

## Evaluating Contamination Level of Raw and Roasted Nuts Distributed in Commercial Markets in Mazandaran Province, Iran

Maryam Azizkhani\*, Fereshteh Jafari, Pouyan Haghighi, Maedeh Dehghan

Department of Food Hygiene, Faculty of Veterinary Medicine, University of Special Modern Technologies, Amol, Iran

### Abstract

**BACKGROUND:** Raw and roasted nuts are one of the most popular snacks consumed in Iran but mishandling and poor storage conditions and practices may lead to promote the growth of microorganisms and foodborne intoxications and infections.

**OBJECTIVES:** The purpose of this study was to investigate the microbial quality of raw and roasted (salted and unsalted) nuts, distributed in commercial markets in Mazandaran province, Iran.

**METHODS:** The moisture content, total colony counts, total coliform, fecal coliform, *Staphylococcus aureus*, and fungal contamination were evaluated according to procedures of Iran national standards.

**RESULTS:** The moisture content of raw and roasted hazelnut, pistachio, almond, and cashew nut samples were above the standard limits. The moisture content of the raw peanuts was within the standard approved limit (maximum 9%). But the moisture content of the roasted peanut was higher than the permissible limit of 5%. For yeasts and moulds, except for all almond samples and 56% of cashew nut samples, all products tended to be loaded with unsatisfactory limits. The total viable count was within the standard limits in hazelnut, almond, and cashew nut samples (less than 4log cfu/gr). Satisfactory limits of coliforms (lower than 1log cfu/gr) were observed in all almond samples, 91.6% of hazelnut, and 16.7% of pistachio samples. No fecal coliforms were detected in samples. *S.aureus* contamination was observed in 6.5% of hazelnut, 8% of almond, 25% of cashew nut, and 33% of peanut samples.

**CONCLUSIONS:** According to the findings, almond and hazelnut showed the least, and pistachio and peanut samples showed the highest microbial contamination.

**KEYWORDS:** Almond, Cashew nut, Hazelnut, Microbial load, Peanut, Pistachio

### Correspondence

Maryam Azizkhani, Department of Food Hygiene, Faculty of Veterinary Medicine, University of Special Modern Technologies, Amol, Iran, Tel: +98 (11) 44271057, Fax: +98 (11) 44271054, Email: [m.azizkhani@ausmt.ac.ir](mailto:m.azizkhani@ausmt.ac.ir)

Received: 2019-11-17

Accepted: 2020-01-14

Copyright © 2020. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution- 4.0 International License which permits Share, copy and redistribution of the material in any medium or format or adapt, remix, transform, and build upon the material for any purpose, even commercially.

### How to Cite This Article

Azizkhani, M, Jafari, F, Haghighi, P. and Dehghan, M. (2020). Evaluating Contamination Level of Raw and Roasted Nuts Distributed in Commercial Markets in Mazandaran Province, Iran. Iranian Journal of Veterinary Medicine, 14(2):167-176.

## Introduction

Nuts are generally consumed in many parts of the world directly as a snack with high nutritive value and desirable taste, accepted by almost everyone. Also, nuts are used in various parts of the food industry such as infant food, complementary food for athletes and kids, cooking, and extraction of oils is common for home and industrial uses. Types of nuts, hazelnut, pistachio, almonds, cashew nut, and peanuts, are rich in high-quality proteins, unsaturated good fats, minerals, and vitamins, and they have low water content; therefore, nuts are highly vulnerable to microbial spoilage especially fungal attack. Microorganisms may enter into the nuts' shell while still on the trees and this usually occurs when the pods or hard shells of the nuts are split open and the seeds are attacked by insects or pests which make space for the microbial spores to access the developing seeds. Other possible ways of contamination of nuts by microorganisms include harvesting process, sorting practices, and washing of the nuts before storage. If the nuts are not properly treated during these stages, it could lead to bacterial and mould growth especially when nut seeds are not properly dried to the safe moisture content before storage or distribution (Adetunji et al., 2014). As mentioned above, both fungi and bacteria are responsible for microbial biodeterioration of food crops resulting in food and economic losses, hence reducing the consumer acceptance value of the food products. The fungal contamination occurs without necessarily showing any form of moldiness, moulds produce mycotoxins as secondary metabolites, which are consumed by humans and lead to different forms of diseases such as cancers, spontaneous abortion, cirrhosis, and other liver diseases, and also immune suppression

interference with micronutrient metabolism and therefore stunted growth (Abbas et al., 2005; Luttfullah and Hussain, 2011; Ritter et al., 2011).

This research has focused on evaluating the microbiological quality and safety of different types of nuts and the effect of packaging type through analyzing the total colony counts, total coliform bacteria, fecal coliform bacteria, *Staphylococcus aureus* and fungal (yeasts and moulds) counts. The objective of the present study was to investigate the microbial quality of raw and roasted (salted and unsalted) nuts, distributed in commercial markets and consumed in Mazandaran province, Iran.

