



## EPIDEMIOLOGY AND ANTIBIOGRAM OF SALMONELLA FROM KUMAUN

**A.K. Upadhyay, Maansi, Deepak and S. P. Singh**

College of Veterinary and Animal sciences, G. B. Pant University of Agri. & Tech.,  
Pantnagar-263145, India.

### ABSTRACT

*Samples from 720 food animals were collected. Isolation, identification and molecular characterization of Salmonella isolates were attempted by various methods. Of these, 15 were found positive and 8 isolates were found susceptible to all antibiotics (Pan Susceptible). Three isolates showed resistance towards at least one of the antibiotics used. Only one isolate was found to be Multi Drug resistant (MDR)*

### INTRODUCTION

Food animals harbor a wide range of *Salmonella* serovars and therefore act as a source of contamination for non-typhoid human salmonellosis. Most human salmonellosis cases are associated with consumption of contaminated egg, chicken, pork, beef and milk products (Zaki *et al.*, 2009). The antimicrobial resistance of *Salmonella* is an increasing problem and has become a public health issue worldwide. Eventually, most of the *Salmonella* isolates have developed resistance against multiple drugs due to their indiscriminate, repeated and abusive applications. Resistant trait of bacteria can transmit from animals to humans through consumption of contaminated meat (Yildirim *et al.*, 2011).

### MATERIAL METHOD

Period of of study was April 2016- March 201. A total of 720 meat samples comprising of chicken meat (100), cara-beef (400), pork (10), poultry caeca (100), buffalo intestine (30) and

human stool (80) were collected from the areas of Pantnagar, Nagla, Lalkuan, Haldwani, Rudrapur, Kiccha, Kashipur, Dineshpur and Kathgodam of District Udham Singh Nagar and Nainital of Uttarakhand state of India. Isolation and identification was carried out using selective plating media as Brilliant Green Agar (BGA), Xylose Lysine Deoxycholate (XLD) Hekoen Enteric Agar (HEA) plates and Bismuth Sulphite Agar (BSA). Morphological characterization of Salmonella isolates was also carried out (Old, 1996).

The identified salmonella isolates were sent for serotyping to Salmonella Typing Centre, Division of Bacteriology and Mycology, IVRI, Izatnagar, Bareilly (U.P.). These isolates were also subjected to PCR based molecular characterization with products at 284 bp, 204 bp and 401 bp for the primer pairs targeting *invA*, *ompC* and *typh* gene respectively (Skyberg *et al.*, 2006).

Antibiotic sensitivity test by disc diffusion on Mueller- Hinton agar (CLSI, 2011) was performed with antibiotic as Ciprofloxacin (5 mcg), Norfloxacin (10 mcg), Ampicillin (10 mcg), Gentamicin (10 mcg), Cefalexin (30 mcg), Tetracycline (30 mcg), Nalidixic Acid (30 mcg), Chloramphenicol (30 mcg), Sulphamethizole (300 mcg), Furazolidone (50 mcg), Tobramycin (10mcg), Streptomycin (10mcg) and Amikacin (30mcg).

## RESULT AND DISCUSSION

The overall prevalence was found to be 2.08 %. (Table 1), but lower prevalence of 0.94% was reported by Chandrashekhar, (2012). Highest prevalence (10%) was recorded in pork but sample size was too low although in another Danish study it ranged between 0.9– 1.2 percent (Nielsen *et al.*, 2001). The prevalence rate of Salmonella in chicken meat and poultry caeca was recorded as 4.0%, unrelated with Kumar and Lakhera, (2013) who reported 2% but concomitant with a study in US (4.2%) and New Zealand (3%) (Wong *et al.*, 2007). Salmonella organism could not be recovered from stool samples concurrent with a study of 232 samples examined, only one sample (0.43%) yielded Salmonella serovar (Bisht, 2010). The prevalence of Salmonella in carabeef was found to be 1.25% and in buffalo intestine 3.33% contrary to our previous study, where none of the carabeef samples revealed Salmonella (Upadhyay *et al.*, 2016). The reason of such low prevalence could be awareness among animal owners for superior managing practices because of extension activities of public health experts. Furthermore, it may also be due to samples collected from healthy individuals, less number of processed samples, low endemicity of salmonellosis in this area and high-quality management and hygienic practices.

