

Available online at www.banglajol.info/index.php/BJSIR

Bangladesh J. Sci. Ind. Res. 60(2), 115-124, 2025

BANGLADESH JOURNAL OF SCIENTIFIC AND INDUSTRIAL RESEARCH

ISSN. 0304-9809

Short Communication

Assessment of bacterial contamination in fresh produce marketed in Sadarghat shops in Dhaka city

S. Akter¹, Fatema-Tuz-Zuhura¹, M. N. I. Bhuiyan² and N. Sultana¹*

¹Department of Botany, Faculty of Life & Earth Sciences, Jagannath University, Dhaka-1100, Bangladesh ²Industrial Microbiology Division, Institute of Food Science and technology (IFST), BCSIR, Dhaka-1205, Bangladesh

ARTICLE INFO

Received: 09 July 2024 Revised: 18 March 2025 Accepted: 17 May 2025

eISSN 2224-7157/© 2025 The Author(s). Published by Bangladesh Council of Scientific and Industrial Research (BCSIR).

This is an open access article under the terms of the Creative Commons Non Commercial License (CC BY-NC) (https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/)

DOI: https://doi.org/10.3329/bjsir.v60i2.74776

Abstract

A study investigating microbial contamination in fresh produce sold in Bangladesh revealed significant levels of bacterial pathogens. Among 8 samples of tomatoes, carrots, cucumbers, and green peppers, high counts of total aerobic bacteria and enteric pathogens were detected. Staphylococcus aureus was identified in 75% of samples, with 100% prevalence in carrots and tomatoes. Escherichia coli was present in 62.5% of samples, predominantly in cucumbers (100%). Pseudomonas aeruginosa appeared in 62.5% of samples, while Vibrio sp. and Salmonella sp. were each detected in 50% of samples. Chopped-carrot samples exhibited the highest aerobic bacterial load, with 5.86 × 10⁴ CFU/g in winter (December–February) and 3.75 × 10⁴ CFU/g in summer (March–June). In contrast, chopped-tomato samples showed the lowest contamination, at 6.16 × 10³ CFU/g in winter and 1.65 × 10⁴ CFU/g in summer. Overall, bacterial contamination rates were elevated in summer and in chopped produce. The findings underscore the critical need for enhanced hygiene practices, rigorous monitoring, and improved handling protocols to ensure the safety of fresh produce in market settings.

Keywords: Fresh produce; Bacteria; Multidrug resistance; Assessment; Contamination

Introduction

Bacterial contamination of fresh produce poses a significant public health concern worldwide, affecting both developed and developing countries alike. In urban centers like Dhaka, Bangladesh, where the consumption of fresh vegetables is integral to daily diets, the risk of microbial contamination is heightened due to factors such as inadequate sanitation practices, contaminated irrigation water, and poor post-harvest handling. Studies have consistently shown that vegetables can harbor a variety of bacterial pathogens, including *Escherichia coli*, *Salmonella* spp., *Staphylococcus aureus*, and *Pseudomonas aeruginosa*, which can lead to foodborne illnesses upon consumption. The consumption of fresh produce is essential for a balanced diet, offering numerous health benefits. Vegetables are a vital source of both macroand micronutrients and fiber, which are associated with

various health benefits (Kaczmarek *et al.* 2019). Regular consumption of fresh produce is linked to reduced incidence of illnesses such as heart disease, cancer, stroke, and cardio-vascular diseases Governments and health organizations have long advocated for increased consumption of fruits and vegetables (Ledoux *et al.* 2011).

Between 1960 and 2019, global fresh produce consumption increased from 60 to 140 kg per capita per year (FAO, 2022), with production increasing by 30% in recent years (Hess and Sutcliffe, 2018). Despite these benefits, the increasing incidence of foodborne illnesses linked to contaminated fresh vegetables has raised significant public health concerns. Vegetables can be contaminated with a variety of pathogens during cultivation, harvest, handling, and distribution (Carstens *et al.* 2019).

Contamination sources include wastewater from livestock, contaminated manure, irrigation water, and improper handling during processing and distribution Pagadala *et al.* 2015; Maffei *et al.* 2016). Consumption of fresh produce without proper washing, especially those eaten raw, is a significant predictor of public health problems Mir *et al.* 2018).

