UF UNIVERSITY of FLORIDA
IFAS Extension

FSHN12-06

Growth, Reduction, and Survival of Bacteria on Tomatoes[1]

Angela M. Valadez, Keith R. Schneider, and Michelle D. Danyluk[2]

Fresh-market tomatoes are a popular commodity in homes and food service around the world. In the United States, fresh-market tomatoes are produced in every state, with commercial-scale production in about 20 states (USDA-ERS, 2009). In terms of consumption, the tomato is the nation's fourth most popular fresh-market vegetable behind potatoes, lettuce, and onions (USAD-ERS, 2009). In total, approximately 5 billion pounds of fresh tomatoes are eaten annually in the United States (CDC, 2007). In 2010, Florida produced 45% of the total U.S. value of fresh-market tomatoes behind California, Georgia, Virginia, and Tennessee (FDACS, 2012; USDA-ERS, 2008).

Tomato producers are committed to taking proactive steps to ensure and enhance the safety of the food they produce, in addition to providing consistency in product quality and wholesomeness. Still, the inherent risks of contamination by foodborne pathogens present a challenge to the produce industry and regulators. Since fresh-market tomatoes are intended to be consumed fresh, there is no "kill-step" in the processing that would eliminate pathogens in the event of contamination (Maitland et al., 2011). As such, the concern for tomato safety in the United States will continue to grow as tomato consumption increases. Even with the advancements in food processing and food safety controls employed by tomato growers and packers, the risk for foodborne pathogens, including *Salmonella enterica*, to be linked to outbreaks of illness associated with tomato consumption still exists.

UF/IFAS Photo / Thomas Wright

Fresh-produce handlers and processors have developed hazard analysis and critical control point (HACCP) plans where the critical control points (CCPs) are set in place

1. This document is FSHN12-06, one of a series of the Food Science and Human Nutrition Department, Florida Cooperative Extension Service, Institute of Food and Agricultural Sciences, University of Florida. Published May 2012. Visit the EDIS website at http://edis.ifas.ufl.edu.

2. Angela M. Valadez, graduate research assistant, CREC (Citrus Research and Education Center, Lake Alfred, FL); Keith R. Schneider, associate professor, FSHN (Food Science and Human Nutrition Department, UF Main Campus); Michelle D. Danyluk (contact author), assistant professor, CREC; Institute of Food and Agricultural Sciences; University of Florida; Gainesville, FL 32611.

This review was supported by USDA NIFA Specialty Crops Research Initiative Grant 2009-51181-05783 and the Center for Produce Safety.

to help reduce contamination and aid in the prevention of cross-contamination (Hedberg et al., 1999). Currently, however, there exists no technology proven to eliminate bacterial hazards in any fresh-market fruit or vegetable once contamination occurs (Maitland et al., 2011). Many processing methods have been studied, a number of which warrant further examination of their efficacy as the search continues for fail-safe intervention strategies to ensure the safety of fresh-market tomatoes.

This document, therefore, is intended to highlight current tomato safety related studies on the growth, reduction, and survival of bacteria on fresh-market tomatoes. Enclosed are evaluated bacterial studies on natural antimicrobials including carvacrol (oregano), eugenol, β-resorcylic acid, *trans*-cinnamaldehyde (cinnamon), allyisothiocynail (mustard and horseradish), thymol, and thyme oil; detergents including chlorine dioxide (C_lO_2), chlorine, carbon dioxide (CO_2), hydrogen peroxide (H_2O_2), sodium hypochlorite, ozone, sodium lauryl sulfate (SDS), tween80, acidified sodium chlorite (ASC), peroxyacetic acid (PAA), and calcinated calcium; and food processing studies including high pressure processing, irradiation, X-ray, and modified atmosphere packaging (MAP). Cross-contamination and shelf-life studies were also evaluated.

The table focuses primarily on three categories:

1. By tomato shape or variety, including Round, Roma, plum, cherry, grape, vine, unknown red, green mature, mixed green to red, and diced
2. By tomato composition, including the tomato stem, pulp, seeds, cotyledons, hypocotyls, and leaves
3. By bacteria, including acid-adapted and non-acid adapted *Salmonella* spp., *Shigella* spp., *E. coli* O157:H7, *Listeria monocytogenes, Erwinia carotovora,* and *Staphylococcus aureus*

The intended audience for this document includes tomato processors, researchers, and government officials interested in tomato safety:

- During evaluation of their current processing and sanitation facilities, tomato processors can use the table as a reference as they seek alternative or adaptable technologies.
- Researchers can use this table as a guide to innovate future experiments from current literature.
- Government officials can reference this table as current policies and regulations are evaluated and updated.

Limited studies in tomato sanitation, primarily focusing on salsa preparation and natural antimicrobial usage, are also featured here for home consumers. Overall, this tomato safety review serves as a reference for everyone concerned in the safety of fresh-market tomatoes.

Table 1

Tomato shape or variety according to publication	Waxed	Microbe	Time	Decontamination variable(s)	Temp. (°C)	Initial bacterial counts	Reduction or growth achieved; detection (positive or negative)	Parameters	Comments	Reference
Round red	Unknown	*S.* Typhimurium *S.* Newport *S.* Javiana *S.* Braenderup (CDC) Dip inoculated for 30 s at ~25°C and then dried overnight	Unspecified time collection points	Compared their lab-model (chicken replica), Pathogen Modeling Program, and ComBase	10 12.5 15 17.5 20 22.5 25 27.5 30 35	10^6 CFU/ml pre-inoculation 10^3 to 10^4 CFU/whole tomatoes 10^2 CFU/g of cut tomato post-inoculation	Their lab model (chicken replica) was more favorable compared to the other models.	pH 4.0–4.5	Researchers developed a mathematical model to predict the growth rate of *Salmonella* (10^2 CFU/g to 10^8 CFU/g) on cut tomatoes as a function of incubation temp.	Pan and Schaffner, 2010
Roma Untreated (no washing or oiling)	No	*S.* Enteritidis ATCC 13076 *S.* Newport ATCC 6962 *S.* Typhimurium ATCC 14028 300 µl spot inoculated	(s) 2 4 6 10	ClO_2 + sterile tap water (ppm) (High) 20 10 5 (Low) 0 1 3 5 10	23	7 log CFU/ml *S. enterica*	**Reduction:** A full minute of contact with ClO_2 at 20 and 10 ppm was required to achieve a 5 log reduction of *S. enterica* on freshly spot-inoculated tomatoes. Immersing wet-inoculated tomatoes in water (0 ppm ClO_2) for 1 min alone reduced *S. enterica* by ~ 1.2 log CFU/cm^2. On inoculated fruit surfaces, populations decreased >3 log CFU/cm^2 during desiccation at 24°C for 24 h. Populations of air-dried *Salmonella* were not significantly reduced by ClO_2 at ≤20 ppm after 1 min.	For each treatment, nine inoculated tomatoes were immersed in 2 liters of ClO_2 or water for 20 to 60 s. Relative humidity 40–50%	The study investigated the sanitizing effects of a ClO_2 solution on *S.* enterica in water, on tomato surfaces, and between tomato loads.	Pao et al., 2007
Roma Untreated (unwashed or oiled)	No	*S.* Enteritidis ATCC 13076 *S.* Newport ATCC 6962 *S.* Typhimurium ATCC 14028 30 ml of inoculum was distributed evenly over two synthetic polyethylene roller brushes rotating at 85 revolutions per minute.	(s) 10 20 40 60	ClO_2 flow rate 5.0 ml/s	NA	Calculated brush contamination of 6.9 log CFU/cm^3	**Reduction:** Washing with ClO_2 at 5 ppm for 10 to 60 s reduced the transfer of *Salmonella* from revolving brushes to fruit surfaces by 4.5 to 5.0 log cycles. The presence of ClO_2 lowered the *Salmonella* transfer to runoff by 5.2 to 6.4 log cycles in comparison to using water alone.		The study tested the ability of ClO_2 at 5 ppm during spray washing of tomatoes to prevent *Salmonella* transfer from inoculated revolving brushes to fruit and wash runoff. Cross-contamination study.	Pao et al., 2009

Tomato shape or variety according to publication	Waxed	Microbe	Time	Decontamination variable(s)	Temp. (°C)	Initial bacterial counts	Reduction or growth achieved; detection (positive or negative)	Parameters	Comments	Reference
Roma Untreated (unwashed or oiled)	No	*S.* Enteritidis ATCC 13076 *S.* Newport ATCC 6962 *S.* Typhimurium ATCC 14028 Spot inoculated	Up to 60 sec	ClO_2 or water spray washing for up to 60 s at either low or high flow rate (5.0 or 9.3 ml/s per fruit, respectively). For wet-inoculum trials, six fruits marked with circles were brushed on inoculated revolving brushes without spraying to obtain cross-contamination for 60 s to simulate newly introduced contaminants.	NA	5.7 log CFU/cm² on fruit surfaces	**Reduction:** Washing with ClO_2 at a low flow rate for 10 to 60 s generated a 4.4 to 5.2 log CFU/cm² reduction of air-dried *Salmonella* on fruit surfaces.		The study tested the ability of ClO_2 at 5 ppm during spray washing of tomatoes to prevent *Salmonella* transfer from fruit surface to uninoculated revolving brushes.	Pao et al., 2009
Roma (*Lycopersicon esculentum*)	No	*S.* Montevideo *S.* Javiana *S.* Baildon (Purdue University Bacteria Collection) 100 µl spot inoculated Air dry, 1 h	(s) 0 10 30 60 120 180	ClO_2 gas (mg/liter) 0 2 5 8 10	25	1.0 x 10^8 CFU/ml	**Reduction:** Range of 1.16 to 5.53 log cfu/cm². The greatest reduction at 10 mg/l of ClO_2 and 180 s gave a post population 4.87 log cfu/cm².	Relative humidity 90–95%	ClO_2 parameters were then taken from this study that gave the optimal 3, 4, and 5 log reduction to select for optimal treatment conditions. The data 10 mg/l for 180 s gave a >5 log reduction.	Trinetta et al., 2010
Ripe Roma (*Lycopersicon esculentum* cv Roma)	Unknown	*S.* Anatum F4317 *S.* Stanley H0558 *S.* Enteritidis PT30 Submerged for 1 min	(h) 0 24 48 72	(kGy) 0.25 0.50 0.75 1.0 1.5	4	8.0 log CFU/ml	**Reductions** ranged from 3.3 to 4.2 log CFU/g (1.5 kGy). The irradiation sensitivity of *Salmonella* did not differ significantly with increasing refrigerated storage time. A 5-log reduction in dose would be approximately 1.9 to 2.4 kGy.	Cesium-137 at a dose rate of 4.89 kGy/h	The study evaluated the influence of refrigerated storage time on the efficacy of irradiation for removing *Salmonella* from sliced Roma tomatoes.	Niemira 2011

