers were processed immediately (i.e., ~ 1 -hr, $n=8$) and the remaining sets of wafers were vacuum-sealed, stored at 3°C, and processed for the *E. coli* O157:H7 inoculum counts after 1- ($n=8$), 7- ($n=8$), and 14 days ($n=8$).

2.8. Inoculation and mechanical tenderization of beef subprimals.

Top sirloin butt beef subprimals (IMPS # 169; ca. 10-15 lb each) were purchased fresh from a local wholesale distributor and stored at 4°C for no longer than 7 days prior to use. The caps were removed and fat was trimmed so that a contiguous intact core could be obtained (Figure 2). For each tenderization treatment, four 5.1-cm diameter circles were marked using edible ink on the lean surface of the beef subprimals (Figure 2). One hundred microliters of a multi-strain cocktail of *E. coli* O157:H7 ($\sim 2 \times 10^6$ cfu/mL) was applied to each circle and then thoroughly spread with a gloved finger within the circles (each ~ 20.25 cm²; i.e., $\sim 1 \times 10^4$ cfu/cm²). The inoculated top sirloin butt beef subprimal was then allowed to sit at 4°C for 30 min to promote attachment of the cells to the meat surface prior to any further processing. Each of the subprimals were moved via a conveyor belt (inoculated side up) on the TC 7000M tenderizer (Ross Industries, Midland, VA; Figure 2) equipped with a custom-built multi-nozzle spray system (Dositron) that eventually lead the meat beneath two sets of tenderizing blades in tandem. The integrated spray intervention system was comprised of 3 nozzles spraying from above, 2 nozzles spraying from the sides, and 5 spraying from below the conveyor belt. There were two control treatments per trial: inoculated with water spray and blade tenderization (W+BT) that served as the positive translocation control, and inoculated with water

spray but without blade tenderization (W-BT) that served as the negative translocation control. Treatments consisted of inoculated subprimals subjected to antimicrobial spray treatment and blade tenderization (A+BT). Each treatment passed once longitudinally through the tenderizer, lean side (inoculated side) up with a water spray. A top sirloin butt beef subprimal was set up with four separated replicates of inoculated circles (20.25-cm²) per top sirloin butt for each antimicrobial. The antimicrobials were then processed at a single concentration as recommended by the manufacturer's technical personnel.

2.9. Microbial sampling, isolation, and confirmation.

For inoculated *E. coli* O157:H7 counts obtained from lean beef discs in our Phase 1 trials, two discs were placed in each stomacher bag (Figure 1; the inoculated side was placed facing the filter membrane which could serve as an abrasive rub during stomaching) to which was added 40.54 mls of Difco™ D/E Neutralizing Broth (Becton, Dickinson & Company; Sparks, MD) and stomached at the 'high' setting for 60 sec with a Model 400 stomacher (Seward Laboratory Systems Inc., Bohemia, New York). Additional dilutions were made and samples were surface-plated onto Bacto™ Tryptic Soy Agar (TSA) (Becton, Dickinson & Company; Sparks, MD) containing gentamycin and rifamycin SV as mentioned earlier. The plates were incubated at 37°C for 48 hours, at which time the plates were counted manually for antibiotic-resistant (*E. coli* O157:H7) colonies. This same protocol was followed for treatment groups processed following 1-, 7-, and 14 days of refrigerated storage. Un-inoculated control lean beef disc samples were also plated to insure the absence of counts from the meat source.