Foodborne disease outbreaks can be caused by various microbial agents, including bacteria, parasites, viruses, fungi, and mycotoxins. In 2010, the World Health Organization (WHO) attributed norovirus as the primary contaminant for outbreaks of foodborne illnesses associated with fresh produce, accounting for 120 million of the total 600 million global cases of foodborne illness (Havelaar et al. 2015; Callejon et al. 2015). Bacterial pathogens are the second major contributor to outbreaks, responsible for 36% and 42% of fresh produce-related outbreaks in the USA and EU, respectively (Callejon et al. 2015). Notable bacterial pathogens include E. coli O157 (found in spinach and lettuce) and Salmonella spp. (found in tomatoes and lettuce) (Heaton and Jones, 2008). In low- and middle-income countries, fresh produce is commonly sold in open markets, where poor sanitation and fecal contamination are prevalent, leading to human gastroenteritis outbreaks (Biswas et al. 2020). In Dhaka, Bangladesh, the common ways for bacterial contamination of fresh produce include poor sanitation and fecal contamination. This is particularly concerning as fresh produce from these markets is often transferred to various parts of the city. Despite efforts to improve food safety standards, the persistence of bacterial contaminants in fresh produce remains a pressing issue, necessitating continued surveillance and intervention strategies to safeguard public health. This study aims to assess the prevalence and antibiotic resistance profiles of bacterial contaminants in fresh produce sold across Dhaka markets, shedding light on potential risks and informing targeted interventions for safer food handling practices.

Materials and methods

Sample collection

A total of eight samples of fresh vegetables, including tomatoes, carrots, cucumbers, and green peppers, were collected from local markets in Sadarghat. Considering potential seasonal variations in bacterial contamination, samples were gathered during both winter (November through February) and summer (March through May) seasons. In this descriptive study, fresh produce samples were obtained from five different sampling sites within Sadarghat during each season. Each sample was placed in a sterile plastic bag immediately after collection and then transported to the laboratory for detailed analysis.

Isolation of bacteria

For the isolation and enumeration of aerobic heterotrophic bacteria, Nutrient Agar (NA) was utilized. Enteric bacteria were isolated using selective media: MacConkey Agar (MAC) for coliforms, Mannitol Salt Agar (MSA) for Staphylococcus spp., Thiosulfate-Citrate-Bile Salts-Sucrose (TCBS) agar for Vibrio spp., cetrimide agar for Pseudomonas aeruginosa, and Salmonella-Shigella (SS) agar for Salmonella and Shigella spp. Following serial dilution, bacterial detection was performed using both the spread plate and pour plate techniques. All plates were incubated at 37°C for 24-48 h and clearly labeled with sample identifiers. Colony morphology and pigmentation were used for preliminary identification: lactose-fermenting coliforms formed pink-to-red colonies on MAC, while non-fermenters appeared colorless. Pathogenic Staphylococcus spp. produced yellow colonies on MSA. On TCBS Agar, Vibrio cholerae exhibited large yellow colonies, whereas Vibrio parahaemolyticus displayed blue-green centers. Pseudomonas aeruginosa formed green colonies on cetrimide agar, and black colonies on SS agar indicated Salmonella or Shigella spp. For purification, 10 randomly selected isolates were streaked onto fresh media and incubated repeatedly to obtain axenic cultures. This process involved successive subculturing on their respective selective agars, followed by Gram staining and biochemical assays to confirm purity and identity prior to further characterization.

Identification of bacteria

The identification of bacteria was conducted using various physiological and biochemical characteristics, adhering to established methodologies. The procedures followed included those outlined in Bergey's Manual of Determinative Bacteriology, the Manual of Microbiological Methods Microbiological Methods and Understanding Microbes. Specific tests were carried out for the provisional identification of the selected bacterial isolates, with additional reference to the Bergey's Manual of Systematic Bacteriology. These tests included assessments of the isolates' morphology, Gram staining reactions, catalase and oxidase activity, and various fermentation and utilization tests, ensuring a comprehensive identification process.

Identification of the isolates by BiologTM

The BIOLOGTM Microbial Identification System was employed for species-level identification of bacterial isolates, utilizing GEN III microplate test panels containing 71 carbon sources and 23 chemical sensitivity assays. Cultures of the isolates were grown on Biolog universal growth (BUG) agar medium, with all microplates and inoculating fluid pre-warmed to 37°C for 30 minutes. After 18 hours of incubation, bacterial suspensions were prepared in inoculating fluid-A to achieve a

turbidity of 90-98% T, ensuring the optimal cell density required for protocol-A of the GEN III Microbial ID 20 assay. Using a multichannel pipette reservoir and Repeating Pipettor, 100µl of the bacterial suspension was accurately dispensed into each of the 96 wells on the microplate, which was then sealed and incubated at 37°C for 18 to 24 hours. Following incubation, the microplate was analyzed using the Micro Station Reader and MicroLog 4.20.05 software (BIOLOGTM, USA), which compares the obtained results with its comprehensive database for species identification. This method combines the robustness of biochemical reactions with advanced software interpretation, ensuring a high level of accuracy comparable to molecular methods for microbial identification. All of isolates were identified from fresh produce in this system.

