

1 **Quantitative Risk Assessment for *Salmonella* in**  
2 **Lettuce (*Lactuca sativa*) Consumed in Benin,**  
3 **West Africa**

4  
5  
6  
7  
8 **ABSTRACT**  
9

The present study aims at quantitatively assessing the risk associated with *Salmonella* in lettuce (*Lactuca sativa*) consumed in Benin (West Africa). To that end, a survey was conducted involving 550 respondents to determine the conditions under which the product is handled along the supply chain and its consumption pattern. The prevalence and concentration of *Salmonella* in lettuce were collected from the literature. The consumption data and the data on *Salmonella* concentrations in lettuce were combined to estimate the exposure to *Salmonella* using a probabilistic risk assessment method. The @Risk software package (Palisade USA) was used to run Monte Carlo simulations with 10,000 iterations. Three dose-response models were used to assess the risk of salmonellosis. Different scenarios were tested to identify factors that could influence the risk of salmonellosis. The results showed that lettuce is exposed to temperature abuse under inappropriate hygienic conditions. In 90% of the cases, the exposure to *Salmonella* was between 3 and 7 log CFU/serving. The risk of salmonellosis per serving varied from 7.7% to 95% depending on the dose-response used with the scenario taking into account the current handling conditions of the lettuce. In contrast, when considering the scenario where the cold chain is respected along the supply chain, the risk of salmonellosis varied from 0% to 3.3% depending on the dose response used. The study highlights the importance of the cold chain, good agricultural practices and good hygienic practices to reduce exposure to *Salmonella* through the consumption of lettuce and thus the risk of salmonellosis.

10  
11 *Keywords: Food safety, Salmonellosis, Cold chain, Vegetables, Good hygiene practices*  
12  
13  
14

15

## 16 1. INTRODUCTION

17

18 In Africa, unsafe food and water contribute noticeably to health-related matters [1]. Of  
19 foodborne diseases, salmonellosis is one of the most frequently reported worldwide [2, 3].  
20 The disease is caused by a bacterial pathogen named *Salmonella* and may be characterized  
21 by gastroenteritis, septicemia, typhoid fever, and even death [4, 5].

22 Although *Salmonella* is most frequently associated with food from animal origin [6], there is  
23 an increase report of food from non-animal origin, especially fresh produce involved in  
24 salmonellosis [7 - 9]. Since fresh produce is well recognized as important parts of a  
25 nutritious and healthy diet, its consumption has increased worldwide in recent years [7]. For  
26 example, vegetables production in rainfed upland ecologies is popular in West Africa,  
27 especially for urban and peri-urban areas [10]. Unfortunately, the increased consumption of  
28 fresh produce has led to an increase in the number of outbreaks especially those caused by  
29 *Salmonella* [11, 12]. For example, *Salmonella* outbreaks related to lettuce in Europe and  
30 other developed countries have been documented [13-15]. The contamination of fresh  
31 produce may occur at the production sites, during its transportation, processing or handling  
32 [8, 9]. Contaminated irrigation water and manure constitute the main sources for the  
33 preharvest contamination of lettuce [16]. In many developing countries, where sanitation in  
34 general and wastewater treatment in particular remain challenges, the risk of getting fresh  
35 produce contaminated by pathogens could be high [17]. Also, lettuce is consumed uncooked  
36 and therefore, may present a higher risk of salmonellosis compared to cooked vegetables.  
37 This risk should be managed to ensure the safety of consumers.

38 Microbial risk assessment (MRA) provides an objective, transparent, evidence-based  
39 assessment of the health risk of (different) exposure pathways/scenarios [18]. MRA can also  
40 explore the potential control of foodborne illness [19] by providing structured information on  
41 the effect of potential interventions on the risk that can be implemented by decision makers  
42 of public health authorities or food industry [20, 21]. Quantitative microbial risk assessment  
43 (QMRA) models for pathogens in vegetables production chains have been developed in  
44 various industrialized countries. Examples are QMRA models developed by [22] in USA, [8]  
45 in the Netherlands, [23] in Australia. To our knowledge, there is a lack of QMRA models for  
46 pathogens in vegetables taking into account the conditions that prevail in West African  
47 vegetables supply chains. Therefore, this study aims at quantitatively assessing the risks  
48 related to *Salmonella* in lettuce in Benin. More specifically, the study aims at (1) determining  
49 the conditions under which lettuce is handled along the supply chain; (2) determining the  
50 exposure to *Salmonella* through consumption of lettuce; and (3) estimating the risk on illness  
51 per serving of lettuce.

52

## 53 2. MATERIAL AND METHODS

54 This study was conducted in three steps as follow. First step, a field survey was carried out  
55 to determine the conditions under which lettuce is handled along the supply chain and the  
56 consumption pattern of the product.

57 Second step, literature review was carried out to determine the prevalence and  
58 concentration of *salmonella* in freshly harvested lettuce in the region. Third step, desk work  
59 was performed by building a modular process model with various nodes taking into account  
60 the different steps of the lettuce supply chain for the risk assessment.

### 61 2.1 Lettuce handing conditions and consumption survey

62

63 A chain-wide survey was carried out to via convenience sampling to get insight into lettuce  
64 handling practices and consumption pattern in Cotonou and Abomey-Calavi; which are the

65 most populous cities in Benin. In total, 150 stakeholders directly involved in lettuce  
 66 production or trading were interviewed. In addition, 400 informants were interviewed during  
 67 the lettuce consumption survey. For the handling practices, questionnaire included washing  
 68 methods (types of water used) at the field if applicable, storages conditions at the field, mode  
 69 of transportation from production sites to the markets (retail points, fast-food stands...).  
 70 ThermoChron iButton (DS 1921G) devices were placed in some lettuce samples to record  
 71 temperature and time from the production sites to the markets.