Tomato shape or variety according to publication	Waxed	Microbe	Time	Decontamination variable(s)	Temp. (°C)	Initial bacterial counts	Reduction or growth achieved; detection (positive or negative)	Parameters	Comments	Reference
Roma (*Lycopersicon esculentum*)	Unknown	A 3-serotype mixture of: *S.* Javiana *S.* Montevideo *S.* Typhimurium (ATCC or personal collection) Spot inoculated	NA	X-ray (# kGy/16 min) 0.1 0.5 0.75 1.0 1.5	22	Three or two strains of each bacterium were mixed with an equal volume to give approximately 10^{7-9} CFU/ml.	**Reduction:** ~3.7 log CFU/tomato reduction S. enterica was achieved by treatment with 0.75 kGy X-ray, respectively. More than a 5 log CFU/tomato reduction was achieved at 1.0 or 1.5 kGy X-ray for all tested pathogens.	Relative humidity 55–60%	Inactivation of inoculated *Salmonella* enterica on whole Roma tomato surfaces.	Mahmoud, 2010
Roma (*Lycopersicon esculentum*)	Unknown	A 2-strain mixture of *S.* flexneri ATCC 9199 and ATCC 12022 Spot inoculated	NA	X-ray (#kGy/16 min) 0.1 0.5 0.75 1.0 1.5	22	Three or two strains of each bacterium were mixed with an equal volume to give approximately 10^{7-9} CFU/ml.	**Reduction:** ~3.6 log CFU/tomato reduction of S. flexneri was achieved by treatment with 0.75 kGy X-ray, respectively. More than a 5 log CFU/tomato reduction was achieved at 1.0 or 1.5 kGy X-ray for all tested pathogens.	Relative humidity 55–60%	Inactivation of inoculated *Shigella flexneri* on whole Roma tomato surfaces.	Mahmoud, 2010
Plum	Wax was washed off with 70% ethanol followed by DI wash	*S.* Montevideo *S.* Poona *S.* Newport v. Baildon *S.* Braenderup *S.* Saintpaul (University of Georgia – L. Beuchat) 100 µl spot inoculated, held to dry for 1 h at 23°C	15 s 1 min 3 min	DI (control) Chlorine (100 ppm) Carvacrol (0.25 and 0.75 %) Trans-cinnamaldehyde (0.5 and 0.75%) Eugenol (0.25 and 0.75%) b-resorcylic acid (0.75 and 1.0 %)	25°C in water bath shaker	10^8 CFU/ml before inoculation and 10^7 CFU/ml post inoculation	**Reduction:** ~2 log CFU/ml for DI ~4 log CFU/ml for Cl ~7 log CFU/ml for Carvacrol (0.25 and 0.75%) ~6 log CFU/ml for Trans-cinnamaldehyde (0.5 and 0.75%) 2.5 log CFU/ml for Eugenol (0.25%) >6 log CFU/ml (0.75%) 6 log CFU/ml for b-resorcylic acid (0.75 and 1.0 %)			Mattson et al., 2010
Cherry (fresh and uncoated)	Unknown	*S.* Enteritidis PT4 E10 (Uludag University) 50 µl spot inoculated for 1 h at 22°C 50 µl was injected into the stem scar with a sterile syringe 50 µl was pipetted onto the stem scar	Day at 7°C: 10 Day at 22°C: 20	Air storage	7 22	Before inoculation: 8.3 and 4.3 log CFU/ml Post inoculation: (high) 7.0 log CFU/tomato; (low) 3.0 log CFU/tomato	**Reduction:** Spot inoculated: (High) ~4–5 log CFU/tomato reduction at 7°C and 22°C; (low) ~3 log CFU/tomato reduction Stem-scar syringe/pipetted: ~1 log CFU/tomato growth at 7 and 22°C			Das et al., 2006

Tomato shape or variety according to publication	Waxed	Microbe	Time	Decontamination variable(s)	Temp. (°C)	Initial bacterial counts	Reduction or growth achieved; detection (positive or negative)	Parameters	Comments	Reference
Cherry (fresh and uncoated)	Unknown	*S.* Enteritidis PT4 E10 (Uludag University) 50 µl spot inoculated for 1 h at 22°C 50 µl was injected into the stem scar with a sterile syringe 50 µl was pipetted onto the stem scar	Day at 7°C: 10 Day at 22°C: 20	Modified atmosphere packaging (LDPE film)	7 22	Before inoculation: 8.3 and 4.3 log CFU/ml Post inoculation: (high) 7.0 log CFU/tomato;(low) 3.0 log CFU/tomato	**Reduction:** Spot inoculated: (High) ~5 log CFU/tomato reduction at 7°C and 22°C; (low) ~3 log CFU/tomato reduction Stem-scar syringe/pipetted: ~1 log CFU tomato **growth** at 7 and 22°C	20% O_2 80% CO_2		Das et al., 2006
Cherry (fresh and uncoated)	Unknown	*S.* Enteritidis PT4 E10 (Uludag University) 50 µl spot inoculated for 1 h at 22°C 50 µl was injected into the stem scar with a sterile syringe 50 µl was pipetted onto the stem scar	Day at 7°C: 10 Day at 22°C: 20	5% CO_2	7 22	Before inoculation: 8.3 and 4.3 log CFU/ml Post inoculation: (high) 7.0 log CFU/tomato; (low) 3.0 log CFU/tomato	**Reduction:** Spot inoculated: (High) ~5 log CFU/tomato reduction at 7°C and 22°C; (low) ~3 log CFU/tomato reduction Stem-scar syringe/pipetted: ~1 log CFU/tomato **growth** at 7 and 22°C			Das et al., 2006
Cherry (fresh and uncoated)	Unknown	*S.* Enteritidis PT4 E10 (Uludag University) 50 µl spot inoculated for 1 h at 22°C	20 min	10 mg/l ozone	NA	Before inoculation: 8.3 and 4.3 log CFU/ml Post inoculation: (high) 7.0 log CFU/tomato (low) 3.0 log CFU/tomato	**Detection:** High/4 h - the cells died completely High/1 h - the complete death time was 15 min Low/1 h and 4 h - the complete death time was 5 min	1 h or 4 h attachment time of the cells on tomatoes after inoculation		Das et al., 2006
Cherry (fresh and uncoated)	Unknown	*S.* Enteritidis PT4 E10 (Uludag University) 50 µl spot inoculated for 1 h at 22°C	20 min	5 and 20 mg/l ozone	NA	Before inoculation: 8.3 log CFU/tomato Post inoculation: 7.0 log CFU/tomato	**Reduction:** High/5 mg/1 h - there was a ~4 log CFU/tomato reduction High/5 mg/4 h - there was a ~2.5 log CFU/tomato reduction High/20 mg/4h - death at 15 min High/20 mg/1h - death at 10 min	1 h or 4 h attachment time of the cells on tomatoes after inoculation		Das et al., 2006
Cherry	Unknown	*S.* Typhimurium (ATCC 14028, KCTC 2421, KCTC 2057) 1 ml spot inoculated	10 day storage	10 mg/L chlorine dioxide (5 min) 5 kJ m^{-2} UV-C (254 nm) irradiation Chlorine dioxide + UV-C irradiation	4	5.90 log CFU/g	**Reduction:** Chlorine dioxide + UV-C irradiation achieved the most effective among the three treatments, which eliminated detection. Chlorine dioxide achieved a 2.53 log CFU/g; UV-C irradiation achieved a 2.58 log CFU/g.			Song et al., 2011

Tomato shape or variety according to publication	Waxed	Microbe	Time	Decontamination variable(s)	Temp. (°C)	Initial bacterial counts	Reduction or growth achieved; detection (positive or negative)	Parameters	Comments	Reference
Cherry	Unknown	*E. coli* 0157:H7 (NCTC 12079) 1 ml spot inoculated	10 day storage	10 mg/L chlorine dioxide (5 min) 5 kJ m^{-2} UV-C (254 nm) irradiation Chlorine dioxide + UV-C irradiation	4	6.21 log CFU/g	**Reduction:** Chlorine dioxide + UV-C irradiation achieved the most effective among the three treatments, which eliminated detection. Chlorine dioxide achieved a 2.26 log CFU/g; UV-C irradiation achieved a 2.65 log CFU/g.			Song et al., 2011
Grape	Unknown	*S.* Typhimurium *S.* Kentucky *S.* Senftenberg *S.* Enteritidis (University of Delaware Culture Collection) Inocula (25 ml) were deposited on intact surfaces to form a drop and allowed to air dry at 25°C for about 2 h.	5 min 10 min	Chlorine (200 ppm) thymol (0.2 and 0.4 mg/ml) thyme oil (2.0 mg/ml) carvacrol (0.4 mg/ml) washing solutions	NA	10^{7-8} CFU/ml	**Reduction:** Thymol was the most effective among the three natural antimicrobial agents, which achieved >4.1 log CFU/ml reductions of *S.* enterica serovars Typhimurium, Kentucky, Senftenberg, and Enteritidis on grape tomatoes after a 5-min washing and >4.3 log CFU/ml reductions after a 10-min washing. A >4.6 log CFU/ml reduction in the *S. enterica* populations in comparison to control was observed with the use of thymol solutions.		Evaluated the antibacterial activities of thymol, carvacrol, and thyme oil compared to chlorine against *Salmonella* spp. on grape tomatoes during the washing procedure.	Lu and Wu, 2010
Grape (*Lycopersicon esculentum* Mill.)	Unknown	*S.* Poona (Cantaloupe) *S.* Stanley H 1256 (Alfalfa sprouts) *S.* Baildon (Tomato) *S.* Typhimurium DT 104 (Resistant to multiple antibiotics) *S.* Montevideo (Tomato) (University of Georgia – M. Harrison) Spot inoculated 100 µl	At 4°C and 10°C (d) 0 4 7 10 At 25°C (h) 0 4 7 10	Allyl isothiocyanate (AIT, from mustard and horseradish) Carvacrol (from oregano) Cinnamaldehyde (from cinnamon) 5, 10, and 15 µl (equivalent to 41.5, 83.3, and 125 µl/liter of air, respectively) of ≥97% pure carvacrol or ≥98% pure cinnamaldehyde or 1, 2, and 4 µl (equivalent to 8.3, 16.6, and 33.3 µl/liter of air, respectively) of ≥98% pure AIT	4 10 25	Whole grape tomatoes 100 µl 9.0 log CFU/ml placed on 10 separate spots	**Reduction:** AIT exhibited the highest antimicrobial activity followed by cinnamaldehyde. This level of AIT inactivated *Salmonella* on whole tomatoes to the detection limit of <2 log CFU/tomato at 4 and 10°C in 10 d and by 1.3 log CFU/tomato at 25°C in 10 h. Overall, greater inactivation occurred at 10 than at 4°C and on the tomato surface than between tomato slice study.		The study elucidated the effect of these antimicrobial activity on pathogen inactivation on tomato skin (using whole tomatoes) and on tomato pulp (using sliced tomatoes).	Obaidat and Frank, 2009

