Technical note: High-throughput method for antifungal activity screening in a cheese-mimicking model

Lucille Garnier,*† Marcia Leyva Salas,*† Nicolas Pinon,† Norman Wiernasz,* Audrey Pawtowski,* Emmanuel Coton,* Jérôme Mounier,* and Florence Valence†¹

*Université de Brest, EA 3882, Laboratoire Universitaire de Biodiversité et Ecologie Microbienne, ESIAB, Technopôle Brest-Iroise, 29280 Plouzané, France

†STLO, Agrocampus Ouest, INRA, 35000 Rennes, France

ABSTRACT

In this study, we developed a high-throughput antifungal activity screening method using a cheese-mimicking matrix distributed in 24-well plates. This method allowed rapid screening of a large variety of antifungal agent candidates: bacterial fermented ingredients, bacterial isolates, and preservatives. Using the proposed method, we characterized the antifungal activity of 44 lactic acid bacteria (LAB) fermented milk-based ingredients and 23 LAB isolates used as protective cultures against 4 fungal targets (*Mucor racemosus*, *Penicillium commune*, *Galactomyces geotrichum*, and *Yarrowia lipolytica*). We also used this method to determine the minimum inhibitory concentration of a preservative, natamycin, against 9 fungal targets. The results underlined the strain-dependency of LAB antifungal activity, the strong effect of fermentation substrate on this activity, and the effect of the screening medium on natamycin minimum inhibitory concentration. Our method could achieved a screening rate of 1,600 assays per week and can be implemented to evaluate antifungal activity of microorganisms, fermentation products, or purified compounds compatible with dairy technology.

Key words: high-throughput screening, antifungal activity, cheese model

Technical Note

Fungal spoilage of dairy products remains a major concern for dairy manufacturers despite the use of preventive and control approaches, including the use of chemical preservatives. Among methods that are increasingly used by industries for microbial contaminant control, biopreservation is gaining increasing attention due to strong societal (Gerez et al., 2013) and legisla-

tive (Fuselli et al., 2012; Stratford et al., 2013) demand for preservative-free products. Biopreservation can be defined as using natural or added microbiota or their antimicrobial compounds to preserve a food product (in terms of safety and quality) and possibly extend its shelf life (Stiles, 1996). Lactic acid bacteria (**LAB**) are well known for their ability to exhibit antifungal activity (Schillinger and Villareal, 2010; Wulijideligen and Taku, 2011; Cheong et al., 2014) and protective cultures containing LAB, such as FreshQ (consisting of *Lactobacillus paracasei* and *Lactobacillus rhamnosus* strains; Chr. Hansen, Hørsholm, Denmark) or the HOLDBAC series (consisting of various lactobacilli and propionibacteria; Danisco/DuPont, Madison, WI), are currently used in dairy products for their antifungal properties (Varsha and Nampoothiri, 2016). Recently, Inglin et al. (2015) developed a high-throughput screening method to detect antimicrobial (including antifungal) activities using an agar-spot assay in 24-well plates. This method enabled screening of 2,000 assays per day. However, despite being a useful primary high-throughput screening method for developing protective cultures, this antifungal screening assay used de Man, Rogosa, and Sharpe (**MRS**) agar medium, which can strongly affect expression of antifungal properties and antifungal molecule activity. Indeed, as mentioned in several articles (Stiles et al., 2002; Delavenne et al., 2012; Le Lay et al., 2016), MRS contains acetate, which may reinforce LAB antifungal activity and artificially inflate the number of active isolates. However, assays applied to real food matrices (e.g., dairy product models such as yogurt) can rapidly become labor intensive, thereby reducing the number of isolates that can be screened to detect strains with antifungal activity (Lynch et al., 2014; Delavenne et al., 2015). In addition, these methods do not allow large-scale and rapid screening of antifungal cultures or compounds.

In the present study, we present a high-throughput screening assay for antifungal activity in a cheese-mimicking matrix distributed in a 24-well plate. The

Received July 18, 2017.

Accepted November 30, 2017.

