Bacteriological status of chicken meat products marketed at Menofia governorate

Fahim, A. Shaltout[1] , Dina, I. El Zahaby[2],Lamiaa, M. Lotfy[3], Hala, F. El-Shorah[1]

[1] Food Hygiene Dept., Fac. Vet. Med., Benha Univ.,
[2]Food Hygiene Dept., Animal Health Res., Shebin El-Kom
[3] Dept. of Home Economics, Faculty of Specific Education, Kafer el-sheikh University

A B S T R A C T

A total of 90 random samples of semi-cooked chicken Pane, Nuggets and Strips products (30 samples of each) were collected from different supermarkets in different districts at Monofia governorate for determination of their bacteriological aspects. The obtained results indicated that the mean values of total bacterial count, total Enterobacteriace and total coliforms counts/g in the examined samples were $4.25x\ 10^6\pm 1.40\ x\ 10^6$, $5.47\ x\ 10^4\pm 1.98\ x\ 10^4$ and $8.32x\ 10^3\pm 3.33x\ 10^3$ for pane, $7.12\ x\ 10^6\pm 2.11\ x\ 10^6$, $6.58\ x\ 10^4\pm 1.98\ x\ 10^4$ and $6.87\ x\ 10^3\pm 2.00\ x\ 10^3$ for Nuggets and $5.96\ x\ 10^6\pm 1.49\ x\ 10^6$, $6.19x\ 10^4\pm 1.30x\ 10^4$ and $5.49x\ 10^3\pm 2.00\ x\ 10^3$ for Strips, respectively. Furthermore, *Staphylococcus aureus*, *E.coli* and Salmonella could be detected in examined sample with different percentages. The public health significances of isolated bacteria were discussed.

Key words; Chicken Pane, Nuggets, Strips, Salmonella, *E.coli*, *Staph aureus.*

(http://www.bvmj.bu.edu.eg) (bvmj, 34(1): **28-40 -** , MARCH, 2018

1. Introduction:

Chicken and chicken products provide animal protein of high biological value for consumers at all ages, where they contain all the essential amino acids required for human growth, higher proportion of unsaturated fatty acids and less in cholesterol value. Moreover, chicken meat is not only highly susceptible to spoilage, but also frequently implicated in the spread of food-borne diseases. During the various stages of slaughter and processing, all potential edible tissues are subjected to contamination from a variety of sources within and outside the animal. **(Kozacinski et al. 2006).**Increased consumer awareness and concern about microbial food borne diseases has resulted in intensified efforts to reduce contamination of chicken meat products, as evidenced by new meat and poultry inspection regulation. Moreover, requiring operation of poultry slaughtering and processing plant under the principle of the hazard analysis critical control point (HACCP) system, the new regulation has established microbiological testing criteria for *E-coli* and Salmonella, as methods of evaluation plant performance **(Sofos et al, 1999)**. Therefore, the present investigation was planned out to throw light on the bacteriological profile of the examined samples of chicken meat products.

2. Material and Methods

2.1. Collection of samples

A total of 90 random samples of chicken meat products pane, nuggets and strips, (30 of

each) were collected from different super markets located in Menofia governorate for bacteriological examination. The weight of each sample was about 50 g and each sample was collected and kept in separated sterile plastic bag and put in an icebox and transferred to laboratory under complete aseptic conditions without undue delay to evaluate their bacteriological quality and evaluate the hygienic health hazard of contaminated with some food borne pathogens.

2.2. Bacteriological examination:

2.2.1. Total bacterial count (aerobic plate count):

Determination of aerobic plate count was carried out according to the method recommended by ICMSF (1996).

2.2.2. Total Enterobacteriaceae count:

The Total Enterobacteriaceae count was done by plating on Violet red bile glucose agar medium at 37^{o}c for 24hours through the method recommended by ISO (2004).

2.2.3. Total Coliforms count:

The total coliform count was done by plating on Violet red bile agar medium at 37^{o}c for 24hours through the method recommended by ICMSF (1996).

