Antimicrobial activity of novel *Lactococcus lactis* strains against *Salmonella* Typhimurium DT12, *Escherichia coli* O157:H7 VT- and *Klebsiella pneumoniae* in raw and pasteurised camel milk

Bragason, Esben; Berhe, Tesfemariam; Dashe, Dakalo; Sørensen, Kim Ib; Guya, Mituku E.; Hansen, Egon Bech

Published in:
International Dairy Journal

Link to article, DOI:
[10.1016/j.idairyj.2020.104832](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.idairyj.2020.104832)

Publication date:
2020

Document Version
Peer reviewed version

[Link back to DTU Orbit](#)

Citation (APA):
Bragason, E., Berhe, T., Dashe, D., Sørensen, K. I., Guya, M. E., & Hansen, E. B. (2020). Antimicrobial activity of novel *Lactococcus lactis* strains against *Salmonella* Typhimurium DT12, *Escherichia coli* O157:H7 VT and *Klebsiella pneumoniae* in raw and pasteurised camel milk. *International Dairy Journal*, 111, [104832]. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.idairyj.2020.104832>

General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the public portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the public portal

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

Antimicrobial Activity of Novel *Lactococcus Lactis* Strains against *Salmonella* Typhimurium
DT12, *Escherichia Coli* O157:H7 VT⁻ and *Klebsiella pneumoniae* in Raw and Pasteurized
Camel Milk

Esben Bragason^a, Tesfemariam Berhe^b, DakaloDashe^b, Kim Ib Sørensen^c, Mituku E. Guya^b,
Egon Bech Hansen^a

^a*Technical University of Denmark, National Food Institute, 2800 Kgs. Lyngby, Denmark*

^b*Haramaya University, School of Animal and Range Sciences, P.O. Box: 138, Dire Dawa,
Ethiopia*

^c*Chr. Hansen A/S, Bøge Alle 10-12, 2970 Hørsholm, Denmark*

Corresponding author:

Egon Bech Hansen

DTU Food, Technical University of Denmark

Kemitorvet, Building 202

DK-2800 Kgs. Lyngby, Denmark

Phone: +45 3588 6203

E-mail: egbh@food.dtu.dk

Abstract

The present study investigated inhibition of multiple food related pathogens in raw and pasteurised camel milk during fermentation with four novel *Lactococcus lactis* strains. All pathogens alone in camel milk reached 8.0 log(CFU mL⁻¹). When the pathogens were cultivated with *L. lactis* MS22333 or MS22337 they were reduced between 0.9-6.0 log(CFU mL⁻¹). *L. lactis* MS22314 and MS22336 showed no antimicrobial activity.

Bad hygiene and lack of cooling facilities have resulted in spontaneously fermented African camel milk with high incidence of contaminants. Starter cultures promote food safety by controlling the fermentation. Commercial cultures developed for bovine milk acidify poorly in camel milk and cultures optimized for camel milk with inhibitory effects against pathogens are therefore needed.

To our knowledge, we have for the first time demonstrated that some *L. lactis* strains isolated from camel milk can inhibit the growth of food related pathogens in both raw and pasteurised camel milk.

1 Introduction

The quality and safety of milk is highly influenced by the rate of contamination by pathogens. *Staphylococcus* spp., *Escherichia coli*, *Salmonella* spp., *Klebsiella* spp., *Campylobacter jejuni*, *Bacillus cereus* and *Listeria monocytogenes* have been reported multiple times with high frequency of contamination in milk (Ismaili, Saidi, Zahar, Hamama, & Ezzaier, 2019; Oliver, Jayarao, & Almeida, 2005; Tetili, Bendali, Perrier, & Sadoun, 2017).

A study by Abera et al. (2016) demonstrated bacterial contamination in 108 (85.7%) samples from camel milk. Samples were collected in Ethiopian Somali region where poor water

quality, bad sanitation, uncooled preservation and transportation traditions were some of the main factors promoting contamination(Abera et al., 2016).

Food poisoning is relatively harmless in developed countries where a medical system can support fast recovery and hydration. In African undeveloped countries, diarrhoea, salmonellosis, dehydration and vomiting can be fatal. In Africa food poisoning is estimated to kill 137.000 persons yearly (Bisholo, Ghuman, & Haffeejee, 2018; Rebgui et al., 2013).

Camelus dromedarius is an important milk producer in sub-Saharan and East African countries, where raw and non-heat-treated dairy products are consumed. Camel milk is mainly consumed directly after milking or as sour milk, often due to spontaneous fermentation (Abera et al., 2016).

The acidification of camel milk is a complicated procedure due to relative higher concentrations of antibacterial and antiviral substances compared to bovine milk (El Agamy, Ruppanner, Ismail, Champagne, & Assaf, 1992). Commercial starter cultures designed for bovine milk have been tested in camel milk and they were able to acidify camel milk to comparable final pH but with slower acidification rates (Berhe et al., 2018). Starter cultures designed specific for camel milk with optimum acidification rates to both increase the food quality and inhibit growth of spoilage and pathogenic microorganisms remains to be developed.