Microbial evaluation of meat core samples obtained in Phase 2 after spray intervention and blade tenderization were processed for presence/absence of our Gen^R/Rif^R *E. coli* O157:H7 inoculum (using the regimen depicted in Figure 2). After removal of beef cores from beef subprimals, approximately 1/8-in of the inoculated surface was removed and the needle-entry side (top) was marked with edible ink. The beef cores were then surface-sanitized from *E. coli* O157:H7 contamination that might have been acquired during liquid spray dispersal and subsequent core removal by running them through a radiant heat oven (IR Grill™, Marlen/Unitherm Food Systems, Bristow, OK) for 5 min at high heat (~approx. 500°F air temperature at the beef surface; Figure 2). Upon exiting the radiant oven, the beef cores were aseptically sectioned into 1-inch sections that were weighed (~45-50-gm), placed into a stainless steel Waring blender with 100 mls enrichment broth, and blended at 'high' speed for 1 min. Blended samples were then poured into sterile filter-lined stomacher sampling bags and incubated at 37°C. After 24-hr enrichment, each sample bag was stomached to mix the contents and 1-ml was removed for extraction with *E. coli* O157:H7-specific immunomagnetic beads (Invitrogen, ThermoFisher Scientific, Waltham, MA, USA) using the USDA-FSIS method for IMS recovery on an automated Bead Retriever™ (Dynal, ThermoFisher Scientific; Figure 2). After recovery by the IMS procedure, the entire magnetic bead-cell mixture was plated onto Levine's eosin methylene blue agar (EMB, Oxoid, Cambridge, UK) containing rifamycin SV. The plates were read after 24 hr of incubation at 37°C as positive (those with the characteristic *E. coli* metallic sheen) or negative for *E. coli* O157:H7 (if green sheen colonies were absent) (Figure 2).

2.10. Statistical analysis.

For each set of treatments duplicate platings were made at each dilution level for each set of combined lean beef disc samples at each time tested and averages were calculated. The surface counts of *E. coli* O157:H7 from lean beef wafers were transformed into log CFU per square cm form

(CFU/cm²). Standard deviation of the log CFU/cm² values associated with each antimicrobial were calculated using the statistical function option offered with Microsoft Excel 2003 software (Redmond, WA) for Phase 1 and the STDEVPA function for Phase 2. Log reduction values were considered dependent variables. Data were analyzed using version 11.2 of the Sigma Plot statistical package (Systat Software Inc., San Jose, CA). A one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was performed and pairwise multiple comparison procedures (Holm-Sidak method) were used for mean separation of log reduction values; differences were considered significant at *P* values of < 0.05.

3. Results

3.1. Phase 1: Evaluation of 14 antimicrobials against *E. coli* O157:H7 on the surface of inoculated lean beef discs.

Phase 1 consisted of testing antimicrobials at supplier-recommended levels on *E. coli* O157:H7-inoculated lean beef discs to mimic *E. coli* on the surface of beef subprimals sprayed with antimicrobials. Processed beef disc samples were held on ice and processed within 1-hr of treatment and additional sets of samples were vacuum-packaged and processed after 1-, 7-, and 14-days. Microbial counts obtained showed significant differences of antimicrobials tested within 1-hr after processing vs. 1-, 7-, or 14-days later (Figure 3). Untreated inoculated lean beef wafers served as primary controls to indicate base inoculation level standard deviations (i.e., untreated) and others sprayed with water served as secondary controls to indicate the level of pathogen displaced by spray pressure (i.e., non-lethal water spray treatment) for comparison with samples spray treated with antimicrobials (Figure 3).

Microbial surface counts of lean beef wafers processed within 1 hr post-treatment with various antimicrobials revealed that at the concentrations used, BeefXide was the most effective (*P* < 0.05) at reducing surface microbial load (~1.46 log CFU/cm²) of *E. coli* O157:H7 (Fig. 3A) on lean wafers. AFTEC 3000, Cytoguard Plus, Citrilow, and AvGard-XP were also good with surface reductions of 1.0-1.2 log CFU/cm² within 1 hr of treatment. This timeline reflects what a processor might expect if antimicrobials were used to reduce surface STECs some time shortly prior to mechanical tenderization. These solutions proved more effective (*P* < 0.05) than the remaining tested antimicrobials at this time period (Figure 3).

The maximum level of reduction of *E. coli* O157:H7 for various antimicrobials differed depending on the post-process hold time before microbial enumeration. This was done to evaluate the potential reduction obtained at different hold times after treatment whereby a supplier might spray an intervention, package the beef, and ship it to an end-user that would then perform blade tenderization at some later time. After spray treatment and 1 day of refrigerated storage, AvGard-XP, AFTEC 3000, and Cytoguard Plus were the most effective (*P* < 0.05) at reducing surface counts (~2.1–1.9 log CFU/cm²) of *E. coli* O157:H7 (Figure 3).

