ABSTRACT

The complex metabolism of probiotic bacteria requires several technological options to guarantee the functionality of probiotic dairy foods during the shelf life. This research aimed to evaluate the effect of the supplementation of increasing amounts of *Lactobacillus acidophilus* (0, 0.4, or 0.8 g/L of milk) on the physicochemical parameters and sensory acceptance of Minas fresh cheese. In addition, the sensory acceptance of probiotic cheeses was assessed using a consumer test and compared with commercial cheeses (conventional and probiotic). High counts (9.11 to 9.42 log cfu/g) of *L. acidophilus* were observed throughout the shelf life, which contributed to the maintenance of its probiotic status and resulted in lower pH values and greater production of organic acids. The probiotic cheeses presented lower scores for appearance, aroma, and texture compared with conventional cheeses. Internal preference mapping explained almost 60% of the total variation of the data and showed a large number of consumers concentrated near the conventional cheeses, demonstrating greater preference for these samples. The findings indicated that some negative sensory effects could occur when high level of supplementation with *L. acidophilus* is used in probiotic cheese processing.
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INTRODUCTION

Cheese is a food consumed throughout the world and it constitutes an integral part of the diet of the population. The high calcium content is related to the maintenance of healthy bones and the presence of essential amino acids in its composition to the development of muscle structure (Ash and Wilbey, 2010); these factors have led to health agencies encouraging its consumption.

The supplementation of cheeses with probiotic bacteria represents the aggregation of added value to a product that already has benefits inherent in its composition. The ingestion of cheese supplemented with probiotic bacteria has been associated with a variety of benefits to human health, such as improvements in the immune system (Ibrahim et al., 2010), oral health in the elderly (Hatakka et al., 2007), and reinforcement of intestinal immunity (Medici et al., 2004) and gastrointestinal health (Modzelewska-Kapituła et al., 2010). Due to these benefits, the development of probiotic cheese is a current topic in the scientific literature (Özer and Kirmaci, 2009; Bergamini et al., 2010; Gursoy and Kinik, 2010; Obando et al., 2010; Wang et al., 2010; Awaish, 2011; Madureira et al., 2011a,b; Rodrigues et al., 2011) and represents a trend for the dairy industry.

Minas fresh cheese (Minas Frescal) is one of the most consumed dairy products in Brazil because of its acceptance on the national market (Pflanzer Junior et al., 2009). It is a fresh, soft, white cheese, slightly salted and with a slight lactic acid taste (Souza et al., 2008). Its potential as a functional food, especially as a food matrix to deliver different probiotic bacteria (e.g., *Lactobacillus acidophilus, Lactobacillus paracasei, Bifidobacterium lactis* and *Bifidobacterium longum*), has been reported previously (Buriti et al., 2005; Souza and Saad, 2009; Fritzen-Freire et al., 2010a). However, studies covering the changes that occur due to the addition of different levels of probiotic bacteria during processing on cheese’s physicochemical parameters and sensory acceptance using commercial conventional and probiotic fresh cheeses have not been described. In this context, the present research aimed to evaluate the effect of adding increasing amounts of probiotic bacteria, particularly *Lactobacillus acidophilus*, on the physicochemical parameters and sensory acceptance of probiotic Minas fresh cheese.
MATERIALS AND METHODS

**Probiotic Strain**

The probiotic strain used in our study was *Lactobacillus acidophilus* LA-5 (Chr. Hansen, Valinhos, São Paulo, Brazil). Although it is a very acidifying bacterium, recent commercial probiotic cheeses launched on the Brazilian market are using this probiotic strain (Balkis, 2011; Polengui, 2011). In this context, our research takes into account the current tendency of the Brazilian cheese industry toward probiotic dairy foods.

