



**HAL**  
open science

## Phenotypes and genotypes of campylobacter strains isolated after cleaning and disinfection in poultry slaughterhouses.

Marie-Bénédicte Peyrat, Christophe Soumet, Pierre Maris, Pascal Sanders

► **To cite this version:**

Marie-Bénédicte Peyrat, Christophe Soumet, Pierre Maris, Pascal Sanders. Phenotypes and genotypes of campylobacter strains isolated after cleaning and disinfection in poultry slaughterhouses.. *Veterinary Microbiology*, 2008, 128 (3-4), pp.313-326. 10.1016/j.vetmic.2007.10.021 . hal-00606186

**HAL Id: hal-00606186**

**<https://anses.hal.science/hal-00606186>**

Submitted on 5 Jul 2011

**HAL** is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

## Accepted Manuscript

Title: Phenotypes and genotypes of campylobacter strains isolated after cleaning and disinfection in poultry slaughterhouses

Authors: M.B. Peyrat, C. Soumet, P. Maris, P. Sanders



PII: S0378-1135(07)00524-X  
DOI: doi:10.1016/j.vetmic.2007.10.021  
Reference: VETMIC 3860

To appear in: *VETMIC*

Received date: 18-7-2007  
Revised date: 16-10-2007  
Accepted date: 17-10-2007

Please cite this article as: Peyrat, M.B., Soumet, C., Maris, P., Sanders, P., Phenotypes and genotypes of campylobacter strains isolated after cleaning and disinfection in poultry slaughterhouses, *Veterinary Microbiology* (2007), doi:10.1016/j.vetmic.2007.10.021

This is a PDF file of an unedited manuscript that has been accepted for publication. As a service to our customers we are providing this early version of the manuscript. The manuscript will undergo copyediting, typesetting, and review of the resulting proof before it is published in its final form. Please note that during the production process errors may be discovered which could affect the content, and all legal disclaimers that apply to the journal pertain.

- 1 **Phenotypes and genotypes of campylobacter strains isolated after cleaning and disinfection in**
- 2 **poultry slaughterhouses**
- 3 MB. Peyrat\*, C. Soumet, P. Maris and P. Sanders
- 4 Agence française de sécurité sanitaire des aliments (AFSSA), Laboratoire d'études et de recherches
- 5 sur les médicaments vétérinaires et les désinfectants. BP 90203 La Haute Marche, 35133 Javené,
- 6 France

---

\* Corresponding author. Tel.: +33 299947878; fax.: +33 299947899

*E-mail address: mb.peyrat@afssa.fr*

## 7 Abstract

8  
9 Campylobacter is responsible for human bacterial enteritis and poultry meat is recognised as a  
10 primary source of infection. In slaughterhouses, cleaning and disinfection procedures are performed  
11 daily, and it has been suggested that disinfectant molecules might select for antibiotic resistant strains  
12 if shared targets or combined resistance mechanisms were involved. The aim of the study was to  
13 investigate if cleaning and disinfection procedures in poultry slaughterhouses select for antibiotic  
14 resistance in *Campylobacter jejuni* and *C. coli* and to determine the genotypes of isolates collected  
15 after cleaning and disinfection. Nine sampling visits were made to four French slaughterhouses.  
16 Samples were collected from transport crates and equipment surfaces, before and after cleaning and  
17 disinfection. Minimal inhibitory concentrations of the recovered *C. jejuni* and *C. coli* isolates to 6  
18 antibiotics and 2 disinfectants were measured. The *C. jejuni* isolates collected from equipment  
19 surfaces after cleaning and disinfection were subjected to PCR-RFLP typing. Twenty-five *C. jejuni*  
20 isolates and 1 *C. coli* were recovered from equipment surfaces after cleaning and disinfection during 5  
21 visits to 3 different slaughterhouses. Those isolates didn't show an increased resistance to the tested  
22 antibiotics compared to isolates collected before cleaning and disinfection. Only one or two genotypes  
23 were recovered after cleaning and disinfection during single visits to each slaughterhouse. This  
24 observation suggests that such genotypes may be particularly adapted to survive cleaning and  
25 disinfection stress. Understanding the survival mechanisms of *Campylobacter* should facilitate the  
26 implementation of better targeted strategies and reduce the public health burden associated with  
27 *Campylobacter* infection.

28  
29 *Keywords: campylobacter; slaughterhouse, disinfectant, antibiotic, cross-resistance, PCR-RFLP*  
30 *genotyping*

31

## 32 1. Introduction

33

34 Campylobacter is one of the most common causes of human bacterial enteritis worldwide.  
35 Thermophilic campylobacters, in particular *Campylobacter jejuni* and its close relative *C. coli*, are the  
36 predominant cause of campylobacter infections (Anonymous, 2003). There is significant

37 epidemiological evidence to suggest that poultry meat is a primary source of human campylobacter  
38 infection (Anonymous, 2003). *C. jejuni* and *C. coli* are generally considered to exist commensally in  
39 the gastro-intestinal tract of birds, particularly poultry. In slaughterhouses, carcass contamination with  
40 spilled gut contents occurs during evisceration (Borck and Pedersen, 2005).

41 Campylobacter are highly sensitive to environmental stress. One of the most intriguing aspects of  
42 campylobacter research is the apparent sensitivity of the microorganism under laboratory conditions  
43 and its contrasting persistence in the food chain and the incidence of human infection (Park, 2005).  
44 Cleaning and disinfection procedures in slaughterhouses are performed daily in each sector of the  
45 slaughter process. In this article, the expressions “cleaning and disinfection” will be shortened to  
46 “cleaning”. Transport crates are usually cleaned and disinfected between each use. Although  
47 Campylobacter is generally considered sensitive to disinfectants (Avrain et al., 2003; Blaser et al.,  
48 1986; Trachoo and Frank, 2002; Wang et al., 1983), it can be routinely detected in floor surface swabs  
49 of commercial transport cages after cleaning (Newell et al., 2001; Slader et al., 2002). It has been  
50 speculated that the increasing use of chemical disinfection, particularly of quaternary ammonium  
51 compounds, might impose a selective pressure and contribute to the emergence of disinfectant-  
52 resistant microorganisms (Langsrud et al., 2003) and that biocides might select for antibiotic resistant  
53 strains (Russell, 2000). The emergence of microorganisms exhibiting combined resistance to  
54 disinfectants and antibiotics represents a public health burden.

55 The ability of a bacterium to survive the variety of stresses experienced during cleaning procedures is  
56 dependent on the presence and expression of stress response genes. Such properties might affect  
57 the genetic diversity of campylobacter population before and after cleaning. Different genotyping  
58 methods have been used to characterise *C. jejuni* and restriction fragment length polymorphism  
59 (RFLP) of the *flaA* polymerase chain reaction (PCR) product appears to be a valuable method for  
60 epidemiological investigations (Wassenaar and Newell, 2000).