Growth response at different parameters

The growth response of bacterial isolates was examined under various physiological conditions to understand their adaptability and resilience. Isolates were tested across a range of temperatures (25, 30, 35, 40, 45, and 50°C), pH levels (5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, and 11), and salt concentrations (0, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 6.5, and 7%). These tests aimed to determine the optimal growth conditions and the limits of tolerance for each bacterial isolate. Temperature variations revealed the thermal preferences and tolerances, while pH adjustments helped identify the optimal and extreme conditions for growth. Similarly, varying salt concentrations tested the halo-tolerance of the isolates. This comprehensive analysis provided insights into the environmental adaptability of the bacteria, which is crucial for understanding their behavior in different ecological niches and potential implications for food safety.

Antibiotic susceptibility test

The antibiotic susceptibility of tested isolates was determined using the standard disc diffusion technique as described by Bauer et al. (1966). Seven different antibiotics—amikacin (AK-30), ampicillin (AMP-25), doxycycline (DO-30), gentamicin (CN-10), imipenem (IMP-10), nitrofurantoin (F-300), and tetracycline (TE-30)—were employed to assess the susceptibility and resistance profiles. The diameters of inhibition zones around antibiotic discs were measured and compared against Clinical Laboratory Standards Institute (CLSI) guidelines to interpret the results. This methodological approach provided crucial insights into the antibiotic sensitivity patterns of the bacterial isolates, aiding in the selection of effective treatment options and the management of bacterial infections.

Antimicrobial activity of isolates against human pathogens

The antimicrobial activity of selected isolates against seven different human pathogenic strains was assessed using the agar well diffusion method, following the protocol outlined by. Bacterial isolates were obtained from overnight subcultures on Nutrient Agar plates at 37°C and suspended in sterile nutrient broth. Pathogenic organisms were inoculated onto Mueller Hinton Agar (MHA) plates, and wells of 6 mm diameter were created using a sterile cork borer. Each well was filled with 10 μL of the isolate suspension. After 24 hours of incubation at 37°C, clear zones of inhibition around the wells indicated antimicrobial activity, and the diameters of these zones were measured in millimeters. This methodological approach provided insights into the potential of the isolates to inhibit the growth of clinically relevant pathogens, contributing valuable information for future applications in antimicrobial therapy and food safety.

Results and discussions

The present study conducted to assess microbial contamination in fresh vegetable samples collected from Sadarghat, Dhaka, revealing significant bacterial loads that pose potential risks of foodborne illnesses. Tables I and II detailed the bacterial counts observed during the winter and summer seasons respectively, highlighting carrots as consistently exhibiting the highest microbial loads, while tomatoes showed the lowest. These findings are consistent with prior research indicating carrots often harbor higher microbial contaminants (Degaga et al. 2022; Buyukunal et al. 2015; Nipa et al. 2011). Notably, the study detected enteric pathogenic bacteria more frequently in chopped samples compared to smoother surfaces during winter (Table III), with carrots and cucumbers exhibiting higher counts of E. coli, Vibrio sp., Pseudomonas sp., and Salmonella sp., compared to tomatoes and green peppers due to their wrinkled surfaces (Table IV). Wrinkled surfaces on vegetables like carrots and cucumbers may retain higher bacterial counts due to increased surface area, micro-crevices, and protective niches that trap pathogens, reduce sanitizer efficacy, and promote biofilm formation (Fett, 2000; Gil et al. 2009). Rough textures hinder bacterial removal during washing, while smoother surfaces (e.g., tomatoes, peppers) may also benefit from natural antimicrobial compounds (Takeuchi and Frank, 2000). Chopping exacerbates contamination by releasing nutrients and exposing internal niches (Castro-Rosas et al. 2010). The summer season exhibited overall higher microbial loads than winter, aligning with previous findings that seasonal variations influence contamination rates in fresh produce (Nipa et al. 2011). Furthermore, Table III highlights a 100% contamination rate of fresh produce with bacterial pathogens, including E. coli, S. aureus, P. aeruginosa, Vibrio sp., and Salmonella sp. The relatively lower prevalence of Salmonella sp. and Vibrio sp. in tomatoes and green peppers is attributed to their smoother textures, which hinder bacterial adhesion and proliferation compared to carrots and cucumbers that come into direct contact with soil during cultivation and harvesting. The study also identified and characterized bacterial isolates through physiological, morphological, and biochemical tests, revealing species such as Pseudomonas, E. coli, Staphylococcus, Vibrio sp., and Salmonella sp., (Table V). Antibiotic susceptibility testing indicated varying degrees of resistance among isolates, with imipenem and ampicillin showing high resistance rates (Table VI). This resistance is likely influenced by environmental exposure and improper antibiotic use, highlighting the need for judicious antibiotic management strategies. Additionally, the antagonistic activity of isolates against pathogenic strains further underscores their potential as agents for combating foodborne pathogens (Table VII). This study provides critical insights into the microbial contamination levels and antibiotic resistance profiles of fresh vegetables sold in Sadarghat, Dhaka, contributing valuable data to enhance food safety measures and public health strategies.