Tomato shape or variety according to publication	Waxed	Microbe	Time	Decontamination variable(s)	Temp. (°C)	Initial bacterial counts	Reduction or growth achieved; detection (positive or negative)	Parameters	Comments	Reference
Vine-ripened (*Lycopersicon esculentum* Mill., cv Rutgers)	No wax or oil	S. Agona (Alfalfa sprouts) *S.* Baildon (Tomato) *S.* Gaminara (Orange juice) *S.* Michigan (Cantaloupe) *S.* Montevideo (Tomato) 50 µl spot inoculated Dip inoculated in 5 liters for 1 min 50 µl spray inoculated for 2 s with thin-layer chromatography reagent sprayer at 22°C for 1 or 24 h	Agitated at 150 rpm for 5 min	Chlorine (200 mg/ml) solution	NA	Spot and spray inocula to each tomato were 7.22 log CFU/tomato. Dip count could not be determined.	**Reduction:** Spot decreased by 0.80 and 2.20 log CFU/ml, respectively, within 1 and 24 h of drying. Spray-inoculated tomatoes decreased by 1.37 and 4.00 log CFU/ml within the same respective drying times 24 and 1 h.		Populations of *Salmonella* declined substantially between 1 and 24 h of drying; reductions were high on spray-inoculated tomatoes compared with spot-inoculated tomatoes.	Lang et al., 2004
Vine-ripened	Unknown	*Shigella exneri* (ATCC 12023) *Shigella sonnei* (ATCC 25931) *Shigella boydii* (ATCC 9207)	2 min	Sodium lauryl sulfate (SLS) 0.1 % Tween 80 (polysorbate 80) 0.1%	22 40	6 log CFU/ml	**Reductions** of 1.5 to 4 log CFU/ml were achieved.		The study evaluated the efficacies of these detergents in removing *Shigella* from the surfaces of vine tomatoes at different treatment temps.	Raiden et al., 2003
Vine-ripened	Unknown	A five-strain *Salmonella* cocktail: *S.* Typhimurium (ATCC 14028) *S.* Agona (Alfalfa sprouts) *S.* Baildon (Lettuce/tomato) *S.* Michigan (Cantaloupe) *S.* Montevideo (Tomato) (University of Georgia – L. Beuchat)	2 min	0.1 % sodium lauryl sulfate (SLS) 0.1% Tween 80 (polysorbate 80)	22 40	6 log CFU/ml	**Reductions** of 1.5 to 4 log CFU/ml were achieved.		The study evaluated the efficacies of these detergents in removing *Salmonella* from the surfaces of vine tomatoes at different treatment temps.	Raiden et al., 2003

Tomato shape or variety according to publication	Waxed	Microbe	Time	Decontamination variable(s)	Temp. (°C)	Initial bacterial counts	Reduction or growth achieved; detection (positive or negative)	Parameters	Comments	Reference
Firm tomatoes at the light-red stage of ripeness, free of external defects	Unknown	*S.* Montevideo G4639 (Tomato) *S.* Baildon 61-99 (Tomato) (University of Georgia – L. Beuchat) Dip inoculated	2 min	200 ppm Cl_2 5% H_2O_2	60	10.13 log CFU/ml	**Reduction:** 1.34 log CFU/g (Cl_2) 1.45 log CFU/g (H_2O_2)		Efficacy of wash treatments in reducing population of *Salmonella* on dip-inoculated tomatoes.	Sapers and Jones, 2006
Fully ripened (variety not known)	Yes	*S.* Montevideo G4639 (CDC) 1 ml inoculated on diced	2 min. treatment; At 5°C (h) 22 46 96 142 216 At 20°C (h) 6 22 46 70 96 142 At 30°C (h) 6 22 46 70	Sodium hypochlorite (0.5%)	5 20 30	~4.5 log CFU/g	*S.* Montevideo remained essentially constant in tomatoes stored at 5°C for 216 h. **Growth** 3 log CFU/g at 30°C and 2 log CFU/g at 20°C		Fate of *S.* Montevideo in chopped ripe tomatoes.	Zhuang et al., 1995
Red, ripened	Unknown	*S.* Braenderup (Tomato) (CDC) Whole tomatoes at room temp. (22°C) were spot inoculated (at stem scar) with 0.1 ml of inoculum.	120 s	High pressure processing (MPa) 350 450 550	20	Whole skin: 6.33 log CFU/g Whole pulp: 5.44 CFU/g	**Reduction:** Whole Skin 4.15 log CFU/g reduction Whole pulp 3.44 log CFU/g reduction		To determine the effect of pressure to reduce or eliminate the more pressure-resistant *S. enterica* tomato outbreak serovar from whole red Round tomatoes.	Maitland et al., 2011

Tomato shape or variety according to publication	Waxed	Microbe	Time	Decontamination variable(s)	Temp. (°C)	Initial bacterial counts	Reduction or growth achieved; detection (positive or negative)	Parameters	Comments	Reference
Red, ripened (*Lycopersicon esculentum*)	Unknown	*S.* Montevideo (Tomato) (University of Georgia), resistant to rifampicin 100 µl spot inoculated for 90 min at 22°C under 97% RH	(d) 0 0.4 1 4 7 10	NA	22 30	5 log CFU/ fruit before attachment; after attachment, 3.8 log CFU/ fruit	**Growth:** After 10 days of storage at 30°C, the *S.* Montevideo population increased to 0.7, 1.0, 1.2, and 2.2 log CFU/ tomato. A similar trend was observed at 22°C, although populations were lower than at 30°C.	Relative humidity (%): 60, 75, 85, 97		Iturriaga et al., 2007
Mature, red, ripe, organic tomato (*Lycopersicon esculentum*)	Unknown	*S.* Montevideo (Tomato) (University of Georgia), resistant to rifampicin 100 µl drops on the tomato surface near the blossom; stored 22°C for 90 min	(min) 0 90	NA	22	5 and 8 log CFU/100 µl	Number is proportional to storage time. The highest percentage of attachment (6.6%) after 90 min occurred on tomatoes inoculated with the lowest population (4.95 log CFU/tomato).	100% RH	Effect of inoculum population on attachment of *Salmonella* on tomatoes.	Iturriaga et al., 2003
Red, ripe	No	*Salmonella* Enteritidis IFO-3313, SE-1, SE-3, SE-4 (Chicken feces); SE-2 (Bovine feces) (Japan) 100 µl spot inoculated	30 min	Calcinated calcium 0.5% (wt/vol) 200 ppm chlorine water Sterile distilled water	22	7.36–7.46 log CFU/tomato for *Salmonella*	**Reduction:** Treatment with 200 ppm chlorine and calcinated calcium resulted in 2.07 and 7.36 log CFU/tomato .	Antimicrobials were sprayed on.		Bari et al., 2002
Lycopersicon esculentum	No	*S.* Agona (Alfalfa sprouts) *S.* Baildon (Tomato) *S.* Montevideo (Tomato) *S.* Gaminara (Orange juice) *S.* Michigan (Cantaloupe) 100 µl spot inoculated and air dried 20–22 h at 22°C	(min) 0 6 12 25	ClO_2 gas (mg/liter) 1.4 2.7 4.1	22	8 log CFU/tomato	**Reduction** (log CFU/tomato): 1.11 2.04 4.33	Relative humidity: 34-62%		Sy et al., 2005

Tomato shape or variety according to publication	Waxed	Microbe	Time	Decontamination variable(s)	Temp. (°C)	Initial bacterial counts	Reduction or growth achieved; detection (positive or negative)	Parameters	Comments	Reference
Hydroponic (*Lycopersicon esculentum*)	Unknown	*S.* Javiana (Tomato) *S.* Baildon (Tomato) *S.* Montevideo (Tomato) 100 µl spot inoculated and air dried 2 h at 22°C	(min) 0 12	ClO_2 Gas (mg/liter) 0.1 0.3 0.5	22	8–9 log CFU/ tomato before drying and 7–8 log CFU/cm^2 after drying	**Reduction** (log CFU/cm^2): ~2.5–3.0 ~3.0 >5	Relative humidity: 85–90%		Bhagat et al., 2010
Hydroponic (*Lycopersicon esculentum*)	Unknown	*Listeria monocytogenes* LCDC 81-861 (Coleslaw/cabbage) and F4244 (Ice cream) 100 µl spot inoculated and air dried 2 h at 22°C	(min) 0 12	ClO_2 Gas (mg/liter) 0 0.1 0.3 0.5	22	8–9 log CFU/ tomato before drying and 7–8 log CFU/cm^2 after drying	**Reduction:** *L. monocytogenes* ~3.5, ~4.5, >5 log CFU/cm^2	Relative humidity: 85–90%		Bhagat et al., 2010
Round, unripe, green 'Florida 47'	No	Cocktail of: *S.* Agona *S.* Gaminara *S.* Michigan *S.* Montevideo *S.* Poona (University of California –Davis – L. Harris) Rifampicin resistant Puncture: 10 µl aliquot inoculum Shaved, stem scars, and intact surfaces: 100 µl aliquot inoculum	(s) 30 60 120	150 ppm free chlorine, pH 6.5	25 35	At 25°C: 6.52 to 6.77 log CFU/ml At 30°C: 5.77 to 6.49 log CFU/ml	**Reductions** at 120 s: At 25°C, Stem 1.86 log CFU/ml, Scrape 1.42 log CFU/ml, Puncture 0.73 log CFU/ml, Intact 6.36 log CFU/ml At 30°C, Stem 1.0 log CFU/ml, Scrape 0.56 log CFU/l, Puncture 0.71 log CFU/ml, Intact 4.85 log CFU/ml		*Salmonella* recovery was tested on four surface types: intact, punctures, shaves, and stem scars.	Felkey et al., 2006
Round, unripe, green 'Florida 47'	No	*S.* Agona *S.* Gaminara *S.* Michigan *S.* Poona *S.* Montevideo Ten-10 µl aliquot, spot inoculated around blossom scar	(d) 0 1 3 7 11 14 21 28		20 30	4.6–5.1 log CFU/ ml	**Reduction** by day 28: At 20°C/60% RH, 3.1 log CFU/ml At 20°C/90% RH, 3.2 log CFU/ml At 30°C/80% RH, 5 log CFU/ml	Relative humidity (%): 60, 80, 90		Allen et al., 2005

Tomato shape or variety according to publication	Waxed	Microbe	Time	Decontamination variable(s)	Temp. (°C)	Initial bacterial counts	Reduction or growth achieved; detection (positive or negative)	Parameters	Comments	Reference
Lightly waxed, mature green	Unknown	*S.* Montevideo (Tomato) *S.* Michigan (Cantaloupe) v. Poona (Cantaloupe) *S.* Hartford Orange juice *S.* Enteritidis (Eggs) (CDC) Ampicillin resistant, inoculated 50 µl near the blossom end of the tomato	Tomatoes were analyzed after storage for (d) 0 1 2 4 7 10 14	NA	20	7.72 log CFU/ tomato	**Reduction** of ~4 log CFU/tomato by day 14	70% RH	Determine the survival characteristics of *Salmonella* inoculated on tomato surfaces following storage at 20°C.	Guo et al., 2002 JFP
Lightly waxed, mature green	Unknown	*S.* Montevideo (Tomato) *S.* Michigan (Cantaloupe) *S.* Poona (Cantaloupe) *S.* Hartford Orange juice *S.* Enteritidis (Eggs) (CDC) Ampicillin resistant, inoculated 50 µl near the blossom end of the tomato	Tomatoes were analyzed after storage for (d) 0 1 2 4 7 10 14	NA	20	7.77–8.15 CFU/g	**Growth** of 2.5 log CFU/tomato at 4–10 days		Study attachment and infiltration of *Salmonella* into tomatoes placed on the surface of water-saturated soil inoculated with the pathogen.	Guo et al., 2002 JFP
Mature green (*Lycopersicon esculentum* cv Agriset, and *Lycopersicon esculentum* cv Solimar), stored at RT until ripe	Unknown	*S.* Montevideo G4639 (CDC) Rifampicin resistant 25 µl spot inoculated	NA	NA	Room temp.	Four groups of 5 tomatoes each were inoculated on the stem scars with a bacterial population of 4.4×10^3, 5.4×10^4, 6.6×10^5,or 5.0×10^6 CFU in 25 µl	**Detection:** 1st set, 33–95% detectable on 10^3–10^6 CFU 2nd set, 10–45% on 10^5–10^6 CFU 3rd set, no detection		Bacterial transfer by using a cutting knife from inoculated to uninoculated tomatoes. Bacteria were transferred by using a cutting knife from inoculated to uninoculated tomatoes at high CFU.	Lin and Wei, 1997