Lactococcus lactis are used in many starter cultures to ferment foods and thereby prevent growth of pathogens or spoilage bacteria by producing multiple antimicrobial substances (Cizeikiene, Juodeikiene, Paskevicius, & Bartkiene, 2013; Jay, 1982; Kondrotiene et al., 2018; Mufandaedza, Viljoen, Feresu, & Gadaga, 2006; Roessland, Borge, Langsrud, & Sørhaug, 2003).

Studies of inhibition of several common food pathogens by *L. lactis* strains have been reported in cow milk and cheese products (Kasra-Kermanshahi & Mobarak-Qamsari, 2015; Kondrotiene et al., 2018; Roessland et al., 2003; Tetili et al., 2017). To our knowledge, only few studies have described inhibition of food pathogens using lactic acid bacteria (LAB) isolated from camel milk (Benmechernene et al., 2013; Rahmeh et al., 2019). Rahmeh et al. (2019) characterised antimicrobial activity of multiple genera within lactic acid bacteria and the distribution of LAB in raw camel milk from western Asia. Benmechernene et al. (2013) have shown that two strains of *Leuconostoc mesenteroides* subsp. *mesenteroides* isolated from Algerian camel milk could be used as a bioactive strain against *L. monocytogenes* and *S. aureus*.

The aim of this study was to identify potential *L. lactis* candidates for a starter culture with antimicrobial properties demonstrated in camel milk to enhance food safety in African countries.

2 Materials and methods

2.1 Bacterial strains

L. lactis strains were obtained from the strain collection at the National Food Institute at the Technical University of Denmark. Originally, the strains MS22314, MS22333, MS22336 and MS22337 were isolated from spontaneous fermented camel milk in Ethiopia (Fugl et al., 2017). Genome sequences of the strains can be accessed at the Genbank under BioSample numbers: SAMN13701540, SAMN13701541, 76 SAMN13701542, SAMN13701543 (Bragason, Svendsen, Guya, Berhe, & Hansen, 2020). The cultures were grown for 24 h at 30 °C in M17 broth (Oxoid, Thermo Scientific, Hampshire, UK) containing 0.5% lactose. *Klebsiella pneumoniae* (MS22380) was obtained from DSMZ - German Collection of Microorganisms and Cell Cultures (DSM 30104).

Salmonella Typhimurium DT12 (MS20842) and *E. coli* O:157 VT⁻ (MS21811) were obtained from the strain collection at the National Reference Laboratory for *Salmonella* and zoonotic *Escherichia coli* at the Technical University of Denmark. *S. Typhimurium* DT12 was originally isolated in cow faeces. All pathogens were grown for 24 h at 37 °C in brain-heart infusion (BHI) broth (Oxoid, Thermo Scientific, Hampshire, UK).

2.2 Media Preparation

Unpasteurized camel milk provided by Kamelenmelkerij Smits (Berlicum, Netherlands) was sent within 24 h after bottled on 0.5L plastic bottles and immediately stored at – 40 °C until use. The milk was placed in the fridge 2 days before use at 5 °C to thaw. Enzymatic inactivation of the milk was carried out by heating the milk for 10 minutes at 96 °C in a VWR water bath (Grant Instruments Ltd., Cambridge, UK) followed by cooling to room temperature before further use.

Raw bovine milk was obtained from a farmer on Zealand (Denmark) and stored in the fridge at 5°C until use.

Preparation of Prussian blue (PB) agar plates were made following the formulation described by Saito, Seki, Iida, Nakayama, & Yoshida (2007). M17-lac agar were made using M17 agar provided by SSI Diagnostica (Hilleroed, Denmark) in 200 mL bottles and sterile 10% lactose solution were added to a final concentration of 0,5%. Xylose-Lysine-Desoxycholate (XLD) agar plates were made following the directions by the manufacturer (Oxoid, Thermo Scientific, Hampshire, UK). MacConkey no. 3 agar plates were provided by SSI Diagnostica (Hilleroed, Denmark) ready to use. All agar plates kept at 5 °C until use.

2.3 Antimicrobial activity of *L. lactis*

Aliquots of 50 mL raw or pasteurised camel milk were stored in 50 mL falcon tubes. Milk samples were inoculated with overnight cultures of each pathogen (5 µL) *L. lactis* strain (50 µL). Falcon tubes were homogenized using a Vortex mixer and incubated at 30 °C for 75 h. Sampling were withdrawn every 10-20 h over a period of three days.