After 7 days of refrigerated storage microbial enumeration showed that AvGard-XP was again the most effective (*P* < 0.05) antimicrobial tested (Figure 3) for reduction of *E. coli* O157:H7 (~3.61 log CFU/cm² log reduction) on the surface of lean beef wafers, followed by HB2, AFTEC 3000, Cytoguard Plus, and Stabilized Sodium Chlorite (~2.3–1.9 log CFU/cm² reduction). Similarly, after 14 days of refrigerated storage, surface counts of lean beef wafers revealed that AvGard-XP remained the most effective (*P* < 0.05) in the reduction (~4.18 Log CFU/cm²) of *E. coli* O157:H7 surface load (Figure 3). HB2 was the second most effective (*P* < 0.05) antimicrobial used for surface reduction (~3.28 Log

CFU/cm²) of *E. coli* O157:H7 after 14 days post-process storage followed by Cytoguard Plus, Stabilized Sodium Chlorite, and AFTEC 3000.

3.2. Phase 2: Translocation of *E. coli* O157:H7 into beef cores.

Seven antimicrobials were chosen to be tested in conjunction with blade tenderization to determine the incidence of *E. coli* O157:H7 translocation into beef core sections as determined by recovery from beef subprimals. The antimicrobials chosen were based on results obtained by performance against *E. coli* O157:H7 through 7 days post treatment with inoculated lean beef discs. Inoculated beef subprimals that were sprayed with water but not blade tenderized (negative control) resulted in 1 of 16 sections (compilation of 4 beef core replications of 4 sections each) positive for *E. coli* O157:H7 whereas inoculated beef subprimals sprayed with water *and* blade tenderized (positive control), resulted in 15 of 16 sections positive for *E. coli* O157:H7 (Figure 4). When inoculated beef subprimals were sprayed with antimicrobials and subjected to blade tenderization, we obtained various levels of translocation into various beef sections, all at levels lower than the positive controls (Figure 4). AvGard-XP was the most effective ($P < 0.05$) at reducing the translocation of *E. coli* O157:H7 into internal beef core sections, resulting in only 1 section positive for *E. coli* O157:H7 (Figure 4). Cytoguard Plus (+PAA), Citrilow, and Lactic Acid were the next effective group of antimicrobials at reducing translocation, resulting in 3-6 sections positive for *E. coli* O157:H7. Although the remaining solutions, HB2, AFTEC 3000, Stabilized Na-Chlorite were less effective ($P < 0.05$), they were still more effective relative to the positive controls using water alone (Figure 4).

4. Discussion

One of the initial works to suggest that mechanical tenderization may lead to food safety concerns was a graduate thesis from Kansas State in 1996 (i.e., S. Sporing) and published several years later [13]. That work suggested possible concerns from internalization of *E. coli* O157:H7 during mechanical tenderization of beef steaks. Since those initial concerns, investigators have examined the possibility that translocation of *E. coli* O157:H7 from the surface of beef subprimals to their interior during mechanical tenderization could be a cause for concern.

The use of 'lean beef discs' as a surface spray model facilitated the analysis of numerous antimicrobials. Prior to spray treatment, a ~30-min hold period was used to facilitate bacterial attachment to lean beef discs after inoculation. This period was sufficient as the inoculum held tenaciously to the inoculated meat surface in control treatments when sprayed with water resulting in only a 0.24-log (± 0.10 -log) reduction; this number was not subtracted from the antimicrobial treatments to indicate net lethality due to antimicrobials. After treatment, we applied a diluent volume (20 ml) equivalent to the beef disc inoculated surface area (20 cm²) that would allow enumeration of 'per ml' solution that would be equivalent to the inoculated surface area on a 'per cm²' basis; all microbial levels could thereby be related to each other and to the treatment received. Also, the beef disc surfaces were positioned in the filter membrane bags such that the inoculated surfaces faced the membrane to receive an abrasive treatment during stomaching as opposed to facing the smooth plastic bag surface.

