



## **Isolation And Antimicrobial Resistance Profile Of *Salmonella* Isolated From Chicken Swab In Asossa, Bambasi And Pawe Poultry Farms, Benishangul Gumuz Regional State**

\*Asmamaw Aki and Birhanu Eticha

Assosa, Regional Veterinary Diagnostic, Surveillance, Monitoring and Study Laboratory, P.O. Box 326, Assosa, Ethiopia; [asmamawaki@gmail.com](mailto:asmamawaki@gmail.com), phone: 0902330029

**Abstract:** A cross - sectional study on isolation and antimicrobial resistance pattern of *Salmonella spp* in Asossa, Bambasi and pawe poultry farms, were carried out from November 2019 to May 2020 with the objectives to determine the prevalence of salmonella species, associated risk factors and antimicrobial resistance pattern of the isolates. For this purpose, a total of 384 cloacal swab samples were collected and were subjected to various cultural and biochemical examinations as the results, 87(22.65%) of the positive isolates were identified. In this study, previous treatment history, body conditions and salmonella spp were potential risk factors, which were statistically significant value for salmonella infection ( $p < 0.000$ ) whereas origin/sites/ and sex groups were not significant ( $p > 0.05$ ). Age categories, breed factors and floor types were slightly significant. The antimicrobial susceptibility profile of all isolates were assessed against ten antimicrobials by disk diffusion technique; almost all isolates were resistant to one or more of the tested antimicrobials. Of all isolates, 95.6 % were multidrug resistant (MDR). 84.78%, 80.43%, 76.08%, 69.56%, 67.39%, 56.52% and 47.82% of the isolates were resistant to Tetracycline, Streptomycin, Kanamycine, Norfloxacin, Trimthoprim, Nalidixic Acid and Chloramphenicol respectively. However, the majority of the isolates were susceptible to ciprofloxacin /Enrofloxacin/ and gentamycin, followed by sulphonamides. This is a significant threat to public health particularly to those who have direct or indirect contact to poultry and poultry products so that hygienic management of poultry and its products in order to reduce the risk and selection of antimicrobials by antimicrobial sensitivity test were also suggested.

[ Asmamaw Akiand Birhanu Eticha. **Isolation And Antimicrobial Resistance Profile Of *Salmonella* Isolated From Chicken Swab In Asossa, Bambasi And Pawe Poultry Farms, Benishangul Gumuz Regional State.** *Researcher* 2020;12(9):57-74]. ISSN 1553-9865 (print); ISSN 2163-8950 (online). <http://www.sciencepub.net/researcher>. 7. doi: [10.7537/marsrsj120920.07](https://doi.org/10.7537/marsrsj120920.07).

**Keywords:** Asossa, Bambasi, Cloacal swab, drug resistant, Isolates, Chicken, multidrug resistance, pawe

### **1. Introduction**

Food borne disease (FBD) has emerged as an important issue of growing public health and economic problem in many countries. The ultimate goal of all food safety programs is to stop contaminated food products from reaching the consumer. Surveillance for food borne diseases is conducted to delineate the occurrence and burden of important public health concern (Olasunmbo *et al.*, 2014). Salmonellosis is one of the major food borne diseases in the world and it is estimated that 93.8 million cases of gastroenteritis due to *Salmonella* species occur globally each year, with 155,000 deaths (Majowicz *et al.*, 2010).

*Salmonella* are short bacilli, 0.7-1.5 x 2.5  $\mu\text{m}$ , Gram-negative, aerobic or facultative anaerobic, oxidase negative, catalase positive, indole and VogesProskauer (VP) negative, methyl red and Simmons citrate positive,  $\text{H}_2\text{S}$  producing and urea negative. They ferment sugars with gas production, non-sporogenic, and are normally motile with peritrichal flagella, except for *Salmonella pullorum*

and *Salmonella gallinarum*, which are non motile (Forshell and Wierup, 2006). Optimal pH for multiplication is around 7.0; pH values above 9.0 or below 4.0 are bactericidal. Ideal temperature is between 35 to 37°C, with minimum of 5°C and maximum of 47°C. As for salt concentration, *Salmonella* do not survive concentrations over 9% (Franco and Landgraf, 1996).

Salmonellosis is now a worldwide problem which is transmitted by faecal-oral route. It becomes the most important zoonotic disease because of its transmission route associated with contamination specifically via water and food. Early diagnosis of salmonellosis using laboratory procedures and clinical result allows having time for applying a prevention strategy before the contaminated water or food entered to the food chain. It also allows detecting outbreak early and treating patients (WHO, 2010).

The use of antibiotics in food animals selects bacteria which are resistant to antibiotics used in humans. These might be spread via the food to humans and cause human infection (Phillips, 2004).

Amongst *Salmonella* spp., antimicrobial resistance is a well confirmed phenomenon and antimicrobial-resistant *Salmonella* are increasingly associated with the use of antimicrobial agents. Antimicrobials are substances that have significantly contributed to the prevention and treatment of infectious diseases in humans, as well as to many animal species (CDC, 2008). However, the excess or overuse of antimicrobials can generate genomic selective pressures to enable microbes to adapt and acquire resistance (Witte, 2001).

Ultimately, increases in bacterial antimicrobial resistance pose a considerable threat to public health, especially for vulnerable populations including young children (Shea, 2003), the elderly and immunocompromised individuals (Hitti and Wolff, 2005). Concentrated animal feeding operations (CAFOs) in agricultural practices have evolved to accommodate food consumption rates with increased agricultural output at the risk of introducing antimicrobial resistant pathogens into the environment. In addition, several studies have suggested that characteristics of agricultural environmental settings, including animal crowding, CAFO hygiene, temperature, ventilation control and stress, can influence antimicrobial resistance and pathogen risk (Silbergeld *et al.*, 2008).

In Ethiopia as in other developing countries, it is difficult to evaluate the burden of salmonellosis because of the limited scope of studies and lack of coordinated epidemiological surveillance systems. In addition, under-reporting of cases and presence of other diseases considered to be of high priority may have overshadowed the problem of salmonellosis (Oosterom, 1991).

In Benishangul Gumuz, poultry salmonellosis is endemic in local poultry farm as well as household farmstead and *Salmonella* species is recognized as a major cause of food borne illnesses, that are closely associated with the consumption of contaminated poultry and egg products, there is a desire to strengthen the monitoring and surveillance of salmonellosis using suitable diagnostic tools so as to prevent and control its occurrence. Besides this, the extent of *Salmonella* contamination of cloacal swab and antimicrobial profile of the *Salmonella* isolates has not been adequately studied and very limited information exists in the region and none in the Asossa, Bambasi and pawe districts.

Therefore, the objectives of the present study are:

- To determine the prevalence of *Salmonellosis*;
- To isolate and identify *Salmonella* spp from local poultry farm;
- To assess the risk factors associated with salmonella infections;

- To determine the antimicrobial susceptibility patterns of the salmonella.

## 2. Materials And Methods

### 2.1 Study Area

The study was conducted in selected Asossa and Bambasi districts and pawe poultry farm, Beni shangul Gumuz Regional state, from November 2019 to May 2020. Within districts it was studied in seven peasant association here after called namely: Asossa twon (01,04,05), Bambasi (01 and 02), Shobora and N/Keshmando Pas and pawe poultry farm. Asossa zone has 214 peasant associations, stretching over an area of 18,340.55 kilometer square, with human population of 270,980. The region is found in the north west of the country between latitude of 9 and 11° N and longitude of 34 and 35°E and its altitude is from 700-1560 meter above sea level. Annual rain fall is between 900-1500 mm with uni modal type of rainfall that extends from April to October with peak rainy periods from June to August, and annual temperature ranges between 25- 35°c (NMSA, 2014; CSA, 2015). Asossa zone, the livelihood of the society largely depends on mixed livestock and crop production. It has 35.6% of the livestock population of the region constituting 81,939 cattle, 167, 281 goats, 10,231 sheep, 14,089 donkeys, 40,3153 poultry, 29 horses and 59,695 beehives (CSA, 2005; CSA, 2016).

Asossa district has 74 kebeles covering an area of 2317 km2 with human population of 47666. And also it is located between 8°30'' and 4°27'' N and 34°21'' and 39°1'' E. It has an altitude range of 1000-1570 meter above sea level. Its annual temperature ranges between 16°c- 34°c. Besides this, Bambasi district has 38 kebeles stretches over an area of 2210.16 square k.m with human population of 62693 and annual temperature ranges between 21°c - 35°c (CSA, 2015).

Similarly, Pawe district has 20 kebeles covering an area of 64,300 hectare with human population of 42,000. It is located at latitude of 11° and 15' 24.7''N and, longitude of 36° and 23'10''E. It has an altitude of 1064m above sea level. Its annual average temperature is 32°c and its rainfall range is 900-1400mm (NMSA, 2007). The livelihood of the society largely depends on mixed livestock and crop production having livestock population of 58,810 Cattle, 5440 Goat, 5523 Sheep, 843 Equines, 29378Poultry and 3076 beehives (CSA, 2015).