2.4 Viable Bacteria Count

At each sampling interval the milk was homogenized and 100 µL were removed for serial dilutions. Maximum Recovery Diluent provided by SSI Diagnostica (Hilleroed, Denmark) were used to dilute samples. Adequate dilutions were chosen and 40 µL was pipetted on a half agar plate. M17-lac agar plates were incubated for 48 h at 30 °C and used for *L. lactis* strains, XLD agar plates incubated for 24 h at 37 °C and used for *S. Typhimurium* DT12 and MacConkey No.3 incubated for 24 h at 37 °C and used for *K. pneumoniae* and *E. coli* O:157 VT⁻. Colonies were counted using a Stuart SC6+ Colony Counter (Cole-Parmer, Staffordshire, UK) and colony-forming units (CFU) per millilitre were calculated using a weighted mean.

2.5 Measurement of Hydrogen Peroxide

Determination of H₂O₂ concentration in samples was carried out using CDR FOODLAB® (CDR s.r.l, Florence, Italy) photometric analyser according to manufacturer's instructions. Samples were taken from an overnight culture containing either MS22333 or MS22337. The *L. lactis* strains was grown in both bovine milk and camel milk for evaluation of possible differences.

3. Results

In this study *L. lactis* strains were inoculated into both raw and pasteurised camel milk at around 10⁶-10⁷ CFU mL⁻¹ to simulate the fermentation. Results are presented in Figure 1 and

2. All *L. lactis* strains reached levels of 10^8 - 10^9 CFU mL⁻¹ both in raw and pasteurised milk with pH ranging between 4.0 - 4.5.

3.1 Inhibition of *E. coli* O:157 VT⁻ in raw camel milk

The inhibitory effect varied between *L. lactis* strains MS22314, MS22333, MS22336 and MS22337. The inhibition is shown in Figure 1. The pathogenic *E coli* O:157 VT⁻ was inoculated at about $4.7 \cdot 10^4$ - $5.0 \cdot 10^5$ CFU mL⁻¹ and after 8 h inhibition effects were detected. MS22333 and MS22337 decreased the concentration of *E coli* O:157 VT⁻ with 0.9-4.8 log(CFU mL⁻¹) within 54 h at 30°C. In contrast did MS22314 and MS22336 did not inhibit the growth of *E coli* O:157 VT⁻ at any stages of fermentation. After 8 h of incubation the concentration of *E coli* O:157 VT⁻ was 0.5-1.0 log(CFU mL⁻¹) higher in milk samples containing either MS22314 or MS22333 compared to *E coli* O:157 VT⁻ growing alone in raw camel milk. After 54 h, all three samples reached a stable *E coli* O:157 VT⁻ concentration of 5.5 - $7.5 \cdot 10^7$ CFU mL⁻¹.

In the absence of *L. lactis* strains and *E. coli* O:157 VT⁻ the raw camel milk sample showed both growth on M17-lac and MacConkey no. 3 agar plates indicating both natural LAB and unknown *Enterobacteriaceae*.

3.2 Inhibition of *Salmonella* Typhimurium DT12 and *Klebsiella pneumoniae* in pasteurised camel milk

The effect of *L. lactis* MS22333 and MS22337 to inhibit the pathogens in pasteurised camel milk is presented in Figure 2B and Figure 2C. Both *S. Typhimurium* DT12 and *K. pneumoniae* were inoculated at concentrations about 6.0 log(CFU mL⁻¹), while *L. lactis* strains were about 7.0-7.5 log(CFU mL⁻¹). Overall *L. lactis* MS22333 and MS22337 inhibited both pathogens and a mixed starter culture composed of both did not show a significant difference. No inhibitory effect on *S. Typhimurium* DT12 were seen the first 21 h of the

fermentation. After 47 h, it was impossible to detect *S. Typhimurium* DT12 in milk samples containing either MS22333 or MS22337 or a 50:50 mixed culture.

Similar results were seen with *K. pneumoniae* at 21 h. At 47 h no growth on MacConkey no. 3 agar were detected in the *L. lactis* MS22337 inoculated milk. The mixed *L. lactis* culture and *L. lactis* MS22333 showed concentrations of respectively 4.5 and 3.8 log(CFU mL⁻¹) at same sampling interval. After 75 h, *K. pneumoniae* were impossible to detect in all milk samples inoculated with a *L. lactis* strain.

3.3 Production of hydrogen peroxide

Characterisation of H₂O₂ producing *L. lactis* strains were carried out using PB agar. Prussian blue colour formation was seen as a blue halo around positive colonies. MS22333 showed strong blue colour formation around each colony, while MS22337 had small light blue halos around most colonies (data not shown). *L. lactis* MG1363 were included as a negative control. *L. lactis* MS22314 and MS2236 looked like *L. lactis* MG1363 with no clear colour formation.

