DOI: 10.5433/1679-0359.2022v43n5p2093

# Antimicrobial resistance profiles in *Escherichia coli* isolated from whole-chicken carcasses from conventional, antibiotic-free, and organic rearing systems

Perfil de resistência em *Escherichia coli* isoladas de carcaças de frango provenientes de sistemas de produção convencional, livre de antibióticos e orgânico

Tatiana Regina Vieira<sup>1</sup>\*; Esther Ferrazza Cavinatto de Oliveira<sup>2</sup>; Samuel Paulo Cibulski<sup>3</sup>; Mauro Riegert Borba<sup>4</sup>; Marisa Cardoso<sup>4</sup>

# Highlights \_

Low resistance to antimicrobials in *Escherichia coli* isolated from chicken carcasses. The highest frequencies of resistance against tetracycline and trimethoprim. Chicken from the organic system presented a lower frequency of MDR *Escherichia coli*. Chicken from the organic system presented a higher frequency of TSUS *Escherichia coli*.

# Abstract .

Antimicrobial resistance (AMR) is a growing concern in human and animal health. Public discussions on these issues have contributed to an increased demand for antibiotic-free food. Studies comparing the antimicrobial resistance profiles of bacteria in foodstuffs originating from farming systems with restrictions on the use of antimicrobials are scarce. This study aimed to assess the antimicrobial resistance profiles of generic *Escherichia coli* isolated from whole chickens originating from farming systems with and without restrictions on the use of antimicrobials. For this purpose, three groups of *E. coli* strains were formed: (GC) from chickens reared in conventional production systems, without restriction on the use of antimicrobials (n=72); (GL) from chickens reared in farming systems certified as free of any antibiotic use (n=72); and (GO) from chickens from an organic farming system (n=72). Whole chicken units were individually rinsed as recommended by ISO 17604:2015, and *E. coli* was isolated from the rinse suspension. To evaluate the resistance profile, *E. coli* strains were tested against 12 antimicrobials using broth microdilution or disk diffusion tests. Eighty strains

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Pos-Doc, Dr<sup>a</sup>, Faculdade de Veterinária, Universidade Federal do Rio Grande do Sul, UFRGS, Porto Alegre, RS, Brazil. E-mail: tatianareginavieira@gmail.com

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> Student of the Biology Undergraduate Course, UFRGS, Porto Alegre, RS, Brazil. E-mail: esthercavinatto@gmail.com

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> Prof. Dr., Universidade Federal da Paraíba, UFPB, João Pessoa, PB, Brazil. E-mail: spcibulski@gmail.com

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup> Profs. Drs., Faculdade de Veterinária, UFRGS, Porto Alegre, RS, Brazil. E-mail: mauro.borba@ufrgs.br; mcardoso@ ufrgs.br

<sup>\*</sup> Author for correspondence

(40.7%) were found to be fully susceptible to the tested antimicrobials, and 23.6% were multidrug resistant. The highest frequencies of resistance were observed to tetracycline (GC=37,5%; GL=34,7%; GO=25%) and trimethoprim (GC=27,8%; GL=34,7%; GO=22,2%). In the case of multidrug resistant strains, GC presented 32% (n=23) of strains with multidrug resistance characteristics whereas the GL and GO groups presented 22% (n=16) and 17% (n=12), respectively. As for the totally susceptible strains, a frequency of 56% of Tsus strains was observed in the organic group, whereas this frequency was 33% in the GC and GL groups. Using GC as a reference, the Poisson regression model showed a higher occurrence of fully susceptible *E. coli* strains, as well as lower frequencies of multidrug resistance and resistance to ampicillin and nalidixic acid in GO. The GL group exhibited the lowest frequency of ampicillin resistance. These observations suggest that the lower selection pressure for antimicrobial use in the farming system may be reflected in the resistance profile of bacteria present in foodstuffs purchased by consumers.

Key words: Alternative production system. Antibiotic restriction. Food-production animals. Public health.

#### **Resumo** .

A resistência antimicrobiana (AMR) é uma preocupação crescente para a saúde humana e animal. A discussão pública dessas questões tem contribuído para o aumento da demanda por alimentos produzidos sem o uso de antibióticos. No entanto, estudos que comparem os perfis de resistência antimicrobiana de bactérias em alimentos oriundos de sistemas agrícolas com restrição ao uso de antimicrobianos ainda são escassos. O objetivo deste estudo foi avaliar o perfil de resistência antimicrobiana em Escherichia coli genérica isolada de carcacas de frangos inteiros oriundos de sistemas de criação com e sem restrições ao uso de antimicrobianos. Para tanto, três grupos de cepas de E. coli foram formados: (GC) isolados de carcaças de frangos criados no sistema convencional - sem restrição de uso de antimicrobianos (n=72); (GL) isolados de frangos de sistemas certificados sem uso de antimicrobianos (n=72); (GO) de frangos originados de produção orgânica (n=72). As unidades de frango inteiro foram submetidas à lavagem conforme recomendado pela ISO 17604: 2015 e E. coli foi isolada da suspensão de enxágue. Para avaliar o perfil de resistência, as cepas de E. coli foram testadas frente à 12 antimicrobianos pelos testes de microdiluição em caldo ou difusão em disco. Oitenta cepas (40,7%) foram totalmente suscetíveis aos antimicrobianos testados e 23,6% multirresistentes. As maiores frequências de resistência foram observadas frente a tetraciclina (GC=37,5%; GL=34,7%; GO=25%) e trimetoprima (GC=27,8%; GL=34,7%; GO=22,2%). No caso de cepas multirresistentes, GC apresentou 32% (n=23) das cepas com características de multirresistência enquanto os grupos GL e GO apresentaram 22% (n=16) e 17% (n=12), respectivamente. Quanto às cepas totalmente suscetíveis, foi observada uma frequência de 56% de cepas Tsus no grupo orgânico enquanto tal frequência foi de 33% nos grupos GC e GL. Utilizando GC como referência, o modelo de regressão de Poisson demonstrou maior ocorrência de cepas de E. coli totalmente suscetíveis, bem como menores frequências de multirresistência e resistência à ampicilina e ácido nalidíxico no GO. Em GL, apenas a frequência mais baixa de resistência à ampicilina pôde ser demonstrada. Essas observações sugerem que a menor pressão de seleção do uso de antimicrobianos no sistema de cultivo pode se refletir no perfil de resistência das bactérias presentes nos alimentos adquiridos pelo consumidor.

