

# ANTIBIOTIC RESISTANCE IN *ENTEROBACTERIACEAE* STRAINS ISOLATED FROM CHICKEN AND MILK SAMPLES

Lukáš Hleba<sup>1</sup>, Jana Petrová<sup>1</sup>, Attila Kántor<sup>1</sup>, Juraj Čuboň<sup>2</sup>, Miroslava Kačániová<sup>1</sup>

Address(es): Ing. Lukáš Hleba, PhD.

<sup>1</sup>Slovak University of Agriculture in Nitra, Faculty of biotechnology and food sciences, Department of microbiology, Tr. Andreja Hlinku 2, 949 76 Nitra, Slovakia. <sup>2</sup>Slovak University of Agriculture in Nitra, Faculty of biotechnology and food sciences, Department of evaluation and animal food processing, Tr. Andreja Hlinku 2, 949 76 Nitra, Slovakia.

chicken. Also our results showed that the higher resistance level is in rectal swabs of chicken like in milk samples.

\*Corresponding author: <u>lukas.hleba@gmail.com</u>

ABSTRACT

doi: 10.15414/jmbfs.2015.4.special1.19-22

Received 5. 11. 2014
Revised 21. 11. 2014
Accepted 27. 11. 2014
Published 2, 2, 2015

ARTICLE INFO

Regular article



Keywords: Antibiotic resistance, Enterobacteriaceae, chicken, milk

# INTRODUCTION

Antibiotic resistance is significant health, social and economic problem at this time. Antibiotic resistance of bacteria is biological risk, which increases morbidity and mortality of animal and human (EFSA, 2008). Keyser et al. (2008) note that in recent years, accumulating problems with bacteria, which are resistant to antibiotics, leading to predictions that we return to the time before the discovery of antibiotics. Resistant bacteria from the intestines of food animals may be transferred to retail meat products resulting from fecal contamination during various stages of the slaughter process (e.g., evisceration) and subsequent handling of animal tissue (Jackson et al., 2001). Endogenous bacterial flora may play an important role as acceptor and donor of transmissible drug resistance genes (Davies et al., 1994 and Sunde et al., 1998). The Enterobacteriaceae family is commonly used as an indicator of fecal contamination during food microbiological analyses, and includes important zoonotic bacteria such as Salmonella spp., Yersinia spp. and Escherichia coli. Enterobacteriaceae are the significant causes of serious infection, and many of the most important members of this family are becoming increasingly resistant to currently available antimicrobials (Paterson, 2006). Recently, antimicrobial resistance has been reported in bacteria isolated from organic dairy products (Sato et al. 2004; Sato et al. 2004; Tikofsky et al. 2003), and in poultry products related to Salmonella and Campylobacter (Cui et al. 2005; Soonthornchaikul et al., 2006). However, little information relative to commensal bacteria isolated from poultry meat and milk products is currently available. Consequently, the main goal of the present study was to investigate the prevalence of antimicrobial susceptibility found in Enterobacteriaceae isolates derived from chicken meat and milk products.

## MATERIAL AND METHODS

## **Collection of samples**

In 2010-2013, a total of 316 samples were collected from different animal farm from Slovakia. In total, 110 rectal swabs of and 206 samples of milk products (100 milk samples, 52 cheese samples, 28 sheep's whey samples and 26 sheep cheese samples). A total of 376 isolates of *Enterobacteriaceae* genera isolates were isolated in this research. Samples was collected by sterile swabs (Copan Inovation, Italy) and transported to the laboratory in transported medium.