72

73 Regarding lettuce consumption, the frequency of consumption and the quantity consumed  
 74 were determined. For the quantification of food portion size, food photographs tool was used  
 75 as previously described [24]. The demographic characteristics of the interviewees (name,  
 76 age, gender, level of education, and contact details) were also recorded. The questionnaires  
 77 were administered by trained interviewers using face-to-face interviews.

78

## 79 2.2 Determination of *Salmonella* prevalence and concentration in lettuce

80

81 *Salmonella* prevalence and concentration in lettuce were retrieved from literature using  
 82 various databases, namely Web of Science, Science Direct, PubMed, and Google Scholar.  
 83 The following search terms were used: *Salmonella* AND lettuce AND Africa. During the  
 84 literature search, we did not make any restrictions with regard to language or year of  
 85 publication. All studies carried out in the same region of that of Benin (West Africa) were  
 86 included

87

## 88 2.3 Exposure and risk model

89

90 A modular process model with six nodes taking into account the different steps of the lettuce  
 91 supply chain was used for the risk assessment (Table 1). Collected data on *Salmonella*  
 92 prevalence, lettuce consumption pattern, and time-temperature profiles were used.  
 93 Additional literature review was performed to make relevant assumptions needed to  
 94 construct the model (Table 1). The @Risk software package (Palisade USA) was used to  
 95 run Monte Carlo simulations with 10,000 iterations. Based on the input data, the exposure to  
 96 *Salmonella* per serving of lettuce and the risk on illness per serving were estimated.

97

98 **Table 1** Description and distribution of variables and models for risk assessment of  
 99 *Salmonella* in lettuce

100

Cell	Variables	Descriptions	Units	Distribution/Model /values	Sources
<b>Harvest</b>					
D3	N	Number of samples	no units	757	Literature
D4	X	Number of positive samples	no units	198	Literature
D5	P	Prevalence of <i>Salmonella</i> in lettuce	no units	=RiskBeta(D4+1;D3-D4+1)	Calculated
D6	C <sub>min</sub>	Minimum concentration of <i>Salmonella</i> in freshly harvested lettuce	log UFC/g	0	Assumption based on literature

D7	C <sub>ml</sub>	Most likely concentration of <i>Salmonella</i> in freshly harvested lettuce	log UFC/g	1	
D8	C <sub>max</sub>	Maximum concentration of <i>Salmonella</i> in freshly harvested lettuce	log UFC/g	6	
D9	C <sub>unc</sub>	Concentration of <i>Salmonella</i> in freshly harvested lettuce with uncertainties	log UFC/g	=RiskPert(D6;D7;D8)	Calculated
D10	C <sub>0</sub>	Initial concentration of <i>Salmonella</i> in lettuce	log UFC/g	=IF(D5=0;0;D9)	Calculated
<b>Transportation</b>					
D12	T <sub>min</sub>	Minimum temperature during transportation	°C	23	Measured during the field survey
D13	T <sub>max</sub>	Maximum temperature during transportation	°C	32	Measured during the field survey
D14	T <sub>unc</sub>	Temperature during transportation with uncertainties	°C	=RiskUniform(D12;D13)	Calculated
D15	t <sub>min</sub>	Minimum time during transportation	hour	0.17	Measured during the field survey
D16	t <sub>max</sub>	Maximum time during transportation	hour	1	Measured during the field survey
D17	t <sub>unc</sub>	Time during transportation with uncertainties	hour	=RiskUniform(D15;D16)	Calculated
D18	C <sub>in-min</sub>	Minimal Increase in <i>Salmonella</i> concentration during transportation	log UFC/g	0	Estimated from ComBase
D19	C <sub>in-max</sub>	Maximum Increase in <i>Salmonella</i> concentration during transportation	log UFC/g	0	Estimated from ComBase
D20	C <sub>in-unc</sub>	Increase in <i>Salmonella</i> concentration during transportation with uncertainties	log UFC/g	=RiskUniform(D18;D19)	Calculated

D21	$C_1$	Concentration of <i>Salmonella</i> in lettuce at the end of transportation	log UFC/g	=D10+D20	Calculated
<b>During lettuce sale</b>					
D23	$T_{\text{min-sale}}$	Minimum temperature during sale	°C	23	Measured during the field survey
D24	$T_{\text{max-sale}}$	Maximum temperature during sale	°C	32	Measured during the field survey
D25	$T_{\text{unc-sale}}$	Temperature during sale with uncertainties	°C	=RiskUniform(D23; D24)	Calculated
D26	$t_{\text{min-sale}}$	Minimum time during sale	hour	24	Measured during the field survey
D27	$t_{\text{max-sale}}$	Maximum time during sale	hour	72	Measured during the field survey
D28	$t_{\text{unc-sale}}$	Time during sale with uncertainties	hour	=RiskUniform(D26; D27)	Calculated
D29	$C_{\text{in-min-sale}}$	Minimal Increase in <i>Salmonella</i> concentration during sale	log UFC/g	6.1	Estimated from ComBase
D30	$C_{\text{in-max-sale}}$	Maximum Increase in <i>Salmonella</i> concentration during sale	log UFC/g	6.2	Estimated from ComBase
D31	$C_{\text{in-unc-sale}}$	Increase in <i>Salmonella</i> concentration during sale with uncertainties	log UFC/g	=RiskUniform(D30; D31)	Calculated
D32	$C_2$	Concentration of <i>Salmonella</i> in lettuce at the end of sale	log UFC/g	=D21+D31	Calculated
<b>Washing step</b>					
D34	$C_{\text{red}}$	Average reduction through washing	log CFU/g	2,7	<b>[25]</b>
D35	$SD_{\text{red}}$	Standard deviation of the reduction through washing	log CFU/g	0,4	<b>[25]</b>
D36	$C_{\text{red-unc}}$	<i>Salmonella</i> concentration reduction through washing with uncertainties	log CFU/g	=RiskLognorm(D34 ;D35)	Calculated