## Materials and Methods

### Sampling

The analyses of the bulk nut samples were conducted in four different sampling times (interval between successive samples, also called the sampling interval), for a total period of four months (April-July 2018). The sampling procedure was conducted according to sampling guidelines of the European Commission for nuts (in a shell and shelled or otherwise prepared). So, the random selection was done from different parts of the consignment, at least five conventional points (one at the top, three at different depths in the middle, and one at the bottom). The recommended minimum quantity for each final sample was 100-500 gr. In this study, the sample size was equivalent to 200 gr. For sample collection, five different types of bulk nuts (raw, roasted and salted, roasted and unsalted) including shelled hazelnut, unshelled pistachio, shelled almonds, cashew nut and shelled peanuts were obtained from local markets of different cities in Mazanda-

ran province (Iran). Samples were collected from four different markets in each city. The mixed samples were blended aseptically using a mixer grinder and 100 g portions kept in zip lock envelopes. Samples that were not used immediately were kept at  $-20^{\circ}\text{C}$  before analysis.

### Chemicals

All were purchased from Sigma Chemical Co. (St. Louis, USA).

### Moisture content

Moisture content was determined according to Iran national standard (2015) for dry fruits. Briefly, 5 gr of samples were oven-dried in a pre-weighed dish at  $105^{\circ}\text{C}$  for 4 h and cooled in a desiccator until a constant weight was obtained. The moisture content was calculated from the reduction in weight and expressed as a percentage of the original weight.

### Total viable count

Ten grams of each nut sample (shelled) were weighted in a sterilized stomacher bag and homogenized using a sterile physiological normal saline solution (0.85% NaCl), then serial dilutions were prepared. Pour plate method was applied for aerobic mesophilic bacteria count, using PCA (Plate Count Agar). PCA plates were incubated at  $30^{\circ}\text{C}$  for 48 h (Iran national standard, 2015).

### Total coliform bacteria and fecal coliform bacteria

For total coliforms counts, the method described by Iran national standard (2007) was used. Growth of coliforms was detected using VRBA (Violet Red Bile Agar) incubated at  $37^{\circ}\text{C}$  for 48 h, and confirmation step was performed through subculturing of suspected colonies into BGLB (Brilliant Green Lactose Bile Broth) and evaluating gas production at  $37^{\circ}\text{C}$  for 48 h, and at  $44^{\circ}\text{C}$  for 24 h for fecal coliforms.

### *Staphylococcus aureus*

To detect the presence of *S.aureus*, 0.2 ml of dilution 1 (first dilution) was spread onto an of Baird Parker Agar plate complemented with 5% of Egg Yolk Tellurite Emulsion. The plates were incubated at  $37^{\circ}\text{C}$  for 48 h, and then they were evaluated for the typical morphology of *S. aureus* colonies (Iran national standard, 2005).

### Fungal contamination

One gram of each blended and well-mixed nut was added to 9 ml of sterile peptone water in a sterile test tube and the solution was diluted decimally. 20 ml of sterilized molten Potato Dextrose Agar (PDA) plates supplemented with 0.01% chloramphenicol were cooled to  $45^{\circ}\text{C}$  and poured into plates (in triplicate) and 0.1 ml aliquots of each sample were added. The plates were gently swirled and allowed to solidify. The PDA plates were incubated at  $25^{\circ}\text{C}$  for 5 days for the determination of fungal counts (Spangenbergi and Ingham, 2000).

### Statistical analysis

Means and standard divisions of the microbial counts and moisture content were analyzed using SPSS 22.0 by the One-Sample t-test. Means were compared by the least significant difference (LSD) test when the P-value was  $<0.05$ .

## Results

Different samples of nuts, including hazelnut, pistachio, almond, cashew nut, and peanut, collected from the local markets of Mazandaran province (Iran) during four months were analyzed. The samples included raw and roasted-salted and roasted-unsalted nuts. The moisture content of all the samples was measured and presented in Table 1. The moisture content of raw and roasted hazelnut, pistachio, almond, and cashew nut samples

was above the standard limits (5%, 5 and 3%, 5 and 4%, 4%, respectively) according to the Iran national standards. The moisture contents of the raw peanuts were within the permitted

limits (max 9%) but that of roasted peanut samples was above the permissible recommended moisture limit of 5% (Iran national standard, 2015).

