Innovative strategies based on the use of bio-control agents to improve the safety, shelf-life and quality of minimally processed fruits and vegetables

Innovative strategies based on the use of bio-control agents to improve the safety, shelf-life and quality of minimally processed fruits and vegetables

Lorenzo Siroli, Francesca Patrignani, Diana I. Serrazanetti, Fausto Gardini, Rosalba Lanciotti

PII: S0924-2244(15)00121-1

DOI: 10.1016/j.tifs.2015.04.014

Reference: TIFS 1659

To appear in: *Trends in Food Science & Technology*

Received Date: 29 December 2014

Revised Date: 16 March 2015

Accepted Date: 29 April 2015

Please cite this article as: Siroli, L., Patrignani, F., Serrazanetti, D.I., Gardini, F., Lanciotti, R., Innovative strategies based on the use of bio-control agents to improve the safety, shelf-life and quality of minimally processed fruits and vegetables, *Trends in Food Science & Technology* (2015), doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.tifs.2015.04.014

Innovative strategies based on the use of bio-control agents to improve the safety, shelf-life and quality of minimally processed fruits and vegetables

Lorenzo Siroli[(1)], Francesca Patrignani[(1)], Diana I. Serrazanetti[(2)], Fausto Gardini[(1-2)], Rosalba Lanciotti[(1-2)]*

[(1)] Department of Agricultural and Food Sciences, Alma Mater Studiorum, University of Bologna, Campus of Food Science, Piazza Goidanich 60, 47521 Cesena, Italy

[(2)] Interdepartmental Center for Industrial Agri-food Research, University of Bologna, Piazza Goidanich 60, 47521 Cesena (FC), Italy

*Corresponding Author: Rosalba Lanciotti, Department of Agricultural and Food Sciences, Alma Mater Studiorum, University of Bologna, Piazza Goidanich 60, 47521 Cesena, Italy.

E-mail: rosalba.lanciotti@unibo.it

Phone: +39 0547 338132

Abstract

The consumption of minimally processed fruits and vegetables has increased in recent years. Currently, the use chemical preservatives is unable to guarantee the safety of minimally processed fruits and vegetables. These conditions have stimulated research into alternative methods for increasing their safety and shelf-life. The use of protective cultures, particularly lactic acid bacteria, microorganisms from indigenous microflora and their antimicrobial products, has been proposed for minimally processed products. However, the application of bioprotective cultures has been limited at the industrial level. In this perspective, the aim of this review was to summarize the state-of-the-art application of biocontrol agents in minimally processed fruits and vegetables and their action mechanisms against spoilage and/or pathogenic microorganisms.

Keywords: minimally processed produce, biocontrol agents, lactic acid bacteria, safety and shelf-life

1 Introduction

Fresh fruits and vegetables are strongly recommended in the human diet because of their contents of vitamins, antioxidants, minerals and dietary fibres; additionally, a significant amount of epidemiological evidence has demonstrated that their consumption is beneficial to health (Boeing *et al*., 2012). They are generally consumed fresh, minimally processed, pasteurized or cooked by boiling in water or microwaving. Although heat treatments increase the safety and shelf-life of these products, heat treatments also decrease the nutritional properties and sensorial features of the raw materials. However, fresh produce and minimally processed products have a short shelf-life as a result of rapid microbial spoilage (Di Cagno *et al*., 2008).

Minimally processed produce is more perishable than the original raw materials (Francis *et al.*, 2012; Selma, Allende, López-Galvez, Conesa, & Gil, 2008). The increase in nutrient availability because of the presence of cut surfaces, the metabolism of tissues, the confinement of the products inside packages and the lack of treatments to ensure microbial stability favour the growth of both microorganisms deriving from raw materials and cross-contamination during handling and processing (peeling, cutting, etc.) (Francis *et al.*, 2012; Lanciotti, Gianotti, Patrignani, Belletti, Guerzoni, & Gardini, 2004). Although raw produce is expected to have a shelf-life of several weeks or months, minimally processed fruits and vegetables have only a very short storage life of 4 to 10 days. Their shelf-life depends on various factors such as fruit and vegetable quality, production technology and the number and interactions among microbial groups (Selma *et al.*, 2008).

Mesophilic bacterial levels of 10^3 to 10^6 colony forming units (CFU)/g are common in minimally processed vegetables analysed immediately after packaging (Belletti, Lanciotti, Patrignani, & Gardini, 2008; Guerzoni, Gianotti, Corbo & Sinigaglia 1996; Ragaert, Devlieghere, & Debevere, 2007; Siroli *et al.*, 2015). However, at the retail level, the counts are more variable, ranging between 10^3 and 10^9 CFU/g (Belletti *et al.* 2008). Because of refrigerated storage, the dominating bacterial population mainly consists of species belonging to *Pseudomonadaceae* (particularly *Pseudomonas*

fluorescens) and *Enterobacteriaceae* (particularly *Erwinia herbicola* and *Rahnella aquatilis*), in addition to some species belonging to the lactic acid bacteria (LAB) (particularly *Leuconostoc mesenteroides*) (Bennik, Vorstman, Smid, & Gorris, 1998; de Azeredo, Stamford, Campos Nunes, Gomez Neto, de Oliveira, & de Souza, 2011; Nguyen-The & Carlin, 1994). Additionally, many different yeast species belonging to the genera *Candida*, *Cryptococcus*, *Rhodotorula*, *Trichosporon*, *Pichia* and *Torulaspora* have been identified during storage (Nguyen-The & Carlin, 1994, Ragaert *et al.,* 2007) whereas moulds are less important in these products because of the intrinsic properties of fruits and vegetables, such as a slightly acidic to neutral pH, which favours bacteria and yeasts (Barth, Hankinson, Zhuang, & Breidt, 2010). By contrast, the spoilage of minimally processed fruit primarily occurs because of the proliferation of its natural acid tolerant and osmophilic microflora (Belletti *et al.*, 2008; Lanciotti *et al.*, 2004). In fact, the microflora is mainly represented by yeasts, which are generally responsible for the fermented taste and carbon dioxide production; LAB, which can produce a buttermilk off-flavour; and moulds, which contribute to spoilage by their surface growth (Tournas, Heeres, & Burgess, 2006). However, yeasts are favoured compared to LAB because of the high sugar content and C/N ratio of the system (Patrignani, Tabanelli, Siroli, Gardini, & Lanciotti, 2013; Siroli *et al.*, 2014a). In addition to spoilage microorganisms, outbreaks of food-borne diseases associated with the consumption of fresh and minimally processed fruits and vegetables, which is primarily a result of *Escherichia coli* O157:H7, *Salmonella* spp. and *Listeria monocytogenes*, have increased dramatically since the 1970s (Alegre, Abadias, Anguera, Oliveira, & Viñas, 2010; Ramos, Miller, Brandão, Teixeira, & Silva, 2013; Sant'Ana, Landgraf, Destro, & Franco, 2011). However, Ramos et al. (2013) also showed that *Clostridium botulinum*, *Shigella* spp., *Staphylococcus* spp., *Vibrio cholerae* and *Yersinia enterocolitica* are amongst the major fruit and vegetable pathogens associated with outbreaks. Moreover, numerous studies showed the presence of *Aeromonas hydrophila* and *Staphylococcus aureus* on fresh produce and related minimally processed products (Alegre *et al.*, 2010; Harris *et al.*, 2003; Nguyen-The & Carlin, 1994). Likewise, *Campylobacter jejuni* was isolated in minimally processed mushrooms from retail

markets in the United States (EFSA 2013; FDA 2001). Castillo and Escartin (1994) showed that this pathogenic species could survive on sliced watermelon and papaya for a sufficient time to be a risk to the consumer. The contamination of vegetables and fruits with spores of *Bacillus cereus*, *Clostridium perfringens* and *C. botulinum* present in soil is common (FDA 2001). When fresh products are handled and processed in a manner that enables the germination of spores and the growth of vegetative cells, there is a threat to public health, particularly when the products are packaged in a modified atmosphere (FDA 2001). There were approximately 110 scientific papers and reports on outbreaks associated with the consumption of minimally processed fruits and vegetables according to the Food and Drug Administration (FDA), the Centres for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) and the World Health Organization (WHO) (Ramos *et al.*, 2013).

Because of the lack of processing steps to kill microbial contaminants, the use of high quality raw materials and efficient temperature control during manufacture, distribution and retailing are key factors for maintaining the microbiological quality and safety of minimally processed fruits and vegetables. However, the quality of raw materials and the maintenance of the cold chain are difficult to be implemented and controlled (Rediers, Claes, Peeters, & Willems, 2009; Siroli *et al.*, 2014a). In fact, the quality of raw materials depends on several factors including agronomic practices, seasonal trends, storage conditions, etc. Moreover, an extensive amount of literature shows that thermal abuse is very frequent during product transport and selling (Lanciotti *et al.*, 2004; Rediers *et al.*, 2009).