¹Corresponding author: florence.valence-bertel@inra.fr

proposed method allowed testing the antifungal activity of a large variety of microbial protective compounds: bacterial fermentation products, bacterial cultures used as adjunct cultures, and purified antifungal preservatives. To prepare the cheese-mimicking matrix, we used a standardized UF milk retentate (3.4×; 244 g/kg of DM, 65.8 g/kg total fat, 116.2 g/kg of total N, pH 6.53) prepared according to Hannon et al. (2006). Briefly, whole raw cow milk was heated to 50°C and skimmed using a cream separator (Westfalia, Handelsweg, the Netherlands). Skim milk was then microfiltered (0.8-µm Sterilox GP membrane, Pall Corp., Port Washington, NY) at 50°C using the pilot equipment GP7 (Brenet, Mamirolle, France) and cream was heat-treated for 2 min at 95°C followed by fat standardization (20 g/kg final concentration). The retentate was ultrafiltered at 0.02 µm at 50°C (T.I.A., Bollene, France) and sterilized sodium chloride (Sogebul, Sainte-Maure de Touraine, France) was added to reach 0.7% (wt/wt). The salted retentate was heat-treated for 2 min at 95°C (Microthermics, Raleigh, NC), distributed in 1-L sterile bottles, and kept at −20°C until use. Before plate preparation, 10 mL/L of a pH indicator (sterile solution of litmus 50 g/L), 10⁶ cfu/L of commercial starter MA016 (*Lactococcus lactis* ssp. *cremoris* and *L. lactis* ssp. *lactis*, Elimeca, Thoissey, France), and 1.5 mL/L of 5× diluted and filtered (0.22 µm) rennet (Danisco, Dangé Saint-Romain, France) were added to the thawed retentate. After vigorous homogenization for 1 min, the retentate was distributed into 24-well plates (2 mL/well) and incubated for 1 h at 30°C and then for 3 d at 20°C, leading to the formation of a “mini-cheese” (pH 5) in each well. The exudate was then removed from the surface of each mini-cheese and plates were stored at 12°C until use.

Using this cheese-mimicking matrix, we screened the antifungal activity of 44 LAB fermented milk-based products and 23 LAB isolates used as protective cultures against 4 fungal targets. The LAB were obtained from the culture collections of CIRM-BIA (Centre International de Ressources Microbienne-Bactéries d'Intérêt Alimentaire, Rennes, France) and LUBEM (Laboratoire Universitaire de Biodiversité et Ecologie Microbienne, Plouzané, France). For fermentation product preparation, a 10%-reconstituted low-heat milk supplemented with 45% anhydrous milk fat and 0.5% litmus (LH medium) was sterilized for 30 min at 110°C. Then, it was individually inoculated with a suspension of the LAB to be tested (1% vol/vol), obtained after 2 subcultures of 24 h at 30°C in MRS broth (Difco, Le Pont de Claix, France). The LH medium inoculated with LAB was then incubated for 20 h at 30°C; 100 µL of the resulting fermentation product was then deposited on the surface of each mini-cheese. After drying

for 2 h at room temperature under laminar air flow, plates were surface inoculated with 1 of 4 fungal targets: *Mucor racemosus* UBOCC-A-116002, *Penicillium commune* UBOCC-A-116003, *Galactomyces geotrichum* UBOCC-A-216001, or *Yarrowia lipolytica* UBOCC-A-216006, which were previously isolated from dairy products (Garnier et al., 2017) and obtained from the Université de Bretagne Occidentale Culture Collection (UBOCC, Plouzané, France). Except for yeasts that were first cultured in potato dextrose broth, 10 µL of suspension containing 5 × 10³ spores or cells/mL, obtained as previously described (Delavenne et al., 2012), was spotted at the center of each mini-cheese (1 tested fungus/plate). Plates were then incubated at 12°C for 5, 6, and 8 d for *M. racemosus*, *G. geotrichum*, and *P. commune* and *Y. lipolytica*, respectively. Antifungal activity was then determined by visually evaluating fungal growth compared with a negative control without any fermentation product (Figure 1). To test the antifungal activity of LAB isolates for potential use as protective cultures, we applied the same methodology except that LAB isolates to be tested were individually suspended in sterilized milk to reach a final concentration of 10⁷ cfu/mL of retentate and inoculated concomitantly with the commercial starter MA016, pH indicator, and rennet before distribution in 24-well plates. In this context, 23 LAB cultures were tested in duplicate against the same fungal targets as those described above, after 2 pre-cultures for 24 h at 30°C in MRS broth. Incubation to obtain the mini-cheeses was performed as described above. Plates were then surface-inoculated with 1 of the 4 fungal targets and antifungal activity was evaluated as described above.