2.2.4. Isolation and identification of *staphylococcus aureus:*

2.2.4.1. Total *Staphylococci* count:

The total *Staphylococcus* count was done by plating on Baird Parker agar plate at 37^{o}c for 48hours through the method recommended by ICMSF (1996).

2.2.4.2. Identification of *Staphylococci spp*.**:**

2.1.2.1. Morphological examination recommended by (Cruickshank et al., 1975)

2.1.2.2. Biochemical identification recommended by (MacFaddin, 2000).

2.2.5. Isolation and identification of *E.coli:*

Isolation was done according to the methods recommended by ICMSF (1996)and identification was done through the following:

2.2.5.1. Morphological identification (Cruickshank et al., 1975).

2.2.5.2. Biochemical identification (Kreig and Holt, 1984).

2.2.5.3. Serological identification (Koko et al. 1996) by using rapid diagnostic *E-coli* antisera sets (DENKASEIKEN Co., Jaban) for diagnostic Enteropathogenic types.

2.2.6. Isolation and identification of salmonella:

2.2.6.1.Identification of salmonellae**:**

Suspected isolates of Salmonella organisms were identified according to MacFaddin (2000).

2.2.6.2. Serological identification ofSalmonellae:

Serological identification of Salmonellae was carried out according to Kauffman – White scheme (Kauffman, 1974) for the determination of Somatic (O) and flagellar (H) antigens using Salmonella antiserum (DENKA SEIKEN Co., Japan).

2.3.Statistical Analysis:

The obtained results were statistically evaluated by application of Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) test according to **Feldman *et al*. (2003)**.

3. Results:

Table (1):Statistical analytical results of Total Bacterial counts (CFU/g) (APC) in the examined samples (n = 30).

Products	Min.	Max.	Mean±S.E.M.	S.D
Chicken Pane	2.00×10^2	$^6 2.40 \times 10$	4.24 x 10^6± 1.40 x 10^6	7.66x10^6
Chicken nuggets	$^4 1.60 \times 10$	$^6 3.00 \times 10$	7.12 x 10^6± 2.11 x 10^6	1.15x10^7
Chicken Strips	$^5 1.60 \times 10$	$^6 3.00 \times 10$	5.96 x 10^6± 1.49 x 10^6	8.17x10^6

Table (2):Statistical analytical results of Total Enterobacteriace counts (CFU/g) in the examined samples (n = 30).

Products	Min	Max	Mean±S.E.M.	S.D
Chicken Pane	6.00x10	$^4 3.00 \times 10$	5.47 x 10^4± 1.98 x 10^4	^{4}9.85x10
Chicken nuggets	8.00 x10^2	$^4 3.00 \times 10$	6.58 x 10^4± 1.98 x 10^4	1.98x10^4
Chicken Strips	8.00 x10^2	$^4 2.40 \times 10$	6.19x 10^4± 1.30x 10^4	7.12x10^4

Table (3):Statistical analytical results of Coliform count (CFU/g) in the examined samples (n = 30).

Products	Min.	Max.	Mean±S.E.M.	S.D
Chicken Pane	1.70x 10	9.00x 10^3	8.32x 10^3± 3.33x 10^3	1.82x10^3
Chicken nuggets	8.00x 10	$^3 3.00 \times 10$	6.87 x 10^3± 2.00 x 10^3	1.09x10^3
Chicken Strips	8.00x 10^2	$^3 3.00 \times 10$	5.49x 10^3± 2.00 x 10^3	1.10x10^3

Table (4): Statistical analytical results of Total *Staphylococcus* (CFU/g) in the examined samples (n = 30).