Decontamination methods are another tool for reducing the microbial cell loads of the raw materials and have been shown to have positive effects on product safety and shelf-life (Ramos *et al.*, 2013). However, the use of chemicals as disinfectants for raw materials is not sufficient to either eliminate or significantly delay microbial spoilage or to ensure product safety (Soliva-Fortuny & Martín-Belloso, 2003).

Disinfection processes incorporating chlorine are often applied to fresh vegetables to enhance safety and shelf-life profiles. However, numerous reports indicate that chlorine has limited antimicrobial

efficacy, allowing 1–2 logarithmic reductions in the bacterial population of raw materials at the permitted concentrations (Abadias, Usall, Anguera, Solsona, & Viñas, 2008). Its inefficacy to eliminate microbial cells was attributed to the inability of its aqueous solutions to wet the hydrophobic surface of the waxy cuticle of vegetables and to its inactivation by the organic matter (Carrasco, Pérez-Rodríguez, Valero, García-Gimeno, & Zurera, 2008; de Azeredo *et al.*, 2011). Additionally, the presence of biofilms on equipment has been reported to reduce the efficacy of chlorine against microorganisms that can cross-contaminate the products during processing (Carrasco *et al.*, 2008). Additional drawbacks of chlorine usage are the possible formation of carcinogenic chlorinated compounds, vapours having adverse health effects and the increase in microbial chlorine resistance (Abadias *et al.*, 2008; Gil, Selma, López-Gálvez, & Allende, 2009). For these reasons, the use of chlorine is prohibited or restricted in some European countries, such as the Netherlands, Sweden, Germany, Switzerland, Denmark and Belgium, for the disinfection of the raw materials used for the production of minimally processed vegetables (Gil *et al.*, 2009; Tirpanalan, Zunabovic, Domig, & Kneifel, 2011). Furthermore, disinfectants alternative to chlorine, such as ozone, H_2O_2, organic acids, calcium-based solutions and peroxiacetic acids, have demonstrated their inability to completely eradicate or kill microorganisms on fresh produce and their potential toxicity and side effects on the sensorial properties of the products (Ramos *et al.*, 2013; Rico, Martín-Diana, Barat, & Barry-Ryan, 2007). In addition, the reduction of the naturally occurring population because of washing and sanitization can reduce the competition for space and nutrients against pathogenic species (Schuenzel & Harrison, 2002).

Consumer concern of chemical synthetic additives has stimulated research into alternative methods for reducing the decay of minimally processed fruits and vegetables and improving product safety (Ayala-Zavala, Oms-Oliu, Odriozola-Serrano, GonzálezAguilar, Álvarez-Parrilla, & Martín-Belloso, 2008). The use of generally recognized as safe (GRAS) microorganisms such as LAB and yeasts and/or their natural metabolites to inhibit the growth of pathogenic and spoilage microorganisms is a promising tool, and it is also perceived by the consumer as a natural food

157 preservation method (Cosentino, Fadda, Deplano, Melis, Pomata, & Pisano, 2012; Ross, Morgan, &
158 Hill, 2002). Bioprotective microorganisms have already shown their potential for practical
159 application in various foods, such as meat (Vermeiren, Devlieghere, & Debevere, 2004) and plant
160 derived products (Settanni & Corsetti, 2008; Trias, Baneras, Badosa, & Montesinos, 2008a; Trias,
161 Baneras, Montesinos, & Badosa, 2008b).
162 In particular, LAB have shown a great potential as biocontrol agents of several non-fermented foods
163 because they are widely used in fermented foods, have a long history of safe use, and have a GRAS
164 status (Carr, Chill, & Maida, 2002). They have also been applied to increase the safety and shelf-life
165 of minimally processed fruits and vegetables (Palmai, & Buchanan, 2002; Torriani, Orsi, Vescovo,
166 1997; Vescovo, Torriani, Orsi, Macchiarolo, & Scolari, 1996). However, several other bacteria and
167 yeasts, often selected among the naturally occurring microbiota, including strains of *Pseudomonas*
168 *syringae*, *Pseudomonas graminis, Gluconobacter asaii, Candida spp., Dicosphaerina fagi*,
169 *Metschnikowia pulcherrima* and *Candida sake* have been proposed as biocontrol agents in these
170 foods (Abadias, Usall, Alegre, Torres, & Vinas, 2009; Alegre, Vinas, Usall, Anguera, Altisent, &
171 Abadias, 2013a; Trias *et al.*, 2008a).
172 This manuscript reviews the application of biocontrol agents belonging to LAB or to other
173 microbial groups and their action mechanisms against spoilage and/or pathogenic microorganisms
174 frequently associated with minimally processed fruits and vegetables.
175
176 ***2 Protective culture for minimally processed vegetables***
177 LAB have been used to preserve meat and dairy products (Stiles & Holzapfel, 1997) and fermented
178 vegetables or fruit juices (Ruiz-Barba, Cathcart, Warner, & Jimenez-Diaz, 1994).
179 LAB are also indubitably the most important bioprotective cultures for non-fermented foods
180 including minimally processed vegetables. In fact, protective cultures of LAB have been developed
181 over the last few decades to increase the safety and shelf-life of minimally processed vegetables.
182 The potential of antagonistic LAB belonging to *Lactobacillus casei* or their culture filtrate to inhibit

the growth of pathogenic bacteria in ready-to-eat vegetables was first demonstrated by Vescovo et al. (1996) and Torriani et al. (1997). In particular, Torriani et al. (1997) showed that the addition of 3% culture permeate of *Lb. casei* IMPC LC34 to mixed salads reduced the total mesophilic bacteria counts from 6 to 1 log CFU/g and suppressed coliforms, enterococci, and *A. hydrophila* after 6 days of storage at 8 ° C. *Lactobacillus plantarum* IMPC LP4 was able to prolong the very limited shelf-life of shredded carrots because of its ability in real systems to control the growth of *Leuconostoc* spp., which have been identified as the main spoilage agents of this minimally processed vegetable (Torriani, Scolari, Dellaglio, & Vescovo, 1999).

The application of a central composite design (CCD) to modulate the carbon dioxide concentration in the packaging atmosphere, the *Lb. casei* inoculum size and the storage temperature allowed the obtaining of models that emphasized the role of the biocontrol agent initial level in controlling *A. hydrophila* and permitted the identification of combinations of the selected variables to reduce the survival of the pathogenic species (Vescovo, Scolari, Orsi, Sinigaglia, & Torriani, 1997).

Bennik, van Overbeek, Smid and Gorris (1999) studied the potential of two *Pediococcus parvulus* strains and one *Enterococcus mundtii* strain to control the growth of *L. monocytogenes* on refrigerated, modified atmosphere stored mung-bean sprouts. These bacteriocinogenic biocontrol agents, previously isolated from minimally processed vegetables, were shown to grow in culture broth at 4, 8, 15 and 30 °C. However, only *E. mundtii* was capable of bacteriocin production at 4–8 °C and was subsequently evaluated for its ability to control the growth of *L. monocytogenes* on vegetable agar and fresh mung-bean sprouts under a modified atmosphere at 8 °C. The growth of *L. monocytogenes* was inhibited by bacteriocinogenic *E. mundtii* on sterile vegetable-medium but not on fresh produce. Otherwise, bacterial cultures that were isolated from the same type of vegetable or product in which they were used as biocontrol agents were reported to have the greatest chance of success in controlling pathogens (Bennik *et al.*, 1999; Siroli *et al.*, 2015).

Palmai and Bouchanan (2002) assessed the inhibitory activity of *Lactococcus lactis* against *L. monocytogenes* inoculated in model systems and sprouts at levels of approximately 2 log CFU/g,

thus demonstrating that their inhibitory activity was substantially reduced on alfalfa compared to that observed in a model system. The apparent decrease in effectiveness of the biocontrol agents in real systems compared to model systems was attributed to the inhibitory activity of naturally occurring microflora (Bennik *et al.,* 1999; Palmai & Bouchanan 2002). Otherwise, there were more variables affecting the success of the biocontrol agents in a real system than in a model system, and they were often unpredictable in a real system. Additionally, the interference of naturally occurring microbiota cannot be exactly identified because it varies according to the raw material and process conditions.

