

## **Mannitol as a Sensitive Indicator of Sugarcane Deterioration and Bacterial Contamination in Fuel Alcohol Production**

**G. Eggleston<sup>1</sup>, L. C. Basso<sup>2</sup>, H. Amorim<sup>3</sup>, S. C. De Lima Paulillo<sup>3</sup>,  
and T. O. Basso<sup>3</sup>**

<sup>1</sup> *USDA-ARS-SRRC, New Orleans, Louisiana, USA*

<sup>2</sup> *Universidade de São Paulo, Piracicaba, São Paulo, Brazil*

<sup>3</sup> *Fermentec, Piracicaba, São Paulo, Brazil*

### **Abstract**

Mannitol, formed mainly by *Leuconostoc mesenteroides* bacteria, is a very sensitive indicator of sugarcane deterioration that can predict processing problems. A rapid (4 to 7 min) enzymatic method has been developed to measure mannitol in juice pressed from consignments of sugarcane delivered to the factory. This screening tool will allow factory staff to know rapidly which consignments of cane will affect processing negatively or reject consignments that will cause unacceptable processing problems. This method can be easily performed using existing equipment in sugarcane factories, with mannitol being measured spectrophotometrically using mannitol dehydrogenase (MDH) as the enzyme catalyst. The stability of the reagents, limited cane juice preparation, linearity, accuracy, and precision are described. The method is highly specific for mannitol and is not affected by the presence of sucrose, glucose, fructose, or dextran. The current cost is only ~60 U.S. cents per analysis. Mannitol has also been proven to be an advantageous indicator of bacterial contamination - one of the main factors causing drops in fuel alcohol fermentation yields as well as yeast (*Saccharomyces*) flocculation and foaming problems. Compared to other indicators, mannitol is not produced by yeast cells but only by some contaminating bacteria (mostly *Lactobacillus* strains) during fermentation. Its presence can account for unexpected yield drops, and it can be measured easily. A strong correlation existed between mannitol formation and bacteria counts in sugarcane juice and molasses fermentations with induced mannitol producing bacterial contaminations.

---

**This paper won the Margaret A. Clarke Best Paper Award**

## Introduction

The delivery of consignments of deteriorated sugarcane to factories can detrimentally affect multiple process units and even lead to a factory shut-down. Currently, there is no reliable, rapid, easy and inexpensive method to measure cane deterioration at the factory. This has meant that factory staff have not been able to screen individual consignments of cane and, thus, are unable to know which consignments would detrimentally affect processing in order to reject unsuitable consignments of cane.

The major (but not sole) contributor to cane deterioration in the United States is *Leuconostoc*, lactic acid bacterial infection. Dextran is considered the major deterioration product from *Leuconostoc* infection. Current methods to determine dextran suffer from being either too long and complicated, not specific enough, too expensive (Rauh, *et al.*, 2001), or too difficult in the interpretation of results (Clarke, *et al.*, 1987).

Numerous metabolic products other than dextran are formed by *Leuconostoc* which are of importance in sugar manufacture, including levan (a fructose polysaccharide) and mannitol. Mannitol is a sugar alcohol that does not degrade under processing conditions (Eggleston, *et al.*, 2004), can be contained in large amounts in factory syrups and massecurtes processed from deteriorated cane, and directly affects processing by reducing sugar recovery (Bliss, 1975) and evaporation rates (Eggleston, *et al.*, 2007). Mannitol has been repeatedly proven to be a sensitive measure of sugarcane (Eggleston, 2002, Eggleston and Legendre, 2003, Eggleston, *et al.*, 2004) and sugarbeet deterioration (Steinmetz, *et al.*, 1998; Thielecke, 2002). Recently, Eggleston, *et al.*, (2007) found that approximately  $\geq 2500$  ppm/Brix of mannitol in sugarcane juice predicted processing problems at the sugarcane factory.

Previously in the sugar industry (Steinmetz, *et al.*, 1998; Eggleston, *et al.*, 2004), mannitol has been measured with IC-IPAD (ion chromatography with integrated pulsed amperometric detection) – a sophisticated technique that cannot be used at the industrial site because of its expense, complication, and the level of expertise required of the operator. Consequently, an enzymatic method to measure mannitol in sugarcane juices at the factory was developed. An enzymatic assay was chosen for its high specificity and because a chemical method would be too complicated, require unsafe chemicals and temperatures, and take too long.