All tested fungal species grew well in the cheese-mimicking model (Supplemental Figure S1; <https://doi.org/10.3168/jds.2017-13518>) and the results obtained for both replicates were similar, confirming the suitability of this matrix to sustain fungal growth and the reproducibility of the screening method. Among the 46 tested LAB fermentation products, 25 showed antifungal activity against at least one fungal target, and 22 out of the 23 tested protective cultures showed antifungal activity against at least one target. More precisely, intermediate antifungal activities against at least one fungal target were observed for 14 (30%) fermentation products and 12 (55%) isolates, whereas complete inhibition against at least one fungal target was only observed for LAB isolates (n = 10; 45%; Table 1). The most active (++ and +++) isolates or fermentation products corresponded to *Lactobacillus casei*, *Lactobacillus plantarum*, *Lactobacillus brevis*, *Lactobacillus paracasei*, *Leuconostoc mesenteroides*, and, to a lesser extent, *Lb. rhamnosus*. Antifungal activity varied depending on the utilization mode (protective culture or

Figure 1. Visual evaluation of fungal growth to determine antifungal activity. Photograph of a 24-well plate showing the antifungal activity of 11 fermentation products from lactobacilli strains (tested in duplicate) against *Penicillium commune* UBOCC-A-116003 (50 spores/well) in mini-cheeses incubated for 8 d at 12°C. Lactobacilli strains: *Lactobacillus plantarum* L89 (well 1) and L96 (8); *Lactobacillus buchneri* L90 (2); *Lactobacillus reuteri* L91 (3), L92 (4), L94 (6), and L97 (9); *Lactobacillus casei* L95 (7); *Lactobacillus paracasei* L93 (5); and *Lactobacillus rhamnosus* CIRM-BIA 607 (10) and CIRM-BIA 909 (11) fermentation products; negative control (without fermentation product) (12). No antifungal activity (–) observation in positions 2, 3, 4, 6, 9; weak activity (+) in position 1; intermediate antifungal activities (++) in positions 5, 7, 8, 10, and 11. When complete inhibition was observed, a “+++” score was attributed to the corresponding isolate.

fermentation product). For example, for *Lb. plantarum* strains tested both for their fermentation products and as protective culture, fermentation products showed no activity against *M. racemosus* but could inhibit the latter when used as protective cultures (Table 1). In contrast, *Lb. brevis* CIRM-BIA 608 showed activity only against *M. racemosus* and *P. commune* when used as a fermentation product. None of the tested isolates of *Lactobacillus pentosus*, *Lactobacillus sakei*, or *Leuconostoc citreum* showed any activity (Table 1). As expected, within a species, not all tested isolates showed the same antifungal activity. For example, each tested *Lb. casei* isolate showed antifungal activity but the inhibited fungal target and the obtained antifungal scores were different among them, confirming that antifungal activity is a strain-dependent trait, as suggested by Cortés-Zavaleta et al. (2014). Finally, under the tested conditions, *P. commune* was the most

frequently inhibited target, followed by *M. racemosus* and *G. geotrichum*. None of the strains used to produce fermentation products was able to inhibit growth of *Y. lipolytica*, whereas only 3 strains used as protective cultures (*Lb. brevis* CIRM-BIA 128, *Lb. plantarum* L244, and *Leu. mesenteroides* CIRM-BIA 1187) showed intermediate antifungal activity against this target (Table 1). Overall, antifungal activity of the tested strains was higher when they were used as protective cultures; indeed, all isolates did show antifungal activity. The reproducibility of antifungal activities obtained with 2 batches of mini-cheeses for 2 protective cultures and fermentates was evaluated (Supplemental Figure S2; <https://doi.org/10.3168/jds.2017-13518>). The obtained antifungal activities showed a good reproducibility despite slight variation.

The proposed method was also used to evaluate resistance to natamycin (a natural antibiotic produced by

Streptomyces natalensis used for fungal control on cheese surface) of 9 fungi, including those previously mentioned as well as *Phoma pinodella* UBOCC-A-116004, *Candida parapsilosis* UBOCC-A-216002, *Meyerozyma guilliermondii* UBOCC-A-216003, *Trichosporon asahii* UBOCC-A-216005, and *Rhodotorula mucilaginosa* UBOCC-A-216004 (Garnier et al., 2017). Natamycin

resistance was tested in a similar concentration range (from 0 to 0.2 mg/dm²) as that used by Garnier et al. (2017). Natamycin was deposited on the mini-cheese surface, in duplicate, using 100 µL of a stock solution followed by fungal inoculation on the cheese surface as described above. The MIC was determined as the concentration for which no visible growth occurred