### Cultivation of microorganisms

Antibiotic resistance and identification of strains in *Enterobacteriaceae* genera isolated from milk, milk products and rectal swabs of chicken was examined in this experiment. After samples collection cultivation and identification of bacterial strain was done. MALDI TOF MS Biotyper for identification of *Enterobacteriaceae* strains was used. For susceptibility testing disc diffusion methodology was used according by EUCAST. Results showed high level of ampicillin resistance in isolates from milk and milk samples. The highest streptomycin resistance was detected in isolates from rectal swabs of chicken. After identification, we determined that *S. enterica* ser. Typhimurium, which was isolated from rectal swabs of chicken showed the most multi-resistance from all identificated strains of *Enterobacteriaceae*. The most isolates bacterial strain was *E. coli*, which showed resistance against four antibiotics from rectal swabs of

Bacterial samples were spread on the surface of agar by sterile cotton swab directly. For cultivation of microorganism from *Enterobacteriaceae* genera selective media MacConkey agar was used. Cultivations were done at 37 °C at 24 hours for *Enterobacteriaceae* genera species in the aerobic condition. Recultivation after the first incubation was needed to obtain pure cultures of microorganisms at the same conditions. For purifying of microorganisms colonies and probably identification of *Enterobacteriaceae* strains Chromogenic coliform agar (Oxoid, UK) was used. For obtaining the pure culture of microorganisms four-ways streak plate method was used. Every recultivation steps were done in the same conditions.

#### Identification of microorganisms

Identification of microorganisms was done by several following methods. The firstly previously mentioned selective and chromogenic media for *Enterobacteriaceae* genera was used. Pure colonies of Enterobacteriaceae species was identified by MALDI TOF MS Biotyper (Brucker, Germany). Methodological procedure for preparing of samples and identification methods were done by **Kmet' and Drugdová**, (2012).

## Antibiotic susceptibility testing

After purifying of colonies, these were suspended in physiological solution inoculated from agar plates and every suspension were adjusted to equal a 0.5 McFarland standard density, where we used standardized densitometer (DensiLaMeter, ErbaLachema, Czech Republic). In this research following antibiotics were used: penicillins – ampicillin (10  $\mu$ g/disc), piperacillin (30  $\mu$ g/disc), cephalosporins – ceftriaxone (30  $\mu$ g/disc), cefotaxime (5  $\mu$ g/disc), carbapenems – doripenem (10  $\mu$ g/disc), meropenem (10  $\mu$ g/disc), fluoroquinolones – nalixid acid screen (10  $\mu$ g/disc), levofloxacin (5  $\mu$ g/disc), aminoglycosides – gentamicicin (10  $\mu$ g/disc), streptomycin (10  $\mu$ g/disc), amikacin (30  $\mu$ g/disc), tetracyclines – tigecycline (15  $\mu$ g/disc), tetracycline (30  $\mu$ g/disc). Antibiotic discs were purchased in OXOID, England. For susceptibility testing of *Enterobacteriaceae* species disc diffusion methodology was used according by **EUCAST**, (2013a). Bacterial species was tested on Mueller-Hinton agar. Cultivation of bacterial species from

Enterobacteriaceae genera were done at  $35\pm2$  °C during 16-20 hours. Interpretation of inhibition zones around the disc were done according by breakpoint tables of **EUCAST**, (2013b).

