

1     **PREVALENCE AND DISTRIBUTION OF MICROBIAL CONTAMINATION IN RAW**  
2     **MILK AND PROCESSED DAIRY PRODUCTS IN JOS METROPOLIS**

3  
4                     **ABSTRACT**

5     The study investigates the microbial contamination of dairy products collected from four  
6     locations within Jos Metropolis; Tina Junction, FarinGada, Terminus, and Katako. A total of 200  
7     dairy samples, including raw milk, *Nono*(fermented milk), Cheese, and Yoghurt, were aseptically  
8     collected and analyzed using standard microbiological methods. The results revealed significant  
9     variations in bacterial prevalence across locations and product types. *Bacillus* spp. was the most  
10    frequently isolated bacterium; it was detected in 144 samples (72.0%), with the highest  
11    prevalence in raw milk (94.0%) and *nono* (92.0%). *Mycobacterium bovis* (*M. bovis*) was  
12    detected exclusively in raw milk (6.0%), indicating a potential risk of zoonotic transmission  
13    through unpasteurized dairy. Processed dairy products had a higher occurrence of yeast cells  
14    (13.2%), *Micrococcus* (2.8%), and *Staphylococcus* (10.4%), suggesting contamination may have  
15    occurred during processing and or storage. Among sampling locations, FarinGada and Katako  
16    had the highest microbial prevalence of 92.0% and 82.0%, respectively, while Tina Junction and  
17    Terminus recorded lower contamination levels (60.0% each). Raw milk had prevalence of 34.7%  
18    compared to processed dairy products (94.0%), it was concluded that , raw milk poses a  
19    significant risk of microbial contamination, while processed dairy products are susceptible to  
20    post-processing contamination. Given the high prevalence of *Bacillus* spp. (72.0%) and the  
21    presence of *M. bovis* in raw milk, all raw dairy products should undergo pasteurization or other  
22    heat treatments before consumption to eliminate harmful pathogens are recommended.

23  
24                     **INTRODUCTION**

25    The presence of pathogenic bacteria such as *Listeria monocytogenes*, *Escherichia coli*,  
26    *Salmonella* spp., and *Staphylococcus aureus* in raw and processed dairy products is a global  
27    public health concern, especially in developing regions with weak regulatory enforcement  
28    (Koskiet al., 2022). Raw milk's high nutrient content and neutral pH make it an ideal medium for  
29    microbial growth, and contamination can occur at any stage production, handling, storage, or  
30    transportation (Velázquez-Ordoñez et al., 2019; Penget al., 2023). Sources of contamination  
31    include poor farm hygiene, mastitis in animals, contaminated water, and improper handling  
32    practices (Adamskiet al., 2023). Additionally, failures in cold chain logistics can facilitate  
33    microbial proliferation (Praçæet al., 2023). Penget al. (2023) reported that 9.89% of raw milk  
34    samples exceeded safe aerobic plate counts, with over 54% containing aerobic *Bacillus* spp. and  
35    36.18% exhibiting high alkaline phosphatase activity indicators of poor hygiene. Even post-  
36    processing techniques like pasteurization may not eliminate all pathogens. Spores from  
37    *Bacillus* and *Clostridium* spp. can survive heat treatment and contaminate products during  
38    packaging and distribution (Mariam, 2021). Koskiet al. (2022) found a link between  
39    unpasteurized milk availability and foodborne outbreaks in the U.S., while Praçæet al. (2023)  
40    detected *L. monocytogenes* and *E. coli* in raw milk cheese samples in Portugal. These pathogens

41 pose serious health risks *E. coli* (especially STEC) can cause hemorrhagic colitis, *Listeria* can  
42 lead to miscarriage or death in vulnerable individuals, *Salmonella* causes gastroenteritis, and *S.*  
43 *aureus* produces heat-resistant enterotoxins (Adamskiet *al.*, 2023; Praçæet *al.*, 2023). The  
44 emergence of antimicrobial resistance further complicates the issue. Addressing contamination  
45 requires good agricultural practices (GAPs), including farm hygiene, animal health monitoring,  
46 and proper milking procedures. Processing plants must enforce pasteurization, prevent post-  
47 processing contamination, and maintain the cold chain. Advanced diagnostics such as PCR and  
48 genome sequencing are crucial for early detection (Martin *et al.*, 2023).