61 These observations led us to hypothesize that the campylobacter strains isolated after cleaning  
62 procedures might present a higher resistance to antibiotics and have a specific genotype. We  
63 therefore measured and compared the minimal inhibitory concentrations to antibiotics and  
64 disinfectants of isolates collected before and after cleaning and determined the genotypes of the *C.*  
65 *jejuni* isolates collected after cleaning.

66

67 **2. Materials and method**

68

69 *2.1. Collection of samples in four poultry slaughterhouses*

70

71 Four unrelated French poultry slaughterhouses (designated A, B, C and D located in Brittany and  
72 Pays de la Loire) were visited from August 2005 to June 2006. Each plant processed industrial poultry  
73 to finished products such as carcasses and pieces with capacities of 6000 to 9000 birds per hour for  
74 broilers, 5000 guinea fowls per hour and 2000 turkeys or ducks per hour. Plants A and C were  
75 investigated once, plant B three times, and plant D four times. Plants B and C processed chickens,  
76 turkeys and guinea fowl on the same chain. Plant D processed poultry and guinea fowl on one chain  
77 and turkeys and ducks on another. Plant A only processed turkeys. The slaughter chains for broilers  
78 and guinea fowl were entirely automated. In turkeys and ducks, most of the evisceration chain after  
79 plucking was carried out manually.

80

81 *2.2. Audit of cleaning and disinfection procedures in slaughterhouses*

82

83 A questionnaire was sent to the quality control manager of each of the 4 slaughterhouses. The  
84 objective was to know which families of disinfectant molecules were used in different sectors. We  
85 focused on the disinfectant molecules used to disinfect the transport crates and the equipment  
86 surfaces in contact with poultry carcasses during processing.

87

88 *2.3. Sampling of transport crates*

89

90 Samples were taken from the transport crates of the flocks slaughtered in each slaughterhouse. A  
91 flock was defined as all birds reared in the same poultry house and slaughtered on the same day.  
92 Samples were taken from 5 different transport crates for each flock. At least 10 fresh droppings were  
93 taken and pooled before cleaning. Sterile gauze swabs (10x10 cm) soaked in sterile saline were used  
94 to collect samples *ad random* from the transport crates (sides and bottom) after cleaning. Swabs were  
95 wiped vigorously over the bottom and door of the cages and placed in sterile stomacher bags. All

96 samples were kept at 4°C until further processing within 48 h. The transport crates of 43 poultry flocks  
97 were sampled.

98

#### 99 *2.4. Sampling of equipment and scald tank water*

100

101 As cleaning was carried out at the end of the working day, the surfaces and scald tank water were  
102 sampled on two consecutive days: the first day, at the end of processing, before cleaning, and the  
103 next day, before starting the slaughter process, after cleaning (one of the 3 visits to slaughterhouse B  
104 occurred only after cleaning). A total of 101 environmental swabs were collected, 45 before and 56  
105 after cleaning. Sterile gauze swabs (10x10 cm) soaked in sterile saline were used to collect samples  
106 from the processing equipment, which included the rubber fingers of the defeathering machine, the  
107 evisceration machines and the conveyor belts. The swabs were wiped vigorously over the appropriate  
108 area for approximately 30 s and placed in sterile stomacher bags. The size of the area depended on  
109 the type of surface. At each visit, 250 ml of scald tank water were collected before and after cleaning  
110 of the scald tank. All samples were kept at 4°C until further processing within 48 h.

111

#### 112 *2.5. Isolation and identification of Campylobacter spp.*

113

114 *Campylobacter* detection was carried out according to the standard French method (AFNOR, 1996).

115 All samples were subjected to a selective enrichment step before bacterial isolation. The

116 *Campylobacter* isolates were cultured in a microaerophilic atmosphere (5% O<sub>2</sub>, 10% CO<sub>2</sub>, 85% N<sub>2</sub>) at  
117 42°C.

118 Ten g of each sample of pooled droppings were aseptically weighed and placed in sterile stomacher  
119 filter bags with 90 ml of Preston broth consisting of nutrient broth N° 2 (Oxoid, Basingstoke, UK)

120 supplemented with 5% (v/v) defibrinated sheep blood (AES laboratories, Combourg, France) and

121 *campylobacter*-selective Preston supplement (SR0117E, Oxoid). The samples from the scald water

122 tank were centrifuged at 3000 g for 20 min and the pellet resuspended in 100 ml of Preston broth.

123 Swabs were placed directly in 100 ml of Preston broth. Each bag was blended for 30 s prior to

124 incubation. After 24 h, 10 µl of enrichment broth were plated onto Karmali agar (*Campylobacter* agar

125 base (CM935) supplemented with the *Campylobacter*-selective Karmali supplements SR0167E, Oxoid)

126 and Virion media (Goossens et al., 1983) and incubated under microaerophilic conditions for 48 h.  
127 Two characteristic colonies from each plate were transferred onto blood agar medium (Mueller Hinton  
128 agar base (Difco, Becton Dickinson, le Pont de Claix, France) with 5% (v/v) defibrinated sheep blood,  
129 AES Laboratories) and incubated for 48 h.  
130 The species of each isolate was identified using a method previously developed by Denis *et al.* (2001)  
131 with some modifications. Briefly, isolated colonies were picked from the agar plate and suspended in 1  
132 ml of distilled water in a microfuge tube. Samples were boiled for 10 min at 95°C and cooled on ice  
133 before being added to the PCR mix. Specific primers selected from *mapA* gene and *ceuE* genes were  
134 used to simultaneously detect the species *C. jejuni* and *C. coli* (Table 1). The PCR reactions were  
135 performed using a Gene Amp 9700 thermocycler (Perkin Elmer Instruments, Norwalk CT, USA) in 30  
136 µl of mixture containing 1 U *AmpliTaq* Gold (Applied Biosystems), 100 µmol/l each of deoxynucleoside  
137 triphosphate, 1X GeneAmp Buffer with 2.5 mmol/l MgCl<sub>2</sub>, 0.42 µmol/l each of MdmapA1, MdmapA2,  
138 Mdcol2 and Mdcol3 primers and 5 µl of boiled cell suspension as template. The reaction included an  
139 initial denaturation of DNA at 94°C for 7 min and then 35 consecutive cycles of denaturation (30 s,  
140 94°C), primer annealing (30 s, 52°C), and extension (72°C, 30 s). A final elongation step was  
141 performed for 10 min at 72°C. PCR products (10 µl) were separated by electrophoresis for 1 h 30 at  
142 110 V on 1% agarose gel (agarose standard, Eurobio, France) stained with ethidium bromide (0.5  
143 µg/ml) and viewed under UV light. A 589 bp PCR product was obtained for *C. jejuni* and 462 bp for *C.*  
144 *coli*. For each positive PCR result, colonies were transferred to a peptone broth with 15% of glycerol  
145 and frozen at -80°C before phenotype and genotype analysis.