Products	Min.	Max.	Mean±S.E.M.	S.D
Chicken Pane	1.20×10	$^{3}2.00 \times 10$	$2.99x10^{3}\pm 9.82x10^{3}$	$5.38\ x10^{3}$
Chicken nuggets	2.00×10	$^{3}3.00 \times 10$	$6.41\ x10^{3}\pm 1.9x10^{4}$	$1.08\ x10^{3}$
Chicken Strips	8.00x10	$^{3}3.00 \times 10$	$1.06x10^{3}\pm 2.26x10^{3}$	$1.24\ x10^{3}$

Table (5): incidence of Coagulase Positive *S.aureus*in-examined samples (n=30)

Sample	No.	Positive	
		No.	%
PaneChicken	30	17	56.60%
Chicken Nuggets	30	13	43.30%
Chicken Strips	30	12	40.00%
Total	90	42	46.60%

Table (6): incidence of *E.coli* in-examined samples (n=30)

Sample	No.	Positive	
		No.	%
Pane	30	14	46.60%
Nuggets	30	11	36.60%
Strips	30	9	30.00%
Total	90	34	37.70%

Table (7) incidence and serotyping of *E.coli* isolated from positive samples of pane products. (n=30)

Sample	Pane		strain characteristics
E.coli serotyping	No.	%	
O_{78}	4	13.30%	EPEC
O_{128}:H_2	2	6.60%	ETEC
O_{114}:H_4	1	3.30%	EIEC
O_1:H_7	1	3.30%	EPEC
O_{91}:H_{21}	2	6.60%	EHEC
O_{26}:H_{11}	1	3.30%	EHEC
O_2:H_6	2	6.60%	EPEC
O_{124}	1	3.30%	EIEC
Total	14	46.60%	------

Table (8) incidence and serotyping of *E.coli*isolated from positive samples of nuggets products. (n=30)

Sample	Nuggets		strain characteristics
E.coli serotyping	No.	%	
O_{78}	2	6.60%	EPEC
O_{128}:H_2	1	3.30%	ETEC
O_{91}:H_{21}	2	6.60%	EHEC
O_{26}:H_{11}	1	3.30%	EHEC
O_2:H_6	1	3.30%	EPEC
O_1:H_7	1	3.30%	EPEC
O_{55}:H_7	1	3.30%	EPEC
O_{140}:H_{21}	1	3.30%	EPEC
O_{121}:H_7	1	3.30%	EHEC
Total	11	36.60%	--------

Table (9) incidence and serotyping of *E.coli* isolated from positive samples of strips products. (n=30)

Sample	Strips		strain characteristics
E.coli serotyping	No.	%	
O_{163}:H_2	2	6.60%	EPEC
O_{146}:H_{21}	1	3.30%	EPEC
O_{121}:H_7	1	3.30%	EHEC
O_1:H_7	2	6.60%	EPEC
O_{78}	1	3.30%	EPEC
O_{91}:H_{21}	1	3.30%	EHEC
O_{128}:H_2	1	3.30%	ETEC
Total	9	30.00%	-------

Table (10) incidence of Identified *Salmonella* serotypes isolated from examined samples of pane products (n=30)

Sample		Pane		antigenic Structure	
Isolated bacteria	No.	%	Group	O	H
S. Tsevie	1	3.30%	B	4,5	i:e,n,Z_{15}
S. Kentucky	2	6.60%	C3	8,20	i:Z_6
S. Typhimurium	1	3.30%	B	1,4,5,12	i:1,2
S. Apeyeme	1	3.30%	C3	8,20	Z_{38}:-
S. Enteritidis	1	3.30%	D1	1,9,12	g,m:-
Total	6	20.00%	--------	--------	--------

Table (11) incidence of identified *Salmonella* serotypes isolated from examined samples of nuggets products (n=30)

Sample	Nuggets			antigenic Structure	
Isolated bacteria	No.	%	Group	O	H
S.Larochelle	1	3.30%	C1	6,7	e,h:1,2
S.Typhimurium	2	6.60%	B	1,4,5,12	i:1,2
S. Kentucky	1	3.30%	C3	8,20	$i:Z_6$
S.Tsevie	1	3.30%	B	4,5	$i:e,n,Z_{15}$
Total	5	16.60%			