D37	C <sub>3</sub>	Concentration of <i>Salmonella</i> in lettuce at the end of the washing step	log CFU/g	=D32-D36	Calculated
<b>Application of sanitizers</b>					
D39	C <sub>red-min-san</sub>	Minimal reduction of <i>Salmonella</i> concentration	log CFU/g	1,85	<b>[26]</b>
D40	C <sub>red-max-san</sub>	Maximal reduction of <i>Salmonella</i> concentration	log CFU/g	3,05	<b>[26]</b>
D41	C <sub>red-unc-san</sub>	Reduction of <i>Salmonella</i> concentration through application of sanitizers with uncertainties	log CFU/g	=RiskUniform(D39; D40)	Calculated
D42	C <sub>3-log</sub>	Concentration of <i>Salmonella</i> in lettuce at the end of the application of sanitizers	log CFU/g	=D37-D41	Calculated
D43	C <sub>3</sub>	Concentration of <i>Salmonella</i> in lettuce at the end of the application of sanitizers	CFU/g	=10 <sup>D42</sup>	Calculated
<b>Consumption</b>					
D45	M	Serving portion size	g	=RiskTriang(-12,161;101,2;218,69;RiskName("consumed quantity (g)"))	Distribution fitted to the consumption data
D46	E	Exposition to <i>Salmonella</i> per serving	CFU/serving	=D43*D45	Calculated
D47	E <sub>log</sub>	Exposition to <i>Salmonella</i> per serving	Log CFU/serving	=LOG10(D46)	Calculated
D48	Dr1	Dose-Response 1	log CFU/serving	=RiskUniform(5;10)	<b>[27]</b>
D49	Dr2	Dose-Response 2	log CFU/serving	=RiskUniform(1;6)	<b>[28]</b>
D50	Dr3	Dose-Response 3	log CFU/serving	=RiskUniform(0;3)	<b>[29]</b>
D51	R1	Risk on illness per serving using	No unit	=D47/D48	Calculated

		D/R 1			
D52	R2	Risk on illness per serving using D/R 2	No unit	=D47/D49	Calculated
D53	R2	Risk on illness per serving using D/R 3	No unit	=D47/D50	Calculated

101

102 Three scenarios were simulated and the impact on the risk on illness was evaluated. These  
 103 scenarios are: (1) assuming that the cold chain was maintained along the supply chain; (2)  
 104 assuming that the product was not (properly) washed before consumption; (3) assuming that  
 105 Good Agricultural Practices (GAP) and Good Hygienic Practices (GHP) were followed,  
 106 resulting in an initial maximum load of 2 log UFC/g of *Salmonella*.

107

## 108 2.4 Data analysis

109

110 Raw data were recorded in Microsoft Excel, and descriptive statistics were calculated. For  
 111 the probabilistic risk assessment method, appropriate statistical distributions were used from  
 112 @Risk software (Palisade USA) (Table 1). For the consumption data, the best fitting  
 113 distribution was selected based on (i) Chi<sup>2</sup> value (the lowest ones); (ii) the P/P plots of the  
 114 distributions (the best straight lines); and (iii) the comparison of fitting and input data  
 115 focusing on the median value (P<sub>50</sub>), P<sub>90</sub>, and the tails (P<sub>95</sub> and P<sub>99</sub>).

116

## 117 3. RESULTS

118

### 119 3.1 Lettuce supply chain and handling practices in Benin

120

121 The socio-demographic profiles of the informants are shown in Table 2. The majority of  
 122 respondents at the production level were men (92%), while most of the stakeholders at the  
 123 trade and restaurant levels were women (64-72%). Lettuce stakeholders in Benin were at  
 124 least 20 years old. Most (> 50%) of traders and restaurateurs were between 20 and 25 years  
 125 old. Most of lettuce stakeholders received formal education with at least junior secondary  
 126 school level.

127

128 **Table 2** Sociodemographic profiles of the respondents

129


Characteristic	% of respondents with characteristic			
	Farmers (n=50)	Traders (n=50)	Restaurateurs (n=50)	Consumers (n=400)
<b>Gender</b>				
Male	92	36	28	58
Female	8	64	72	42
<b>Age (year)</b>				
<20	0	0	0	21.3
20-25	4	68	54	47
26-29	24	30	40	13.3
30-34	16	2	6	5.3
35-39	22	0	0	4.8
40-44	24	0	0	4

45-50	2	0	0	4
>50	8	0	0	0.5
<b>Educational level</b>				
No schooling	2	0	0	0.3
Primary school	4	0	0	2
Junior secondary school	84	60	38	13.2
Senior secondary school	10	38	54	31.8
University	0	2	8	52.7

130

131 Lettuce supply chain in the cities of Cotonou and Abomey-Calavi is depicted in Fig. 1

132



133

134

135 **Fig. 1. Lettuce supply chain in urban areas in Benin**

136 After harvest, lettuce is delivered mainly to wholesalers who in turn supply mainly retailers or  
 137 restaurateurs with the product. Consumers then buy the product from restaurateurs at  
 138 restaurants, hotels, schools etc. or from retailers for home consumption. However, in some  
 139 cases, some people act as an intermediary between the farmers and the wholesalers. These  
 140 intermediate traders buy the lettuce from farmers before the harvest time and sell it to

141 wholesalers when the product is ready to be harvested. Also, it should be noted that  
 142 sometimes restaurateurs can be provided with lettuce by retailers.