## **RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

In this study, we researched antibiotic resistance in bacteria from Enterobacteriaceae genera isolated from milk products and rectal swabs of chicken. We considered resistance in bacteria by disc diffusion methodology according by EUCAST. From the results, we determined that the most resistant Enterobacteriaceae strains was against natural and semi-natural antibiotics such as penicillins, aminoglycosides and tetracyclines. In this research E. coli strains were isolated the most often. E. coli is a main representative bacteria from Enterobacteriaceae genera (Finney et al., 2003), therefore we noted them in this research as individual category. E. coli isolates isolated from previous mentioned samples were the most resistant against ampicillin (35.89 %), levofloxacin (20.51 %), streptomycin (20 %), piperacillin (16.07 %) and tetracycline (12.9 %). Smaller resistance *E. coli* showed against ofloxacin (4.16 %) and chloramphenicol (0.7 %) (see Table 1). Authors **Sáenz** *et al.* (2001) determined antibiotic resistance of E. coli in broiler chicken and they detected resistance against 88 % even, 40 % resistance against gentamicin, 58 % resistance against ampicillin, 15 % resistance against tetracycline and 12 % resistance against chloramphenicol. Higher resistance against antibiotics determined authors Cho et al. (2012), who searched resistance in E. coli isolated from different husbandry and they determined resistance against ampicillin in 87 to 93 % level. Tetracycline resistance was detected in 58 to 60 %. Resistance to carbapenems was not detected like in our research. But they detected resistance against cefalotine, but didn't detected resistance to other cephalosporins like in our study. Van et al. (2008) isolated E. coli from different type of husbandry animal and chicken too. They detected resistance against ampicillin (20 - 84.2 %), tetracycline (60 - 100 %), gentamicin (0 - 47.5 %), nalixid acid (0 - 68.4 %) and chloramphenicol (20 - 65%). The highest level of resistance was measured by Lei et al. (2010), who determined that E. coli was from 64 to 100 % against ampicillin. Resistance against gentamicin (32.6 - 76.9 %), chloramphenicol (39.7 - 90.3 %), tetracycline (60.3 - 98.1 %). Many researchers examined antibiotic resistance of E. coli from different samples and everybody meats in one opinion. Antibiotic resistance of bacteria is differ from study to study (Lira et al., 2004; Picozzi et al., 2005; Caro et al., 2007 and Čížek et al., 2007). Also we examined antibiotic resistance in Enterobacteriaceae strains isolated from milk and milk products, because its a products which people use to direct consumption. If products which contain antibiotic resistant bacteria, then these can transfer resistant genes from non-pathogenic to pathogenic bacteria. This fact can lead to problem with treatment of diseases caused by resistant bacteria (Sorum and Sunde, 2001). Slightly different situation was determined in the samples of milk products. We determined that the most resistant from the all tested samples, in the case of ampicillin. Even 59 % of isolates showed resistance against ampicillin. Resistance against other used antibiotics were in the lower level. A 17.39 % of samples was resistant against tetracycline, 10.53 % were resistant against cefotaxime, 7.14 % were resistant against piperacillin and 3.13 % were resistant against chloramphenicol (Table 1). From the samples of milk

and milk products were isolated following strains: Escherichia coli, Serratia spp., Serratia rubidae, Serratia odorifera bv. 1, Serratia odorifera bv. 2, Serratia plymuthica, Klebsiella spp., Klebsiella oxytoca, Klebsiella pneumoniae, Citrobacter spp., Citrobacter braakii, Citrobacter gillenii, Enterobacter spp., Enterobacter aerogenes, Enterobacter omnigenus, Enterobacter kobei, Enterobacter georgoviae, Enterobacter cloacae, Yersinia spp., Raoultella ornithinolytica a Raoultella terrigena. Resistance against ampicillin was detected in all isolated strains, expect Citrobacter gilenii. Resistance against three antibiotic together was determined in E. coli, S. plymuthica and C. gilenii. Resistance against two antibiotics was determined in Serratia spp. and Serratia rubidae and Citrobacter spp. More described results are in the Table 2. Also Solomakos et al. (2009) examined resistance in E. coli isolated from milk samples and they determined resistance against ampicillin, tetracycline, chloramphenicol. Their work showed resistance against streptomycin and gentamicin. Farzana et al. (2009) determined higher levels of resistance against ampicillin and chloramphenicol. Conversely, resistance against tetracycline was in lower level (less then 10 %). They isolated following bacteria: E. coli, Enterobacter spp. and Klebsiella sp.) Antibiotic resistance of isolates isolated from rectal swabs of chicken was different too. The main resistance was against streptomycin, even 86.36 %. Equally penicillins resistance was determined against ampicillin (31.25 %) and piperacillin (28.57 %). Resistance against tetracycline was 25 %, levofloxacin 5.55 %, chloramphenicol 4.5 % and resistance against ofloxacin 1.52 % (Table 1). Miranda et al. (2008) determined similar results as we in our study. They determined resistance against ampicillin (21.7 - 48.3 %), chloramphenicol (0 - 6.7 %) and gentamicin (0 - 5 %). Also Machado et al. (2008) examined resistance against tetracycline and streptomycin and they detected resistance too. The higher level of resistance determined Tessi et al. (1997), who noted in their study that resistance against tetracycline was from 49.3 to 52.7 % and streptomycin from 37.6 to 39.4 %. Similar results as Tessi et al. (1997) were detected by Van et al. (2008). Lei et al. (2010) determined higher level of resistance as we in our study. From the rectal swabs of chicken we isolated following strains: Escherichia coli, Serratia spp., Serratia fonticola, Citrobacter freundii, Enterobacter cloacae, Raoultella ornithinolytica, Proteus vulgaris, Shigella flexneri a Salmonella enterica ser. Typhimurium. Also we examined resistance in these strains and we determined that the most resistant was S. enterica ser Typhimurium which was resistant to 5 antibiotic. E. coli and Raoultella ornithinolytica were resistant against four antibiotics. Resistance against two antibiotics showed in E. cloacae. Serratia fonticola was resistant against ampicillin only and Shigella flexneri against chloramphenicol only. Results are more described in the Table 3. Many researchers confirmed multi-resistant strains isolated from rectal swabs of chicken (Unno et al. 2010; Lim et al. 2007; Miranda et al. 2008). Authors Husseina et al. (2008) identificated bacteria as E. coli, Enterobacter aerogenes, Staphylococcus aureus, Klebsiella pneumoniae, Streptococcus spp., Proteus mirabillis and Pseudomonas aeruginosa. They detected resistance against antibiotic which we didnt used in this experiment. Also they detected multiresistant E. coli. Miranda et al. (2008) identificated bacteria as Serratia spp., Enterobacter spp., Klebsiella spp. and Escherichia spp. and they detected resistance against ampicillin, cholramphenicol and gentamicin.