### 2.2 Study Design

Across-sectional study was carried out from November, 2019 to May 2020 for isolation, identification and assess antimicrobial resistance profile of salmonella isolates from small house hold local poultry farms.

### 2.3 Study population

The target population were apparently healthy chickens in local poultry farms of Bambasi, Asossa and pawe including local and exotic breed. A total of 384 commercial chickens and chickens of local poultry comprising different age group, management system, breed and production level were included in this study. Birds are kept under intensive poultry management systems. Birds are provided with industrially produced poultry feed and water ad libitum.

#### 2.4 Sample size determination

The total sample size for chicken cloacal swab sample collection, isolation and enumeration of salmonella species were assigned (Thrustfield, 2007). A 5% absolute precision (5% sampling error) at 95% confidence interval was used during estimation of the sample size. Since there is no similar work done in the Asossa, Bambasi and pawe district at the same time, the expected prevalence was taken as 50% (Thrustfield, 2007). Therefore, the total sample size for the study were calculated using the following formula for each sampling units.

$$n = \frac{(1.96)^2 \times P(1-P)}{d^2}$$

Where: n = the total sample size, p = expected prevalence (50%), d = desired absolute precision/marginal error between the samples and population / (5%), (0.05) at 95% CI,

$Z_{\alpha/2}$  = the standard normal deviation corresponding 95% of confidence level = 1.96

$n = (1.96) \times (1.96) \times (0.5) \times (1-0.5) / (0.05) \times (0.05) = 384$ ; accordingly, from a total of 384 chicken cloacal swab; 209 was sampled from local poultry farm at Bambasi, 85 swab samples from pawe poultry farms and 90 swab sampled from Asossa local poultry farms.

## 2.5 Laboratory methods

### 2.5.1. Questionnaire survey

Data on each sampled chicken cloacal swab were collected using a properly designed questionnaire format for determining the associated risk factors. This includes environmental contamination, management factor, feeding status, housing /ventilation/, treatment status, handling practices, chicken transportation, breed, age, sex, previous history of treatment, biosecurity measures, hygienic/ sanitary condition and other relevant information related to salmonellosis was gathered.

### 2.5.2 Sampling methods, collection and transportation of samples

Purposive sampling technique was applied for selection of study sites, based on the availability of chickens, accessibility and presence or absence of disease in kebeles. Besides, random sampling methods

was used for selection of each chicken in Asossa, Bambasi local poultry farmstead as well as pawe poultry farms. A total of 384 cloacal poultry swab samples were collected aseptically from every local poultry farms. Aseptic procedure were followed when collecting samples. The sterile plastic bags or cotton bud/ sterile ice box/ were used for containing selected cloacal swab. The cloaca/ vulva/ surface was sterilized by swabbing in 70 % alcohol for 2 min. The cloacal swab samples were collected in sterile ice box. The collected swab samples from pawe, Asossa and Bambasi poultry farmsteads were individually placed into a sterile plastic container in an ice box. Therefore, samples were properly transported immediately in an ice box to the analyzing Regional Veterinary Laboratory of Benishangul Gumuz, Asossa, for microbiological examination. The isolation was conducted utilizing the conventional methods for the detection of *Salmonella species* following the standard guidelines from ISO 6579 (ISO, 2002).

### 2.5.3 Cultural Isolation techniques

According to the International Organization for Standardization (ISO 6579, 1998) it is customar to use three stage processes: pre-enrichment, selective enrichment and selective plating to isolate *Salmonella*.

#### 2.5.3.1 Pre-enrichment in non-selective liquid medium

Pre-enrichment allows the resuscitation and multiplication of sub-lethally damaged *Salmonella* cells (Blackburn, 1993). Non-selective media such as buffered peptone water (BPW) and nutrient broth are most widely used for resuscitation; buffered peptone water being recommended for routine purposes. BPW inoculated at ambient temperature with the test portion, then incubated at  $37 \text{ }^\circ\text{C} \pm 1 \text{ }^\circ\text{C}$  for  $18 \text{ h} \pm 2 \text{ h}$ . For large quantities, the buffered peptone water should be heated to  $37 \text{ }^\circ\text{C} \pm 1 \text{ }^\circ\text{C}$  before inoculation with the test portion. The need for resuscitation is now widely accepted for all types of samples and not merely those which have been dried or frozen (Varnam and Evans, 1991).

#### 2.5.3.2 Enrichment in selective liquid media

Selective enrichment helps to increase the ratio of *Salmonella* to competitor organisms. Many types of inhibitors have been proposed for the selective enrichment of *Salmonella*, the most widely used of which bile, tetrathionate, selenite and dyes are including brilliant green and malachite green. Various formulations of selenite and tetrathionate broths have been widely used, although in recent years there has been increasing use of the malachite green based Rappaport-Vassilliadis medium with soya (RVS) broth, the RVS broth is incubated at  $41.5 \text{ }^\circ\text{C} \pm 1 \text{ }^\circ\text{C}$  for  $24 \text{ h} \pm 3 \text{ h}$  (Varnam and Evans, 1991; Blackburn, 1993).

#### 2.5.4 Plating out and Identification of salmonella spp

Plating on selective agar media enables the recognition of *Salmonella* colonies while suppressing the growth of the back ground microflora. A wide range of media has been devised for selective plating. Selective plating media for *Salmonella* all contain a diagnostic system to permit differentiation of the organisms from non-*Salmonella*. This is commonly based on the inability of most salmonellas to ferment lactose and, in some cases, other carbohydrates such as sucrose and salicin. Bile containing media often employ a second diagnostic system based on the ability of *Salmonella* to produce hydrogen sulphide. Where competition from other bacteria is insignificant, a general-purpose medium such as MacConkey agars may be used (Quinn *et al.*, 2002).

Cloacal swabs were collected by sterile cotton and the swabs with bud were immediately inoculated in to nutrient broth incubated at 37°C for 1-2hrs and /or the RVS broth is incubated at 41.5 °C ± 1 °C for 24 h ± 3 h. In many cases, greater selectivity is required and it is necessary to use a medium devised specially for *Salmonella*, such as brilliant green agar (BGA), *Salmonella-Shigella* agar (SS agar), Xylose- lysine deoxycholate agar (XLD agar) and Eosin- methylene blue agar (EMB) agar plate were used for plating and identification purpose (Varnam and Evans, 1991; Blackburn, 1993; Quinn *et al.*, 1994). So, the nutrient broth containing the samples were incubated at 37° C for 1-2 hrs. A loop-full of inoculum from each cloacal swab sample was transferred and streaked/ spread/ separately onto the surface of S-S agar plates. The plates was incubated at 37°C ± 1°C for 24 ± 3 hours. After proper incubation, the plates were examined for the presence of suspected *Salmonella* colonies, which on SS agar were colourless or translucent and black color colonies were observed. The pure organisms were sub- cultured in to XLD agar were pink with a darker center and a lightly transparent zone of reddish color due to the color change of the indicator whereas lactose positive salmonellae are yellow with or without blackening. Similarly, subcultured onto EMB agar, small, circular pink colour colony was examined. Thus single pure colony was obtained. These pure isolates were used for the further study. 87 *Salmonella* presumptive colonies were transferred to non selective solid media for further confirmatory tests.

#### 2.5.5 Biochemical confirmation of Salmonella isolates

All suspected *Salmonella* isolates were subjected to the following biochemical tests for confirmation: Triple Sugar Iron (TSI) test, Indole test, Citrate utilization test, Methyl red test, vogues Proskauer (VP) test, and urease test. Colonies producing red slant (alkaline), with yellow butt (acid) on TSIA with

blackening due to hydrogen sulphide (H<sub>2</sub>S) production and (gas production) in butt, negative for Indole test, positive for Methyl red test (red broth culture), negative for urea hydrolysis (yellow), positive for citrate utilization (deep blue slant), and negative for Voges-Proskauer (VP) test were considered to be *Salmonella* positive (ISO 6579, 2002; Quinn *et al.*, 2004). Presumptive *Salmonella* isolates that were found fulfilled the *Salmonella* characteristics on all biochemical tests indicated above were transferred and cultured on Nutrient Agar (NA) for antimicrobial sensitivity and motility tests.

#### 2.6 Antimicrobial Susceptibility test

The antimicrobial susceptibility testing of the isolates was performed with Kirby-Bauer disk diffusion method according to Clinical and Laboratory Standards Institute of U.S.A (CLSI, USA) and Kirby-Bauer Disk Diffusion Susceptibility Test Protocol (Jan, 2013) on Muller Hinton agar medium.