143  
 144 The survey revealed that 100% of the lettuce farmers ( $n=50$ ) use poultry manure as fertilizer  
 145 (data not shown). In addition to poultry manure, most of farmers (96%) use chemical  
 146 fertilizers (urea or NPK) or other organic fertilizers (cow dung or compost) (data not shown).

147  
 148 As far as lettuce handling practices are concerned, after harvest, surface water is used to  
 149 wash the product by up to 16% of the informants (Table 3).

150  
 151 **Table 3** Lettuce handling conditions in urban areas in Benin  
 152

Lettuce handling conditions	Variant	% of informants using the variant
Lettuce washing water after harvest by wholesaler ( $n=50$ )	Surface water	16
	Groundwater	84
Main holding containers during lettuce transportation by wholesalers ( $n=50$ )	Wooden basket	24
	Jute bags	18
	Plastic baskets	10
	Mosquito nets	22
	Clothes	26
Mean of transportations by wholesaler ( $n=50$ )	Motorbike	86
	Foot	10
	Car	4
Storage methods along the chain (farmers, wholesalers, retailers, and restaurateurs) ( $n=150$ )	Ambient temperature ( $26 \pm 3^\circ\text{C}$ )	87.3
	Refrigerated storage ( $7 \pm 2^\circ\text{C}$ )	12.7
Strategies to maintain the freshness of the product during selling by retailers ( $n=50$ )	Water spray	64
	Wrapping the lettuce up with humidified clothes/Jute bags	28
	Shade	8

153  
 154 The most holding materials were clothes, wooden baskets and mosquito nets. The most  
 155 common means of lettuce transportation from the growing areas to selling points are  
 156 motorbikes (86% of the informants). The transportation lasts between 10 and 60 min (data  
 157 not shown). Lettuce is kept at ambient temperature ( $26 \pm 3^\circ\text{C}$ ) along the supply chain by  
 158 most stakeholders (approximately 90%). Only restaurateurs at hotels and at some  
 159 restaurants store the product in a refrigerator ( $7 \pm 2^\circ\text{C}$ ). To keep the product fresh during  
 160 storage at ambient temperature, water is regularly sprayed on the product by most of the  
 161 informants (64%). According to the lettuce stakeholders interviewed, the shelf-life of the  
 162 product is 48-72h when it is kept at ambient temperature while under refrigerator storage it  
 163 is between five and seven days.

164 Before using the lettuce to make salad dishes, the product is sometimes treated with  
 165 chemical additives acting as sanitizers such as potassium permanganate ( $\text{KMnO}_4$ ), vinegar  
 166 (acid acetic), sodium hypochlorite ( $\text{NaClO}$ ) or lemon juice.

### 167 3.2 Exposure assessment

168  
 169  
 170 Our survey showed that the portion size of lettuce per serving ranged approximately  
 171 between 60 g to 200 g with P50 value of 101.2 g and an average value of 110.5 g (Table 4).

172 The consumers weight varied between 61 kg and 122.3 kg with P50 value of 58 kg and an  
 173 average of 61.4 kg (Table 4). The frequency of consumption ranged from 6 times per week  
 174 (0.3% of informants  $n=400$ ) to 1 time per year (1.8% of informants  $n=400$ ). The most cited  
 175 frequencies were: two times per month (24.5% of informants  $n=400$ ), once a week (21.8%  
 176 of informants  $n=400$ ) and once a month (21.3% of informants  $n=400$ ).

177  
 178  
 179

**Table 4** Portion size of lettuce and weight of consumers ( $n=400$ )

Variants	Mean	Minimum	P50	P90	P97,5	P99,5	Maximum
Weight (kg)	61,4	40	58	78,2	95,8	100	122,3
Portion size (g)	110,5	61	101,2	170	202,4	202,4	202,4

180  
 181  
 182  
 183  
 184  
 185  
 186  
 187  
 188

*P= percentile*

Table 5 shows the prevalence and concentration in freshly harvested lettuce in some West African countries. The prevalence of *Salmonella* in the region ranged from 3% to 50%. Data on *Salmonella* concentration in lettuce from the region is scanty. Concentration up to 6 log UFC/g was reported (Table 5).

**Table 5** *Salmonella* prevalence and concentration in fresh lettuce in some West African countries


Product	Country	Concentration (UFC/g)	Prevalence	Sources
Fresh lettuce	Ghana	64.10 <sup>5</sup>	nr	[30]
		36.10 <sup>5</sup>	nr	
		42.10 <sup>5</sup>	nr	
	Côte-d'Ivoire	8.2.10 <sup>4</sup>	nr	[31]
	Nigeria	nr	6/14 (42%)	[32]
		nr	10/20 (50%)	[33]
	Burkina-Faso	nr	26/78 (33%)	[34]
		nr	9/80 (11%)	[35]
		nr	133/360 (36%)	[36]
	Niger	nr	3/99 (3 %)	[37]
nr		11/106 (11 %)		

189

*nr = not reported*

190  
 191  
 192  
 193  
 194  
 195  
 196

Combining lettuce consumption data, *Salmonella* prevalence and concentration data and other data from the survey and literature in a modular process model (Table 1), the exposure to *Salmonella* per serving was estimated (Fig. 2). In 90% of cases, consumers of lettuce were exposed to a dose ranging from 3.0 to 7.0 log UFC/serving. The average exposure and P50 dose were 4.8 log UFC/serving and 4.6 log UFC/serving, respectively.



197  
198  
199  
200

**Fig. 2. The frequency distribution of *Salmonella* concentration on lettuce at the time of consumption** Values in x axis are in log CFU/serving.