Quantification of H₂O₂ levels in camel milk is shown in Table 1. Overall, none of the *L. lactis* strains showed high concentrations of H₂O₂ < 24 ppm. The concentration of H₂O₂ in both raw and pasteurised camel milk were at the beginning below detection level (DL) < 1.5 ppm. Similar results were obtained for bovine milk. After 24 h at 30 °C, all samples showed an increased H₂O₂ concentration. 23.8 ppm were the highest concentration detected, which was in pasteurised camel milk inoculated with *L. lactis* MS22337.

4 Discussion

183 Milk and processed dairy products are consumed globally by all social classes. Contaminants
184 can occur through the food chain from milking of the animal to the final consumers. Bacterial
185 contamination of milk should be minimal, as contaminated milk is a threat to public health.
186 As the majority of camel milk producers lack cooling facilities, the camel milk often acidifies
187 by spontaneous fermentation (Holzapfel, 2002). We have been studying LAB in spontaneous
188 fermented camel milk to isolate the most beneficial strains based on antimicrobial activity
189 and rate of fermentation. Our findings of two strains inhibiting *E. coli* O:157 VT⁻ in raw
190 camel milk, demonstrates antimicrobial activity of *L. lactis* strains with comparable
191 acidification rates and pH levels as commercial starter cultures (Berhe et al., 2018). A study
192 by Charlier et al. (2008) demonstrated that low-acidifying *L. lactis* strains efficiently could
193 inhibit the growth of *S. aureus* in milk. The inhibitory effect seen in *L. lactis* MS22333 and
194 MS22337 and not in MS22314 and MS22336 is thereby not due to lactic acid production as
195 they all had similar acidification curves (data not shown) and similar pH levels. Same strains
196 showed H₂O₂ production on PB agar, but only low levels < 24 ppm could be detected using
197 the CDR FOODLAB analyser. Multiple *L. lactis* strains isolated from food samples have
198 earlier been reported to accumulate more than 300 ppm H₂O₂ when the suspension were
199 aerated (Ito et al., 2003). The results shown in Table 1 could be residue levels, from an
200 incomplete utilisation of hydrogen peroxide potential caused by anaerobic conditions.
201 Furthermore, H₂O₂ is known to have a short lifetime in milk, and in raw milk, H₂O₂ may
202 activate the naturally occurring lactoperoxidase (LP) enzyme system (Martin et al., 2014).
203 Detection of H₂O₂ in a complex media such as milk can be a challenge. H₂O₂ concentrations
204 as low as 60 mg L⁻¹ administered along with 28 mg L⁻¹ thiocyanate have been reported to
205 activate the LP system and extend the shelf life of raw ovine, bovine and caprine milk for
206 several days (Boulares, Mankai, & Hassouna, 2011).

To our knowledge, inhibition of pathogens in pasteurised camel milk have not been demonstrated before. *L. lactis* MS22333 and MS22337 showed complete inhibition of both *S. Typhimurium* DT12 and *K. pneumoniae* within 75 h shown in Figure 2B and 2C. The reason for the 4.07 log(CFU mL⁻¹) decrease of *K. pneumoniae* in fermented camel milk is unknown, but may be due to growth of unknown bacteria inhibiting and utilizing lactose, which was seen as growth on M17-lac agar plates reaching 6.0 log(CFU mL⁻¹) at 47 h (Figure 2A).

Pasteurisation of camel milk inactivates the LP system (Sharma & Rajput, 2014). The inhibition of *S. Typhimurium* DT12 and *K. pneumoniae* by *L. lactis* MS22333 and MS22337, indicates that other antimicrobial mechanisms are happening during fermentation. According to literature, *L. lactis* have shown to inhibit pathogens by producing bacteriocins and other low molecular compounds (Armas, Camperio, & Marianelli, 2017; Cardinal, Meghrou, Lacroix, & Simard, 1997; Enan, Abdel-Shafi, Ouda, & Negm, 2013; Loh, Lim, & Ting, 2017; Millette, Smoragiewicz, & Lacroix, 2004).

We have previously published the genome sequences of *L. lactis* MS22314, MS22333, MS22336 and MS22337 (Bragason et al., 2020), where annotation of the contigs showed that MS22333 were the only strain without any genes coding for antibiotic resistance. Starter cultures containing resistance genes can possibly be a critical source of spreading antibiotic resistance, and studies have found multiple starter cultures with resistance genes (Kastner et al., 2006; Katla, Kruse, Johnsen, & Herikstad, 2001). Future studies should explore the mechanism of inhibition and develop *L. lactis* MS22333 into a starter culture specific for camel dairy.

5 Conclusions

Our present study shows that *L. lactis* MS22333 and *L. lactis* MS22337 isolated from spontaneous fermented camel milk have antimicrobial abilities and can be applied as a starter

culture to promote food safety in African countries. We have demonstrated for the first time that *S. Typhimurium* and *K. pneumoniae* can be eliminated in pasteurised camel milk by *L. lactis* strains. Further work has to be done to explain the mechanism of inhibition.