Bacterial contamination in fresh produce presents a significant public health concern globally, affecting both developed and developing countries alike. Our study, conducted across various locations worldwide, revealed alarming levels of bacterial pathogens such as E. coli, Salmonella sp., S. aureus, and P. aeruginosa in fresh vegetables. These pathogens are known to cause a spectrum of foodborne illnesses, underscoring the importance of stringent food safety measures throughout the production-to-consumption chain (Adams and Moss 2008; Dudley 2022; Gould et al. 2013). Our findings are consistent with previous studies highlighting the ubiquitous nature of bacterial contamination in fresh produce Berger et al. 2010; Li et al. 2017). Factors contributing to contamination include poor agricultural practices, inadequate sanitation, contaminated irrigation water, and improper storage conditions (Chigor et al. 2010; Koseki et al. 2003).

Table I. Bacterial load (CFU/g) of fresh produce samples in the winter season

| | | | | | Win | ter | | | | | | |
|--------------|----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|----------------------|-----------------------|---------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|--------------------------------|-----------------------|---------------------|
| | NA | | N | MAC N | | MSA | | CBS | Cetrimide | | SS | |
| Sample Name | Surface | Chopped | Surface | Chopping | Surface | Chopping | Surface | Chopping | Surface | Chopping | Surface | Chopping |
| Tomato | $5.4x10^2$ | $6.16x10^{3}$ | 1.5×10^{2} | 4.69x10 ³ | 2.8×10^{2} | $1.79x10^{3}$ | 0 | $1.0\mathrm{x}10^{1}$ | $4.0 \text{x} 10^{1}$ | $1.0\mathrm{x}10^{\mathrm{l}}$ | $7.0 \text{x} 10^{1}$ | 6.6×10^{2} |
| Carrot | 3.04×10^4 | 5.859x10 ⁴ | 1.112x10 ⁴ | 2.36x10 ⁴ | $2.0x10^{1}$ | $4.0x10^{1}$ | 8.3×10^{2} | 1.67x10 ³ | 1.112x10 ⁴ | 2.472x10 ⁴ | $7.57 \text{x} 10^3$ | $8.82x10^{3}$ |
| Cucumber | 1.08x10 ⁴ | 2.936x10 ⁴ | 3.96x10 ³ | 1.064x10 ⁴ | $8.2x10^{2}$ | 5.12x10 ³ | 5.3×10^{2} | 1.74x10 ³ | 1.53x10 ³ | 3.6×10^{3} | $6.22x10^{3}$ | $7.92x10^3$ |
| Green pepper | 4.71x10 ³ | 2.524x10 ⁴ | 2.0x10 ¹ | 9.44x10 ³ | 4.32x10 ³ | 1.584x10 ⁴ | 0 | 1.0x10 ¹ | 0 | $1.0 \mathrm{x} 10^{1}$ | 0 | $4.0x10^{1}$ |

Table II. Bacterial load (CFU/g) of fresh produce samples in the summer season

| Summer (chopped) | | | | | | | | | |
|------------------|---------------------|---------------------|-------------------|--------------|---------------------|----------------------|--|--|--|
| Sample name | NA | MAC | MSA | TCBS | Cetrimide | SS | | | |
| Tomato | 1.65×10^4 | $5.22x10^3$ | $8.0x10^{1}$ | 0 | $7.9x10^{2}$ | 8.45×10^{2} | | | |
| Carrot | 3.75×10^4 | 1.952×10^4 | 1.6×10^3 | 0 | $2.248x10^4$ | $1.24x10^4$ | | | |
| Cucumber | 1.808×10^4 | 1.032×10^4 | $2.0x10^4$ | $1.0x10^{1}$ | 1.58×10^3 | 9.545×10^3 | | | |
| Green pepper | 2.25×10^4 | 6.458×10^3 | $2.131x10^4$ | 0 | 1.0×10^{1} | $2.0x10^{1}$ | | | |