49

50

## MATERIALS AND METHODS

### 51 3.1 Study Area

52 The study was conducted in Jos, the capital of Plateau State in North Central Nigeria. Plateau  
53 State spans approximately 26,899 km<sup>2</sup> and is home to about three million people (National  
54 Population Commission, 2006). Located between latitudes 08°24'N and longitudes 008°32'–  
55 010°38'E, the state is named after the Jos Plateau a high-altitude region marked by unique rock  
56 formations, extensive grasslands, and elevations ranging from 1,200 m to 1,829 m at Shere  
57 Hills. The area's history of tin and columbite mining has shaped its landscape, leaving behind  
58 gorges and artificial lakes. Due to its elevation, Plateau State experiences a near-temperate  
59 climate, with average temperatures between 13°C and 22°C. The coldest months occur between  
60 December and February, while March and April are the hottest. Annual rainfall averages 131.75–  
61 146 cm, peaking in July and August. Jos' cooler climate contributes to lower incidences of certain  
62 tropical diseases, such as malaria. The Plateau also functions as a major watershed, giving rise to  
63 key rivers in northern Nigeria, including the Kaduna, Gongola, Hadejia, and Yobe Rivers.

### 64 3.2 Sample Collection and Distribution

65 A total of 200 dairy product samples were collected from four major locations within Jos  
66 Metropolis Tina Junction, FarinGada, Terminus, and Katakowith each location contributing 50  
67 samples to ensure even distribution. The dairy products sampled included raw milk, *nono* (a  
68 traditional fermented milk), cheese, and yoghurt, with 50 samples collected for each product  
69 type. The sample size was determined based on resource availability, feasibility, and the need for  
70 statistical reliability in assessing the microbiological quality and diversity of dairy products sold  
71 in the area. Samples were aseptically collected into sterile containers, appropriately labeled, and  
72 immediately transported in ice-cooled boxes to the laboratory for microbiological analysis.

### 73 3.3 Bacteriological Analysis

74 For microbiological evaluation, 50 mL of raw milk and 10 grams of each processed dairy  
75 product (*nono*, cheese, and yoghurt) were aseptically collected into sterile containers. The  
76 samples were immediately transported under chilled conditions (maintained at 4°C) to the  
77 National Veterinary Research Institute (NVRI) laboratory in Jos for bacteriological analysis. All

78 procedures followed standard microbiological protocols to ensure the accuracy and reliability of  
79 results.

### 80 **3.3.1 Isolation of *Bacillus* spp.**

81 Samples were cultured on Nutrient Agar (NA) and incubated at 37°C for 24 to 48 hours to isolate  
82 *Bacillus* species. Colonies displaying typical *Bacillus* morphology such as large, rough, irregular  
83 edges and opaque appearance were further subjected to Gram staining. Biochemical confirmation  
84 was performed using catalase and oxidase tests to distinguish *Bacillus* from other Gram-positive  
85 spore-formers.

### 86 **3.3.2 Detection of *Mycobacterium bovis***

87 Detection of *Mycobacterium bovis* was conducted using Ziehl-Neelsen staining to identify acid-  
88 fast bacilli. Samples that tested positive for acid-fast organisms were further confirmed through  
89 polymerase chain reaction (PCR)-based identification to ensure specificity and accuracy of *M.*  
90 *bovis* detection.

### 91 **3.3.3 Isolation of Yeast, *Micrococcus*, and *Staphylococcus* spp.**

92 Yeast cells were isolated using Sabouraud Dextrose Agar (SDA) and incubated at 25°C for 48 to  
93 72 hours. Colonies with yeast-like morphology were subjected to microscopic examination for  
94 confirmation.