The antibiotics that were used against the isolated organisms with their disc concentration are Chloramphenicol 30 µg (CHL), Ciprofloxacin 5 µg (CIP), Streptomycin (10µg), Gentamycin 10 µg (GEN), Kanamycin 30 µg (KAN), Tetracycline 30µg (TE), Norfloxacin 10 µg (NOR), Nalidixic acid (NA) (30µg), and Trimethoprim 5 µg (TMP), Oxoid Company (Hampshire, England), was used for Antimicrobial susceptibility testing.

From each biochemically confirmed isolates, loopful of well grown colonies on nutrient agar were transferred with sterile loop into sterile tubes containing 2ml of normal saline solution (0.85%NaCl).

The inoculated colonies mixed well with saline solution by vortex until smooth suspension was formed. Saline solution (if suspension more turbid) or colonies (if suspension less turgid) were added to the suspension until it achieved to the 0.5 McFarland turbidity standards. Then sterile cotton swab were dipped into the suspension and the bacteria were swabbed uniformly over the entire surface of Muller Hilton Agar plate. The plates were being held at room temperature for 3 minutes in biosafety cabinet to allow drying. The antibiotic discs was placed on the agar plate using disc dispenser/ sterile forceps and pressed gently to ensure the complete contact with the agar surface. The plates was read after 24 hours of incubation at 35 °C under aerobic condition. The isolates was classified in accordance with the guideline of the National Committee for Clinical Laboratory Standards (CLSI, 2006) as susceptible, intermediate or resistance for each antibiotic tested according to the manufacturer's instructions. The diameters of clear zone of inhibition produced by diffused antimicrobial on lawn inoculated bacterial

colonies were measured to the nearest mm using caliper.

This method allowed for the rapid determination of the efficacy of the drugs. Intermediate results was considered as resistant (Huber *et al.*, 2011). Multiple antibiotic resistant (MAR) phenotypes was recorded for isolates showing resistance to three and more antibiotics (Rota *et al.*, 1996).

### 2.7. Data Management and Analysis

Processing of data was done by computer software. Data was coded and entered to MS Excel spreadsheet and checked for accuracy. After validation, it was transferred and processed using computer software STATA version 12 for analysis. Pearson's chi-square tests were used when appropriate to analyze the proportions of categorical data. Odd ratio and 95% CI were computed, the 95% confidence

level was used, and results was considered significant at ( $P < 0.05$ ).

## 3. Results

### 3.1 Distribution of Salmonella in poultry

A total of 384 local and exotic poultry samples were randomly collected at Bambasi, Assosa and pawe local poultry farms during the study period. Samples were processed microbiologically for isolation and identification of *Salmonella*. Based on the bacteriological culture and biochemical test, 87/384 (22.65%) *Salmonella spp* were isolated and it was found to be statistically significant ( $P < 0.000$ ,  $\chi^2 = 365.08$ ). The highest salmonella distribution were observed in pawe poultry farm (31.76%) while the lowest prevalence was reported in Asossa pa (16.66%) as shown in (Table 5).

**Table 5: Origin based prevalence of salmonella by culture and biochemical test**

Study sites	No of chickens examined	Prevalence%	95%CI	Chi2	p-value
Bambasi no. 02 & 01	77	15(19.48)	0.86-1.19	6.29	0.17
Shobora	75	17(22.66)			
N/keshmando	57	13(22.80)			
Pawe	85	27(31.76)			
Asossa (01,04,05)	90	15(16.66)			
Total	<b>384</b>	<b>87(22.65)</b>			

Up on kwallis and logistic regression tests, (384 Chicken swab samples were examined, overall salmonella prevalence at different study site level were ( $n=384$ , 22.65%). The prevalence of salmonella amongst study sites has significant difference ( $df= 4$ ,  $St. err=0.08$ ,  $OR=1.01$ ,  $X^2=6.29$ ,  $P=0.2$ ) (Table 5).

### 3.2 Motility test Results

All 87/384 (22.65%) positive isolates of salmonella species were screened for motility test. 70 (80.45%) isolates were found to be non motile while 17 (19.54%) were motile, which were isolated from cloacal swab, as shown in table 6.

**Table 6: Motility test for positive isolates**

Motility test	Prevalence (%)	Asossa farm	Bambasi farm	Pawe farms	total
Non- motile	17(19.54)	3.28	8.39	5.33	17
Motile	70(80.45)	17.24	51.73	31.03	70

### 3.3. Risk Factors Associated with salmonellosis

Prevalence of salmonella related to the specific risk factors were determined as the proportion of affected chickens out of the total examined. As indicated in (Table 7), the questionnaire survey and observation data result shows previous treatment history, breed factors, age, and body conditions are amongst the potential risk factors, which are

associated with salmonella disease in poultry/chicken farms. Accordingly, salmonella prevalence showed significant variation among previous treatment history ( $p = 0.04$ ), body conditions ( $p=0.004$ ). In present study, however; sanitary, breed, sex, floor type and age categories have no significant difference with salmonella ( $p > 0.05$ ) as indicated in table 7.

**Table 7: Distribution of poultry salmonellosis in Assosa, Bambasi and pawe woredas' association with different potential risk factors**

Factor	Level	No examined	Prevalence (%)	Chi2	P-value
Age	1-4m	151	43(28.47)	5.59	0.06
	>4-7m	172	30(17.44)		
	>7m-2yr	61	14 (22.95)		
Sex	Male	178	45(25.28)	1.30	0.25
	Female	206	42(20.38)		
Bcs	Good	175	33(18.85)	15.52	0.004
	Medium	180	39(21.66)		
	Poor	29	15(51.72)		
Sanitary	Good	64	12(18.75)	0.66	0.41
	Poor	320	75(23.4)		
Housing system	floor bedding	221	52(23.52)	0.22	0.63
	cage system	163	35(21.47)		
Previous treatment	Yes	154	43(27.92)	4.06	0.04
	No	230	44(19.13)		
Treatment status	Yes	133	34(25.56)	0.98	0.32
	No	251	53(21.16)		
Management status	Good	41	10(24.39)	0.58	0.74
	Medium	83	21(25.30)		
	Poor	260	56(21.54)		
Breed	Local	134	23(17.16)	3.54	0.06
	Exotic	250	64(25.6)		

NB: Chi2= chi-square

### 3.4. *In vitro* antimicrobial Susceptibility Test

From 70 isolates of *Salmonella gallinarium/pullorium* obtained from the study, antimicrobial susceptibility tests were performed on 46 isolates. The present study has demonstrated the existence of the levels of resistance of *S.gallinarium* to commonly used antimicrobial agents in the study area. The antimicrobial susceptibility profile of all isolates were assessed against ten antimicrobials by disk diffusion technique; almost all isolates were resistant to one or more of the tested antimicrobials. 84.78%, 80.43%, 76.08%, 69.56%, 67.39%, 56.52% and 47.82% of the isolates were resistant to Tetracycline, Streptomycin, Kanamycine, Norfloxacin, Trimthoprim, Nalidixic Acid and Chloramphenicol respectively (Table-9). However, the majority of the isolates were susceptible to ciprofloxacin and gentamycin, followed by sulphonamides (Table-8).

Out of 46 isolates, 44(95.65%) were /MDR/ resistant to different combinations of two or more/ multidrug/ tested antimicrobials and the remaining 1(2.2%) isolates were non multidrug resistance/non MDR/. Besides this, 6 (13.04%) of the isolates were the most frequent multidrug resistant pattern to four drugs which were, Tetracycline, Streptomycin,

kanamycin and norfloxacin as shown in table 9. From the total pure isolated *S. gallinarium*, 2(4.4%), 3(6.5%), 4(8.7%), 7(15.2%), 8(17.4%), 9(19.6%), and 12(26.08%) of the isolates were resistant for 2-10 drugs, respectively in Table 9.