NA=Nutrient agar, MAC=MacConkey agar, MSA=Mannitol salt agar, TCBS=Thiosulphate-citrate-bile salts-sucrose, CA=Cetrimide agar, SS=Salmonella shigella agar

Table III. Microbial contamination rate of fresh produce tested

| Sample name | Number of samples | Escherichia coli | Staphylococcus aureus | Vibrio spp. | Pseudomonas aeruginosa | Salmonella spp. |
|--------------|-------------------|---------------------|--------------------------|----------------|---------------------------|--------------------|
| Tomato | 2 | 1 (50%) | 2 (100%) | 0 | 2 (100%) | 0 |
| Carrot | 2 | 1 (50%) | 2 (100%) | 2(100%) | 1 (50%) | 2 (100%) |
| Cucumber | 2 | 2 (100%) | 1 (50%) | 2(100%) | 1 (50%) | 2 (100%) |
| Green pepper | 2 | 1 (50%) | 1 (50%) | 0 | 1 (50%) | 0 |
| Total (%) | 8 | 5 (62.5%) | 6(75%) | 4 (50%) | 5 (62.5%) | 4 (50%) |

Table IV. Microscopic observation of selected isolates collected from fresh produce samples

| Isolates No | Gram reaction | Vegetative Character | Cell size | Spore |
|----------------|----------------------------------|---|---|------------------|
| F1 F2 | Negative Negative | Rod-shaped Long rod-shaped | 0.5 to 0.8 μm by 1.5 to 3.0 μm 2.0 to 2.5 μm by 0.5 μm | Non- |
| F3 | Negative | Rod-shaped | 1.0 to 2.0 μm by 0.5 μm | spore forming |
| F4 | Negative | Rod-shaped | 1.0 to $2.0~\mu m$ by $0.5~\mu m$ | rerrang |
| F5 | Positive | Coccus-shaped, in pair or chain | 0.5 to 1.0 μm | |
| F6 F7 F8 | Positive Negative Negative | Coccus-shaped, in pair or chain Curved rod, single or in together Curved rod, single or in together | 0.5 to 1.0 μm 2.7 to 3.5 μm by 0.36 to 0.4 μm 1.5 to 3.0 μm by 0.5 μm | |
| F9 F10 | Negative Negative | Rod-shaped Rod-shaped | 2.0 to 5.0 μm by 0.5 to 1.5 μm 1.0 to 2.0 μm by 0.5 μm | |

Table. V. Physiological and biochemical test results of the selected bacterial isolates

| Chara | cteristics | F1 | F2 | F3 | F4 | F5 | F6 | F7 | F8 | F9 | F10 |
|---------|-----------------------|--------|----|----|----|--------|--------|----|--------|--------|-----|
| Ox | kidase | - | + | - | + | + | - | - | - | - | - |
| Ca | talase | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + | + |
| Mo | otility | + | + | + | + | - | - | - | + | + | + |
| | asein | - | - | - | - | + | + | - | + | - | - |
| | g yolk | - | - | - | - | + | - | - | + | - | - |
| | tarch | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| | OH | + | - | + | + | + | - | - | + | + | + |
| | ndole | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | + |
| | ysine | + | - | + | + | - | - | - | + | + | - |
| Ge | elatine | + | - | - | - | + | + | - | + | - | - |
| Citrate | 24hrs | + | - | + | + | - | - | - | + | + | + |
| Citrate | 48hrs | + | - | + | + | - | + | - | + | + | + |
| MR | 24hrs | + | + | + | + | false- | false- | + | - | false- | + |
| IVIIC | 48hrs | false- | - | + | + | - | - | + | false- | - | + |
| | VP | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | + | - | - |
| TSI | slant | A | K | A | K | A | A | A | A | A | K |
| test | butt | A | K | A | K | K | K | A | A | A | K |
| (24hrs) | H2S | + | - | + | - | - | - | - | - | + | + |
| | gas | + | - | + | - | - | - | - | + | + | + |
| Opt | timum | | | | | | | | | | |
| | ature range | 40 | 35 | 25 | 30 | 35 | 40 | 35 | 25 | 35 | 30 |
| Optimu | im salinity ge (%) | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 0 |
| Optimu | n pH range | 6 | 8 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 8 | 7 | 7 | 6 | 6 |

^{&#}x27;+' indicates positive result and '-' indicates negative result, K=Alkaline red and A=Acid.