**Cheese Processing**

Cheese processing was performed in accordance with the methods described earlier (Souza and Saad, 2009; Gomes et al., 2011), with slight modifications. Eighty liters of raw milk (3.0% fat, wt/wt) (Faculdade de Tecnologia Termomecânica, São Bernardo, São Paulo, Brazil) was pasteurized at 72°C for 15 s (model Pro110, Arpífrío, São Paulo, Brazil) and then cooled to 37°C. Calcium chloride (0.2 g/L; Labsynth, São Paulo, Brazil) was then added to the milk. The lactic (*Lactococcus lactis* R-704, 1.0% wt/vol milk; Chr. Hansen) and probiotic (*Lactobacillus acidophilus* LA-5, Chr. Hansen) cultures were added in the following amounts: 0.0 (control, P0), 0.4 (P1, 10.20 log cfu/mL), and 0.8% (wt/vol) milk (P2, 10.54 log cfu/mL), which correspond to 0-, 4-, and 8-fold the concentration recommended by the manufacturer. Both cultures were freeze-dried commercial cultures for direct vat inoculation, and adequate distribution throughout the milk was achieved by manual homogenization for 2 min. The resulting cheese-milk was kept at 37°C for 40 min to coagulate. The curd was then cut, the whey run off, and the remaining curd placed in 250-g plastic molds. The cheeses were dried at 0.8% wt/vol NaCl, Labsynth, vacuum-packaged, and stored in a cold room at 5 to 7°C for 20 d. Simultaneously, full-fat commercial fresh Minas cheeses (C1 and C2) and full-fat commercial probiotic (CP) Minas fresh cheese (the only probiotic cheese available in the Brazilian market at the time of this research) were acquired from supermarkets in the city of São Paulo at the start of their shelf life, according to their labels. The cheeses were placed in Styrofoam ice-boxes and immediately transported to the laboratory, where they were also maintained in cold chambers at 5°C for 20 d. Table 1 provides information about the probiotic and conventional cheeses.

**Physicochemical and Microbiological Analyses**

The physicochemical and microbiological analyses were carried out on d 1 and 20 after manufacture for both the commercial and probiotic cheeses (typical beginning and end of Minas fresh cheese shelf life, respectively). The processing was repeated twice and the analyses were performed in triplicate.

The pH values of the cheese samples were determined using a digital pH meter (B-375; Micronal Ind. Ltd., Piracicaba, Brazil) by direct insertion of the electrode into the sample (Marshall, 1993). The proteolysis extent was quantified by measuring the amino acids and peptides produced by the lactic and probiotic cultures, using a reactive solution (*o*-phthalaldehyde) containing the following reagents: sodium dodecyl sulfate, sodium tetraborate decahydrate, dithiothreitol, *o*-phthalaldehyde, and ethanol. The proteolytic extent was expressed as the absorbance of the *o*-phthalaldehyde derivatives at 340 nm (Masuda et al., 2005).

The levels of organic acids (lactic and acetic acids) were determined by HPLC using an Aminex X-87H column (300 mm × 7.8 mm, Bio-Rad Laboratories, Richmond, CA) and a guard column with disposable cartridges H⁺ (Bio-Rad Laboratories) maintained at 65°C (Ong et al., 2006). Sulfuric acid (0.009 mol/L), previously prepared by dilution with ultra-pure water obtained from a Milli-Q system (Millipore Corp., Billerica, MA) and subsequently filtered and degassed through a 0.45-mm membrane filter (Millipore), was used as the mobile phase with a flow rate of 0.6 mL/min. A UV-visible detector was used at 220 nm. The organic acids were quantified using standard curves prepared with solutions of the compounds of known concentrations (at least 5). Twenty-five microliters was injected.