**Table 1.** Moisture content in different nut products

|                   | Moisture content (%)      |                         |                         |                         | Standard limit |
|-------------------|---------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|----------------|
|                   | T <sub>1</sub> *          | T <sub>2</sub>          | T <sub>3</sub>          | T <sub>4</sub>          |                |
| <b>Hazelnut</b>   |                           |                         |                         |                         |                |
| Raw               | **6.25±0.114 <sup>a</sup> | 6.38±0.713 <sup>a</sup> | 5.85±0.320 <sup>a</sup> | 6.41±0.328 <sup>a</sup> | Max 5%         |
| Roasted-salted    | 5.45±0.371 <sup>a</sup>   | 4.02±0.836 <sup>b</sup> | 5.47±0.513 <sup>a</sup> | 6.25±0.914 <sup>a</sup> | -              |
| Roasted-unsalted  | 5.11±0.230 <sup>a</sup>   | 5.5±0.937 <sup>a</sup>  | 5.03±0.184 <sup>a</sup> | 5.95±0.320 <sup>a</sup> | -              |
| <b>Pistachio</b>  |                           |                         |                         |                         |                |
| Raw               | 7.23±0.922 <sup>a</sup>   | 7.5±0.691 <sup>a</sup>  | 6.92±0.515 <sup>a</sup> | 7.54±0.216 <sup>a</sup> | Max 5%         |
| Roasted-salted    | 6.45±0.560 <sup>a</sup>   | 7.11±0.573 <sup>a</sup> | 7.05±0.384 <sup>a</sup> | 6.90±0.738 <sup>a</sup> | Max 3%         |
| Roasted-unsalted  | 6.70±0.732 <sup>a</sup>   | 6.83±0.447 <sup>a</sup> | 6.55±0.821 <sup>a</sup> | 7.04±0.580 <sup>a</sup> | Max 3%         |
| <b>Almonds</b>    |                           |                         |                         |                         |                |
| Raw               | 8.50±0.673 <sup>a</sup>   | 7.33±0.838 <sup>a</sup> | 7.15±0.377 <sup>a</sup> | 8.60±0.511 <sup>a</sup> | Max 5%         |
| Roasted-salted    | 7.73±0.315 <sup>a</sup>   | 6.15±0.190 <sup>a</sup> | 5.90±0.834 <sup>a</sup> | 6.74±0.809 <sup>a</sup> | Max 4%         |
| Roasted-unsalted  | 7.50±0.528 <sup>a</sup>   | 6.55±0.411 <sup>a</sup> | 5.17±0.610 <sup>a</sup> | 6.35±0.314 <sup>a</sup> | Max 4%         |
| <b>Cashew nut</b> |                           |                         |                         |                         |                |
| Raw               | 8.25±0.451 <sup>a</sup>   | 7.92±0.174 <sup>a</sup> | 8.5±0.116 <sup>a</sup>  | 8.47±0.219 <sup>a</sup> | -              |
| Roasted-salted    | 7.10±0.603 <sup>a</sup>   | 6.75±0.900 <sup>a</sup> | 6.68±0.450 <sup>b</sup> | 5.81±0.564 <sup>b</sup> | Max 4%         |
| Roasted-unsalted  | 5.05±0.380 <sup>b</sup>   | 6.44±0.815 <sup>a</sup> | 7.28±0.315 <sup>a</sup> | 6.5±0.259 <sup>b</sup>  | Max 4%         |
| <b>Peanut</b>     |                           |                         |                         |                         |                |
| Raw               | 7.65±0.825 <sup>a</sup>   | 8.5±0.794 <sup>a</sup>  | 8.13±0.620 <sup>a</sup> | 7.75±0.310 <sup>a</sup> | Max 9%         |
| Roasted-salted    | 6.80±0.254 <sup>a</sup>   | 7.90±0.433 <sup>a</sup> | 7.15±0.340 <sup>a</sup> | 6.55±0.241 <sup>a</sup> | Max 5%         |
| Roasted-unsalted  | 6.47±0.318 <sup>a</sup>   | 7.63±0.651 <sup>a</sup> | 7.84±0.895 <sup>a</sup> | 7.50±0.414 <sup>a</sup> | Max 5%         |

\* Time of sampling

\*\* Data are presented as mean ± standard deviation

a Mean values with the same superscript along the same column are not significantly different ( $P < 0.05$ ).

The whole samples were evaluated microbiologically to detect the levels of a total viable count, coliforms, fecal coliforms, *S. aureus*, yeasts, and moulds (Tables 2 and 3). For yeasts and moulds (Table 2), except all almond samples and 56% of cashew nut samples, all kinds of pistachio products

ended up being loaded with unsatisfactory limits ( $>2.69 \log_{10} \text{cfu/gr}$ ) (Iran national standard, 2014). There is still no microbiological permissible limit for hazelnut and peanut in Iran national standards but it is obvious that yeast and mould count in peanut samples is high.