201  
202  
203  
204  
205  
206

### 3.3 Risk on illness estimation

The risk on illness per serving according to the dose response models is depicted in Table 6. **Table 6** Estimation of the risk on illness for various scenarios using three dose response models

Scenarios	Dose Response models		
	Dose-response 1 [27] $10^5 - 10^{10}$ CFU/serving	Dose-response 2 [28] $10 - 10^6$ CFU/serving	Dose-response 3 [29] $1 - 10^3$ CFU/serving
Baseline scenario (based on the current handling practices)	7,7 %	73,5 %	95 %
Scenario 1 : assuming that the cold chain was maintained along the supply chain ( $T \leq 7$ $^{\circ}\text{C}$ )	0 %	0,4 %	3,3 %
Scenario 2 : assuming that the product was not properly washed before consumption (so, no reduction in <i>Salmonella</i> concentration through washing)	49,6 %	99,5 %	100 %
Scenario 3 : assuming that Good agricultural practices (GAP) and good hygienic practices (GHP) were followed	0,8 %	62,7 %	95 %

---

resulting in an initial  
maximum load of 2  
log UFC/g of  
*Salmonella*

---

207

208

209

#### 4. DISCUSSION

210

211

212

213

214

215

216

217

218

219

220

In this study, lettuce handling practices along the supply chain in urban areas in Benin was investigated and the health risk associated with the consumption of the product was assessed. Like in many previous studies [38 - 40] this study shows that in Benin, men are more involved in raw food production while women are specialized in the processing and trade of these products. After harvest, lettuce is washed to get rid of sand and other debris attached to the leaves. However, the quality of water used may constitute a source of microbiological contamination of the product. Indeed, various studies have reported the presence of fecal indicator organisms and specific foodborne pathogens including *Salmonella* especially in surface water used to irrigate or wash vegetables [34, 41, 42].

221

222

223

224

225

226

227

228

229

230

In addition to water used for lettuce irrigation or washing, another potential source of *Salmonella* contamination is the poultry manure widely used as fertilizer. It is in fact well documented that poultry manure can play an important role in contaminating soil and root vegetables with *Salmonella* for a relatively long time [43-45]. Moreover, cross-contamination along the supply chain due to the poor handling practices observed during the survey could be an important cause of *Salmonella* contamination in lettuce in the region as previously reported in other studies [46, 47]. Although the use of sanitizers can play an important role in controlling pathogens associated with vegetables, they are not always effective against the targeted microorganisms and they cannot eliminate cross-contamination [46, 48].

231

232

233

234

235

236

Our study reveals that in most cases, lettuce is kept at ambient temperature along the supply chain (from farmers to consumers). This practice in a tropical region where ambient temperature is above 20°C all year long, is in violation of Codex Alimentarius recommendations which stipulate that fresh vegetables should be maintained at low temperatures at all stages to minimize microbiological growth [49].

237

238

239

240

Similar observations of temperature abuse and inappropriate handling practices of vegetables have also been reported in other West African cities including Ouagadougou (Burkina-Faso) and Accra (Ghana) [50].

241

242

243

244

245

246

247

This temperature abuse could explain the relatively high prevalence and concentration of *Salmonella* in lettuce from the region as demonstrated by [51]. In a study on systematic review and meta-analysis of *Salmonella* spp. and *Escherichia coli* O157:H7 prevalence and levels on lettuce from various countries across the globe, [52] found that the highest prevalence of *Salmonella* spp. on lettuce (50%) was from Burkina-Faso, which is a neighboring country of Benin.

248

249

250

251

252

253

254

255

Although, relatively high *Salmonella* prevalence and concentration on lettuce were reported in West Africa (Table 5), little is known about the health risk incurred by the population in the region. In this study, based on lettuce consumption data in Benin the health risk associated with the contamination of the product by *Salmonella* was assessed using a probabilistic risk assessment method. As expected, the risk per serving was relatively high, especially with dose response models addressing low *Salmonella* doses. However, this health risk can be significantly reduced when the cold chain is maintained along the supply chain. This study highlights the need to maintain temperature control along the lettuce supply chain. Good

256 Agricultural practices and good hygiene practices including appropriate washing step with  
257 potable water of the lettuce before consumption are also important to reduce the health risk  
258 associated with this product.

259  
260  
261

## 262 **5. CONCLUSION**

263

264 This study shows that like in other West African countries, lettuce is exposed to temperature  
265 abuse under inappropriate hygienic conditions in Benin. This leads to high prevalence and  
266 concentration of *Salmonella* on lettuce in the region. The median portion size of lettuce was  
267 101.2 g and in 90% of cases, consumers are exposed to a dose of *Salmonella* ranging from  
268 3 to 7 log UFC/serving. The estimated health risk depends on the type of dose response  
269 model used varying between 7.7% and 95% per serving. However, this risk can be  
270 significantly reduced (0% to 3.3%) if cold chain is implemented and maintained along the  
271 supply chain preventing *Salmonella* from growing. Reducing the initial concentration of  
272 *Salmonella* through Good Agricultural Practice and Good Hygiene Practice, and appropriate  
273 lettuce washing step before consumption are also important to minimize the health risk. It is  
274 therefore important to train lettuce stakeholders in Good Agricultural Practices and safe food  
275 handling practices. In addition, affordable and energy efficient pre-cooling and cold storage  
276 facilities for stakeholders should be promoted.