### Table 1. Probiotic and conventional cheeses: features and codes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cheese</th>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Standard cheese</td>
<td>0% (wt/vol) <em>Lactobacillus acidophilus</em></td>
<td>P0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probiotic cheese 1</td>
<td>0.4% (wt/vol) <em>L. acidophilus</em></td>
<td>P1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probiotic cheese 2</td>
<td>0.8% (wt/vol) <em>L. acidophilus</em></td>
<td>P2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial cheese 1</td>
<td>Absence of probiotic bacteria</td>
<td>C1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial cheese 2</td>
<td>Absence of probiotic bacteria</td>
<td>C2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probiotic commercial cheese</td>
<td><em>Bifidobacterium animalis</em></td>
<td>CP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
using an automatic injector, and the chromatographic peaks were integrated using the Millenium software.

For microbiological analyses, 25 g of cheese was transferred into a stomacher containing 225 mL of sterile 0.1% (wt/vol) peptone water (Oxoid, São Paulo, Brazil). Further dilutions were made from this original dilution and the quantification of microbial counts was carried out using the pour plate technique. The starter lactococci were enumerated on M17 agar (Oxoid) and incubated under aerobic conditions at 30°C for 72 h (Ong and Shah, 2009), whereas the Lactobacillus acidophilus LA-5 count was enumerated using 0.15% bile salts–de Man, Rogosa, and Sharpe agar (Oxoid), at 37°C for 72 h under aerobic conditions (Mortazavian et al., 2007).

**Consumer Test**

One hundred twenty cheese consumers were recruited at random from the Faculty of Thermomechanical Technology (São Bernardo do Campo, São Paulo, Brazil) to take part in the study. The criterion for selection was the absence of allergic reactions to milk. For sensory evaluation, 6 samples were evaluated: the probiotic cheeses manufactured in the plant (P1, P2, and P3), 2 commercial full-fat cheeses purchased in grocery stores (C1 and C2), and a commercial probiotic Minas cheese recently launched on the Brazilian market, supplemented with Bifidobacterium lactis (CP).

The cheese samples were removed from the refrigerator, cut into pieces (about 1.5 × 1.5 × 1.5 cm), and placed on white plates coded with random 3-digit numbers 1 h before evaluation at room temperature (25°C). The consumers were instructed to evaluate the cheese with respect to the degree of liking of the appearance, aroma, flavor, texture, and overall impression using a 9-point hybrid hedonic scale (1 = disliked immensely, 9 = liked immensely; Villanueva and Da Silva, 2009). Between tasting each sample, the participants were requested to eat a cream cracker biscuit and drink some spring water. The first-order and carry-over effects were balanced using a specific design, and the samples were presented monadically (MacFie et al., 1989).

**Statistical Analyses**

As a first step, all variables were subjected to Hartley’s test to check for homogeneity of the variances within the treatments, and one-way ANOVA was then applied to the physicochemical and microbiological analysis to identify contrasts among the cheese samples. For the sensory assessment data, a 2-way ANOVA (consumers × samples) followed by Tukey’s test was carried out. To compare the results from d 1 with those from d 20, the data were first subjected to the Shapiro-Wilk test to check for normality of the distribution, followed by the Student t-test or Mann-Whitney U-test. P-values < 0.05 were considered significant.

Consumer preference responses are often heterogeneous, and the mean scores may not be representative of individual opinions (Felberg et al., 2010). In this context, internal preference mapping (MDPREF) is a statistical tool that allows for the examination of individual ratings by consumers (Allgeyer et al., 2010). This method was applied to the consumer acceptance scores to examine discrimination between samples. All analyses were carried out using the Statistica 7.1 software (StatSoft, Tulsa, OK). The internal preference mapping was applied using XLSTAT software (Addinsoft, New York, NY).

**RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

**Physicochemical Analyses**

Table 2 shows the evolution of the physicochemical characteristics of the probiotic and conventional cheeses throughout refrigerated storage. In general, changes were observed in all parameters with respect to storage time (P < 0.05), with evidence of the behavior that depended on the metabolism of the microbial strain used to manufacture the cheese. Indeed, although it was not possible to obtain this information from the processors, different Lactococcus strains are likely used by each dairy processor, which results in different acidification profiles during cheese processing. In addition, we observed that supplementation with increasing concentrations of L. acidophilus resulted in changes in the parameters (P < 0.05) compared with those of the commercial cheeses and commercial probiotic cheeses analyzed for each of the periods.