Tomato shape or variety according to publication	Waxed	Microbe	Time	Decontamination variable(s)	Temp. (°C)	Initial bacterial counts	Reduction or growth achieved; detection (positive or negative)	Parameters	Comments	Reference
Mature green (*Lycopersicon esculentum* cv Agriset, and *Lycopersicon esculentum* cv Solimar), stored at RT until ripe	Unknown	*S.* Montevideo G4639 (CDC) Rifampicin resistant 25 µl spot inoculated	NA	NA	Room temp.	25 µl 2.8×10^2, 2.8×10^3, 2.8×10^4 or 2.8×10^5 CFU/ml in butterfield phosphate buffer or tryptic soy broth was placed on the stem scars of 10 tomatoes to yield a final population of 7, 70, 700, or 7,000 CFU.	**Detection:** 3.8–36% detectable by direct plating for 70–7,000 CFU, no detection for 7 CFU, 4.2–94% detectable after 6 h enrichment for 7–7,000 CFU		Determination of the rate of bacterial detection following cutting of inoculated tomatoes: introduction and/or transfer of bacterial contaminants by using a cutting knife could occur at a bacterial population as low as <10 CFU at the stem scar.	Lin and Wei, 1997
Mature green (*Lycopersicon esculentum* cv Agriset, and *Lycopersicon esculentum* cv Solimar), stored at RT until ripe	Unknown	*S.* Montevideo G4639 (CDC) Rifampicin resistant 25 µl spot inoculated	NA	NA	Room temp.	Four tomatoes were each inoculated with 6.25×10^3, 6.25×10^4, or 9.5×10^5 CFU in 25 µl at stem scar.	**Detection:** At the lower inoculum dose of 6.25×10^3 CFU, *S.* Montevideo colonies were found to cluster at the stem scar region on TSA-RIF plates. However, as the inoculum levels were increased, the colonies were found to spread from the stem scar region to the center and bottom of cut tomatoes along the cutting direction of the knife.		Bacterial distribution on the cut surface of tomato halves.	Lin and Wei, 1997
Green ('Florida 47' cultivar)	No	*S.* Agona *S.* Gaminara *S.* Michigan *S.* Montevideo *S.* Poona (University of California - Davis – L. Harris) Rifampicin resistant, spot inoculated	(s) 60 20 treatment and 5 d study	200 ppm chlorine (pH 6.5)	35	30–100 µL of inoculums of 10^8 to 10^9 CFU/mL *Salmonella* cocktail	**Reduction** of 96.19 – >99.99 % at 120 sec on day 5		Effectiveness of 200 ppm chlorine (pH 6.5) treatment on smooth surface, stem scar tissue, and puncture wound of tomatoes.	Yuk et al., 2005

Tomato shape or variety according to publication	Waxed	Microbe	Time	Decontamination variable(s)	Temp. (°C)	Initial bacterial counts	Reduction or growth achieved; detection (positive or negative)	Parameters	Comments	Reference
Green ('Florida 47' cultivar)	No	*S.* Agona *S.* Gaminara *S.* Michigan *S.* Montevideo *S.* Poona (University of California - Davis – L. Harris) Rifampicin resistant Spot inoculated	(s) 60 20 treatment and 5 d study	1,200 ppm acidified sodium chlorite (ASC; pH 2.5)	35	30-100 µL of inoculums of 10^8 to 10^9 CFU/mL *Salmonella* cocktail	**Reduction** of 98.05 – >99.99 % at 120 sec on day 5		Effectiveness of 1200 ppm acidified sodium chlorite wash on smooth surface, stem scar tissue, and puncture wound of tomatoes.	Yuk et al., 2005
Green ('Florida 47' cultivar)	No	*S.* Agona *S.* Gaminara *S.* Michigan *S.* Montevideo *S.* Poona (University of California - Davis – L. Harris) Rifampicin resistant Spot inoculated	(s) 60 20 treatment and 5 d study	87 ppm peroxyacetic acid (PAA)	35	30–100 µL of inoculums of 10^8 to 10^9 CFU/mL *Salmonella* cocktail	**Reduction** of 94.79 – >99.99 % at 120 sec on day 5		Effectiveness of 87 ppm peroxyacetic acid treatment on smooth surface, stem scar tissue, and puncture wound of tomatoes.	Yuk et al., 2005
Green ('Florida 47' cultivar)	No	*S.* Agona *S.* Gaminara *S.* Michigan *S.* Montevideo *S.* Poona (University of California - Davis – L. Harris) Rifampicin resistant Spot inoculated	1 h treatment and 5 d study	100 mg chlorine dioxide (ClO_2) gas treatment	35	30–100 µL of inoculums of 10^8 to 10^9 CFU/mL *Salmonella* cocktail	**Reduction** of 99.35 – >99.99 % at 120 sec on day 5		Effectiveness of chlorine dioxide (ClO_2) gas treatment on smooth surface, stem scar tissue, and puncture wound of tomatoes.	Yuk et al., 2005

Tomato shape or variety according to publication	Waxed	Microbe	Time	Decontamination variable(s)	Temp. (°C)	Initial bacterial counts	Reduction or growth achieved; detection (positive or negative)	Parameters	Comments	Reference
Green ('Florida 47' cultivar)	No	*S.* Agona *S.* Gaminara *S.* Michigan *S.* Montevideo *S.* Poona (University of California - Davis – L. Harris) Rifampicin resistant Spot inoculated	NA	200 ppm chlorine (pH 6.5), a 1200 ppm acidified sodium chlorite (ASC; pH 2.5) a chlorine dioxide (ClO_2), gas treatment	35	30–100 µL of inoculums of 10^8 to 10^9 CFU/mL *Salmonella* cocktail	**Reduction** of 99.245 – >99.99 % at 120 sec on day 5	2 min in the chlorine bath (200 ppm, 35°C, pH 6.5) as the initial treatment, followed by a 30 s washing in acidified sodium chlorite (1200 ppm, 35°C, pH 2.5), and then tomatoes were treated with chlorine dioxide gas for 1 hour at room temp. (23°C ± 2°C) in a 22-quart vessel	Effectiveness of combination treatment on smooth surface, stem scar tissue, and puncture wound of tomatoes.	Yuk et al., 2005
Mature green (Sunny cultivar)	No	*S.* Montevideo G4639 (CDC) Batches of tomatoes (18 to 20) were submerged and constantly agitated in the bacterial suspension for 2 min and were then air dried in a laminar flow hood at 22°C for 4 h.	Storage (d) 1 2 4 7 9 15 18	NA	10 20 30	~1.5 log CFU/cm^2	**Growth:** Pathogen did not change significantly on tomatoes stored at 10°C throughout the 18-day storage period. Significant increases in the population of *S.* Montevideo occurred within 7 days and within 1 day when tomatoes were stored at 20 and 30°C, respectively. A 3 log CFU/cm^2 growth at 30°C	Relative humidity 45–60%	Fate of *S.* Montevideo on tomato surfaces.	Zhuang et al., 1995

Tomato shape or variety according to publication	Waxed	Microbe	Time	Decontamination variable(s)	Temp. (°C)	Initial bacterial counts	Reduction or growth achieved; detection (positive or negative)	Parameters	Comments	Reference
Mature green (Sunny cultivar)	No	*S.* Montevideo G4639 (CDC) 10 tomatoes were submerged and constantly agitated for 2 min, dried, placed in plastic bags, and stored at 10 or 20°C.	Storage (d) at 10°C 1 3 5 8 At 20°C (d) 1 3 5 8 18	NA	10 20	~4.5 log CFU/g	**Growth:** A significantly higher number of *S.* Montevideo cells were taken up by core tissue when tomatoes at 25°C were dipped in suspension at 10°C compared with the number of cells taken up by tomatoes dipped in suspensions at 25 or 37°C. Tomatoes remained essentially constant throughout subsequent storage for 18 days at 10°C. Storage of tomatoes at 20°C resulted in significant increases in the population of *S.* Montevideo in core tissues within 3, 5, and 18 days of storage of tomatoes that had been dipped in suspension at 10, 25, and 37°C.		Uptake of *S.* Montevideo by core tissue. Effect of temp. differential between tomatoes (25°C) and dip suspension (10, 25, or 37°C) on uptake of *S.* Montevideo by core tissue, and effect of subsequent storage temp. (10 or 20°C) on survival.	Zhuang et al., 1995
Mature green (Sunny cultivar)	No	*S.* Montevideo G4639 (CDC) Batches (18 to 22) of tomatoes were submerged in the suspension, constantly agitated for 2 min, air dried for 5 h, and stored at 25°C for 18 h.	2-min treatment	Free Cl_2 (ppm) 60 110 210 320	NA	~4.95 log CFU/cm^2 on surface and unknown in core	**Reduction:** Dipping in a solution containing 320 ppm chlorine for 2 min resulted in approximately 1.5 log reduction in the number of viable *S.* Montevideo on the surfaces of tomatoes. Concentrations of 110 to 320 ppm significantly reduce the number of viable cells.		Efficacy of chlorine for inactivating *S.* Montevideo.	Zhuang et al., 1995

Tomato shape or variety according to publication	Waxed	Microbe	Time	Decontamination variable(s)	Temp. (°C)	Initial bacterial counts	Reduction or growth achieved; detection (positive or negative)	Parameters	Comments	Reference
Freshly-harvested Unripened (green), and ripened	Unknown	Separately: *S.* Javiana 5913 (Chicken feces) *S.* Javiana 6027 (Bovine feces) *S.* Montevideo (Tomato) *S.* Newport (Alfalfa sprouts) v. Enteritidis (Egg) *S.* Hadar (Poultry house) *S.* Typhimurium (Pork slaughter line) *S.* Dublin (Raw milk) *S.* Senftenberg (Alfalfa sprouts) *S.* Infantis (Clinical isolate) (University of Guelph Culture Collection)	(d) 7 14	NA	15 25	10^6 CFU/ml	**Growth** (internal and external) was promoted at the high incubation temp. (25°C) and high relative humidity (95%), although this was serovar dependent. The growth and persistence of *Salmonella* introduced on and into ripened (red) tomatoes was serovar dependent. *Salmonella* serovars Enteritidis, Typhimurium, and Dublin were less adapted to grow in or on intact red tomatoes than were serovars Hadar, Montevideo, or Newport.	Vacuum chamber (operating at 10^3 Pa), 75 or 95% RH	Inoculation of tomato fruit on surface and internally.	Shi et al., 2007
Mature, red, ripe tomato; green tomato; ripened tomatillo (*Physalis ixocarpa*)	Unknown	*S.* Montevideo (Tomato) (University of Georgia) Rifampicin resistant 100 µl spot inoculated	90 min	NA	12 22 30	7 log CFU/fruit	Population ranged from 4.0 to 5.4 log CFU/fruit). Temp. and RH alone did not affect the number of cells attached to the tomato or tomatillo surface. Both the type of product and interaction of temp. and RH showed a significant effect on the attachment of *Salmonella* Montevideo to the surface of tomatoes and tomatillos.	Relative humidity (%): 75, 85, 97	Influence of relative humidity, temp., and stage of ripening on attachment of *Salmonella* to tomatoes and tomatillos.	Iturriaga et al., 2003

