

# International Journal of **Dairy Science**

ISSN 1811-9743



www.academicjournals.com

# **∂ OPEN ACCESS**

#### **International Journal of Dairy Science**

ISSN 1811-9743 DOI: 10.3923/ijds.2020.123.133



# Research Article Risk Profile of Some Food Safety Hazards Associated with Ice-cream Sold in Egypt

# Ahmed H. GadAllah, Abdel-Hay M. Abou Zied and Karima M. Fahim

Department of Food Hygiene and Control, Faculty of Veterinary Medicine, Cairo University, Egypt

# Abstract

**Background and Objective:** Ice cream is one of the most popular and massively consumed dairy products for children and adults. Contaminated ice cream is considered a potential threat to the population, so ensuring the safety of ice cream is a significant issue for the public health. This study aimed to determine the potential biological, chemical and physical hazards of small and large scale manufactured ice cream consumed in Egypt. **Materials and Methods:** Seventy five samples of ice-cream (35 large scale and 40 small scale) were collected from street vendors, dairy shops and supermarkets in Cairo and Giza governorates and inspected for different types of hazards. Independent samples t-test and the significant ( $p\leq0.05$ ) relationship between the hygienic status of small and large scale ice cream samples were calculated. **Results:** The *S. aureus* was detected with an incidence of 12.5% for small scale samples and 11.42% for large scale ice-cream samples, while *E. coli, Salmonella* and *L. monocytogenes* couldn't be detected in all examined samples. Total mesophilic bacteria; Psychrotrophs, Coliform, Fecal coliform, Yeast, Mold and Total staphylococci counts were also determined. Aflatoxin M1 was present in 16 of the 20 examined small scale and large scale ice-cream samples, while Organochlorinated pesticides and Polychlorinated biphenyls couldn't be detected in all examined samples. Physical hazard was inspected in 3(7.5%) samples of the examined small scale ice-cream including hair, plastic piece and metal piece. **Conclusion:** It is considered a top priority to improve the hygienic status of the produced ice-cream in addition to implementing regulatory measures for ensuring the safety and quality of ice cream.

Key words: Risk, food safety hazards, ice-cream, aflatoxin, pesticide residues, dairy products, organic pollutant

Citation: Ahmed H. GadAllah, Abdel-Hay M. Abou Zied and Karima M. Fahim, 2020. Risk profile of some food safety hazards associated with ice-cream sold in Egypt. Int. J. Dairy Sci., 15: 123-133.

Corresponding Author: Ahmed H. GadAllah, Department of Food Hygiene and Control, Faculty of Veterinary Medicine, Cairo University, Egypt

Copyright: © 2020 Ahmed H. GadAllah *et al.* This is an open access article distributed under the terms of the creative commons attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author and source are credited.

Competing Interest: The authors have declared that no competing interest exists.

Data Availability: All relevant data are within the paper and its supporting information files.

### INTRODUCTION

Ice-cream is one of the favorite dairy products for large segments of the population as it is consumed by all aged groups, it is considered as nutritive food, due to its composition, which includes milk proteins, fat and lactose, it is also a rich supply of calcium, phosphorous and essential vitamins<sup>1</sup>.

During production, handling, transportation and storage, ice cream may become contaminated with different types of hazards that are transmissible to human. Ice-cream is a good medium for microbial growth owing to its high nutrient value, almost neutral pH and long storage duration. Primary sources of microbial contamination to ice-cream incorporate water and raw milk, whereas secondary sources incorporate flavoring agents, utensils and inappropriate handling. Despite the fact that pasteurization, freezing and hardening steps in production can destroy the majority of microbial hazards, numerous microorganisms like *L. monocytogens, S. aureus, Salmonella, E. coli* and coliforms have been documented to contaminate ice-cream during the different steps of production<sup>2,3</sup>.

Yeasts and molds may also get entry into ice-cream from the use of inadequately treated cane sugar, emulsifiers and flavorings, equipment, utensils, human hands and atmosphere<sup>4,5</sup>.

The production of ice cream in Egypt is classified into three main classes, large scale industrialized plants, small scale manufacturers and street vendors. Large scale industrialized plants are typically supplied for pasteurization, freezing and machine packing; small scale manufacturers are supplied with a mechanical operated freezer, while street vendors (mainly modest community and villages) utilize the simplest materials and primitive techniques of production. Unfortunately, the sanitary condition of small scale ice-cream in Egypt is still underway in most cases due to lack of satisfactory hygiene and regular microbiological control<sup>6</sup>.

Various chemical contaminants also might be presented during milk production, dairy processing or packaging, these chemical hazards include toxins as mycotoxins which can contaminate the animal feed and have some residues in milk and dairy products. The aflatoxins are groups of chemically similar toxic fungal metabolites produced by certain molds of the genus Aspergillus. Aflatoxin M1 (AFM1) might be found in the milk of animals that are fed with aflatoxin B1 (AFB1) containing feed<sup>7</sup>.

Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs) are chemical hazards that are resistant to degradation in the environment, bioaccumulate and are toxic. Organochlorine pesticides are one of POPs that can be transferred to milk through the contaminated feed of lactating cows or by their application to the cow's body, in the cow barn or even in the milk processing areas for pest infestation. These pesticides can cause a wide range of toxic effects, genotoxicity, carcinogenicity and hormonal disturbance<sup>8,9</sup>.

Polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs) which also categorized as POPs were used in electrical systems and in hydraulic fluid. Cow milk is a source of human exposure to polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs), they are of particular concern because they are endocrine disruptors and neurotoxicants that persist and bio-accumulate due to their inherent high lipophilicity<sup>8,10</sup>.

Milk and dairy products in general exposed to physical hazards from different sources, the main physical hazards found in milk and dairy products are insects, metals and plastics<sup>11,12</sup>, which are major sources of consumer complaints as reported by numerous food manufacturers and retailers. Some of these sources can cause serious health risks to the consumer, for example injury to the oral cavity, damage to the teeth, asphyxiation, internal bleeding, throat pain, dysphagia, regurgitation and death<sup>13</sup>.

Several aspects are significant in the production of high quality ice-cream and are related to the stages of production, which incorporate cleaning and sanitation, hygiene of storage area, hygienic design and personnel training. The failure to apply these practices may prompt high bacterial count and potential public health problems. As most of the ice-cream consumers are children of the vulnerable age groups, it is required to be microbiologically safe<sup>5</sup>.

Risk assessment is the scientific logical procedure of determining the relationship between exposure to a given hazard under a defined set of conditions and the probability of an adverse health effect or disease. Risk assessments principally composed of four major steps, including hazard identification, hazard characterization, exposure assessment and risk characterization<sup>14</sup>.

On account of the great importance of ice cream consumption and its role as a carrier of some public health risks, the present study was conducted to assess the different hazards, which can be associated with small scale and large scale ice cream samples which sold in Cairo and Giza governorates and evaluate their acceptability according to the Egyptian guidelines with the possible control measures of this hazards.

# **MATERIALS AND METHODS**

**Collection and preparation of samples:** A total of 75 ice-cream samples (35 large and 40 small scale) was collected

from street vendors, dairy shops and supermarkets from October 2018 to June 2019 in Cairo and Giza governorates. Ice-cream samples included wide varieties i.e., vanilla, strawberry, chocolate, peanut and almonds. The collected samples were labelled and immediately transferred to the laboratory in an ice-box at 4°C and stored at -20°C prior to examination, the samples were thawed up to 40 for not more than 15 min with continuous agitation in a thermostatically controlled water bath (polyscienceG35486)<sup>15</sup>.

**Investigation of some microbiological hazards:** Decimal dilutions of the samples were prepared according to the standard method given by APHA<sup>15</sup>. The prepared samples and their decimal dilutions were subjected to the following microbiological examinations:

- Total aerobic bacterial count: It was adopted according to ISO<sup>16</sup> by using pour plate method. The inoculated plates of standard plate count agar and the control ones were incubated at 30°C/48 h for mesophilic counts and at 7±1/10 days for psychrotrophic counts. Plates showing 30-300 colonies were counted and the results were calculated as the number of colony forming units (CFU g<sup>-1</sup>) of each ice-cream sample
- **Coliform and fecal coliform content (MPN/g):** This was conducted according to BAM<sup>17</sup> using Most Probable Number (MPN) technique. Identification of the isolated Coliforms and Isolation of *E. coli* were carried out according to BAM online and Silva *et al.*<sup>18, 19</sup>
- Total yeast and mold counts: It was depicted according to ISO<sup>20</sup>
- **Total staphylococci count:** It was determined as described by BAM<sup>17</sup>. Isolation and Identification of *S. aureus* were assessed according to BAM online<sup>21</sup>
- Incidence of *Salmonella* and *Listeria monocytogenes:* It was assessed according to BAM online<sup>22,23</sup>

# Investigation of some chemical hazards

**Quantitative determination of Aflatoxin M1:** Aflatoxin M1 was detected using a commercial enzyme-linked immunosorbent assay (ELISA), Helica Biosystems Inc., Santa Ana, CA, USA, catalogue No. 961AFLM01M-96<sup>24</sup>.