Mannitol is currently determined in hospitals as an indicator of intestinal permeability, with mannitol being measured enzymatically in urine (Hessels, *et al.*, 2003). Mannitol dehydrogenase (MDH) is used to convert mannitol to fructose in the presence of co-enzyme  $\text{NAD}^+$ . The NADH formed can be easily measured spectrophotometrically at 340 nm:

*Mannitol  
Dehydrogenase*



By extrapolating Eggleston's research on the use of mannitol to predict sugarcane deterioration

(Eggleston, *et al.*, 2004) to the fuel alcohol industry, it was recently discovered that mannitol is an advantageous indicator of bacterial contamination in fuel alcohol production from sugarcane juice or molasses (Basso, 2005). Commercial fuel ethanol in Brazil is currently produced by a fed-batch or continuous fermentation process of sugarcane juice and/or molasses by *Saccharomyces cerevisiae* culture yeast with cell recycle. Microbial contaminants (including bacteria and wild yeast) can also be recycled with the culture yeast that can cause many problems due to competition between bacteria and yeasts for the same substrate. Bacterial contamination of alcohol fermentations is regarded as a major technological problem that can cause (i) significant drops in fermentation yields, (ii) yeast (*Saccharomyces*) flocculation (not all contaminating bacteria cause floc formation), (iii) foaming problems (see Figure 1), and (iv) production of by-products that detrimentally affect the quality of distillates. Bacterial contamination control in Brazil is currently undertaken in (1) factory crushing by cleaning with hot water or the sometime addition of biocides (depends on the factory) or in (2) fermentation by sulfuric acid washing of yeast cell suspensions (Simpson and Hammond, 1989) or the sometime addition of antibiotics (penicillin, virginiamicin, Kamoran HJ) (Oliva-Neto and Yokoya, 2001). Oliveira, *et al.*, (1993) developed a procedure to optimize the use of antibiotics by evaluating the sensitivity of the bacterial population. However, bacterial contaminants are frequently adaptable to the products used for their control, particularly antibiotics, which makes industrial control difficult.



**Figure 1.** Bacterial contamination of fuel alcohol producing yeast. Photograph reproduced with permission from Fermentec Ltda, Brazil.

To effectively control bacterial contamination, monitoring and measurement are essential. Typical monitoring methods are either direct or indirect. Direct methods include the counting of live

bacteria by light microscopy (15 min), or plating of bacteria on rich medium (very time consuming). Indirect methods include the acidification of the culture medium, or the measurement of lactic acid. However, some methods are not specific enough for bacterial contamination, while others could be tedious, complex, or expensive.

In this paper we describe the development of a rapid, enzymatic method using MDH that can be undertaken at the factory to measure mannitol in pressed cane juices, which represent individual sugarcane consignments. We also describe the use and advantages of using mannitol as an indicator of bacterial contamination in fuel alcohol production.

## Materials and Methods

### Development of Enzymatic Method to Measure Mannitol

#### Enzyme, Chemicals, Sugarcane Juices and Buffers

Mannitol dehydrogenase (EC 1.1.1.67) was purchased as a freeze-dried powder (8.45 U/mg dry weight) from Biocatalysts Ltd, Cardiff, Wales. All chemicals were analytical grade. Dextran T2000<sup>TM</sup> (MW $\geq$ 2,000,000 Da) was from G. E. Healthcare (U.S.). Sugarcane juices were obtained from Louisiana factories. All juices (120 ml) were stored with 5 drops of biocide (Bussan 881<sup>TM</sup>, Buckman Labs.) in a -60 °C freezer. Glycine buffer (100 mM; pH 10.5) and phosphate buffer (25 mM; pH 6.0) with 30 % glycerol were prepared (Eggleston and Harper, 2005).

#### NAD solution

NAD (0.22 g) was dissolved in 10 ml of de-ionized water and prepared *daily*.

#### Preparation of Enzyme

A stock solution of enzyme was first prepared by dissolving 0.01 g freeze-dried MDH in 1 ml ice cold phosphate + 30 % glycerol buffer. For the assays, a further dilution was made by pipetting 100  $\mu$ l of stock/10 ml phosphate + 30% glycerol buffer (10,000-fold dilution). Both the stock and diluted enzyme solutions were stored in a -20 °C freezer. The stock solution can be stored for ~1 month, and the diluted enzyme for 1-2 weeks.

#### Mannitol Dehydrogenase Activity

See Eggleston and Harper (2005) for method.