Table 1. Lactic acid bacteria used as dairy ingredient (fermentation product) or protective culture for the antifungal assay

Genus and species	Strain number ¹	Antifungal activity of fermentation product (F) or protective culture (Pc) ²							
		<i>Galactomyces geotrichum</i>		<i>Mucor racemosus</i>		<i>Penicillium commune</i>		<i>Yarrowia lipolytica</i>	
		F	Pc	F	Pc	F	Pc	F	Pc
<i>Lactobacillus casei</i>	L1	+	–	++	+	+	++	–	–
	L37	–	+	–	++	–	++	–	–
	L61	–	–	+	+	+	++	–	–
	L95	–	ND	–	ND	+	ND	–	ND
	L142	–	–	+	+++	+	+++	–	–
	L194	–	–	+	++	++	+++	–	–
<i>Lactobacillus brevis</i>	L93	–	–	++	+	++	++	–	–
	L128	–	–	+	+++	++	+++	–	++
	L31	–	–	–	++	–	++	–	–
	L30	–	ND	–	ND	++	ND	–	ND
	CIRM-BIA 608	+	ND	++	ND	++	ND	–	ND
	CIRM-BIA 932	–	ND	–	ND	–	ND	–	ND
<i>Lactobacillus buchneri</i>	L233	–	–	+	++	++	++	–	+
	L56	–	ND	–	ND	–	ND	–	ND
	L84	–	ND	–	ND	++	ND	–	ND
	L90	–	ND	–	ND	–	ND	–	ND
	L137	–	ND	–	ND	++	ND	–	ND
	CIRM-BIA 913	–	–	–	+	–	–	–	–
<i>Lactobacillus rhamnosus</i>	CIRM-BIA 607	–	ND	–	ND	++	ND	–	ND
	CIRM-BIA 909	–	ND	–	ND	++	ND	–	ND
	CIRM-BIA 1107	–	+	–	+	–	+	–	–
	CIRM-BIA 1112	–	+	–	+	+	+++	–	–
	CIRM-BIA 1436	–	–	–	+	–	+	–	–
	CIRM-BIA 522	–	+	+	–	++	++	–	++
<i>Lactobacillus reuteri</i>	L91	–	ND	–	ND	–	ND	–	ND
	L92	–	ND	–	ND	–	ND	–	ND
	L94	–	ND	–	ND	–	ND	–	ND
	L97	–	ND	–	ND	–	ND	–	ND
	CIRM-BIA 853	–	ND	–	ND	–	ND	–	ND
	CIRM-BIA 1490	–	ND	–	ND	–	ND	–	ND
<i>Lactobacillus pentosus</i>	L11	–	–	–	+++	++	++	–	–
	L14	+	+	–	+++	+	++	–	–
	L17	–	+	–	+++	+	++	–	–
	L63	–	–	–	+	++	++	–	–
	L89	–	ND	–	ND	+	ND	–	ND
	L96	–	ND	–	ND	++	ND	–	ND
<i>Lactobacillus plantarum</i>	L244	–	–	+	++	++	+++	–	++
	CIRM-BIA 892	–	ND	–	ND	–	ND	–	ND
	CIRM-BIA 1559	–	ND	–	ND	–	ND	–	ND
	CIRM-BIA 742	–	ND	–	ND	–	ND	–	ND
	CIRM-BIA 852	–	ND	–	ND	–	ND	–	ND
	CIRM-BIA 1453	–	ND	–	ND	–	ND	–	ND
<i>Leuconostoc mesenteroides</i>	CIRM-BIA 1454	–	ND	–	ND	–	ND	–	ND
	CIRM-BIA 1176	+	+	–	–	–	–	–	–
	CIRM-BIA 1187	–	+	–	+++	+	+++	–	+
	L126	–	–	–	+++	–	++	–	–

¹L = isolates from Laboratoire Universitaire de Biodiversité et Ecologie Microbienne (Plouzané, France); CIRM-BIA = isolates from Centre International de Ressources Microbienne-Bactéries d'Intérêt Alimentaire (Rennes, France).

²Where – = no antifungal activity; + = weak antifungal activity; ++ = intermediate antifungal activity; +++ = complete inhibition; ND = not determined (not tested as protective culture).