**Table 2.** Fungal contamination of different nut products

|                   | Yeast and Moulds (log cfu/g) |                         |                         |                         | Standard limit |
|-------------------|------------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|----------------|
|                   | T <sub>1</sub> <sup>*</sup>  | T <sub>2</sub>          | T <sub>3</sub>          | T <sub>4</sub>          |                |
| <b>Hazelnut</b>   |                              |                         |                         |                         |                |
| Raw               | 2.30±0.518 <sup>a**</sup>    | 2.51±0.445 <sup>a</sup> | 1.98±0.095 <sup>a</sup> | 2.07±0.359 <sup>a</sup> |                |
| Roasted-salted    | 1.81±0.655 <sup>a</sup>      | 1.97±0.314 <sup>a</sup> | 2.05±0.141 <sup>a</sup> | 1.84±0.319 <sup>a</sup> | -              |
| Roasted-unsalted  | 2.14±0.430 <sup>a</sup>      | 2.55±0.909 <sup>a</sup> | 2.23±0.550 <sup>a</sup> | 2.37±0.881 <sup>a</sup> |                |
| <b>Pistachio</b>  |                              |                         |                         |                         |                |
| Raw               | 4.85±0.672 <sup>a</sup>      | 3.73±0.811 <sup>a</sup> | 3.72±0.850 <sup>a</sup> | 4.61±0.372 <sup>a</sup> |                |
| Roasted-salted    | 3.70±0.201 <sup>a</sup>      | 4.05±0.935 <sup>a</sup> | 4.15±0.618 <sup>a</sup> | 3.80±0.195 <sup>a</sup> | 2.69           |
| Roasted-unsalted  | 3.31±0.622 <sup>a</sup>      | 3.68±0.412 <sup>a</sup> | 3.28±0.475 <sup>a</sup> | 4.51±0.262 <sup>a</sup> |                |
| <b>Almonds</b>    |                              |                         |                         |                         |                |
| Raw               | 1.33±0.217 <sup>a</sup>      | 1.21±0.150 <sup>a</sup> | 1.55±0.091 <sup>a</sup> | 1.38±0.101 <sup>a</sup> |                |
| Roasted-salted    | 0.57±0.010 <sup>a</sup>      | 0.90±0.013 <sup>a</sup> | 1.06±0.085 <sup>a</sup> | 1.05±0.067 <sup>a</sup> | 2              |
| Roasted-unsalted  | 1.08±0.105 <sup>a</sup>      | 1.14±0.208 <sup>a</sup> | 1.28±0.119 <sup>a</sup> | 0.95±0.035 <sup>a</sup> |                |
| <b>Cashew nut</b> |                              |                         |                         |                         |                |
| Raw               | 1.05±0.118 <sup>a</sup>      | 1.41±0.315 <sup>a</sup> | 2.36±0.175 <sup>a</sup> | 2.10±0.560 <sup>a</sup> |                |
| Roasted-salted    | 2.60±0.214 <sup>a</sup>      | 1.58±0.220 <sup>a</sup> | 2.15±0.105 <sup>a</sup> | 1.21±0.137 <sup>a</sup> | 2              |
| Roasted-unsalted  | 1.90±0.272 <sup>a</sup>      | 2.11±0.508 <sup>a</sup> | 1.30±0.097 <sup>a</sup> | 2.4±0.715 <sup>a</sup>  |                |
| <b>Peanut</b>     |                              |                         |                         |                         |                |
| Raw               | 4.50±0.335 <sup>a</sup>      | 3.91±0.182 <sup>a</sup> | 4.58±0.350 <sup>a</sup> | 3.76±0.613 <sup>a</sup> |                |
| Roasted-salted    | 3.11±0.525 <sup>a</sup>      | 2.85±0.166 <sup>a</sup> | 3.25±0.284 <sup>a</sup> | 3.55±0.117 <sup>a</sup> | -              |
| Roasted-unsalted  | 3.47±0.680 <sup>a</sup>      | 3.05±0.485 <sup>a</sup> | 3.18±0.505 <sup>a</sup> | 3.45±0.282 <sup>a</sup> |                |

\* Time of sampling

\*\* Data are presented as mean ± standard deviation

a Mean values with the same superscript along the same column are not significantly different ( $P < 0.05$ ).

The total viable count was within the standard limits in hazelnut, almond, and cashew nut samples (less than 4log cfu/gr). Satisfactory limits of coliforms (lower than 1log cfu/gr) were observed in all almond samples, 91.6% of hazelnut and 16.7% of pista-

chio samples (Table 3). No fecal coliforms were detected in samples (results are not shown). *S.aureus* contamination was found in 6.5% of hazelnut, 8% of almond, 25% of cashew nut, and 33% of peanut samples.