A decrease in pH values, increased proteolysis, and consequent production of organic acids is intrinsically related to the cheese manufacturing process, where the final objective is to reach the pH value corresponding to the isoelectric point of the caseins such that the gel coagulates. For cheeses processed by enzymatic coagulation, this is obtained by the lactic culture consuming the lactose and producing lactic acid, and for cheeses processed by direct acidification, this is obtained by the addition of organic acids (Everett and Auty, 2008). Cheeses processed with Bifidobacterium strains present an additional production of acetic acid due to their metabolism (Grattepanche et al., 2008).

In the present work, all cheeses were processed by enzymatic coagulation, including the commercial samples, according to information provided by the manufacturers. Lower pH values, increased proteolysis, and greater...
production of organic acids were found in the probiotic cheeses inoculated with increasing concentrations of \textit{L. acidophilus} (P1 and P2) and in the commercial cheese CP, which was supplemented with \textit{B. animalis}, at the 2 storage times analyzed throughout the storage period ($P < 0.05$). Interestingly, we also observed acetic acid production in the cheeses supplemented with increased \textit{L. acidophilus}. Although \textit{Lactobacillus} strains are predominantly homofermentative, they also present a heterofermentative pathway, fermenting glucose in equimolar amounts of lactic acid, CO$_2$, and ethanol or acetic acid (Gomes and Malcata, 1999). Similar findings were found for Cheddar cheese supplemented with \textit{Lactobacillus casei}, bifidobacteria, and \textit{L. acidophilus} (Ong et al., 2006). On the other hand, different results were observed for a fresh probiotic Minas cheese produced by direct acidification during 28 d of refrigerated storage (Fritzen-Freire et al., 2010b), which is probably linked to the processing conditions (direct acidification).

Fresh cheeses, with limited refrigerated shelf life, have as their main event the primary proteolysis, which is performed by the coagulating agents and, to a lesser extent, plasmin, residual coagulants, and enzymes from the starter organisms (Sousa et al., 2001). The supplementation of cheeses with probiotic bacteria only has a relevant effect on secondary proteolysis, resulting in an increase in the total free amino acid content and the formation of compounds responsible for flavor and aroma, resulting from the catabolism of these amino acids (Cruz et al., 2009). In this way, differences between the proteolytic profiles of probiotic and conventional cheeses have only been observed in ripened cheeses, such as sheep’s milk cheese (Albenzio et al., 2010), Argentinean probiotic cheese (Vinderola et al., 2009), hard and semi-hard Argentina cheeses (Bergamini et al., 2009; Milesi et al., 2009), and ovine cheese (Albenzio et al., 2010). The present study showed similar results, which could be related to the greater concentration of \textit{L. acidophilus} used in P1 and P2 cheeses, and to the proteolytic capacity of \textit{B. animalis} used in the manufacture of the CP cheese, suggesting the need for careful selection of the probiotic strain to be incorporated into cheeses, because alterations can be observed even in nonripened cheeses with a limited shelf life.

In addition, the mesophilic starter cultures should be compatible with the probiotic strain, and the proper ripening temperature must be used (Ziarno et al., 2010) because poor choices can influence the product’s functionality due to inhibition by metabolism products, such as organic acids, peroxide, and bacteriocin, as reported previously for fermented dairy products (Vinderola et al., 2002).