146

#### 147 *2.6. Antimicrobial agents and antimicrobial susceptibility testing*

148

149 The antibiotics tested were: ampicillin, tetracycline, gentamicin, streptomycin, erythromycin, and  
150 enrofloxacin purchased from Sigma Aldrich (St Quentin-Fallavier, France). The disinfectants were  
151 benzalkonium chloride (BTC50®; Stepan Europe, Voreppe, France) and didecyl-dimethyl ammonium  
152 chloride (Bardac 22®, Lonza, Basel, Switzerland).

153 The minimum inhibitory concentrations (MIC) of the antimicrobial agents were determined on Mueller-  
154 Hinton agar (Difco) supplemented with 5% defibrinated sheep blood by an agar dilution method, in



155 accordance with the CLSI formerly NCCLS document M7-A6 (NCCLS, 2003). Cultures were grown on  
156 Karmali agar plates for 48 h under microaerophilic conditions at 37°C.  
157 Antibiotic susceptibility was determined according to guideline 2007 of the “Comité de l’antibiogramme  
158 de la société française de microbiologie” (<http://www.sfm.asso.fr> last access: 11/05/2007). The  
159 antibiotic and disinfectant molecules, their respective concentrations (in two-fold increases) and  
160 resistance breakpoints are shown in table 2. *Campylobacter jejuni* ATCC33560 and *Campylobacter*  
161 *coli* ATCC33559 were used as quality controls (NCCLS document M31-A2) (NCCLS, 2002) for each  
162 MIC determination. Each measure was repeated twice. The choice of antibiotics was made in  
163 accordance with the national antimicrobial resistance monitoring system (Anonymous, 2006).  
164 Quaternary ammonium compounds were selected as disinfectants as these were used in the  
165 slaughterhouses visited.

166

#### 167 2.7. Genotyping of *Campylobacter* spp: PCR-RFLP of the *pfla/gyrA* and *flaA* genes

168

169 All *C. jejuni* isolates from samples collected after cleaning of slaughterhouse surfaces were  
170 genotyped. *Campylobacter* isolates were incubated on Karmali agar for 48 h at 37°C under  
171 microaerophilic conditions. Cells were harvested and resuspended in 1.5 ml of Brucella broth. Total  
172 DNA was extracted using the Nucleospin® Tissue kit (Macherey-Nagel, Hoerd, France) according to  
173 the manufacturer’s instructions. DNA samples were kept at –20°C for further analysis.

174 PCR was performed in a 50 µl reaction volume with a Chromo-4 thermal cycler (Biorad S.A., Marnes  
175 la coquette, France) according to the conditions described by Ragimbeau *et al.* (1998) with slight  
176 modifications. The reaction mixture consisted of 1X XL PCR buffer II (Applied Biosystems,  
177 Courtaboeuf, France) with 1 mmol/l Mg(Oac)<sub>2</sub>, 1.5 U *rTth* polymerase XL (Applied Biosystems), 0.4  
178 µmol/l of each primer, 0.2 mmol/l concentrations of deoxynucleoside triphosphates (Applied  
179 Biosystems) and 5 µl of template DNA at 10 pmol/l. The reaction included an initial denaturation of  
180 DNA at 94°C for 1 min and then 35 consecutive cycles of denaturation (15 s, 94°C), primer annealing  
181 (30 s, 45°C) and chain extension with a ramp of 2 min to 68°C. A final extension step was performed  
182 for 10 min at 72°C. The amplified product size was 1448 bp for the *flaA* gene (Table 1).

183 Amplification of *pflA* and *gyrA* genes by multiplex PCR was carried out as previously described by  
184 Ragimbeau *et al.* (1998) (Table1).

185 The presence of the expected PCR product was verified by subjecting 5  $\mu$ l of the reaction mixture to  
186 electrophoresis on a 1 % agarose gel (electrophoresis grade agarose, InVitrogen, Cergy Pontoise,  
187 France) for 90 min at 110 V and stained with ethidium bromide solution (1  $\mu$ g/ml). Amplified products  
188 were visualized under UV light.

189 For *flaA* gene polymorphism, 8  $\mu$ l of PCR products were digested in 30  $\mu$ l with 10 U of *DdeI* (Qbiogen,  
190 Illkirch, France) in buffer number 3 added to 100 ng/ $\mu$ l bovine serum albumin (BSA, Q Biogen). For  
191 *pfla/gyrA* polymorphism, 15  $\mu$ l of PCR products were simultaneously digested with 1 U of *HindIII*, *HinfI*,  
192 *HhaI* and *DdeI* (Q Biogen) in a total volume of 30  $\mu$ l with buffer number 2 added to BSA.

193 The reaction mixture was incubated in a water bath for 4 h at 37°C. The digested PCR products (10  $\mu$ l)  
194 were analysed by electrophoresis at 3 V/cm for 4 h on 2.5 % ethidium bromide (2  $\mu$ g/ml) stained  
195 agarose gel in 1X TBE (Tris 89 mmol/l; borate 89 mmol/l, EDTA 2 mmol/l pH 8.3). The molecular size  
196 markers were  $\Phi$ X174-*HaeIII* (Promega, Charbonnières les bains, France) and 100 bp DNA ladder  
197 (Promega). The restriction enzyme profiles were visualized under UV light and images were captured  
198 by Bio 1-D analyser (Fisher Bioblock Scientific, Illkirch, France). The electrophoretic profiles were  
199 compared visually.

200

## 201 2.8. Statistical analysis

202

203 Statistical analyses were performed with Systat 9<sup>®</sup> for Windows (Systat, Inc., 1800 Sherman Ave.,  
204 Evanston, Illinois, USA). The isolation percentages and MIC distributions were compared by Chi<sup>2</sup> or  
205 exact Fisher test. Results were considered significant when  $p \leq 0.05$ . A Spearman coefficient was  
206 calculated for the correlation matrix between MIC distributions.

207

## 208 3. Results

209

### 210 3.1 Cleaning and disinfection procedures used in slaughterhouses

211

212 Three of the four slaughterhouses visited (A, B and D) completed our questionnaire about cleaning  
213 and disinfection procedures.