**Table 3.** Results of bacteriological contamination of different nut products

|                       | Total viable count (log cfu/g) |                         |                         |                         | Total coliform (log cfu/g) |                         |                         |                         |
|-----------------------|--------------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|----------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|
|                       | T <sub>1</sub> <sup>a</sup>    | T <sub>2</sub>          | T <sub>3</sub>          | T <sub>4</sub>          | T <sub>1</sub>             | T <sub>2</sub>          | T <sub>3</sub>          | T <sub>4</sub>          |
| <b>Hazelnut</b>       |                                |                         |                         |                         |                            |                         |                         |                         |
| Raw                   | 3.05±0.185**                   | 3.41±0.117 <sup>a</sup> | 3.38±0.179 <sup>a</sup> | 3.25±0.275 <sup>a</sup> | 1.65±0.095 <sup>a</sup>    | 0.91±0.83 <sup>a</sup>  | 1.86±0.117 <sup>a</sup> | 1.60±0.119 <sup>a</sup> |
| Roasted-salted        | 3.89±0.446 <sup>a</sup>        | 2.20±0.238 <sup>a</sup> | 3.50±0.233 <sup>a</sup> | 3.40±0.165 <sup>a</sup> | 1.13±0.092 <sup>a</sup>    | 1.08±0.066 <sup>a</sup> | 1.75±0.105 <sup>a</sup> | 2.11±0.145 <sup>a</sup> |
| Roasted-unsalted      | 3.55±0.475 <sup>a</sup>        | 2.15±0.289 <sup>a</sup> | 3.85±0.171 <sup>a</sup> | 3.23±0.155 <sup>a</sup> | 1.40±0.085 <sup>a</sup>    | 1.61±0.048 <sup>a</sup> | 0.80±0.055 <sup>a</sup> | 1.90±0.121 <sup>a</sup> |
| <b>Pistachio</b>      |                                |                         |                         |                         |                            |                         |                         |                         |
| Raw                   | 4.58±0.713 <sup>a</sup>        | 5.27±0.671 <sup>a</sup> | 5.13±0.91 <sup>a</sup>  | 4.66±0.715 <sup>a</sup> | 1.01±0.040 <sup>a</sup>    | 2.16±0.151 <sup>a</sup> | 0.70±0.032 <sup>a</sup> | 2.11±0.156 <sup>a</sup> |
| Roasted-salted        | 3.95±0.483 <sup>b</sup>        | 3.81±0.115 <sup>b</sup> | 3.70±0.238 <sup>a</sup> | 3.98±0.585 <sup>a</sup> | 1.82±0.150 <sup>b</sup>    | 1.58±0.075 <sup>a</sup> | 2.63±0.115 <sup>a</sup> | 1.91±0.083 <sup>a</sup> |
| Roasted-unsalted      | 4.35±0.550 <sup>a</sup>        | 4.05±0.205 <sup>a</sup> | 4.39±0.871 <sup>a</sup> | 5.13±0.820 <sup>b</sup> | 1.50±0.085 <sup>a</sup>    | 1.44±0.056 <sup>a</sup> | 1.87±0.095 <sup>a</sup> | 0.26±0.009 <sup>a</sup> |
| <b>Almonds</b>        |                                |                         |                         |                         |                            |                         |                         |                         |
| Raw                   | 3.51±0.225 <sup>a</sup>        | 3.90±0.426 <sup>a</sup> | 2.85±0.220 <sup>a</sup> | 3.08±0.172 <sup>a</sup> | 0.38±0.416 <sup>a</sup>    | 0.90±0.075 <sup>a</sup> | 0.85±0.054 <sup>a</sup> | 0.49±0.010 <sup>a</sup> |
| Roasted-salted        | 2.07±0.135 <sup>a</sup>        | 1.72±0.085 <sup>a</sup> | 2.35±0.175 <sup>a</sup> | 2.75±0.215 <sup>a</sup> | 0.67±0.045 <sup>a</sup>    | 0.81±0.060 <sup>a</sup> | 0.52±0.019 <sup>a</sup> | 0.19±0.015 <sup>a</sup> |
| Roasted-unsalted      | 2.66±0.190 <sup>a</sup>        | 2.81±0.115 <sup>a</sup> | 3.05±0.471 <sup>a</sup> | 3.40±0.385 <sup>a</sup> | 0.58±0.022 <sup>a</sup>    | 0.74±0.038 <sup>a</sup> | 0.48±0.011 <sup>a</sup> | 0.97±0.082 <sup>a</sup> |
| <b>Cashew nut</b>     |                                |                         |                         |                         |                            |                         |                         |                         |
| Raw                   | 3.67±0.275 <sup>a</sup>        | 3.11±0.455 <sup>a</sup> | 3.55±0.128 <sup>a</sup> | 4.41±0.317 <sup>a</sup> | 2.71±0.303 <sup>a</sup>    | 2.18±0.145 <sup>a</sup> | 2.27±0.183 <sup>a</sup> | 2.66±0.131 <sup>a</sup> |
| Roasted-salted        | 2.14±0.129 <sup>a</sup>        | 2.51±0.167 <sup>a</sup> | 3.50±0.262 <sup>a</sup> | 3.49±0.232 <sup>a</sup> | 2.59±0.110 <sup>a</sup>    | 2.50±0.265 <sup>a</sup> | 2.03±0.116 <sup>a</sup> | 2.05±0.090 <sup>a</sup> |
| Roasted-unsalted      | 2.80±0.320 <sup>a</sup>        | 3.07±0.285 <sup>a</sup> | 2.95±0.150 <sup>a</sup> | 3.16±0.155 <sup>a</sup> | 2.38±0.439 <sup>a</sup>    | 2.15±0.106 <sup>a</sup> | 2.20±0.195 <sup>a</sup> | 2.75±0.118 <sup>a</sup> |
| <b>Peanut</b>         |                                |                         |                         |                         |                            |                         |                         |                         |
| Raw                   | 4.09±0.239 <sup>a</sup>        | 4.57±0.360 <sup>a</sup> | 4.68±0.310 <sup>a</sup> | 4.91±0.412 <sup>a</sup> | 2.76±0.113 <sup>a</sup>    | 3.25±0.140 <sup>a</sup> | 3.16±0.301 <sup>a</sup> | 2.81±0.115 <sup>a</sup> |
| Roasted-salted        | 4.31±0.181 <sup>a</sup>        | 4.89±0.172 <sup>a</sup> | 4.75±0.241 <sup>a</sup> | 4.06±0.163 <sup>a</sup> | 3.13±0.220 <sup>a</sup>    | 3.28±0.211 <sup>a</sup> | 3.35±0.295 <sup>a</sup> | 2.57±0.200 <sup>a</sup> |
| Roasted-unsalted      | 3.22±0.290 <sup>a</sup>        | 4.07±0.158 <sup>a</sup> | 4.67±0.150 <sup>a</sup> | 4.15±0.201 <sup>a</sup> | 2.55±0.337 <sup>a</sup>    | 2.92±0.127 <sup>a</sup> | 3.87±0.194 <sup>a</sup> | 3.80±0.146 <sup>a</sup> |
| <b>Standard limit</b> |                                |                         | Max 4                   |                         |                            |                         | Max 1                   |                         |

