

Development of a quantitative risk assessment model for cheese made from raw goat milk contaminated by *Listeria monocytogenes*



Delhalle L^{a*}, Ellouze M.^b; Clinquart A.^a, Daube G.^a, Yde M.^c and Korsak N.^a

^a University of Liege, Food Science Department, Sart-Tilman, B43bis, 4000 Liege, Belgium
^b IFIP, 7, Avenue du Général de Gaulle, 94 704 Maisons Alfort, France.
^c Scientific Institute of Public Health, Bacteriology section, Rue Juliette Wytsmanstraat 14 - 1050 Brussels, Belgium.

Introduction

A retrospective study was performed to assess the risk of listeriosis following a contamination by *Listeria monocytogenes* in cheeses made from goat raw milk. This incident was reported by the Belgian Federal Agency for the Safety of the Food Chain in 2005. A quantitative risk assessment model was developed covering the production chain from the milking of goats until the storage of end-products.



Figure 1: Description of the cheese process made of raw goat milk

Materials and methods

The principles of the Modular Process Risk Model (MPRM) methodology were used to break down the food production chain into modules and to follow the bacteriological concentration of the pathogen throughout the process (Figure 1). Each module generates an output that is used as an input for the next module. The simulated events are identified for each module: growth, mixing and/or partitioning. Input values are classified as process inputs, microbiological or food characteristics. Predictive microbiology models were used in the exposure assessment step to simulate the growth of *L. monocytogenes* during the cheese manufacturing process taking into account temperature, pH and water activity.

Results and discussion

Table 1 gives the results of the modular exposure assessment model and shows a significant growth of L. monocytogenes during chilling and storage of the milk collected the day before the cheese production (increase of 0.6 log cfu / ml) and during adjunction of starter and rennet to milk (increase of 0.8 log cfu / ml). The estimated final result (P50) in the fresh cheese is equal to 3.3 log cfu/a. The model was validated by comparison of the final result issued from the exposure assessment with the number of L. monocytogenes analyzed in the fresh cheese (3.6 log cfu / g) reported in the listeriosis episode. The average number of expected cases of listeriosis was 1 for a high-risk subpopulation. Scenarios analysis were finally performed to identify the most significant factors and aid in developing priorities for risk mitigation (table 2). The Installation of a heat exchanger could be a good opportunity to reduce the final contamination.

Conclusions

The process does not prevent the contamination by *Listeria monocytogenes (L. m.)*

The model seems to correctly estimate the fate of L. m.

Surveillance in the primary sector difficult but may be improved

No reported human listeriosis connect to this contamination

Risk analysis can be useful in a HACCP process

		Percentiles			
Modules	Item	5 th	50 th	95 th	Unit
	Concentration in a tank before storage				
Milking	over night of the evening milk	-5	0	0.47	log cfu/ml
Storage of the	Concentration in the tank after storage				
evening milk	over night of the evening milk	-3.3	2	2.8	log cfu/ml
Adjunction of	Concentration before draining off the				
ferment and	curdles	-2.1	3.3	4.8	log cfu/ml
Draining off	Number of L. monocytogenes per				
the curds	cheese	0.2	5.7	7.4	log cfu/cheese
	Concentration of L. monocytogenes in				
	a serving of cheese	-1.8	3.7	5.4	log cfu/g
Cooled storage	Number of L. monocytogenes per				
and wrapping	serving of cheese	-0.1	5.4	7.1	log cfu/serving
	KISK OI numan listeriosis (normai				
	population)	0	0	0	
	KISK OI numan listeriosis (susceptible				
	population)	0	0	2.10^{-5}	

 Human effect
 Total number of human listeriosis
 0
 0
 1
 people

 Table 1:
 Baseline results of the exposure assessment and the risk characterization modules
 Image: Comparison of the exposure assessment and the risk characterization modules
 Image: Comparison of the exposure assessment and the risk characterization modules
 Image: Comparison of the exposure assessment and the risk characterization modules
 Image: Comparison of the exposure assessment and the risk characterization modules
 Image: Comparison of the exposure assessment and the risk characterization modules
 Image: Comparison of the exposure assessment and the risk characterization modules
 Image: Comparison of the exposure assessment and the risk characterization modules
 Image: Comparison of the exposure assessment and the risk characterization modules
 Image: Comparison of the exposure assessment and the risk characterization modules
 Image: Comparison of the exposure assessment and the risk characterization modules
 Image: Comparison of the exposure assessment and the risk characterization modules
 Image: Comparison of the exposure assessment and the risk characterization modules
 Image: Comparison of the exposure assessment and the risk characterization modules
 Image: Comparison of the exposure assessment and the risk characterization modules
 Image: Comparison of the exposure assessment and the risk characterization modules
 Image: Comparison of the exposure assessment and the risk characterization modules
 Image: Comparison of the exposure assessment and the exposure assessment and the exposure assessment and the exposure

	Percentiles			
Scenarios	5 th	50 th	95 th	
Baseline results	-1.8	3.7	5.4	
Scenario 1: Installation of a heat exchanger plate to obtain a temperature of 7 °C directly after milking and maintain a constant temperature during the overnight storage.	-3.1	2.2	3.4	
Scenario 2: pH reduction of 0.5 units at the start of adjunction of ferment and rennet. This could be achieved, for example, by adjunction of food acid.	-2.2	3.3	4.8	
Scenario 3: Increase efforts in the production by combining previous scenarios.	-3.5	1.8	2.9	
Scenario 4: 2 shedder goats excreting each 2.6 log <i>L. monocytogenes</i> /ml in the right part of the mammary gland.	-0.8	4.2	5.7	

Table 2: Results of the scenarios analysis (Concentration of *L. monocytogenes* in a cheese (log cfu/g))