214 The transport crates were cleaned with cold water (10-15°C). In slaughterhouse D, the transport  
215 crates were turned in a tunnel during cleaning, and large pieces of dirt (feathers, droppings or chicken  
216 legs) could be removed from the crate. In the other slaughterhouses, the cleaning system did not allow  
217 reversal of the crates, and large pieces of dirt were still present at the end of the cleaning procedure.  
218 The transport crates were disinfected with a mixture of quaternary ammonium and glutaraldehyde in  
219 slaughterhouses A and D, and with chlorine compounds in slaughterhouse B. Organic matter was still  
220 visible in the transport crates at the end of the cleaning procedure in all slaughterhouses visited.  
221 The slaughterhouse equipment was pre-cleaned with high-pressure water. It was then cleaned using a  
222 device with foam containing alkaline – chlorinated molecules in slaughterhouses A and D and with a  
223 neutral detergent in slaughterhouse B. Quaternary ammonium compounds combined with  
224 glutaraldehyde were used to disinfect equipment in slaughterhouses A and B. Equipment in  
225 slaughterhouse D was disinfected with a formulation containing poly (hexamethylene biguanide)  
226 hydrochloride. Disinfectant product, concentration and contact times are indicated on table 3.

227

### 228 3.2. Isolation percentages before and after cleaning and disinfection

229

230 *Campylobacter* was isolated from 81% (35/43) of the crate samples before cleaning and in 77%  
231 (33/43) after cleaning (data not shown). Although different methods and molecules were used by the  
232 slaughterhouses to clean and disinfect their transport crates, no significant difference between the  
233 different slaughterhouses was observed for the percentages of *campylobacter* isolation from transport  
234 crates before and after cleaning procedures ( $p > 0.05$ ). Different types of transport crates are used to  
235 transport poultry: those for turkeys are made with metal and those for chickens in plastic. No  
236 significant difference in *campylobacter* isolation percentage was observed between the two types of  
237 transport crate (data not shown,  $p > 0.05$ ). *C. jejuni* was isolated from 28, and *C. coli* from 12 of the  
238 35 positive samples before cleaning, and in 28 and 9 respectively of the 33 positive samples after  
239 cleaning. No significant difference between the isolation percentages of the two *campylobacter*  
240 species from transport crates was observed before or after cleaning procedures ( $p > 0.05$ ) data not  
241 shown).

242 Results of sampling from slaughterhouse equipment are shown in table 4. *Campylobacter* was  
243 recovered in all slaughterhouses before cleaning and in 3 of the 4 slaughterhouses after cleaning.

244 Campylobacter was isolated from 80 % (36/45) of surface sample swabs taken before cleaning and  
245 from 18 % (10/56) of swabs collected after cleaning. No difference was observed between the different  
246 positive slaughterhouses nor the different sample sites (data not shown) ( $p > 0.05$ ).

247 Both species could be isolated from the same sample. We isolated *C. jejuni* from 29 of the 36 positive  
248 samples, and *C. coli* from 10 samples before cleaning, and from 9 and 1 respectively of the 10 positive  
249 samples after cleaning. There was no statistically significant difference between species isolation  
250 percentages on equipment surfaces before and after cleaning ( $p > 0.05$ ).

251 Campylobacter was detected in 71% (5/7) of water samples taken before cleaning and in none of the  
252 water samples collected after cleaning of the scald tank.

253

### 254 3.3. Susceptibility to antibiotics before and after cleaning and disinfection

255

256 In transport crates, 142 *C. jejuni* isolates and 44 *C. coli* isolates were collected. The antibiotics and  
257 disinfectant MICs of all isolates collected from transport crate samples were measured. None of the  
258 isolates of *C. jejuni* and *C. coli* from transport crate samples was resistant to gentamicin and none of  
259 the *C. jejuni* isolates was resistant to streptomycin (data not shown). All isolates of *C. coli* collected  
260 from transport crates were resistant to tetracycline. No statistically significant difference was observed  
261 between resistance percentage to antibiotics before and after cleaning of transport crates.

262 An isolate is considered multidrug resistant when it is resistant to more than one antibiotic. No  
263 statistically significant differences in multidrug resistant percentages before and after cleaning were  
264 observed for either *C. jejuni* or *C. coli* from transport crates (data not shown,  $p > 0.05$ ).

265 From surface samples of slaughterhouse equipment, 135 isolates were collected, 85 % (115/135)  
266 were *C. jejuni* and 15 % (20/135) *C. coli* (Table 4). As shown in Table 4, only one isolate of *C. coli*  
267 was collected after cleaning, so the resistance percentages before and after cleaning were compared  
268 for *C. jejuni* only. No *C. jejuni* isolates from swabs of slaughterhouse equipment were resistant to  
269 gentamicin. The histogram of antibiotic resistant percentages before and after cleaning is shown in  
270 Figure 1. No statistically significant difference between resistances to tetracycline, erythromycin,  
271 enrofloxacin and streptomycin ( $p > 0.05$ ) were observed before and after cleaning. A significant  
272 difference was observed for ampicillin, (Fisher exact test:  $p = 0.042$ ). Isolates obtained after cleaning

273 were less resistant to ampicillin than isolates obtained before cleaning. The overall results in Figure 1  
274 show a slight decrease in the level of antibiotic resistance.

275 A complete antibiotic resistance pattern was obtained for only 96 *C. jejuni* isolates. The antibiotic  
276 resistance profiles of *C. jejuni* isolates collected before and after cleaning procedures are shown in  
277 Table 5. We observed 9 phenotypes before cleaning and 5 after, but differences between the profile  
278 distributions before and after cleaning were not significant (Chi<sup>2</sup> test,  $p > 0.05$ ).

279 A statistically significant difference was observed between the multidrug resistant percentage before  
280 and after cleaning of the equipment surfaces. *C. jejuni* isolates collected after cleaning were less  
281 multidrug resistant than those collected before cleaning (Chi<sup>2</sup> test,  $p = 0.011$ )

282

### 283 3.4. Disinfectant susceptibility before and after cleaning and disinfection

284

285 The MIC distributions for benzalkonium chloride and didecyl-dimethyl-ammonium chloride were  
286 examined for isolates from transport crates and equipment surfaces before and after cleaning. Figure  
287 2 shows the histograms of isolates collected before and after cleaning from equipment surfaces. The  
288 MIC distributions of the disinfectant are monomodal and limited to only a few values. No difference  
289 between the MIC distributions before and after cleaning was observed for transport crates and  
290 equipment surfaces ( $p > 0.05$ ).

291

### 292 3.5. Correlation between the distributions of antibiotic MICs and disinfectant MICs

293

294 A Spearman correlation matrix was calculated for the 6 distributions of antibiotic MICs and the 2  
295 distributions of disinfectant MICs. A correlation between MICs distribution of gentamicin and  
296 streptomycin (antibiotics of the aminoglycoside family) was observed for both species ( $r = 0.479$  for *C.*  
297 *jejuni* and  $0.571$  for *C. coli*). Another correlation was observed for both species between quaternary  
298 ammonium molecules ( $r = 0.684$  for *C. jejuni* and  $0.514$  for *C. coli*). No correlation was observed  
299 between antibiotic and disinfectant MICs.