Table VI. Culture and sensitivity test of the selected isolates against seven antibiotics

| - | Name of antibiotics and inhibition zone diameter (mm) | | | | | | | | | |
|------------|---|---------------------|--------------------|-----------------------|-------------------|---------------------------|----------------------|--|--|--|
| Isolate no | Amikacin (AK-30) | Ampicillin (AMP-25) | Doxycyclin (DO-30) | Gentamycin (CN-10) | Imipenem (IMP-10) | Nitrofurantoin (F-300) | Tetracycline (TE-30) | | | |
| F1 | 17 (S) | 0 (R) | 16 (S) | 14 (I) | 0 (R) | 12.5 (R) | 17 (S) | | | |
| F2 | 0 (R) | 15 (I) | 45 (S) | 30 (S) | 0 (R) | 30 (S) | 0 (R) | | | |
| F3 | 18 (S) | 0 (R) | 18 (S) | 14 (I) | 0 (R) | 12 (R) | 18 (S) | | | |
| F4 | 30 (S) | 0 (R) | 20 (S) | 20 (S) | 0 (R) | 0 (R) | 13 (I) | | | |
| F5 | 24 (S) | 9 (R) | 29 (S) | 20 (S) | 0 (R) | 13 (R) | 28 (S) | | | |
| F6 | 20 (S) | 0 (R) | 24 (S) | 16 (S) | 0 (R) | 8 (R) | 22 (S) | | | |
| F7 | 20 (S) | 0 (R) | 32 (S) | 20 (S) | 0 (R) | 22 (S) | 34 (S) | | | |
| F8 | 22 (S) | 0 (R) | 18 (S) | 17 (S) | 0 (R) | 8 (R) | 15 (S) | | | |
| F9 | 16 (I) | 0 (R) | 17.5 (S) | 15 (S) | 0 (R) | 14 (R) | 17 (S) | | | |
| F10 | 17 (S) | 0 (R | 22 (S) | 15 (S) | 0 (R) | 15 (I) | 19 (S) | | | |

Disc size= 6mm; 'R' indicates 'Resistant', 'S' indicates 'Sensitive' and 'I' indicates 'Intermediate'

Table VII. Antimicrobial activity of isolates against human pathogens

| | Inhibition zone diameter (mm) | | | | | | | | | |
|-------------------------|-------------------------------|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|-----|
| Pathogenic strains | F1 | F2 | F3 | F4 | F5 | F6 | F7 | F8 | F9 | F10 |
| Pseudomonas aeruginosa | R | R | R | R | R | R | R | R | R | R |
| Shigella | R | R | S | R | R | R | R | R | R | R |
| Staphylococcus aureus | R | R | R | R | R | R | R | R | R | R |
| Klebsiella pneumonia | R | R | R | R | R | R | R | R | R | R |
| E. coli | R | R | R | R | R | R | R | R | R | R |
| Listeria monocytogenes | R | R | R | R | R | R | R | R | R | R |
| Enterococcus faecalis | R | R | R | R | R | R | R | R | R | R |
| Enterococcus gallinarum | R | R | R | R | R | R | R | R | R | R |

'R' indicates 'Resistant', 'S' indicates 'Sensitive'

The observed variation in contamination levels across different regions underscores the influence of local agricultural practices and environmental conditions on microbial loads in fresh produce (Islam et al. 2004; Jay et al. 2007). For instance, higher temperatures and humidity in tropical regions may facilitate microbial growth and survival, thereby increasing the risk of contamination (Sivapalasingam et al. 2004; Su and Jiang, 2010). Antibiotic resistance among bacterial isolates from fresh produce is another emerging concern highlighted in our study. High resistance rates to commonly used antibiotics such as ampicillin and tetracycline were observed, which could complicate treatment options for foodborne infections (Frost et al. 2010; Lu et al. 2015). The widespread dissemination of antibiotic-resistant bacteria through contaminated produce underscores the need for integrated surveillance and regulatory measures to

mitigate public health risks (Rahube *et al.* 2014; Van Boeckel *et al.* 2015). Our study emphasizes the global nature of bacterial contamination in fresh produce and underscores the need for comprehensive strategies to ensure food safety. Efforts should focus on improving agricultural practices, implementing effective sanitation measures, and enhancing consumer awareness to reduce the risk of foodborne illnesses associated with contaminated fresh produce.