#### Factory Mannitol Enzymatic Method

The method was first standardized using five mannitol standards (1, 10, 100, 500 and 1000 ppm) diluted in de-ionized water, to generate a linear standard curve and equation. A new standard curve must be generated for each batch of enzyme. Sugarcane juice was first diluted 1:1 (i.e., 2-fold) in glycine buffer and then filtered through a 0.45  $\mu$ m then 0.22  $\mu$ m pore-size PVDF filter. For difficult to filter samples, celite can be first added to the juice before filtering through the PVDF filters or the juice can first be filtered through Whatman<sup>TM</sup> 91 filter paper (185 mm; 10  $\mu$ m). (NOTE: If PVDF filters are not available then add 0.5 g celite to 10 ml juice in a syringe body, mix, filter juice through a glass filter, discard first 2 ml of filtrate, and dilute 2-fold with glycine buffer). To two test-tubes the following are added:

<b>Sample Test-Tube</b>	<b>Blank Test-Tube</b>
1.4 ml glycine buffer	1.4 ml glycine buffer
0.2 ml diluted and filtered juice	0.2 ml diluted and filtered juice
0.2 ml NAD	0.2 ml NAD
0.2 ml MDH enzyme	0.2 ml water

The test-tube mixtures were vortex stirred and immediately added to a 1 cm cuvette, then placed in a spectrophotometer. The change in absorbance at 340 nm is measured from 0 to 5 min. Final absorbance was [sample absorbance - blank absorbance]. Calculations were based on the equation of the standard curve and dilution factors. For deteriorated juices containing high amounts of mannitol which cause the mannitol absorbance to be higher than the upper limit of the standard curve, further dilutions of 1:3 (4-fold) or 1:7 (8-fold) in glycine buffer are required.

#### Effect of Temperature on the Factory Enzymatic Method

The factory mannitol method was followed except 0.2 ml of mannitol (1400 ppm) replaced the juice and, after the enzyme was added, the two test-tubes were placed in a shaking (90 rpm) waterbath (Julaba SW22) at different temperatures (23-48° C) for 5 min, before the absorbance was measured.

#### Effect of Added Sugars on the Factory Enzymatic Method

Model solutions were made to simulate levels of sugars in a typical sugarcane juice, and all the solutions had a final °Brix of 14.0. All the solutions contained either 1000 or 2000 ppm mannitol. Glucose and fructose additions were on ~3% on solids basis, sucrose ~90% solids. Dextran was added at 1000 ppm level. The factory mannitol method was followed except the model sugar solution containing mannitol (1000 or 2000 ppm) replaced the juice.

#### Haze Dextran in Sugarcane Juices

Haze dextran in juices was based on the modified method of Eggleston and Monge (2005).

#### Mannitol Determined by IC-IPAD

See Eggleston (2002) for method. Dilutions varied, depending on the juice, from 1 g/50 ml to 1 g/500 ml.

#### Statistics

Single factor ANOVA was conducted using Microsoft Excel™, version 2002 with SP-2.

## Development of Mannitol as an Indicator of Bacterial Contamination in Fuel Alcohol Production

### Growth of Bacterial Isolates

Bacteria, in freeze-dried form, were from the Fermentec (Piracicaba, Brazil) industrial collection. They were reactivated in MRS medium (24 h at 32° C) and then grown for 48 h at 32° C in cane juice medium (containing 2.5% reducing sugars) supplemented with 1% yeast extract. Bacterial counts were performed either by plating or optical microscopy. Mannitol in the growth mixtures was measured by IC-IPAD.

### Yeasts

Two *Saccharomyces cerevisiae* strains (BG-1 and PE-2, from the Fermentec collection) commonly used in industrial fermentation were propagated under anaerobic conditions at 32° C using molasses medium with 8% total sugar, doubling the medium volume each 24 h until there was sufficient biomass for the assay, which was collected by centrifugation (20 min, 800 x G).

### Mannitol Determined by IC-IPAD

Mannitol was measured on a Dionex DX-300 system.