\* Time of sampling \*\* Data are presented as mean ± standard deviation <sup>a</sup> Mean values with the same superscript along the same column are not significantly different ( $P < 0.05$ ).

## Discussion

The moisture contents of all the raw and roasted nuts, except for raw peanut, were above the permissible recommended moisture limit. In comparison to our study, lower moisture content, 5.10-7.2%, and 6.48-7.05% were reported for peanuts from different states of Nigeria by Adetunji et al. (2018) and Oyedele et al. (2017), respectively. Also, the moisture content of our raw and roasted cashew nuts was higher than the results of Adebajo and Diyaolu (2003) who reported a range of moisture content of 4.1–6.8% and higher than the findings of Oluwafemi et al. (2009) who reported a low moisture content range of 3.7–4.3 and 3.2–5.4% for cashew nuts during the dry and raining seasons. Similar results to our work were found by Adetunji et al. (2018) who obtained 5.2-8.6% of moisture content for cashew nuts. There is no report on the moisture content of hazelnut, pistachio or almond. As nuts are hygroscopic materials, they absorb moisture from the surrounding atmosphere. The higher moisture content of the raw samples could be as a result of their raw nature as they have not yet been treated by any form of the drying process. The high moisture contents of the samples may also be as a result of inappropriate packaging, use of improper packaging compositions, and harvesting methods in the farms (Oladapo et al., 2014).

Nuts are vulnerable to fungal attacks at different stages of cultivation, harvesting, sorting, processing, and storage. If the nuts are not properly handled at these stages, it could result in mould development especially when they are not dried enough to be considered as the safe moisture level and stored under conditions suitable for mould growth such as high humidity and temperature (Ab-

dulla, 2013; Adetunji et al., 2014). However, the total bacteria, total coliforms, and fungi load of the almond samples were less than the limits recommended in nuts by the Iran National Standard Commission on Specification for almond as  $10^4$ cfu/gr,  $10^1$ cfu/gr and  $10^2$ cfu/gr, respectively. As reported by Adetunji et al. (2018), total viable count of groundnut and cashew nut in Nigeria was 4.85 and 4.47 log cfu/gr, respectively, which is almost the same as our findings of peanut samples and a little higher than our results from cashew nut microbiological analysis. The lower counts of viable organisms in the almond, hazelnut and cashew nut samples possibly is due to the presence of amygdalin in almond and phenolic compounds in all these three nuts which exert inhibitory effects against bacteria, yeast, and fungi. Although the cashew nut is known to be a rich substrate for microbial growth, an outbreak of intoxication and infections through its consumption had rarely been reported. Also, Torquato et al. (2004) observed that the cashew nut contains the anacardic acid which is an inhibitor for microbial growth. Anacardic acid has lateral chains that are effective against the growth of *S. aureus*. Contaminated food handlers, surfaces, and types of equipment may result in staphylococcal infections that is one of the most important pathogens as a cause of foodborne intoxication. The results show *S. aureus* contamination was observed in all groups of nuts samples except the pistachio. It seems that the shell of pistachio decreases the probability of staphylococcal cross-contamination through handlers or surfaces. Adetunji et al. (2018) reported the presence of *S. aureus* in groundnuts and roasted cashew nuts in Nigeria (2 and 2.1 log cfu/gr). Also, Oluwafemi et al. (2009) announced high contamination of *S.*

*aureus* (> 4 logs cfu/gr) in Nigerian roasted cashew nuts.

As it is observed in the findings of the present work, almond and hazelnut showed the least and pistachio peanut samples the highest microbial contamination. Higher microbial counts of the pistachio and peanut samples than the recommended limit show poor handling practices of the products by the farmers, producers, and sellers. It is recommended that nut processors and handlers meet all the sanitary principles such as personal hygiene, avoid handling nuts in conditions such as sneezing, coughing and getting cold, flu, diarrhea, wounds and lesions, and following proper cleaning standard operation procedure (SOP) for the surfaces and equipment.

### Acknowledgments

This work has been supported by a research grant from the Amol University of Special Modern Technologies, Amol, Iran.

### Conflict of Interest

The authors declared that there is no conflict of interest.