The effectiveness of the strain used by Palmai and Bouchanan (2002) was not a result of the production of bacteriocin but of its ability to produce high amounts of lactic acid. However, *L. monocytogenes* was able to proliferate in the control samples in sprouts (without the biocontrol agent), reaching levels of approximately 6 log CFU/g within 48 hours. When *L. lactis* was co-inoculated onto the seeds, the maximum levels of *L. monocytogenes* were approximately 1 log lower than those observed in the control samples. The reduction of *L. monocytogenes* observed by Palmai and Bouchanan (2002) was similar to that observed by Cai, Ng, & Farber (1997) using a bacteriocin-producing *L. lactis* strain at a lower inoculation level (5 log CFU/g).

Scolari and Vescovo (2004) performed several challenge experiments on scarola salad leaves by simultaneously inoculating *Lb. casei* and pathogenic species such as *S. aureus*, *A. hydrophila*, *E. coli* and *L. monocytogenes*. These authors showed a remarkable inhibitory effect by the LAB towards all the pathogenic strains. Scolari, Vescovo, Zacconi and Bonadé (2004) studied the influence of *Lb. plantarum* on the growth of *S. aureus* through an impedometric method and by varying the inoculum size of the single strain and the growth temperature according to a CCD. These authors showed that temperature affected the growth of both *S. aureus* and *Lb. plantarum* strains. The pathogenic strain, independent of its inoculum size, was inhibited by *Lb. plantarum* at all the tested temperatures. The authors outlined that a proper combination of specific LAB and storage temperature should improve the safety of the minimally processed vegetables. Trias,

Badosa, Montesinos and Baneras (2008c) characterized ten *L. mesenteroides* strains and one *Leuconostoc citreum* strain isolated from fresh fruits and vegetables for their antagonistic capacity against *L. monocytogenes*; they identified organic acids, hydrogen peroxide and bacteriocins as the main inhibition mechanisms. In a successive study, Trias et al. (2008a) studied the ability of the selected biocontrol agents to inhibit the growth of foodborne human pathogens when inoculated in iceberg lettuce leaf cuts. The selected strains grew on the substrates and did not cause negative effects on the general aspect of the lettuce tissues. In addition, the treatment of the lettuce cuts with the antagonistic strains reduced the cell count of *Salmonella typhimurium* and *E. coli* by 1 to 2 log CFU/wound or g, whereas the growth of *L. monocytogenes* was completely inhibited.

Although the importance of the biocontrol agent inoculum size had been previously reported by others authors, Trias et al. (2008c) used a dose response assay to determine the efficacy of *Leuconostoc* strains as bioprotective agents against *L. monocytogenes* inoculated in minimally processed lettuce, thus demonstrating that the efficacy of biocontrol agents was affected by the cell loads of both the pathogenic and biocontrol agents.

Siroli et al. (2015) characterized several LAB strains that were previously isolated from commercial minimally processed fruits and vegetables for their ability to grow at low temperature and low pH values and to antagonize the pathogenic species frequently associated with these food products. In addition, these authors studied the effect of the biocontrol agents to prolong the shelf-life of the product. In fact, most of the literature available studied the effects of biocontrol cultures on minimally processed vegetable safety without considering the effects on product shelf-life and quality. On the basis of the results obtained, these authors selected *Lb. plantarum* V7B3 and *Lb. casei* V4B4 to be used as biocontrol agents alone or in combination with thyme essential oil (EO) in lamb's lettuce. The results obtained indicated that applying the *Lb. plantarum* V7B3 strain to lettuce during the washing phase at a level of 6 log CFU/ml instead of chlorine increased product shelf-life and safety. In fact, *Lb. plantarum* V7B3 showed an interesting potential for controlling *L. monocytogenes* and *E. coli* when deliberately inoculated in washing solution at levels ranging

between 3 and 4 log CFU/ml. The presence of the *Lb. plantarum* V7B3 strain increased the *E. coli* death kinetics and reduced the viability of *L. monocytogenes* over the 9 days of refrigerated storage of lamb's lettuce. Moreover, combining the selected strains with natural antimicrobials produced a further increase in the shelf-life (12 days) of the product without detrimental effects on the organoleptic quality compared to the traditional products washed with chlorine (120 ppm), thus contributing to the substitution of this chemical raw material sanitizer. Moreover, Siroli, Patrignani, Salvetti, Torriani, Gardini and Lanciotti (2014b) showed the good performance of a nisin producing strain, *L. lactis* CBM21, which was inoculated at a level of 7 log CFU/ml in the washing solution of minimally processed lamb's lettuce and combined or not with thyme EO, to inhibit both the inoculated *L. monocytogenes* and *E. coli* and the total mesophilic species, significantly increasing the product shelf-life. In fact, the addition of the biocontrol agent did not affect the quality parameters (*i.e.,* colour parameters and sensory attributes) of lamb's lettuce. The use of *L. lactis* CBM21 and/or thyme EO added in the tap water used for lamb's lettuce washing was also experienced at the industrial level, confirming their potential as an alternative to chlorine (Siroli et al. unpublished results). In fact, the products obtained with the innovative washing solutions showed the same safety and shelf-life of the controls but with improved sensorial properties. Moreover, the products added with the biocontrol agent maintained a good appearance for up to 12 days (Figure 1).

In addition to LAB, some authors studied the competitive, inhibitory, or antagonistic activity of biocontrol agents selected among the naturally occurring microbiota of fresh or minimally processed vegetables. Several studies showed that fresh-cut produce are sources of competitive microorganisms (Francis & O'Beirne 1998; Janisiewicz, Conway, & Leverentz, 1999; Liao & Fett 2001; Schuenzel & Harrison, 2002). Liao and Sapers (1999) also demonstrated that potential soft rot microorganisms belonging to the natural resident microflora, such as *P. fluorescens* and *P. viridiflava*, can have great potential as biocontrol agents, inhibiting the growth of *L. monocytogenes* inoculated on potato tuber slices. Additionally, Carlin, Nguyen-The and Morris (1996) found that *P.*

fluorescens was able to inhibit the growth of *L. monocytogenes* on endive leaves maintained at 10 °C by approximately 1 log compared to controls when the endive leaves were inoculated with the *Pseudomonas* at levels ranging between 6 and 7 log CFU/g. Using a model system, Buchanan and Bagi (1999) reported that the inhibition of *L. monocytogenes* by *P. fluorescens* was limited to a repression in the maximum levels attained and that the extent of inhibition was dependent on the water activity and pH of the environment.

Liao and Fett (2001) demonstrated the inhibitory action against *Salmonella chester*, *L. monocytogenes*, and *E. coli* from *Pseudomonas* species on green pepper, romaine lettuce, baby carrots, alfalfa and clover. The six isolates that inhibited at least one pathogen were *Bacillus* spp. (3 isolates), *Pseudomonas aeruginosa* (1 isolate), *P. fluorescens* (1 isolate), and a yeast (1 isolate). On green pepper disks inoculated with *P. fluorescens* and the yeast isolates, the growth of *S. chester* and *L. monocytogenes* was reduced by 1 and 2 logs, respectively, over a period of 3 days.

Schuenzel and Harrison (2002) screened isolates from fresh-cut produce for antimicrobial activity against *S. aureus*, *E. coli* O157:H7, *L. monocytogenes*, and *Salmonella montevideo*. Of the 180 isolates screened, 37 were found to have various degrees of inhibitory activity against at least one pathogen.

Johnston, Harrison and Morrow (2009) evaluated the competitive, inhibitory, or antagonistic activity of native microflora obtained from fresh-cut iceberg lettuce and bagged baby spinach against *E. coli* O157:H7. These authors isolated 495 inhibitors of *E. coli* O157:H7, demonstrating that naturally occurring microorganisms on foods can have inhibitory activities towards foodborne pathogens. A summary of the biocontrol agents used for vegetables and minimally processed vegetables are reported in Table 1.

3 Protective culture for minimally processed fruits

The use of protective cultures and biocontrol agents has also been reported in minimally processed fruits because they can be an alternative to chemical treatments to increase the product safety, shelf-

life and quality (Abadias *et al.*, 2009). Biocontrol agents have been utilized alone or in combination with modified-atmosphere packaging, natural antimicrobials (Siroli *et al.*, 2015), gamma radiation (Mostafavi, Mirmajlessi, Fathollahi, Shahbazi, & Mirjaliliet, 2013), reducing agents (Alegre *et al.*, 2013a; Alegre, Viñas, Usall, Teixidó, Figge, & Abadias, 2013b) and heat treatments (Leverentz, Janisiewicz, Conway, Saftner, & Camp, 2003) to obtain a synergic effect on both the safety and quality of fruit, postharvest fruit and minimally processed produce.