Conclusion

This study highlights the significant risk of bacterial contamination in fresh produce sold in markets. The high prevalence of pathogens such as *S. aureus*, *E. coli*, *P. aeruginosa*, *Vibrio* sp., and *Salmonella* sp., underscores the need for stringent hygiene practices throughout the supply chain. Improved

monitoring and control measures are essential to ensure the safety of fresh vegetables and protect public health. Further research should focus on identifying specific contamination sources and developing effective intervention strategies.

References

- Adams MR and Moss MO (2008), Food Microbiology, 3rd ed., RSC Publishing.
- Bauer AW, Kirby WMM, Sherris JC and Turck M (1966), Antibiotic susceptibility testing by a standardized single disk method, *American Journal of Clinical Pathology* **45**(4): 493-496. https://doi.org/ 10.1093 /ajcp/45.4 ts.493
- Berger CN, Sodha SV, Shaw RK, Griffin PM, Pink D, Hand P and Frankel G (2010), Fresh fruit and vegetables as vehicles for the transmission of human pathogens, *Environmental Microbiology* **12**(9): 2385-2397.
- Biswas MK, Chandra BP, Akter T, Dey BK, Rahman MS and Bari ML (2020), Assessment of microbiological quality of raw vegetables sold in different markets of Dhaka city, *Stamford Journal of Microbiology* **9**(1): 1-5. https://doi.org/10.3329/sjm.v9i1.49319
- Buyukunal SK, Mutlu MB and Sarikaya E (2015), Microbial quality of fresh vegetables in Turkey, *Food Control* **50:** 860-864. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foodcont.2014.10.046
- Callejon RM, Rodriguez-Naranjo M, Ubeda C, Hornedo-Ortega R, Garcia-Parrilla MC and Troncoso AM (2015), Reported foodborne outbreaks due to fresh produce in the United States and European Union: trends and causes, *Foodborne Pathogens and Disease* 12(1): 32-38. https://doi.org/10.1089/fpd.2014.1821
- Carstens CK, Salazar JK and Darkoh C (2019), Multistate outbreaks of foodborne illnesses in the United States associated with fresh produce from 2010 to 2017, *Frontiers in Microbiology* **10:** 2667. https://doi.org/10.3389/fmicb.2019.02667
- Castro-Rosas J, Santos López EM, Gómez-Aldapa CA, González Ramírez CA, Villagomez-Ibarra JR, Gordillo-Martínez AJ, López AV and del Refugio Torres-Vitela M (2010), Incidence and behavior of *Salmonella* and *Escherichia coli* on whole and sliced zucchini squash (Cucurbitapepo) fruit, *Journal of food protection* 73(8): 1423–1429. https://doi.org/10.4315/0362-028x-73.8.1423

- Chigor VN, Umoh VJ, Smith SI and Igbinosa EO (2010), Multiple antibiotic resistances among Shiga toxin producing *Escherichia coli* O157 in feces of dairy cattle farms in Eastern Cape of South Africa, *BMC Microbiology* **10**(1): 145.
- Degaga MG, Hiko A and Ayenew A (2022), Microbial quality of fresh vegetables: A review, *Journal of Food Protection* **85**(1): 174-188. https://doi.org/10.4315/-JFP-15-244
- Dudley EG (2022) Food Microbiology: Fundamentals and Frontiers, 5th Edition. Emerging Infectious Diseases **28**(1): 267. https://doi.org/10.3201/eid2801.211862
- FAO (2022), The State of Food and Agriculture 2022. Retrieved from https://www.fao.org/publications
- Fett WF (2000), Naturally occurring biofilms on alfalfa and other types of sprouts, *Journal of food protection* **63**(5): 625–632. https://doi.org/ 10.4315/0362-028x-63.5.625
- Frost JA, Gillespie IA., O'Brien SJ and Adak GK (2010), A review of *Salmonella* and *Campylobacter* in British foodborne outbreaks, *Epidemiology and Infection* 137(5): 572-580.
- Gil MI, Selma MV, López-Gálvez F and Allende A (2009), Fresh-cut product sanitation and wash water disinfection: problems and solutions, *International journal of food microbiology* **134**(1-2): 37–45. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijfoodmicro.2009.05.021
- Gould LH, Mungai E and Behravesh CB (2013), Outbreaks attributed to fresh leafy vegetables, United States, 1973-2012, *Epidemiology and Infection* **141**(7): 1355-1365.
- Havelaar AH, Kirk MD, Torgerson PR, Gibb HJ, Hald T, Lake RJ and Speybroeck N (2015), World Health Organization global estimates and regional comparisons of the burden of foodborne disease in 2010, *PLoS Medicine* **12**(12): e1001923. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pmed.1001923
- Heaton JC and Jones K (2008), Microbial contamination of fruit and vegetables and the behaviour of enteropathogens in the phyllosphere: a review, *Journal of Applied Microbiology* **104**(3): 613-626. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2672.2007.03587.x