**Determination of pesticide residues:** Quick and easy method (QuEChERS) for determination of pesticide residues in foods using GC-MSMS, using the Multi-Residues technique standards. It analyzed organochlorine pesticides,  $\alpha$ -hexachlorocyclohexane ( $\alpha$ -HCH),  $\beta$ -hexachlorocyclohexane

 $(\beta$ -HCH),  $\gamma$ -hexachlorocyclohexane  $(\gamma$ -HCH), p,pdichlorodiphenyltrichloroethane (p,p-DDT), o,pdichlorodiphenyltrichloroethane (o,p-DDT), p,pdichlorodiphenyldichloroethylene (p,p-DDE), p,pdichlorodiphenyldichloroethane (p,p-DDD), Aldrin, dieldrin, Endrin, Heptachlor, Heptachlor epoxide and PCB congeners 28, 52, 101, 118, 138, 153 and 180, European Standard Method EN 15662-2018. The standard mixture was supplied by QCAP (Quality Control of Agriculture Products), Central Laboratory of Residue Analysis of Pesticides and Heavy Metals in Food, Agricultural Research Center Ministry of Agriculture and Land Reclamation<sup>25,26</sup>.

**Investigation of physical hazards:** The samples were examined for the presence of any foreign bodies and physical hazards by naked eye observation according to van Asselt<sup>27</sup>.

**Statistical analysis:** The obtained data were analyzed statistically using SPSS statistics 17.0 for windows. The results of microbiological analysis of small scale and large scale ice cream samples were analyzed using independent-samples t-test to compare results between the two categories and using Levene's test for variances. The differences were considered significant at the p<0.05 level.

# RESULTS

**Total mesophilic bacterial count:** The results in Table 1 revealed that total viable mesophilic bacterial count of the examined ice-cream samples ranged from 2.5-5.8 and 3.6-7.1 log CFU g<sup>-1</sup> with mean values of  $5.2\pm5.5$  and  $6.32\pm5.8 \log$  CFU g<sup>-1</sup> in large scale and small scale ice-cream samples, respectively, with significant difference (t = 3.056, p<0.001).

**Psychrotrophic bacterial count:** The obtained results in Table 1 revealed that psychrotrophic counts were recorded in all small and large scale ice-cream samples, the mean values of Psychrotrophs were  $5.3 \pm 4.7 \log \text{ CFU g}^{-1}$  for large scale ice-cream samples and  $4.8 \pm 4.4 \log \text{ CFU g}^{-1}$  for small scale ice-cream samples with non-significant statistical difference (t = 0.834).

**Coliform count:** The results illustrated in Table 1 showed that 17.1% of the examined large scale ice-cream samples were contaminated with coliform ranged from 2.8-3.5 with an average of  $3.06\pm2.91 \log$  CFU g<sup>-1</sup>, while 77.5% of the small scale samples were contaminated with coliform ranged from 3.3-7.4 with an average of  $6.1\pm5.8 \log$  CFU g<sup>-1</sup>.