Tomato shape or variety according to publication	Waxed	Microbe	Time	Decontamination variable(s)	Temp. (°C)	Initial bacterial counts	Reduction or growth achieved; detection (positive or negative)	Parameters	Comments	Reference
Mature green through fully red tomatoes of the Sunny variety	Unknown	*S.* Montevideo G4639 (CDC) Rifampicin resistant 25-µl aliquots on the stem scar of each tomato	30 s 1 min 2 min	Free chlorine (ppm) 100	Room temp.	8.09 log CFU/ tomato skin circle in DI 3.25 log CFU/ tomato skin circle in TSB Low 3.98 log CFU/stem scar in DI High 8.09 log CFU/stem scar in DI	**Reduction:** After 2 min, 1.09 (DI) to 5.95 (TSB) log CFU/tomato skin circle and Low 1.27 log CFU/stem scar After 1 min, High 1.66 log CFU/ stem scar		Efficacy of aqueous chlorine solutions against populations of *S.* Montevideo located on the surface, wounded areas, or stem scars of tomatoes.	Wei et al., 1995
Mature green through fully red tomatoes of the Sunny variety	Unknown	*S.* Montevideo G4639 (CDC) 0.5 ml aliquot added	30 s 1 min 2 min	Free chlorine (ppm) 50 75 100	Room temp.	Tryptic soy broth: 3.72, 5.99, 9.07 log CFU/ml Butterfield buffer: 9.34 log CFU/ml DI: 9.36 log CFU/ml	**Reduction:** After 2 min for TSB, 2.60 (75 ppm), 3.61 (75 ppm), 7.18 (100 ppm) log CFU/ml Buffer, 8.49 log CFU/ml (100 ppm) DI, 8.36 log CFU/ml (100 ppm)		Efficacy of aqueous chlorine against *S.* Montevideo populations suspended in distilled water, in growth medium, or on the dried surface of glass beads (a model for cellular attachment or embedding in particulates).	Wei et al., 1995
Mature green through fully red tomatoes of the Sunny variety	Unknown	*S.* Montevideo G4639 (CDC) 25 µl aliquot added	Growth (h) 18 24 48 Survival (d) 1 2 3 7	NA	Growth 25°C Survival 20°C 25°C	Growth: 9.06 log CFU/ml to 9.48 CFU/ml Survival: 25 µl of low 4.76, medium 5.76, or high 8.76 log CFU/ml, which dried up to be 3.16, 4.16, and 7.16 log CFU/ml	**Growth:** Low ~1.75 log CFU/wounded area growth Medium ~0.4 log CFU/wounded area High no growth. Ripeness had no apparent effect on bacterial growth.	Survival, relative humidity: 83 and 72%	Determine the ability of *S.* Montevideo to grow and/or survive on tomato surfaces, including the unbroken skin, wounded areas, growth cracks, or stem scars.	Wei et al., 1995

Tomato shape or variety according to publication	Waxed	Microbe	Time	Decontamination variable(s)	Temp. (°C)	Initial bacterial counts	Reduction or growth achieved; detection (positive or negative)	Parameters	Comments	Reference
Roma (*Lycopersicon esculentum*)	Unknown	A 3-strain mixture of *E. coli* 0157:H7 (C7927, EDL933, and 204P) Spot inoculated	NA	X-ray (#kGy/16 min) 0.1 0.5 0.75 1.0 1.5	22	Three or two strains of each bacterium were mixed with an equal volume to give approximately 10^{7-9} CFU/ml.	**Reduction:** ~ 4.2 log CFU/tomato reduction of E. coli O157:H7 were achieved by treatment with 0.75 kGy X-ray. More than a 5 log CFU/tomato reduction was achieved at 1.0 or 1.5 kGy X-ray for all tested pathogens.	Relative humidity: 55–60%	Inactivation of inoculated *Escherichia coli* O157:H7 on whole Roma tomato surfaces.	Mahmoud, 2010
Vine-ripened (*Lycopersicon Esculentum* Mill. cv Rutgers)	No	*E. coli* 0157:H7 strains LJH557 (Apple cider), SEA-13B88 (Apple cider), CDC-658 (Cantaloupe), H1730 (Lettuce), and F4546 (Alfalfa sprouts) 50 µl spot inoculated or dip inoculated in 5 liters for 1 min or 50 µl spray inoculated for 2 sec with thin-layer chromatography reagent sprayer at 22°C for 1 or 24 h	Agitated at 150 rpm for 5 min	Chlorine (200 mg/ml) solution	NA	Spot and spray inocula to each tomato were 7.21, log CFU/ml. Dip could not be determined.	**Reduction:** Spot inoculation was reduced by 1.07 and 3.17 log CFU/ml after drying times of 1 and 24 h. Spray-inoculated tomatoes were 1.03 and 4.34 log CFU/ml at 1 and 24 h, no recovery from chlorine.		Evaluate methods for applying inoculum and to examine the effect of inoculum drying time on survival and recovery of foodborne pathogens inoculated onto the surface of raw, ripe tomatoes.	Lang et al., 2004
Firm tomato at the light-red stage of ripeness, free of external defects	Unknown	*E. coli* NRRL B-766 (ATCC 9637), a nonpathogenic surrogate for *Salmonella* (USDA-ARS-NCAUR - L.K. Nakamura)	(min) 2 3 5	5% H_2O_2	60	9.71 log CFU/ml	**Reduction** of 0.95–1.90 log CFU/g		Effect of treatment time and surfactant addition on efficacy of 5% H_2O_2 in reducing population of *E. coli* NRRL B-766 on dip-inoculated tomatoes held 24 h at 20°C prior to treatment.	Sapers and Jones, 2006

Tomato shape or variety according to publication	Waxed	Microbe	Time	Decontamination variable(s)	Temp. (°C)	Initial bacterial counts	Reduction or growth achieved; detection (positive or negative)	Parameters	Comments	Reference
Firm tomato at the light-red stage of ripeness, free of external defects	Unknown	*E. coli* NRRL B-766 (ATCC 9637), a nonpathogenic surrogate for *Salmonella* (USDA-ARS-NCAUR – L.K. Nakamura)	(h) 24 48	1% or 5 % H_2O_2 (2 min or 15 min)	20 60	5.62 log CFU/g (48 h)	**Reduction** of 1.12 to 2.04 log CFU/g (48 h)		Efficacy of H_2O_2 in reducing the population of *E. coli* NRRL B-766 on dip-inoculated tomatoes, as affected by post-inoculation storage at 20°C.	Sapers and Jones, 2006
Firm tomato at the light-red stage of ripeness, free of external defects	Unknown	*E. coli* NRRL B-766 (ATCC 9637), a nonpathogenic surrogate for *Salmonella* (USDA-ARS-NCAUR - L.K. Nakamura)	48 h	200 ppm chlorine	4	3.98 log CFU/mL	**Reduction** of 1.16 CFU/g		Efficacy of water rinse and 200 ppm Cl_2 treatment in reducing the population of *E. coli* NRRL B-766 on dip-inoculated tomatoes, as affected by post-inoculation storage at 4°C.	Sapers and Jones, 2006
Red, ripe	No	*E. coli* 0157:H7 CR-3, MN-28, MY-29, DT-66 (Bovine feces) (Japan) 100 µl spot inoculated	30 min	Calcinated calcium 0.5% (wt/vol), 200 ppm chlorine water, or sterile distilled water	22	7.63 -7.85 log CFU/tomato for *E. coli* O157:H7;	**Reduction:** Treatment with 200 ppm chlorine and calcinated calcium resulted in 3.40 and 7.85 log reductions of *E. coli* O157:H7, respectively.	Antimicrobials were sprayed on.		Bari et al., 2002
Roma (*Lycopersicon esculentum*)	Unknown	A 3-strain mixture of *L. monocytogenes* (Scott A, F5069 and LCDC 81-861) Spot inoculated	NA	X-ray (#kGy/16 min) 0.1 0.5 0.75 1.0 1.5	22	Three or two strains of each bacterium were mixed with an equal volume to give approximately $10^{7\text{-}9}$ CFU/ml	**Reduction:** ~2.3 log CFU/tomato reduction of *L. monocytogenes* were achieved by treatment with 0.75 kGy X-ray, respectively. More than a 5 log CFU/tomato reduction was achieved at 1.0 or 1.5 kGy X-ray for all tested pathogens.	Relative humidity: 55–60%	Inactivation of inoculated *Listeria monocytogenes* on whole Roma tomato surfaces.	Mahmoud, 2010

Tomato shape or variety according to publication	Waxed	Microbe	Time	Decontamination variable(s)	Temp. (°C)	Initial bacterial counts	Reduction or growth achieved; detection (positive or negative)	Parameters	Comments	Reference
Vine-ripened (*Lycopersicon esculentum* Mill. cv Rutgers)	No	*L. monocytogenes* strains G1091 (Coleslaw), F8255 (Peach/plum), F8369 (Corn), H0222 (Potato), and F8027 (Celery) 50 µl spot inoculated or dip inoculated in 5 liters for 1 min or 50 µl spray inoculated for 2 sec with thin-layer chromatography reagent sprayer at 22°C for 1 or 24 h	Agitated at 150 rpm for 5 min	Sterile deionized water (control) or chlorine (200 mg/ml) solution	NA	*L. monocytogenes* spot and spray inocula to each tomato were 7.37 log CFU/ml. Dip could not be determined.	**Reduction:** Spot reduced by 1.00 and 1.54 log CFU/ml within 1 and 24 h. Reductions on spray-inoculated tomatoes were 0.52 and 1.45 log CFU/ml for 1 and 24 h.		*L. monocytogenes* is known to be more resistant than *E. coli* O157:H7 and *Salmonella* to stresses. Higher numbers of cells were recovered from dip-inoculated tomatoes compared with spot- or spray-inoculated tomatoes, regardless of drying time or treatment.	Lang et al., 2004
Red, ripe	No	*Listeria monocytogenes* ATCC 43256, ATCC 49594, JCM 7676, JCM 7672, JCM 7671 100 µl spot inoculated	30 min	Calcinated calcium 0.5% (wt/vol) 200 ppm chlorine water sterile distilled water	22	7.54 -7.59 log CFU/tomato for *L. monocytogenes*	**Reduction:** Treatment with 200 ppm chlorine and calcinated calcium reduced *L. monocytogenes* numbers by 2.27 and 7.59 log CFU per tomato, respectively.	Antimicrobials were sprayed on		Bari et al., 2002
Roma Untreated (no washing, oiling, or waxing)	No	*E. carotovora* ATCC 495, ATCC 15359, ATCC 25272 300 µl spot inoculated	(s) 2 4 6 10	ClO_2 – (ppm) (High) 20 10 5 (Low) 0 1 3 5 10	23	7 log CFU/ml *E. carotovora.*	**Reduction:** A full minute of contact with ClO_2 at 20 and 10 ppm was required to achieve a 5 log reduction of *E. carotovora* on freshly spot-inoculated tomatoes. Immersing wet-inoculated tomatoes in water (0 ppm ClO_2) for 1 min alone reduced *E. carotovora* by about 1.9 log CFU/cm^2. On inoculated fruit surfaces, populations decreased >3 log CFU/cm^2 during desiccation at 24°C for 24 h. Populations of air-dried *Erwinia* were not significantly reduced by ClO_2 at ≤20 ppm after 1 min.	For each treatment, nine inoculated tomatoes were immersed in 2 liters of ClO_2 or water for 20 to 60 s. Relative humidity: 40–50%	Researchers investigated the sanitizing effects of a ClO_2 solution on *E. carotovora* in water, on tomato surfaces, and between tomato loads.	Pao et al., 2007