Table (12) incidence of identified *Salmonella* serotypes isolated from examined samples of strips products (n=30)

Sample	Nuggets			antigenic Structure	
Isolated bacteria	No.	%	Group	O	H
S. Kentucky	1	3.30%	C3	8,20	$i:Z_6$
S. Enteritids	1	3.30%	D1	1,9,12	g,m:-
Total	2	6.60%			

4.Discussion

In recent years there is great awareness of food poisoning and how such is of great public health hazards and this is due to consumption of food especially poultry meat and its products contaminated with various hazards kinds of microorganisms from different sources starting from the chicken carcass itself and throughout the processing plant and their products, in the latest many efforts were made to produce food products free from those microbial hazards and of high quality to be fit for human consumption.

It is evident from the result recorded in table (1) that the total APC in the examined samples was varied from $2.00\times1o^2$ to 2.40×10^6cfu/g in chicken Pane, $1.00\times1o^4$ to 3.00×10^6cfu/g in chicken Nuggets and $1.60\times1o^5$ to 3.00×10^6 cfu/g in chicken Strips with mean value of $4.25\times 10^5 \pm 1.40 \times 10^5$ cfu/g for chicken Pane, $7.12\times 10^5$to 2.11×10^5 cfu/g for chicken Nuggets and 5.96×10^5 to1.49×10^5cfu/g for chicken strips.

In other words, there is a no significant difference of total APC between the examined chicken pane, chicken nuggets and chicken strips ($P > 0.05$).

Nearly similar results for chicken products were obtained byHassan-O (2015)and Mohamed (2016). But this results are higher than which obtained by Shaltout (2002), Sengupta et al. (2012), Ahmed et al. (2013), Ibrahim et al. (2014), Marwan- H. (2016) and El-Sayed (2017).

The results in table (2)indicated that the total Enterobacteriacae count in the examined samples was ranged from 6.00× 10 to 3.00× 10^4 with an average value of 5.47× 10^4± 1.80×10^4 cfu/g for chicken Pane, 8.00×10^2 to 3.00× 10^4 with an average value of 6.58×10^4 ± 1.98×10^4cfu/g for chicken Nuggets and 8.00× 10^2 to 2.40× 10^4 with an average value of 6.19×10^4± 1.30×10^4 cfu/g for chicken strips.

In other words, there is a no significant difference of total Enterobacteriace between the examined chicken pane, chicken nuggets and chicken strips (P > 0.05).

Nearly similar results for chicken products were obtained by Vural et al. (2006) and Marwan- H. (2016). But this results are higher than which obtained by Shaltout (2002), Kozacinski et al. (2006) and Nawar (2007) and lower than which obtained by Osman (2001) and Saikia and Joshi (2010).

The results in table (3) indicated that the total coliform count in the examined samples was ranged from 1.70× 10 to 9.00× 10^3 with an average value of 8.32× 10^3± 3.33×10^3cfu/g for chicken Pane, 8.00×10 to 3.00× 10^3 with an average value of 6.87×10^3 ± 2.00×10^3cfu/g for chicken Nuggets and 8.00× 10^2 to 3.00× 10^3 with an average value of 5.49x 10^3± 2.00 x 10^3cfu/g for chicken strips.

In other words, there is a no significant difference of total Coliform between the examined chicken pane, chicken nuggets and chicken strips (P > 0.05).

The current results were nearly similar to those obtained by Cohen et al. (2007) and Nawar (2007). These results are higher than which obtained by Javadi and Safarmashaei (2011), Ruban and Fairoze (2011), but lower than which obtained by Ibrahim- H. (2014), Hassan- O. (2015) and Marwan- H. (2016).

Results achieved in table (4) declared that the *Staphylococus* count ranged from 1.20x10 to 2.00 x10^3 with mean value 2.99x10^3± 9.82x$10^3$for Pane, 2.00 x10 to 3.00 x10^3 with mean value 6.41 x10^3± 1.9x10^4 for Nuggets and 8.00x10 to 3.00x10^3 with mean value 1.06x10^3± 2.26x10^3 for Strips.