## **Molecular Characterization**

All presumed isolates were confirmed as *Salmonella* using *invA* gene primers which produced a 284 bp amplicon specific for *Salmonella* genus (Figure 1, Table 2). A multiplex PCR was used for simultaneous detection of *Salmonella* genus and *Salmonella* Typhimurium targeting *ompC* and *typh* genes, respectively (Figure 2). All 15 isolates came positive for *ompC* *Salmonella* genus and 10 (66.67%) isolates were confirmed as *S. Typhimurium* on the basis of *typh* gene concomitant to Upadhyay *et al.*, (2016).

## **Antibiotic sensitivity test of *Salmonella* isolates**

To attempt antibiogramme the antibiotic discs (Hi-media, Mumbai) used were Ampicillin, Amoxy-clav, Chloramphenicol, Cefatoxime, Tetracycline, Norfloxacin, Cotrimoxazole, Gentamicin, Kanamycin, Streptomycin, Amikacin, Sulfafurazole, Ciprofloxacin, Levofloxacin, Cefazolin, Cefoxitin, Ceftriaxone and Nalidixic acid. Strains were evaluated as susceptible, intermediate or resistant (Table 3). Eight isolates were found susceptible to all antibiotics (Pan Susceptible). Kumar and Lakhera (2013) reported Nalidixic Acid to be 100% sensitive against all the isolates. Extensive awareness programme of public health experts in this area contributed to little resistance against antibiotics over the last few years as only five isolates were found resistant to Ampicillin, Tetracycline, Nalidixic Acid and Sulfafurazole. Chuanchuen and Padungtod, (2009) observed presence of resistance genes in almost 78% of the *Salmonella enterica* isolates from poultry and pig meat. There is a shoddier prevalence of multi-drug resistance in the *Salmonella*, which might be due to judicious use of antimicrobials in studied geographical areas.

## **SUMMARY**

The overall prevalence of *Salmonella* in different meat samples was 2.08%. Higher prevalence was reported in pork (10%) followed by chicken meat as well as poultry caeca (4%). Low antimicrobial-resistant against commonly used in *Salmonella* is regarded achievement of purpose. Antimicrobials are being used judiciously in livestock and poultry since the problem of resistance has taken a serious turn. However, *Salmonella* shows change in resistance from one place to another.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

We are thankful to ICAR for grant of Outreach programme on zoonotic diseases, in which the research was carried out.

## REFERENCES

1. Bisht, G. 2010. Isolation, identification and molecular characterization of *Salmonella* serovars recovered from man and animals. M.V.Sc thesis submitted to Department of Vet. Public Health. Govind Ballabh Pant University of Agriculture & Technology.
2. Chandrashekhar, 2012. Isolation, identification and molecular characterization of *Salmonellae* from man, animals and foods of animal origin with special reference to determination of virulence genes. P.H.D thesis submitted to Department of Vet. Public Health. Govind Ballabh Pant University of Agriculture & Technology.
3. Chuanchuen, R. and Padungtod, P. 2009. Antimicrobial resistance genes in *Salmonella enterica* isolates from poultry and swine in Thailand. *J. Vet. Med. Sci.* 71(10): 1349-135
4. CLSI. 2011. Clinical and laboratory Standards Institute. Performance standards for antimicrobial susceptibility testing; Twenty-first Information Supplement M100-S21 Vol. 31 No. 1, Jan. 2011. CLSI document M100-S21.
5. Hur, J., Kim, J.H., Park, J.H., Lee, Y.J. and Lee, J.H. 2010. Molecular and virulence characteristics of multi-drug resistant *Salmonella Enteritidis* strains isolated from poultry. *Vet. J.* 189: 306–311.
6. Kumar, K and Lakhera, P.C. 2013. Isolation, plasmid profiling and antibiogram of *Salmonella* from poultry meat and env. sources. *J. of Anim. Res.* 3: 53-57.
7. Nielsen, B., Alban, L., Stege, H., Sørensen, L.L., Møgelmoose, V., Bagger, J., Dahl, J. and Baggesen, D.L. 2001. A new *Salmonella* surveillance and control programme in *Wochenschrift*. 114: 323–326.
8. Old, D.C. 1996. *Salmonella*. In: Mackie and McCartney Practical Medical Microbiology. 14<sup>th</sup> Edn. Churchill Livingstone Edinburgh London New York Philadelphia Sydney Toronto.
9. Skyberg, J.A., Logue, C.M. and Nolan, L.K. 2006. Virulence genotyping of *Salmonella* spp. with multiplex PCR. *Avian Dis.* 50 (1): 77-81.
10. Upadhyay, A. K., Kiran, Maansi, Singh, P. K., Ipshita and Kumar, A., 2016. Epidemiology and antimicrobial resistance of *Salmonella* isolated from Meat. *International Jour. of Natural and Applied Sci.* 3 (2). 40-45.