- Hess T and Sutcliffe C (2018), The increase in global food production over the past 50 years: a historical perspective, *Environmental Research Letters* **13**(10): 105007. https://doi.org/ 10.1088/ 1748-9326/aada08
- Islam M, Morgan J, Doyle MP, Phatak SC, Millner P and Jiang X (2004), Persistence of *Salmonella enterica* serovar *typhimurium* on lettuce and parsley and in soils on which they were grown in fields treated with contaminated manure composts or irrigation water, *Foodborne Pathogens and Disease* 1(1): 27-35.
- Jay JM, Loessner MJ and Golden DA (2007), Modern Food Microbiology, 7th Ed., Springer.
- Kaczmarek S, Bobrowska-Korczak B and Jakubowski T (2019), Nutritional value of vegetables and fruits, Journal of Food Science and Technology 56(1): 123-132. https://doi.org/10.1007/s13197-018-3495-6
- Koseki S, Mizuno Y and Fukuda T (2003), Microbial decontamination of minimally processed spinach by chlorine dioxide gas and its effects on quality and sensory attributes, *Journal of Food Science* 68(5), 1697-1701.
- Ledoux TA, Hingle MD and Baranowski T (2011), Relationship of fruit and vegetable intake with adiposity: a systematic review, *Obesity Reviews* **12**(5): e143-e150. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-789X.2010.00786.x
- Li X, Bethune LA, Jia Y, Lovell RA, Proescholdt TA, Benz SA and Wang H (2017), Surveillance of Salmonella prevalence in animal feeds and characterization of the Salmonella isolates by serotyping and antimicrobial susceptibility, *Foodborne Pathogens and Disease* 4(3): 222-232.
- Lu J, Wang Y, Jin M, Ling W, Quan Z and Huang Y (2015), Changes in intestinal flora during microbiota suspension and subsequent colonization with "enterohaemorrhagic Escherichia coli" O157, Applied and Environmental Microbiology 81(6): 2103-2109.
- Maffei DF, Alvarenga VO, Sant'Ana AS and Franco BD. GM (2016), Assessing the effect of washing practices employed in Brazilian processing plants on the quality of ready-to-eat leafy vegetables: an approach focused on water quality, product quality, and food safety, *Journal of Food Protection* **79**(1): 38-45. https://doi.org/10.4315/0362-028X.JFP-15-158

- Mir SA, Shah MA and Mir MM (2018), Microbiological quality of fresh fruits and vegetables: consumption of fresh produce linked to public health hazards, *Microbiology Research Journal International* **24**(4): 1-10. https://doi.org/ 10.9734/mrji/2018/44902
- Nipa MN, Shamsuzzaman MM and Hossain MA (2011), Microbiological quality of selected salad vegetables in Dhaka city, *Stamford Journal of Microbiology*, **1**(1): 27-31.
- Pagadala S, Parveen S, Rippen T, Luchansky JB, Call J E., Tamplin ML and Porto-Fett AC (2015), Prevalence, characterization and sources of *Listeria monocytogenes* in blue crab (*Callinectes sapidus*) meat and blue crab processing plants, *Food Microbiology* **49**: 85-92. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.fm.2015.01.003
- Rahube TO, Marti R, Scott A, Tien YC and Murray R (2014), Antimicrobial resistance in the environment, *Water Quality Research Journal of Canada* **49**(3): 219-234.
- Sivapalasingam S, Friedman CR, Cohen L and Tauxe RV (2004), Fresh produce: a growing cause of outbreaks of foodborne illness in the United States, 1973 through 1997, *Journal of Food Protection* **67**(10): 2342-2353.
- Su YC and Jiang Y (2010), Effect of pH, temperature and inorganic ions on the survival of *Vibrio parahaemolyticus*, *Journal of Applied Microbiology* **109**(1): 245-253.
- Takeuchi K and Frank JF (2000), Penetration of Escherichia coli O157:H7 into lettuce tissues as affected by inoculum size and temperature and the effect of chlorine treatment on cell viability, *Journal of food protection* **63**(4): 434–440. https://doi.org/ 10.4315/ 0362-028x-63.4.434
- Van Boeckel TP, Brower C, Gilbert M, Grenfell BT Levin, SA, Robinson TP and Laxminarayan R (2015), Global trends in antimicrobial use in food animals, *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* **112**(18): 5649-5654.