In other words, there is a highly significant difference of Total *Staphylococcus* between the examined samples pane, nuggets and strips ($p \leq 0.01$).

These results are came in agreement with Abbas (2011), Ibrahim et al. (2015),Saif-M. (2015), Mohamed (2016) and El-Sayed (2017).These results are higher than which obtained by Sengupta et al. (2011) and Al-Jasser (2012),but lower than results which obtained by Ibrahim (2013), Nossair et al. (2015) and Marwan- H. (2016).

The result obtained in the table (5) showed that 42 isolates of Coagulase positive S. aureus were isolated from examined chicken meat samples represented as 17(56.60%) from pane samples, 13(43.30%) from nuggets samples and 12(40.00%) from strips samples.

These results came in accordance with those obtained by Mohamed-Gh. (2010) and Ali (2011). These results are lower than which obtained by Buyukcangaz et al. (2013), Ahmed (2015) and El-Sayed (2017). But higher than results which obtained by Kozacins et al. (2012), Abo-Samra (2013), Abd El-Fattah- SH. (2014) and Marwan- H. (2016).

The results intable (6) revealed that the incidence of *E.coli* was 46.6%, 36.6% and 30% of examined samples of chicken pane, nuggets and strips, respectively. This results is nearly similar to which obtained by Rashid et al. (2013) 40%, Ibrahim et al. (2014) 33.33% and Hemeda (2017) 44%. This results

were lower than which obtained by Saikia and Joshi (2010) 98% and Ruban et al. (2012) 85.7%, but higher than Samaha et al. (2012) 12% and Hassanin et al. (2014) 15%.

The results in table (7) showed that the incidence of serologically identified *E. coli* in Pane, as *Enteropathogenic E. coli* (*E.Coli* O_{78}(13.3%), *E. coli* $O_1:H_7$ (3.3%), and *E. coli* $O_2:H_{11}$(6.6%), *Enterotoxogenic E. coli* (*E coli* $O_{128}:H_2$ (6.6%) , *Enterheamorrhagic E. coli* (*E coli* $O_{91}:H_{21}$(6.6%) and *E coli* $O_{26}:H_{11}$(3.3%) and *Enteroinvasive E.Coli* (*E coli* $O_{114}:H_4$(3.3%) and *E coli* O_{124}(3.3%).

The results in table (8) revealed that the incidence of serologically identified *E. coli* in Nuggets, as *Enteropathogenic E. coli* (*E.Coli* O_{78}(6.6%), *E. coli* $O_1:H_7$ (3.3%), and *E. coli* $O_2:H_6$(3.3%), *E.coli* $O_{55}:H_7$(3.3%) and *E coli* $O_{146}:H_{21}$(3.3%) , *Enterotoxogenic E. coli* (*E.coli* $O_{128}:H_2$ (3.3%) , *Enterheamorrhagic E. coli* (*E.coli* $O_{91}:H_{21}$(6.6%) and *E.coli* $O_{26}:H_{11}$(3.3%) and E.coli O_{121}:H_7(3.3%).

The results in table (9) showed that the incidence of serologically identified *E.coli* in Strips as *Enteropathogenic E. coli* (*E.Coli* O_{78}(3.3%), *E. coli* $O_1:H_7$ (3.3%), *E. coli* $O_{146}:H_{21}$ (3.3%) and *E. coli* $O_{163}:H_2$ (6.6%), *Enterotoxogenic E. coli* (*E coli* $O_{128}:H_2$ (3.3%), *Enterheamorrhagic E. coli* (*E.coli* $O_{121}:H_7$(3.3%) and *E.coli* $O_{91}:H_{21}$(3.3%).