### Microbiological Count

Table 3 shows the evolution of the microbiological characteristics of the probiotic and conventional cheeses during refrigerated storage. In the same way, the behavior was shown to be dependent on the metabolism of the microbial strain used to manufacture the cheese and on the probiotic bacteria, for both the qualitative and quantitative aspects ($P < 0.05$). Supplementation with excessive amounts of \textit{L. acidophilus} resulted in elevated counts of this microorganism (9.42 to 9.11 log cfu/g), which maintained the probiotic status of the

### Table 2. Physicochemical parameters of probiotic and conventional cheeses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Day</th>
<th>Cheese</th>
<th>pH</th>
<th>Proteolysis</th>
<th>Lactic acid (g/100 g)</th>
<th>Acetic acid (g/100 g)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>P0</td>
<td>5.31$^{a,b}$</td>
<td>0.565$^{a,b}$</td>
<td>1.13$^{a,b}$</td>
<td>0.13$^{a,b}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P1</td>
<td>5.44$^{a}$</td>
<td>0.589$^{a,b}$</td>
<td>1.35$^{a}$</td>
<td>0.15$^{a,c}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P2</td>
<td>5.31$^{a,b}$</td>
<td>0.574$^{b}$</td>
<td>1.56$^{b}$</td>
<td>0.16$^{b}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>5.95$^{a,b}$</td>
<td>0.592$^{b}$</td>
<td>1.24$^{a,b}$</td>
<td>0.19$^{a,b}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C2</td>
<td>5.29$^{a}$</td>
<td>0.589$^{b}$</td>
<td>1.13$^{b}$</td>
<td>0.15$^{b}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>CP</td>
<td>6.28$^{a}$</td>
<td>0.635$^{b}$</td>
<td>1.40$^{b}$</td>
<td>0.17$^{a}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>P0</td>
<td>5.30$^{a,b}$</td>
<td>0.588$^{a}$</td>
<td>1.87$^{a}$</td>
<td>0.17$^{a,c}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P1</td>
<td>5.26$^{a}$</td>
<td>0.623$^{a}$</td>
<td>2.58$^{a}$</td>
<td>0.17$^{a,c}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P2</td>
<td>5.22$^{a,b}$</td>
<td>0.697$^{a,b}$</td>
<td>2.78$^{a,b}$</td>
<td>0.36$^{a,b}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>5.65$^{a,b}$</td>
<td>0.597$^{a,b}$</td>
<td>2.07$^{a,b}$</td>
<td>0.31$^{a,b}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C2</td>
<td>5.01$^{a}$</td>
<td>0.604$^{a}$</td>
<td>1.97$^{a}$</td>
<td>0.27$^{a}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CP</td>
<td>CP</td>
<td>5.19$^{a}$</td>
<td>0.714$^{a}$</td>
<td>2.96$^{a}$</td>
<td>0.26$^{b}$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$^a,b$Means with different lowercase superscripts in the same column indicate presence of statistical difference ($P < 0.05$) among treatments (cheeses).

$A,B$Means with different uppercase letters in the same column indicate presence of statistical difference ($P < 0.05$) between storage days.

1Analysis performed in duplicate. Proteolysis is expressed in absorbance at 340; lactic acid and acetic acid are expressed in g/100 g.

2See Table 1.
product throughout the shelf life. However, the count decreased during cheese manufacture, especially during whey drainage; the initial level of inoculation was around 10 log cfu/g for both cheeses. This resulted in similar counts (around 9 log cfu/g) for different levels of supplementation of \textit{L. acidophilus} in cheeses, and the count of this strain did not increase significantly during the cheese processing.

With respect to \textit{B. animalis}, counts between 8.36 and 8.91 log cfu/g were maintained, conferring probiotic functionality on the product. Considering that the results for the survival of probiotic bacteria in commercial cheese are limited, our present findings are noteworthy. Variations in \textit{L. lactis} counts could be explained by the different strains used in the manufacture of the conventional cheeses, which possess different acidification velocities and proteolytic activities. However, differences in \textit{L. lactis} counts among the probiotic cheeses were obtained: P2 presented a lower viable count compared with P1 and P3, which could be related to the different levels of addition during the cheese processing. Although efforts were made to standardize cheese manufacturing, the possibility of a small variation in the dosage level cannot be completely excluded.