300

### 301 3.6. Genotypes of isolates collected after cleaning and disinfection

302

303 Twenty-five *C. jejuni* isolates collected after cleaning were genotyped. Profiles of *pflA/gyrA* and *flaA*  
304 migrations are shown in figure 3. Eight different genotypes were apparent from *pflA/gyrA* (A, B, C, D,  
305 E or F) and *flaA* profiles (a, b, c, d, e, f, g and h). Most genotypes (6/8) were recovered from only one  
306 sampling location. One genotype (Bb) was recovered from 4 different sampling sites, and one (De)  
307 from 3 different sampling sites. Conversely, two genotypes (Bb and Cc) were observed at the same  
308 site (Table 6). No isolate with the same genotype was ever recovered during successive visits to the  
309 same slaughterhouse. One to 10 *C. jejuni* isolates were collected from each slaughterhouse after  
310 cleaning, (mean=5). No more than two genotypes were observed during any slaughterhouse visit after  
311 cleaning.

312

#### 313 4. Discussion

314

315 Campylobacter are the most fastidious and stress-sensitive of the common food-borne pathogens  
316 (Park, 2002). However their mechanisms of survival are such that they can survive in the  
317 slaughterhouse environment and also survive cleaning procedures.

318 Different methods and disinfectant molecules were used to clean and disinfect the transport crates in  
319 the four slaughterhouses visited, with or without reversal of the crates. However, organic matter was  
320 still regularly detected on the washed crates in all slaughterhouses. This has already been reported in  
321 other studies (Berrang and Northcutt, 2005; Slader et al., 2002). Disinfection had no effect on the  
322 percentage of campylobacter isolation from transport crates in our study. Other investigations have  
323 revealed that the cleaning process had little (if any) effect on the campylobacter status of transport  
324 crates (Slader et al., 2002). This observation is of concern for public health as it has also been  
325 demonstrated that transport crates can be a source of campylobacter-free flock contamination by  
326 campylobacter (Newell et al., 2001). None of the treatments eliminated campylobacter as the organic  
327 matter protected bacteria from contact with disinfectant molecules and decreased the efficiency of  
328 these molecules.

329 The equipment in the four slaughterhouses visited was cleaned and disinfected by an outside  
330 company. The procedures were relatively standardized, starting in all cases with removal of the  
331 organic matter with high-pressure water, then application of detergent and disinfectant molecules to

332 surfaces presumed free of organic matter. Although little information is available about campylobacter  
333 susceptibility to disinfectant, this pathogen is generally considered susceptible to the disinfectants  
334 used in the food industry, especially quaternary ammonium and chlorine compounds (Avrain et al.,  
335 2003; Blaser et al., 1986; Wang et al., 1983). To our knowledge, this is the first description of  
336 campylobacter isolates collected from equipment surfaces in poultry slaughterhouses after cleaning. A  
337 few studies have been carried out to detect campylobacter after cleaning in the food industry  
338 environment (Borck and Pedersen, 2005; Cools et al., 2005; Malakauskas et al., 2006; Miwa et al.,  
339 2003). All samples collected after cleaning in those studies were negative for campylobacter although  
340 there was an enrichment step, as in our study. We were able to detect campylobacter in three of the  
341 four slaughterhouses visited, after cleaning. No organic matter was visually detectable on surface  
342 samples (evisceration machines, conveyor belts), but feathers were observed on the rubber fingers of  
343 the defeathering machines in some cases. However, this had no effect on isolation percentages, and  
344 no difference was observed between the isolation percentages in samples from different sample sites.  
345 All samples of scald water taken before the start of processing on the second sampling day were  
346 negative for campylobacter. These results are in agreement with those of other authors (Borck and  
347 Pedersen, 2005). However, even after refilling the cleaned and disinfected scald tank, organic matter,  
348 such as feathers and dust, was still present in the water samples. The amount of water sampled may  
349 have been too small, and the limit of our detection method lower than the number of campylobacter  
350 cells present in the water in the cleaned scald tank. Another hypothesis is that campylobacter may not  
351 be detectable with our traditional microbiological method. Campylobacter is able to enter a viable but  
352 non-cultivable form (VNC) under stress conditions such as starvation and the hypo-osmotic stress  
353 encountered in aqueous environments (Rollins and Colwell, 1986). Further experiments should be  
354 developed to detect the viable but non-cultivable form of the pathogen and see if campylobacter was  
355 present in the scald tank water at the beginning of processing.

356 Although the mechanisms of resistance to disinfectant are poorly known, it is important to understand  
357 why certain bacteria survive after an apparently effective cleaning programme so that the procedure  
358 can be improved to avoid contamination of raw materials and products with pathogens and spoilage  
359 organisms present on surfaces in contact with food (Langsrud et al., 2003). Characterisation of the  
360 campylobacter strains isolated after cleaning would be promising in terms of control. Twenty-five  
361 isolates of *C. jejuni* but only one *C. coli* were collected after cleaning of equipment surfaces. There



362 was no statistically significant difference between the isolation percentages of *C. jejuni* and *C. coli*  
363 before and after cleaning but this result may be biased due to the small number of isolates recovered  
364 after cleaning: *C. jejuni* was detected in 9 (90%), and *C. coli* in only 1 (10 %) of the 10 positive  
365 samples. Nevertheless, this suggests that *C. coli* may be more sensitive than *C. jejuni* or may be more  
366 stressed and then, more difficult to recover after a cleaning procedure. Similarly, in another study  
367 (Slader et al., 2002), it was suspected that the *C. coli* strain isolated from poultry before processing  
368 was less robust than the strains of *C. jejuni* and could not survive processing. In our study, the  
369 isolation method and more particularly the enrichment step, cannot be involved because strictly the  
370 same procedure was used for samples collected before and after cleaning.