11. Wong, T.L., Nicol, C., Cook, R. and MacDiarmid, S. 2007. *Salmonella* in uncooked retail meats in New Zealand. *J. of Food Prot.* 70: 1360–1365.
12. Yildirim, Y., Gonulalan, Z., Pamuk, S. and Ertas, N. 2011. Incidence and antibiotic resistance of *Salmonella* spp. on raw chicken carcasses. *Food Res. Int.* 44: 725-728.
13. Zaki, S., Abd-El-Haleem, D., El-Helow, E. and Mustafa, M. 2009. Molecular and biochemical diagnosis of *Salmonella* in wastewater. *J. Appl. Sci. Environ. Manage.* 13: 83-92.

**Table 1:** Prevalence of *Salmonella* in samples collected from different sources

S. No.	Sample type	No. of Sample	Prevalence (%)
1.	Human stool	80	0
2.	Chicken meat	100	4 (4)
3.	Cara-beef	400	5 (1.25)
4.	Pork	10	1 (10)
5.	Poultry caeca	100	4 (4)
6.	Buffalo intestine	30	1 (3.33)
	<b>Total</b>	<b>720</b>	<b>15 (2.08)</b>


**Table 2:** Details of *Salmonella*-specific primers

Target gene	Sequence of primer(5'-3')	Amplicon	Reference
<i>invA</i>	GTG AAA TTA TCG CCA CGT TCG GGC AA TCA TCG CAC CGT CAA AGG AAC C	284 bp	Olivera <i>et al.</i> (2003)
<i>ompC</i>	ATC GCT GAC TTA TGC AAT CG CGG GTT GCG TTA TAG GTC TG	204 bp	Alveraz <i>et al.</i> (2004)
<i>typh</i>	TTGTTCACTTTTTACCCCTGAA CCCTGACAGCCGTTAGATATT	401 bp	Alveraz <i>et al.</i> (2004)



**Figure 1:** *invA* gene PCR for *Salmonella* genus confirmation.

Lane M: 100 bp DNA ladder; Lane 1-15: Positive *Salmonella* isolates (284 bp)



**Figure 2:** Multiplex PCR for *Salmonella* genus and *S. Typhimurium* identification.

Lane M: 100 bp DNA ladder; Lane 1-2: Positive *S. Typhimurium* isolates; Lane 3-5: *Salmonella* isolates

**Table 3:** Antibiotic sensitivity results of *Salmonella* isolates (n = 15)

S. No.	Antibiotic	Sensitive (%)	Intermediate (%)	Resistant (%)
1	Ampicillin (AMP)	14 (93.3)	0	1 (6.6)
2	Amoxyclav(AMC)	15 (100)	0	0
3	Chloramphenicol (C)	15 (100)	0	0
4	Cefotaxime (CTX)	15 (100)	0	0
5	Tetracycline (T)	11 (73.3)	3 (20)	1 (6.6)
6	Norfloxacin (NX)	13 (86.6)	2 (13.3)	0
7	Co-trimoxazole (COT)	15 (100)	0	0
8	Gentamicin (GEN)	15 (100)	0	0
9	Kanamycin (K)	15 (100)	0	0
10	Streptomycin (S)	15 (100)	0	0
11	Amikacin (AK)	14 (93.3)	1(6.6)	0
12	Sulfafurazole (SF)	14 (93.3)	0	1 (6.6)
13	Ciprofloxacin (CIP)	14 (93.3)	1 (6.6)	0
14	Levofloxacin (LE)	15 (100)	0	0
15	Cefazolin (CZ)	12 (80)	3 (20)	0
16	Cefoxitin (CX)	15 (100)	0	0
17	Ceftriaxone (CTR)	13 (86.6)	2 (13.3)	0
18	Nalidixic Acid (NA)	13 (86.6)	0	2 (13.3)