Table 1 Resistance of Enterobacteriaceae genera and E. coli isolated from milk products and chicken

Antimianobial agenta	Entero	bacteriaced	ıe									
Antimicrobial agents	E. coli only				Milk products				Chicken			
(µg)	Ν	R	Ι	S	Ν	R	Ι	S	Ν	R	Ι	S
Penicillins												
Ampicillin (10)	117	35.89	ND	64.11	100	59	8	33	96	31.25	3.12	65.63
Piperacillin (30)	56	16.07	ND	83.93	14	7.14	0	92.86	28	28.57	7.14	64.29
Cephalosporins												
Ceftriaxone (30)	24	0	ND	100					66	0	0	100
Cefotaxime (5)	18	0	ND	100	19	10.53	24.32	63.16				
Carbapenems												
Doripenem (10)	18	0	ND	100					18	0	0	100
Meropenem (10)	24	0	ND	100	19	0	0	100	66	0	0	100
Fluoroquinolones												
Nalixid acid (10) screen	14	0	ND	100	32	0	9.38	90.62				
Levofloxacin (5)	39	20.51	ND	79.49	6	0	0	100	18	5.55	0	94.45
Ofloxacin (5)	24	4.16	ND	95.84					66	1.52	0	98.48
Aminoglycosides												
Gentamicin (10)	43	0	ND	100	28	0	0	100	43	0	2.33	97.67
Streptomycin (10)	20	20	ND	80	31	0	9.68	90.32	22	86.36	0	13.63
Amikacin (30)	64	0	ND	100	15	0	0	100	43	2.33	0	97.67
Tetracyclines												
Tigecycline (15)	56	0	ND	100					28	0	0	100
Tetracycline (30)	62	12.9	ND	87.1	46	17.39	4.35	78.26	64	25	11	64
Miscallaneous agents												
Chloramphenicol (30)	142	0.7	ND	99.3	96	3.13	0	96.87	110	4.5	0	95.5

Legend: N – number of tested strains, R – percentage of resistance, I – percentage of intermediate isolates, S – percentage of susceptible strains, ND – not detected