In the Table (10), (11) and (12) revealed that the incidence of Salmonella in examined samples of chicken pane, chicken nuggets and chicken strips were 20%, 16.60% and 6.60%, respectively. This agrees with those reported by Saikia and Joshi (2010) 12.37%, Kozacins et al. (2012) 7.4%, khallaf et al. (2014) 12.66% and El- Gayar (2017) 16% in pane and 8% in nuggets. This results were lower than those reported by Ruban et al. (2012) 65.71%, Bhandari et al. (2013) 46.2% and Ibrahim et al. (2014) 33.33%, butthe results were higher than those reported by Colmegna et al. (2009) 4.7% and Hemeda, (2017) 4%.

Salmonellacould be identified serologically as *Salmonella Typhimurium* (3.3%) in Pana and (6.6%) in Nuggets, *Salmonella Enteritidis* (3.3%) in Pana and Strips, *Salmonella Tsevie* (3.3%) in Pana and Nuggets, *Salmonella Kentucky* (6.6%) in Pana and (3.3%) in Nuggets and Strips. While, *Salmonella Apeyeme* isolated only from Pana with percentage (3.3%) and *Salmonella Larochelle* (3.3%) in Nuggets. These results were in agreement with that of Nawar (2007) and Ibrahim et al. (2014) who found that the isolated *Salmonella* was serologically identified as *S.Typhimurium, S.Enteritidis*and *S.Kentucky*.

5.References:

Abbas, O.M (2011): Evaluation of the HACCP system in the restaurants of the tourism sector.M. V.Sc. Thesis, (Meat Hygiene), Fac. Vet. Benha Univ. Egypt.

Abo-Samra, R.G. (2013): "Staphylococcus aureus, Salmonella spp. and Listeria monocytogens in locally fresh and frozen chicken meat in Dammitta city". Animal Health Research J. 192): 1-10.

Abd El-Fattah- S. (2014): Enteropathogenic bacteria in broiler carcasses and some poultry products. Ph. D. Thesis, Fac. Vet. Med. Alex. Univ. Egypt.

Ahmed, M. U. D.; Sarwar, A.; Najeeb, M, I.; Nawaz, M.; Anjum, A.A; Ali, M. A. and Mansur. N. (2013): Assessment of microbial load of raw meat at abattoirs and retail outlets. The journal of Animal & Plant Sciences, 23(3): 754-748.

Ahmed- A., S.O.S. (2015): Quality of native and Imported Meat in The

Egyptians Markets. M. Sc. Thesis (Food Hygiene and Control) Fac. Vet.Med.Cairo University.

Ali, E. A. (2011): Microbial and chemical evaluation of fast foods. M.V.Sc. Thesis, (Meat Hygiene), Fac. Vet. Med. Benha Univ. Egypt.

Bhandari, N.; Nepali, D. B. and Paudyal, S. (2013): Assessment of bacterial load in broiler chicken meat from the retail shops in Chitwan, Nepal. Int J. Infect Microbiol., 2(3): 99-104.

Buyukcangaz, E.; Velasco, V.; Sherwood, J. S.; Stepan, R. M.; Koslofsky, R. J.; Logue, C. M. (2013): "Molecular typing of *Staphylococcus aureus* and methicillin- resistant *S.aureus* (MRSA) isolated from animals and retail meat in North Dakota, United Stated". Food borne Pathog.Dis., 10,608-617.

Cohen, N.; Ennaji, H.; Bouchrif, B.; Hassar, M. and Karib, H. (2007): Comparative study of microbiological quality of raw poultry meat at various seasons and for different slaughtering processes in Casablanca (Morocco). J. Appl. Poul. Res., 16: 502–508.

Colmegna, S.; Invernizzi, A.; Mascher, A. L.; Corsale, E.; Ferrazzi, V. and Grilli, G. (2009): Microbiological characteristics of poultry meats-Results of inspection carried out in the province of Milano, Italy. Ital. J.Anim.Sci., 8: 765-770.

Cruickshank, R.; Duguid, J.P.; Marmion, B.P. and Swain, R.H.A. (1975): Medical Microbiology. 12th Ed. Churchill Livingstone Edinburgh, London and New York.