Positive samplesMicrobiological parameters (CFU g <sup>-1</sup> )NumberPercentageMinimumTotal aerobic mesophilic bacteria40100.03.67.1Psychrotrophs count3177.53.37.4Coliform count (MPN/g)3177.53.37.4Fecal coliform count3485.02.97.1Wold count1435.04.176.17Veast count1127.52.04.0Mold count1127.52.04.0Total Staphylococci count1127.52.04.0Mold count1127.52.04.0Total Staphylococci count1127.52.04.0Mold count1127.52.04.0Total Staphylococci count1127.52.04.0Mold count1127.52.04.0Mold count1127.52.04.0Mold count1127.52.04.0Mold count1127.52.04.0Microbiological parameterCritical limitNumberPercentageMicrobiological parameterCritical limitNumber92.5Microbiological parameterCritical limitNumber92.7Salmonellaspip.334.0100Salmonellaspip.334.0100Salmonellaspip.334.0100Salmonellaspip.<	m Mean±S.E.M. 6.32±5.8 4.80±4.4 6.10±5.8 5.13±4.75 5.90±5.6 3.00±2.6 5.70±5.2 5.70±5.2 her (2)	Positive samples Number Percentage 35 100.0 6 17.1 1 2.9 32 91.4 3 8.57 33 94.2 005/1185-1)	Minimum Maxim 2.5 5.5 3.4 6.5 2.8 3.5 2.55 2.5 2.5 2.5 2.0 4.3 2.5 2.5 5.5	Num         Mean±S.E.M.           8         5.20±5.5           1         5.30±4.7           5         3.06±2.91           55         2.55           8         2.05±4.5           9         2.05±2.8           9         5.00±4.5           9         5.00±4.5	T-test statistical 	results -value 0.004b 0.407 0.041c 0.041c 0.042c 0.404 0.024c
Microbiological parameters (CFU g <sup>-1</sup> )NumberPercentageMinimumMaximumTotal aerobic mesophilic bacteria40100.03.67.1Psychrotrophs count3177.53.37.4Coliform count (MPN/g)3177.53.37.4Fecal coliform count3485.02.97.1Yeast count1127.52.04.0Mold count1127.52.04.0Total Staphylococci count1127.52.04.0Total Staphylococci count1127.52.04.0Total Staphylococci count1127.52.04.0Mold count1127.52.04.0Total Staphylococci count1127.52.04.0Mold count1127.52.04.0Table 2: Acceptability of small scale and large scale ice-cream samples in relation to the Small scale colony countAcceptableMicrobiological parameterCritical limitNumberPercentageMicrobiological parameterCritical limitNumber922.5Coliform countabsent/g3.54.0100S aureusabsent/g3.54.0100S aureusabsent/g3.54.0100S aureusabsent/g3.54.0100S aureusabsent/g3.54.0100S aureusabsent/g3.54.0100S aureusabsent/g4.0 </th <th>n Mean±S.E.M. 6.32±5.8 4.80±4.4 6.10±5.8 5.13±4.75 5.90±5.6 3.00±2.6 5.70±5.2 6.70±5.2 fies (n = 40)</br></th> <th>Number Percentage 35 100.0 6 17.1 1 2.9 32 91.4 3 8.57 33 94.2 005/1185-1)</th> <th>Minimum Maxim 2.5 5.5 3.4 6.1 2.8 3.5 2.55 2.5 2.0 4.13 2.5 5.5 2.5 2.5 5.5 2.5 2.5 5.5 2.5 2.5 5.5</th> <th>Num         Mean±S.E.M.           8         5.20±5.5           6         5.30±4.7           5         3.06±2.91           55         2.55           6         2.55           7         2.55           8         2.55           9         4.90±4.5           9         2.60±4.5           9         5.00±4.5           9         5.00±4.5</th> <th>t- test value 3.056 0.834 2.114 2.564 2.105 0.840 2.342 2.342</th> <th>P-value 0.004b 0.407 0.041f 0.041f 0.042f 0.404 0.024c</th>	n Mean±S.E.M. 6.32±5.8 4.80±4.4 	Number Percentage 35 100.0 6 17.1 1 2.9 32 91.4 3 8.57 33 94.2 005/1185-1)	Minimum Maxim 2.5 5.5 3.4 6.1 2.8 3.5 2.55 2.5 2.0 4.13 2.5 5.5 2.5 2.5 5.5 2.5 2.5 5.5 2.5 2.5 5.5	Num         Mean±S.E.M.           8         5.20±5.5           6         5.30±4.7           5         3.06±2.91           55         2.55           6         2.55           7         2.55           8         2.55           9         4.90±4.5           9         2.60±4.5           9         5.00±4.5           9         5.00±4.5	t- test value 3.056 0.834 2.114 2.564 2.105 0.840 2.342 2.342	P-value 0.004b 0.407 0.041f 0.041f 0.042f 0.404 0.024c
Total aerobic mesophilic bacteria40100.03.67.1Psychrotrophs count3177.53.37.4Psychrotrophs count3177.53.37.4Fecal coliform count (MPN/g)3485.02.97.1Yeast count1127.52.04.0Mold count1127.52.04.0Total Staphylococci count1127.52.04.0Total Staphylococci count1127.52.06.7*n: Total number of examined samples, <sup>b</sup> Significant at p<0.001, <sup>c</sup> Significant at p<0.056.7*n: Total number of examined samples, <sup>b</sup> Significant at p<0.001, <sup>c</sup> Significant at p<0.056.7Table 2: Acceptability of small scale and large scale ice-cream sample5Table 2: Acceptability of small scale and large scale ice-cream sample5Total Colony countnot >10 CFU g <sup>-1</sup> 922.5Coliform countnot >10 CFU g <sup>-1</sup> 2767.5Coliform countnot >10 CFU g <sup>-1</sup> 2767.5Salmonella spisent/g35387.5Salmonella spisent/g40100*n: Total number of examined samples100*n: Total number of examined samples35*n: Total number of examined samples	6.32±5.8 4.80±4.4 6.10±5.8 5.13±4.75 5.90±5.6 3.00±2.6 5.70±5.2 5.70±5.2 he Egyptian standard (2)	35 100.0 35 100.0 6 17.1 1 2.9 32 91.4 3 8.57 33 94.2 005/1185-1)	2,5 5,8 3,4 6,1 2,8 6,1 2,5 2,5 3,15 2,5 5,5 2,5 5,6 2,5 5,6 2,5 5,6 2,6 1,6 1,6 1,6 1,6 1,6 1,6 1,6 1,6 1,6 1	<ul> <li>S.20±5.5</li> <li>5.30±4.7</li> <li>5.30±4.7</li> <li>3.06±2.91</li> <li>2.55</li> <li>2.55</li> <li>4.90±4.5</li> <li>2.80±2.8</li> <li>5.00±4.5</li> <li>5.00±4.5</li> </ul>	3.056 0.834 2.114 2.564 2.105 0.840 2.342 2.342	0.004 <sup>b</sup> 0.407 0.041 <sup>c</sup> 0.041 <sup>c</sup> 0.042 <sup>c</sup> 0.404 0.024 <sup>c</sup>
Psychrotrophs count40100.02.65.9Coliform count (MPN/g.)3177.53.37.4Fecal coliform count1435.04.176.17Yeast count3485.02.97.1Mold count1127.52.04.0Total Staphylococci count1127.52.04.0Total Staphylococci count40100.03.06.7*n. Total number of examined samples, "Significant at $p \leq 0.001$ , "Significant at $p \geq 0.001$ 5.06.7*n. Total number of examined samples, "Significant at $p \geq 0.001$ , "Significant at $p \geq 0.05$ 5.06.7*n. Total number of examined samples, "Significant at $p \geq 0.001$ , "Significant at $p \geq 0.05$ 6.76.7*n. Total number of examined samples, "Significant at $p \geq 0.001$ , "Significant at $p \geq 0.05$ 6.76.7Table 2: Acceptability of small scale and large scale ice-cream sample6.76.7*n. Total colony countnot >10 CFU g^{-1}2767.5Coliform countnot >10 CFU g^{-1}2767.5Salmonella spp.absent/g3587.5Salmonella spp.absent/g40100*n: Total number of examined samples40100	4.80±4.4 6.10±5.8 5.13±4.75 5.90±5.6 3.00±2.6 5.70±5.2 5.70±5.2	35 100.0 6 17.1 1 2.9 32 91.4 3 8.57 33 94.2 005/1185-1)	3.4 6.1 2.8 3.5 2.55 2.5 2.0 2.1 2.5 5.5 2.5 5.5 2.5 5.5 2.5 5.5 2.5 5.5	<ul> <li>5.30±4.7</li> <li>5.30±4.7</li> <li>3.06±2.91</li> <li>2.55</li> <li>2.55</li> <li>4.90±4.5</li> <li>5.00±4.5</li> <li>5.00±4.5</li> </ul>	0.834 2.114 2.564 2.105 0.840 2.342 2.342	0.407 0.041 <sup>c</sup> 0.041 <sup>c</sup> 0.042 <sup>c</sup> 0.404 0.024 <sup>c</sup>
Coliform count (MPN/g1)3177.53.37.4Fecal coliform count1435.04.176.17Yeast count3485.02.97.1Mold count1127.52.04.0Total Staphylococci count1127.52.04.0Total Staphylococci count40100.03.06.7*n: Total number of examined samples, "Significant at $p \leq 0.001$ , "Significant at $p \leq 0.05$ 7.1Table 2: Acceptability of small scale and large scale ice-cream samples in relation to the Staphylococci countAcceptableTable 2: Acceptability of small scale and large scale ice-cream samples in relation to the Staphylococci countAcceptableTable 2: Acceptability of small scale and large scale ice-cream samples in relation to the Staphylococci countAcceptableTable 2: Acceptability of small scale and large scale ice-cream samples in relation to the Staphylococci countAcceptableTable 2: Acceptability of small scale ice-cream samples in relation to the Staphylococci countAcceptableAcceptableAcceptableAcceptableTotal colony countnot >10 CFU g^{-1}2761form countabsent/g3587.55 aureusabsent/g3587.55 aureusabsent/g401006.100Acoil number of examined samplesAcceptable7.101absent/g3587.56.11absent/g401007.11absent/g401007.12absent/g40100<	6.10±5.8 5.13±4.75 5.90±5.6 3.00±2.6 5.70±5.2 6.70±5.2 he Egyptian standard (2)	6 17.1 1 2.9 32 91.4 33 8.57 33 94.2 005/1185-1)	2.8 3.5 2.55 2.5 2.0 4.3 2.5 5.5 2.5 5.5 2.5 5.5 2.5 5.5	<ul> <li>3.06±2.91</li> <li>3.06±2.91</li> <li>4.90±4.5</li> <li>2.80±2.8</li> <li>5.00±4.5</li> <li>am camples (n = 35)</li> </ul>	2.114 2.564 2.105 0.840 2.342 2.342	0.041 <sup>c</sup> 0.041 <sup>c</sup> 0.042 <sup>c</sup> 0.404 0.024 <sup>c</sup>
Fecal coliform count1435.04.176.17Yeast count3485.02.97.1Mold count1127.52.04.0Total Staphylococci count40100.03.06.7*n: Total number of examined samples, <sup>b</sup> Significant at $p \leq 0.001$ , °Significant at $p \leq 0.05$ 4.0Table 2: Acceptability of small scale and large scale5mall scale ice-cream samples in relation to the Staphylococci countMicrobiological parameterCritical limitNumber67.5Microbiological parameterCritical limit922.5Total colony countnot >10 CFU g^{-1}922.5Saimonella spp.absent/g3.587.5Saimonella spp.absent/g4.0100Stamonella spp.absent/g4.0100Mumber of examined samples3587.5Saimonella spp.absent/g4.0100Mumber of examined samples100100Saimonella spp.absent/g4.0100Mumber of examined samples100100	5.13±4.75 5.90±5.6 3.00±2.6 5.70±5.2 he Egyptian standard (20 hes (n = 40)	1 2.9 32 91.4 3 8.57 33 94.2 005/1185-1)	2.55 2.5 2.5 5.5 2.0 4.3 2.5 5.5 2.5 5.5	<ul> <li>55 2.55</li> <li>6 4.90±4.5</li> <li>8 2.80±2.8</li> <li>5.00±4.5</li> <li>am camples (n = 35)</li> </ul>	2.564 2.105 0.840 2.342	0.041 <sup>c</sup> 0.042 <sup>c</sup> 0.404 0.024 <sup>c</sup>