### References

- Abbas, A.R., Baldwin, D., Ma, Y., Ouyang, W., Gurney, A., Martin, F., Fong, S., van Lookeren, C.M., Godowski, P., Williams, P.M., Chan, A.C., Clark, H.F.(2005) Immune response in silico (IRIS): Immune-specific genes identified from a compendium of microarray expression data. *Genes Immun.* 6(4): 319–331. <https://doi.org/10.1038/sj.gene.6364173>. PMID: 15789058
- Abdulla, N.Q.F. (2013) Evaluation of fungal flora and mycotoxin in some important nut products in Erbil local markets. *Res J Environ Earth Sci.* 5: 330–336.
- Adetunji, M., Atanda, O., Ezekiel, C. N., Sulyok, M., Warth, B., Beltrán, E., Krska, R., Adewale, O., Bakare, A., Chilaka, C.A. (2014) Fungal and bacterial metabolites of stored maize (*Zea mays*, L.) from five agro-ecological zones of Nigeria. *Mycotoxin Res.* 30(2): 89–102. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12550-014-0194-2>. PMID: 24643458
- Adebajo, L.O., Diyaolu, S.A. (2003) Mycology and spoilage of retail cashew nuts. *Afr J Biotechnol.* 2(10): 369–373.
- Adetunji, M.C., Aliko, O.P., Awa, N.P., Atanda, O.O., Mwanza, M. (2018) Microbiological quality and risk assessment for aflatoxins in groundnuts and roasted cashew nuts meant for human consumption. *J Toxicol.* 1–11. <https://doi.org/10.1155/2018/1308748>. PMID: 30046306
- European Commission for Taxation and Customs Union. (2019) Coffee, tea, spices, beans, nuts and dried fruit sampling. SAM-118. (1st ed.). [https://ec.europa.eu/taxation\\_customs/dds2/SAMANCTA/EN/SamplingProcedure/Coffee\\_EN.htm](https://ec.europa.eu/taxation_customs/dds2/SAMANCTA/EN/SamplingProcedure/Coffee_EN.htm)
- Institute of Standards and Industrial Research of Iran.(2015) Dry fruits –Determination of the moisture content- test methods. ISIRI no 672. (1st ed.). Karaj, Iran. (Persian) <http://standard.isiri.gov.ir/StandardView.aspx?Id=46679>
- Institute of Standards and Industrial Research of Iran. (2015) Microbiology of the food chain Horizontal method for the enumeration of microorganisms -Part 1:Colony count at 30 °C by the pour plate techniqu. ISIRI no 5272-1. (1st ed.). Karaj, Iran. (Persian) <http://standard.isiri.gov.ir/StandardView.aspx?Id=43263>
- Institute of Standards and Industrial Research of Iran. (2007) Microbiology of food and animal feeding stuffs – Horizontal method for the enumeration of coliforms – Colony-count technique. ISIRI no 9263. (1st ed.). Karaj, Iran. (Persian) <http://standard.isiri.gov.ir/StandardView.aspx?Id=10295>
- Institute of Standards and Industrial Research of Iran. (2005) Microbiology of food and animal feeding stuffs – Enumeration of coagulase – Positive staphylococci (*Staphylococcus aureus* and other species ) – Test method Part 1 : Technique using baird – parker agar medium. ISIRI no 6806–1. (1st ed.). Karaj, Iran. (Per-