The application of lactic acid bacteria (LAB) as biocontrol agents in fresh and minimally processed fruits has not yet been fully developed (Settanni & Corsetti, 2008; Trias *et al.*, 2008a) because the high sugar content associated with the low pH of these food matrices favours yeast growth compared to bacterial growth. The use of LAB as bioprotective agents in fruit was proposed as an optional method to circumvent the limitations found with other antagonists such as *Candida* and *Gluconobacter* species by Trias et al. (2008a). These authors isolated *L. mesenteroides* and *L. citreum* from fruits and vegetables in a survey from commercial products in Spain and tested them against *L. monocytogenes* inoculated in the wounds of Golden Delicious apples. The use of *Leuconostoc* strains as bioprotective agents provided encouraging results in inhibiting *L. monocytogenes* growth. Promising results of LAB biocontrol cultures were also obtained by Siroli et al. (2015). These authors selected some interesting LAB from apples and lamb's lettuce and used these strains as biocontrol agents in minimally processed Golden Delicious apples packaged in a modified atmosphere alone or in combination with natural antimicrobials such as 2-(E)-hexenal/hexanal and 2-(E)-hexenal/citral. The most promising strain resulted from *Lb. plantarum* CIT3, which, when inoculated at levels of 6-7 log CFU/g in the dipping solution of sliced apples, both alone or in combination with natural antimicrobials, increased the safety features of the products. This strain was able to significantly inhibit the growth of yeast but negatively affected the sensory characteristics of the product, which is an important consumer factor choice. However, the colour of the samples inoculated with LAB remained acceptable for up to 9 days of storage at 6 °C.

Combining the selected strains with the natural antimicrobials prolonged the shelf-life quality for up to 16 days without detrimental effects on the organoleptic.

Moreover, Siroli et al. (unpublished results) showed that the nisin-producer *L. lactis* CBM21, inoculated at a level of 7 log CFU/ml in the dipping solution of sliced apples in combination or not with 2-(E)-hexenal/hexanal and/or 2-(E)-hexenal/citral, limited the growth of yeasts below 5 log CFU/g during 28 days of storage. This strain also inhibited the growth of *L. monocytogenes* during 28 days of storage, particularly when used in combination with the proposed natural antimicrobials. Negative effects on colour parameters were observed but only after 16 days of storage in the presence of natural antimicrobials. Similar results were obtained by Siroli et al. (unpublished results) on the shelf-life of sliced apples that were produced on an industrial scale by adding the mixture of hexanal/2-(E)-hexenal and/or *L. lactis* CBM21 to the dipping solution. The products obtained at the industrial level with the innovative dipping solutions maintained good microbiological, organoleptic and textural characteristics for up to 20 days. These results are promising because one of the most important selection criteria of a biocontrol agent is the maintenance of their performance in real production conditions.

Biocontrol agents, different from LAB, have also been selected for their application in minimally processed fruits. *P. syringae* L-59-66 prevented the growth of *E. coli* on apple wounds (Janisiewicz *et al.*, 1999). The growth of *L. monocytogenes* and *Salmonella* on fresh-cut apples was reduced by *G. asaii*, *Candida* spp., *D. fagi* and *M. pulcherrima* (Leverentz, Conway, Janisiewicz, Abadias, Kurtzman, & Camp, 2006). These antagonists reduced the *L. monocytogenes* populations and, except for the *Candida* spp., the *S. enterica* serovar Poona populations. This reduction was higher at 25 °C than at 10 °C, and the growth of the antagonists and pathogens increased at higher temperatures (Leverentz *et al.*, 2006).

The postharvest biocontrol agent *C. sake* CPA-1 reduced *E. coli* growth on apple wounds but not in minimally processed apples (Abadias *et al.*, 2009). In particular, this yeast was effective at colonizing apple wounds and tissues, and the competition for nutrients could play the main role in

364 the biocontrol of *C. sake* CPA-1 on pome fruits. Trials were conducted with a mixture of five
365 strains of *E. coli* isolated from apples. The results provided evidence that *E. coli* was unable to grow
366 in apple juice at 5, 15 and 25 °C, but it was able to survive. At 10 °C and above, *E. coli* thrived in
367 fresh-cut apples and wounds. When *E. coli* was inoculated in apple wounds with the yeast
368 antagonist *C. sake*, its growth was reduced by approximately 1 log CFU/wound at 25 °C. At 5 °C,
369 no effect of the biocontrol agent was observed. The biocontrol agent *C. sake*, which was developed
370 to prevent fruit decay during storage, also reduced *E. coli* growth in wounded apples at abusive
371 temperatures.
372 However, none of these studies were performed under realistic conditions for minimally processed
373 apples. Beyond microbiological contamination, the development of fresh cut apple slices has been
374 hampered by the rapid oxidative browning of apple flesh. Alegre et al. (2013a) tested the
375 combination of antioxidant treatment and packaging atmosphere conditions to improve the efficacy
376 of the biocontrol agent *P. graminis* CPA-7 in reducing the viability of a cocktail of four *Salmonella*
377 and five *L. monocytogenes* strains deliberately inoculated on minimally processed apples under
378 simulated commercial processing.
379 The antagonistic strain increased the activity of NatureSeal AS1 (6%, w/v) (a commercial anti-
380 browning agent) on apple wedges stored at 10 °C with or without modified atmosphere packaging
381 (Rößle, Gormley, & Butler, 2009). Moreover, in a semi-commercial assay, the efficacy of *P.*
382 *graminis* CPA-7 inoculated at 5 and 7 log CFU/ml against *Salmonella* and *L. monocytogenes* was
383 evaluated on minimally processed apples with NatureSeal and modified atmosphere packaging and
384 stored at 5 and 10 °C. Although high CPA-7 concentrations avoided *Salmonella* growth at 10 °C
385 and lowered the *L. monocytogenes* population increases, the effect was not instantaneous. No effect
386 on apple sensory properties was detected. Therefore, CPA-7 could avoid pathogen growth on
387 minimally processed apples during storage when used as part of a hurdle technology in combination
388 with disinfection techniques, low storage temperature and modified atmosphere packaging.
389 Recently, the ability of *P. graminis* CPA-7 to reduce *E. coli* O157:H7, *Salmonella* and *Listeria*

390 *innocua* on minimally processed apples and peaches was demonstrated (Alegre et al., 2013b). The
391 results support the potential use of CPA-7 as a bioprotective agent against foodborne pathogens in
392 minimally processed fruit.
393 Alegre et al. (2012) showed the efficacy of the CPA-6 strain, an unidentified species of
394 *Enterobacteriaceae* that was isolated from minimally processed apples, to control non-pathogenic
395 strains of *Escherichia coli* O157:H7, *Salmonella* and *Listeria innocua* on minimally processed
396 apples and peaches. In fact, CPA-6 inoculated at a level of 6 log CFU/plug inhibited the growth, or
397 in some cases reduced the growth, of pathogen populations (inoculated at a level of 5 log
398 CFU/plug) to below the limit of detection compared to the pathogen inoculated alone. A summary
399 of the biocontrol agents used for fruits and minimally processed fruits are reported in Table 2.
400 Although research on the use of biocontrol agents in minimally processed fruits and vegetables has
401 increased in recent decades, a critical analysis of the literature available clearly indicates that the
402 efficacy of biocontrol agents, independent of the species and strains used, is affected by the
403 inoculation level, the presence of background microflora, the physic-chemical and compositional
404 features of the products and the storage conditions. These aspects make it difficult to standardize the
405 bio-preservative approaches based on the use of live cells and, consequently, their scaling up at the
406 industrial level in which process conditions can also interfere with maintaining their effectiveness.
407
408 ***4 Action mechanisms of biocontrol agents***
409 Numerous studies have shown the potential of several microorganisms to inhibit the growth of
410 foodborne pathogens in minimally processed fruits and vegetables (Alegre *et al.* 2012; Alegre *et al.*
411 2013b; Leverentz, *et al.*, 2006; Scolari & Vescovo, 2004; Torriani *et al.*, 1997; Trias *et al.*, 2008a;
412 Vescovo *et al.*, 1996). In particular, LAB have shown great potential as biocontrol agents in these
413 types of products. The preservation abilities of LAB are a result of several mechanisms of action
414 and are mainly related to the production of antimicrobial compounds, organic acids, hydrogen
415 peroxide, bacteriocins and diacetyl (Cleveland, Montville, Nes, & Chikindas, 2001; Trias *et al.*,

2008c). Moreover, they compete with pathogens and spoilage microorganisms for nutrients (vitamins, minerals, trace elements and peptides). The decreased pH values and antibacterial activities of organic acids produced by LAB represent the main mechanisms for the biopreservation of fermented foods (Galvez, Abriouel, Benomar, & Lucas, 2010).