Obtaining desirable therapeutic effects in probiotic lactic products such as cheeses requires the maintenance of the viability of the probiotic bacteria in sufficient amounts throughout storage of the product. Probiotic bacteria should be present in the food product in minimal amounts of $10^6$ cfu/g, representing a daily dose of $10^8$ cfu/g, to compensate for a possible reduction in numbers during their passage through the gastrointestinal tract (Granato et al., 2010). Our findings indicate that 30 g of cheese contains about 4 billion viable probiotic cells, which is still lower than the values found in commercial fermented milks and yogurts (10 billion cells per portion). Besides, it is more practical to ingest a volume of 200 mL of fermented milk or yogurt compared with consuming a slice of cheese, which may explain, among other factors, the consumer preference for fermented milks or yogurts as food matrices to deliver probiotic bacteria (Hailu et al., 2009). This finding emphasizes the importance of an effective work of communication and marketing aimed to emphasize cheese as a probiotic food carrier. Our findings confirm the potential of cheese as a food matrix to deliver probiotic microorganisms, because all samples reached the minimal value capable of conferring therapeutic benefits on the consumer. Despite the economic question covered by the increased dosage level, which most of the time is prohibitive, the probiotic count values found indicate a high probiotic density, well above the minimum requirements of many legislative organizations and it emphasizes the importance of encouraging the consumption of probiotic cheese. The probiotic viable counts obtained were in accordance with the regulatory recommendations of several countries and regions: the Brazilian Legislation, which establishes a minimum quantity of 8 to 9 log cfu/g (Brasil, 2008); the new Canadian legislation, which requires that a serving-size probiotic product should contain at least 9 log cfu/g of the eligible microorganism (Canadian Food Inspection Agency, 2009); and finally, the European act, which requires 8 log cfu/g for the improved lactose digestion health claim for yogurt (European Food Safety Authority, 2010).

\begin{table}
\centering
\caption{Microbiological viable counts of probiotic and starter bacteria of probiotic and conventional cheeses$^1$
}
\begin{tabular}{lcccc}
\hline
Day & Cheese$^2$ & \textit{Lactococcus lactis} & \textit{Lactobacillus acidophilus} & \textit{Bifidobacterium animalis} \\
\hline
\hline
1 & P0 & 8.32$^{bcd,A}$ & — & — \\
     & P1 & 7.74$^{d,b}$ & 9.11$^{b,B}$ & — \\
     & P2 & 8.11$^{abcd,A}$ & 9.19$^{b,B}$ & — \\
     & C1 & 8.77$^{abcd,A}$ & — & — \\
     & C2 & 8.41$^{abcd,A}$ & — & — \\
     & CP & 7.93$^{d,B}$ & — & 8.36$^{A}$ \\
20 & P0 & 8.55$^{abc,A}$ & — & — \\
     & P1 & 8.14$^{abcd,A}$ & 9.31$^{b,B}$ & — \\
     & P2 & 8.12$^{abcd,A}$ & 9.42$^{A}$ & — \\
     & C1 & 8.93$^{A}$ & — & — \\
     & C2 & 8.37$^{abcd,A}$ & — & — \\
     & CP & 7.49$^{A}$ & — & 8.91$^{b,B}$ \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

$^a$-$^d$Means with different lowercase superscripts in the same column indicate presence of statistical difference ($P < 0.05$) among treatments (cheeses).

$^A$-$^B$Means with different uppercase letters in the same column indicate presence of statistical difference ($P < 0.05$) between storage days.

$^1$Analysis performed in duplicate. Microbiological analyses of \textit{Lc. lactis}, \textit{Lb. acidophilus}, and \textit{B. animalis} are expressed in log cfu/g of cheese.