Tomato shape or variety according to publication	Waxed	Microbe	Time	Decontamination variable(s)	Temp. (°C)	Initial bacterial counts	Reduction or growth achieved; detection (positive or negative)	Parameters	Comments	Reference
Roma, diced at the light-red to red stages	Unknown	*S.* Agona (Alfalfa sprouts) *S.* Baildon (Diced tomato) *S.* Gaminara (Orange juice) *S.* Michigan (Canataloupe) *S.* Montevideo (Tomato) Acid- and non-acid adapted environment, 5ml inoculation of inoculums in 450 g diced tomatoes	(d) 0 3 6 9	NA	4 12 21	Acid low 0.88 log CFU/g Acid high 2.88 log CFU/g No acid low 0.99 log CFU/g No acid high 2.99 log CFU/g	**Growth** at 10 days for: Acid low at 12°C and 21°C, ~1.32 and ~8.22 log CFU/g. Acid high at 12°C and 21°C, ~3.62 log CFU/g and ~5.32 log CFU/g. No acid low at 12°C and 21°C, ~1.61 log CFU/g and ~7.71 log CFU/g. No acid high at 12°C and 21°C, ~3.81 CFU/g, and ~4.81 log CFU/g		Survival and growth of acid-adapted and not acid-adapted cells in diced Roma tomatoes.	Beuchat and Mann, 2008
Diced	Unknown	Separately: *S.* Enteritidis NVI 153 (Cow) *S.* Infantis NVI 110 (Broiler chicken) *S.* Typhimurium NVI 199 (Broiler chicken) (Finland) Spot inoculated	6 24 48	NA	7 (only 48 h) 22 30	1–2 × 10^2 CFU/g	**Growth:** *S.* Infantis - No growth at 7°C; At 48 h, 2.4 × 10^8 CFU/g at 22°C, and 4.5 × 10^7 CFU/g at 30°C. *S.* Enteritidis - No growth at 7°C; At 48 h, 8 × 10^8 CFU/g at 22°C, and 6 × 10^7 CFU/g at 30°C. *S.* Typhimurium - No growth at 7°C; At 48 h, 1.1 × 10^8 CFU/g at 22°C, and 5 × 10^7 CFU/g at 30°C.			Asplund and Nurmi, 1991
Diced, Round, red, ripened tomato	Unknown	*S.* Braenderup (Tomato) (CDC) Diced tomatoes at room temp. (22°C) were spot inoculated (at stem scar) with 0.1 ml of inoculum.	120 s	High pressure processing (MPa) 350 450 550	20	Diced, 5.93 log CFU/g	**Reduction:** 550 MPa Diced, 3.65 log CFU/g reduction		To determine the effect of pressure to reduce or remove *S. enterica* from whole red Round tomatoes.	Maitland et al., 2011

Tomato shape or variety according to publication	Waxed	Microbe	Time	Decontamination variable(s)	Temp. (°C)	Initial bacterial counts	Reduction or growth achieved; detection (positive or negative)	Parameters	Comments	Reference
Diced grape tomato *Lycopersicon esculentum* mill.	Unknown	*S.* Poona (Cantaloupe) *S.* Stanley H 1256 (Alfalfa sprouts) *S.* Baildon (Tomato) *S.* Typhimurium DT 104 (Resistant to multiple antibiotics) *S.* Montevideo (Tomato) (University of Georgia – M. Harrison) Spot inoculated 100 µl	At 4°C and 10°C (d) 0 4 7 10 At 25°C (h) 0 4 7 10	Allyl isothiocyanate (AIT, from mustard and horseradish) Carvacrol (from oregano) Cinnamaldehyde (from cinnamon) 5, 10, and 15 µl (equivalent to 41.5, 83.3, and 125 µl/liter of air, respectively) of ≥97% pure carvacrol or ≥98% pure cinnamaldehyde or 1, 2, and 4 µl (equivalent to 8.3, 16.6, and 33.3 µl/liter of air, respectively) of ≥98% pure AIT	4 10 25	Sliced tomatoes, 100 µl 6.7 log CFU/ml placed on 10 separate spots	**Reduction:** AIT exhibited the highest antimicrobial activity followed by cinnamaldehyde. The lowest level of AIT (8.3 µl/liter of air) inactivated *Salmonella* on sliced tomatoes by 1.0 and 3.5 log at 4 and 10°C, respectively, in 10 days and by 2.8 log at 25°C in 10 h. Overall, greater inactivation occurred at 10 than at 4°C and on the tomato surface than between slices.		Elucidate the effect of antimicrobials' activity on pathogen inactivation on tomato skin (using whole tomatoes).	Obaidat and Frank, 2009
Stem scar tissue light red, Round	Unknown	*S.* Agona (Alfalfa sprouts) *S.* Baildon (Diced tomato) *S.* Gaminara (Orange juice) *S.* Michigan (Cantaloupe) *S.* Montevideo (Tomato) Acid- and non-acid adapted environment, 20 µl syringe inoculated	(d) 0 3 6 10	NA	12 21	Acid-adapted and not acid-adapted cells: Round, light red, 2.05 and 1.84 CFU/g	**Growth** at 10 days for *Light red, Round*: Acid-adapted stem at 12°C and 21°C, ~2.05 log CFU/g and ~4.05 log CFU/g Not acid-adapted stem at 21°C and 21°C, ~0.76 log CFU/g and ~2.66 log CFU/g		Survival and growth of acid-adapted and not acid-adapted cells in Round tomatoes.	Beuchat and Mann, 2008

Tomato shape or variety according to publication	Waxed	Microbe	Time	Decontamination variable(s)	Temp. (°C)	Initial bacterial counts	Reduction or growth achieved; detection (positive or negative)	Parameters	Comments	Reference
Stem scar tissue of light-red Roma	Unknown	*S.* Agona (Alfalfa sprouts) *S.* Baildon (Diced tomato) *S.* Gaminara (Orange juice) *S.* Michigan (Cantaloupe) *S.* Montevideo (Tomato) Acid- and non-acid adapted environment, 20 µl syringe inoculated	(d) 0 3 6 10	NA	12 21	Acid-adapted and not acid-adapted cells: Roma, light red, 2.00 and 2.01 CFU/g	**Growth** at 10 days, *Roma light red:* Acid-adapted stem at 12°C and 21°C, ~1.5 log CFU/g and ~3.8 log CFU/g Not acid-adapted stem at 21°C and 21°C, ~2.29 log CFU/g and ~4.19 log CFU/g		Survival and growth of acid-adapted and not acid adapted cells in Roma tomatoes.	Beuchat and Mann, 2008
Stem scar tissues of Round and Roma, initially at the turning and/or pink stages of ripeness	Unknown	*S.* Agona (Alfalfa sprouts) *S.* Baildon (Diced tomato) *S.* Gaminara (Orange juice) *S.* Michigan (Cantaloupe) *S.* Montevideo (Tomato) 20 µl syringe inoculated	12°C (d) 0 3 6 10 14 27 21°C (d) 0 3 6 10 14	NA	12 21	Pre-inoculation 4 log CFU/ml and post-inoculation 0.08 log CFU/g	**Growth:** *Salmonella* increased significantly in the stem scar of tomatoes stored at both temps. . Higher populations (4.9 to 8.4 log CFU/g) were reached at 21°C than at 12°C (3.3 to 4.9 log CFU/g) in tomatoes stored for 14 and 27 days, respectively	Tomatoes were held up to 27 days at 12 or 21°C with 15 and 36% relative humidity before experiment.	Survival and growth of *Salmonella* in Round and Roma tomatoes.	Beuchat and Mann, 2008
Stem scar on the skin surface of grape tomato	Unknown	*S.* Agona (Alfalfa sprouts) *S.* Baildon (Diced tomato) *S.* Gaminara (Orange juice) *S.* Michigan (Cantaloupe) *S.* Montevideo (Tomato) Not adapted to acidic environment 20 µl inoculated	14 d	NA	4 12 21	1.76 log CFU/ml (57 CFU/ml)	**Growth** at 14 days: Stem at 12°C and 21°C, ~2.65 and ~4.05 log CFU/g		Survival and growth of *Salmonella* in and on grape tomatoes.	Beuchat and Mann, 2008

Tomato shape or variety according to publication	Waxed	Microbe	Time	Decontamination variable(s)	Temp. (°C)	Initial bacterial counts	Reduction or growth achieved; detection (positive or negative)	Parameters	Comments	Reference
Stem scar tissue of green tomato	Unknown	*S.* Agona (Alfalfa sprouts) *S.* Baildon (Diced tomato) *S.* Gaminara (Orange juice) *S.* Michigan (Cantaloupe) *S.* Montevideo (Tomato) Acid- and non-acid adapted environment 20 µl syringe inoculated	(d) 0 3 6 10	NA	12 21	Acid-adapted and not acid-adapted cells: Green, 2.03 and 1.78 log CFU/g	**Growth** at 10 days for *Green*: Acid-adapted stem at 12°C and 21°C, ~0.067 log CFU/g and ~1.77 log CFU/g Not acid-adapted stem at 21°C, ~3.22 log CFU/g		Survival and growth of acid-adapted and not acid-adapted cells in green tomatoes.	Beuchat and Mann, 2008
Round - Pulp of light red	Unknown	*S.* Agona (Alfalfa sprouts) *S.* Baildon (Diced tomato) *S.* Gaminara (Orange juice) *S.* Michigan (Cantaloupe) *S.* Montevideo (Tomato) Acid- and non-acid adapted environment 20 µl syringe inoculated	(d) 0 3 6 10	NA	12 21	Acid-adapted and not acid-adapted cells: Round, light red, 2.05 and 1.84 CFU/g	**Growth** at 10 days for *Light red Round:* Acid pulp at 12°C and 21°C, ~3.95 log CFU/ml and ~5.45 log CFU/ml Not acid-adapted pulp at 12°C and 21°C, ~2.46 log CFU/g and ~5.56 log CFU/g.		Survival and growth of acid-adapted and not acid adapted cells in Round tomatoes.	Beuchat and Mann, 2008
Round and Roma tomato pulp (radial pericarp) initially at the turning and/or pink stages of ripeness	Unknown	*S.* Agona *S.* Baildon *S.* Gaminara *S.* Michigan *S.* Montevideo 20 µl syringe inoculated	12°C (d) 0 3 6 10 14 27 21°C (d) 0 3 6 10 14	NA	12 21	Pre-inoculation 4 log CFU/ml, and post-inoculation 0.08 log CFU/g	**Growth:** *Salmonella* increased significantly in the pulp tissues of tomatoes stored at both temps. Higher populations (4.9 to 8.4 log CFU/g) were reached at 21°C than at 12°C (3.3 to 4.9 log CFU/g) in tomatoes stored for 14 and 27 days, respectively.	Tomatoes were held up to 27 days at 12 or 21°C with 15 and 36% relative humidity before experiment.	Survival and growth of *Salmonella* in Round and Roma tomatoes.	Beuchat and Mann, 2008