Figure 1: Antimicrobial drug sensitivity test on sample from Assosa, Bambasi and pawe districts. 1) TTC, 2) Sterptomycin, 3) Norfloxacin, 4) Gentamycin, 5) Kanamycin

**Table 8: Antimicrobial susceptibility test result for Salmonella isolates (n = 46).**

Antimicrobial agents	Disc content (µg)	No of isolates	Resistance	Intermediate	Susceptible
			No (%)	No (%)	No (%)
Tetracycline (TE)	30	46	39 (84.78)	3 (6.52)	4 (8.69)
Gentamycin (CN)	10	46	8 (17.39)	12 (26.08)	26 (56.52)
Streptomycin (S)	10	46	37(80.43)	4 (8.69)	5 (10.86)
Chloramphenicol (C)	30	46	22(47.82)	10(21.73)	14(30.43)
Trimethoprim (w)	2	46	31(67.39)	4(8.69)	11(23.91)
Kanamycin (K)	30	46	35(76.08)	6(13.04)	5(10.86)
Sulphonamides (S3)	300	46	19(41.30)	3(6.52)	24(52.2)
Nalidixic Acid (NA)	30	46	26(56.52)	12(26.08)	8(17.39)
Ciprofloxacin (CIP)	5	46	3(6.52)	-	43(93.47)
Norfloracin (NOR)	10	46	32(69.56)	6(13.04)	8(17.39)

**Key:** S- Susceptible, I- Intermediate, R- Resistant profile of *Salmonella* isolated from cloacal swab of chicken.

**Table 9. Multi drug resistance (MDR) profile of the isolated salmonella**

Number	Antimicrobial resistance pattern ( No.)	No. of isolates resistance (%)
<b>One</b>	GEN (1), S (1)	2(4.34)
<b>Two</b>	CAF & STR (1)	1(2.17)
<b>Four</b>	STR, NAL, TET & GEN (1)	8(17.39)
	KAN, S, TET & NOR (6)	
<b>Five</b>	S3, CAF, TET, CIP (1)	7(15.22)
	STR, KAN, NAL, TMP, TET (2)	
	STR, KAN, NAL, TMP, TET (1)	
<b>Six</b>	KAN, S3, NAL, W, TET (4)	6(13.04)
	STR, CAF, NAL, TET, GEN, & NOR (1)	
	STR, S3, NAL, NOR, TET & CAF (2)	
<b>Seven</b>	STR, KAN, NAL, TMP, NOR, TET (3)	4(8.69)
	KAN, S3, NAL, TMP, NOR, TET & CAF (1)	
<b>Eight</b>	STR, CAF, KAN, NAL, TMP, TET, GEN & NOR (4)	9(19.56)
	STR, CAF, KAN, S3, GEN, TMP, NOR & TET (1)	
	STR, CAF, KAN, S3, NAL, NOR, TET & TMP (3)	
<b>Nine</b>	STR, CAF, KAN, NAL, TMP, GEN, TET & S3 (1)	6(13.04)
	STR, CAF, KAN, NAL, TMP, NOR, GEN, TET & S3 (1)	
	CAF, KAN, S3, NAL, TMP, NOR, GEN, TET & CIP (3)	
<b>Ten</b>	STR, CAF, KAN, S3, NAL, TMP, TET, CIP, & GEN (2)	3(6.52)
	STR, CAF, KAN, S3, NOR, NAL, TMP, GEN, TE & CIP (1)	
<b>Total</b>		<b>46(100%)</b>

**Key:** GEN = Gentamicin; KAN = Kanamycin; CIP = Ciprofloxacin; CAF = Chloranphenicol; TMP = Trimethoprim; S3 = Sulphonamides; TET = Tetracycline; NAL = Nalodixic Acid; and STR = Streptomycine, NOR= norfloracin

#### MAR (Multiple Antibiotic Resistance) Index

The MAR Index of an isolate is defined as a/b, where **a** represents the number of antibiotics to which the isolate was resistant and **b** represents the number of antibiotics to which the isolate was subjected. The MAR indexes of the isolates were calculated and noted and if bacteria having MAR Index > 0.2 indicates originate from an environment where several antibiotics are used (Jayaraman *et al.*, 2012).

In present observation, number of drugs to which the isolate was resistance = 7, number of antibiotic to which the isolate subjected =10, so MAR index = 7/10= 0.7; so, the MAR Index analysis reveals that the isolate had a very high MAR index value (>0.2).

#### 4. Discussion

In the present study, the overall prevalence of salmonella was 22.65 % in chickens/ poultry, which was statistically significant and associated with the

infection ( $\chi^2=365.08$ ,  $p < 0.000$ ). This result was in line with the previous studies made by Kasech M. (2015) in DAZARC poultry farm, at Bishoftu, Central Oromia, by Beshatu F. (2014) in Dire Dawa municipal abattoir, Ashwani *et al.* (2014) by serology method in Ethiopia, by Asmamaw A *et al.* (2018) by bacteriological method in Asossa and Bambasi districts, 30.4 %, 18%, 20%, and 23.2 salmonella infection respectively. Besides this, the prevalence of *Salmonella* in chicken samples was concord with the results of earlier studies made by Molla *et al.* (1999a) who reported 28.6%, 22.6%, and 15.4% in chicken gizzard, liver, and heart, respectively, Molla and Mesfin (2003) who detected (21.1%) *Salmonella* in chicken carcass and giblets samples in central Ethiopia, Tibaijuka *et al.* (2003) who indicated 18 % prevalence (54/301) in chicken meat and edible offals and Hang'ombe (1999) who published 20.5% frequency of isolation for *Salmonella* from dressed chicken carcass in Lusaka, Zambia. This variability in prevalence of salmonellosis between different reports could be attributed to differences in farms management practice. As poultry salmonellosis is a complex disease involving interactions of various factors such sanitary problems, environmental conditions, and causative agents, contamination in the farm during collection, transportation and poor hygiene of workers as well as farms and different in different farming system. Different authors reported that the presence of chickens of different ages in the farm, the presence of arthropod pests, wet and soiled litter in the farm (Smeltzer T *et al.*, 1979) and the housing system and flock size could be important reasons for egg contamination with various micro-organisms. Chicken feeds and hatcheries also possible sources of *Salmonella* infections in the farm.

However, this finding is higher as compared with the previous findings of Solomon T *et al.*, (2016) in Alage, Ziway and Shashemene area, Endrias ZG (2004) in Addis Ababa supermarkets, Liyuwork T *et al.* (2013) in Addis Ababa and F. Abunna *et al.* (2016) in and around Modjo, Central Oromia, (Aseffa *et al.*, 2011) from chicken table eggs by bacteriological methods in Ethiopia, (Hassanain *et al.*, 2012) in Egypt, and (Urji *et al.*, 2005) in Nigeria by bacteriological methods, 13.3%, 14%, 1.6%, 15.2%, 11.5%, 11.4%, and 12.5% salmonella infection in poultry farm respectively. The difference might be difference in farming system, poor hygienic practice in semi-intensive farm might contribute the major problem for high prevalence rate of salmonellosis.

Higher prevalence than present finding was also reported in Ethiopia and in other counties as 41.9% (Kindu and Addis, 2013) from fecal sample by bacteriological method, 35.7% (Endris *et al.*, 2013) of *S. Gallinarum* and *S. pullorum* from cloacal swab by

serology and culture, 55% (Kagambega *et al.*, 2013) in Burkina Faso, 56.5% (Khan *et al.*, 2014) in Pakistan, 45% v 60% (Jahan *et al.*, 2012) in Bangladesh in cloacal poultry swab samples, 66% (Jerngklinchan *et al.* 1994) from Thailand, 29.7% by Plummer *et al.* (1995) from whole bird in UK, 38.3% (Rusal *et al.*, 1996) in Malaysia from poultry carcass arising from wet markets and processing plants, and Arumugaswamy *et al.*, (1995) from Malaysia also reported a much higher *Salmonella* isolation rate from chicken portions (39%), liver (35%) and gizzard (44%).

Likewise, lower prevalence than the present finding was also reported in Ethiopia and other countries. Few examples include 0.8% (Kassaye *et al.*, 2010) of *Gallinarum* and *S. pullorum* from cloacal swabs by culture technique, 10.9% (Agada *et al.*, 2014) in Nigeria, 9.2% (Al-Abadi and Al-Mayah, 2012) in Iraq in culture techniques in cloacal swab samples and 32(16%) of the 198 skin samples (Whyte *et al.* (2000) in Ireland, using the culture methods. These differences above (higher or lower prevalence) from present finding might be resulted from the difference in isolation technique, and difference in geographical location, difference in biosecurity measure like cross – contamination and poor housing system.

Occurrence of salmonella was significantly associated with hygienic practice. Poultry at farms with poor hygiene/ poor management/ standard are severely affected than those with good hygiene/ sanitary/ management practices. (23.43%) higher prevalence of salmonella infection was recorded in poor housing system whereas (18.75%) lower infection was investigated in good housing system but it was not significantly associated with infection ( $\chi^2=66$ ,  $p=0.41$ ).

This might be due to absence of good sanitary /bedding of poultry house and feed, water contamination infected ones faces and egg as well. This result was consistent with Deen *et al.* (2001) who indicated, stresses due to transport, improper feeding and poor hygiene, etc. might happen to these animals considering the prevailing socioeconomic conditions, knowledge and awareness of the people, particularly those from rural areas. Different authors (Deen *et al.*, 2001; Wray and Davies, 2000) have attributed various stress factors to be in favor of increased *Salmonella* prevalence. Besides this, the present finding supports the report of Davies and Hinton (2000) “Even though feed, sanitary is widely accepted as a source of possible contamination, the incidence of outbreaks being attributed to feed is very low”. The detection were more or less in harmony with AL-Iedani *et al.* (2014) finding that 14% from cloacal swab, 37% from litter, 10% from water and



20% from ration of *Salmonella* isolate had identified. And also the level of contamination of dressed chicken meat was found to be slightly higher than the 11.5% prevalence report by Živkovic *et al.* (1997) on market ready dressed chicken meat, in Zagreb, Croatia and 4.2% by Zhao *et al.* (2001) from Greater Washington D.C. area. Variation in the frequency of isolation of *salmonella* between the present and earlier studies in Ethiopia might stem from either actual difference in prevalence of *Salmonella* in carrier chicken in the flock of origin or the fact that, unlike our studies, giblets were included in previous studies, which contributed substantially for the difference in prevalence.