### Alcohol Fermentation

Fermentation was performed at 33° C in 150 ml centrifuge vials containing 8 g of yeast (fresh weight with 25% dry matter) and 80 ml of substrate (a mixture of cane juice and molasses containing 18% total sugar, each source representing 50% of the sugar). Two different strains of *Saccharomyces cerevisiae* (BG-1 and PE-2) were used in separate experiments (in duplicate) with induced bacterial contamination (*Lactobacillus fermentum* inoculated during the first fermentation at different levels:  $2 \times 10^6$ ,  $1 \times 10^7$ , and  $5 \times 10^7$  cells/ml). After fermentation (8-10 h) the fermented medium was centrifuged (800 G, 20 min) and the yeast and bacteria settled were fed again with substrate, performing two additional fermentations cycles. Bacterial counts (microscopy) and mannitol content were measured in the fermented media at the end of the last two fermentation cycles.


## Results and Discussion

### Development of Enzymatic Method to Measure Mannitol


#### ***Stability of the Enzyme***

Initially there was a problem with the stability of the enzyme which had been diluted in a phosphate buffer without glycerol, even if the stock or diluted enzyme was stored in a -40° C freezer. This is illustrated in Figure 2. After 8 days of storage in a -20° C freezer the MDH activity had markedly decreased from 1.88 to 0.20 U/ml. Stabilization studies were undertaken, and it was found that the addition of glycerol to the buffer stabilized the enzyme stored as both stock or as a further diluted solution. There was a slightly higher level of stability of the enzyme diluted from stock that had been stored in buffer containing 30% glycerol, compared to that from stock that contained no glycerol, and this increased stability was observed even in fresh, unstored preparations (day 1). As can be seen in Figure 3, both the preparation of the enzyme stock, and diluted enzyme from the stock, need to be undertaken in phosphate buffer with glycerol. Glycerol at the 30 % level was found to be optimum (Figure 3). The freeze dried enzyme is stable in a -20° C freezer for up to 6

months. The enzyme stock and diluted enzyme can be stored in conventional  $-20^{\circ}\text{C}$  freezers.



**Figure 2.** Instability of MDH when the stock enzyme solution was prepared in phosphate buffer only with no added glycerol.



**Figure 3.** Stabilization of MDH after 8 days when the stock solution was prepared in phosphate buffer, with added glycerol at different concentrations.

### ***Effect of Temperature***

In early efforts to develop a simple method to determine mannitol in sugarcane consignments, there was concern that the method was relatively rapid. For this reason, we investigated the effect of temperature on MDH activity – see Figure 4.




Figure 4. Effect of temperature on the activity of mannitol dehydrogenase (MDH)


Although the activity of MDH is optimum between 37-43°C (Figure 3), incubating the enzyme/juice mixture in a waterbath at the factory would only add another level of complexity and cost. We therefore decided to keep the reaction at room temperature (23°C) for the final factory method. Nevertheless, if factory staff wanted an even faster method, they can incubate the enzyme/juice mixture in a waterbath at 40°C for 2 min, instead of leaving it at room temperature for 5 min.

### ***Linearity***

The relationship between the mannitol concentration and the absorbance at 340 nm after 5 min was found to be only approximately linear up to 1000 ppm, which may be due to lack of substrate at much lower levels, and product inhibition ~1000 ppm level. Therefore, up to the 1000 ppm level, a quadratic fit would be better. A better linear fit was found from 1-500 ppm mannitol (Figure 5).

### ***Precision of the Enzymatic Factory Method to Determine Mannitol in Cane Juices***

The method precision was very acceptable in four cane juices assayed (Table 1), with coefficients of variation ranging from 1.73 - 5.13%. The precision tended to become worse when relatively lower amounts of mannitol were present in slightly deteriorated and undeteriorated cane juices (Table 1).



**Figure 5.** The linear relationship between mannitol concentration and absorbance at 340 nm after 5 min incubation at room temperature.

**Table 1.** Precision of the enzymatic method for the determination of mannitol in sugarcane pressed juices expressed as the coefficient of variance (CV).

Cane juice sample	Juice °Brix	N	Mean concentration of mannitol (ppm)	Mannitol variation CV (%)	Haze dextran (ppm)
Deteriorated, pressed cane juice <sup>a</sup>	14.89	10	20,455	3.32	4,688
Crusher juice from Factory A	14.70	8	3,870	4.50	585
Crusher juice from Factory B	16.01	10	3,259	5.32	204
Crusher juice from Factory C	14.67	9	7,180	1.73	944


<sup>a</sup> Had to be diluted 8-fold

### ***Determination of Mannitol in the Presence of Other Sugars in Cane Juice***

Sugarcane juices have high levels of glucose, fructose, and particularly sucrose. Dextran will also be present when mannitol is present in cane juice because both are formed from *Leuconostoc* (Eggleston, 2002). Short and long chain carbohydrates could potentially interfere with the measurement of mannitol. We, therefore, investigated the effect of different sugars as they approximately occur in sugarcane juice, using simulated, model juice and results are shown in Table 2. None of the sugars showed any statistical interference at the 95% probability level with the mannitol determination, which confirms the ability of the method to accurately measure mannitol in cane juices. The analytical recoveries were very acceptable between 99.1-104.2% (Table 2).