95 *Micrococcus* and *Staphylococcus* species were isolated using Mannitol Salt Agar (MSA), which  
96 supports the selective growth of salt-tolerant organisms. Presumptive colonies were further  
97 characterized using a series of biochemical tests, including coagulase, catalase, and sugar  
98 fermentation assays, to differentiate and identify specific bacterial species.

## 99 **3.4 Data Analysis**

100 The prevalence of bacterial contamination was determined as percentages and presented in  
101 tables. The data were statistically analyzed using descriptive statistics (percentages and  
102 frequency distributions) to compare bacterial contamination across sampling locations and dairy  
103 product types.

## 104 **5.1 Prevalence and Distribution of Microbial Contamination by Location**

105 The study revealed notable variations in microbial contamination across sampling sites, largely  
106 influenced by handling, processing, and storage practices. *Bacillus* species were the most  
107 frequently isolated organisms, with an overall prevalence of 72.0%, particularly high in  
108 FarinGada (88.0%) and Katako (80.0%). This aligns with Edema and Akingbade (2007), who  
109 reported a high presence of spore-forming bacteria in dairy products, often linked to poor

110 hygiene and environmental exposure. *Mycobacterium bovis* was detected in only 1.5% of  
 111 samples, found exclusively in FarinGada (4.0%) and Katako (2.0%), indicating sporadic  
 112 occurrence likely tied to localized handling conditions. The absence of *Yeast*, *Micrococcus*, and  
 113 *Staphylococcus* spp. suggests relatively good sanitary practices in preventing contamination by  
 114 these organisms. These results are consistent with Attahet *al.* (2021) and Anagbosoet *al.* (2024),  
 115 who emphasized that poor sanitation, improper storage, and inadequate post-milking hygiene  
 116 significantly contribute to microbial contamination. The findings reinforce the need for improved  
 117 hygiene protocols, better handling practices, and continuous microbial monitoring in milk  
 118 production and distribution systems.

119 **Table 1: Prevalence of Microbial Contamination and Distribution by Sampling Location**

Sampling Location	Total Samples Collected	Bacillus	<i>M. bovis</i>	Yeast Cell	<i>Micrococcus</i>	<i>Staphylococcus</i>	Overall Prevalence (%)
Tina Junction	50	30(60.0)	0(0.00)	0(0.00)	0(0.00)	0(0.00)	60.0
FarinGada	50	44(80.0)	2(4.0)	0(0.00)	0(0.00)	0(0.00)	92.0
Terminus	50	30(60.0)	0.00)	0(0.00)	0(0.00)	0(0.00)	60.0
Katako	50	40(80.0)	1(2.00)	0(0.00)	0(0.00)	0(0.00)	82.0
<b>Total</b>	<b>200</b>	<b>144 (72.0)</b>	<b>3(1.50)</b>	<b>0(0.00)</b>	<b>0(0.00)</b>	<b>0(0.00)</b>	<b>73.5</b>

120

121 **5.2 Prevalence and Distribution of Microbial Contamination in Raw Milk and Its Products**

122 The study findings are consistent with existing literature on microbial contamination in dairy  
 123 products. *Bacillus* spp. showed the highest prevalence in raw milk (94.0%), confirming their  
 124 widespread occurrence and resistance to pasteurization, as reported by Tan *et al.* (2020). The  
 125 exclusive detection of *Mycobacterium bovis* in raw milk (6.0%) reinforces concerns about  
 126 consuming unpasteurized milk and supports prior findings on its health risks (Eltokhyet *al.*,  
 127 2021). Yeast cells were found in fermented products nono (8.0%), cheese (12.0%), and yoghurt  
 128 (18.0%) indicating the influence of fermentation on yeast growth. While generally sensitive to  
 129 thermal and pressure treatments, some heat-resistant molds can survive, posing spoilage and  
 130 safety risks (Pal *et al.*, 2016). The presence of *Staphylococcus* spp. in yoghurt (30.0%) suggests  
 131 possible post-processing contamination, likely due to inadequate hygiene during handling and  
 132 storage. This aligns with Agarwalet *al.* (2012), who reported similar contamination patterns in  
 133 dairy products linked to poor sanitary conditions. These findings emphasize the importance of  
 134 strict hygiene and pasteurization to ensure dairy safety.