$^2$See Table 1.
Indeed, cheeses have several advantages compared with fermented milks because they tend to have higher pH values, greater buffering capacity, a solid consistency, and relatively high protein and fat contents. These characteristics offer protection to the probiotic bacteria during storage and passage through the gastrointestinal tract (Gobbetti et al., 2010; Madureira et al., 2011a). Fresh cheese, due to its manufacturing process, appears suited to serve as a carrier for probiotic bacteria as it is an unripened cheese with a limited shelf-life under refrigeration temperatures (Cruz et al., 2009; Ouwehand et al., 2010). However, its negative characteristics are the bacteriocin production by some strains of lactococci (Ortolani et al., 2010) and the higher level of salt in some cheese varieties (Cruz et al., 2011), which can inhibit the probiotic cultures. In this context, the adoption of cheese as a food probiotic carrier should be carefully evaluated taking into account the kind of cheese chosen.

**Consumer Test**

Table 4 shows the scores obtained in the sensory acceptance test of the Minas fresh cheese samples. The excessive addition of probiotic microorganisms in cheese manufacture caused changes \((P < 0.05)\) in the appearance, aroma, taste, and texture, resulting in reduced overall acceptance of these samples compared with the conventional commercial cheeses. Similar results were found for yogurts supplemented with excessive amounts of *L. acidophilus* (Olson and Aryana, 2008).

The addition of 0.8% (wt/vol) *L. acidophilus* in cheeses resulted in rejection by consumers with respect to taste and texture, 2 attributes with great influence on the acceptance of a food product (Martín-Diana et al., 2003; Melo et al., 2009; Palazzo and Bolini, 2009; Villanueva et al., 2010). However, when compared with the control sample (P0), the use of 0.4% (wt/vol) *L. acidophilus* did not result in significant sensory differences, and a suitable mean value for acceptance was obtained.

Buriti et al. (2005) also found good acceptance of Minas fresh cheese with added *L. acidophilus*. In other studies, with fresh or ripened cheeses with added *L. acidophilus*, fresh buffalo Minas cheese (Marcatti et al., 2009) and Turkish white cheese (Kasimoglu et al., 2004), no negative effect on acceptance of the samples was observed. The addition of probiotic cultures to a food should not result in lower acceptance of the food compared with a similar conventional product (Cruz et al., 2010a), as shown in the development of various probiotic cheeses, such as Iranian white cheese produced by ultrafiltration (Zomorodi et al., 2011), Turkish Beyaz cheese (Kılıç et al., 2009), and Pategras cheese (Perotti et al., 2009).

Among the commercial brands, supplementation with *B. animalis* significantly reduced \((P < 0.05)\) the acceptance of probiotic Minas fresh cheese. A possible explanation is the interaction between the pH values and acetic acid concentration. The lower pH value, allowing a greater fraction of the acetic acid in an undissociated form, increased the vinegar perception, resulting an increased acetic taste. Similar results were found in Cheddar cheese supplemented with *Bifidobacterium* (Ong et al., 2006). However, probiotic whey cheese supplemented with *L. casei* and *B. animalis* and with some other additives in its formulation showed an increase in sensory acceptance, demonstrating that the metabolism of a probiotic strain together with manipulation of the food matrix can result in a product with differentiated sensory attributes (Madureira et al., 2011b).

Internal preference mapping showed a large number of consumers concentrated near the conventional cheeses, demonstrating a greater preference for these samples and confirming the results of the consumer test (Figure 1), explaining 59.63% of the total variation of the data. A small, distinct group of consumers preferred the probiotic samples (CP, P0, P1) over the conventional cheeses, whereas P2 was the least preferred sample. Interestingly, P0 was located near P1 and far from C1 and C2 in the preference map, suggesting that consumers had a strong preference for the control samples.