Yeast count3485.02.97.1Mold count1127.52.04.0Total Staphylococci count40100.03.06.7*n: Total number of examined samples, "Significant at $p \leq 0.001$ , "Significant at $p \leq 0.001$ , "Significant at $p \leq 0.05$ *.0*.0*n: Total number of examined samples scale ice-cream samples in relation to the Small scale and large scale ice-cream samples in relation to the Small scale ice-cream sample*.0*.0Ible 2: Acceptability of small scale and large scale ice-cream samplesSmall scale ice-cream samples*.0*.0Microbiological parameterCritical limitNumberPercentageIotal colony countnot >10 CFU g^{-1}2767.5Coliform countnot >10 CFU g^{-1}2767.5Sairnonella spp.absent/g3587.5Sairnonella spp.absent/g4.0100L. monocytogenesabsent/g4.0100L. monocytogenesabsent/g4.0100L. monocytogenesabsent/g4.0100	5.90±5.6 3.00±2.6 5.70±5.2 e Egyptian standard (2) iles (n = 40)	32 91.4 3 8.57 33 94.2 005/1185-1)	2.5 5.5 2.0 4.3 2.5 5.5	<ul> <li>4.90±4.5</li> <li>2.80±2.8</li> <li>5.00±4.5</li> <li>am camples (n = 35)</li> </ul>	2.105 0.840 2.342	0.042 <sup>c</sup> 0.404 0.024 <sup>c</sup>
$\begin{tabular}{ c c c c c c c } \hline 11 & 27.5 & 2.0 & 4.0 \\ \hline Total Staphylococci count & 40 & 100.0 & 3.0 & 6.7 \\ \mbox{$^{-1}$: Total number of examined samples, $^{-5}$:gniftcant at $p$=0.001, $^{-5}$:gniftcant at $p$=0.05 \\ \hline Table 2: Acceptability of small scale and large scale ice-cream samples in relation to the $$$ Table 2: Acceptability of small scale and large scale ice-cream samples in relation to the $$$ Table 2: Acceptability of small scale and large scale ice-cream samples in relation to the $$$ Table 2: Acceptability of small scale and large scale ice-cream samples in relation to the $$$ Table 2: Acceptability of small scale and large scale ice-cream samples in relation to the $$ Table 2: Acceptability of small scale and large scale ice-cream samples in relation to the $$ Table 2: Acceptability of $$ Table 2: Acceptable $$ Table 2: Accept$	3.00±2.6 5.70±5.2 ne Egyptian standard (2 iles (n = 40)	3 8.57 33 94.2 005/1185-1)	2.0 4.3 2.5 5.5	<ul> <li>2.80±2.8</li> <li>5.00±4.5</li> <li>am camples (n = 35)</li> </ul>	0.840 2.342	0.404 0.024 <sup>c</sup>
Total Staphylococci count40100.03.06.7*n: Total number of examined samples, "Significant at $p \leq 0.01$ , "Significant at $p \leq 0.05$ *n: Total number of examined samples, "Significant at $p \geq 0.05$ *n: Total number of examined samples, "Significant at $p \geq 0.05$ Table 2: Acceptability of small scale and large scale ice-cream samples in relation to the Small scale ice-cream sample*n: Total number of the Small scale ice-cream samples in relation to the Small scale ice-cream sampleMicrobiological parameterCritical limitNumberPercentageTotal colony countnot >10.5 × 10 <sup>4</sup> CFU g <sup>-1</sup> 2767.5Coliform countnot >10 CFU g <sup>-1</sup> 2767.5Salmonella spp.absent/g3587.5Salmonella spp.absent/g40100LonooCytogenesabsent/g40100LonooCytogenesabsent/g40100*n: Total number of examined samples40100	$5.70\pm 5.2$ ne Egyptian standard (2 les (n = 40)	33 94.2 005/1185-1)	2.5 5.5	) 5.00±4.5 am samples (n = 35)	2.342	0.024 <sup>€</sup>
<ul> <li><sup>a</sup>h: Total number of examined samples, <sup>b</sup>Significant at p≤0.001, <sup>c</sup>Significant at p≤0.05</li> <li>Table 2: Acceptability of small scale and large scale ice-cream samples in relation to the Small scale ice-cream samples</li> <li>For Small scale ice-cream samples in relation to the Small scale ice-cream sample</li> <li>Microbiological parameter</li> <li>Critical limit</li> <li>Number</li> <li>Percentage</li> <li>Coliform count</li> <li>not &gt;10. CFU g<sup>-1</sup></li> <li>27</li> <li>67.5</li> <li>Coliform count</li> <li>not &gt;10. CFU g<sup>-1</sup></li> <li>27</li> <li>67.5</li> <li>5 aureus</li> <li>absent/g</li> <li>40</li> <li>100</li> <li><i>L monocytogenes</i></li> <li>absent/g</li> <li>40</li> <li>100</li> <li><i>L monocytogenes</i></li> <li>absent/g</li> <li>40</li> <li>100</li> </ul>	ne Egyptian standard (20 Nes (n = 40)	005/1185-1)		am samoles (n = 35)		
Table 2: Acceptability of small scale and large scale ice-cream samples in relation to the Small scale ice-cream sample         Small scale ice-cream sample         Small scale ice-cream sample         Small scale ice-cream sample         Acceptable         Acceptable         Microbiological parameter       Critical limit       Number       Percentage         Total colony count       not >10 CFU g <sup>-1</sup> 27       67.5         Coliform count       not >10 CFU g <sup>-1</sup> 27       67.5         S aureus       absent/g       35       87.5         Salmonella spp.       absent/g       40       100         L. monocytogenes       absent/g       40       100         M. Total number of examined samples       40       100	ne Egyptian standard (2) Nes (n = 40)	005/1185-1)		am samnles (n = 35)		
Small scale ice-cream sample       Microbiological parameter     Critical limit       Total colony count     not >15×10 <sup>4</sup> CFU g <sup>-1</sup> Zofform count     not >10×10 <sup>4</sup> CFU g <sup>-1</sup> Saureus     absent/g       Saureus     absent/g       Salmonella spp.     absent/g       L. monocytogenes     absent/g       Microtal number of examined sample	les (n = 40)			am samples ( $n = 35$ )		
Microbiological parameter         Critical limit         Number         Percentage           Total colony count         not >15 × 10 <sup>4</sup> CFU g <sup>-1</sup> 27         67.5           Coliform count         not >10 CFU g <sup>-1</sup> 27         67.5 <i>E coli</i> .         absent/g         35         87.5           Salmonella spp.         absent/g         36         87.5 <i>L monocytogenes</i> absent/g         40         100 <i>L monocytogenes</i> absent/g         40         100			Large scale ice-crea			
Microbiological parameter         Critical limit         Number         Percentage           Total colony count         not >15 × 10 <sup>4</sup> CFU g <sup>-1</sup> 27         67.5           Coliform count         not >10 CFU g <sup>-1</sup> 27         67.5           Salmorella spp.         absent/g         35         87.5           Salmonella spp.         absent/g         35         87.5           L monocytogenes         absent/g         40         100           L monocytogenes         absent/g         40         100	Unacceptable		Acceptable		Unacceptable	
Total colony count         not >15 × 10 <sup>4</sup> CFU g <sup>-1</sup> 27         67.5           Coliform count         not >10 CFU g <sup>-1</sup> 9         22.5 <i>E. coli</i> absent/g         40         100 <i>S. aureus</i> absent/g         35         87.5 <i>S. aureus</i> absent/g         35         87.5 <i>S. aureus</i> absent/g         35         87.5 <i>L. monoella</i> spp.         absent/g         40         100 <i>L. monocytogenes</i> absent/g         40         100           *n: Total number of examined samples         40         100	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage
Coliform count         not >10 CFU g <sup>-1</sup> 9         22:5 <i>E. coli</i> .         absent/g         40         100 <i>S. aureus</i> absent/g         35         87.5 <i>Salmonella</i> spp.         absent/g         40         100 <i>L. monocytogenes</i> absent/g         40         100 <i>L. monocytogenes</i> absent/g         40         100           *n: Total number of examined samples         40         100	13	32.5	33	94.28	2	5.71
<i>E coli.</i> absent/g 40 100 <i>S. aureus</i> absent/g 35 87.5 <i>Salmonella</i> spp. absent/g 40 100 <i>L. monocytogenes</i> absent/g 40 100 *n: Total number of examined samples	31	77.5	29	82.85	9	17.14
<i>S aureus</i> absent/g 35 87.5 <i>Salmonella</i> spp. absent/g 40 100 <i>L. monocytogenes</i> absent/g 40 100 *n: Total number of examined samples	0	0.0	35	100.00	0	0.00
Salmonella spp.     absent/g     40     100       L. monocytogenes     absent/g     40     100       *n: Total number of examined samples	5	12.5	31	88.57	4	11.42
L monocytogenes         absent/g         40         100           *n: Total number of examined samples         *100         1	0	0.0	35	100.00	0	0.00
*n: Total number of examined samples	0	0.0	35	100.00	0	0.00
Table 3: Prevalence of some chemical hazards in the examined ice-cream samples						
Positive samples Number of	Conce	entration		Unacceptable sa	amples according to	legislation:
Examined chemical hazards examined samples Number Perce	centage Minim	um Maximum	Mean±S.E.M.	Number	Pe	ercentage
Aflatoxin M1 (ppt. <sup>3</sup> ) 20 16 80	80 2.17	7 108.7	24.31±8.11	5		25
Pesticide residues (ppm. <sup>b</sup> ) 20 0.00 C	0.00 0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00		0.00