**Palavras-chave:** Restrição de antibióticos. Animais de produção. Saúde pública. Sistemas de produção alternativa.

#### Introduction \_\_\_\_

Chicken meat is globally the main source of animal protein with consumption surpassing 98 million tons in 2019 (Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development [OECD], 2020). The success of poultry production has resulted from decades of genetic selection, nutrition, vaccines, new technologies, and improvements in sanitary management. However, the use of antimicrobials is assumed to have played a role in bringing industrial poultry farming to the current level of production.

Antimicrobial resistance is one of the top concerns in human and animal health. Among the players involved in the emergence and spread of antimicrobial resistance, intensive animal production systems are considered an important link in the selection of resistant bacteria (World Health Organization [WHO], 2015, 2019). Concerns regarding the spread of resistant bacteria have led many countries to adopt policies to control the use of antimicrobials in animal production, and in several cases, a complete ban has been placed on their use in prophylaxis and growth promotion (Agyare et al., 2018). However, initiatives towards the withdrawal of antimicrobial use in food animals have raised questions related to their effectiveness and the time span needed to reduce or eradicate antimicrobial-resistant populations (Millman et al., 2013; Davis et al., 2018; Roth et al., 2019). Investigations of resistant bacteria in animal production systems, in which antimicrobials have been withdrawn, can contribute to determining the frequency of resistance, especially with regard to antimicrobials classified as critically important to human health (WHO, 2019).

In this scenario, the livestock industry has looked for alternatives to reduce the use of antimicrobials; among them, organic and antibiotic-free breeding systems have emerged as options. In alternative farming systems, among other premises, is the withdrawal of antimicrobials used as growth promoters, prophylaxis, and restriction of therapeutic administration (Diaz-Sanchez et al., 2015; Demattê & Pereira, 2017). Consumers' perception of foodstuffs from alternative systems, such as organics, is that they are inherently safer than conventional systems. However, studies comparing the antimicrobial resistance profiles of bacteria in foodstuffs produced by alternative systems and those available to consumers are scarce. Specifically, there is a lack of understanding of how restriction on the use of antimicrobials on farm may be reflected in the resistance profile of bacteria in retail food. Therefore, the present study aimed to compare patterns of antimicrobial resistance in generic Escherichia coli isolated from frozen wholeoriginating from chicken conventional production systems and those from farming systems certified as having restricted use of antimicrobials.

# Materials and Methods \_\_\_\_\_

## Study design

A descriptive comparative study of the phenotypic profile of resistance to antimicrobials was carried out in generic *Escherichia coli* (*E. coli*) isolated from frozen whole chickens acquired in the Brazilian retail market. Based on the results of a pilot study, the sample size in each of the three groups was determined to be 72 *E. coli* strains in

order to detect a difference in proportions characterized by a variance of 0.01 with an average proportion of 0.66, assuming a 0.05 level Chi-square test and a power of 80%. The group of E. coli strains was formed according to the origin of isolation in terms of the whole-chicken carcass package information, as follows: (GC) from chickens reared in conventional production systems, without restriction on the use of antimicrobials as growth promoters, prophylaxis or therapeutic; (GL) from chickens reared in farming systems certified as free of any antibiotic use; (GO) from chickens from an organic farming system, in which the use of antimicrobials is not allowed in any of the production stages; however, diseased animals can be treated once in their lives, and the withdrawal period set by the organic regulation must be followed before slaughter. Antibiotic-free and organic farming was considered only when a certification seal was provided on the package. To include intra-sample diversity, three *E. coli* strains per whole chicken sample were included in each group. Therefore, 24 frozen whole chickens from each conventional, antibiotic-free, and organic farming system were purchased to obtain the number of *E. coli* strains.

All purchased products were frozen whole chickens, slaughtered under federal inspection, packaged in the industry, with or without giblets, and available in commercial establishments selling directly to the consumer. Retail markets were selected by convenience, considering the availability of products and access to points of sale. The purchased whole-chicken units belonged to different batches from five brands of the conventional production system, two brands of the antibiotic-free system, and one brand of the organic system.

# Isolation of Escherichia coli and grouping of strains according to the origin

Frozen whole-chicken samples were transported in cooling boxes to the laboratory and stored under refrigeration until they were completely thawed. The samples were then transferred to sterile plastic bags, weighed, and washed with 1% buffered peptone water (BPW), as recommended by ISO 17604:2015.

The enumeration of *E. coli* was performed after serial decimal dilutions (10<sup>-1</sup> to 10<sup>-6</sup>) of the liquid obtained from carcass washing. From the dilutions, 1mL aliquots were transferred, in duplicate, to plates containing chromogenic agar for E. coli (Chromocult® Merck Millipore), following the manufacturer's instructions. After incubation at 36 °C ± 1 °C for 24-hour, typical colonies (dark blue to violet) were counted, and the number of colony-forming units (CFU) per gram was calculated according to ISO 17604:2015 and ISO 6887-1:2017. In addition, 30mL of washing suspension was added to 30mL of BPW 1% for enrichment. After incubation at 36 °C ± 1 °C for 18-24h, serial dilutions of the enrichment broth were performed, followed by isolation on CHROMagar<sup>™</sup> E. coli. After incubation at 36 °C ± 1 °C for 18-24h, typical colonies of E. coli were selected in different quadrants of the plate.

The *E. coli* strains were formed from three colonies of each chicken sample obtained from Chromocult<sup>®</sup> or CHROMagar<sup>TM</sup> agar plates. In both cases, each *E. coli* typical colony were transferred to tryptic soy agar plates (TSA, Merck Millipore), and phenotypic confirmation of the species was performed as described by Quinn et al. (2011) or by matrix-assisted laser desorption ionization time of flight mass spectrometry (MALDI-ToF).



After confirmation, 72 strains were assigned according their isolation origin to each GC, GL, or GO, and were stored in skim milk with glycerol at -20 °C until the performance of susceptibility tests.