One aspect that our timed study brought out (Figure 3) was the potential issue of 'processing aid vs ingredient'. According to federal labeling requirements, processing aids are defined as "Substances that are added to a food for their technical or functional effect in the processing but are present in the finished food at insignificant levels and do not have any technical or functional effect

in that food" [21,22], and therefore, are not required to be labelled. This brings into consideration whether the antimicrobial has residual activity whereby microbial reduction continues to occur over time as observed in Figure 3. Although these are specifics to be argued at the point of process implementation, our studies were not intended to be an exhaustive treatise on antimicrobial spray treatment as we examined a considerable number of potential antimicrobials in one-off trials based on levels recommended by the various suppliers. It should be noted that the effectiveness of each of these antimicrobials could be further optimized or improved relative to the results observed herein by additional studies. Our data confirms those observed by Heller et al. [23] in which antimicrobial spray interventions prior to mechanical tenderization could reduce surface viability and therefore the incidence of internal translocation of surface STECs.

Because of the various potential sizes of meat cuts (from steaks to large subprimals), we applied our inoculum according to bacterial surface density (cfu/cm²) as we believe it is the bacterial surface density that determines the likelihood of a (clean) tenderizing blade to come in contact with bacterial cells and draw them into the interior; a higher density would be more likely to contribute to this while a lower density would less likely contribute (i.e., at a lower rate). Similarly, loss of viability due to antimicrobial spray intervention changes the viable population to a somewhat lower (viable) cell density, reducing the likelihood of needle translocation. Standardizing the inoculated population density on the surface of different-sized beef cuts also standardizes the population that would be effected by antimicrobials since it is at the surface where the antimicrobial spray is addressing the surface microbiota. If an inoculum was applied on a weight basis of the beef products tested, then one could experience significantly different bacterial surface population densities if small vs. large beef products were being treated. This could change the risk of needle-based surface entry into beef between samples and/or the impact of different antimicrobials being applied to different population densities on different beef samples. Our data shows that antimicrobials demonstrating good antimicrobial performance in the lean beef wafer assays also performed well (i.e., fewer positive sections) in reducing the number of positive sections obtained after blade tenderization (Figure 4) compared to positive controls with no antimicrobial treatment. The degree of surface reduction is reflected in the reduction of translocation frequency (Figures 3, 4).

We examined sections of beef cores measured in 1-inch sections from the point of blade entry during mechanical tenderization, keeping track of sections in the order they occurred. It was observed that when antimicrobials were applied, as the number of sections that were STEC-positive started to decrease relative to the positive control, those sections that were farthest from the needle entry side were mostly negative compared to those close to the needle entry side (data not shown). We consider this an indication that the level of *E. coli* O157:H7 was diminished on the surface that translocation by blade entry was only sufficient to inoculate the first 1-to-3 sections of the 4 sections whereas the higher inoculation level (i.e., 10⁴ CFU/cm²) of the positive control allowed entry all the way to the 4th section.

The USDA-FSIS has referred to such mechanically-tenderized products as non-intact beef and indicated that processors and end-users should re-evaluate their processes that involves this technology for possible safety concerns [12]. USDA-FSIS proposal a rule (2013) that mechanically-tenderized beef should be labelled as such so that potential customers may be informed as to the potential risk from consuming such products and a final rule has recently been issued and enacted as of May, 2016 [16]. This issue was hard fought between consumer interest groups claiming that consumers have a 'right to know' if there is a risk from consumption of mechanically-tenderized beef

vs. industry groups suggesting that labelling to indicate such would hurt their industry, and USDA-FSIS was caught in the middle of this argument. During our study we used a radiant oven (InfraRed Grill, Figure 2) to ‘sanitize’ the outside of our recovered beef cores from potential surface contamination. This process of sanitizing the outside of the recovered beef cores to insure that recovered STEC was from internalized cells, also simulated the exact consumer issue. That is, by cooking beef at high heat on the outside while still being rare on the inside, it still allowed the recovery of *E. coli* O157:H7 that was translocated to the interior of the meat by mechanical tenderization. One food safety approach is to assure that all steaks are cooked to a safe endpoint insuring no survival of blade-translocated organisms. Studies have examined heat lethality of various cooking methods [19,20] or thickness of steak cuts [24,25], however, not everyone enjoys medium-to-well-cooked steaks. However, recent data shows that heat-resistant STECs possessing the locus of heat resistance (LHR) are still able to survive at >9+ log difference over non-heat-resistant strains when heated at 60°C for 15 min [26].