Table 2. Minimal inhibitory concentrations (g/L) of natamycin in model cheese versus potato dextrose agar (Garnier et al., 2017) for 9 isolates of representative spoilage fungal species encountered in dairy products

Fungal species	Strain number ¹	Isolation source	MIC ²	
			Model cheese	Potato dextrose agar
<i>Galactomyces geotrichum</i>	UBOCC-A-216001	Fresh cheese	0.12 (0.6)	0.1 (0.5)
<i>Mucor racemosus</i>	UBOCC-A-116002	Semi-hard cheese	0.04 (0.2)	0.1 (0.5)
<i>Penicillium commune</i>	UBOCC-A-116003	Semi-hard cheese	0.06 (0.3)	0.06 (0.3)
<i>Phoma pinodella</i>	UBOCC-A-116004	Cream cheese	0.08 (0.4)	0.1 (0.5)
<i>Candida parapsilosis</i>	UBOCC-A-216002	Yogurt	0.08 (0.4)	0.1 (0.5)
<i>Meyerozyma guilliermondii</i>	UBOCC-A-216003	Cream cheese	0.1 (0.5)	0.08 (0.4)
<i>Rhodotorula mucilaginosa</i>	UBOCC-A-216004	Fresh cheese	0.08 (0.4)	0.1 (0.5)
<i>Trichosporon asahii</i>	UBOCC-A-216005	Fresh cheese	0.04 (0.2)	0.1 (0.5)
<i>Yarrowia lipolytica</i>	UBOCC-A-216006	Semi-hard cheese	0.16 (0.8)	>0.2 (>1.0) ³

¹Université de Bretagne Occidentale Culture Collection (UBOCC, Plouzané, France).

²With mg/dm² in parentheses.

³Highest tested concentration.

after the incubation period (Table 2). The obtained MIC values were then compared with those obtained by Garnier et al. (2017) in potato dextrose agar at pH 5. Independently of the fungal target, natamycin MIC were generally slightly lower in the cheese model than in potato dextrose agar. This result may be explained by differences in the physiological status of the fungal targets as well as by the fact that other compounds present in the cheese may enhance natamycin activity. For example, lactic acid produced by lactococci starter cultures could act synergistically with natamycin.

Mucor racemosus and *T. asahii* were the most sensitive fungi to natamycin with a MIC of 0.04 mg/dm², followed by *P. commune* (0.06 mg/dm²; Table 2). *Yarrowia lipolytica* showed the highest resistance to natamycin with a MIC of 0.16 mg/dm², which is very close to the maximum authorized concentration (0.2 mg/dm²) that can be used in dairy products within the European Union.

The main objective of this work was to develop a high-throughput screening method to evaluate antifungal activities of various antifungal agent candidates (bioprotective cultures, fermentation products, or purified molecules) in a matrix as close as possible to real dairy products, such as cheese, in terms of physical, chemical, and biological composition. The proposed method, based on the use of a cheese mimicking-model distributed in 24-well plates, could achieve a screening rate of 1,600 assays per week, is easy to implement, and does not require complex and high-cost equipment. Such a screening matrix, closer to an actual dairy product, makes antifungal activity screening more robust in regards to scale-up validation, which follows the screening step. Even though the gross composition of the retentate used to make mini-cheeses was verified in 3 batches (252 ± 8 g/kg DM, 67.8 ± 1.9 g/kg fat, 113.9 ± 2.08 g/kg N content, pH 6.53 ± 0.02), slight

variations in observed antifungal activities could occur from one retentate batch to another. Indeed, minor compound (e.g., micronutrient) variability is expected due to seasonal variation in milk composition but such variability was not verified in the context of this study. In addition, by determining the number of pixels represented by the targeted fungi on the cheese surface, estimation of fungal growth could be automated using image analysis, yielding a quantitative estimation of fungal growth. In conclusion, the developed method offers new perspectives for developing new biopreservation solutions.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This work was financially supported by the Conseils Régionaux de Bretagne (grant no. 13008651) and Pays de la Loire (grant no. 2014-01081) in the framework of the PROFIL interregional project under the scientific coordination of INRA (J. Leonil) and managed by the Bretagne Biotechnologies Alimentaires industrial association (Rennes, France).