#### Antimicrobial susceptibility tests

Antimicrobial susceptibility was assessed by determining the minimum inhibitory concentration (MIC) or by agar diffusion test. The selection of antimicrobials was based on the importance of their use in human and veterinary medicine, following the panel determined by the Commission Decision Implementing 2013/652/EU (European Center for Disease Prevention and Control, European Food Safety Authority and Europe Medicines Agency [ECDC, EFSA, EMA], 2017). The minimum inhibitory concentration (MIC) was determined by the broth microdilution method in plastic 96well plates, as recommended by the Clinical and Laboratory Standards Institute [CLSI] (2020) for the following antimicrobials (Sigma-Aldrich): nalidixic acid (NAL), ampicillin (AMP), cefotaxime (CTX), ciprofloxacin (CIP), colistin (COL), gentamicin (GEN), and tetracycline (TET). The tested concentration range and cutoff points used in the interpretation of the results followed the recommendations of the European Committee on Antimicrobial Susceptibility Testing (EUCAST) and CLSI (2020). After the incubation period (24-hour at 36 °C ± 1 °C), the plates were examined visually, and the lowest concentration of an antimicrobial, in which no bacterial growth was observed, was considered the MIC of the antimicrobial for the tested isolate. Discs (Thermo Scientific Oxoid) of ceftazidimeCAZ (30  $\mu$ g), chloramphenicol-CLO (30  $\mu$ g), meropenem - MER (10  $\mu$ g), tigecycline - TIG (15  $\mu$ g), and trimethoprim (TRI; 5  $\mu$ g) were used in the agar diffusion test of the *E. coli* strains, performed as recommended (CLSI, 2018, 2020). *Escherichia coli* ATCC 25922 was used as quality control.

## Data analysis

The results were tabulated in a Microsoft Excel spreadsheet and exported to statistical software when necessary. The difference in the average of total antimicrobial-resistant isolates in the GC, GL, and GO groups was calculated using analysis of variance (ANOVA), as described by Millman et al. (2013). To verify the relationship of resistance, to each antimicrobial evaluated, and the three different groups (assuming GC as the basis), prevalence ratios (PR) were estimated using a *Poisson* regression model. This calculation was performed using R software (R Core Team [R], 2013), with the packages Epitools and Stat.

## **Results and Discussion** \_

There was no significant difference (p=0.72) in *E. coli* counts (CFU.g<sup>-1</sup>) on carcasses from different types. All whole-chicken samples had *E. coli* counts per gram within the microbiological limits  $(5x10^3)$  determined by the Brazilian legislation (Ministério da Saúde [MS], 2019a,b). Besides, 27 (37.5%) samples had counts lower than 1 CFU.g<sup>-1</sup> of *E. coli*, demonstrating that all products were suitable for consumption based on this indicator of hygienic quality.

The distribution of the MIC values of the isolated E. coli strains showed that MIC<sub>50</sub> in all groups of strains was much lower than the resistance breakpoint for all tested antimicrobials (Table 1). Moreover, no statistically significant difference (p>0.05) was observed between the mean MIC values for any of the antimicrobials among the three groups (p>0.05). Comparisons between group pairs also showed no statistical difference: GC × GL (p=0.96), GC × GO (p=0.06), and GL × GO (p=0.07). Considering that the selection pressure is supposed to benefit the multiplication of resistant bacteria (WHO, 2015; European Centre for Disease Prevention and Control, European Food Safety Authority & Europe Medicines Agency [ECDC, EFSA & EMA], 2017), it could be expected that in production systems with restricted use of antimicrobials, a modulation towards the reduction in antimicrobial MIC against bacterial populations will take place. In the present study, no significant difference

in the mean MIC values between the groups was detected. However, it must be taken into account that the average MIC levels were not particularly high even in the GC group, which encompassed E. coli strains isolated from chicken carcasses originating from rearing systems that were administered antimicrobials. Considering the importance of Brazil in the global market and the growing restrictions on the use of antimicrobials in animal production worldwide, it is possible to speculate that, even in conventional farming, the use of antibiotics might have been reduced in recent times. Despite the low diversity of brands available in the market for the GL (two brands) and GO (one brand) groups, this apparently did not influence the results obtained, because even with different management, there was no difference in the resistance averages between the groups. In addition, the focus of this study was to demonstrate the profile of bacterial resistance that reaches every consumer.

Table 1

Minimum Inhibitory Concentration values of antimicrobials for Escherichia coli strains isolated from whole-chicken carcasses originated from conventional (GC), antibiotic-free (GL) and organic (GO) farming systems