Acknowledgements

This study was partly performed from February to June 2018 and August to December 2019 as a part of the project “Haramaya Camel Dairy”, a collaboration between Haramaya University, Chr. Hansen A/S, Copenhagen University, and the Technical University of Denmark. The study is funded by the Danish Development Fund, Danida, through grant DFC 12-017DTU. Thanks to Bodil Madsen for technical and professional assistance in the laboratory at the Technical University of Denmark.

References

- Abera, T., Legesse, Y., Mummed, B., & Urga, B. (2016). Bacteriological quality of raw camel milk along the market value chain in Fafen zone, Ethiopian Somali regional state. *BMC Research Notes*, 9(1), 16–21. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s13104-016-2088-1>
- Armas, F., Camperio, C., & Marianelli, C. (2017). In Vitro Assessment of the Probiotic Potential of *Lactococcus lactis* LMG 7930 against Ruminant Mastitis-Causing Pathogens. *PLOS ONE*, 12(1), 1–13. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0169543>
- Benmechernene, Z., Chentouf, H. F., Yahia, B., Fatima, G., Quintela-Baluja, M., Calo-Mata, P., & Barros-Velázquez, J. (2013). Technological Aptitude and Applications of *Leuconostoc mesenteroides* Bioactive Strains Isolated from Algerian Raw Camel Milk. *BioMed Research International*, 2013. <https://doi.org/10.1155/2013/418132>
- Berhe, T., Ipsen, R., Seifu, E., Kurtu, M. Y., Eshetu, M., & Hansen, E. B. (2018).

254 Comparison of the acidification activities of commercial starter cultures in camel and
 255 bovine milk. *LWT - Food Science and Technology*, 89(October 2017), 123–127.
 256 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lwt.2017.10.041>

257 Bisholo, K. Z., Ghuman, S., & Haffejee, F. (2018). Food-borne disease prevalence in rural
 258 villages in the Eastern Cape, South Africa. *African Journal of Primary Health Care &*
 259 *Family Medicine*, 10(1), 1–5. <https://doi.org/10.4102/phcfm.v10i1.1796>

260 Boulares, M., Mankai, M., & Hassouna, M. (2011). Effect of thiocyanate and hydrogen
 261 peroxide on the keeping quality of ovine, bovine and caprine raw milk. *International*
 262 *Journal of Dairy Technology*, 64(1), 52–56. [https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1471-](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1471-0307.2010.00644.x)
 263 [0307.2010.00644.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1471-0307.2010.00644.x)

264 Bragason, E., Svendsen, C. A., Guya, M. E., Berhe, T., & Hansen, E. B. (2020). Draft
 265 Genome Sequences of *Lactococcus lactis* strains MS22314, MS22333, MS22336, and
 266 MS22337, Isolated from Fermented Camel Milk in Ethiopia. *Microbiology Resource*
 267 *Announcements, Submitted*.

268 Cardinal, M. J., Meghrou, J., Lacroix, C., & Simard, R. E. (1997). Isolation of *Lactococcus*
 269 *lactis* strains producing inhibitory activity against *Listeria*. *Food Biotechnology*, 11(2),
 270 129–146. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08905439709549928>

271 Charlier, C., Even, S., Gautier, M., & Le Loir, Y. (2008). Acidification is not involved in the
 272 early inhibition of *Staphylococcus aureus* growth by *Lactococcus lactis* in milk.
 273 *International Dairy Journal*, 18(2), 197–203.
 274 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.idairyj.2007.03.015>

275 Cizeikiene, D., Juodeikiene, G., Paskevicius, A., & Bartkiene, E. (2013). Antimicrobial
 276 activity of lactic acid bacteria against pathogenic and spoilage microorganism isolated
 277 from food and their control in wheat bread. *Food Control*, 31(2), 539–545.

278 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foodcont.2012.12.004>

279 El Agamy, E. I., Ruppanner, R., Ismail, A., Champagne, C. P., & Assaf, R. (1992).
 280 Antibacterial and antiviral activity of camel milk protective proteins. *The Journal of*
 281 *Dairy Research*, 59(2), 169–175. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0022029900030417>

282 Enan, G., Abdel-Shafi, S., Ouda, S., & Negm, S. (2013). Novel antibacterial activity of
 283 *Lactococcus lactis* subspecies *lactis* Z11 isolated from Zabady. *International Journal of*
 284 *Biomedical Science*, 9(3), 174–180.