Several bacteriocin-producing LAB have been shown to be effective against spoilage and pathogenic microorganisms in minimally processed fruits and vegetables (Allende, Martınez, Selma, Gil, Suarez, & Rodrıguez, 2007; Bennik *et al.*, 1999; Randazzo, Pitino, Scifo, & Caggia, 2009). In fact, many LAB are able to produce bacteriocins and bacteriocin-like molecules. Bacteriocins are antimicrobial peptides produced by bacteria to compete against bacteria of the same species or even other genera (Cotter, Hill, & Ross, 2005). Both gram-positive and gram-negative bacteria are able to produce bacteriocins. However, bacteriocins produced by LAB appear to be more promising for potential use in the food industry as natural preservatives (Settanni & Corsetti, 2008) because they are normally designed as GRAS by the U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA), in particular when they are familiar with the selected food product.

Bacteriocins are ribosomally synthesized peptides and proteinaceous inhibitors that act through the depolarization of the target cell membrane or through the inhibition of cell wall synthesis (Heng & Tagg, 2006). They have a wide or limited spectrum of action. For example, lactococcins can inhibit only lactococci; however, the lantibiotic nisin has a broad range of antimicrobial activity (Ross *et al.*, 2002). Moreover, bacteriocins are secondary metabolites, and consequently the physiological status of the protective culture is a key factor affecting its effectiveness when inoculated in food. Bacteriocins can be divided according to Heng & Tagg (2006) into four classes: Class I includes the lantibiotics family, Class II includes peptide bacteriocins and small, heat-stable, non-lanthionine-containing bacteriocins; Class III includes bacteriolytic and non-lytic large proteins; and Class IV includes cyclic peptides. Furthermore, some strains are able to produce more than one bacteriocin; additionally, this aspect can play a determinant role in the inhibition mechanism and spectrum of the antimicrobial actions of biocontrol cultures.

442 It appears that the mechanisms of action of bacteriocins are related to the permeabilization of the
443 cell membrane. They are cationic and amphiphilic or hydrophobic (Hasper *et al.*, 2006). However,
444 it is demonstrated that each bacteriocin possesses more than one mode of action on the target
445 microorganism (Hasper *et al.*, 2006).

446 Although the number of known bacteriocins is very large, nisin is the most characterized
447 bacteriocin and the only one to have realized widespread commercial use (Ross *et al.*, 2002).

448 The direct application of bacteriocins on fresh-cut products has been tested in recent years. In
449 particular, bacteriocins such as nisin, pediocin PA-1/AcH and enterocin AS-48 have been tested in
450 tinned vegetables, fruit juices, and salads against pathogens such as *E. coli* O157:H7, *S. aureus*, and
451 the spoilage bacterium *Alicyclobacillus acidoterrestris* (Cleveland *et al.*, 2001; Cobo-Molinos *et al.*,
452 2005). Randazzo et al. (2009) showed a reduction in *L. monocytogenes* cell loads of 1.9 log unit and
453 of 2.7 log units in iceberg lettuce that was washed with commercial nisin and RUC9 bacteriocin,
454 respectively, compared to samples without bacteriocin after the 7th day of refrigerated storage.
455 Additionally, Allende et al. (2007) reported that washing fresh-cut lettuce with solutions containing
456 a mix of nisin, plantaricin, lacticin, coagulin and pediocin PA-1 reduced the viability of *L.*
457 *monocytogenes* by 1.2–1.6 log units immediately after treatment. Cai et al. (1997) showed that the
458 addition of nisin in ready-to-eat Caesar salad caused a reduction of 1.4 log in *Listeria* cell loads.
459 Cobo-Molinos et al. (2005) found a reduction of *L. monocytogenes* of 2.0–2.4 log CFU/g on fresh
460 alfalfa sprouts, soybean sprouts and green asparagus added with enterocin AS-48.

461 The direct use of bacteriocins on fresh products may not be completely satisfactory, which is mainly
462 a result of the adsorption or deactivation of the added antimicrobials (Allende *et al.*, 2007; Settanni
463 & Corsetti, 2008; Trias *et al.*, 2008c). For this reason, the application of the bacteriocin-producer
464 strains on the product can avoid these problems and provide other advantages, including the
465 production of other antimicrobial compounds and competition for space and nutrients with spoilage
466 and pathogenic microorganisms (Settanni & Corsetti, 2007; Trias *et al.*, 2008c). However, Bennik
467 et al. (1999) showed that bacteriocin production is dependent on temperature.

The best effects of bacteriocins and bacteriocin-producing LAB on food products have been achieved when the use of bacteriocins was combined with other preservation methods (Ananou, Maqueda, Martinez-Bueno, & Valdivia, 2007). Their use combined with chemical additives, natural antimicrobials, physical treatments, or new physical methods (HHP, pulsed electric field, *vacuum*, or modified atmosphere packaging) was reported mainly for meat products (Ananou *et al.,* 2010). The use of physical or chemical treatments increases the permeability of the outer-membrane, thus improving the effectiveness of some LAB bacteriocins against gram-negative cells, which are generally resistant. Siroli et al. (unpublished results) used a nisin-producer *L. lactis* strain CBM21, in combination with the mixture of natural antimicrobials hexanal/2-(E)-hexenal, during the washing of minimally processed sliced apples and obtained a significant increase in product safety and shelf-life.

The key role of the native microbial community that is naturally present on the surfaces of fresh produce in maintaining the health-supporting status of minimally processed produce (Nguyen-The & Carlin, 1994) is attributed to out-competing the pathogens for physical space and nutrients and/or producing antagonistic compounds that reduce the viability of pathogens (Leverentz *et al.,* 2006; Liao & Fett, 2001). Therefore, there is potential for the use of native microflora to reduce pathogen growth and survival on fruits and vegetables (Siroli *et al.,* 2015). These organisms have the advantage of being part of the natural microbial community that is already established on the target produce, which may facilitate their colonization and survival when applied in appropriate numbers (Leverentz et al., 2006). Amongst biocontrol agents, yeasts have been successfully used in minimally processed fruits because of their ability to rapidly overcome the naturally occurring bacterial population. However, there are only a few reports about their use to control human pathogens on fresh and minimally processed fruits (Janisiewicz *et al.* 1999; Liao & Fett, 2001).

5 Conclusion

493 The results reported in this review provide encouraging information concerning the effects of
494 biocontrol agents on the safety and shelf-life of minimally processed fruits and vegetables. The
495 results also highlight the importance of the isolation and selection of appropriate biocontrol agents
496 from the products themselves. In fact, the superior performance of the strains used was not only
497 against deliberately inoculated pathogens but also against spoilage microorganisms that are
498 naturally present in fruits and vegetables. These abilities have been attributed to the capability of the
499 strains to colonize the product and survive under the stringent conditions of refrigerated storage.
500 Moreover, the ability of biocontrol agents to not adversely affect the quality of the product is
501 important. Several authors reported negative effects of added biocontrol agents on the colour and
502 texture parameters of the products (Leverentz *et al.*, 2006; Siroli *et al.* 2015 Trias *et al.*, 2008a). The
503 combination of biocontrol agents with anti-browning solutions reduced these negative effects.
504 Therefore, some of the proposed biocontrol agents, particularly in combination with other
505 preservative methods, may represent a good strategy to increase the safety and shelf-life of
506 minimally processed fruits and vegetables. However, the introduction of biocontrol agents can be
507 further optimized by focusing on the level and mode of inoculation and by limiting the negative
508 effects observed on the colour parameters.

509

510 ***Acknowledgements***

511 Several data described in this review were obtained in the framework of the national project AGER-
512 STAY FRESH 2010 2370.

513

514 ***Figure Captions***

515 **Figure 1.** Lamb's lettuce, produced at industrial levels by using different washing solutions,
516 immediately after washing and after 12 days of storage. The controls were washed with 120 mg/l of

chlorine. The samples added to the biocontrol agent were washed in solution containing 6 log CFU/ml of *L. lactis* CBM21. The samples washed with the biocontrol agent and thyme essential oil were washed in a solution containing 6 log CFU/ml of *L. lactis* CBM21 and 250 mg/l of thyme essential oil.

544 ***References***

545 Abadias, M., Usall, J., Anguera, M., Solsona, C., & Viñas, I. (2008). Microbiological quality of
546 fresh, minimally-processed fruit and vegetables, and sprouts from retail establishments.
547 *International Journal of Food Microbiology*, 123, 121–129.

548 Abadias, M., Usall, J., Alegre, I., Torres, R., & Vinas, I. (2009). Fate of *Escherichia coli* in apple
549 and reduction of its growth using the postharvest biocontrol agent *Candida sake* CPA-1.
550 *Journal of the Science of Food and Agriculture*, 89, 1526-1533.