**Table 2** Enterobacteriaceae isolates from milk and milk products, sources and antibiotic resistance profile

Microorganisms	Source of isolates	Antibiotics	
Escherichia coli	Sheep whey, cheeses, milk	AMP, PIP, TET	
Serratia spp.	Milk, cheese	TET, AMP	
Serratia rubidea	Milk	CHL, AMP	
Serratia odorifera bv. 1	Smoked cheese	AMP	
Serratia odorifera bv. 2	Cheese	AMP	
Serratia plymuthica	Milk	TET, CHL, AMP	
Klebsiella spp.	Milk, cheese, smoked cheese	AMP <sup>NR</sup>	
Klebsiella oxytoca	Smoked cheese, cheese	AMP <sup>NR</sup>	
Klebsiella pneumoniae	Cheese	AMP <sup>NR</sup>	
Citrobacter spp.	Milk, sheep whey	AMP, CHL	
Citrobacter braakii	Cheese	AMP	
Citrobacter gillenii	Sheep whey	PIP, CTX, CHL	
Enterobacter spp.	Milk	AMP	
Enterobacter aerogenes	Sheep whey, milk	AMP <sup>NR</sup>	
Enterobacter omnigenus	Milk	AMP	
Enterobacter kobei	Smoked cheese	AMP	
Enterobacter georgoviae	Sheep whey	AMP	
Enterobacter cloacae	Milk	AMP <sup>NR</sup>	
Yersinia spp.	Milk	AMP	
Raoultella ornithinolytica	Cheese, sheep whey, milk	AMP	
Raoultella terrigena	Sheep whey, cheese	AMP	

Legend: <sup>NR</sup> – natural resistance

 Table 3 Enterobacteriaceae isolates from chicken and antibiotic resistance profile

Microorganisms	Antibiotics
Escherichia coli	AMP, TET, PIP, OFL
Serratia spp.	Susceptible
Serratia fonticola	AMP
Klebsiella oxytoca	AMP <sup>NR</sup>
Citrobacter freundii	AMP <sup>NR</sup>
Enterobacter cloacae	AMP <sup>NR</sup>
Enterobacier cloacae	STR, TET
Raoultella ornithinolytica	AMP, STR, TET, CHL
Proteus vulgaris	AMP <sup>NR</sup>
Proteus mirabilis	TET <sup>NR</sup>
Shigella flexneri	CHL
Salmonalla antoriaa sor. Turphimurium	AMP, PIP, LVX, OFL, CHL,
Salmonella enterica ser. Typhimurium	TET

Legend: <sup>NR</sup> – natural resistance

## CONCLUSION

Results from this study showed that the most resistance was against penicillins and aminoglycosides. The highest level of ampicillin resistance was determined in milk and milk samples. Conversely, the highest level of streptomycin resistance was detected in bacteria isolated from rectal swabs of chicken. Also these results showed that more multi-resistant strains were isolated from rectal swabs of chicken, where we determined that *Salmonella enterica* ser. Typhimurium was resistant against five antibiotics, then *E. coli* and *R. ornithinolytica* which were resistant against four antibiotics together. In the isolates from milk and milk products samples we isolated bacteria as *E. coli*, *S. plymuthica* and *C. gilenii* which were resistant against three antibiotics together. Other isolated and identificated bacteria showed resistance against maximum two or one antibiotics.

Acknowledgement: The paper was supported by the project: The research leading to these results has received funding from the European Community under project no 26220220180: Building Research Centre "AgroBioTech", by grant of VEGA 1/0611/14.

## REFERENCES

CARO I., MATEO J., GARCI'A-ARMESTO M. R. 2007. Phenotypical characteristics of Shigalike toxin *Escherichia coli* isolated from sheep dairy products. *Letters in Applied Microbiology*, 45, 295-300. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1472-765x.2007.02186.x

CUI S., GE B., ZHENG J., & JIANGHON, M. 2005. Prevalence and antimicrobial resistance of *Campylobacter* spp. and *Salmonella* serovars in organic chickens in Maryland retail stores. *Applied and Environmental Microbiology*, 71, 4108–4111. <u>http://dx.doi.org/10.1128/aem.71.7.4108-4111.2005</u>

ČĺŽEK A., DOLEJSKÁ M., NOVOTNÁ R., HAAS D., VYSKOČIL, M. 2007. Survey of Shiga toxigenic *Escherichia coli* O157 and drug-resistant coliform bacteria from in-line milk filters on dairy farms in the Czech Republic. *Journal of*  *Applied Microbiology*, 104, 852-860. <u>http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-</u>2672.2007.03602.x

DAVIES, J., 1994. Inactivation of antibiotics and the dissemination of resistance genes. *Science*, 1994, 264, 375-382. <u>http://dx.doi.org/10.1126/science.8153624</u>

EFSA. 2008. Foodborne antimicrobial resistance as a biological hazard. Draft Scientific Opinion of the Panel on Biological Hazards (Question No EFSA– Q-2007-089). Draft endorsed on 6 March 2008.