371 The aim of our study was to characterise and compare campylobacter isolates obtained before with  
372 those obtained after cleaning. We therefore attempted to see if isolates collected after cleaning  
373 showed reduced sensitivity to quaternary ammonium compounds. The choice of disinfectant  
374 molecules in our study was limited to quaternary ammonium compounds: firstly, they are widely used  
375 in the food-industry (and in at least two of the visited slaughterhouses), and secondly, they can be  
376 used in the dilution agar method of MIC measurement. The distribution of quaternary ammonium MICs  
377 was found to be monomodal and limited to a few values. Isolates collected after cleaning did not show  
378 higher MICs to quaternary ammonium compounds than isolates collected before. However, firm  
379 conclusions cannot be drawn due to the small number of isolates collected after cleaning. Also, MIC  
380 measurement may not be the method of choice for studying disinfectant susceptibility, since the aim of  
381 disinfection is primarily not to prevent growth, but to kill microorganisms. The MIC determination  
382 method may not be suitable to reveal the distinctive features that enable *C. jejuni* strains to persist on  
383 surfaces after cleaning. Nevertheless, in the food processing industry, disinfectants may be left on  
384 surfaces with the resulting possibility of prolonged exposure of the micro-organism to the disinfectant  
385 used (Bore and Langsrud, 2005), and for that reason, bacteria may be exposed to disinfectant  
386 concentrations close to those used in MIC measurement.

387 The antibiotic phenotype of isolates obtained before and after cleaning procedures was determined,  
388 because it has been widely suspected that disinfectant may select for antibiotic resistance (Russell,  
389 2000). The cleaning of transport crates had no effect on the antibiotic resistance percentage or the  
390 antibiotic phenotypes of isolates. The *C. jejuni* isolates obtained after cleaning of surfaces showed a  
391 decreased degree of ampicillin resistance and multiresistance percentage compared to those obtained



392 before cleaning. This “in situ” observation does not suggest a cross-resistance or co-resistance  
393 between antibiotics and disinfectants. These results are in agreement with other experiments that did  
394 not show any cross- or co-resistance between biocides and antibiotics (Lear et al., 2006; Ledder et al.,  
395 2006). Our correlation matrix confirmed the absence of cross-resistance between antibiotics and  
396 quaternary ammonium MICs. At the same time, the validity of the data was confirmed by correlations  
397 between molecules of the same chemical family. Our results contradict our initial hypothesis and  
398 suggest that cleaning procedures do not select for antibiotic resistance in *C. jejuni* and *C. coli* species  
399 and seem to reduce the levels of resistance and multiresistance.

400 To survive in the environment, bacteria must respond to several stresses such as low nutrient  
401 concentrations and non-ideal growth conditions (Russell, 2003) and certain genotypes are likely to be  
402 better adapted to survive such stresses. Restriction fragment length polymorphism (RFLP) is a  
403 recommended method for typing poultry *Campylobacter* strains during the slaughtering process  
404 because of its low levels of strain non-typeability, acceptable levels of discriminatory power, and cost-  
405 effectiveness (Newell et al., 2001). Moreover, *flaA* typing has proven to be stable during storage  
406 (Wassenaar and Newell, 2000). Our results are probably biased due to the few isolates collected  
407 after cleaning but still, they do suggest that only a limited number of genotypes are recovered after  
408 cleaning. Two genotypes were recovered from 3 to 4 different locations in slaughterhouse B, which  
409 was the most contaminated, strongly suggesting that these genotypes possess the ability to survive a  
410 routine cleaning procedure. *C. jejuni* is well known for its genome plasticity which may increase its  
411 potential to adapt and survive in hostile environments (Murphy et al., 2006). By the end of the working  
412 day, the slaughterhouse environment is heavily contaminated with campylobacter as a result of cross  
413 contamination of surfaces from the different flocks slaughtered. Evidence of both the repeated  
414 isolation of similar strains and the isolation of multiple genetically and phenotypically distinct strains  
415 within individual slaughterhouses, before cleaning, has been reported (Steele et al., 1998). Only  
416 similar genotype isolates were isolated after cleaning in our study. Quantitative analysis of  
417 campylobacter contamination on surfaces should be done to provide information about logarithmic  
418 decrease after cleaning. It would also allow to find out if strains recovered after cleaning were the  
419 most numerous before or if specific mechanisms are involved in their survival. The scope of  
420 investigations now needs to be broadened to include biofilms in which bacteria are relatively resistant  
421 to changes in environmental conditions, antimicrobial agents and host immune responses. The

422 hypothesis that *C. jejuni* cells form a biofilm to survive adverse conditions between animal hosts  
423 (Joshua et al., 2006) is attractive although another study indicated that *C. jejuni* in biofilms was  
424 susceptible to all the sanitizers tested (Trachoo and Frank, 2002).

425 In conclusion, our results show that *C. jejuni* and *C. coli* can survive overnight on the surfaces of  
426 slaughterhouse equipment after cleaning procedures. These procedures did not select for antibiotic  
427 resistance in *C. jejuni* in our study. Our results also suggest that specific genotypes have the ability to  
428 survive routine cleaning procedures. The mechanisms of survival of *Campylobacter* in the  
429 environment remain elusive which is one reason why these bacteria continue to pose a serious threat  
430 to public health. Understanding these survival mechanisms should facilitate the implementation of  
431 better targeted strategies and reduce the public health burden associated with *Campylobacter*  
432 infection.

433

#### 434 **Acknowledgements**

435

436 We thank the staff at slaughterhouses for making this study possible. We are very grateful to I. Kempf  
437 for critical reading of the manuscript and comments.

438

#### 439 **References**

440

441 AFNOR, 1996, Microbiologie des aliments: méthode horizontale pour la recherche de campylobacter  
442 thermotolérants, In: ISO 10272, N. (Ed.)Paris: Association française de normalisation, pp. 11-  
443 14.

444 Anonymous 2003. Trends and sources of zoonotic agents in animals, feedingstuffs, food and man in  
445 the European Union and Norway in 2003. (European commission, Health and Consumer  
446 Protection Directorate D - Food safety: Production and distribution Chain), pp. 191-197.

447 Anonymous 2006. Rapport du programme français de surveillance de l'antibiorésistance des bactéries  
448 d'origine animale (AFSSA).


449 Avrain, L., Allain, L., Vernozy-Rozand, C., Kempf, I., 2003, Disinfectant susceptibility testing of avian  
450 and swine *Campylobacter* isolates by a filtration method. Vet Microbiol 96, 35-40.