135 **Table 2: Prevalence of Microbial Contamination and Distribution in Raw Milk and its Products**  
 136

Sample Type	Total Samples Collected	<i>Bacillus</i> (%)	<i>M. bovis</i> (%)	Yeast Cell (%)	<i>Micrococcus</i> (%)	<i>Staphylococcus</i> (%)
Raw Milk	50	47 (94.00)	3 (6.00)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)
Nono	50	46 (92.00)	0 (0.00)	4 (8.00)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)
Cheese	50	29 (58.00)	0 (0.00)	6 (12.00)	4 (8.00)	0 (0.00)
Yoghurt	50	22 (44.00)	0 (0.00)	9 (18.00)	0 (0.00)	15 (30.00)
<b>Total</b>	<b>200</b>	<b>144 (72.00)</b>	<b>3 (1.50)</b>	<b>19(9.50)</b>	<b>4(2.00)</b>	<b>15(7.50)</b>

137

### 138 5.3 Comparison of Microbial Contamination in Raw and Processed Dairy Products

139 The study revealed a higher prevalence of *Bacillus* isolates in processed dairy products (67.4%)  
140 compared to raw milk (32.6%), suggesting that while pasteurization reduces many pathogens, it  
141 does not eliminate heat-resistant *Bacillus* spp. This supports findings by Ledenbach and Marshall  
142 (2009) and Pal *et al.* (2016), who noted the ability of *Bacillus* spores to survive pasteurization  
143 and germinate under favorable storage or handling conditions. *Mycobacterium bovis* was  
144 exclusively detected in raw milk (2.1%), underscoring the health risks of consuming  
145 unpasteurized milk. Its absence in processed dairy highlights the effectiveness of pasteurization  
146 in eliminating zoonotic pathogens (Li, 2022; Kahlaet *al.*, 2011). The detection of yeast (13.2%)  
147 and *Micrococcus* (2.8%) mainly in processed products suggests contamination during  
148 fermentation or post-processing stages. Yobouetet *al.* (2014) reported similar findings,  
149 emphasizing the vulnerability of dairy products to contamination during handling and  
150 packaging. The presence of *Staphylococcus* spp. (10.4%) particularly in yoghurt points to post-  
151 pasteurization contamination, likely linked to inadequate sanitation. Previous studies by  
152 Svensson *et al.* (2000) and Collins *et al.* (2022) have shown that poor hygiene and contaminated  
153 equipment in dairy plants can facilitate the persistence and spread of such bacteria in processed  
154 products. These findings reinforce the need for comprehensive hygiene controls throughout dairy  
155 processing to prevent contamination, especially by heat-resistant and post-processing-introduced  
156 microbes.

157 **Table 3 Comparison of Microbial Contamination and Distribution in Raw and Processed**  
158 **Dairy Products**

Dairy Category	<i>Bacillus</i>	<i>M. bovis</i>	Yeast Cell	<i>Micrococcus</i>	<i>Staphylococcus</i>	Overall Prevalence (%)
Raw Milk	47(32.6)	3(2.10)	0(0.00)	0(0.00)	0(0.00)	34.7

---

<b>Processed Dairy</b>						
<i>Nono</i> ,						
Cheese	97(67.4)	0(0.00)	19(13.2)	4(2.80)	15(10.4)	94.0
and						
Yoghurt						
<b>Total</b>	<b>144(72.0)</b>	<b>3(1.5)</b>	<b>19(9.50)</b>	<b>4(2.00)</b>	<b>15(7.50)</b>	<b>73.5</b>

---

159

160 **Conclusion and Recommendations**

161 This study highlights significant microbial contamination in dairy products across Jos  
 162 Metropolis, with *Bacillus* spp. showing the highest prevalence (72.0%) and *Mycobacterium bovis*  
 163 detected exclusively in raw milk (6.0%). Contamination levels varied by location and product  
 164 type, with raw milk posing the greatest health risk due to its high microbial load. Processed dairy  
 165 products showed evidence of secondary contamination particularly with yeast, *Staphylococcus*,  
 166 and *Micrococcus* spp. likely introduced during fermentation or post-processing.