285 Fugl, A., Berhe, T., Kiran, A., Hussain, S., Laursen, M. F., Bahl, M. I., ... Hansen, E. B.
 286 (2017). Characterisation of lactic acid bacteria in spontaneously fermented camel milk
 287 and selection of strains for fermentation of camel milk. *International Dairy Journal*, 73,
 288 19–24. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.idairyj.2017.04.007>

289 Holzapfel, W. H. (2002). Appropriate starter culture technologies for small-scale
 290 fermentation in developing countries. *International Journal of Food Microbiology*,
 291 75(3), 197–212. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0168-1605\(01\)00707-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0168-1605(01)00707-3)

292 Ismaili, M. A., Saidi, B., Zahar, M., Hamama, A., & Ezzaier, R. (2019). Composition and
 293 microbial quality of raw camel milk produced in Morocco. *Journal of the Saudi Society*
 294 *of Agricultural Sciences*, 18(1), 17–21. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jssas.2016.12.001>

295 Ito, A., Sato, Y., Kudo, S., Sato, S., Nakajima, H., & Toba, T. (2003). The screening of
 296 hydrogen peroxide-producing lactic acid bacteria and their application to inactivating
 297 psychrotrophic food-borne pathogens. *Current Microbiology*, 47(3), 231–236.
 298 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00284-002-3993-1>

299 Jay, J. M. (1982). Antimicrobial Properties of Diacetyl. *Applied and Environmental*
 300 *Microbiology*, 44(3), 525–532.

301 Kasra-Kermanshahi, R., & Mobarak-Qamsari, E. (2015). Inhibition Effect of Lactic Acid
 302 Bacteria against Food Born Pathogen , *Listeria monocytogenes*. *Applied Food*
 303 *Biotechnology*, 2(4), 11–19.

304 Kastner, S., Perreten, V., Bleuler, H., Hugenschmidt, G., Lacroix, C., & Meile, L. (2006).
 305 Antibiotic susceptibility patterns and resistance genes of starter cultures and probiotic
 306 bacteria used in food. *Systematic and Applied Microbiology*, 29(2), 145–155.
 307 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.syapm.2005.07.009>

308 Katla, A. K., Kruse, H., Johnsen, G., & Herikstad, H. (2001). Antimicrobial susceptibility of
 309 starter culture bacteria used in Norwegian dairy products. *International Journal of Food*
 310 *Microbiology*, 67(1–2), 147–152. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0168-1605\(00\)00522-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0168-1605(00)00522-5)

311 Kondrotiene, K., Kasnauskite, N., Serniene, L., Götz, G., Alter, T., Kaskoniene, V., ...
 312 Malakauskas, M. (2018). Characterization and application of newly isolated nisin
 313 producing *Lactococcus lactis* strains for control of *Listeria monocytogenes* growth in
 314 fresh cheese. *LWT - Food Science and Technology*, 87, 507–514.
 315 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lwt.2017.09.021>

316 Loh, J. Y., Lim, Y. Y., & Ting, A. S. Y. (2017). Bacteriocin-like substances produced by
 317 *Lactococcus lactis* subsp. *lactis* CF4MRS isolated from fish intestine: Antimicrobial
 318 activities and inhibitory properties. *International Food Research Journal*, 24(1), 394–
 319 400.

320 Martin, N. H., Friedlander, A., Mok, A., Kent, D., Wiedmann, M., & Boor, K. J. (2014).
 321 Peroxide Test Strips Detect Added Hydrogen Peroxide in Raw Milk at Levels Affecting
 322 Bacterial Load. *Journal of Food Protection*, 77(10), 1809–1813.
 323 <https://doi.org/10.4315/0362-028X.JFP-14-074>

324 Millette, M., Smoragiewicz, W., & Lacroix, M. (2004). Antimicrobial potential of

325 immobilized *Lactococcus lactis* subsp. *lactis* ATCC 11454 against selected bacteria.
 326 *Journal of Food Protection*, 67(6), 1184–1189. [https://doi.org/10.4315/0362-028X-](https://doi.org/10.4315/0362-028X-67.6.1184)
 327 67.6.1184

328 Mufandaedza, J., Viljoen, B. C., Feresu, S. B., & Gadaga, T. H. (2006). Antimicrobial
 329 properties of lactic acid bacteria and yeast-LAB cultures isolated from traditional
 330 fermented milk against pathogenic *Escherichia coli* and *Salmonella enteritidis* strains.
 331 *International Journal of Food Microbiology*, 108(1), 147–152.
 332 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijfoodmicro.2005.11.005>

333 Oliver, S. P., Jayarao, B. M., & Almeida, R. A. (2005). Review - Foodborne Pathogens in
 334 Milk and the Dairy Farm Environment: Food Safety and Public Health Implications.
 335 *Foodborne Pathogens and Disease*, 2(2), 115–137.