0         1         2         1         4         7         4           0         1         2         1         4         7         4         4           0         0         0         0         1         2         1         4         7         4           0         1         2         1         2         4         3         5         4         4           1         2         4         3         5         4         3         4           1         2         4         3         1         1         1         0           1         2         1         2         1         2         4         3         4           1         2         1         2         1         2         1         1         1           1         2         1         2         4         3         4         1           1         2         4         3         1         1         1         1           1         2         4         3         1         1         1         1           1         1         2
0         1         2         1         4         7         4           0         0         0         0         4         3         5         4         4           0         0         0         0         4         3         5         4         4           0         1         2         4         3         5         4         4           1         2         4         3         0         1         1         0           1         2         4         1         0         1         1         0         0           1         2         1         2         0         0         1         1         0           1         0         0         0         0         1         1         0         0           0         0         0         0         1         2         0         0         0           0         0         0         0         1         2         0         0         0           0         0         0         0         0         0         0         0         0         0
0         0         1         3         5         4         4           0.25         0.5         1         2         4         8         8         8         8         1         2         4         1         1         0.01         1         1         0.015         1         1         1         0.015         1         1         0         0.015         1         1         0         0.015         1         1         0         0.015         1         1         0         0.015         1         1         0         0.015         1         0         0         1         0         0.015         1         0         0         0         1         0         0.015         0 </td
0.25         0.5         1         2         4         8         8         MIC <sub>5</sub> 8         6         4         0         0         1         1         0         015           6         4         2         0         0         0         1         1         0         015           6         4         2         0         0         0         1         1         0         015           1         8         16         2         4         8         16         1         0         015           0         0         0         0         0         1         1         1         0         0           0         0         0         0         0         1         2         1         1         1         1           0         0         0         0         1         2         1         1         1           0         1         2         4         1         2         1         1           0         0         0         0         0         1         2         1         1           0         0
8         6         4         0         0         1         1         0015           7         4         2         0         0         1         1         0015           1         2         0         0         0         1         1         0015           1         8         16         1         0         1         1         0015           1         9         0         0         0         1         1         0         0           0         0         0         0         0         0         1         3         0015           0         0         0         0         0         0         1         3         0015           0         0         0         0         0         0         1         3         005           0         0         0         0         0         1         2         0         0           0         0         0         0         0         1         2         0         0           0         0         0         0         0         0         0         0         0         0
5         4         2         0         0         1         0015           0         4         1         0         0         1         3         0015           1         8         16         1         0         1         3         0015           0         0         0         0         1         3         0         0           0         0         0         0         1         3         0         0           0         0         0         1         2         1         3         0         0           0         0         0         0         1         2         1         3         0         0           0         0         0         0         1         2         1         3         0         0           0         0         0         1         2         1         2         0         0         0           0         1         2         1         2         2         1         1         1         1         1         1         1         1         1         1         1         1         1 <td< td=""></td<>
0         4         1         0         0         1         3         0015           1         8         16         1         1         3         0015           0         0         0         0         1         3         0015           0         0         0         1         2         1         3         0015           0         0         0         0         1         2         1         3         0015           0         0         0         0         1         2         4         3         1         0         0           0         0         0         0         1         2         1         1         1           0         0         0         0         1         2         1         1         1           0         0         0         1         2         1
0         0         0         0         0           0         0         0         0         0         1         1           0         0         0         0         0         0         1         1           0         0         0         0         0         0         1         1         1           0         0         0         0         0         1         2         1         1           0         0         0         0         1         2         4         2         1         1         1           0         0         0         1         2         4         2         1         2         1
0         0         0         1         2         1         1           0.5         1         2         4         8         16         32         MC <sub>50</sub> 0         0         0         0         0         1         2         4         8         16         32         MC <sub>50</sub> 0         0         0         0         1         0         1         0         06           0         0         0         1         2         64         1         2         0
0.5         1         2         4         8         16         32         MIC <sub>sol</sub> 0         0         0         0         0         1         0         1 <t< td=""></t<>
0         0         0         1         0
0         0         0         3         0         1         0,06           0         0         0         0         1         2         0         0,06           8         16         32         64         >64         >64         0,06           0         0         3         1         0         0         0,06           0         0         1         2         64         >64         >64         1           0         1         1         1         0         0         0,05           32         64         128         551         1         1         1           32         64         128         256         1         1         1           4         0         3         12         0         0         4           33         0         6         3         0         1         4           1         1         1         1         1         1         4           33         0         6         3         0         4         4           1         1         1         1         1         4         4
0         0
8         16         32         64         >64         >64         MIC.so           0         0         3         1         0         0         0.5           0         0         3         1         0         0         0.5           0         0         12         5         1         1         1           0         12         55         1         1         1           32         64         128         256         512         11           32         64         128         256         12         1         1           32         0         3         12         0         0         4         4           1         0         6         3         0         4         4           1         10         0         6         3         0         4         4           1         13         8         256         3         4         4           1         13         8         3         0         4         4           1         13         8         3         3         2         4           1
$ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$
0         0         12         5         1         1           0         8         1         1         1         1           0         8         1         1         1         1           32         64         128         256         512         2512         1           32         64         128         256         512         26         4         1           3         0         6         3         02         0         4         4           1         0         0         12         0         4         4           1         1         12         0         4         4         4           1         1         12         12         12         14         4           1         1         1         1         1         4         4           1         1         1         1         1         4         4           1         1         1         1         1         4         4           1         1         1         1         1         4         4           1         1
0       8       1       1       1       1         32       64       128       256       512       MC         4       0       3       12       556       512       MC         3       0       3       12       0       4       4         1       1       0       6       3       0       4         1       1       0       6       3       0       4         1       1       12       128       26       4       4         1       1       12       128       26       4       4         0       1       13       8       26       4       4         0       1       13       8       3       6       4         0       1       13       8       3       7       4         0       1       13       8       3       7       4         1       13       8       3       7       3       3         1       13       8       3       7       3       3       3         1       1       1       1       3
32       64       128       256       512       MIC.so         4       0       3       12       0       4         3       0       0       3       12       0       4         1       0       0       6       3       0       4         1       0       0       6       3       0       4         1       10       0       8       0       4         16       32       64       128       256       4         0       1       13       8       3       2         0       5       19       3       2       2         0       5       19       3       2       2         0       5       0       6       7       2         0       5       7       3       2       2
4       0       3       12       0       4         3       0       0       6       3       12       4         1       1       0       6       3       0       4         1       1       0       0       6       3       4         1       1       0       0       8       0       4         1       1       1       1       1       1       4         0       1       1       1       1       1       4         0       1       1       1       1       1       4         0       1       1       1       1       1       4         1       1       1       1       1       1       4         1       1       1       1       1       1       4         1       1       1       1       1       1       4       4         1       1       1       1       1       1       4       4         1       1       1       1       1       1       4       4       5       5       5       5 <t< td=""></t<>
3 0 0 6 3 0 1 0 0 6 3 0 1 1 0 0 0 8 0 3 256 1 0 1 13 8 0 5 19 3 0 7 4 MC <sub>50</sub> 0 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2
1       0       0       0       4         16       32       64       128       256       MIC <sub>50</sub> 0       0       5       19       3       3       3         0       1       13       8       3       3       3       3         0       1       13       8       3<
16         32         64         128         256         MIC <sub>50</sub> 0         0         5         19         3         2         2           0         1         13         8         3         2         2           0         5         0         6         7         2         2         2
0 0 5 19 3 0 1 13 8 3 0 5 0 6 7 2
0 1 13 8 3 0 5 0 6 7 2
0 5 0 6 7 2

Ciências Agrárias

Regarding the profile of resistance or susceptibility to antimicrobials among the 216 E. coli strains analyzed, 88 (40.7%) were fully susceptible to 12 tested antimicrobials. All the strains were susceptible to colistin, meropenem, and tigecycline. These results are guite encouraging from a public health perspective, since these antimicrobials are on the list of last-resort drugs for the treatment of life-threatening infections in humans (WHO, 2019). Resistance to meropenem and tigecycline has seldom been reported in enterobacteria originating from animal production (Osman et al., 2018; European Food Safety Authority & European Centre for Disease Prevention and Control [EFSA & ECDCI, 2019), which corroborates the results of our study. Although resistance to tigecycline has been reported in 29.3% of E. coli strains isolated from organic chicken farms (Musa et al., 2021), the authors did not rule out the possibility of an environmental origin for the resistant strains. In contrast, resistance to colistin has been detected in several investigations in the poultry production chain, including in Brazil (Lopes et al, 2020; Lentz et al., 2021), with frequencies ranging from 1.8% (Perrin-Guyomard et al., 2016; Pesciaroli et al., 2020) to as high as 57.94% (Barbieri et al., 2021) and 79.8% (Irrgang et al., 2016). In addition, food animals have been suggested as possible reservoirs and spreaders of genes that confer resistance to this class of antimicrobials (Irrgang et al., 2016; Perrin-Guyomard et al., 2016; Guenther et al., 2017; Monte et al., 2017; Yassin et al., 2017; Bitrus et al., 2018; Zhang et al., 2018). The absence of strains resistant to colistin observed in our study may be related to the ban on the use of this antibiotic as a growth promoter in Brazil (Ministério da Agricultura Pecuária e Abastecimento [MAPA], 2016). This fact may have led to the phasing out of its use for all purposes in poultry farming, resulting in lower selection pressure in recent years. Supporting this hypothesis, a study in China also demonstrated that the prevalence of colistin-resistant *E. coli* decreased from 18% to 5% a few years after the ban on colistin as a poultry growth promoter (Wang et al., 2020).