Similarly, according to D'Aoust (1989) high prevalence of *Salmonella* in chicken carcass is attributable to problems associated with poultry husbandry, processing, and cross-contamination of carcasses in slaughtering plant through common scalding, de-feathering, and chilling processes. The same author also showed that cross-contamination from the hands of workers, equipment and utensils can spread the bacterium to uncontaminated carcass and parts. The relatively high prevalence of *Salmonella* in dressed chicken carcass might have emerged, in part, from their feeding habits i.e., their daily ration comprises of animal proteins, as source of essential amino acids and minerals, that might have been contaminated with *Salmonella* (D'Aoust, 1989; Pegram, 1981). Similar result was reported by Netsanet *et al.* (2012), who indicated, the low prevalence in the intensive farms might be due to a relatively good management practice including ventilation, proper spacing and relatively trained workers whereas high prevalence of infection in semi-intensive system due to economic reason to accommodate good housing with trained personnel.

The findings of (23.52%) high prevalence of salmonella in farms with floors bedding was diagnosed whereas (21.47%) lower infection was recorded in cage types, which influence the occurrence of salmonella, and was not statistically significant ( $p > 0.05$ ), this result was concord with finding of Al-Abadi and Al-Mayah (2012) 19.1 % salmonella isolated from fecal samples. Comparably low result was reported by Tessema K. *et al.*, (2017) in Haramaya poultry farm, 2.3% and 3.3% salmonella positive egg samples were recorded from cage and floor house system respectively; however, there was no statistically significant difference ( $P > 0.05$ ) in the prevalence of *Salmonella* among the two house systems. The slight increase of prevalence might be due to poor housing system which have access to entrance of carriers of salmonella like rodents, birds and pests to poultry farm and cross contamination also associated with farm workers, hygienic status, air

quality, confinement of birds and dust originated from feed and faeces may contain large number of microorganisms and this poor system favor the proliferation and transmission of salmonella pathogens. It could also be due to contamination from equipment, floor and hands of personnel, as has been reported by various authors (Baird-Parker, 1990; Smeltzer *et al.*, 1980b; Smeltzer *et al.*, 1980a; Smeltzer *et al.*, 1979; Watson, 1975). Comparably, Baird-Parker (1990) reported that, the main sources of infection are infected chickens transferred via environment contamination.

The prevalence of salmonella in local chicken was (17.16%) whereas infection in cross/ exotic/ breed was (25.6%) which was slightly not significantly associated with the occurrence of salmonellosis ( $p > 0.06$ ,  $\chi^2 = 3.54$ ). This finding was lower when compared with the reports made by Zhao *et al.* (2001) from Greater Washington D.C. area, it is of interest to note that 69.2% of dressed chicken carcass sampled, originated from indigenous backyard local chicken with different management from commercial farms. Unlike the previous studies made on chicken in Ethiopia, it is of interest to note that 144 (69.2%) of dressed chicken carcass sampled in this research work originated from indigenous backyard local chicken with different management from commercial farms. Comparably lower research was reported by Tessema K. *et al.*, (2017) in Haramaya poultry farm, who indicated, the prevalence of *Salmonella* in eggs on the bases of chicken breed sources was 2.9%, 3.8% and 2% for Bovans, Fayoumi and White leg horn, respectively; the prevalence difference was not show statistical significance ( $P > 0.05$ ) between the rate of detecting *Salmonella* spp., and non-significant analytical situation was observed in eggs sampled from different chicken breeds. This is presumably due to unequal exposure to the risk factors as the breeds were housed in different house system. This difference might be due to Fayoumi breed was kept in the floor house system in which there is lower hygienic and high cross contamination between the flock eggs at laying than the cage house system. Other study also reported that one day- old chicks orally infected with *S.pullorum* produced contaminated eggs frequently during the period of sexual maturity as a consequence of reproductive tract colonization (Wigley *et al.*, 2001).

The effect of different risk factors such as sex, study sites, age categories, body conditions, previous treatment history, treatment status, and breed types on prevalence of chicken salmonellosis was studied and statistically significant associations were observed in body conditions and previous treatment history ( $p < 0.05$ ), and also breed type, and age factors were slightly significant ( $p < 0.06$ ) while study sites, sex

groups, sanitary conditions and treatment status were not found to be statistically significant in this study ( $P>0.05$ ). This result is in agreement with previous reports of (Wigley *et al.*, 2001). So, (28.47%) higher salmonella infection was recorded in 1-4 month years age of chicken where as lower infection (17.44%) was diagnosed in >4month - 7month years of age chickens which was statistically non-significant ( $p>0.06$ ,  $\chi^2=5.59$ ). And also body condition had a significant influence on the occurrence of salmonella, higher prevalence (51.72%) of salmonella infection was recorded in poor body conditions whereas 18.85% salmonella infection were observed in good body conditions respectively, which was significantly associated with salmonella infection ( $\chi^2=15.52$ ,  $p<0.004$ ). Higher prevalence of salmonella infection was recorded in male (25.28%) where as lower infection was registered in female (20.38%) sex categories, which was not statistically significant ( $\chi^2=1.30$ ,  $p>0.05$ ). The fact that salmonellosis do not depend on gender could possibly be hypothesised that both male and female animals have virtually equal chance of being in contact with infection and ultimately developing the disease.

Many reports on treatment trials of *Salmonella* infection do not contain detailed descriptions of host factors of the treated animals, or of the strains causing the infections that are treated (Barkema *et al.*, 2006). In the previously infected animals, the *Salmonella* isolates which were responsible to the previous infection were not eliminated by the effect of various antibiotics which was related to the development of drug resistance by *Salmonella* organisms. But mainly, salmonellosis is a complex disease involving interactions of several factors, mainly of management, and factors relating to animal and causative organisms (Tessema K. *et al.*, (2017).

Previous treatment history of poultry had a significant influence on the occurrence of salmonella infection, 27.92 % of salmonella was reported in previously treated poultry where as 19.13% infection was registered in not previously treated case of salmonella, which were higher. This result was not significant ( $\chi^2=0.406$ ,  $P < 0.04$ ). Similarly, 25.56% salmonella infection was recorded in treated poultry whereas 21.16% infection was recorded in not treated case of salmonella, which were not statistical significant difference ( $\chi^2=0.98$ ,  $P > 0.32$ ). The possible fair judgment for this could be that inappropriate implementation of antibiotics to treat salmonella case in some part of the study area leading to occurrence of an isolate which had a potential of drug resistance.

*Salmonella* in poultry are commonly classified into two groups on the basis of the diseases caused. The first group which consists of the poultry host-

adapted, pathogenic, non-motile *Salmonellae*, *S. pullorum* causes pullorum disease in chickens, and *S. gallinarum* is responsible for Fowl typhoid (Kwon *et al.*, 2000). The second groups of *Salmonellae* are known as the paratyphoid *Salmonellae* and, they contain the two motile leading serotypes that are responsible for human infection, *S. typhimurium*, and *S. enteritidis* (Gast, 2003). The serotypes, *S. typhimurium*, and *S. enteritidis*, which produces illness in humans, usually remain sub-clinical in layer birds (Quinn *et al.*, 2002). Accordingly, most of non- host specific, motile *Salmonella* in poultry are probably zoonotic which cause disease in humans through food chains. With this view and understanding that motility tests were conducted for all 87 *Salmonella* isolates identified by culture and biochemical tests methods. Accordingly, 70(80.45%) were non-motile while 17(19.54%) were found motile. This findings was high as compare to, Jahan *et al.* (2012) in Bangladesh, and F. Abunna *et al.* (2016) in and around Modjo, (59.26%, motile v 40.74%, non-motile) and ( 67.74% motile v 32.3% non motile ) salmonella respectively by motility test. The motile isolates were suspected to be zoonotic serovars like *S. typhimurium*, and *S. enteritidis* while non motile once suspected as poultry adapted salmonellosis (*S. pullorum* and *S. gallinarum*).

Regarding culture methods, since the isolation and correct identification of *Salmonella* are very crucial for the characterization purpose, the colonies having typical cultural characteristics were selected as presumptive for *Salmonella* serovars. In this study several selective media such as SS, EMB, XLD were used simultaneously to culture the organism because all of them are not equally suitable for all the serovars of *Salmonella*. In the present study, specific enriched media were used for the isolation and identification of *Salmonellae* which was also used by a number of researchers such as Hyeon JY *et al.*, (2012), Muktaruzzaman *et al.*, (2010), Habrun, and Mitak, (2003). The colony characteristics of *Salmonella spp.* found in this study was translucent, black, smooth, small round colonies on SS agar, Pink color colony on EMB agar and pink color colony with black centre in XLD agar, were similar to the findings of other authors (Muktaruzzaman *et al.*, (2010) Sujatha *et al.*, (2003) Habrun, and Mitak., (2003 ). Of which 87 samples were detected as positive for *salmonella spp.*

All the isolates were susceptible to Ciprofloxacin, Gentamycin and sulphonamides. The reason why these antimicrobials were less resistant/susceptible/ might be that they are not used in the study area in veterinary clinics or services and even not frequently used (infrequent use of therapeutics) perhaps in human medicine.