277

## 278 **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

279

280 Authors are grateful to vegetables growers' association for facilitating the field survey.

281

## 282 **COMPETING INTERESTS**

283

284 Authors have declared that no competing interests exist

285

## 286 **AUTHORS' CONTRIBUTIONS**

287

288 *D. Sylvain Dabadé designed the study, performed the microbial risk assessment and wrote*  
289 *the first draft. Vioutou E. C. participated in data collection and contributed to the*  
290 *improvement of the first draft of the manuscript. Paulin Azokpota contributed to the*  
291 *improvement of the first draft of the manuscript. All authors read and approved the final*  
292 *manuscript.*

293

294

295

## 296 **REFERENCES**

297

298 1. World Health Organization. WHO estimates of the global burden of foodborne  
299 diseases: foodborne disease burden epidemiology reference group 2007-  
300 2015.WHO. 2015.

301 2. Lee KM, Runyon M, Herrman TJ, Phillips R, Hsieh J. Review of *Salmonella*  
302 detection and identification methods: Aspects of rapid emergency response and  
303 food safety. *Food control*. 2015;47:264-  
304 276.<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foodcont.2014.07.011>

- 305 3. Li F, Li F, Chen B, Zhou B, Yu P, Yu S, Xu H. Sextuplex PCR combined with  
306 immunomagnetic separation and PMA treatment for rapid detection and specific  
307 identification of viable *Salmonella* spp., *Salmonella enterica* serovars Paratyphi B,  
308 *Salmonella* Typhimurium, and *Salmonella* Enteritidis in raw meat. *Food Control*.  
309 2017;73:587-594. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foodcont.2016.09.009>
- 310 4. Alakomi HL, Saarela M. *Salmonella* importance and current status of detection and  
311 surveillance methods. *Qual Assur Saf Crop Foods*. 2009;1(3):142-152.  
312 <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1757-837X.2009.00032.x>
- 313 5. Tatavarthy A, Cannons A. Real-time PCR detection of *Salmonella* species using a  
314 novel target: the outer membrane porin F gene (ompF). *Lett Appl Microbiol*.  
315 2010;50(6):645-652. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1472-765X.2010.02848.x>
- 316 6. Pires SM, de Knecht L, Hald T. Estimation of the relative contribution of different food  
317 and animal sources to human *Salmonella* infections in the European Union. *EFSA*  
318 *Supporting Publications*. 2011;8(8):184E.
- 319
- 320 7. Denis N, Zhang H, Leroux A, Trudel R, Bietlot H. Prevalence and trends of bacterial  
321 contamination in fresh fruits and vegetables sold at retail in Canada. *Food control*.  
322 2016;67:225-234. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foodcont.2016.02.047>
- 323 8. Franz E, Tromp SO, Rijgersberg H, Van Der Fels-Klerx HJ. Quantitative microbial  
324 risk assessment for *Escherichia coli* O157: H7, *Salmonella*, and *Listeria*  
325 *monocytogenes* in leafy green vegetables consumed at salad bars. *J Food Prot*.  
326 2010;73(2):274-285. <https://doi.org/10.4315/0362-028X-73.2.274>
- 327 9. World Health Organization. Microbiological hazards in fresh leafy vegetables and  
328 herbs: meeting report. WHO. 2008;(14).
- 329 10. James B, Atcha-Ahowé C, Godonou I, Baimey H, Goergen H, Sikirou R, Toko, M.  
330 Integrated pest management in vegetable production: A guide for extension workers  
331 in West Africa. IITA. 2010.
- 332 11. Gunel E, Kilic GP, Bulut E, Durul B, Acar S, Alpas H, Soyer Y. *Salmonella*  
333 surveillance on fresh produce in retail in Turkey. *Int J Food Microbiol*. 2015;199:72-  
334 77. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijfoodmicro.2015.01.010>
- 335 12. Kozak GK, MacDonald D, Landry L, Farber JM. Foodborne outbreaks in Canada  
336 linked to produce: 2001 through 2009. *J Food Prot*. 2013;76(1):173-183.  
337 <https://doi.org/10.4315/0362-028X.JFP-12-126>

- 338 13. Gajraj R, Pooransingh S, Hawker JI, Olowokure B. Multiple outbreaks of *Salmonella*  
339 braenderup associated with consumption of iceberg lettuce. *Int J Environmental*  
340 *Health Research*. 2012;22(2):150-155.  
341 <https://doi.org/10.1080/09603123.2011.613114>
- 342 14. Horby PW, O'brien SJ, Adak GK, Graham C, Hawker JI, Hunter P, Ward L. R. A  
343 national outbreak of multi-resistant *Salmonella* enterica serovar Typhimurium  
344 definitive phage type (DT) 104 associated with consumption of lettuce. *Epidemiol*  
345 *Infect*. 2003;130(2):169-178. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0950268802008063>
- 346 15. Nygård K, Lassen J, Vold L, Andersson Y, Fisher I, Löfdahl S, Aavitsland P.  
347 Outbreak of *Salmonella* Thompson infections linked to imported rucola  
348 lettuce. *Foodborne Pathog Dis*. 2008;5(2):165-173.  
349 <https://doi.org/10.1089/fpd.2007.0053>
- 350 16. Söderström A, Österberg P, Lindqvist A, Jönsson B, Lindberg A, Blide Ulander S,  
351 Andersson Y. A large *Escherichia coli* O157 outbreak in Sweden associated with  
352 locally produced lettuce. *Foodborne Pathog Dis*. 2008;5(3):339-349.  
353 <https://doi.org/10.1089/fpd.2007.0065>
- 354 17. Amoah P, Drechsel P, Henseler M, Abaidoo RC. Irrigated urban vegetable  
355 production in Ghana: microbiological contamination in farms and markets and  
356 associated consumer risk groups. *J Water Health*. 2007;5(3):455-466.
- 357 18. De Keuckelaere A, Jacxsens L, Amoah P, Medema G, McClure P, Jaykus LA,  
358 Uyttendaele M. Zero risk does not exist: lessons learned from microbial risk  
359 assessment related to use of water and safety of fresh produce. *Compr Rev Food*  
360 *Sci Food Saf*. 2015;14(4):387-410. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1541-4337.12140>
- 361 19. Møller COA, Nauta MJ, Schaffner DW, Dalgaard P, Christensen BB, Hansen, TB.  
362 Risk assessment of *Salmonella* in Danish meatballs produced in the catering sector.  
363 *International J Food Microbiol*. 2015;196:109-125.  
364 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijfoodmicro.2014.10.010>
- 365 20. Koutsoumanis KP, Aspidou Z. Moving towards a risk-based food safety  
366 management. *Curr Opin Food Sci*. 2016;12:36-41.  
367 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cofs.2016.06.008>
- 368 21. Zwietering MH. Risk assessment and risk management for safe foods: Assessment  
369 needs inclusion of variability and uncertainty, management needs discrete  
370 decisions. *Int J Food Microbiol*. 2015;213:118-123.  
371 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijfoodmicro.2015.03.032>
- 372 22. Danyluk MD, Harris LJ, Schaffner DW. Monte Carlo simulations assessing the risk of  
373 salmonellosis from consumption of almonds. *J Food Prot*. 2006;69(7):1594-1599.  
374 <https://doi.org/10.4315/0362-028X-69.7.1594>