5. Conclusions

Our data shows that the implementation of antimicrobial spray interventions can result in a reduced risk of translocated STEC *E. coli* to interior sections. It is possible that effective industry-based interventions could lead to softening of the meat labelling requirements for mechanically-tenderized products. A similar ‘loosening’ of USDA-FSIS testing for *Listeria monocytogenes* is currently accommodated in the RTE processed meat industry by defining product processing categories based on risk (i.e., Alternative 1, 2, or 3) according to the final rule for control of *L. monocytogenes* in RTE meats [27]. If processors incorporate antimicrobial interventions as either a post-process lethality step or antimicrobial ingredients to prevent growth of *L. monocytogenes* during shelf life (or both), the products are considered by USDA-FSIS as having a ‘reduced risk’ and rewarded by being tested less than products not receiving the interventions. The same reduced-risk scenario could be incentivized for mechanically-tenderized beef whereby those that receive a validated antimicrobial intervention to reduce the presence of potential surface pathogens, and therefore reduce the risk of internalization (internal translocation), could possibly have some type of incentive awarded, such as a waiver of the labeling requirement. Of course, similar to the interventions implemented for control of *L. monocytogenes* on RTE meats, they would be required to be validated with appropriate studies by qualified individuals. The application of antimicrobial surface interventions to address surface microbiota before mechanical tenderization may provide the best approach to facilitate reduction during heating which is often an issue of both heating time and microbial load.

Acknowledgments: Funding for the study was contributed in part by each of the manufacturers/distributors of the various antimicrobials tested, by in-kind of the blade tenderizer by Ross Industries, by the R.M. Kerr Food & Ag Products Center, the USDA National Institute of Food and Agriculture, [Hatch Project #OKL03090] and the Division of Agricultural Sciences and Natural Resources at Oklahoma State University. Special thanks to Mr. Wayne Spillner, engineering manager at Ross Industries Inc., who served as our technical consultant with the TC700M tenderizer.

Author Contributions: All of the authors contributed significantly to the project. Drs. P. Muriana and B. Morgan were PI’s involved with project concept and oversight; J. Eager and B. Wellings were graduate students conducting research for their respective dissertations; K. Kushwaha was a post-doc with project responsibility on antimicrobial interventions and the grad students; J. Nelson was pilot plant manager of meat pilot plant and assisted greatly with facilities and equipment. All contributed to some degree with writing of the final manuscript.

Conflicts of Interest: The authors declare no conflict of interest. The funding sponsors had no role in the design of the study; in the collection, analyses, or interpretation of data; in the writing of the manuscript, or in the decision to publish the results.




Figure 1. Phase 1, evaluating antimicrobial efficacy against *E. coli* O157:H7-inoculated lean beef discs. (a) BSL-2 lab personal protection equipment; (b) Ross blade tenderizer; (c) 10 spray nozzles integrated 360° into the entrance of the blade tenderizer; (d) solution reservoir and pump system in an adjacent room; (e) inoculated lean beef discs; (f) placement of inoculated discs on conveyor belt; (g) inoculated discs travelling through the 360° spray zone for 18-sec dwell time; (h) processed beef discs are sampled in pairs prior to processing for microbial plating or vacuum-packaged for later analysis.



Figure 2. Phase 2, evaluation of select antimicrobials against *E. coli* O157:H7-inoculated beef subprimals in conjunction with blade tenderization. (a) array of beef subprimals during one trial; (b) beef subprimal prepared for inoculation in labeled zones; (c) inoculated beef subprimal entering blade tenderizer; (d) sprayed and blade-tenderized subprimal being cored; (e) recovery of beef cores using 2-inch circular drill bit; (f) recovered beef cores; (g) sanitizing outside of beef cores by passage through radiant heat oven; (h) sectioning of beef cores; (i) blending and (j) enrichment incubation of beef sections; (k) Bead Retriever™ for immunomagnetic bead recovery and enrichment of *E. coli* O157:H7 from enrichment broth; (l) plating of immunomagnetic beads with recovered *E. coli* O157:H7 onto EMB media containing rifamycin.