This finding is similar with finding of Begum *et al.* (2010) on *Salmonella* isolates from chicken eggs, intestines and environmental samples. For the rest 7 different drugs, 43 (97.82%) were resistant to one or more of antimicrobials. This finding was concord with a numbers finding on *Salmonella* antibiogram tests, for isolates from poultry and poultry products samples like Maria (2010) from America, Jahan *et al.* (2012) in Bangladesh, Tabo *et al.* (2013) in Chad, Carraminana *et al.* (2004) from Spain. However, the current finding is not in agreement with results of Singh *et al.* (2013) from India, and Antunes *et al.* (2003) from Portugal, but different with resistant patterns. Disagreement may be due to different strains of isolates and/or difference in levels of strains' resistivity.

Accordingly, 39 (84.8%), 37 (80.43%), 35(76.08%), 32(69.56%), 31 (67.39%), 26 (56.52%), and 22 (47.82%) were resistant to Tetracycline, Streptomycin, kanamycin, Norfloxacin, Trimethoprim, Nalidixic acid and Chloramphenicol respectively. High resistant to Tetracycline, Streptomycin, Nalidixic acid, Norfloxacin, Kanamycin, Sulphamethoxazole-Trimethoprim were in agreement with what Maria, (2010) and Jahan *et al.* (2012) found on poultry related resistant isolates. And also this finding goes with what Davies (1996) found that most of the *Enterobacteriaceae* family including *Salmonella* is resistant to the drugs including Aminoglycosides, beta lactams, Trimethoprim and Chloramphenicol. Similar research was reported by Tessema K. *et al.*, (2017) in Haramaya poultry farm, who indicated, 72.7% were resistant to one or more of the tested antimicrobials and the most common resistance observed was tetracycline (72.7%). However, spectinomycin, kanamycin and chloramphenicol were effective against most of the *Salmonella* isolate. Comparable result was reported by Beshatu F. (2014) in Dire Dawa municipal abattoir, who showed, highest level of resistance was observed for tetracycline (100%), nitrofurans (100%), streptomycin (81.8%) and kanamycin (79.5%).

Out of 46 isolates, 44(95.65%) were /MDR/ resistant to different combinations of two or more tested antimicrobials and the remaining 1(2.2%) isolates were non multi drug resistance/non MDR/. Besides this, 6 (13.04%) of the isolates were the most frequent multidrug resistant pattern to four drugs which were, Tetracycline, Streptomycin, kanamycin and norfloxacin. From the total pure isolated *S. gallinarium*, 2(4.4%), 3(6.5%), 4(8.7%), 7(15.2%), 8(17.4%), 9(19.6%), and 12(26.08%) of the isolates were resistant for 2-10 drugs, respectively. Comparably result was reported by F. Abunna *et al.*, (2016) in and around Modjo, Central Oromia, and Ethiopia, who indicated, 18 (94.73%) of multi-drug resistant (MDR) isolates were found resistant to five to

seven different antimicrobials. The present finding was concord with the findings of Payne *et al.* (2006) on broiler farms in which 96% of the isolates were resistant to greater than one antimicrobial agent (s) and Silvia *et al.* (2005) all strains isolated from poultry related samples were resistant to at least one antimicrobial agent. All except one (45/46) multi-drug resistant isolates were resistant to two to ten (2-10 drugs) different antimicrobials. Only one isolate was resistant to two different antimicrobials, 8(17.39%) isolates are resistance to 4 drugs, 7(15.22%) isolates are resistance to 5 drugs, 4(8.69%) isolates are resistance to 7 drug, 9 (19.56%) isolates were resistance to 8 drugs, 12 isolates (26.08%) were resistance to 6-9 drugs, and 3( 6.52%) isolates were resistance to 10 drugs. Eight isolates (17.4%), 7 isolates (15.2%), 4 isolates (8.7%), 9 isolates (19.6%), 12 isolates (26.08%), 3 isolates (6.5%) resistant to isolates were shows tetra-, penta-, hepta, octa, hexa v nano, and deca respectively, with different resistance patterns. This result was similar with the findings of F. Abunna *et al.* (2016) in and around modjo, reported, 2, 5, 4, and 7 isolates were tetra-, penta-, hexa-, and hepta resistant, respectively.

This finding support the one that Sangeeta *et al.* (2010) reported on resistant isolated from chicken eggs poultry farms and from markets in that two isolates were resistant to as many as 10 antibiotics whereas, 2 isolates were resistant to 9 antibiotics, 2 to 8 and 5 to 7 antibiotics. It also seems consort with that of Jahan *et al.* (2012) in which out of 27 multi-resistant isolates, five isolates were resist to five different antimicrobials, 6 to 8, 7 to7, and 7 to 8 different antimicrobials with different resistance patterns. These all multidrug *Salmonella* isolates were confirms what Poppe *et al.* (1995 and 2002) reported as saying *Salmonellae* are among those most known to carry plasmids, which encode for drug resistance R (resistance) plasmids. This implies that widespread use of antimicrobials in animals or humans may cause an increase in the frequency of occurrence of bacteria resistant to other antimicrobials as the R plasmid may encode resistance to additional antimicrobials.

Antimicrobial resistant *Salmonella* isolates to commonly used antimicrobials were detected; all isolates were resistant at least for one antimicrobial. However, all the isolates were susceptible to, ciprofloxacin, gentamycin and sulphonamides. All of the total isolates were resistant to one or more of the tested antimicrobials; 95.6 % were multiple antimicrobial resistant while the rest 2.2 % were resistant to single antimicrobial. This finding is in contrast to Zewdu (2004) who reported 25% antimicrobial resistant *Salmonella* isolates from cottage cheese. Detection of antimicrobial resistant *Salmonella* might be associated with their frequent

usage both in livestock and public health sectors as these antimicrobials are relatively cheaper and commonly available (D'Aoust, 1997).

The effectiveness of gentamycin, ciprofloxacin, and sulphonamides in this study might be due to the difference in frequency of usage among the available antimicrobials, the nature of drugs, and their interaction with the bacteria. Different individuals reported antimicrobial resistant *Salmonella* isolates in previous studies from Ethiopia (Gedebou and Tassew, 1981; Ashenafi and Gedebou, 1985; Molla *et al.*, 1999; Molla *et al.*, 2003) and from other countries (D'Aoust *et al.*, 1992; White *et al.*, 2001). The findings of 100% antimicrobial resistant *Salmonella* isolates from examined dairy items samples were remarkable. It represents public health hazard due to the fact that food poisoning outbreaks would be difficult to treat and this pool of MDR *Salmonella* in food supply represents a reservoir for the transferable resistant genes (Diaze De Aguayo *et al.*, 1992). This multidrug resistance occurred might be due to administration of multiple antibiotics for prophylaxis or infection, lack of drug sensitivity tests in the poultry farms, uncontrolled or discriminate use of antibiotics in the farms and another possibility is that poultry/chickens/ are being treated with antibiotics for other conditions, thereby selecting for resistant populations of *S. gallinarium* (Shitandi and Sternesjo, 2004). Similarly, comparable result was reported by Iwabuchi *et al.*, (2011) described that among 452 *Salmonella* isolates, 443 (98.0%) were resistant to one or more antibiotics, and 221 (48.9%) showed multiple antibiotic resistance, thereby implying that multiple-antibiotic resistant salmonella organisms are widespread in chicken meat in Japan and resistance to oxytetracycline was most common (72.6%), followed by dihydrostreptomycin (69.2%).

Most isolates showed high level of susceptibility to Ciprofloxacin which is in agreement with Harsha *et al.* (2011) who described Ciprofloxacin as an increasingly demanded and successfully used to treat septicemic case in humans and *Salmonella* isolates resistance to Ciprofloxacin has been found occasionally. The antimicrobial susceptibility test result revealed that the isolated bacterium that were subjected to ten different antibiotics found only non-resistant to ciprofloacin. Bacteria having MAR Index > 0.2 originate from an environment where several antibiotics are used (Tambekar *et al.*, 2006).