167 To mitigate these risks, several actions are recommended:

168 Mandatory pasteurization or heat treatment of all raw dairy products before consumption is  
 169 essential to eliminate harmful pathogens.

170 Strict hygiene protocols should be enforced among dairy farmers and vendors, including proper  
 171 milking, equipment sanitation, and safe handling practices.

172 Cold chain maintenance ( $\leq 4^{\circ}\text{C}$ ) must be prioritized across the dairy supply chain, supported by  
 173 investments in refrigeration and temperature-controlled transportation.

174 Routine microbiological surveillance at production, processing, and retail levels is crucial to  
 175 monitor contamination trends and enforce food safety standards.

176 Public health education campaigns should raise awareness about the risks of consuming  
 177 unpasteurized dairy products, while regulatory agencies ensure vendor compliance with hygiene  
 178 laws.

179 Support for small-scale producers through training, technical assistance, and access to equipment  
 180 subsidies will promote safer production practices and reduce contamination risks.

181 **REFERENCES**

182 Adamski, P., Byczkowska-Rostkowska, Z., Gajewska, J., Zakrzewski, A. J., & Kłębukowska, L.  
 183 (2023). Prevalence and antibiotic resistance of *Bacillus* sp. isolated from raw  
 184 milk. *Microorganisms*, 11(4), 1065.

- 185 Agarwal, A., Awasthi, V., Dua, A., Ganguly, S., Garg, V., & Marwaha, S. S. (2012).  
186 Microbiological profile of milk: impact of household practices. *Indian Journal of Public*  
187 *Health*, 56(1), 88-94.
- 188 Anagboso, M., Ohaebuka, C., Mbah, E., Osuala, O., Daokoru-Olukole, C., Agedah, E., Onu, E.,  
189 Nwankwo, G., Okafor, F., & Okonko, I. (2024). Microbial contamination and antibiotic  
190 resistance in selected yoghurt brands in Elele, Rivers State, Nigeria. *Covenant Journal of*  
191 *Physical and Life Sciences*, 12(2). Retrieved from  
192 <https://journals.covenantuniversity.edu.ng/index.php/cjpls/article/view/4521>
- 193 Attah, F., Abalaka, M. E., Jesse, I. A., Garba, D. E., & Emmanuel, A. (2021). *Bacteriological*  
194 *quality of raw cow's milk sold in Minna Central Market, Niger State, Nigeria.*  
195 *International Journal of Pathogen Research*, 6(1), 29–35.  
196 <https://doi.org/10.9734/ijpr/2021/v6i130153>
- 197 Collins, Á. B., Floyd, S., Gordon, S. V., & More, S. J. (2022). Prevalence of *Mycobacterium*  
198 *bovis* in milk on dairy cattle farms: An international systematic literature review and  
199 meta-analysis. *Tuberculosis (Edinburgh, Scotland)*, 132,  
200 102166. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tube.2022.102166>
- 201 Edema, M. O., & Akingbade, O. A. (2007). Incidence of spore-forming bacteria in unsweetened  
202 evaporated milk brands in Nigeria. *Nigerian Food Journal*, 25(1), 138-145.
- 203 Eltokhy, H., Abdelsamei, H., El Barbary, H., & Nassif, M. (2021). Prevalence of some pathogenic  
204 bacteria in dairy products. *Benha Veterinary Medical Journal*, 40(2), 51-55. doi:  
205 10.21608/bvmj.2021.90181.1461
- 206 Kahla, I. B., Boschioli, M. L., Souissi, F., Cherif, N., Benzarti, M., Boukadida, J., & Hammami,  
207 S. (2011). Isolation and molecular characterisation of *Mycobacterium bovis* from raw  
208 milk in Tunisia. *African Health Sciences*, 11, 2-5.
- 209 Koski, L., Kisselburgh, H., Landsman, L., Hulkower, R., Howard-Williams, M., Salah, Z., ...&  
210 Nichols, M. (2022). Foodborne illness outbreaks linked to unpasteurised milk and  
211 relationship to changes in state laws—United States, 1998–2018. *Epidemiology &*  
212 *Infection*, 150, e183.
- 213 Ledenbach, L. H., & Marshall, R. T. (2009). "Microbiological Spoilage of Dairy Products." In W.  
214 H. Sperber & M. P. Doyle (Eds.), *Compendium of the Microbiological Spoilage of Foods*  
215 *and Beverages* (pp. 41–67). Springer.
- 216 Li, K. (2022). An overview of microbial contamination in milk and dairy products. *Global*  
217 *Journal of Dairy Farming and Milk Production*, 7(2), 1–2.
- 218 Mariam, S. H. (2021). Isolation and Characterization of Gram-Negative Bacterial Species from  
219 Pasteurized Dairy Products: Potential Risk to Consumer Health. *Journal of Food*  
220 *Quality*, 2021(1), 8876926. <https://doi.org/10.1155/2021/8876926>