- 451 Berrang, M.E., Northcutt, J.K., 2005, Use of water spray and extended drying time to lower bacterial  
452 numbers on soiled flooring from broiler transport coops. *Poult Sci* 84, 1797-1801.
- 453 Blaser, M.J., Smith, P.F., Wang, W.L., Hoff, J.C., 1986, Inactivation of *Campylobacter jejuni* by  
454 chlorine and monochloramine. *Appl Environ Microbiol* 51, 307-311.
- 455 Borck, B., Pedersen, K., 2005, Pulsed-field gel electrophoresis types of *Campylobacter* spp. in Danish  
456 turkeys before and after slaughter. *Int J Food Microbiol* 101, 63-72.
- 457 Bore, E., Langsrud, S., 2005, Characterization of micro-organisms isolated from dairy industry after  
458 cleaning and fogging disinfection with alkyl amine and peracetic acid. *J Appl Microbiol* 98, 96-  
459 105.
- 460 Cools, I., Uyttendaele, M., Cerpentier, J., D'Haese, E., Nelis, H.J., Debevere, J., 2005, Persistence of  
461 *Campylobacter jejuni* on surfaces in a processing environment and on cutting boards. *Lett*  
462 *Appl Microbiol* 40, 418-423.
- 463 Denis, M., Refregier-Petton, J., Laisney, M.J., Ermel, G., Salvat, G., 2001, *Campylobacter*  
464 contamination in French chicken production from farm to consumers. Use of a PCR assay for  
465 detection and identification of *Campylobacter jejuni* and *Camp. coli*. *J Appl Microbiol* 91, 255-  
466 267.
- 467 Goossens, H., De Boeck, M., Butzler, J.P., 1983, A new selective medium for the isolation of  
468 *Campylobacter jejuni* from human faeces. *Eur J Clin Microbiol* 2, 389-393.
- 469 Joshua, G.W., Guthrie-Irons, C., Karlyshev, A.V., Wren, B.W., 2006, Biofilm formation in  
470 *Campylobacter jejuni*. *Microbiology* 152, 387-396.
- 471 Langsrud, S., Singh Sidhu, M., Heir, E., Holck, A.L., 2003, Bacterial disinfectant resistance-a  
472 challenge for the food industry. *Int Biodeter & Biodegrad* 51, 283-290.
- 473 Lear, J.C., Maillard, J.Y., Dettmar, P.W., Goddard, P.A., Russell, A.D., 2006, Chloroxyleneol- and  
474 triclosan-tolerant bacteria from industrial sources-susceptibility to antibiotics and other  
475 biocides. *Int Biodeter & Biodegrad* 57, 51-56.
- 476 Ledder, R.G., Gilbert, P., Willis, C., McBain, A.J., 2006, Effects of chronic triclosan exposure upon the  
477 antimicrobial susceptibility of 40 ex-situ environmental and human isolates. *J Appl Microbiol*  
478 100, 1132-1140.

- 479 Malakauskas, M., Jorgensen, K., Nielsen, E.M., Ojeniyi, B., Olsen, J.E., 2006, Isolation of  
480 *Campylobacter* spp. from a pig slaughterhouse and analysis of cross-contamination. Int J  
481 Food Microbiol 108, 295-300.
- 482 Miwa, N., Takegahara, Y., Terai, K., Kato, H., Takeuchi, T., 2003, *Campylobacter jejuni* contamination  
483 on broiler carcasses of *C. jejuni*-negative flocks during processing in a Japanese  
484 slaughterhouse. Int J Food Microbiol 84, 105-109.
- 485 Murphy, C., Carroll, C., Jordan, K.N., 2006, Environmental survival mechanisms of the foodborne  
486 pathogen *Campylobacter jejuni*. J Appl Microbiol 100, 623-632.
- 487 NCCLS, 2002, Approved standard M31-A2-NCCLS, In: Performance standards for antimicrobial disk  
488 and dilution susceptibility tests for bacteria isolated from animals. Wayne, Pa.
- 489 NCCLS, 2003, Approved standard M7-A6-NCCLS, In: Method for detection: antimicrobial susceptibility  
490 tests for bacteria that growth aerobically. Wayne, Pa.
- 491 Newell, D.G., Shreeve, J.E., Toszeghy, M., Domingue, G., Bull, S., Humphrey, T., Mead, G., 2001,  
492 Changes in the carriage of campylobacter strains by poultry carcasses during processing in  
493 abattoirs. Appl Environ Microbiol 67, 2636-2640.
- 494 Park, S.F., 2002, The physiology of *Campylobacter* species and its relevance to their role as  
495 foodborne pathogens. Int J Food Microbiol 74, 177-188.
- 496 Park, S.F., 2005, *Campylobacter jejuni* stress responses during survival in the food chain and  
497 colonization., In: *Campylobacter* -Molecular and cellular biology. Horizon Bioscience, pp. 311-  
498 330.
- 499 Ragimbeau, C., Salvat, G., Colin, P., Ermel, G., 1998, Development of a multiplex PCR gene  
500 fingerprinting method using *gyrA* and *pflA* polymorphisms to identify genotypic relatedness  
501 within *Campylobacter jejuni* species. J Appl Microbiol 85, 829-838.
- 502 Rollins, D.M., Colwell, R.R., 1986, Viable but nonculturable stage of *Campylobacter jejuni* and its role  
503 in survival in the natural aquatic environment. Appl Environ Microbiol 52, 531-538.
- 504 Russell, A.D., 2000, Do biocides select for antibiotic resistance? J Pharm Pharmacol 52, 227-233.
- 505 Russell, A.D., 2003, Biocide use and antibiotic resistance: the relevance of laboratory findings to  
506 clinical and environmental situations. Lancet Infect Dis 3, 794-803.

- 507 Slader, J., Domingue, G., Jorgensen, F., McAlpine, K., Owen, R.J., Bolton, F.J., Humphrey, T.J.,  
508 2002, Impact of transport crate reuse and of catching and processing on *Campylobacter* and  
509 *Salmonella* contamination of broiler chickens. Appl Environ Microbiol 68, 713-719.
- 510 Steele, M., McNab, B., Fruhner, L., DeGrandis, S., Woodward, D., Odumeru, J.A., 1998,  
511 Epidemiological typing of *Campylobacter* isolates from meat processing plants by pulsed-field  
512 gel electrophoresis, fatty acid profile typing, serotyping, and biotyping. Appl Environ Microbiol  
513 64, 2346-2349.
- 514 Trachoo, N., Frank, J.F., 2002, Effectiveness of chemical sanitizers against *Campylobacter jejuni*-  
515 containing biofilms. J Food Prot 65, 1117-1121.
- 516 Wang, W.L., Powers, B.W., Leuchtefeld, N.W., Blaser, M.J., 1983, Effects of disinfectants on  
517 *Campylobacter jejuni*. Appl Environ Microbiol 45, 1202-1205.
- 518 Wassenaar, T.M., Newell, D.G., 2000, Genotyping of *Campylobacter* spp. Appl Environ Microbiol 66,  
519 1-9.
- 520

Fig. 1. Antibiotic resistance percentage of *C. jejuni* isolates from equipment swab samples before and after cleaning and disinfection



\* significant difference ( $p < 0.05$ )



Before cleaning & disinfection



After cleaning & disinfection


Fig. 2. Distribution of quaternary ammonium MICs of *C. jejuni* isolates collected before and after cleaning and disinfection on surfaces of slaughterhouse equipment



Before cleaning & disinfection (n=85)

After cleaning & disinfection (n=23)

Fig. 3. *Pfla/gyrA* and *flaA* profiles of *C. jejuni* isolates collected on surfaces after cleaning and disinfection



Sample sites 1- 2 : fingers of defeathering machines; sample sites 3-8 and 10: evisceration machines; sample site 9: conveyor belts. The *Pfla/gyrA* profile D not obtained for one isolate from slaughter B (sample site 8) was confirmed by further determination



Table 1.