Tomato shape or variety according to publication	Waxed	Microbe	Time	Decontamination variable(s)	Temp. (°C)	Initial bacterial counts	Reduction or growth achieved; detection (positive or negative)	Parameters	Comments	Reference
Pulp of light-red Roma tomato	Unknown	*S.* Agona *S.* Baildon *S.* Gaminara *S.* Michigan *S.* Montevideo Acid- and non-acid adapted environment 20 µl syringe inoculated	(d) 0 3 6 10	NA	12 21	Acid-adapted and not acid adapted cells: Roma light red 2.00 and 2.01 CFU/g	**Growth** at 10 days *Roma light red:* Acid-adapted pulp at 12°C and 21°C, ~3.5 log CFU/ml and ~6.0 log CFU/ml Not acid-adapted pulp at 12°C and 21°C, ~3.29 log CFU/g and ~5.19 log CFU/g		Survival and growth of acid-adapted and not acid-adapted cells in Roma tomatoes.	Beuchat and Mann, 2008
Pulp tissues on the skin surface of grape tomato	Unknown	*S.* Agona *S.* Baildon *S.* Gaminara *S.* Michigan *S.* Montevideo Acid- and non-acid adapted environment 20 µl syringe inoculated	14 d	NA	4 12 21	1.76 log CFU/ml (57 CFU/ml)	**Growth** at 14 days: Pulp at 12°C and 21°C, ~3.35 and ~4.85 log CFU/g		Survival and growth of *Salmonella* in and on grape tomatoes.	Beuchat and Mann, 2008
Pulp of green tomato	Unknown	*S.* Agona *S.* Baildon *S.* Gaminara *S.* Michigan *S.* Montevideo Acid- and non-acid adapted environment 20 µl syringe inoculated	(d) 0 3 6 10	NA	12 21	Acid-adapted and not acid-adapted cells: Green 2.03 and 1.78 log CFU/g	**Growth** at 10 days for *Green:* Acid-adapted pulp at 12°C and 21°C, ~1.47 log CFU/ml and ~3.77 log CFU/ml Not acid-adapted pulp at 12°C and 21°C, ~1.52 log CFU/g and ~4.02 log CFU/g.		Survival and growth of acid-adapted and not acid-adapted cells in green tomatoes.	Beuchat and Mann, 2008
Salsa with either fresh Roma tomato or canned whole tomato, different salsa recipes	Unknown	*S.* Typhimurium, DT 104 (Beef isolate) and PTC 1 (Poultry isolate) two *S.* Enteritidis, H4639 (Clinical isolate) and MH24981 (Environmental isolate) one *S.* Heidelberg, MH27651 (Turkey isolate) 100 µl spot inoculated	(d) 0 1 2 3 7	NA	21	5-6 log CFU/ tomato	Salsa, depending on its ingredients, could be inhibitory to, or support the survival and possibly growth of, *Salmonella* during storage. Salsa can be formulated with ingredient combinations such as lime juice plus fresh garlic to prevent or suppress the growth of *Salmonella*.	Inoculated whole tomatoes, then chopped them	Fate of *Salmonella* in salsas.	Ma et al., 2010

Tomato shape or variety according to publication	Waxed	Microbe	Time	Decontamination variable(s)	Temp. (°C)	Initial bacterial counts	Reduction or growth achieved; detection (positive or negative)	Parameters	Comments	Reference
Salsa, ripened Roma tomato, intact	Unknown	*S.* Typhimurium, DT 104 (Beef isolate) and PTC 1 (Poultry isolate) two *S.* Enteritidis, H4639 (Clinical isolate) and MH24981 (Environmental isolate) one *S.* Heidelberg, MH27651 (Turkey isolate) 20 µl spot inoculated, air dried 1 h RT	(d) 0 1 2 5 7	NA	4 12 21	Inoculated at 5.36 log CFU/g and after spot-inoculation was 2.47 log CFU/g	**Growth** on surface of raw whole tomato: At 21°C, 4-5 log CFU/g growth No growth observed at 4 and 12°C	Relative humidity: 55-65% Inoculated whole tomatoes, then chopped them	Survival and growth of *Salmonella* on intact tomato, jalapeño, and cilantro.	Ma et al., 2010
Salsa, ripened Roma tomato, diced	Unknown	*S.* Typhimurium, DT 104 (Beef isolate) and PTC 1 (Poultry isolate) two *S.* Enteritidis, H4639 (Clinical isolate) and MH24981 (Environmental isolate) one *S.* Heidelberg, MH27651 (Turkey isolate) 100 µl spot inoculated	(d) 0 1 2 5 7	NA	4 12 21	~4 log CFU/g	**Growth** on chopped tomato: No growth at 4°C (kept at 3-4 log CFU/g) Growth at 12°C at 6.02 log CFU/g and a decrease in growth at <1 log CFU/g (day 2) at 21°C		Survival and growth of *Salmonella* in chopped tomatoes, jalapeño peppers, and cilantro.	Ma et al., 2010
Restaurant-made salsa with red tomato	Unknown	*S.* Enteritidis *S.* Typhimurium *S.* Thompson ATCC 8391 Spot inoculated on salsa container	For 20°C (h) 0 2 4 6 24 For 4°C (d) 0 1 3 5 7	NA	20 4	15-20 CFU/ sample			Comparison of detection methods between CHROMagar, XLD, and RapidCheck SELECT. RapidCheck SELECT was best to detect *Salmonella* under both temps. at all time points except 5 s, 7 d at 4°C.	Franco et al., 2010

Tomato shape or variety according to publication	Waxed	Microbe	Time	Decontamination variable(s)	Temp. (°C)	Initial bacterial counts	Reduction or growth achieved; detection (positive or negative)	Parameters	Comments	Reference
Restaurant-made salsa with red tomato	Unknown	*S. aureus* ATCC 29247, ATCC 12600-U, and ATCC 35548 Spot inoculated on salsa container	For 20°C (h) 0 2 4 6 24 For 4°C (d) 0 1 3 5 7	NA	20 4	Low (3.2 log CFU/g) High (4.2 log CFU/g)	**Reduction:** At 20°C, 1.1 log CFU/g for low and 0.6 log CFU/g for high At 4°C, 1.7 log CFU/g for low and 2.5 log CFU/g for high	pH at 4 °C ranged from 3.96 to 3.65 pH at 20°C ranged from 3.95 to 3.73	Survival study.	Franco et al., 2010
Cultivar Better Boy tomato seeds grown for 7 days or until cotyledons emerged	No	*S.* Montevideo (Tomato) *S.* Michigan (Cantaloupe) *S.* Poona (Cantaloupe) *S.* Hartford (Orange juice) *S.* Enteritidis (Eggs) (CDC) All ampicillin resistant Plants with intact or cut roots were then transferred to trays containing 4 liters of Hoagland solution inoculated with the five-serotype mixture.	7 d	NA	25°C	Hoagland solution modified to contain ampicillin (100 g/ml) in order to obtain a preparation containing 4.55 log CFU/ml	**Detection:** Within 1 day of exposure of plant roots to nutrient solution containing ca. 4.5 log CFU of the pathogen/ml, populations were 3.0 log CFU/g of hypocotyls and cotyledons, and 3.4 log CFU/g of stems. Populations > 3.4 log CFU/g of hypocotyl/cotyledon, stem, and leaf tissue of plants grown for 9 days were detected.	Hypocotyls, cotyledons, stem, leaves	Investigate the possibility of association of *Salmonellae* with hypocotyls, cotyledons, stems, and leaves of young plants grown in a hydroponic nutrient solution inoculated with the pathogen.	Guo et al., 2002 AEM

Tomato shape or variety according to publication	Waxed	Microbe	Time	Decontamination variable(s)	Temp. (°C)	Initial bacterial counts	Reduction or growth achieved; detection (positive or negative)	Parameters	Comments	Reference
Tomato seeds (*Lycopersicon esculentum* variety Abigail VFET)	Unknown	*S.* Javiana 5913 (Chicken feces) *S.* Javiana 6027 (Bovine feces) *S.* Montevideo (Tomato) *S.* Newport (Alfalfa sprouts) *S.* Enteritidis (Egg) *S.* Hadar (Poultry house) *S.* Typhimurium (Pork slaughter line) *S.* Dublin (Raw milk) *S.* Senftenberg (Alfalfa sprouts) *S.* Infantis (Clinical isolate) (University of Guelph) 100 µl spot inoculated	6-7 weeks	NA	NA	100-µl aliquots of *Salmonella* suspension (10^7 CFU/ml) were introduced onto the flowers of the plants.	**Detection:** The lowest recovery was observed for serovar Dublin (14%), and the highest was observed for Javiana 6027 (84%). *Salmonella* serovars introduced onto the flowers of growing plants were recovered on and within the developing tomato fruit. Of all the *Salmonella* serovars tested, Montevideo appeared to be more adapted to survival within tomatoes and was recovered from 90% of the fruit screened.	Batches (five batches per serovar, three fruits per batch) were screened for the presence of *Salmonella* on the surface and in internal tissue.	Inoculation of tomato plants with *Salmonella*.	Shi et al., 2007
Tomato plants 'Bonnie Select'	No	*S.* Montevideo ATCC 8387 Spot inoculated	48 h	NA	NA	6.6 log CFU/ leaflet	**Reductions** of 3-4 log CFU/leaflet occurred when leaves were dried after inoculation. When leaves were supported in a hydroponic nutrient medium and incubated at 100% RH, there was no significant reduction for at least six days.	*Salmonella* on the surface of excised leaves, leaf disks, and fruit pericarp disks under dry (60% RH) and high-humidity (100% RH) conditions	Examine the survival of *Salmonella* Montevideo on tomato leaves.	Rathinasabapathi, 2004
Tomato plants 'Bonnie Select'	No	*S.* Montevideo ATCC 8387 Spot inoculation	6 d		20		No significant effect on the survival of *Salmonella* on leaf surfaces	100 ppm Ethylene at 100% RH	With high relative humidity and the addition of ethylene, it was examined for the pathogen's survival on tomato leaves.	Rathinasabapathi, 2004

Tomato shape or variety according to publication	Waxed	Microbe	Time	Decontamination variable(s)	Temp. (°C)	Initial bacterial counts	Reduction or growth achieved; detection (positive or negative)	Parameters	Comments	Reference
Tomato plants 'Better Boy,' harvested when red-ripe color was achieved	No	Separately: *S.* Montevideo (Tomato) *S.* Michigan (Cantaloupe) *S.* Poona (Cantaloupe) *S.* Hartford (Orange juice) *S.* Enteritidis (Egg) (CDC) Brushed by using a small paintbrush saturated with inoculum, or 25-gauge syringe needle stem injected	27–49 d	NA	NA	Open flower: 9 log CFU/ml Stem injection before and after flowering: 7.5 log CFU/50 µl	**Detection:** Eleven of thirty tomatoes (37%) harvested from inoculated plants were positive for all *Salmonella* serotypes except *S.* Hartford. Presumptive *Salmonella* was detected in enriched samples of peptone wash water, stem scar tissue, and pulp of tomatoes from inoculated plants. *Salmonella* was detected on or in tomatoes from plants receiving stem inoculation before or after flower set and on or in tomatoes that developed from inoculated flowers.		Determine the fate of *Salmonella* inoculated into tomato stems and onto tomato flowers.	Guo et al., 2001

References

Allen, R. L., B.R. Warren, D. L. Archer, S. A. Sargent, and K. R. Schneider. 2005. Survival of *Salmonella* spp. on the surfaces of fresh tomatoes and selected packing line materials. *HortTechnology* 15, 831–836.