- 221 Martin, N. H., Evanowski, R. L., &Wiedmann, M. (2023).Invited review: Redefining raw milk  
222 quality Evaluation of raw milk microbiological parameters to ensure high-quality  
223 processed dairy products. *Journal of Dairy Science*, 106(3), 1502-1517.
- 224 Pal, M., Mulu, S., Tekle, M., Pintoo, S. V., &Prajapati, J. (2016). Bacterial contamination of  
225 dairy products.*Beverage and Food World*, 43(9), 40-43.
- 226 Peng, Z., Li, Y., Yan, L., Yang, S., & Yang, D. (2023). Correlation Analysis of Microbial  
227 Contamination and Alkaline Phosphatase Activity in Raw Milk and Dairy  
228 Products. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 20(3),  
229 1825. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph20031825>
- 230 Svensson, B., Eneroth, Å. S. A., Brendehaug, J., Molin, G., &Christiansson, A.  
231 (2000).Involvement of a pasteurizer in the contamination of milk by *Bacillus cereus* in a  
232 commercial dairy plant.*Journal of Dairy Research*, 67(3), 455-460.
- 233 Tan, S. F., Chin, N. L., Tee, T. P., &Chooi, S. K. (2020).Physico-Chemical Changes,  
234 Microbiological Properties, and Storage Shelf Life of Cow and Goat Milk from Industrial  
235 High-Pressure Processing.*Processes*, 8(6), 697.<https://doi.org/10.3390/pr8060697>
- 236 Velázquez-Ordoñez, V., Valladares-Carranza, B., Tenorio-Borroto, E., Talavera-Rojas, M.,  
237 Varela-Guerrero, J.A., Acosta-Dibarrat, J., Puigvert, F., Grille, L., Revello, Á.G.,  
238 &Pareja, L. (2019).Microbial Contamination in Milk Quality and Health Risk of the  
239 Consumers of Raw Milk and Dairy Products. *Nutrition in Health and Disease - Our*  
240 *Challenges Now and Forthcoming Time*.
- 241 Yobouet, B. A., Kouamé-Sina, S. M., Dadié, A., Makita, K., Grace, D., Djè, K. M., &Bonfoh, B.  
242 (2014).Contamination of raw milk with *Bacillus cereus* from farm to retail in Abidjan,  
243 Côte d'Ivoire and possible health implications.*Dairy Science & Technology*, 94, 51-60.

244

245