Among the 128 generic E. coli strains that showed resistance, 76 (59.4%) were resistant to up to two antimicrobials tested (Table 2), indicating a relatively low level of resistance in the strains analyzed. Overall, the highest frequencies of resistant strains were found against tetracycline (32.4%), trimethoprim (28.2%), ampicillin (25.0%), and nalidixic acid (18.5%). Similar patterns of resistance to tetracycline, ampicillin, and nalidixic acid were observed in all groups, with a predominance of resistant strains in GC (Figure 1). Despite the fact that tetracyclines and beta-lactams have been prohibited as growth promoters since 2009 in Brazil [MAPA], 2009), these antibiotics are still used therapeutically and are included, along with quinolones and ionophores, among the antimicrobials commonly used in the treatment of sick birds (Hofacre et al., 2013; Landoni & Albarellos, 2015; Cardoso, 2019; Rabello et al, 2020). This may contribute to the persistence of resistance to these antimicrobials. Studies carried out with E. coli isolated from the poultry production chain have demonstrated variable frequencies of resistance to antimicrobials. However, ampicillin, tetracycline, and nalidixic acid have often been reported to have the highest resistance rates (Elumba et al., 2018; Abraham et al., 2019; Varga et al., 2019; Jahantigh et al., 2020; Musa et al., 2020; Pesciaroli et al., 2020; Rabello et al., 2020). In addition, this study demonstrates a much less critical scenario than that reported between 2007 and 2013 in Brazil and listed by Rabello et al. (2020). In this study, relatively higher frequencies of resistance against tetracycline (70-91%), nalidixic acid (61-78%), and ampicillin (20-67%) were observed in *E. coli* isolated from chicken.

# Table 2Frequencies of resistant strains by the number of resistant antimicrobial categories

Group	Number of resistant antimicrobial categories							Total registent strains
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Conventional (GC)	17	8	16	2	4	1	0	48
Antibiotic-free (GL)	15	16	9	3	3	0	2	48
Organic (GO)	4	16	7	3	0	2	0	32
Total	36	41	32	7	7	3	2	128



**Figure 1.** Relative frequency of antimicrobial resistant, multidrug resistant and fully susceptible *Escherichia coli* strains isolated from whole-chicken samples originated from conventional (GC), antibiotic-free (GL) and organic (GO) farming systems.

TET, tetracycline; TRI, trimethoprim; AMP, ampicillin; NAL, nalidixic acid; GEN, gentamicin; CTX, cefotaxime; CLO, chloramphenicol; CIP, ciprofloxacin; CAZ, ceftazidime; COL, colistin; MER, meropenem; TIG, tigecycline; MDR, multidrug resistance; Tsus, fully susceptible.

Differences between groups in the prevalence ratios of resistance were estimated using the Poisson regression model (Table 3). A statistically significant difference in the prevalence of resistance among the groups was observed to ampicillin, nalidixic acid, and gentamicin, as well as in the prevalence of fully susceptible and MDR strains. For ampicillin, the prevalence of resistance in GL was 0.56 times and in GO 0.44 times compared to that in GC. For nalidixic acid, the prevalence of GO was 0.47 times the prevalence of GC. However, a discrepant scenario occurred in relation to gentamicin, as in GL, 25% of the strains were resistant to this antimicrobial compared to 5% in GC. The Poisson model estimated a prevalence rate of 4.5 of resistant strains in GL in relation to GC. Because resistant strains were identified in different samples of frozen chicken from different batches and slaughterhouses, any possibility of being a resistant clone can be ruled out. In agreement with the results found in GC, the reported resistance to gentamicin is usually lower than 10% in commensal E. coli (EFSA & ECDC, 2018; Much et al., 2019; Sanchez et al., 2020). Higher gentamicin resistance has also been reported in laying hens of organic keeping systems in comparison to conventional systems in Germany, but no hypothesis has been raised for these findings (Schwaiger et al., 2008). Although the use of antimicrobials is an important factor in the selection of resistant strains (Xiong et al., 2018), this result may be related to other factors that might be involved in the persistence of antimicrobialresistant strains in farms. Among these, the carriage of resistant strains by other animal species (Literak et al., 2009), long-term persistence in the environment (Schwaiger et al., 2008) and exposure to biocides or heavy metals (Kampf, 2019; Puangseree et al., 2021) have been suggested. All of these factors may be present even in organic farming.

The most relevant differences among the groups of E. coli strains were found between GO and GC regarding MDR, defined as non-susceptibility to at least one agent in three or more antimicrobial categories, and full susceptible strains (Magiorakos et al., 2012). In this sense, GO presented frequencies estimated at 1.67 times and 0.52 times of those observed in GC, respectively, for full susceptibility and MDR. In general, data from the literature consistently report higher resistance patterns in strains from conventional and antimicrobial-free groups when compared to organic groups (Pesciaroli et al., 2020; Sanchez et al., 2020; Musa et al., 2020). Moreover, and consistent with our results, MDR rate is often smaller in strains from organic production systems (Davis et al., 2018; Much et al., 2019; Pesciaroli et al., 2020; Musa et al., 2020). These data suggest that the restriction on antimicrobial use reflects first in the selection of MDR strains and allow the enhancement of full susceptible ones in the population, probably as result of decreasing the selection of some resistance phenotypes (for instance, ampicillin and nalidixic acid in our study). On the contrary, changes in other resistance markers, such as tetracycline, might need a longer time span to become observable. The predominance of tetracycline-resistant strains in E. coli of chickens and chicken meat has been reported (EFSA & ECDC, 2018), and the fact that chickens are raised free or in organic farming does not seem to change this profile (Much et al., 2019).