126

# Int. J. Dairy Sci., 15 (3): 123-133, 2020



Fig. 1: Incidence of isolated Coliform organisms from the examined samples of small and large scale ice-cream

**Fecal coliform count:** In the present study, the incidence of fecal coliform was 35% in the examined small scale ice-cream samples with a count ranged from 4.17-6.17 with an average of  $5.13 \pm 4.75 \log \text{CFU g}^{-1}$ , while only one sample (2.9%) of the large scale ice-cream samples was contaminated with fecal coliform with a count of 2.55 log CFU g<sup>-1</sup>, which differed significantly (t = 2.564, p<0.05), (Table 1).

**Isolated coliform organisms:** Results presented in Fig. 1 revealed that the isolated coliform organisms from the examined small scale ice-cream samples were *Citrobacter diversus, Citrobacter freundii, Klebsiella oxytoca, Serratia fonticola, Enterobacter cloacae* and *Enterobacter intermedium* in percentages of 66.67, 15.39, 2.56, 2.56, 2.56 and 10.25%, respectively; while that isolated from large scale ice-cream samples were *Citrobacter diversus, Citrobacter freundii, Klebsiella oxytoca and Enterobacter freundii, Klebsiella oxytoca and Enterobacter intermedium* in percentages of 72.22, 16.67, 2.55 and 5.55%, respectively. The *E. coli* could not be detected in the examined small and large scale ice-cream samples.

**Yeast count:** The data presented in Table 1 revealed that yeasts were found in the examined large and small scale ice-cream samples with percentages of 91.4 and 85%, respectively, with an average count of  $4.9\pm4.5$  and  $5.9\pm5.6$  log CFU g<sup>-1</sup>, with significant difference (t = 2.105, p<0.05).

**Mold count:** Data illustrated in Table 1 inspected that molds were found in percentages of 8.57 and 27.5% with average



Fig. 2: Presence of piece of hair in small scale ice cream sample (2.5%)



Fig. 3: Presence of piece of plastic in small scale ice cream sample (2.5%)



Fig. 4: Presence of piece of metal (Aluminum sheet) in small scale ice cream sample (2.5%)

counts of 2.8  $\pm$  2.8 and 3.0  $\pm$  2.6 log CFU g<sup>-1</sup> for the examined samples of large and small scale ice-cream, respectively, with no significant difference statistically.

**Total staphylococci count:** From the results represented in Table 1 and 2, it was evident that Staphylococci were present in all examined small scale ice-cream samples, while detected in 94.2% of the large scale ones with mean values of  $5.7\pm5.2$  and  $5.0\pm4.5 \log$  CFU g<sup>-1</sup> in the examined samples of small and large scale ice-cream, respectively; the incidences of *S. aureus* were 11.42 and 12.05%, respectively, that significantly differed (t = 2.342, p<0.05).

**Prevalence of pathogenic micro-organisms:** Data given in Table 2 explored that none of the examined samples were contaminated with *L. monocytogenes, Salmonella* and *E. coli.* On the other hand, 5 (12.5%) and 4 (11.42%) of the examined small scale and large scale ice cream samples were contaminated with *S. aureus*, respectively.

# Incidence of some chemical residues

**Aflatoxin M1:** AFM1 was detected in 16 (80%) of 20 examined ice-cream samples at detection limit of 2.00 ppt with concentration ranged between 2.17-108.7 ppt with mean value of  $24.31\pm8.11$  ppt. According to the Egyptian standards (E.S., 7136/2010), which speculated that AFM1 shouldn't exceed 50 ppt., 5 (25%) of the examined samples were unacceptable according to the Egyptian legislation as shown in Table 3.

**Pesticide residues:** Data presented in Table 3 showed that organochlorine pesticides  $\alpha$ -HCH,  $\beta$ -HCH,  $\gamma$ -HCH, p,p-DDT,

o,p-DDT, p,p-DDD, p,p-DDE, Aldrin, dieldrin, Endrin, Heptachlor, Heptachlor epoxide and Polychlorinated biphenyl pesticides (PCB congeners 28, 52, 101, 118, 138, 153 and 180) couldn't be detected in the examined ice-cream samples at detection limit of 0.002 ppm. All of the examined samples were acceptable in accordance with Codex legislation, which stated that the allowed Maximum Residual Limits (MRL) of the examined pesticides were 0.01, 0.02, 0.006, , 0.0008, 0.006 and 0.0002 ppm for α-HCH, β-HCH, γ-HCH, p,p-DDT, o,p-DDT, p,p-DDD, p,p-DDE, Aldrin, dieldrin, Endrin, Heptachlor, Heptachlor epoxide and polychlorinated biphenyl pesticides (PCB congeners 28, 52, 101, 118, 138, 153 and 180), respectively.

**Physical hazards:** Our visual inspection revealed the presence of physical hazards in 3 (7.5%) samples of the examined small scale ice-cream including hair, plastic piece and metal piece, respectively, while the examined large scale samples were free from these physical hazards as shown in Fig. 2-4.

#### DISCUSSION

Our results of total mesophilic bacteria showed a comparatively higher count of microbial contamination of the examined small scale ice-cream samples, that could be attributed to the initial microflora of raw milk and other ingredients, insufficient or no heat treatment, poor personal hygiene, improper cleaning and sanitation and unhygienic measures during manufacturing, handling, storage, transportation and distribution<sup>6</sup>. These results were in agreement with those obtained by EL-Malt<sup>6</sup>, Edward *et al.*<sup>5</sup> and Abo El-Makarem<sup>28</sup>. Higher counts were recorded by Kumar *et al.*<sup>29</sup> and Barman *et al.*<sup>30</sup>, while, lower results obtained by Ambily and Beena<sup>31</sup>. Higher Total Colony Count (TCC) was the main reason for microbiological non-acceptability of the ice-cream samples<sup>32</sup>.

The presence of psychrotrophic bacteria in ice-cream could be of great significance as these organisms may grow and proliferate during the storage even at low temperatures and bring about the spoilage of these products<sup>2,30</sup>. The high results of psychrotrophic bacterial counts of the examined ice cream samples were similar to the findings obtained by EL-Malt<sup>6</sup>, who investigated the presence of Psychrotrophs in 100% of the examined small scale and 78% of large scale ice-cream samples with mean values o f 4.9 and 3.9 log CFU g<sup>-1</sup>, respectively and the results obtained by Barman *et al.*<sup>30</sup>, that were ranged from 3.32-4.7 log CFU g<sup>-1</sup>. The high incidence of psychrotrophs in

ice-cream samples may be attributed to post processing contamination during freezing, packaging, storage and distribution. In this respect ageing period is very important as ageing temperature ( $0-5^{\circ}C$ ) is suitable for proliferation of psychrotrophs.

It is evident from the obtained results that coliforms and fecal Coliforms contaminate high percentages of small scale ice cream samples, which may attribute to poor quality ingredients, ineffective cleaning methods and unhygienic practices during manufacturing, packaging and storage<sup>28</sup>. The presence of coliform in large scale ice-cream samples could be backed to faulty heat process or to post-pasteurization contamination from the added ingredients to the mix after pasteurization, contaminated water, improperly cleaned equipment and handlers with poor sanitary practices<sup>6,33</sup>. These findings were similar to those obtained by Abo El-Makarem<sup>28</sup>, Barman et al.<sup>30</sup> and Damer et al.<sup>34</sup>, relatively higher results were obtained by EL-Malt and Bahareem et al.6,35, while comparatively lower results were obtained by Yaman et al.<sup>36</sup>, Rizzo-Benato and Gallo<sup>37</sup> and El-Ansary<sup>38</sup>. Some members of coliform bacteria can be implicated in gastrointestinal illness as gastroenteritis, epidemic diarrhea in children and cases of food poisoning<sup>30,39</sup>. The incidence of coliform isolates that reported in Fig. 1 were higher than that reported by Abo El-Makarem<sup>28</sup>, who revealed that *Citrobacter diversus*, Citrobacter freundii, Enterobacter cloacae and E. coli could be isolated form ice-cream samples with percentages of 6.39, 6.39, 4.25 and 48.96%, respectively, while *E. coli* couldn't be isolated from the examined ice cream samples. Citribacter spp. and Enterobacter spp. are implicated in gastrointestinal illness, food poisoning and respiratory tract infections<sup>39</sup>.