### Conclusion And Recommendations

Salmonellae are an important group of pathogens responsible for human and animal diseases. Among the 87(22.65%) positive isolates. Age categories, body conditions, previous treatment history, and breed factors were potential risk factors, which were

statistically significant value for salmonella infection ( $p < 0.05$ ) whereas origin/ sites/, sex groups, floor type and sanitary system were not significant ( $p > 0.05$ ). Almost all isolates were resistant to one or more of the tested antimicrobials. Of all isolates, 95.6 % were multidrug resistant (MDR). 84.78%, 80.43%, 76.08%, 69.56%, 67.39%, 56.52% and 47.82% of the isolates were resistant to Tetracycline, Streptomycin, Kanamycine, Norfloxacin, Trimthoprim, Nalidixic acid and Chloramphenicol respectively. However, the majority of the isolates were susceptible/ less resistance/ to ciprofloxacin and gentamycin, followed by sulphonamides.

Based on the above conclusion, the following recommendations are forwarded:-

- poultry farms are a potential source of *Salmonella* infection with antimicrobial resistance, and significant threat to public health particularly to those who have direct or indirect contact to poultry and poultry products so, hygienic management of poultry products and prudent use of antimicrobials are also suggested.
- Identified potential risk factors should be managed properly in order to minimize the transmission of salmonella species.
- Biosecurity measures should be strictly applied in poultry farms where cross contamination was high.
- Chickens should be checked for healthiness and adaptation of the environment for that particular area before rearing was planned to design and also precondition, predisposing factors should be assessed before production was conducted in farms so as to reduce or eradicated salmonellosis which was carrier once infect the chickens.
- Since *Salmonella* is resistant to most common drugs, attention should be taken in selecting antimicrobials in treating *Salmonella* infection both in animals and human being based on antimicrobial sensitivity test

### Acknowledgement

The author is very much indebted to the Benishagul Gumuz regional state, Regional Veterinary.

Diagnostic, Surveillance, Monitoring and Study Laboratory for funding the study. We are also grateful to the staffs for their unlimited support during the study.

### Corresponding Author:

Dr. Asmamaw Aki Jano  
Regional Veterinary Diagnostic, Surveillance,  
Monitoring and Study Laboratory  
Telephone: +251 0902330029  
Email: [asmamawaki@gmail.com](mailto:asmamawaki@gmail.com)

## References

1. Agada, Abdullahi, Aminu, Odugbo, Chollom, Okeke, and Okwori. (2014): Prevalence and risk factors associated with *Salmonella* species contamination of commercial poultry farms in Jos, Plateau State, Nigeria. *World Journal of Biology and Biological Sciences*,2:049-061.
2. Al-Abadi, and Al- Mayah. (2012): Isolation and identification of *Salmonella spp.* from chicken and chicken environment in Basrah province. MSc thesis submitted to Department of Pathology and Poultry Diseases, College of Veterinary Medicine Basrah University, Basrah, Iraq.
3. Ayalu A. Reda, Berhanu Seyoum, Jemal Yimam, Gizachew Andualem, Sisay Fiseha and Jean-Michel Vandeweerd. (2011): Antibiotic susceptibility patterns of *Salmonella* and *Shigella* isolates in Harar, Eastern Ethiopia. *Journal of Infectious Diseases and Immunity* 3(8): 134-139, Available at (<http://www.academicjournals.org/JIDI>).
4. Antunes, P., C. Re'u, C. Sousa, L. Peixe, and N. Pestana. (2003): Incidence of *Salmonella* from poultry products and their susceptibility to antimicrobial agents. *International Journal of Food Microbiology*,82:97– 103.
5. Ashenafi M. and Gedebo M. (1985): *Salmonella* and *Shigella* in adult diarrhoea in Addis.
6. Ababa - prevalence and antibiograms. *Trans R Soc. Trop. Med. Hyg.*79(5): 719-721.
7. AL-Iedani, M. Khudor, and Oufi. (2014): Isolation and identification of *Salmonella*spp from poultry farms by using different techniques and evaluation of their antimicrobial susceptibilities. Basrah. *Journal of Veterinary Resistance*,1: 234-239.
8. Assefa, M., A. Teklu, and H. Negussie. (2011): The Prevalence and Public Health Importance of *Salmonella* from Chicken Table Eggs, Ethiopia. *American-Eurasian Journal of Agriculture and Environmental Science*,11: 512-518.
9. Ashwani, K., K. Etsay, T. Yohaness, K.Y.o. Tsegabirhan, A. Kassaw, and T. Tsegay. (2014): Seroprevalence of *Salmonella Gallinarum* Infection in Chicken Population of parts of Tigray and Addis Ababa by Plate Agglutination and Microagglutination Tests. *Momona Ethiopian Journal of Science*,6: 33-38.
10. Beshatu F. (2014): Isolation, Identification, Antimicrobial susceptibility test and public awareness of *salmonella* on raw goat meat at dire dawa municipal abattoir, Eastern Ethiopia, Addis Ababa University, College of Veterinary Medicine and agriculture. MSc thesis.
11. Netsanet, B., A. Berihun, A. Nigus, T. Abreha and K. Shewit, (2012): Seroprevalence of *Salmonella Pullorum* infection in local and exotic commercial chicken from Mekelle areas, northern Ethiopia, *J. Veterinary Med.*, 13: 1-16.
12. Arumugaswamy, R.K., Rusul, G., Abdul Hamid, S.N. and Cheah, C.T. (1995): Prevalence of *Salmonella* in raw and cooked foods in Malaysia. *Food Microbiol.* 12: 3 – 8.
13. Kasech M. (2015): Isolation and characterization of bacteria associated with yolk sac infection (omphalitis) in chicks in bishoftu poultry farms, ethiopia. Addis Ababa University college of Veterinary Medicine and Agriculture. MSc thesis.
14. Liyuwork T. *et al.* (2013): Prevalence and antimicrobial resistance profile of *Salmonella* isolates from Dairy products in Addis Ababa, Ethiopia. *African journal of microbiology research*, Vol. 7 (43), pp 5046-5050.
15. F. Abunna *et al.*, (2016): *Salmonella*: Isolation and Antimicrobial susceptibility tests on isolates collected from poultry farms in and around Modjo, Central Oromia, and Ethiopia. *Journal of Animal and poultry science* 2016, 5(2): 21-35.
16. Tessema K. *et al.*, (2017): Prevalence and Antibiotic Resistance of *Salmonella* Species Isolated from Chicken Eggs by Standard Bacteriological Method. *J Vet Sci Technol* 2017, 8:1.
17. Endriaszg (2004): Prevalence, Distribution and Antimicrobial resistance profile of *salmonella* isolated from food items and personnel in addis ababa, Ethiopia, Addis Ababa University Faculty of Veterinary Medicine, pp 32-36.
18. Endris, M., F. Tadesse, M. Geloye, T. Degefa, T. Jibat. (2013): Sero and Media culture prevalence of Salmonellosis in local and exotic chicken, DebreZeit, Ethiopia African. *Journal of Microbiology Research*, 7:1041-1044.
19. Solomon T. *et al* (2016): Prevalence and Antimicrobial Susceptibility Pattern of *Salmonella* Species from Exotic Chicken Eggs in Alage, Ziway and Shashemene, Ethiopia. *African Journal of Basic & Applied Sciences* 8 (3): 180-184, 2016.
20. Beyene, G., Nair, S., Asrat, D., Mengistu, Y., Engers, H. and Wain, J. (2011): Multidrug resistant *Salmonella* Concord is a major cause of salmonellosis in children in Ethiopia, *Journal of Infect Dev Ctries*, 5: 023–033.
21. Brenner, F.W., Villar, R.G., Angulo, F.J., Tauxe, R. and Swaminathan, B. (2000): *Salmonella* nomenclature. *Journal of Clinical Microbiology* 38: 2465-2467.