- 375 23. Hamilton AJ, Stagnitti F, Premier R, Boland AM, Hale G. Quantitative microbial risk  
376 assessment models for consumption of raw vegetables irrigated with reclaimed  
377 water. *Appl Environ Microbiol.* 2006;72(5):3284-3290.  
378 <https://doi.org/10.1128/AEM.72.5.3284-3290.2006>
- 379 24. Huybregts L, Roberfroid D, Lachat C, Van Camp J, Kolsteren P. Validity of  
380 photographs for food portion estimation in a rural West African setting. *Public Health*  
381 *Nutr.* 2008;11(6):581-587. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S1368980007000870>
- 382 25. Zhang G, Ma L, Phelan VH, Doyle MP. Efficacy of antimicrobial agents in lettuce leaf  
383 processing water for control of *Escherichia coli* O157: H7. *J Food Prot.*  
384 2009;72(7):1392-1397. <https://doi.org/10.4315/0362-028X-72.7.1392>
- 385 26. Cuggino SG, Bascon-Villegas I, Rincón F, Pérez MA, Posada-Izquierdo G, Marugan  
386 J, Pérez-Rodríguez F. Modelling the combined effect of chlorine, benzyl  
387 isothiocyanate, exposure time and cut size on the reduction of Salmonella in fresh-  
388 cut lettuce during washing process. *Food Microbiol.* 2020;86:103346.  
389 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.fm.2019.103346>
- 390 27. Blaser MJ, Newman LS. A review of human salmonellosis: I. Infective dose. *Rev*  
391 *Infect Dis.* 1982;4(6):1096-1106 <https://doi.org/10.1093/clinids/4.6.1096>
- 392 28. Oscar T. Dose-response model for 13 strains of Salmonella. *Risk Analysis: An Int J.*  
393 2004;24(1):41-49. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordjournals.aje.a113411>
- 394 29. Blaser MJ, Huq MI, Glass RI, Zimicki S, Birkness KA. Salmonellosis at rural and  
395 urban clinics in Bangladesh: epidemiologic and clinical characteristics. *Am J*  
396 *Epidemiol.* 1982;116(2):266-275.  
397 <https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordjournals.aje.a113411>
- 398 30. Adetunde LA, Sackey I, Dombiri DD, Mariama ZW. Potential links between irrigation  
399 water microbiological quality and fresh vegetables quality in Upper East region of  
400 Ghana subsistence farming. *Annu Res Rev Biol.* 2015;347-354.  
401 <https://doi.org/10.9734/ARRB/2015/8273>
- 402 31. Kouassi CK, Kouassi AK, Yao KM, Kouassi GA, Koffi-Nevry R. Assessment of the  
403 Risk of Microbial Contamination of an Urban Crop in the City of Daloa (Côte  
404 d'Ivoire): Case of Lettuce (*Lactuca sativa* L.). *J Food Res.* 2019;8(3):122.  
405 <https://doi.org/10.5539/jfr.v8n3p122>
- 406 32. Odu NN, Okomuda MO. Prevalence of *Salmonella* species and *Escherichia coli* in  
407 fresh cabbage and lettuce sold in Port Harcourt Metropolis, Nigeria. *Rep Opinion.*  
408 2013;5(3):1-8.
- 409 33. Traoré O, Nyholm O, Siitonen A, Bonkougou IJO, Traoré AS, Barro N, Haukka K.  
410 Prevalence and diversity of *Salmonella enterica* in water, fish and lettuce in