List of primers used for identification and typing of campylobacter isolates

Target gene	Primers	Sequence	Annealing temperature (°C)	PCR-product (bp)	Reference
<i>mapA</i>	MDmapA1	5' CTA TTT TAT TTT TGA GTG CTT GTG 3'	52	589	Denis et al., 2001
	MDmapA2	5' GCT TTA TTT GCC ATT TGT TTT ATT A 3'			
<i>ceuE</i>	MDCOL3	5' AAT TGA AAA TTG CTC CAA CTA TG 3'	52	462	Denis et al., 2001
	MDCOL2	5' TGA TTT TAT TAT TTG TAG CAG CG 3'			
<i>pflA</i>	PFLA1	5' GAG CTT GTT TTA AAC ACG GGT CGC 3'	60	2026	Ragimbeau et al.,1998
	PFLA2	5' TGA TAG TCA ATG GCC TTA GGT GCG 3'			
<i>gyrA</i>	GYR1	5' CTG GTT CTA GCC TTT TGG AAG C 3'	60	2661	Ragimbeau et al.,1998
	GYR2	5' GGA CAC TTA GCG ATG CTA ACC A 3'			
<i>flaA</i>	Pg50	5' ATG GGA TTT CGT ATT AAC 3'	45	1448	Alm et al., 1993
	RAA19	5' GCA CCY TTA AGW GTR GTT ACA CCT GC 3'			

Table 2.

Range of concentrations for antibiotics and disinfectants and breakpoints for antibiotics (according to CA-SFM 2007)

Antibiotic	Concentration ( $\mu\text{g/ml}$ )	Resistance breakpoint ( $\mu\text{g/ml}$ )
Ampicillin	2-32	> 16
Tetracycline	1-64	> 8
Erythromycin	0.25-32	> 4
Gentamicin	0.25-8	> 4
Enrofloxacin	0.25-16	> 1
Streptomycin	1-64	> 16
Benzalkonium chloride	0.5-32	
Didecyl-dimethyl-ammonium chloride	0.5-32	

Table 3.

Disinfectant products : composition, concentration and contact time used in the 3 visited slaughterhouses

		Product	Composition	Concentration	Contact time
Slaughter A	Transport crates	Deptil G4 <sup>®</sup>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lauryl-dimethyl-benzyl ammonium chloride</li> <li>• Glutaraldehyde</li> </ul>	1%	nd <sup>1</sup>
	Equipment	Galox-Azur <sup>®</sup>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lauryl-dimethyl-benzyl ammonium chloride</li> <li>• Glutaraldehyde</li> </ul>	1%	20 minutes
Slaughter B	Transport crates	Baso agri+ <sup>®</sup>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sodium hypochloride</li> </ul>	nd	nd
	Equipment	Divosan 2000 <sup>®</sup>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Dimethyl-dialkyl ammonium chloride</li> <li>• Glutaraldehyde</li> </ul>	3%	nd
Slaughter D	Transport crates	Hyprelva 4+ <sup>®</sup>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Didecyl-dimethyl ammonium chloride</li> <li>• Formaldehyde</li> <li>• Glutaraldehyde</li> <li>• Glyoxal</li> </ul>	1.5%	nd
	Equipment	Indaluve <sup>®</sup>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Poly(hexamethylene biguanide) chlorhydrate</li> <li>• Butylglycol</li> </ul>	1%	15 minutes

<sup>1</sup>: not determined ie the slaughterhouse didn't provide the information

Table 4.

Results of sampling from equipment in the four slaughterhouses

	Cleaning and disinfection	No. of positive visits/ No. of visits	No of positive samples/ No. of samples	No of positive samples with <i>C. jejuni</i> / No. of positive samples	No. of positive samples with <i>C. coli</i> / No. of positive samples	No. of <i>C. jejuni</i> isolates	No. of <i>C. coli</i> isolates
Slaughter A	Before	1/1	6/6	5/6	2/6	20	4
	After	0/1	0/6	0	0	0	0
Slaughter B	Before	2/2	14/14	13/14	1/14	43	4
	After	2/3	7/22	7/7	0/7	19	0
Slaughter C	Before	1/1	3/6	3/3	0/3	5	0
	After	1/1	1/9	1/1	0/1	1	0
Slaughter D	Before	4/4	13/19	8/13	7/13	22	11
	After	2/4	2/19	1/2	1/2	5	1
Total	Before	8/8	36/45	29/36	10/36	90	19
	After	5/9	10/56	9/10	1/10	25	1

Table 5.

Antibiotic resistance profiles of *C. jejuni* isolates collected on slaughterhouse equipment surfaces before and after cleaning and disinfection

No. resistance	Resistance profile <sup>1</sup>	Before cleaning and disinfection			After cleaning and disinfection		
		No. of isolates	%	95% CI <sup>2</sup>	No. of isolates	%	95% CI
1	E	17	23	[14-35]	8	35	[16-57]
1	S	0	0	[0-5]	1	4	[0-22]
1	T	18	25	[15-36]	7	31	[13-53]
2	ES	4	6	[2-13]	0	0	[0-15]
2	TA	1	1	[0-7]	0	0	[0-15]
2	TAS	1	1	[0-7]	0	0	[0-15]
2	TE	1	1	[0-7]	0	0	[0-15]
3	TEA	13	18	[10-29]	1	4	[0-22]
3	TES	2	3	[0-10]	0	0	[0-15]
0	Susceptible	16	22	[13-33]	6	26	[10-48]
	Total	73	100		23	100	

<sup>1</sup> E: enrofloxacin resistant; S: streptomycin resistant; T: tetracycline resistant; A: ampicillin resistant; Susceptible to all antibiotics tested

<sup>2</sup> CI : confident interval

Table 6.

Samples sites of *Pfla/gyrA* and *flaA* profiles of *C. jejuni* isolates collected on surfaces after cleaning and disinfection

	Visit	Sample site	<i>Pfla/gyrA</i> type	<i>flaA</i> type
Slaughter B	1	Fingers of defeathering machines	B	b
		Evisceration machines	B	b
			C	c
	2	Evisceration machines	D	e
		Conveyor belts	D	e
			E	e
Slaughter C		Fingers of defeathering machines	A	a
Slaughter D	1	Evisceration machines	A	d
	2	Evisceration machines	F	f
			A	g