Figure 3. Reduction of *E. coli* O157:H7 on inoculated lean beef wafers passing through the tenderizer spray system. Data shows reductions observed relative to inoculated samples (control), water spray treatment, and 14 different antimicrobials. Groups of 4 represent samples processed within 1-hr, 1-day, 7-days, and 14-days after treatment. Each data bar represents the mean of 4 pairs of lean beef wafers ($n=8$) and error bars represent the standard deviation of the means. One way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was applied to data within each grouping of 4 time points for each antimicrobial. Data bars with the same lowercase letter (below the bars) are not significantly different; those with different letters are significantly different ($p < 0.05$).




Figure 4. Reduction of *E. coli* O157:H7 in antimicrobial spray-treated, blade-tenderized beef as determined from individual core sections recovered after processing (i.e., inoculation, spray treatment, blade tenderization, core excised, sectioning, blending, enrichment, and microbial plating). Results for each treatment (4 cores/treatment; 4 sections/core; n=16 sections) were determined for presence/absence of our inoculated *E. coli* 157:H7 strains. Negative controls represented inoculated but non-tenderized beef (Neg CTL) while positive controls represented inoculated and tenderized beef (Pos CTL). Positive and negative controls were sprayed with water instead of antimicrobials. Error bars represent standard deviation of *E. coli* O157:H7 presence (vs absence) within each set of 4 replicate core samples while bar height is the total of positive sections among 4 replications. Pairwise analysis of variance (Holm-Sidak method) of treatments with different letters represents significant differences ($p < 0.05$); data bars with the same letters are not significantly different.

References

1. NCBA. Beef industry long range plan. *National Cattlemen's Beef Assoc., Englewood, CO*. **1998**.
2. Harrison, A.; Smith, M.; Allen, D.M.; Hunt, M.C.; Klastner, C.; Kroft, D. Nutritional regime effects on quality and yield characteristics of beef. *Journal of Animal Science* **1978**, *47*, 383-388.
3. Davis, K.; Huffman, D.; Cordray, J. Effect of mechanical tenderization, aging and pressing on beef quality. *Journal of Food Science* **1975**, *40*, 1222-1224.
4. Glover, E.; Forrest, J.; Johnson, H.; Bramblett, V.; Judge, M. Palatability and cooking characteristics of mechanically tenderized beef. *Journal of Food Science* **1977**, *42*, 871-874.
5. Schwartz, W.; Mandigo, R. In *Effect of conveyor speed on mechanical tenderization of beef inside rounds*, Journal of Animal Science, 1974; AMER SOC ANIMAL SCIENCE 1111 NORTH DUNLAP AVE, SAVOY, IL 61874: pp 174-174.
6. Boyd, K.J.; Ockerman, H.W.; Plimpton, R.F. Sensory characteristics and microbiological evaluation of stored mechanizally tenderized beef semimembranosus muscle. *Journal of Food Science* **1978**, *43*, 670-672.
7. Mandigo, R.W.; Olson, D.G. Effect of blade size for mechanically tenderizing beef rounds. *Journal of Food Science* **1982**, *47*, 2095-2096.
8. Miller, S. In *Mechanical tenderization of meat in the HRI trade*, Proceedings, Reciprocal Meats Conference, 1975; p 134.
9. Bell, B.P.; Goldoft, M.; Griffin, P.M.; et al. A multistate outbreak of *Escherichia coli* O157:H7—associated bloody diarrhea and hemolytic uremic syndrome from hamburgers: the washington experience. *JAMA* **1994**, *272*, 1349-1353.
10. USDA-FSIS. Beef products contaminated with *Escherichia coli* O157:H7. *Federal Register* **1999**, *64*, 2803-2805.
11. USDA-FSIS. Shiga toxin-producing *Escherichia coli* in certain raw beef products (final rule, implementation). *Federal Register* **2012**, *77*, 31975-31981.
12. USDA-FSIS. HACCP plan reassessment for mechanically tenderized beef products. *Federal Register* **2005**, *70*, 30331-30334.
13. Phebus, R.; Thippareddi, H.; Sporing, S.; Marsden, J.; Kastner, C. *Escherichia coli* O157: H7 risk assessment for blade-tenderized beef steaks. *Cattlemen's Day* **2000**, *2000*, 117-118.
14. Laine, E.S.; Scheftel, J.M.; Boxrud, D.J.; Vought, K.J.; Danila, R.N.; Elfering, K.M.; Smith, K.E. Outbreak of *Escherichia coli* O157:H7 infections associated with nonintact blade-tenderized frozen steaks sold by door-to-door vendors. *Journal of Food Protection* **2005**, *68*, 1198-1202.
15. CDC. Multistate outbreak of *E. coli* O157:H7 infections associated with beef from National Steak and Poultry (final update). *Centers for Disease Control and Prevention* **2010**.
16. USDA-FSIS. Descriptive designation for needle- or blade-tenderized (mechanically tenderized) beef products. *Federal Register* **2015**, *80*, 28153-28172.