- 411 Ouagadougou, Burkina Faso. BMC Microbiol. 2015;15(1):1-7.  
412 <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12866-015-0484-7>
- 413 34. Somda NS, Bonkougou IJO, Sambe-Ba B, Drabo MS, Wane AA, Sawadogo-  
414 Lingani H, Savadogo A. Diversity and antimicrobial drug resistance of non-typhoid  
415 Salmonella serotypes isolated in lettuce, irrigation water and clinical samples in  
416 Burkina Faso. J Agric Food Res. 2021;5:100167.  
417 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jafr.2021.100167>
- 418 35. Rouamba SS, Somda NS, Tapsoba F, Somda A, Ouédraogo MLP, Kabré E,  
419 Savadogo A. Prevalence and antibioresistance of Escherichia coli and Salmonella  
420 isolated from lettuce and irrigation water in Ouagadougou, Burkina Faso. J Life Sci  
421 Biomed. 2022;12(01):01-07. <https://dx.doi.org/10.51145/jlsb.2022.1>
- 422 36. Alio SA, Inoussa MM, Samna SO, Bakasso Y. Diversité et dynamique des  
423 Salmonella isolées de la laitue (Lactuca sativa L.) dans les cultures maraîchères au  
424 Niger (Afrique de l'ouest). J Appl Biosci. 2017;119:11917-11928. French.
- 425 37. Ndiaye ML, Dieng Y, Niang S, Pfeifer HR, Tonolla M, Peduzzi R. Effect of irrigation  
426 water on the incidence of Salmonella spp. on lettuces produced by urban agriculture  
427 and sold on the markets in Dakar, Senegal. Afr J Microbiol Res. 2011;5(19):2885-  
428 2890.
- 429 38. Dabade DS, den BESTEN HM, Azokpota P, ROB NOUT MJ, Hounhouigan DJ,  
430 Zwietering MH. Quality perceptions of stakeholders in Beninese export-oriented  
431 shrimp chain. J Food Prot. 2014;77(9):1642-1648. [https://doi.org/10.4315/0362-  
432 028X.JFP-13-525](https://doi.org/10.4315/0362-028X.JFP-13-525)
- 433 39. Honfo FG, Hounhouigan MH, Dabade DS, Hounsou M, Gotz B, Albrecht A,  
434 Hounhouigan DJ. Handling Practices and Quality Attributes Along the Supply Chain  
435 of gboma (Solanum Macrocarpon): A Leafy Vegetable in Southern Benin. Int J Food  
436 Stud. 2022;11(2):296-306. <https://doi.org/10.7455/ijfs/11.2.2022.a4>
- 437 40. Hounsou M, Dabadé DS, Götz B, Hounhouigan MH, Honfo GF, Albrecht A,  
438 Hounhouigan DJ. Waragashi handling practices, quality and loss estimation along  
439 the value chain of waragashi, a soft cheese from Benin. Afr J Food Agric Nutr Dev.  
440 2022;22(7):20774-20792.
- 441 41. Ijabadeniyi OA, Debusho LK, Vanderlinde M, Buys EM. Irrigation water as a  
442 potential preharvest source of bacterial contamination of vegetables. J Food Saf.  
443 2011;31(4):452-461. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1745-4565.2011.00321.x>
- 444 42. Steele M, Odumeru J. Irrigation water as source of foodborne pathogens on fruit and  
445 vegetables. J Food Prot. 2004;67(12):2839-2849. [https://doi.org/10.4315/0362-  
446 028X-67.12.2839](https://doi.org/10.4315/0362-028X-67.12.2839)

- 447 43. Islam M, Morgan J, Doyle MP, Phatak SC, Millner P, Jiang X. Fate of *Salmonella*  
448 *enterica* serovar Typhimurium on carrots and radishes grown in fields treated with  
449 contaminated manure composts or irrigation water. *Appl Environ Microbiol.*  
450 2004;70(4):2497-2502. <https://doi.org/10.1128/AEM.70.4.2497-2502.2004>
- 451 44. Ssemanda JN, Reij MW, van Middendorp G, Bouw E, van der Plaats R, Franz E,  
452 Joosten, H. Foodborne pathogens and their risk exposure factors associated with  
453 farm vegetables in Rwanda. *Food Control.* 2018a;89:86-96.  
454 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foodcont.2017.12.034>
- 455 45. Silva MBRD, Maffei DF, Moreira DA, Dias M, Mendes MA, Franco BDGDM.  
456 Agricultural practices in Brazilian organic farms and microbiological characteristics of  
457 samples collected along the production chain. *J Appl Microbiol.* 2022; 32(2):1185-  
458 1196. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jam.15247>
- 459 46. Possas A, Pérez-Rodríguez F. New insights into Cross-contamination of Fresh-  
460 Produce. *Curr Opin Food Sci.* 2022;100954.  
461 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cofs.2022.100954>
- 462 47. Wachtel MR, Charkowski AO. Cross-contamination of lettuce with *Escherichia coli*  
463 O157:H7. *J Food Prot.* 2022;65(3):465-470. [https://doi.org/10.4315/0362-028X-](https://doi.org/10.4315/0362-028X-65.3.465)  
464 [65.3.465](https://doi.org/10.4315/0362-028X-65.3.465)
- 465 48. Ssemanda JN, Joosten H, Bagabe MC, Zwietering MH, Reij, MW. Reduction of  
466 microbial counts during kitchen scale washing and sanitization of salad  
467 vegetables. *Food Control.* 2018b;85:495-503.  
468 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foodcont.2017.10.004>
- 469 49. Codex Alimentarius Commission, Joint FAO/WHO Codex Alimentarius Commission,  
470 Joint FAO/WHO Food Standards Programme, World Health Organization. *Codex*  
471 *Alimentarius: Fresh Fruits and Vegetables.* 2007.
- 472 50. Karg H, Drechsel P. *Atlas of West African urban food systems: examples from*  
473 *Ghana and Burkina Faso.* International Water Management Institute (IWMI). CGIAR  
474 Research Program on Water, Land and Ecosystems (WLE). 2018.
- 475 51. Waitt JA, Kuhn DD, Welbaum GE, Ponder MA. Postharvest transfer and survival of  
476 *Salmonella enterica* serotype enteritidis on living lettuce. *Lett Appl Microbiol.*  
477 2014;58(2):95-101. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1745-4565.2011.00321.x>
- 478 52. de Oliveira Elias S, Noronha TB, Tondo EC. *Salmonella* spp. and *Escherichia coli*  
479 O157: H7 prevalence and levels on lettuce: A systematic review and meta-analysis.  
480 *Food Microbiology.* 2019;84:103217. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.fm.2019.05.001>  
481  
482  
483