El-Gayar H. A. (2017): Microbiological quality of some retail chicken products. MVCs. Thesis (Meat Hygiene), Fac. Vet. Med. Alex. Univ.

Elsayed, A. E. (2017): Effect of some microbial decontamination on slaughtered chicken. M. V. Sc. Thesis, Fac. Vet. Med. (Meat Hyg.)Benha university.

Feldman, D.; Ganon, J.; Haffman, R. and Simpson, J. (2003): The solution for data analysis and presentation graphics. 2nd Ed., Abacus Lancripts, Inc., Berkeley, USA.

Gill, C.O.; Rahn, K.; Sloan, K. and McMullen, L.M. (1997): Assessment of the hygienic performances of hamburger patty production processes. Inter. J. Food Microbiol., 36: 171-178 .

Hassan- O. (2015): Microbiological status of poultry carcasses from retail outlets in Alexandria province. M.V.Sc., Thesis, Fac. Vet. Med. Alex. Univ. Egypt.

Hasanin F. S.; Salem, A. M.; Shorbagy, E. M. and Kholy, R. L. (2014): Traditional and recent techniques for detection of *E.coli* in fresh chicken cuts and giblets. Benha veterinary medical J., 26(2): 21-29.

Hemeda N.A.I (2017): Incidence of some pathogenic bacteria in poultry products. MVSC. Thesis (Meat Hygiene), Fac. Vet. Med. Alex. Univ. Egypt.

Ibrahim, H. M.; Amin, R. A.; Ibrahim, I.A and Yunis, O. F. (2014): Isolation of Enterobacteriacaea from poultry products in El-Behera and Alexandria governorates. Benha veterinary Medical J., 27(1): 109-117.

Ibrahim, H.M.; Amin, El- Shater, M.A. and Hafez, Salwa. M. (2015): Bacteriological evaluation of freshly slaughtered chicken carcasses. Vet. Med.J, 28(2): 74-82.

International Commission on Microbiological Specification for Foods "ICMSF" (1996): "Microorganisms in food". 1- Their significant and methods of enumeration, 3rd Ed. Univ. of Toronto Press, Toronto, Canada.

International Organization for Standardization (ISO) (2004): No.11291-1. Microbiology of food and animal feeding stuffs – Horizontal methods for detection and enumeration of Enterobacteriaceaepart2 : colony count. method.

Javadi, A. and Safarmashaei, S. (2011):Microbial profile of marketed broiler meat. Middle-East J. Sci. Res., 9(5): 652-656.

Jordan, E.; Egan, J.; Dullea, C.; Ward, J.; Mcgllicuddy, K.; Murray, G.; Murphy, A.; Bradshaw, B.; Leonard, N. and Rafter, P. (2006): Salmonella surveillance in raw and cooked meat and meat products in the Republic of Ireland from 2002 to2004. Inter. J. Food Microbiol., 112: 66-70.

Kauffman, G.(1974):Kauffmann white scheme. J. Acta. Path. Microbiol. Sci., 61:385.

Khallaf, M.; Ameur, N.; Terta, M.; Larkranbi, M.; Senoucil, S. and Ennaji, M. M. (2014): Prevalence and antibiotic resistance of Salmonella isolated from chicken meat marketed in Rabat, Morocco. International Journal of Innovation and Applied Studies ISSN 2028-9324 6 (4): 1123-1128.

Kok, T.; Worswich, D. and Gowans, E.(1996):Some serological techniques for microbial and viral infections. In Practical Medical Microbiology (Collee, J.; Fraser, A.; Marmion, B. and Simmons, A., eds.), 14th ed.,

Edinburgh, Churchill Livingstone, UK.

Kozačins, L.; Fleck, Z. C., Kozačinski, Z. M.; ilipovič, I.; M.; Bratulic, M. and Mikus, T. (2012): Evaluation of shelf life of pre-packed cut poultry meat. VeterinarskiArhiv., 82(1): 47-58.