17. Luchansky, J.B.; Phebus, R.K.; Thippareddi, H.; Call, A.E. Translocation of surface-inoculated *Escherichia coli* O157:H7 into beef subprimals following blade tenderization. *Journal of Food Protection* **2008**, *71*, 2190-2197.
18. Huang, L. Growth kinetics of *Escherichia coli* O157:H7 in mechanically-tenderized beef. *International Journal of Food Microbiology* **2010**, *140*, 40-48.
19. Luchansky, J.B.; Porto-Fett, A.C.S.; Shoyer, B.; Phebus, R.K.; Thippareddi, H.; Call, J.E. Thermal inactivation of *Escherichia coli* O157:H7 in blade-tenderized beef steaks cooked on a commercial open-flame gas grill. *Journal of Food Protection* **2009**, *72*, 1404-1411.
20. Luchansky, J.B.; Porto-Fett, A.C.S.; Shoyer, B.A.; Call, J.E.; Schlosser, W.; Shaw, W.; Bauer, N.; Latimer, H. Fate of shiga toxin-producing O157:H7 and Non-O157:H7 *Escherichia coli* cells within blade-tenderized beef steaks after cooking on a commercial open-flame gas grill. *Journal of Food Protection* **2012**, *75*, 62-70.
21. Post, R.; Budak, C.; Canavan, J.; Duncan-Harrington, T.; Jones, B.J.; Kegley, M. A Guide to federal food labeling requirements for meat and poultry products. *US Department of Agriculture* **2007**.
22. United States Food and Drug Administration, U.F. TITLE 21--Food and Drugs; Chapter I--Food and Drug Administration, Department of Health and Human Services; Subchapter B--Food for Human Consumption; Part 101 -- Food Labeling; Subpart G--Exemptions From Food Labeling Requirements. . *Code of Federal Regulations* **2016**, *Title 21, Volume 2*.
23. Heller, C.E.; Scanga, J.A.; Sofos, J.N.; Belk, K.E.; Warren-Serna, W.; Bellinger, G.R.; Bacon, R.T.; Rossman, M.L.; Smith, G.C. Decontamination of beef subprimal cuts intended for blade tenderization or moisture enhancement. *Journal of Food Protection* **2007**, *70*, 1174-1180.
24. Adler, J.M.; Geornaras, I.; Belk, K.E.; Smith, G.C.; Sofos, J.N. Thermal Inactivation of *Escherichia coli* O157:H7 Inoculated at Different Depths of Non-Intact Blade-Tenderized Beef Steaks. *Journal of Food Science* **2012**, *77*, M108-M114.
25. Saha, J.; Jaroni, D.; Nelson, J.; Willoughby, C.; McDaniel, C.; Jadeja, R. Influences of weight and thickness on cooking time required for various mechanically tenderized beef steaks to reach minimum safe internal temperature without resting. *LWT* **2018**.
26. Ma, A.; Chui, L. Identification of heat resistant *Escherichia coli* by qPCR for the locus of heat resistance. *Journal of Microbiological Methods* **2017**, *133*, 87-89.
27. USDA-FSIS. Compliance guidelines to control *Listeria monocytogenes* in post-lethality exposed ready-to-eat meat and poultry products. USDA-FSIS: Washington, DC, **2012**.