Yeast and mold contamination of ice cream causes various types of defects, spoilage and severe economic losses; in addition, certain species may induce public health hazard to human. Samples with high mold contamination have the probability to be a source of mycotoxins, which incriminated in food poisoning outbreaks. The high incidence of yeast in the examined ice-cream samples may be attributed to contaminated ingredients, ineffective pasteurization and contamination during distribution in containers or during holding after serving. Discrepantly, lower percentages of yeast and mold were recorded by Mathews et al.4, Edward et al.5 and Barman et al.<sup>30</sup>, while higher incidence was documented by El-Malt<sup>6</sup>. The reduced incidence of mold in the examined samples may be related to the different conditions under which each of the ice cream samples is stored and distributed or served, that magnifies the need for high sanitary conditions, control of adequate heat treatment of ice-cream and appropriate storage conditions<sup>5,40</sup>.

Our results show high incidence of staphylococci in both small and large scale ice cream samples, that were in accordance with those reported by Barman et al.<sup>30</sup>, El-Malt<sup>6</sup>, Edward et al.<sup>5</sup> and Abo El-Makarem<sup>28</sup>. Higher findings were obtained by El-Malt<sup>6</sup>, Edward et al.<sup>5</sup> and Nazem et al.<sup>41</sup>. Staphylococcal presence may have resulted from the insufficient pasteurization of milk and unhygienic manufacturing conditions<sup>4,36</sup>. The presence of staphylococcus organisms in ice-cream is highly undesirable and has a great significance in relation to consumer health because of S. aureus is highly pathogenic micro-organisms producing enterotoxins, which lead to food intoxication<sup>5</sup>. The high prevalence of *S. aureus* in the examined samples could be explained as it can survive better and increased in counts in frozen products like ice-cream, in addition, S. aureus favors the presence of starch and protein to elaborate enterotoxin<sup>42</sup>.

On studying the degree of acceptability of the examined ice cream samples according to the requirements of the Egyptian standards, data given in Table 2 explored that 100% of the examined samples of both large scale ice cream and small scale ice cream were acceptable regarding their content of *L. monocytogenes, Salmonella* and *E. coli*. On the other hand, 67.5, 22.5 and 87.5% of the examined small scale ice cream samples were acceptable according to their content of the total aerobic mesophilic count, total coliforms and *S. aureus*, respectively, while 94.82, 82.85 and 88.57% of the examined large scale ice cream samples were acceptable for the critical limit of the same organisms, respectively.

Our results were coincided with El-Ziney<sup>32</sup> and Edward *et al.*<sup>5</sup>, who failed to isolate *E. coli.* from the examined ice-cream samples. On the contrary, a higher prevalence of *E. coli* were investigated in previous studies as 48.96% of unpacked ice-cream samples and 27% of packed ice-cream samples<sup>28</sup>, 30% of the examined ice-cream samples<sup>41</sup>, 41 and 22% of the examined small and large scale ice-cream with fruits<sup>43</sup>. Our findings are certainly alarming about the possible hazard due to the consumption of ice-cream as *S. aureus* is a significant cause of food-borne disease and important pathogen due to a combination of "toxin-mediated virulence, invasiveness and antibiotic resistance"<sup>44</sup>.

Fortunately, the examined ice cream samples were free from salmonella and *L. monocytogenes*, as *Salmonella* is an enteric bacterial pathogen that causes food poisoning, paratyphoid fever, hematosepsis and gastroenteritis, the presence of *Salmonella* spp. in ice-cream may come from either eggs or egg powder used in the ice-cream production<sup>36,45</sup>. *L. monocytogenes* is a food-borne human pathogen responsible for listeriosis with a fatality rate up to 20-30%. More often, systemic infection, such as Septicemia, meningitis, life threatening meningoencephalitis may occur in immuno-compromised individuals, newborn and elderly. *L. monocytogenes* can cause abortion and stillbirth in pregnant women<sup>46,47</sup>. Our findings were similar to the studies adopted by El-Ziney<sup>32</sup> and Varga<sup>48</sup>. These results were nearly in agreement with Kahraman<sup>49</sup>, who revealed that none of the examined ice-cream samples contained Salmonella and only one sample was positive for *L. monocytogenes*. Discrepantly, higher percentages were recorded by El-Sharef *et al.*<sup>50</sup>, who found *Salmonella* spp. (5%) and *L. monocytogenes*(4%) in the examined ice-cream samples and Edward *et al.*<sup>5</sup> who found salmonella with incidence rate of 17.65% and with a mean count of 3.95 log CFU g<sup>-1</sup>.

From the results shown in Table 3, Aflatoxin M1 was detected in 16 (80%) of 20 examined ice-cream samples, these higher figures were nearly similar to those obtained by Fallah<sup>51</sup> (69.4%, with a range of 15-132 ppt), Darsanak et al.<sup>52</sup> (68.88%, with a range of 8.4-147.7 ppt) and Rahimi<sup>53</sup> (56.7%), this high incidence of AFM1 may be attributed to that AFM1 is a very stable aflatoxin during milk processing such as; pasteurization, autoclaving, freezing and storage; therefore it is usually found in the dairy products<sup>54,55</sup>. The amount of AFM1 in milk and milk products varies widely according to geography, animal species, season, milking time and level of AFB1 intake<sup>56,57</sup>. Due to the high toxicity and carcinogenicity of AFM1, the Egyptian standards established a permissible limit of 50 ppt. The obtained results from our study revealed that (25%) of the examined samples exceeded the recommended safety limits outlined by Egyptian standards and these results were analogues to those obtained by Moktabi et al.58 (30%) and Khoshnevis et al.59 (22.2%); while lower results were reported by Darsanaki et al.<sup>52</sup> (12.22%). This high prevalence of AFM1 in the examined samples magnifies the need to decrease AFM1 in milk to the lowest point, the feed stuff ration should be checked regularly to be free from AFB1 contamination and it should be kept away from fungal contamination<sup>60</sup>.

Recently, there is a raised concern about the risk of pesticide residues through the food chain and particularly via milk and dairy products, most pesticied residues are characterized by a strong persistence in the environment, a high volatility and lipophilicity, which lead to their accumulation in fat tissues<sup>61</sup>. The presence of OCPs and PCBs were associated with high risk to public health, they can cause neurobehavioral changes and adverse neurologic development <sup>8,10</sup>; make it of great importance to monitor their level in ice cream. Investigation of pesticide residues in the examined ice cream samples revealed that ( $\alpha$ -HCH,  $\beta$ -HCH,

 $\gamma$ -HCH), (p,p-DDT, o,p-DDT, p,p-DDD, p,p-DDE), (Aldrin, dieldrin), Endrin, (Heptachlor, Heptachlorepoxide) and Polychlorinated biphenyl pesticides (PCB congeners 28, 52, 101, 118, 138, 153 and 180), couldn't be detected in the examined ice-cream samples at detection limit of 0.002 ppm. Higher results were obtained by Schecter et al.<sup>8</sup>, who found PCB-180 in ice-cream with a limit of 0.091 ng  $g^{-1}$ . ww and p,p-DDT, p,p-DDE and dieldrin with limits of 0.038, 1.23, 0.13 ng  $g^{-1}$ . All of the examined samples were acceptable in accordance with the European Community<sup>62</sup> and Codex<sup>63</sup> MRLs in food; this may be attributed to the proper control in using pesticides in the last few years with increasing the public awareness about the dangerous effect of these toxic materials. It is worth mentioning that there is hardly any available recent research data concerning the pesticide residues evaluation in ice cream.

Physical hazards can be described as any extraneous objects present in food products and they can cause several health risks to the consumer including injury, illness, or psychological trauma<sup>64</sup>. Our visual inspection revealed the presence of physical hazards in 3 (7.5%) samples of the examined small scale ice-cream, while the examined large scale samples were free from physical hazards as shown in Fig. 2-4. Physical hazards can be controlled by Good Manufacturing Practices (GMPs) and are avoided in the final products by means of visual observations or other methods as metal detection techniques<sup>65</sup>. It is recommended to implement regulatory measures as GMPs and HACCP system as they consider powerful tools for ensuring the safety and quality of ice cream, in addition to the evaluation of risk assessment of safety hazards associated with ice cream.