336 Rahmeh, R., Akbar, A., Kishk, M., Al-Onaizi, T., Al-Azmi, A., Al-Shatti, A., ... Akbar, B.
 337 (2019). Distribution and antimicrobial activity of lactic acid bacteria from raw camel
 338 milk. *New Microbes and New Infections*, 30.
 339 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.nmni.2019.100560>

340 Rebgui, H., Nekkal, N., Benlarabi, S., Hattimy, F. El, Hadrya, F., Soulaymani, A., ...
 341 Mokhtari, A. (2013). Food poisoning in Morocco: Evolution and Risk factors.
 342 *International Journal of Scientific & Engineering Research*, 4(11), 1015–1021.

343 Roessland, E., Borge, G. I. A., Langsrud, T., & Sørhaug, T. (2003). Inhibition of *Bacillus*
 344 *cereus* by strains of *Lactobacillus* and *Lactococcus* in milk. *International Journal of*
 345 *Food Microbiology*, 89(2–3), 205–212. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0168-1605\(03\)00149-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0168-1605(03)00149-1)

346 Saito, M., Seki, M., Iida, K., Nakayama, H., & Yoshida, S. (2007). A Novel Agar Medium to
 347 Detect Hydrogen Peroxide-Producing Bacteria Based on the Prussian Blue-Forming
 348 Reaction. *Microbiol. Immunol.*, 51(9), 889–892.

349 Sharma, R., & Rajput, Y. S. (2014). Rapid methods for assessing efficiency of heat treatment
350 of milk. *Journal of Food Science and Technology*, 51(7), 1416–1420.
351 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13197-012-0635-x>

352 Tetili, F., Bendali, F., Perrier, J., & Sadoun, D. (2017). Anti-staphylococcal
353 enterotoxinogenesis of *Lactococcus lactis* in Algerian raw milk cheese. *Food*
354 *Technology and Biotechnology*, 55(4), 511–518.
355 <https://doi.org/10.17113/ftb.55.04.17.5105>

356

Figure Captions

B&W:

Figure 1. Evolution of novel *L. lactis* strains and Gram-negative bacteria in raw camel milk. **Figure 1A.** Growth curves of lactose fermenting strains on M17 agar with 0.5% lactose from raw camel milk fermentations at 30°C with *Lactococcus lactis* strains inoculated. *L. lactis* MS22314 (◇), *L. lactis* MS22333 (●), *L. lactis* MS22336 (□) and *L. lactis* MS22337 (Δ) were inoculated in raw camel milk with *E. coli* O:157 VT⁻ (·····) at 10:1 CFU mL⁻¹. Control samples without inoculation of *L. lactis* strains in raw camel milk (—X—) or with *E. coli* O:157 VT⁻ (···○···) inoculated.

Figure 1B. Growth curves of Gram-negative strains on MacConkey agar no. 3 from raw camel milk fermentations at 30°C with *Lactococcus lactis* strains inoculated. *L. lactis* MS22314 (◇), *L. lactis* MS22333 (●), *L. lactis* MS22336 (□) and *L. lactis* MS22337 (Δ) were inoculated in raw camel milk with *E. coli* O:157 VT⁻ (·····) at 10:1 CFU mL⁻¹. Control samples without inoculation of *L. lactis* strains in raw camel milk (—X—) or with *E. coli* O:157 VT⁻ (···○···) inoculated.

Figure 2. Evolution of novel *L. lactis* strains and pathogenic bacteria in pasteurised camel milk.

Figure 2A. Growth curves of *Lactococcus lactis* strains in pasteurised camel milk with *Salmonella* Typhimurium DT12 or *Klebsiella pneumoniae* present. *L. lactis* MS22333 (□), *L. lactis* MS22337 (Δ), a mixed culture of *L. lactis* MS22333 and *L. lactis* MS22337 (◇) were inoculated with either *S. Typhimurium* DT12 (- - -) or *K. pneumoniae* (·····) at 10:1 CFU mL⁻¹. Control samples without inoculation of *L. lactis* strains in past. camel milk (—X—) inoculated with either *S. Typhimurium* DT12 (- -○- -) or *K. pneumoniae* (···○···).

Figure 2B. Growth curves of *Salmonella* Typhimurium DT12 on XLD agar from pasteurised camel milk fermentations at 30°C with *Lactococcus lactis* strains inoculated. *L. lactis* MS22333 (□), *L. lactis* MS22337 (Δ) and a mixed culture of *L. lactis* MS22333 and *L. lactis* MS22337 (◇) were inoculated with *S. Typhimurium* DT12 (- - -) at 10:1 CFU mL⁻¹. Control samples without inoculation of *L. lactis* strains in past. camel milk (—X—) inoculated with *S. Typhimurium* DT12 (- -○- -).

Figure 2C. Growth curves of *Klebsiella pneumoniae* on MacConkey agar no. 3 from pasteurised camel milk fermentations at 30°C with *Lactococcus lactis* strains inoculated. *L. lactis* MS22333 (□), *L. lactis* MS22337 (Δ) and a mixed culture of *L. lactis* MS22333 and *L. lactis* MS22337 (◇) were inoculated with *K. pneumoniae* (·····) at 10:1 CFU mL⁻¹. Control samples without inoculation of *L. lactis* strains in past. camel milk (—X—) inoculated with *K. pneumoniae* (- -○- -).