### ***Accuracy***

The accuracy of the developed enzymatic method to measure mannitol in cane juices was determined by comparing the results with an ion chromatography (IC-IPAD) method (Figure 6).



**Figure 6.** Linear correlation between the enzymatic method for determining mannitol in cane juice and an ion chromatography (IC) method. No statistical differences between the two methods were found at the 95% probability level for any sugarcane juice studied.

An excellent correlation existed ( $R^2 = 0.99$ ) between the two methods, validating the accuracy of the enzymatic method. Furthermore, there were no significant differences at the 95% probability level, between the two methods for any of the juices analyzed. Precision was, however, worse for both methods in the juice containing <550 ppm mannitol (Figure 6), which reflects the difficulty of detecting small amounts of mannitol, and confirms results listed in Table 1. As factory staff are more concerned with detecting mannitol concentrations >550 ppm in deteriorated pressed cane juice at the factory, this lower precision should have limited impact at the factory.

**Table 2.** Determination of mannitol in the presence of other sugarcane sugars in simulated 14.0 °Brix juices.

<b>Simulated juice<sup>a</sup></b>	<b>Mannitol conc. added (ppm)</b>	<b>Mean % recovery of mannitol<sup>b, c</sup></b>	<b>Total variation CV (%)<sup>c</sup></b>
<b>Sucrose</b>	2000	100.6	1.86
<b>Sucrose + glucose</b>	2000	102.5	3.16
<b>Sucrose + glucose + fructose</b>	2000	99.6	3.28
<b>Sucrose</b>	1000	103.6	2.97
<b>Sucrose + glucose</b>	1000	104.2	3.26
<b>Sucrose + fructose</b>	1000	103.6	1.36
<b>Sucrose + glucose + fructose</b>	1000	99.1	7.16
<b>Sucrose + glucose + fructose + dextran (diluted 1:2; 7.0°Brix)</b>	1000	100.5	1.63

<sup>a</sup> See Materials and Methods section

<sup>b</sup> N=3

<sup>c</sup> No statistical differences were found amongst the simulated juices with different sugars added using single factor ANOVA

#### ***Relationship of Mannitol with Dextran Measured by the Haze Method***

As well as mannitol concentrations, Haze dextran concentrations in four cane juices are shown in Table 1, and the correlation between Haze dextran and mannitol was excellent at  $R^2 = 0.99$  at the 99% probability level. This confirms previous observations from a laboratory cane deterioration study (Eggleston, 2002). In more complex field studies of cane deterioration (Eggleston and Legendre, 2003; Eggleston, *et al.*, 2004), other strong correlations were found between mannitol measured by IC and dextran, but with slightly lower  $R^2$  values of 0.84, which reflects the further complexity of the multiple field samples representing numerous cane varieties, and possibly other bacterial sources of sugarcane deterioration (see Table 3).

As seen in Table 1, mannitol concentrations were markedly higher than Haze dextran concentrations. Higher mannitol than dextran concentrations have been previously observed in deteriorated juices from different cane varieties (Eggleston and Legendre, 2003; Eggleston, *et al.*, 2004) and in juices from *Rhizoctonia* affected beets that were susceptible to *Leuconostoc* deterioration in the late stages (Bruhns, *et al.*, 2004). This not only highlights the usefulness and higher sensitivity of mannitol to better predict *Leuconostoc* and other bacterial cane deterioration (see Table 3) than dextran, but the underestimation by sugar industry personnel of the relatively large amounts of mannitol present in

deteriorated cane that can affect processing.

## Development of Mannitol as an Indicator of Bacterial Contamination in Fuel Alcohol Production

### *Mannitol in Contaminating Bacteria*

Numerous types of bacteria can contaminate yeast fuel ethanol fermentations. Lactic acid bacteria, *Leuconostoc* and *Lactobacillus*, are common contaminants and frequently associated with process problems. *Lactobacillus* is adapted to the alcoholic and nutritional conditions of the process (Oliva-Neto and Yokoya, 1994), but *Leuconostoc* is more sensitive to alcohol and usually does not persist as long. The lactic acid formed by such bacteria can strongly inhibit yeast metabolism and decrease alcohol yield.