EUCAST. 2013a. Antimicrobial susceptibility testing: EUCAST disk diffusion method, version 3.0, April 2013.

EUCAST. 2013b. European Committee on Antimicrobial Susceptibility Testing, Breakpoint tables for interpretation of MICs and zone diameter, version 3.1, valid from 2013-02-11.

FARZANA K., AKHTAR S., JABEEN F. 2009. Prevalence and antibiotic resiatnace of bacteria in two ethnic milk based products. *Pakistan journal of botany*, 41(2), 935-943.

FINNEY M., SMULLEN J., FOSTER H. A., BROKX S., STOREY D. M. 2003. Evaluation of chromocult coliform agar for th detection and enumeration of *Enterobacteriaceae* from faecal samples from healthy subjects. *Journal for microbiological methods*, 54, 353-358. <u>http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/s0167-</u> 7012(03)00068-x

HUSSEINA S. A., HASSANB A. H., SULAIMANC R. R. 2008. Bacteriological and pathological study of yolk sac infection in broiler chicks in Sulaimani district. *Journal of Dohuk University*, 11(1), 48-56.

CHO S. H., LIM Y. S., KANG Y. H. 2012. Comparison of antimicrobial resiatnce in *Escherichia coli* strains isolated from healthy poultry and swine farm worker using antibiotics in Korea. *Osong Public Helath Resources Perspective*, 3(3), 151-155. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.phrp.2012.07.002

JACKSON T. C., MARSHALL, D. L., ACUFF G. R., DICKSON J. S., 2001. Meat, poultry, and seafood. Doyle, M.P., Beuchat, L.R., Montville, T.J. (Eds.), Food Microbiology: Fundamentals and Frontiers, 2nd ed. ASM Press, Washington, DC, 91-109.

KEYSER P., ELOFSON M., ROSELL S., WOLF-WATZ H., 2008. Virulence blockers as alternatives to antibiotics: type III secretion inhibitors against Gramnegative bacteria. *Journal of International Medicine*, 264, 1, 17-29. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2796.2008.01941.x

KMEŤ V., DRUGDOVÁ Z. 2012. Antimicrobial susceptibility of microflora from ovine cheese. *Folia microbiologica*, 57(4), 291-293. http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s12223-012-0128-3

LEI T., TIAN W., HE L., HUANG X. H., SUN Y. X., DENG Y. T., SUN Y., LV H. D., WU C. M., HUANG L. Z., SHEN J . Z., LIU, J. H. 2010. Antimicrobial resistance in *Escherichia coli* isolates from food animals, animal food products and companion animal in China. *Veterinary microbiology*, 146, 85-89. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.vetmic.2010.04.025

LIM S. K., LEE H. S., NAM H. M., CHO Y. S., KIM J. M., SONG S. W., PARK Y. H., JUNG S. C. 2007. Antimicorbial resistance observed in *Escherichia coli* strains isolated from fecal samples of cattle and pigs in Korea during 2003-2004. *International Journal of Food Microbiology*, 116, 283-286. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.ijfoodmicro.2006.12.014

LIRA W. M., MACEDO C., MARIN, J. M. 2004. The incidence of Shiga toxinproducing *Escherichia coli* in cattle with mastitis in Brazil. *Journal of Applied Microbiology*, 97, 861-866. <u>http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2672.2004.02384.x</u> MACHADO E., COQUE T. M., CANTÓN R., SOUSA J. C., PEIXE, L. 2008.