551 Alegre, I., Abadias, M., Anguera, M., Oliveira, M., & Viñas, I. (2010). Factors affecting growth of
552 foodborne pathogens on minimally processed apples. *Food Microbiology*, 27, 70-76.

553 Alegre, I., Viñas, I., Usall, J., Anguera, M., Figge, M. J., & Abadias, M. (2012). An
554 *Enterobacteriaceae* species isolated from apples controls foodborne pathogens on fresh-cut
555 apples and peaches. *Postharvest Biology and Technology*, 74, 118-124.

556 Alegre, I., Viñas, I., Usall, J., Anguera, M., Altisent, R., & Abadias, M. (2013a). Antagonistic effect
557 of *Pseudomonas graminis* CPA-7 against foodborne pathogens in fresh-cut apples under
558 simulated commercial conditions. *Food Microbiology*, 33, 139-148.

559 Alegre, I., Viñas, I., Usall, J., Teixidó, N., Figge, M. J., & Abadias, M. (2013b). Control of
560 foodborne pathogens on fresh-cut fruit by a novel strain of *Pseudomonas graminis*. *Food*
561 *Microbiology*, 34, 390-399.

562 Allende, A., Martınez, B., Selma, V., Gil, M. I., Suarez, J. E., & Rodrıguez, A. (2007). Growth and
563 bacteriocin production by lactic acid bacteria in vegetable broth and their effectiveness at
564 reducing *Listeria monocytogenes* in vitro and in fresh-cut lettuce. *Food Microbiology* 24,
565 759–766.

566 Ananou, S., Maqueda, M., Martinez-Bueno, M., & Valdivia, E. (2007). Biopreservation, an
567 ecological approach to improve the safety and shelf-life of foods. *Communicating current*
568 *Research and Educational Topics and trends in Applied Microbiology* 475-486.

569 Ananou, S., Garriga, M., Jofre, A., Aymerich, T., Galvez, A., Maqueda, M., *et al.* (2010).
570 Combined effect of enterocin AS-48 and high hydrostatic pressure to control food-borne
571 pathogens inoculated in low acid fermented sausages. *Meat Science* 84, 594-600.

572 Ayala-Zavala, J. F., Oms-Oliu, G., Odriozola-Serrano, I., GonzálezAguilar, G. A., Álvarez-Parrilla,
573 E., & Martín-Belloso, O. (2008). Biopreservation of fresh-cut tomatoes using natural
574 antimicrobials. *European Food Research and Technology*, 226, 1047–1055.

575 Barth, M., Hankinson, T. R., Zhuang, H., & Breidt, F. (2010). Microbiological Spoilage of Fruits
576 and Vegetables. *Compendium of the Microbiological Spoilage of Foods and Beverages,*
577 *Food Microbiology and Food Safety*, 135-183.

578 Belletti, N., Lanciotti, R., Patrignani, F., & Gardini, F. (2008). Antimicrobial efficacy of citron
579 essential oil on spoilage and pathogenic microorganisms in fruit-based salads. *Journal of*
580 *Food Science*, 73, 331-338.

581 Bennik, M. H. J., Vorstman, W., Smid, E. J., & Gorris, L. G. M. (1998). The influence of oxygen
582 and carbon dioxide on the growth of prevalent *Enterobacteriaceae* and *Pseudomonas*
583 species isolated from fresh and controlled-atmosphere-stored vegetables. *Food*
584 *Microbiology*, 15, 459-469.

585 Bennik, M.H.J., van Overbeek, W., Smid, E.J., & Gorris, L.G.M. (1999). Biopreservation in
586 modified atmosphere stored mungbean sprouts: the use of vegetable-associated
587 bacteriocinogenic lactic acid bacteria to control the growth of *Listeria monocytogenes*.
588 *Letters in Applied Microbiology*, 28, 226-232.

589 Boeing, H., Bechthold, A., Bub, A., Ellinger, S., Haller, D., Kroke, A., *et al.* (2012). Critical
590 review: vegetables and fruit in the prevention of chronic diseases. *European Journal of*
591 *Nutrition*, 51, 637-663.

592 Buchanan, R. L., & Bagi, L. K. (1999). Microbial competition: effect of *Pseudomonas flurescens* on
593 the growth of *Listeria monocytogenes*. *Food Microbiology*, 16, 523-529.

Cai, Y., Ng, L. K., & Farber, J. M. (1997). Isolation and characterization of nisin-producing *Lactococcus lactis* subsp. *lactis* from bean-sprouts. *Journal of Applied Microbiology*, 83, 499-507.

Carlin, F., Nguyen-The, C., & Morris, C. E. (1996). Influence of background microflora on *Listeria monocytogenes* on minimally processed fresh broad-leaved endive (*Cichoriumendivia* var. latifolia). *Journal of Food Protection*, 59, 698-703.

Carr, F.J., Chill, D., & Maida, N. (2002). The lactic acid bacteria: A literature survey. *Critical Reviews in Microbiology*, 28, 281-370.

Carrasco, E., Pérez-Rodríguez, F., Valero, A., García-Gimeno, R. M., & Zurera, G. (2008). Growth of *Listeria monocytogenes* on shredded, ready-to-eat iceberg lettuce. *Food Control*, 19, 487-494.

Castillo, A., & Escartin, E. F. (1994). Survival of *Campylobacter jejuni* on Sliced Watermelon and Papaya. *Journal of Food Protection*, 2, 97-178.

Cleveland, J., Montville, T. J., Nes, I. F., & Chikindas, M. L. (2001). Bacteriocins: safe, natural antimicrobials for food preservation. *International Journal of Food Microbiology* 71, 1–20.

Cobo-Molinos, A., Abriouel, H., Ben Omar, N., Valdivia, E., Lucas, R., Maqueda, M., *et al.* (2005). Effect of immersion solutions containing enterocin AS-48 on *Listeria monocytogenes* in vegetable foods. *Applied and Environmental Microbiology* 71, 7781–7787.

Cosentino, S., Fadda, M. E., Deplano, M., Pomata, R., & Pisano, M. B. (2012). Antilisterial Activity of Nisin-Like Bacteriocin-Producing *Lactococcus lactis* subsp. *lactis* Isolated from Traditional Sardinian Dairy Products. *Journal of Biomedicine and Biotechnology*, 2012, 376428.

Cotter, D., Hill, C., & Ross, P. (2005). Bacteriocins: developing innate immunity for food. *Nature Reviews Microbiology* 3, 777-788.

618 de Azeredo, G. A., Stamford, T. L. M., Campos Nunes, P., Gomez Neto, N. J., de Oliveira, M. E.
619 G., de Souza, E. L. (2011). Combined application of essential oils from *Origanum vulgare*
620 L. and *Rosmarinus officinalis* L. to inhibit bacteria and autochthonous microflora associated
621 with minimally processed vegetables. *Food Research International*, 44, 1541-1548.

622 Di Cagno, R., Surico, R. F., Siragusa, S., De Angelis, M., Paradiso, A., Minervini, F. *et al.* (2008).
623 Selection and use of autochthonous mixed starter for lactic acid fermentation of carrots,
624 French beans or marrows. *International Journal of Food Microbiology*, 127, 220-228.

625 EFSA, (2013). Scientific Opinion on the risk posed by pathogens in food of non-animal origin. Part
626 1 (outbreak data analysis and risk ranking of food/pathogen combinations). *EFSA Journal*,
627 11(1)-2035.

628 FDA, (2001). Analysis & Evaluation of Preventive Control Measures for the Control &
629 Reduction/Elimination of Microbial Hazards on Fresh & Fresh-Cut Produce. Chapter IV.
630 Outbreaks Associated with Fresh and Fresh-Cut Produce. Incidence, Growth, and Survival
631 of Pathogens in Fresh and Fresh-Cut Produce.
632 http://www.fda.gov/Food/FoodScienceResearch/SafePracticesforFoodProcesses/ucm091265
633 .htm

634 Francis, G. A., & O'Beirne, D. (1998). Effects of the indigenous microflora of minimally processed
635 lettuce on the survival and growth of *Listeria innocua*. *International Journal of Food*
636 *Science and Technology*, 33, 477-488.

637 Francis, G. A., Gallone, A., Nychas, G. J., Sofos, J. N., Colelli, G., Amodio, M. L., & Spano, G.
638 (2012). Factors affecting quality and safety of fresh-cut produce. *Critical Review in Food*
639 *Science and Nutrition*, 52, 595-610.

640 Galvez, A., Abriouel, H., Benomar, N., & Lucas, R. (2010). Microbial antagonists to food-borne
641 pathogens and biocontrol. *Current Opinion in Biotechnology*, 21, 142-148.