Known contamination bacteria were grown on a medium of sugarcane juice to evaluate their ability to produce mannitol, and results are listed in Table 3.


**Table 3.** Formation of mannitol by bacterial isolates from industrial processes.

Bacteria	Mannitol (ppm)	Plating Counts (CFU x 10 <sup>7</sup> /ml)
<i>Acetobacter pasteurianus</i>	<50	71.0
<i>Bacillus coagulans</i>	<50	2.8
<i>Bacillus megaterium</i>	<50	1.0
<i>Bacillus subtilis</i>	<50	2.0
<i>Bacillus stearothermophilus</i>	<50	2.0
<i>Lactobacillus buchneri</i>	1070	15.0
<i>Lactobacillus fermentum</i>	5110	4.8
<i>Lactobacillus fructosus</i>	5970	3.4
<i>Lactobacillus vaccinostrercus</i>	1875	16.0
<i>Leuconostoc mesenteroides</i>	7480	8.3

Mannitol production depended on the bacterial species and strain. The highest producer of mannitol was *Leuconostoc mesenteroides*, which supports the evidence that mannitol is a sensitive indicator of sugarcane (Eggleston, 2002; Eggleston, *et al.*, 2004) and sugarbeet deterioration (Thielecke, 2002). Furthermore, it was the common contaminant of fuel ethanol fermentations from *Lactobacillus fermentum* and *fructosus* that produced the most mannitol (Table 3). This suggested that mannitol would be a useful indicator of bacterial contamination. More importantly, it also explained why ethanol yields are sometimes lower than expected with respect to the acidification of the fermentation medium, because these bacteria competed with the yeast for substrate to produce mannitol rather than ethanol.

### *Mannitol as an Indicator of Bacterial Fermentation in Alcohol Fermentation*

To verify if mannitol could be an indicator of bacterial fermentation, an experiment was conducted to measure mannitol in fermentations performed with induced bacterial contaminants, and results are illustrated in Figure 7. A good correlation existed between mannitol and the bacterial cell count, proving that mannitol was a valid indicator.



**Figure 7.** Relationship between bacteria grown in alcoholic fermentation and mannitol formation. Fermentation was performed with induced bacterial contamination.

#### ***Advantages of Mannitol as an Indicator of Bacterial Fermentation***

Mannitol serves as a very important complimentary method to other direct and indirect methods to monitor bacterial contamination in sugarcane processing to fuel alcohol production:

- 1) Mannitol is not produced by the starter strain or by wild *Saccharomyces cerevisiae* yeast.
- 2) Mannitol is produced (mannitol at the end of fermentation – mannitol in the input must and yeast) by bacteria during fermentation and can account partly or wholly for decreased ethanol yields. Approximately 6000 ppm mannitol can cause an approximate 4% drop in ethanol yield.
- 3) Mannitol is easily measured.

## Conclusions

An enzymatic method has been developed to measure mannitol and, therefore, the extent of deterioration in juice pressed from consignments of sugarcane delivered to the factory. This enzymatic method has many advantages for the factory staff:

- ✓ Simplicity
- ✓ Rapid
- ✓ Uses existing equipment at most factories
- ✓ Accurate
- ✓ Precise
- ✓ Not affected by the presence of other sugarcane sugars
- ✓ Only ~60 U.S. cents per analysis (largest cost is the NAD at 45 cents; MDH cost is 12.5 cents per analysis) that is much lower than the cost for rapid dextran analysis by monoclonal antibody technology (Rauh et al, 2001)
- ✓ Mannitol is a more sensitive indicator of sugarcane deterioration than dextran.

Further research needs to be undertaken to verify if the method can be used to measure bacterial contamination in fuel alcohol production. A bright purple color forms when the enzymatic method is used to measure mannitol in deteriorated sugarbeet juice; research is needed to ensure that this color does not interfere with the determination of mannitol in sugarbeet juice.

Mannitol has been shown to be an indicator of bacterial contamination in fuel alcohol fermentations that can complement other indicators and methods to monitor contamination:

- ✓ It is not produced by the starter or wild strains of *Saccharomyces cerevisiae* yeast
- ✓ It is produced by bacteria during fermentation
- ✓ It can account for unexpected alcohol yield drops
- ✓ It is easily measured

Not all contamination bacteria produce mannitol so other monitoring techniques are also needed for a full picture. Future research is planned to evaluate mannitol as a bacterial contamination indicator further using other bacteria isolated from industrial processes.