Antibiotic resiatnce integrons and extended-spectrum Beta-lactamases among *Enterobacteriaceae* isolates recovered from chicken and swine in Portugal. *Journal of Antimicrobial Chemotheraphy*, 62, 296-302. http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/jac/dkn179

MIRANDA J. M., GUARDDON M., VÁZQUEZ B. I., FENTE C. A., BARROS-VELÁZQUEZ J., CEPEDA A., FRANCO, C. M. 2008. Antimicrobial resiatnce in *Enterobactericaeae* strains isolated from organic chicken, conventional chicken and conventional turkey meat: A comparative survey. *Food Control*, 19(4), 412-416. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.foodcont.2007.05.002

PATERSON D. L. 2006. Resistance in Gram-negative bacteria: *Enterobacteriaceae. American Journal of Medicine*, 119, 520–528. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.amjmed.2006.03.013

PICOZZI C., FOSCHINO R., HEUVELINK A., BEUMER, R. 2005. Phenotypic and genotypic characterization of sorbitol-negative or slow-fermenting (suspected 0157) *Escherichia coli* isolated from milk samples in Lombardy region. *Letters in Applied Microbiology*, 40, 491–496. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1472-765x.2005.01718.x

SÁENZ Y., ZARAZAGA M., BRINAS L., LANTERO M., RUIZ-LARREA F., TORRES, C. 2001. Antibiotic resistance in *Escherichia coli* isolates obtained from animals, food and humans in Spain. *Antimicrobial agents*, 18, 353-358. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/s0924-8579(01)00422-8

SATO K., BARLETT P. C., KANEENE J. B., & DOWNES F. P. 2004. Prevalence and antimicrobial susceptibilities of *Campylobacter* spp. Isolates from organic and conventional dairy hens in Wisconsin. *Applied and Environmental Microbiology*, 70, 1442–1447. <u>http://dx.doi.org/10.1128/aem.70.3.1442-1447.2004</u>

SATO K., BENNEDSGAARD T. W., BARLETT P. C., ERSKINE R. J., & KANEENE J. B. 2004. Comparison of antimicrobial susceptibility of

*Sthapylococcus aureus* isolated from bulk tank milk in organic and conventional dairy herds in the Midwestern United States and Denmark. *Journal of Food Protection*, 67, 1104–1110.

SOLOMAKOS N., GVARIS A., ANGELIDIS A. S., POURNARAS S., BURRIEL A. R., KRITAS S. K., PAPAGEORGIOU, D. K. 2009. Occurance, virulence genes and antibiotic resistance of *Escherichia coli* 0 157 isolated from raw bovine, caprine and ovine milk in Greece. *Food microbiology*, 26, 865-871. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.fm.2009.06.002

SOONTHORNCHAIKUL N., GARELICK H., JONES H., JACOBS J., BALL D., & CHOUDHURY M. 2006. Resistance to three antimicrobial agents of *Campylobacter* isolated from organically- and intensively-reared chickens purchased from retail outlets. *International Journal of Antimicrobial Agents*, 27, 125–130. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.ijantimicag.2005.09.020

SORUM H., SUNDE M. 2001. Resistance to antibiotics in the normal flora of<br/>animals. Veterinary research, 32, 227-241.http://dx.doi.org/10.1051/vetres:2001121

SUNDE M., FOSSUM K., SOLBERG A., SØRUM H., 1998. Antibiotic resistance in *Escherichia coli* of the normal intestinal flora of swine. *Microbial Drug Resistance*, 4, 289-299. http://dx.doi.org/10.1089/mdr.1998.4.289

TESSI M. A., SALSI M., CAFFER M., MOGUILEVSKI M. A. 1997. Drug resistance of *Enterobacteriaceae* isolated from chicken carcasses. *J. Food Prot.*, 60, 1001–1005.

UNNO T., HAN D., JANG J., LEE S. N., KIM J. H., KO G., KIM B. G., AHN J. H., KANALY R. A., SADOWSKY M. J., HUR, H. G. 2010. High diversity and abundance of antibiotic-resistant *Escherichia coli* isolated from humans and farm animal host in Jeonnam Province, South Korea. *Science of the Total Environment*, 408, 3499-3506. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2010.04.046 VAN T. T. H., CHIN J., CHAPMAN T., TRAN L. T., COLOE, P. J. 2008. Safety of raw meat and shelfish in Vietnam: An Analysis of *Escherichia coli* isolations for antibiotic resistance and virulence genes. *International journal of food microbiology*, 124, 217-223. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.ijfoodmicro.2008.03.029