642 Gil, M. I., Selma, M. V., López-Gálvez, F., & Allende, A. (2009). Fresh-cut product sanitation and
643 wash water disinfection: Problems and solutions. *International Journal of Food*
644 *Microbiology*, 134, 37-45.
645 Guerzoni, M. E., Gianotti, A., Corbo, M. R., & Sinigaglia, M. (1996). Shelf-life modelling for
646 fresh-cut vegetables. *Postharvest Biology & Technology*, 9, 195-207.
647 Harris, L. J., Farber, J. N., Beuchat, L. R., Parish, M. E., Suslow, T. V., Garrett, E. H., *et al.* (2003).
648 Outbreaks associated with fresh produce: incidence, growth, and survival of pathogens in
649 fresh and fresh-cut produce. *Comprehensive Reviews in Food Science and Food Safety*, 2,
650 78-141.
651 Hasper, H. E., Kramer, N. E., Smith, J. L., Hillman, J. D., Zachariah, C., Kuipers, O. P. *et al.*
652 (2006). An alternative bactericidal mechanism of action for lantibiotic peptides that target
653 lipid II. *Science* 313, 1636–1637.

654 Heng, N. C. K., & Tagg, J. R. (2006). What's in a name? Class distinction for bacteriocins. *Nature*
655 *Reviews Microbiology*, 4(2).

656 Janisiewicz, W. J., Conway, W. S., & Leverentz, B. (1999). Biological control of postharvest
657 decays of apple can prevent growth of *Escherichia coli* O157:H7 in apple wounds. *Journal*
658 *of Food Protection*, 62, 1372–1375.
659 Johnston, M. A., Harrison, M. A., & Morrow, R. A. (2009). Microbial antagonists of *Escherichia*
660 *coli* O157:H7 on fresh-cut lettuce and spinach. *Journal of Food Protection*, 72, 1569-1575.

661 Lanciotti, R., Gianotti, A., Patrignani, F., Belletti, N., Guerzoni, M. E., & Gardini, F., (2004). Use
662 of natural aroma compounds to improve shelf-life and safety of minimally processed fruits.
663 *Trends in Food Science & Technology*, 15, 201–208.
664 Leverentz, B., Janisiewicz, W. J., Conway, W. S., Saftner, R. A., & Camp, M. J. (2003). Effect of
665 combining MCP, heat and biocontrol treatments on the reduction of postharvest decay of
666 'Golden Delicious' apples. *Postharvest Biology and Technology*, 27, 221–233.

667 Leverentz, B., Conway,W. S., Janisiewicz, W., Abadias, M., Kurtzman, C. P., & Camp, M.J.
668 (2006). Biocontrol of the Food-Borne Pathogens *Listeria monocytogenes* and *Salmonella*
669 *enterica* Serovar Poona on Fresh-Cut Apples with Naturally Occurring Bacterial and Yeast
670 Antagonists. *Applied and Environmental Microbiology* 72, 1135-1140.

671 Liao, C. H., & Sapers, G. M. (1999) Influence of soft rot bacteria on growth of *Listeria*
672 *monocytogenes* on potato tuber slices. *Journal of food protection*, 62, 343-348.

673 Liao, C. S., & Fett, W. F. (2001). Analysis of native microflora and selection of strains antagonistic
674 to human pathogens on fresh produce. *Journal of Food Protection*, 64:1110–1115.

675 Mostafavi, H. A., Mirmajlessi, S. M., Fathollahi, H., Shahbazi, S., & Mirjaliliet, S. M. (2013).
676 Integrated effect of gamma radiation and biocontrol agent on quality parameters of apple
677 fruit: An innovative commercial preservation method. *Radiation Physics and Chemistry*, 91,
678 193-199.

679 Nguyen-The, C., & Carlin, F. (1994). The microbiology of minimally processed fresh fruits and
680 vegetables. *Critical Reviews in Food Science and Nutrition*, 34, 371-401.

681 Palmai, M., & Buchanan, R.L. (2002). Growth of *Listeria monocytogenes* during germination of
682 alfalfa sprouts. *Food Microbiology*, 19, 195-200.

683 Patrignani, F., Tabanelli, G., Siroli, L., Gardini, F., & Lanciotti, R. (2013). Combined effects of
684 high pressure homogenization treatment and citral on microbiological quality of apricot
685 juice. *International Journal of Food Microbiology*, 160, 273–281.

686 Ragaert, P., Devlieghere, F., & Debevere, J. (2007). Role of microbiological and physiological
687 spoilage mechanisms during storage of minimally processed vegetables. *Postharvest*
688 *Biology & Technology*, 44, 185-194.

689 Ramos, B., Miller, F. A., Brandão, T. R. S., Teixeira, P., & Silva, C. L. M. (2013). Fresh fruits and
690 vegetables—An overview on applied methodologies to improve its quality and safety.
691 *Innovative Food Science and Emerging Technologies*, 20, 1-15.
692 Randazzo, C. L., Pitino, I., Scifo, G. O., & Caggia, C. (2009). Biopreservation of minimally
693 processed iceberg lettuces using a bacteriocin produced by *Lactococcus lactis* wild strain.
694 *Food Control* 20, 756-763.
695 Rediers, H., Claes, L., Peeters, M., & Willems, K. A. (2009). Evaluation of the cold chain of fresh-
696 cut endive from farmer to plate. *Postharvest Biology and Technology*, 51, 257-262.
697 Rico, D., Martín-Diana, A. B., Barat, J. M., & Barry-Ryan, C. (2007). Extending and measuring the
698 quality of fresh-cut fruit and vegetables: a review. *Trends in Food Science & Technology*,
699 18, 373-386.
700 Rößle, C., Gormley, T. R., & Butler, F. (2009). Efficacy of Natureseal® AS1 browning inhibitor in
701 fresh-cut fruit salads applications, with emphasis on apple wedges. *Journal of Horticultural*
702 *Science & Biotechnology*, ISAFRUIT Special Issue 62–67.
703 Ross, R. P., Morgan, S., & Hill, C. (2002). Preservation and fermentation: past, present and future.
704 *International Journal of Food Microbiology*, 79, 3–16.
705 Ruiz-Barba, J.L., Cathcart, D.P., Warner, P.J., & Jimenez-Diaz, R. (1994). Use of *Lactobacillus*
706 *plantarum* LPCO10, a bacteriocin producer, as a starter culture in Spanish-style green olive
707 fermentations. *Applied and Environmental Microbiology*, 60, 2059-2064.
708 Sant'Ana, A. S., Landgraf, M., Destro, M. T., & Franco, B. D. G. M. (2011). Prevalence and counts
709 of *Salmonella* spp. in minimally processed vegetables in São Paulo, Brazil. *Food*
710 *Microbiology*, 28, 1235-1237.
711 Schuenzel, K. M., & Harrison, M. A. (2002). Microbial antagonists of foodborne pathogens on
712 fresh, minimally processed vegetables. *Journal of Food Protection*, 65, 1909-1915.

713 Scolari, G., & Vescovo, M. (2004). Microbial antagonism of *Lactobacillus casei* added to fresh
714 vegetables. *Italian Journal of Food Science*, 16, 465.
715 Scolari, G., Vescovo, M., Zacconi, C., & Bonadé, A. (2004). Influence of *Lactobacillus plantarum*
716 on *Staphylococcus aureus* growth in a fresh vegetable model system. *European Food*
717 *Research and Technology*, 218, 274-277.
718 Selma, M. V., Allende, A., López-Galvez, F., Conesa, M. A., & Gil, M. I. (2008). Disinfection
719 potential of ozone, ultraviolet-C and their combination in wash water for the fresh-cut
720 vegetable industry. *Food Microbiology*, 25, 809-814.
721 Settanni, L., & Corsetti, A. (2008). Application of bacteriocins in vegetable food biopreservation.
722 *International Journal of Food Microbiology*, 121, 123-138.
723 Siroli, L., Patrignani, F., Serrazanetti, D.I., Tabanelli, G., Montanari, C., Tappi, S., *et al.* (2014a).
724 Efficacy of natural antimicrobials to prolong the shelf-life of minimally processed apples
725 packaged in modify atmosphere. *Food Control*, 46, 1-9.
726 Siroli, L., Patrignani, F., Salvetti, E., Torriani, S., Gardini, F., & Lanciotti, R. (2014b). Use of a
727 nisin-producing *Lactococcus lactis* strain, combined with thyme essential oil, to improve the
728 safety and shelf-life of minimally processed lamb's lettuce. Proceeding of 11th International
729 Symposium on Lactic Acid Bacteria, Egmond aan Zee, the Netherlands, August 31-
730 September 4.
731 Siroli, L., Patrignani, F., Serrazanetti, D. I., Tabanelli, G., Montanari, C., Gardini, F., *et al.* (2015).
732 Lactic acid bacteria and natural antimicrobials to improve the safety and shelf-life of
733 minimally processed sliced apples and lamb's lettuce. *Food Microbiology*, 47, 74-84.
734 Siroli, L., Patrignani, F., Serrazanetti, D. I., Vannini, L., Salvetti, E., Torriani, S. *et al.* (Unpublished
735 results). Use of a nisin-producing *Lactococcus lactis* strain, combined with natural
736 antimicrobials, to improve the safety and shelf-life of minimally processed sliced apples.
737 Soliva-Fortuny, R. C., & Martin-Belloso, O. (2003). New advances in extending the shelf-life of
738 fresh-cut fruits: a review. *Trends in Food Science and Technology*, 14, 341-353.