Figure 1. Evolution of novel *L. lactis* strains and Gram-negative bacteria in raw camel milk. **Figure 1A.** Growth curves of lactose fermenting strains on M17 agar with 0.5% lactose from raw camel milk fermentations at 30°C with *Lactococcus lactis* strains inoculated. *L. lactis* MS22314 (◇), *L. lactis* MS22333 (●), *L. lactis* MS22336 (□) and *L. lactis* MS22337 (△) were inoculated in raw camel milk with *E. coli* O:157 VT⁻ (·····) at 10:1 CFU mL⁻¹. Control samples without inoculation of *L. lactis* strains in raw camel milk (—X—) or with *E. coli* O:157 VT⁻ (···○···) inoculated.

Figure 1B. Growth curves of Gram-negative strains on MacConkey agar no. 3 from raw camel milk fermentations at 30°C with *Lactococcus lactis* strains inoculated. *L. lactis* MS22314 (◇), *L. lactis* MS22333 (●), *L. lactis* MS22336 (□) and *L. lactis* MS22337 (△) were inoculated in raw camel milk with *E. coli* O:157 VT⁻ (·····) at 10:1 CFU mL⁻¹. Control samples without inoculation of *L. lactis* strains in raw camel milk (—X—) or with *E. coli* O:157 VT⁻ (···○···) inoculated.

Figure 2. Evolution of novel *L. lactis* strains and pathogenic bacteria in pasteurised camel milk.

Figure 2A. Growth curves of *Lactococcus lactis* strains in pasteurised camel milk with *Salmonella* Typhimurium DT12 or *Klebsiella pneumoniae* present. *L. lactis* MS22333 (□), *L. lactis* MS22337 (△), a mixed culture of *L. lactis* MS22333 and *L. lactis* MS22337 (◇) were inoculated with either *S. Typhimurium* DT12 (- - -) or *K. pneumoniae* (·····) at 10:1 CFU mL⁻¹. Control samples without inoculation of *L. lactis* strains in past. camel milk (—X—) inoculated with either *S. Typhimurium* DT12 (- -○- -) or *K. pneumoniae* (···○···).

Figure 2B. Growth curves of *Salmonella* Typhimurium DT12 on XLD agar from pasteurised camel milk fermentations at 30°C with *Lactococcus lactis* strains inoculated. *L. lactis* MS22333 (□), *L. lactis* MS22337 (△) and a mixed culture of *L. lactis* MS22333 and *L. lactis* MS22337 (◇) were inoculated with *S. Typhimurium* DT12 (- - -) at 10:1 CFU mL⁻¹. Control samples without inoculation of *L. lactis* strains in past. camel milk (—X—) inoculated with *S. Typhimurium* DT12 (- -○- -).

Figure 2C. Growth curves of *Klebsiella pneumoniae* on MacConkey agar no. 3 from pasteurised camel milk fermentations at 30°C with *Lactococcus lactis* strains inoculated. *L. lactis* MS22333 (□), *L. lactis* MS22337 (△) and a mixed culture of *L. lactis* MS22333 and *L. lactis* MS22337 (◇) were inoculated with *K. pneumoniae* (·····) at 10:1 CFU mL⁻¹. Control samples without inoculation of *L. lactis* strains in past. camel milk (—X—) inoculated with *K. pneumoniae* (- -○- -).

Table 1. H₂O₂ levels in raw and pasteurised camel and bovine milk fermented with *L. lactis* strains MS22333 or MS22337 at 30°C

Sample	H ₂ O ₂ (ppm)		
	0 h	3 h	24 h
Raw camel milk (RC)	<DL	x*	x*
Raw Bovine milk (RB)	<DL	x*	x*
Pasteurised camel milk (PC)	<DL	<DL	4.2
Pasteurised bovine milk (PB)	<DL	<DL	4.1
RB_MS22333	2.9	<DL	15.0
RC_MS22333	1.5	<DL	3.6
RB_MS22337	<DL	<DL	14.2
RC_MS22337	<DL	<DL	4.3
PB_MS22333	<DL	<DL	17.3
PC_MS22333	<DL	<DL	7.4
PB_MS22337	<DL	<DL	6.6
PC_MS22337	<DL	<DL	23.8

* RC and RB were only measured at t=0 h for baseline.

DL refers to below detection limit which is 1.5 ppm

Esben Bragason: Conceptualization, Investigation, Writing; **Tesfemariam Berhe:** Resources;

DakaloDashe: Resources; **Kim Ib Sørensen:** Validation; **Mituku E. Guya:** Resources; **Egon**

Bech Hansen: Supervision, Funding acquisition.