**Table 4. Sensory acceptance of probiotic and conventional cheeses**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cheese</th>
<th>Appearance</th>
<th>Aroma</th>
<th>Taste</th>
<th>Texture</th>
<th>Overall acceptance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P0</td>
<td>6.46b</td>
<td>6.14d</td>
<td>5.64b</td>
<td>6.03c</td>
<td>6.11b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P1</td>
<td>5.74c</td>
<td>6.04d</td>
<td>5.43b</td>
<td>6.09c</td>
<td>5.83bc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P2</td>
<td>6.16bc</td>
<td>5.83d</td>
<td>4.65c</td>
<td>5.40d</td>
<td>5.52c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C1</td>
<td>7.47b</td>
<td>6.91bc</td>
<td>6.98a</td>
<td>6.83b</td>
<td>7.10b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2</td>
<td>7.77bc</td>
<td>7.23c</td>
<td>7.43c</td>
<td>7.55c</td>
<td>7.56b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CP</td>
<td>6.10bc</td>
<td>6.56bc</td>
<td>5.83b</td>
<td>6.14c</td>
<td>6.23b</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(a-d\)Mean values in the same column not followed by the same letter are significantly different \((P < 0.05)\).

1Mean data from 120 consumers and based on a 9-point hedonic scale (1 = dislike extremely; 5 = neither like nor dislike; 9 = like extremely).

See Table 1.
differences in sensory acceptance of the probiotic and conventional cheeses can also be related to the starter cultures used and to different technologies used by each cheese processor.

The addition of probiotic cultures may change the flavor or texture of the food product, sometimes in a positive way, as in the Petit Suisse cheese (Pereira et al., 2010) and probiotic goat cheese (Gomes and Malcata, 1998), or in a negative way such as in acerola probiotic ice cream (Fávaro-Trindade et al., 2006). Besides, repeated exposure (Luckow et al., 2005) and flavor-masking (Luckow et al., 2006) are potential and reasonable strategies to increase the sensory qualities of cheeses. Even though health claims may positively influence initial consumer interest and purchase, positive sensory acceptance is required to ensure continued

**Biplot (F1 and F2: 59.63 %)**

![Biplot](image)

**Figure 1.** Internal preference mapping of probiotic and conventional cheeses. F1 and F2 = factor in the first and second dimension, respectively. For definitions of cheeses, see Table 1. Color version available in the online PDF.
purchase. The success of a probiotic product is linked to consumer perceptions and the product’s sensory properties throughout its commercial shelf life (Drake and Drake, 2011).

With regard to probiotic cheeses, satisfactory sensory performance compared with conventional commercial cheeses requires the use of probiotic bacteria with mild acidifying ability to prevent an excessive formation of acid organic and excessive proteolysis, which is linked to an adequate storage and ripening temperature to minimize the excessive bacterial growth, which would also change the flavor and texture of the final product (Karimi et al., 2011). The ideal situation is that the probiotic bacteria remain viable but not metabolically active, as reported recently with Bifidobacterium longum in Cheddar cheese (Scheller and O’Sullivan, 2011), suggesting that the probiotic cultures are suitable for fortifying cheeses without affecting their sensory properties. However, it is possible to develop probiotic dairy foods with similar acceptance and preference as conventional products (Majchrzak et al., 2010). Moreover, many nonsensory factors, such as price, brand loyalty, health claims, label, and adequacy of food carrier, are fundamental factors related to consumption of a certain food and even acceptance and, therefore, must be taken into account by cheese processors (Ares et al., 2010; Cruz et al., 2010b; Krutulyte et al., 2011).

CONCLUSIONS

The addition of increasing amounts of L. acidophilus exerted an influence on the quality parameters of the fresh probiotic Minas fresh cheese. Elevated counts of this microorganism were observed throughout storage, potentially contributing to maintenance of its probiotic status. However, the lower pH values and greater production of organic acids due to microbial metabolism resulted in alterations in its appearance, aroma, taste, and texture, resulting in a reduced (P < 0.05) acceptance of these samples compared with conventional commercial cheeses. Overall, the supplementation of fresh cheeses with excessive counts of probiotic bacteria should be carefully evaluated, taking into account technological and financial considerations.
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