#### Table 3

Poisson regression model to estimate the association between *Escherichia coli* resistance of strains originated from farming systems with restricted antibiotic use for each evaluated antimicrobial and assuming GC as basis

Antimicrobial	Farming system	Prevalence Ratio	95% CI
Ampicillin	GL	0.56*	0.32-0.95
	GO	0.44*	0.24-0.80
Cefotaxime	GL	1.80	0.63-5.10
	GO	1.20	0.38-3.75
Chloramphenicol	GL	1	0.36-2.70
	GO	0.43	0.11-1.59
Ciprofloxacin	GL	0.50	0.13-1.92
	GO	0.83	0.26-2.60
Gentamicin	GL	4.50*	1.60-12.64
	GO	2.75	0.91-8.23
Nalidixic acid	GL	0.63	0.33-1.2
	GO	0.47*	0.22-0.97
Tetracycline	GL	0.93	0.59-1.43
	GO	0.67	0.40-1.09
Trimethoprim	GL	1.25	0.76-2.03
	GO	0.80	0.45-1.41
Multidrug resistant (MDR)	GL	0.70	0.40-1.20
	GO	0.52*	0.28-0.96
Fully susceptible (Tsus)	GL	1	0.63-1.58
	GO	1.67*	1.13-2.45

Cl, confidence interval; GC, strains isolated from whole-chicken samples originating from conventional farming; GL, strains isolated from whole-chicken samples originating from antibiotic-free farming; GO, strains isolated from whole-chicken samples originating from organic farming.

(\*) Statistical difference at a significance level of 0.05.

In our study, the association of the frequency of resistance in whole-chicken *E. coli* with the type of production may be limited by the fact that the samples analyzed were collected from retail sources instead of taking them from live birds in the production system itself. Even considering this limitation,

the results suggest that the administration regime of antibiotics on farms may be reflected in retail products. In this case, the hazard to public health might be diminished, since food is the most consistent link in terms of the transfer of bacteria-carrying resistance genes between farm animals and humans.

# Conclusions \_

There are still many knowledge gaps regarding the association of the use of antimicrobials in animal production and the increase and dissemination of resistant strains. The results of the present study corroborate the complexity of this theme and the need of an approach involving not only the animal and human health sectors, but also the environmental, to tackle this problem. The observations indicate that the rate of antimicrobial resistance in generic E. coli strains isolated from frozen whole-chicken is in general not high in Brazil, especially against the critically important antimicrobials for humans. The lower prevalence of multidrug resistance and the higher full-susceptibility among E. coli strains from organic-raised chicken suggest that there is a lower selective pressure towards resistance in the organic farming.

#### **References** \_

- Abraham, S., O'Dea, M., Sahibzada, S., Hewson, K., Pavic, A., Veltman, T., Abraham, R., Harris, T., Trott, D. J, & Jordan, D. (2019). *Escherichia coli* and *Salmonella* spp. isolated from Australian meat chickens remain susceptible to critically important antimicrobial agents. *PLoS One, 14*(10), e0224281. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.02 24281
- Agyare, C., Boamah, V. E., Zumbi, C. N., & Osei, F. B. (2018). Antibiotic use in poultry production and its effects on bacterial resistance. In Y. Kumar (Ed.), *Antimicrobial resistance - a global threat* [Online]. London: IntechOpen. doi: 10.5772/ intechopen.79371

- Barbieri, N. L., Pimenta, R. L., Melo, D. A. de, Nolan, L. K., Souza, M. S. de, & Logue, C. M. (2021). mcr-1 Identified in fecal Escherichia coli and avian pathogenic E. coli (APEC) from Brazil. Frontiers in Microbiology, 12(659613). doi: 10.3389/ fmicb.2021.659613
- Bitrus, A. A., Chuanchuen, R., & Luangtongkum, T. (2018). Emergence of colistin resistance in extended-spectrum beta lactamase producing Enterobacteriaceae isolated from food animals and its public health implication: a review. *Journal of Advanced Veterinary and Animal Research, 5*(1), 1-11. doi: 10.5455/ javar.2018.e246
- Cardoso, M. (2019). Antimicrobial use, resistance and economic benefits and coststolivestockproducersinBrazil.*OECD Food, Agriculture and Fisheries Papers, 135,* 1-44. doi: 10.1787/27137b1e-en
- Clinical and Laboratory Standards Institute (2018). *Performance standards for antimicrobial susceptibility testing* (28nd ed.). Clinical and Laboratory Standards Institute.
- Clinical and Laboratory Standards Institute (2020). *Performance standards for antimicrobial susceptibility testing* (30nd ed.). Clinical and Laboratory Standards Institute.
- Davis, G. S., Waits, K., Nordstrom, L., Grande, H., Weaver, B., Papp, K., Horwinski, J., Koch, B., Hungate, B. A., Liu, C. M., & Price, L. B. (2018). Antibiotic-resistant *Escherichia coli* from retail poultry meat with different antibiotic use claims. *BMC Microbiology*, *18*(174), 7. doi: 10.1186/s12866-018-1322-5

- Demattê, L. C., F<sup>o</sup>., & Pereira, G. V. (2017). O mercado de frangos e ovos orgânicos e caipira potencial de mercado. *Anais do Seminário Nordestino de Pecuária PECNordeste*, Fortaleza, CE, Brasil, 21. http:// www.cpmo.org.br/cms/ publicacoes/1.pdf
- Diaz-Sanchez, S., Moscoso, S., Santos,
  F. S., Andino, A., & Hanning, I. (2015).
  Antibiotic use in poultry: a driving force for organic poultry production.
  Food Protection Trends, 35(6), 440-447.
  https://www.researchgate.net/
  publication/282332674\_Antibiotic\_use\_
  in\_poultry\_A\_driving\_force\_for\_organic\_
  poultry\_production
- Elumba, Z. S., Allera, M. L. M., & Taganas, R.
  R. R. (2018). Occurrence and antibiotic sensitivity of Escherichia coli and Salmonella spp. in retail chicken meat at selected markets in Valencia City, Bukidnon, Philippines. *Asian Journal of Biological and Life Sciences*, 7(2), 53-58. doi: 10.5530/ajbls.2018.7.4
- European Centre for Disease Prevention and Control, European Food Safety Authority & Europe Medicines Agency (2017). ECDC, EFSA and EMA Joint Scientific Opinion on a list of outcome indicators as regards surveillance of antimicrobial resistance and antimicrobial consumption in humans and food-producing animals. *EFSA Journal, 15*(10), 70. http://doi.wiley. com/10.2903/j.efsa.2017.5017
- European Food Safety Authority & European Centre for Disease Prevention and Control (2018). The European Union summary report on antimicrobial resistance in zoonotic and indicator bacteria from

humans, animals and food in 2016. *EFSA Journal, 16*(2), 270. doi: 10.2903/j. efsa.2018.5182