Asplund, K., and E. Nurmi. 1991. The growth of Salmonellae in tomatoes. *International Journal of Food Microbiology* 13, 177–181.

Bari, M. L., Y. Inatsu, S. Kawasaki, E. Nazuka, and K. Isshiki. 2002. Calcinated calcium killing of *Escherichia coli* O157:H7, *Salmonella*, and *Listeria monocytogenes* on the surface of tomatoes. *Journal of Food Protection* 65, 1706–1711.

Beuchat, L. R., and D. A. Mann. 2008. Survival and growth of acid-adapted and unadapted *Salmonella* in and on raw tomatoes as affected by variety, stage of ripeness, and storage temperature. *Journal of Food Protection* 71, 1572–1579.

Bhagat, A., B. S. M. Mahmoud, and R. H. Linton. 2010. Inactivation of *Salmonella enterica* and *Listeria monocytogenes* inoculated on hydroponic tomatoes using chlorine dioxide gas. *Foodborne Pathogens and Disease* 7, 677–685.

CDC (Centers for Disease Control and Prevention). 2007. Multistate outbreaks of *Salmonella* infections associated with raw tomatoes eaten in restaurants — United States, 2005–2006. *Morbidity and Mortality Weekly Report* 56, 909–911.

Das, E., G. C. Gurakan, and A. Bayindirli. 2006. Effect of controlled atmosphere storage, modified atmosphere packaging and gaseous ozone treatment on the survival of *Salmonella* Enteritidis on cherry tomatoes. *Food Microbiology* 23, 430–438.

FDACS (Florida Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services). 2012. Overview of Florida Agriculture. http://www.florida-agriculture.com/agfacts.htm. Accessed May 13, 2012.

Felkey, K., D. L. Archer, J. A. Bartz, R. M. Goodrich, and K. R. Schneider. 2006. Chlorine disinfection of tomato surface wounds contaminated with *Salmonella* spp. *HortTechnology* 16, 253–256.

Franco,W., W. Y. Hsu, and A. H. Simonne. 2010. Survival of *Salmonella* and *Staphylococcus aureus* in Mexican red salsa in a food service setting. *Journal of Food Protection* 73, 1116–1120.

Guo, X., J. R. Chen, R. E. Brackett, and L. R. Beuchat. 2001. Survival of Salmonellae on and in tomato plants from the time of inoculation at flowering and early stages of fruit development through fruit ripening. *Applied and Environmental Microbiology* 67, 4760–4764.

Guo, X. A., M. W. Van Iersel, J. R. Chen, R. E. Brackett, and L. R. Beuchat. 2002. Evidence of association of Salmonellae with tomato plants grown hydroponically in inoculated nutrient solution. *Applied and Environmental Microbiology* 68, 3639–3643.

Guo, X. A., J. R. Chen, R. E. Brackett, and L. R. Beuchat. 2002. Survival of *Salmonella* on tomatoes stored at high relative humidity, in soil, and on tomatoes in contact with soil. *Journal of Food Protection* 65, 274–279.

Hedberg, C. W., F. J. Angulo, K. E. White, C. W. Langkop, W. L. Schell, M. G. Stobierski, A. Schuchat, J. M. Besser, S. Dietrich, L. Helsel, P. M. Griffin, J. W. McFarland, and M. T. Osterholm. 1999. Outbreaks of salmonellosis associated with eating uncooked tomatoes: implications for public health. *Epidemiology and Infection* 122, 385–393.

Iturriaga, M. H., E. F. Escartin, L. R. Beuchat, and R. Martinez-Peniche. 2003. Effect of inoculum size, relative humidity, storage temperature, and ripening stage on the attachment of *Salmonella* Montevideo to tomatoes and tomatillos. *Journal of Food Protection* 66, 1756–1761.

Iturriaga, M. H., M. L. Tamplin, and E. F. Escartin. 2007. Colonization of tomatoes by *Salmonella* Montevideo is affected by relative and storage temperature. *Journal of Food Protection* 70, 30–34.

Lang, M. M., L. J. Harris, and L. R. Beuchat. 2004. Evaluation of inoculation method and inoculum drying time for their effects on survival and efficiency of recovery of *Escherichia coli* O157 : H7, *Salmonella*., and *Listeria monocytogenes* inoculated on the surface of tomatoes. *Journal of Food Protection* 67, 732–741.

Lin, C. M., and C. I. Wei. 1997. Transfer of *Salmonella* Montevideo onto the interior surfaces of tomatoes by cutting. *Journal of Food Protection* 60, 858–862.

Lu, Y. J., and C. Q. Wu. 2010. Reduction of *Salmonella enterica* contamination on grape tomatoes by washing with thyme oil, thymol, and carvacrol as compared with chlorine treatment. *Journal of Food Protection* 73, 2270–2275.

Ma, L., G. D. Zhang, P. Gerner-Smidt, R. V. Tauxe, and M. P. Doyle. 2010. Survival and growth of *Salmonella* in salsa and related ingredients. *Journal of Food Protection* 73, 434–444.

Mahmoud, B. S. M. 2010. The effects of x-ray radiation on *Escherichia coli* O157:H7, *Listeria monocytogenes, Salmonella enterica* and *Shigella flexneri* inoculated on whole Roma tomatoes. *Food Microbiology* 27, 1057–1063.

Maitland, J. E., R. R. Boyer, J. D. Eifert, and R. C. Williams. 2011. High hydrostatic pressure processing reduces *Salmonella enterica* serovars in diced and whole tomatoes. *International Journal of Food Microbiology* 149, 113–117.

Mattson, T. E., A. K. Johny, M. A. R. Amalaradjou, K. More, D. T. Schreiber, J. Patel, and K. Venkitanarayanan. 2010. Inactivation of *Salmonella* spp. on tomatoes by plant molecules. *International Journal of Food Microbiology* 144, 464–468.

Niemira, B. A. 2011. Influence of refrigerated storage time on efficacy of irradiation to reduce *Salmonella* on sliced Roma tomatoes. *Journal of Food Protection* 74, 990–993.

Obaidat, M. M., and J. F. Frank. 2009. Inactivation of *Salmonella* and *Escherichia coli* O157:H7 on sliced and whole tomatoes by allyl isothiocyanate, carvacrol, and cinnamaldehyde in vapor phase. *Journal of Food Protection* 72, 315–324.

Pan, W. J., and D. W. Schaffner. 2010. Modeling the growth of *Salmonella* in cut red round tomatoes as a function of temperature. *Journal of Food Protection* 73, 1502–1505.

Pao, S., D. F. Kelsey, M. F. Khalid, and M. R. Ettinger. 2007. Using aqueous chlorine dioxide to prevent contamination of tomatoes with *Salmonella enterica* and *Erwinia carotovora* during fruit washing. *Journal of Food Protection* 70, 629–634.

Pao, S., D. F. Kelsey, and W. Long. 2009. Spray washing of tomatoes with chlorine dioxide to minimize *Salmonella* on inoculated fruit surfaces and cross-contamination from revolving brushes. *Journal of Food Protection* 72, 2448–2452.

Raiden, R. M., S. S. Sumner, J. D. Eifert, and M. D. Pierson. 2003. Efficacy of detergents in removing *Salmonella* and *Shigella* spp. from the surface of fresh produce. *Journal of Food Protection* 66, 2210–2215.

Rathinasabapathi, B. 2004. Survival of *Salmonella* Montevideo on tomato leaves and mature green tomatoes. *Journal of Food Protection* 67, 2277–2279.

Sapers, G. M., and D. M. Jones. 2006. Improved sanitizing treatments for fresh tomatoes. *Journal of Food Science* 71, M252–M256.

Shi, X., A. Namvar, M. Kostrzynska, R. Hora, and K. Warriner. 2007. Persistence and growth of different *Salmonella* serovars on pre- and postharvest tomatoes. *Journal of Food Protection* 70, 2725–2731.

Song, H. J., D. W. Choi, and K. B. Song. 2011. Effect of aqueous chlorine dioxide and UV-C treatment on the microbial reduction and color of cherry tomatoes. *Horticulture Environment and Biotechnology* 52, 488–493.

Sy, K. V., M. B. Murray, M. D. Harrison, and L. R. Beuchat. 2005. Evaluation of gaseous chlorine dioxide as a sanitizer for killing *Salmonella, Escherichia coli* O157:H7, *Listeria monocytogenes*, and yeasts and molds on fresh and fresh-cut produce. *Journal of Food Protection* 68, 1176–1187.

Trinetta, V., M. T. Morgan, and R. H. Linton. 2010. Use of high-concentration-short-time chlorine dioxide gas treatments for the inactivation of *Salmonella enterica* spp. inoculated onto Roma tomatoes. *Food Microbiology* 27, 1009–1015.

USDA-ERS (U.S. Department of Agriculture, Economic Research Service). 2009. *Vegetables and Melons: Tomatoes*. http://www.ers.usda.gov/briefing/vegetables/tomatoes.htm. Accessed January 9, 2012.

USDA-ERS (U.S. Department of Agriculture, Economic Research Service). 2008. Background Statistics: Fresh-market Tomatoes. http://www.ers.usda.gov/News/tomatocoverage.htm. Accessed May 19, 2012.

Wei, C. I., T. S. Huang, J. M. Kim, W. F. Lin, M. L. Tamplin, and J. A. Bartz. 1995. Growth and survival of *Salmonella* Montevideo on tomatoes and disinfection with chlorinated water. *Journal of Food Protection* 58, 829–836.

Yuk, H. G., J. A. Bartz, and K. R. Schneider. 2005. Effectiveness of individual or combined sanitizer treatments for inactivating *Salmonella* spp. on smooth surface, stem scar, and wounds of tomatoes. *Journal of Food Science* 70, M409–M414.

Zhuang, R. Y., L. R. Beuchat, and F. J. Angulo. 1995. Fate of *Salmonella* Montevideo on and in raw tomatoes as affected by temperature and treatment with chlorine. *Applied and Environmental Microbiology* 61, 2127–2131.