#### CONCLUSION

The results of this study showed an inferior level of hygiene in both small and large scale ice-cream samples vended in Cairo and Giza governorates in Egypt, that constitutes a high health risk to consumers especially children and defenseless elderly people. Small scale ice-cream showed a lower quality than large scale ice-cream. Ice-cream has been contaminated by both pathogenic and spoilage microorganisms as well as AFM1 with a level in disagreement with the recommended legislation. Thus, it is considered a top priority to keep ice-cream safe and fit for consumption by improving the hygienic status of the produced ice-cream in all steps of production, distribution, storage and at the retail level. Pesticides couldn't be detected by examining ice-cream samples which may be ascribed to the use of integrated pest management options that allow controlling pests with the least possible hazard due to increasing the public awareness about the proper use of pesticides as well as the control measures from the concerning authorities which minimize these toxic materials.

# SIGNIFICANCE STATEMENT

This study discovers the possible health risks associated with the consumption of ice cream through the detection of some existed biological, chemical and physical hazards of small scale and large scale ice cream; in addition we discover the significant correlation between inadequate hygienic measures of small scale ice cream production and its high incidence of being more hazardous than large scale ice cream; which can be beneficial for the manufacturers to pay more attention to improve the hygienic quality. This study will help the researcher to reveal various hazards linked to ice cream especially chemical hazards (Aflatoxin M1 and Pesticides residues) and physical hazards that many researchers were not able to explore; as there is hardly any available recent research data concerning residues evaluation in ice cream; that need more investigation.

#### REFERENCES

- 1. Balthazar, C.F., H.L.A. Silva, A.H. Vieira, R.P.C. Neto and L.P. Cappato *et al.*, 2017. Assessing the effects of different prebiotic dietary oligosaccharides in sheep milk ice cream. Food Res. Int., 91: 38-46.
- Hossain, K.M.H., S.M.L. Kabir, M.M. Rahman, M.B. Rahman and K.A. Choudhury, 2012. Organoleptic and microbial quality of ice cream sold at retail stores in Mymensingh, Bangladesh. J. Microbiol. Res., 2: 89-94.
- Samarzija, D., S. Zamberlin and T. Pogacic, 2012. Psychrotrophic bacteria and milk and dairy products quality. Mljekarstvo, 62: 77-95.
- Mathews, S., L. Ngoma, B. Gashe and S. Mpuchane, 2013. General microbiological quality of ice cream and ice pop sold in gaborone, botswana. Stud Ethno-Med., 7: 217-226.
- Edward, K.C., P.O. Owuamalam, O.V. Onyekachi, O.A. Nnochiri and C.N. Akumah, 2017. Microbial quality assessment of ice-cream sold in Umuahia, South-Eastern Nigeria: A comparative study. J. Biology, Agriculture and Healthcare, 7: 40-48.
- El-Malt, L., K.A. Hameed and A. Mohammed, 2013. Microbiological quality assessment of ice-cream products in Qena city, Egypt. Zagazig Vet. J., 41: 775-783.
- Ahmed, K.M.F., R.S.Hafez, S.D. Morgan and A.A. Awad, 2015. Detection of some chemical hazards in milk and some dairy products. Afr. J. Food Sci., 9: 187-193.

- Schecter, A.J. Colacino, D.Haffner, K. Patel, M. Opel, O.Päpke and L.Birnbaum, 2010. Perfluorinated compounds, polychlorinated biphenyls and organochlorine pesticide contamination in composite food samples from Dallas, Texas, USA. Environ. Health Perspect., 118: 796-802.
- LeDoux, M., 2011. Analytical methods applied to the determination of pesticide residues in foods of animal origin. A review of the past two decades. J. Chromatogr A., 1218: 1021-1036.
- Chen, X.,Y. Lin, K. Dang and B.Puschner, 2017. Quantification of Polychlorinated Biphenyls and Polybrominated Diphenyl Ethers in commercial cows' milk from California by gas chromatography–triple quadruple mass spectrometry. PLoS ONE, 10.1371/journal.pone.0170129
- Condrea, E., M. Mirea, K.A. Aivaz and O. Nitu, 2012. Risk analysis-Important activity in the food safety management. Hazards and risks identified in the milk processing industry. J. Environ. Prot. Ecol., 13: 2151-2160.
- Afoakwa, E.O., H. Mensah-Brown, G.K. Crentsil, K. Frimpong and F. Asante, 2013. Application of ISO 22000 in comparison with HACCP on industrial processing of milk chocolate. Int. Food Res. J., 20: 1771-1781.
- 13. European Commission, 2014. RASF for safer food the Rapid Alert System for Food and Feed 2014 annual report. Publications Office of the European Union, Luxembourg.
- 14. McLauchlin, J., R.T. Mitchell, W.J. Smerdon and K. Jewell, 2004. *Listeria monocytogenes* and listeriosis: A review of hazard characterization for use in microbiological risk assessment of foods. Int. J. Food Microbiol., 92: 15-33.
- Wehr, H.M. and J.F. Frank, 2004. Standard Methods for the Examination of Dairy Products. 17th Edn., American Public Health Association Inc., Washington, DC., USA., ISBN-13: 978-0875530024 pages: 570.
- ISO., 2002. Milk and Dairy products, enumeration of containing microorganisms- Colony count technique at 30 degrees C. International Standard Organization: ISO Standard DIS 13559: 2002 (E), IDF.
- 17. FDA 2013. Bacteriological Analytical Manual. (eds.) FDA Washington. .
- Feng, P., S.D. Weagant, M.A. Grant and W. Burkhardt, 2011. Enumeration of *Escherichia coli* and the coliform bacteria. In: Bacteriological Analytical Manual. FDA, FDA Washington.
- Silva, N.D., M.H. Taniwaki, N.F.A. Junqueira, M.S. do Nascimento and R.A.R. Gomes, 2013. Microbiological Examination Methods of Food and Water: A Laboratory Manual. 1st Edn. CRC Press, New York. London. pages: 526.
- 20. ISO., 2012. Milk and milk products, Enumeration of colony-forming units of yeasts and/or moulds, Colony-count technique at 25 degrees C. 2nd Edn., International Standard Organization Geneva, Switzerland. Pages: 8.

- Tallent, S., J. Hait, R.W. Bennett (ret.) and G.A. Lancette, 2001. Staphylococcus aureus. In: Bacteriological Analytical Manual Online. FDA, U.S. Food & Drug Administration Center for Food Safety and Applied Nutrition. Washington. .
- 22. Andrews, W.H., H. Wang, A. Jacobson and T. Hammack, 2007. Salmonella. In: Bacteriological Analytical Manual online. FDA, U.S. Food & Drug Administration Center for Food Safety and Applied Nutrition. Washington. .
- Hitchins, A.D., , K. Jinneman and Y. Chen, 2011. Detection and enumeration of Listeria monocytogenes. In: Bacteriological Analytical Manual online. FDA, U.S. Food and Drug Administration Center for Food Safety & Applied Nutrition. Washington. Pages: 29.
- 24. Lindahl, J.F., I.N. Kagera and D. Grace, 2018. Aflatoxin M1 levels in different marketed milk products in Nairobi, Kenya Mycotoxin Res., 34: 289-295.
- Jeong, I.S., B.M. Kwak, J.H. Ahn and S.H. Jeong, 2012. Determination of pesticide residues in milk using a QuEChERS-based method developed by response surface methodology. Food Chem., 133: 473-481.
- 26. Rejczak, T. and T. Tuzimski, 2017. QuEChERS-based extraction with dispersive solid phase extraction clean-up using PSA and ZrO2-based sorbents for determination of pesticides in bovine milk samples by HPLC-DAD. Food Chem., 217: 225-233.
- Van Asselt, E.D., H.J.P. Marvin, P.E. Boon, M. Swanenburg, M. Zeilmaker, M.J.B. Mengelers and H.J. van der Fels-Klerx, 2016. Chemical and physical hazards in the Dairy Chain. Wageningen, RIKILT Wageningen UR (University & Research centre), RIKILT report 2016.003. 46 pp.; 10 fig.; 1 tab.; 140 ref.
- 28. Abo El-Makarem H.S., 2017. Microbial quality of street-vended ice cream. J. Vet. Med. Res., 24: 147-155.
- 29. Kumar, H., G. Wadhwa, R. Palaha, R. Gandhi and S. Singh, 2011. Microbiological quality analysis of ice creams sold by street hawkers: A case study of Jalandhar city, India. Internet J. Food Saf., 13: 164-169.
- Barman, A.K., P.K. Roy, S. Ray, R. Kumar, B. Rani and B.K. Singh, 2017. Evaluation of microbiological quality of Ice-cream available in Kolkata and its suburbs. Pharma Innov. J., 6: 377-380.
- Ambily, R. and A.K. Beena, 2012. Bacteriological quality of icecream marketed in Thrissur town, Kerala, India. Vet. World, 5: 738-741.
- 32. El-Ziney, M.G., 2018. Evaluation of microbiological quality and safety of milk and dairy products with reference to european and gulf standards. Food and Public Health., 8: 47-56.
- 33. Abd El-Rahman, A.M., 2010. Relation between *E. coli*, Enterococci and *Clostridium*. perfringens as fecal contaminates in milk and some milk products. M.V.Sc Thesis, Fac. Vet. Med., Assiut Univ.