REFERENCES

- Cheong, E. Y. L., A. Sandhu, J. Jayabalan, T. T. Kieu Le, and N. T. Nhiep., H. TMy Ho, J., N. Zwielerhner, Bansal, and M. S. Turner. 2014. Isolation of lactic acid bacteria with antifungal activity against the common cheese spoilage mould *Penicillium commune* and their potential as biopreservatives in cheese. *Food Control* 46:91–97.
- Cortés-Zavaleta, O., A. López-Malo, A. Hernández-Mendoza, and H. S. García. 2014. Antifungal activity of lactobacilli and its relationship with 3-phenyllactic acid production. *Int. J. Food Microbiol.* 173:30–35.
- Delavenne, E., S. Cliquet, C. Trunet, G. Barbier, J. Mounier, and G. Le Blay. 2015. Characterization of the antifungal activity of *Lactobacillus harbinensis* K.V9.3.1Np and *Lactobacillus rhamnosus* K.C8.3.1I in yogurt. *Food Microbiol.* 45:10–17.
- Delavenne, E., J. Mounier, F. Deniel, G. Barbier, and G. Le Blay. 2012. Biodiversity of antifungal lactic acid bacteria isolated from

- raw milk samples from cow, ewe, and goat over one-year period. *Int. J. Food Microbiol.* 155:185–190.
- Fuselli, F., C. Guarino, A. La Mantia, L. Longo, A. Faberi, and R. M. Marianella. 2012. Multi-detection of preservatives in cheeses by liquid chromatography-tandem mass spectrometry. *J. Chromatogr. B Analyt. Technol. Biomed. Life Sci.* 906:9–18.
- Garnier, L., F. Valence, A. Pawtowski, L. Auhustsinava-Galerie, N. Frotté, F. Deniel, E. Coton, and J. Mounier. 2017. Diversity of spoilage fungi associated with various French dairy products. *Int. J. Food Microbiol.* 241:191–197.
- Gerez, C. L., M. J. Torres, G. Font de Valdez, and R. Rollan. 2013. Control of spoilage fungi by lactic acid bacteria. *Biol. Control* 64:231–237.
- Hannon, J. A., S.-M. Deutsch, M.-N. Madec, J.-Y. Gassi, M.-P. Chapot-Chartier, and S. Lortal. 2006. Lysis of starters in UF cheeses: Behaviour of mesophilic lactococci and thermophilic lactobacilli. *Int. Dairy J.* 16:324–334.
- Inglin, R. C., M. J. Stevens, L. Meile, C. Lacroix, and L. Meile. 2015. High-throughput screening assays for antibacterial and antifungal activities of *Lactobacillus* species. *J. Microbiol. Methods* 114:26–29.
- Le Lay, C., J. Mounier, V. Vasseur, A. Weill, G. Le Blay, G. Barbier, and E. Coton. 2016. *In vitro* and *in situ* screening of lactic acid bacteria and propionibacteria antifungal activities against bakery product spoilage molds. *Food Control* 60:247–255.
- Lynch, K. M., A. M. Pawlowska, B. Brosnan, A. Coffey, E. Zannini, A. Furey, P. L. H. McSweeney, D. M. Waters, and E. K. Arendt. 2014. Application of *Lactobacillus amylovorus* as an antifungal adjunct to extend the shelf-life of Cheddar cheese. *Int. Dairy J.* 34:167–173.
- Schillinger, U., and J. V. Villarreal. 2010. Inhibition of *Penicillium nordicum* in MRS medium by lactic acid bacteria isolated from foods. *Food Control* 21:107–111.
- Stiles, J., S. Penkar, M. Plocková, J. Chumchalová, and L. B. Bullerman. 2002. Antifungal activity of sodium acetate and *Lactobacillus rhamnosus*. *J. Food Prot.* 65:1188–1191.
- Stiles, M. E. 1996. Biopreservation by lactic acid bacteria. *Antonie van Leeuwenhoek* 70:331–345.
- Stratford, M., H. Steels, G. Nebe-von-Caron, M. Novodvorska, K. Hayer, and D. B. Archer. 2013. Extreme resistance to weak-acid preservatives in the spoilage yeast *Zygosaccharomyces bailii*. *Int. J. Food Microbiol.* 166:126–134.
- Varsha, K. K., and K. M. Nampoothiri. 2016. Appraisal of lactic acid bacteria as protective cultures. *Food Control* 69:61–64.
- Wulijidiligen, S., and M. Taku. 2011. Screening and identification of lactic acid bacteria from Airag for antifungal activity. *J. Anim. Vet. Adv.* 10:2751–2757.