## Acknowledgements

The authors thank Eldwin St. Cyr for excellent technical assistance. This research was funded by a grant from the American Sugar Cane League, Thibodaux, Louisiana. Mention of trade names or commercial products in this article is solely for the purpose of providing specific information and does not imply recommendation or endorsement by the U.S. Department of Agriculture.

## References

- Basso, L. C. (2005). Mannitol as an indicator of bacterial contamination in alcoholic fermentation. Proc. 26<sup>th</sup> Mtg Fermentec, Sao Paulo State, Brazil. Fermentec publication, pp. 11-12.
- Bliss, L. Q. (1975). Los sistemas de cosecha y su influencia en la cristalización de los azúcares. *Miscellaneous publication, No. 53 EEAT, Hoy EEAOC, Tucuman, Argentina.*
- Bruhns, M., Lemmes, R. and Schick Jr., R. (2004). Processing characteristics of *Rhizoctonia*-affected sugarbeets. *Zuckerindustrie, 129*, 105-111.
- Clarke, M.A, Bergeron, J., and Cole, F. (1987). A rapid dextran screening test. *Sugar y Azucar, 82(3)*, 23-24.
- Eggleston, G. (2002). Deterioration of cane juice - sources and indicators. *Food Chem., 78*, 99-107.
- Eggleston, G. and Harper, W. (2006). Determination of sugarcane deterioration at the factory: Development of a rapid, easy and inexpensive enzymatic method to determine mannitol. *Food Chem., 98(2)*, 366-372.
- Eggleston, G. and Legendre, B. L. (2003). Mannitol and oligosaccharides: Potential new criteria for determining cold tolerance in sugarcane varieties. *Food Chem., 80*, 451-461.
- Eggleston, G., Legendre, B. L., and Tew, T. (2004). Indicators of freeze damaged sugarcane varieties which can predict processing problems. *Food Chem., 87(1)*, 119-133.
- Eggleston, G. and Monge, A. (2005). Optimization of sugarcane factory application of commercial dextranases. *Proc. Biochem., 40(5)*, 1881-1894.
- Eggleston, G., Karr, J., Harper, W. and Parris, T. (2007). Mannitol at the sugarcane factory and its implications. *Food Chem.*, in preparation.
- Hessels, J., Snoeyink, J. M., Platenkamp, A. J., Voortman, G., Steggink, J., and Eldhof H. H. M. (2003). Assessment of intestinal permeability: Enzymatic determination of urinary mannitol, raffinose, sucrose and lactose on Hitachi Analyzer. *Clin. Chem. Lab. Med.* 41(1), 33-38.
- Oliva-Neto, P. and Yokoya, F. (1994). Evaluation of bacterial contamination in a fed-batch alcoholic fermentation process. *World J. Microb. Biotechnol., 10*, 697-699.
- Oliva-Neto, P. and Yokoya, F. (2001). Susceptibility of *Saccharomyces cerevisiae* and lactic acid bacteria from the alcohol industry to several antimicrobial compounds. *Braz. J. Microbiol*, 32(1).
- Oliveira, A. J., Gallo, C. R., Alcarde, V. E., Amorim, H.V. (1993). Avaliação de sensibilidade a antimicrobianos das principais bactérias contaminantes da fermentação alcoólica por espectrofotometria. *STAB. Açúcar, Alcool e Subproducts, 11(6)*, 32.
- Rauh, J.S., Cuddihy, J. A., and Falgout, R. N. (2001). Analyzing dextran in the sugar industry: A review of dextran in the factory and a new analytical technique. Proc. XXVII Conf. West Indies Sugar Technols., Trinidad, pp. 1-11.
- Thielecke, K. (2002). Oligosaccharides and polysaccharides. Referee's Report Subject 2. *ICUMSA Reports*, pp. 107-122.
- Steinmetz, K., Buczyk, R., and Buchholz, K. (1998). The quality of frost-damaged sugar beet. *Zuckerindustrie, 123 (12)*, 933-942.
- Simpson, W.J. and Hammond, J. R. M. (1989). The response of brewing yeast to acid washing. *J. Inst. Brewing, 95*, 347-354.