- sian) <http://standard.isiri.gov.ir/StandardView.aspx?Id=11206>
- Institute of Standards and Industrial Research of Iran. (2013) Processed cashew kernel– Specifications and test methods. ISIRI no 16032. (1st ed.). Karaj, Iran. (Persian) <http://standard.isiri.gov.ir/StandardView.aspx?Id=38662>
- Institute of Standards and Industrial Research of Iran. (2009) Hazelnut Kernels - Specifications and test methods. ISIRI no 3338. (2nd ed.). Karaj, Iran. (Persian) <http://standard.isiri.gov.ir/StandardView.aspx?Id=44425>
- Institute of Standards and Industrial Research of Iran.(2015) Peanut -Specifications and test methods. ISIRI no 3416. (1st ed.). Karaj, Iran. (Persian)<http://standard.isiri.gov.ir/StandardView.aspx?Id=42156>
- Institute of Standards and Industrial Research of Iran.(2014) Natural Open Pistachio –Specifications. ISIRI no 15. (5th ed.). Karaj, Iran. (Persian)<http://standard.isiri.gov.ir/StandardView.aspx?Id=37045>
- Institute of Standards and Industrial Research of Iran.(2015) Almonds kernel (Sweet and Bitter) Specifications and Test Methods. ISIRI no 16. (3rd ed.). Karaj, Iran. (Persian) <http://standard.isiri.gov.ir/StandardView.aspx?Id=38444>
- Institute of Standards and Industrial Research of Iran. (2013) Processed almond kernel– Specifications and test methods. ISIRI no 16031. (1st ed.). Karaj, Iran. (Persian) <http://standard.isiri.gov.ir/StandardView.aspx?Id=35065>
- Lutfullah, G., Hussain, A. (2011) Studies on contamination level of aflatoxins in some dried fruits and nuts of Pakistan. Food Control. 22(3-4): 426–429. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foodcont.2010.09.015>.
- Oladapo, A.S., Abiodun, O.A., Akintoyese, O., Adepeju, A. (2014) Effect of packaging materials on moisture and microbiological quality of roasted cashew nut (*Anacardium Occidentale* L). Res J Eng Appl Sci.3(2): 98–103.
- Oluwafemi, F., Ewelukwa, U., Okuwa, G. (2009) Outbreak of *E. coli* 0157: H7 infections associated with ready-to eat cashew nuts in a Nigerian university community. Afr J Biomed Res. 12: 113–119.
- Oyedele, O.A., Ezekiel, C.N., Sulyok, M., Ade-tunji, M.C., Warth, B., Atanda, O.O., Krska, R. (2017) Mycotoxin risk assessment for consumers of groundnut in domestic markets in Nigeria. Int J Food Microbiol. 251: 24–32. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijfoodmicro.017.03.020> PMID: 28380344
- Ritter, A.C., Hoeltz, M., Noll, I.B. (2011) Toxicogenic potential of *Aspergillus flavus* tested in different culture conditions. Ciênciæ Tecnologia de Alimentos. 31(3): 623–628. <https://doi.org/10.1590/S0101-20612011000300011>
- Spangenbergi, D.S., Ingham, S.C. (2000) Comparison of methods for enumeration of yeasts and molds in shredded low-moisture, part-skim mozzarella cheese. J Food Prot. Vol. 63(4): 529–533. <https://doi.org/10.4315/0362-028x-63.4.529> PMID: 10772220
- Torquato, D., Ferreira, M., Sa, G., Brito, E., Pinto, G., Azevedo, E. (2004) Evaluation of antimicrobial activity of cashew tree gum. World J Microbiol Biotechnol. 20: 505–507.

## ارزیابی آلودگی در آجیل خام و بو داده توزیع شده در بازار مصرف استان مازندران (ایران)

مریم عزیزخانی<sup>۱</sup>، فرشته جعفری، یویان حقیقی، مائده دهقان

گروه بهداشت مواد غذایی، دانشکده دامپزشکی، دانشگاه تخصصی فناوری های نوین امل، امل، ایران

(دریافت مقاله: ۲۶ آبان ماه ۱۳۹۸، پذیرش نهایی: ۲۴ دی ماه ۱۳۹۸)

### چکیده

**زمینه مطالعه:** آجیل های خام و بو داده یکی از محبوب ترین میان وعده های غذایی مورد مصرف در ایران هستند. اما شرایط و روش نگهداری نامناسب می تواند منجر به رشد میکروارگانیسم ها در آجیل و در نتیجه بروز مسمومیت و عفونت های غذایی در مصرف کننده شود.

**هدف:** هدف از مطالعه حاضر، بررسی کیفیت میکروبی آجیل خام و برشته شده (شور و بدون نمک)، توزیع شده در بازارهای تجاری استان مازندران (ایران) بود.

**روش کار:** میزان رطوبت، تعداد کل باکتری، کلی فرم کل، کلی فرم مدفوعی، استافیلوکوکوس اورئوس و آلودگی قارچی مطابق با روش های استاندارد ملی ایران مورد ارزیابی قرار گرفت.

**نتایج:** مقدار رطوبت محصولات فندق، پسته، بادام درختی و بادام هندی خام و برشته شده بالاتر از حد استاندارد بود. میزان رطوبت بادام زمینی خام در محدوده مجاز (حداکثر ۹٪) قرار داشت اما نمونه های بادام زمینی برشته شده دارای رطوبت بالاتر از حد توصیه شده (۵٪) بودند. در مورد مخمرها و کپک ها، به جز همه نمونه های بادام درختی و ۵۶٪ نمونه های بادام هندی، سایر نمونه ها دارای بار قارچی بیش از حد مجاز بودند. تعداد کل باکتری ها در نمونه های فندق، بادام درختی و بادام هندی در محدوده استاندارد (کمتر از ۴ log cfu/gr) بود. تعداد کلی فرم در همه نمونه های بادام، ۹/۱۶٪ و نمونه های فندق و ۱۶/۷٪ از نمونه های پسته در محدوده قابل قبول (کمتر از ۱ log cfu/gr) قرار داشت. هیچ کلی فرم مدفوعی در نمونه ها مشاهده نشد. آلودگی به استافیلوکوکوس اورئوس در ۶/۵٪ از نمونه های فندق، ۸٪ بادام درختی، ۲۵٪ بادام هندی و ۳۳٪ بادام زمینی شناسایی شد.

**نتیجه گیری نهایی:** مطابق یافته ها، بادام درختی و فندق کمترین و نمونه های بادام زمینی و پسته بیشترین میزان آلودگی میکروبی را نشان دادند.

**واژه های کلیدی:**

بادام درختی، بادام زمینی، بادام هندی، پسته، فندق، بار میکروبی.