- Damer, J., V. Garcia, A. Gusmão and T. Moresco 2015. Sanitary-higienic conditions of Italian style and pasta (artisanal and industrial) ice cream marketed in the northwestern region of Rio Grande do Sul, Brazil. Demetra., 10: 821-834.
- Bahareem, O.H., H.A. El-Shamy, W.M. Bakr and N.F. Gomaa, 2007. Bacteriological quality of some dairy products (kariesh cheese and ice cream) in alexandria. J. Egypt Public Health Assoc., 82: 491-510.
- Yaman, H., M. Elmali, Z. Ulukanli, M. Tuzcu and K. Genctav, 2006. Microbial quality of ice cream sold openly by retail outlets in Turkey. Rev. Med. Vet., 157: 457-462.
- Rizzo-Benato, R. and C. Gallo, 2007. Comparison of the efficiency of Escherichia coli broths and bright green broth lactose bile in the enumeration of thermotolerant coliforms in milk and ice cream. Magazine of Instituto Adolfo Lutz., 66: 18-25.
- 38. El-Ansary, M., 2015. Hygienic quality of vanilla ice-cream sold at local market. Alex. J. Vet. Sci., 44: 54-58.
- 39. Karima, M.F., 2012. Detection of food safety hazards in milk and some dairy products. M.Sc. Thesis, Faculty of Veterinary Medicine, Cairo University.
- Ahmed, K., A. Hussain, Imran, M.A. Qazalbash and W. Hussain, 2009. Microbiological quality of ice cream sold in Gilgit town. Pak. J. Nutr., 8: 1397-1400.
- 41. Nazem, A.M., A.A. Amer and A. Soukayna, 2010. Prevalence of some food poisoning microorganisms in some dairy products. Alex. J. Vet. Sci., 30: 1-6.
- Joshi, D.R., P.K. Shah, S. Manandhar, S. Sharma and P. Banmali, 2004. Microbial quality of ice-cream sold in Kathmandu. J. Nepal Health Res. Council, 2: 37-40.
- Abou-El Khair, E., A. Al-Raziq Salama, H. Radwan, A. Khalafallah and H. Arafa, 2014. Bacteriological quality of packaged ice cream in Gaza city, Palestine. J. Food Nutr. Sci., 2: 68-73.
- 44. Kadariya, J., T.C. Smith and D. Thapaliya, 2014. *Staphylococcus aureus* and staphylococcal food-borne disease: An ongoing challenge in public health. BioMed Res. Int. 10.1155/2014/827965.
- 45. Tsolis, R.M., G.M. Young, J.V. Solnick and A.J. Baumler, 2008. From bench to bedside: stealth of enteroinvasive pathogens. Nat. Rev. Microbiol., 6: 883-892.
- 46. Scallan, E., R.M. Hoekstra, F.J. Angulo, R.V. Tauxe and M.A. Widdowson *et al.*, 2011. Foodborne illness acquired in the United States-major pathogens. Emerg. Infect. Dis., 17: 7-15.
- Olaimat, A.N., M.A. Al-Holy, H.M. Shahbaz, A.A. Al-Nabulsi and M.H. Abu Ghoush *et al.*, 2018. Emergence of antibiotic resistance in *Listeria monocytogenes* isolated from food products: A comprehensive review. Compr. Rev. Food Sci. Food Saf., 17: 1277-1292.

- Varga, L., 2007. Microbiological Quality of Commercial Dairy Products. In: Communicating Current Research and Educational Topics and Trends in Applied Microbiology, Mendez-Voias, A. (Ed.). Formatex, Badajoz, Spain, ISBN: 978-84-611-9422-3, pp: 487-494.
- 49. Kahraman, T. and A.M. Kolanciyan, 2016. Microbiological quality of ice cream consumed in Istanbul. Veterinaria, 65: 111-115.
- El-Sharef, N., K.S. Ghenghesh, Y.S. Abognah, S.O. Gnan and A. Rahouma, 2006. Bacteriological quality of ice cream in Tripoli-Libya. Food Control, 17: 637-641.
- 51. Fallah, A.A., 2010. Aflatoxin M<sub>1</sub> contamination in dairy products marketed in Iran during winter and summer. Food Control, 21: 1478-1481.
- 52. Darsanaki, R.K., M.A. Aliabadi and M.M.D. Chakoosari, 2013. Aflatoxin M1 contamination in Ice-cream. J. Chem. Health Risk., 3: 43-46.
- 53. Rahimi, E., 2012. Survey of the occurrence of aflatoxin M1 in dairy products marketed in Iran. Toxicol. Ind. Health, 30: 750-754.
- 54. Tajkarimi, M., M.A. Faghih, H. Poursoltani, A.S. Nejad, A.A. Motallebi and H. Mahdavi, 2008. Lead residue levels in raw milk from different regions of Iran. Food Chem., 19: 495-498.
- Abdelmotilib, N.M., G.M. Hamad, H.B. Elderea, E.G. Salem and S.A. El Sohaimy, 2018. Aflatoxin M1 reduction in milk by a novel combination of probiotic bacterial and yeast strains. Eur. J. Nutr. Food Saf., 8: 83-99.
- European Food Safety Authority, 2009. Annual report of European food safety authority. ISBN: 978-92-9199-211-9 doi: 10. 2805 /3682.

- 57. Assaf, J.C., S.Nahle, A.Chokr, N.Louka, A.Atoui and A.El Khoury, 2019. Assorted methods for decontamination of Aflatoxin M1 in milk using microbial adsorbents. Toxins, 10.3390/toxins 11060304.
- Moktabi, S., A. Fazlara, M. Ghorbanpour and K. GhasemianYadegari, 2011. Contamination of ice-cream by Aflatoxin M1 in Iran. American-Eurasian J. Toxicological Sci., 3: 120-123.
- 59. Khoshnevis, S.H., I.G. Azizi, S. Shateri and M. Mousavizadeh, 2012. Determination of the Aflatoxin M in Ice-Cream in Babol City (Northern, Iran). Global Veterinaria, 8: 205-208.
- 60. Kim, E.K., D.H. Shon, D. Ryu, J.W. Park, H.J. Hwang and Y.B. Kim, 2000. Occurrence of aflatoxin  $M_1$  in Korean dairy products determined by ELISA and HPLC. Food Addit. Contam., 17: 59-64.
- 61. Rychen, G., S. Jurjanz, H. Toussaint and C. Feidt, 2008. Dairy ruminant exposure to persistent organic pollutants and excretion to milk. Animal, 2: 312-323.
- 62. European Commission, 2006. Commission regulation (EC) No. 1881/2006 of 19 December 2006 setting maximum levels for certain contaminants in foodstuffs. Official J. Eur. Union, L364: 5-24.
- 63. Codex Alimentarius Commission Joint FAO/WHO, 2006. Codex committee on pesticide residues. Thirty-eight Session, Brazil.
- 64. Aladjadjiyan, A., 2006. Physical hazards in the agri-food chain. In: Safety in the agri-food chain. Luning, P.A., F. Devlieghere and R. Verhé, Wiley-Blackwell, Hoboken, USA 13:978-90-7699-877-0 pages: 688.
- 65. Peariso, D., 2005. Preventing foreign material contamination of foods. Wiley-Blackwell, Hoboken, USA. pages: 306.