Kozačinski, L.; Hadžiosmanović M. and Zdolec, N. (2006): Microbiological quality of poultry meat on the Croatian market. Vet. Arhiv, 76:305-313.

Kreig, N. and Holt, J. (1984): Bergey'sManual of systemic bacteriology Vol.1.William and Wilkins, Baltimore, M.D.21202, USA.

MacFaddin, J. F. (2000): Biochemical tests for identification medical bacteria. Warery Press Inc, Baltimore, Md. 21202 USA.

Marwan, H., A.I. (2016): Sanitary status of meat meals at hospital level in Kaliobia Governorate. M.V. Sc. Thesis (Meat Hygiene), Fac. Vet. Med., Benha Univ. Egypt.

Mohamed, Gh. M.; Ebraheem Lubna, M.; and ThabtManal, H. (2010): Electrophoretic analysis and Immunological characterization of *Staphylococcus aureus* isolated from chicken meat. Assuit Vet. Med. J., 56:127.

Mohamed, M.S.E. (2016): Frozen chicken meat in Quality Governmental hospital. M.V.Sc. Thesis (Meat Hygiene), Fac. Vet. Med., Benha Univ. Egypt.

Nawar, A.Z. (2007): Correlation between salmonella and sanitation level in poultry processing plants. M. V. Sc. Thesis (Meat Hygiene). Fac. Vet. Med. Benha Univ. Egypt.

Osman- E., M. S. (2001): Quality assurance of locally dressed broiler cuts and their products. Thes is (Meat Hygiene) Ph.D. Vet. Med. Cairo Univ. Egypt.

Rashid, M.; Kotwal, S.K.K.; Malik, M.A. and Singh, M. (2013): Prevalence genetic profile of virulence determination and multi drug resistance of E-coli isolates from foods of animal origin, Vet. World 6(3): 139-142.

Ruban, S.W. and Fairoze, N (2011): Effect of processing condition on microbiological quality of market poultry meats in Bengalore, Ind. J. Ani. Vet. Adv., 10(2):188-191.

Ruban, S.W.; Prabhu, K.N. and Kumer, G.S.N. (2012): Prevalence of food borne pathogens in markets sam;les of chicken meat in Ban galore chain reactions. International J. of microbiological research, 1(3): 106-109.

Saif-M., Z. M. A. (2015): "Bacterial Status Of Fresh Marketed Chicken Cuts". M. V. Sc. Thesis, Meat Hygiene, Fac.

Vet. Med. Moshtohor. Benha Univ.

Saikia, P. and JoshI, S.R. (2010): Retail market poultry meats of North-East India- A microbiological survey for pathogenic contaminant. Res. J. Microbiol., 5(1): 36-43.

Samaha , I.A.; Ibrahim, H.A.A. and Hamada, M.O. (2012): Isolation of Some Enteropathogens from Retailed Poultry Meat in Alexandria ProvinceISSN 110-2047 ALEX. J. VET. Sc., 37(1): 17-22.

Sengupta, R.; Das, R.; Ganguly, S. and Mukhopadhayay, S.K. (2012): Survey on microbial quality of chicken meat in Kolkata, India. International J. of Research in pure and Applied Microbiology, 1(3): 3233.

Sengupta, R.; Das, R.; Ganguly, S. and Mukhopadhayay, S.K. (2011): Commonely occurring bacterial pathogens affecting the quality of chicken meat. International J. of Chemical and BiochemicalScience, 1:21-23.

Shaltout (2002): Microbiological aspects of semi-cooked chicken meat products. Benha. V. M. J. (2):17-19.

Sofos, J. N; Kochevar, S. L; Reagan, J. O. and Smith, G. C. (1999): "Incidence of *Salmonella* on beef carcasses as related to the United States meat and poultry inspection regulations". J. Food Protect. 62: in Press.

Vural, A.; Erkan, M.E and Yeşilme,S. (2006):Microbiological quality of retail chicken carcasses and their products in Turkey. Medycyna Wet, 62 (12): 1371-1374.