- European Food Safety Authority & European Centre for Disease Prevention and Control (2019). The European Union summary report on antimicrobial resistance in zoonotic and indicator bacteria from humans, animals and food in 2017. *EFSA Journal, 17*(6), 278. doi: 10.2903/j. efsa.2019.5709
- Guenther, S., Falgenhauer, L., Semmler, T., Imirzalioglu, C., Chakraborty, T., Röesler, U., & Roschanski, N. (2017). Environmental emission of multiresistant Escherichia coli carrying the colistin resistance gene mcr-1 from German swine farms. *Journal of Antimicrobial Chemotherapy*, *72*(5), 1289-1292. doi: 10.1093/jac/dkw585
- Hofacre, C., Fricke, J., & Inglis, T. (2013).
  Antimicrobial use in poultry. In S. Giguère DVM, J. F. Prescott, & P. M. Dowling (Eds.), Antimicrobial therapy in veterinary medicine (pp. 569-588). Wiley Blackwell.
- Irrgang, A., Roschanski, N., Tenhagen, B. A., Grobbel, M., Skladnikiewicz-Ziemer, T., Thomas, K., Resler, U., & Käsbohrer, A. (2016). Prevalence of mcr-1 in E. coli from livestock and food in Germany, 2010-2015. *PLoS One, 11*(17), e0159863. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0159863.
- Jahantigh, M., Samadi, K., Dizaji, R. E., & Salari, S. (2020). Antimicrobial resistance and prevalence of tetracycline resistance genes in *Escherichia coli* isolated from lesions of colibacillosis in broiler chickens in Sistan, Iran. *BMC Veterinary Research*, *16*(267), 1-6. doi: 10.1186/s12917-020-02488-z

- Kampf, G. (2019). Antibiotic resistance can be enhanced in Gram-positive species by some biocidal agents used for disinfection. *Antibiotics*, 8(13), 15. doi: 10.3390/antibiotics8010013
- Landoni, M. F., & Albarellos, G. (2015). The use of antimicrobial agents in broiler chickens. *The Veterinary Journal, 205*(2015), 21-27. doi: 10.1016/j.tvjl.2015.04.016
- Lentz, S. A. M., Dalmolin, T. V., Barth, A. L., & Martins, A. F. (2021). *mcr-1* Gene in Latin America: how is it disseminated among humans, animals, and the environment? *Frontiers in Public Health, 9*(648940). doi: 10.3389/fpubh.2021.648940
- Literak, I., Dolejska, M., Rybarikova, J., Cizek, A., Strejckova, P., Vyskocilova, M., Friedman, M., & Klimes, J. (2009). Highly variable patterns of antimicrobial resistance in commensal *Escherichia coli* isolates from pigs, sympatric rodents, and flies. *Veterinary Microbiology*, *15*(3), 229-237. doi: 10.1089/mdr.2009.0913
- Lopes, H. P., Costa, G. A., Pinto, A. C. L. Q., Machado, L. S., Cunha, N. C., Nascimento, E. R., Pereira, V. L. A., & Abreu, D. L. C. (2020). Detection of the mcr-1 gene in Enteropathogenic Escherichia coli (EPEC) and Shigatoxigenic E. coli (STEC) strains isolated from broilers. *Pesquisa Veterinária Brasileira, 40*(3), 165-169. doi: 10.1590/1678-5150-PVB-5983
- Magiorakos, A. P., Srinvasan, A., Carey, R. B., Carmeli, Y., Falagas, M. E., Giske, C. G., Harbarth, S., Hindler, J. F., Kaahlmeter, G., Olsson-Liljequist, B., Paterson, D. L., Rice, L. B., Stelling, J., Struelens, M. J., Vatopoulos, A., Weber, J. T., & Monnet, D. L. (2012). Multidrug-resistant, extensively

drug-resistant and pandrug-resistant bacteria: an international expert proposal for interim standard definitions for acquired resistance. *Clinical Microbiology and Infectious Diseases, 18*(3), 268-281. doi: 10.1111/j.1469-0691.2011.03570.x

- Millman, J. M., Waits, K., Grande, H., Marks, A. R., Marks, J. C., Price, L. B., & Hungate, B. A. (2013). Prevalence of antibiotic-resistant *E. coli* in retail chicken: comparing conventional, organic, kosher, and raised without antibiotics. *F1000Research*, *2*(155), 13. doi: 10.12688/f1000research.2-155.v2
- Ministério da Agricultura Pecuária e Abastecimento (2009). MAPA. Instrução Normativa n. 26, de 10 de julho de 2009. Diário Oficial da União, Brasília, DF, Brasil.
- Ministério da Agricultura Pecuária e Abastecimento (2016). MAPA. Instrução Normativa n. 45, de 22 de novembro de 2016. Diário Oficial da União, Brasília, DF.
- Ministério da Saúde (2019a). MS. Instrução Normativa n. 60, de 23 de dezembro de 2019. Diário Oficial da União, Brasil.
- Ministério da Saúde (2019b). MS. RESOLUÇÃO - RDC n. 331, de 23 de dezembro 2019. Diário Oficial da União, Brasil.
- Monte, D. F., Mem, A., Fernandes, M. R., Cerdeira, L., Esposito, F., Galvão, J. A., Franco, B. D. G. M., Lincopan, N., & Landgraf, M. (2017). Chicken meat as a reservoir of colistin-resistant *Escherichia coli* strains carrying *mcr-1* genes in South America. *Antimicrobial Agents and Chemotherapy*, *61*(5), e02718 -16. doi: 10.1128/AAC.02718-16
- Much, P., Sun, H., Lassnig, H., Koeberl-Jelovcan, S., Schliessnig, H., & Stueger, H. P. (2019).