739 Stiles, M., & Holzapfel, W. (1997). Lactic acid bacteria of foods and their current taxonomy.
740 *International Journal of Food Microbiology*, 36, 1–29.
741 Tirpanalan, O., Zunabovic, M., Domig, K. J., & Kneifel, W. (2011). Mini review: antimicrobial
742 strategies in the production of fresh-cut lettuce products. In Méndez-Vilas A (ed), Science
743 against microbial pathogens: communicating current research and technological advances,
744 vol 1. Formatex Research Center, Badajoz, Spain.
745 http://www.formatex.org/microbiology3/chapters1.html. Accessed 13 December 2014.
746 Torriani, S., Orsi, C., & Vescovo, M. (1997). Potential of *Lactobacillus casei*, culture permeate, and
747 lactic acid to control microorganisms in ready-to-use vegetables. *Journal of Food*
748 *Protection*, 12, 1564-1567.
749 Torriani, S., Scolari, G., Dellaglio, F., & Vescovo, M. (1999). Biocontrol of leuconostocs in ready-
750 to-use shredded carrots. *Annali di Microbiologia ed Enzimologia*, 49, 23-31.
751 Tournas, V. H., Heeres, J., & Burgess, L. (2006) Moulds and yeasts in fruit salads and fruit juices.
752 *Food Microbiology*, 23, 684–688.
753 Trias, R., Baneras, L., Badosa, E., & Montesinos, E. (2008a). Bioprotection of Golden Delicious
754 apples and Iceberg lettuce against foodborne bacterial pathogens by lactic acid bacteria.
755 *International Journal of Food Microbiology*, 123, 50-60.
756 Trias, R., Baneras, L., Montesinos, E., & Badosa, E. (2008b). Lactic acid bacteria from fresh fruit
757 and vegetables as biocontrol agents of phytopathogenic bacteria and fungi. *International*
758 *Microbiology*, 11, 231-236.
759 Trias, R., Badosa, E., Montesinos, E., & Baneras, L. (2008c). Bioprotective *Leuconostoc* strains
760 against *Listeria monocytogenes* in fresh fruits and vegetables. *International Microbiology*,
761 127, 91-98.

762 Vermeiren, L., Devlieghere, F., & Debevere, J. (2004). Evaluation of meat born lactic acid bacteria
763 as protective cultures for the biopreservation of cooked meat products. *International Journal*
764 *of Food Microbiology* 96, 149-164.

765 Vescovo, M., Torriani, S., Orsi, C., Macchiarolo, F., & Scolari, G. (1996). Application of
766 antimicrobial-producing lactic acid bacteria to control pathogens in ready-to-use vegetables.
767 *Journal of Applied Microbiology*, 81, 113-119.

768 Vescovo, M., Scolari, G., Orsi, C., Sinigaglia, M., & Torriani, S. (1997). Combined effects of
769 *Lactobacillus casei* inoculum, modified atmosphere packaging and storage temperature in
770 controlling *Aeromonas hydrophila* in ready-to-use vegetables. *International Journal of Food*
771 *Science & Technology*, 32, 411-419.

772

Biocontrol Agent	Target Organism	Vegetable	Reference
Bacillus spp. and *Pseudomonas* spp.	*Salmonella chester, Listeria monocytogenes, Escherichia coli*	green pepper, romaine lettuce, baby carrots, alfalfa, and clover	Liao and Fett, 2001
Enterococcus mundtii, Pediococcus parvulus	*Listeria monocytogenes*	mung bean sprouts	Bennik et al., 1999
Gram negative bacteria	*Staphylococcus aureus, Escherichia coli* O157:H7, *Listeria monocytogenes*, *Salmonella montevideo*	model system	Schuenzel and Harrison, 2002
Lactobacillus casei	*Staphylococcus aureus, Aeromonas hydrophila, Escherichia coli, Listeria monocytogenes*	scarola salad leaves	Scolari and Vescovo, 2004
Lacobacillus casei	coliforms, enterococci and *Aeromonas hydrophila*	mixed salads	Torriani et al., 1997
Lactobacillus casei, Lactobacillus plantarum, Pediococcus spp.	*Aeromonas hydrophila, Salmonella typhimurium and Staphylococcus aureus, Listeria monocytogenes*	salads and juice prepared from vegetable salads	Vescovo et al., 1996
Lactobacillus plantarum	*Leuconostoc* spp.	shredded carrots	Torriani et al., 1999
Lactobacillus plantarum	*Staphylococcus aureus*	minimally processed vegetables	Scolari et al., 2004
Lactobacillus plantarum and *Lactobacillus casei*	*Listeria monocytogenes* and *Escherichia coli*	lamb's lettuce	Siroli et al., 2015
Lactococcus lactis	*Listeria monocytogenes*	alfalfa sprouts	Palmai et al., 2002
Lactococcus lactis	*Listeria monocytogenes*	ready to eat Caisar salad	Cai et al., 1999
Leuconostoc mesenteroides and *Leuconostoc citreum*	*Listeria monocytogenes*	iceberg lettuce	Trias et al., 2008c
Leuconostoc spp.	*Salmonella typhimurium, Escherichia coli, Listeria monocytogenes*	iceberg lettuce leaf cuts	Trias et al., 2008a
Pseudomonas fluorescens	*Listeria monocytogenes*	endive leaves	Carlin et al., 1996
Pseudomonas fluorescens	*Listeria monocytogenes*	model system	Buchanan and Bagi, 1999

Pseudomonas fluorescens and *Pseudomonas viridiflava*	*Listeria monocytogenes*	potato tuber slices	Liao and Sapers, 1999
Weissella cibaria and lactic acid bacteria	*Xanthomonas campestris, Erwinia carotovora, Penicillium expansum, Monilinia laxa, Botrytis cinerea*	model system	Trias et al., 2008b

Table 1. Summary of the biocontrol agents isolated and used for vegetable and minimally processed vegetable.

Biocontrol Agent	Target Organism	Fruit	Reference
Candida sake	*Escherichia coli*	apple wounds	Abadias et al., 2009
Candida sp.; Gluconobactera saii, Candida spp., Dicosphaerina fagi and *Metschnikowia pulcherrima*	*Listeria monocytogenes* and *Salmonella enterica*	minimally processed apples	Leverentz et al., 2006
Enterobacteriaceae	*Escherichia coli, Salmonella, Listeria innocua*	Minimally processed apples and peaches	Alegre et al., 2012
Lactobacillus plantarum	*Listeria monocytogenes* and *Escherichia coli*	sliced apples	Siroli et al., 2015
Lactococcus lactis	*Listeria monocytogenes*	sliced apples	Siroli et al., 2014
Lactococcus lactis	spoliage microrganisms	industrial sliced apples	Siroli et al., unpublished results
Leuconostoc mesenteroides and *Leuconostoc citreum*	*Listeria monocytogenes*	apple Golden delicious	Trias et al., 2008a
Pseudomonas fluorescens	*Penicillium expansum*	apple, apple wounds	Mostafavi et al., 2013
Pseudomonas graminis	*Salmonella* and five *Listeria monocytogenes*	minimally processed apples	Alegre et al., 2013a
Pseudomonas graminis	*Escherichia coli*, *Salmonella* and *Listeria innocua*	minimally processed apples	Alegre et al., 2013b
Pseudomonas syringae	*Escherichia coli*	apple wounds	Janisiewicz et al., 1999

Table 2. Summary of the biocontrol agents isolated and used for fruits and minimally processed fruits.

T0

Control | Biocontrol agent *L. Lactis* CBM21 | Thyme EO + Biocontrol agent

T12

Control | Biocontrol agent *L. Lactis* CBM21 | Thyme EO + Biocontrol agent

Figure 1.

- Biocontrol agents are able to prolong shelf-life and safety of minimally processed fruits

- Bioprotection of minimally processed vegetables

- LAB to increase safety and shelf-life of minimally processed products

- Mechanisms of action of biocontrol agents