Differences in antimicrobial resistance of commensal *Escherichia coli* isolated from caecal contents of organically and conventionally raised broilers in Austria, 2010-2014 and 2016. *Preventive Veterinary Medicine*, *171*(2019), 104755. doi: 10.1016/j.prevetmed.2019.104755

- Musa, L., Proietti, P. C., Branciari, R., Menchetti, L., Bellucci, S., Ranucci, D., Marenzoni, M. L., & Franciosini, M. P. (2020). Antimicrobial susceptibility of *Escherichia coli* and ESBL-producing *Escherichia coli* diffusion in conventional, organic and antibioticfree meat chickens at slaughter. *Animals*, *10*(1215), 12. doi: 10.3390/ani10071215
- Musa, L., Proietti, P. C., Marenzoni, M. L., Stefanetti, V., Kika, T. S., Blasi, F., Magistrali, C. F., Toppi, V., Ranucci, D., Branciari, R., & Franciosini, M. P. (2021). Susceptibility of commensal *E. coli* isolated from conventional, antibiotic-free, and organic meat chickens on farms and at slaughter toward antimicrobials with public health relevance. *Antibiotics*, *10*(11), 1321. doi: 10.3390/antibiotics10111321
- Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (2020). *Meat consumption (indicator).* https:// data.oecd.org/ agroutput/meat-consumption.htm
- Osman, K. M., Kappell, A. D., Elhadidy, M., ElMougy, F., El-Ghany, W. A. A., Orabi, A., Mubarak, A. S., Dawoud, T. M., Hemeg, H. A., Moussa, I. M. I., Hessain, A. M., & Yousef, H. M. Y. (2018). Poultry hatcheries as potential reservoirs for antimicrobialresistant *Escherichia coli*: a risk to public health and food safety. *Scientific Reports*, *8*(5859), 14. doi: 10.1038/s41598-018-23962-7

- Perrin-Guyomard, A., Bruneau, M., Houée, P., Deleurme, K., Legrandois, P., Poirier, C., Soumet, C., & Sanders, P. (2016).
  Prevalence of mcr-1 in commensal Escherichia coli from French livestock, 2007 to 2014. Eurosurveillance, European Centre for Diesease Prevention and Control, 21(6), 1-3. doi: 10. 2807/1560-7917.ES.2016.21.6.30135
- Pesciaroli, M., Magistrali, C. F., Filippini, G., Epifanio, E. M., Lovito, C., Marchi, L., Maresca, C., Massacci, F. R., Orsini, S., Scoccia, E., Tofani, S., & Pezzotti, G. (2020). Antibiotic-resistant commensal Escherichia coli are less frequently isolated from poultry raised using nonconventional management systems than from conventional broiler. International Journal of Food Microbiology, 314(2020). 108391. 10.1016/j. doi: ijfoodmicro.2019.108391
- Puangseree, J., Jeamsripong, S., Prathan, R., Pungpian, C., & Chuanchuen, R. (2021).
  Resistance to widely-used disinfectants and heavy metals and cross resistance to antibiotics in *Escherichia coli* isolated from pigs, pork and pig carcass. *Food Control, 124*(107892), 11. doi: 10.1016/j. foodcont.2021.107892
- Quinn, J. P., Markey, B. K., Leonard, F. C., Hartigan, P., Fanning, S., & Fitzpatrick, E. S. (2011). *Veterinary microbiology and microbial disease* (2nd ed.). John Wiley and Sons.
- R Core Team (2013). R: A language and environment for statistical computing. http://www.r-project.org/
- Rabello, R. F., Bonelli, R. R., Penna, B. A., Albuquerque, J. P., Souza, R. M., & Cerqueira, A. M. F. (2020). Antimicrobial

resistance in farm animals in Brazil: an update overview. *Animals, 10*(552), 43. doi: 10.3390/ani10040552

- Roth, N., Käsbohrer, A., Mayrhofer, S., Zitz, U., Hofacre, C., & Domig, K. J. (2019). The application of antibiotics in broiler production and the resulting antibiotic resistance in *Escherichia coli:* a global overview. *Poultry Science*, *98*(4), 1791-1804. doi: 10.3382/ps/pey539
- Sanchez, H. M., Whitener, V. A., Thulsiraj, V., Amundson, A., Collins, C., Duran-Gonzalez, M., Giragossian, E., Hornstra, A., Kamel, S., Maben, A., Reynolds, A., Roswell, E., Schmidt, B., Sevigny, L., Xiong, C., & Jay, J. A. (2020). Antibiotic resistance of *Escherichia coli* isolated from conventional, no antibiotics, and humane family owned retail broiler chicken meat. *Animals*, *10*(2217), 17. doi: 10.3390/ ani10122217
- Schwaiger, K., Schmied, E. V., & Bauer, J. (2008). Comparative analysis of antibiotic resistance characteristics of Gramnegative bacteria isolated from laying hens and eggs in conventional and organic keeping systems in Bavaria, Germany. *Zoonoses and Public Health*, 55(7), 331-341. doi: 10. 1111/j.1863-2378.2008.01151.x
- Varga, C., Guerin, M. T., Brash, M. L., Slavic, D., Boerlin, P., & Susta, L. (2019). Antimicrobial resistance in fecal *Escherichia coli* and *Salmonella* enterica isolates: a two-year prospective study of small poultry flocks in Ontario, Canada. *BMC Veterinary Research*, *15*(464), 10. doi: 10.1186/ s12917-019-2187-z
- Wang, L. Y. R., Jokinen, C. C., Laing, C. R., Johnson, R. P., Ziebell, K., & Gannon,

V. P. J. (2020). Assessing the genomic relatedness and evolutionary rates of persistent verotoxigenic *Escherichia coli* serotypes within a closed beef herd in Canada. *Microbial Genomics*, 6(6), e000376. doi: 10.1099/mgen.0.000376

- World Health Organization (2015). *Global action plan on antimicrobial resistance.* World Health Organization.
- World Health Organization (2019). *Critically important antimicrobials for human medicine* (6nd Revision). World Health Organization.
- Xiong, W., Sun, Y., & Zeng, Z. (2018). Antimicrobial use and antimicrobial resistance in food animals. *Environmental Science and Pollution Research, 25*(19), 18377-18384. doi: 10.1007/s11356-018-1852-2
- Yassin, A. K., Zhang, J., Wang, J., Chen, L., Kelly, P., Butaye, P., Lu, G., Gong, J., Li, M., Wei, L., Wang, Y., Qi, K., Han, X., Price, S., Hathcock, T., & Wang, C. (2017). Identification and characterization of mcr mediated colistin resistance in extraintestinal *Escherichia coli* from poultry and livestock in China. *Federation of European Microbiological Societies - Microbiology Letters*, 364(24), 6. doi: 10.1093/femsle/fnx242
- Zhang, J., Chen, L., Wang, J., Yassin, A. K., Butaye, P., Kelly, P., Gong, J., Guo, W., Li, J., Li, M., Yang, F., Feng, Z., Jiang, P., Song, C., Wang, Y., You, J., Yang, Y., Price, S., Qi, K., Wang, C. (2018). Molecular detection of colistin resistance genes (mcr-1, mcr-2 and mcr-3) in nasal/oropharyngeal and anal/cloacal swabs from pigs and poultry. *Scientific Reports*, 8(1), 3705. doi: 10.1038/s41598-018-22084-4