22. Blackburn, C. de. W. (1993): Rapid and alternative methods for the detection of salmonellas in foods. *J. Appl. Bacteriol.* 75, 199-214.
23. Baird-parker, A. C. (1990): Foodborn salmonellosis. *The Lancet*, 336, 1231-1235.
24. Begum K, Reza TA, Haque M, Hossain A, Hussar FMK, et al. (2010): Isolate, Identification and Antibiotic Resistance Patterns of Salmonella Species from Chicken Eggs, Intestine and Environmental Samples. Bangladesh, Pharmaceutical Journal. 13: 0301-4606.
25. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC). (2007): *Salmonella* surveillance: annual summary, 2005. U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. Atlanta, Georgia.
26. Centers for Disease Control (CDC). (2008): Get Smart: Know When Antibiotics Work: Glossary. (<http://www.cdc.gov/drugresistance/community/glossary.htm>) Accessed on August 14, 2012.45.
27. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention [CDC]. *Salmonella*. Technical information [online]. CDC; 2013 Jan. Available at: <http://www.cdc.gov/salmonella/general/technical.html>. Accessed 6 Dec 2013.
28. Davies, H., and H. Hinton. (2000): *Salmonella* in animal feed. CAB International, New York. Pp: 285-300.
29. D'Aoust, J., (2000): *Salmonella* in microbiological safety and quality of food, *Int J Food Microbiol.*, 2: 233-299.
30. Duijkeren, E.V., Wannet, W.J.B., Houwers, D.J. and Pelt, W.V. (2003): Antimicrobial susceptibilities of *Salmonella* strains isolated from humans, cattle, pigs and chickens in The Netherlands from 1984 to 2001. *Journal of Clinical Microbiology* 41: 3574-3578.
31. D' Aoust J Y, (1989): *Salmonella*. Foodborne Bacterial Pathogens. M. P. Doyle, ed. Marcel Dekker Inc., New York, NY. pp 327-445.
32. NMSA (National Meteorological Services Agency), (2014): Monthly report on temperature and Rainfall. Distribution for Asossa Zone, Regional Metrological Office, Asossa, Ethiopia.
33. CSA (2015): The 2015/16 Ethiopian Agricultural Sample Enumeration (EASE), Executive summary, May 2016, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia.
34. Davies, R. H. (1995): *Salmonella* isolation methods in the United Kingdom. In: Proc. Symposium on the diagnosis of *Salmonella* infections, Reno, Pp. 33-55.
35. Deen, J., Dec, S., Morrison, R.B., Radostits, O.M. (2001): Health and Production Management in Swine Herds. In: Radostits, O.M. (ed.), *Herd Health: Food Animal Production Medicine*. 3 rd ed. E.B. Saunders Company. USA. Pp 749 – 750.
36. Diaz De Aguayo, M.E., Duarte, A.B.L., and Montes De Oca Canastillo, F. (1992): Incidence of multiple antibiotic resistant organisms isolated from retail milk products in Hermosillo, Mexico. *J. Food Prot.* 55 (5): 370 – 373.
37. Ellermeier, C.D and Slauch, J.M. (2006): Genus *Salmonella*. In: Dworki M.D. (ed.). *The Prokaryotes: A Handbook on the Biology of Bacteria*. SpringerPress. New York.
38. Endrias Z. (2004): Prevalence, distribution and antimicrobial resistance profile of *Salmonella* isolated from food items and personnel in Addis Ababa, Ethiopia. A MSc. thesis submitted to the Faculty of Veterinary Medicine, Addis Ababa University in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the Degree of Master of Science in Tropical Veterinary Medicine.
39. Environmental Science and Research Limited (ESR). (2004): Risk profile: *Salmonella* (no typhoidal) in and on eggs. Avialable at: ([www.nzfsa.govt.nz/science/datasheets/salmonella-eggs.pdf](http://www.nzfsa.govt.nz/science/datasheets/salmonella-eggs.pdf)).
40. European Commission (EC). (2006): Commission Regulation (EC) No 1177/2006 of 1 August 2006 implementing Regulation (EC) No 2160/2003 of the European Parliament and of the Council as regards requirements for the use of specific control methods in the framework of the national programmes for the control of *Salmonella* in poultry. *Official J European Union* 212: 3-5.
41. European Food Safety Authority (EFSA). (2005): Opinion of the scientific panel on biological hazards on the request from the commission related to the microbiological risks on washing of table eggs. *The EFSA Journal* 269: 1-39.
42. Fluit, A.C. (2005): Mini review: Towards more virulent and antibiotic-resistant *Salmonella*? *FEMS Immunology and Medical Microbiology* 43: 1-11.
43. Forshell, P., and M. Wierup. 2006. *Salmonella* contamination: a significant challenge to the global marketing of animal foods products. *Review OfficeInternational des Epizooties, Paris*,25: 541-554.
44. Franco, M., and M. Landgraf. 2004. *Microbiologia dos alimentos*. *Atheneu*, page: 182, Sao Paulo.
45. Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations/World Health Organization. (2004): FAO/WHO Regional conference on food safety for Asia and Pacific. The national surveillance system for food-borne disease in China. Seremban, Malaysia, 24-27.

46. Gedebo, M and Tassew A. (1981): Antimicrobial resistance and R factor of *Salmonella* isolates from Addis Ababa, *Ethiop Med J.* 19: 77-85.
47. Hassanain, A., A. Siam, M. Hamed, and M. Salman. (2012): Incidence of antibiotic resistant *Salmonella* species in food producing animals and human contacts. *Zoonotic Diseases Department, National Research Center, Giza, Egypt*, Pp: 1-4.
48. Hitti, W. & Wolff, M. (2005): Two cases of multidrug-resistant *Nocardia farcinica* infection in Immune suppressed patients and implications for empiric therapy. *European Journal of Clinical Microbiology and Infectious Diseases* 24: 142-144.
49. Hang'ombe, B.M., Sharma, N.R., Skjerve, E., and Tuchili, L.M. (1999): Isolation of bacteria during processing of chicken carcasses for the market in Lusaka, Zambia. *Vet. Arh.* 69 (4): 191 - 197.
50. Habrun B, Mitak M, (2003): Monitoring for faecal *Salmonella* spp. in poultry. Zagreb, Croatia: Croatian Veterinary Institute, Poultry Centre. V-Simpozij- Peradarski-Dani, Zbornik, Radova, Porec, Hrvatska, 14-17-svibnja, 161-163.
51. Hyeon JY, Chon JW, Hwang IG, Kwak HS, Kim MS, Kim SK, Choi IS, Song CS, Park C, Seo KH, (2012): Prevalence, antibiotic resistance, and molecular characterization of *Salmonella* serovars in retail meat products. *J. Food Protec.* 74: 161-166.
52. International Organization for Standardization (ISO), (2002): Microbiology of Food and Animal Feeding Stuff-Horizontal Method for the Detection of *Salmonella*. 4th ed. ISO 6579, Geneva.
53. Kassaye, A., T. Lencho, and A. Mesele. (2010): Prevalence of *Salmonella* Infection in Intensive Poultry Farms in Hawassa and Isolation of *Salmonella* species from sick and dead chickens. *Ethiopia Veterinary Journal*,14:115-124.
54. Khan, M., S. Mahmood, I. Hussain, F. Siddique, A. Rafique, A. Iqbal, and R. Zahid. (2014): Bacteriological and Epidemiological Investigations of Pullorum Disease in Selected Poultry Farms of Faisalabad, Pakistan. *Global Veterinaria*, 12: 455-460.
55. Kindu, A., and M. Addis. (2013): A survey on *Salmonella* infection among chicken flocks in Jimma town, Ethiopia. *African Journal of Microbiology Research*,7:1239-1245.
56. Kwon, J., Y. Park, S. Yoo, Y. Park, H. Park, and J. Kim. (2000): Differentiation of *Salmonella enterica* serotype *gallinarum* biotype *Gullorum* from biotype *Gallinarum* by analysis of phase 1 flagellin C gene (*fliC*). *Journal of Microbiology Methods*, 40:33-38.
57. Kagambega, A., L. Taru, A. Laura, T. Alfred, B. Nicolas, S. Anja, and H. Kaisa. ( 2013): Prevalence and characterization of *Salmonella enterica* from the feces of cattle, poultry, swine and hedgehogs in Burkina Faso and their comparison to human *Salmonella* isolates. *BMC Microbiology*,13:253.
58. Lauderdale, T.L., Aarestrup, F.M., Chen, P.C., Lai, J.F., Wang, H.Y., Shiao, Y.R., Huang, I.W. and Hung, C.L. (2006): Multidrug resistance among different serotypes of clinical *Salmonella* isolates in Taiwan. *Diagnostic Microbiology and Infectious Diseases* 55: 149-155.
59. Nagappa, K., Shantanu, T., Brajmadhur, Saxena, M. K. and Singh, S. P. (2007): Isolation of *Salmonella* Typhimurium from poultry eggs and meat of Tarai regio of Uttaranchal. *Indian Journal of Biotechnology* 6: 407-409.
60. Rodriguez-Romo, L., and Yousef, A. (2005): Inactivation of *Salmonella enterica* serotype Enteritidis on shell eggs by ozone and UV radiation. *Journal of Food Protection* 68: 711–717.
61. Herikstad, H., Motarjemi Y. and Tauxe R.V. (2002): *Salmonella* surveillance: a global survey of public health serotyping. *Epidemiology Infection* 129: 1–8.
62. Muktaruzzaman M, Haider MG, Ahmed AKM, Alam KJ, Rahman MM, Khatun MB, Rahman MH, Hossain MM, (2010): Validation and Refinement of *Salmonella pullorum* (SP) Colored Antigen for Diagnosis of *Salmonella* Infections in the Field. *Int. J. Poul. Sci.* 9 (8): 801-808.
63. Molla, B., Kleer, J., Sinell, H. J. (1999a): Occurrence, distribution and level of *Salmonella* in selected food items in Addis Ababa (Ethiopia). *Fleischwirtschaft. International*, 37-39.
64. Molla, B., Kleer, J. Sinell, H. J. (1999b): Antibiotics resistance pattern of foodborne *Salmonella* isolates in Addis Ababa, (Ethiopia). *Berl. Munch. Tierärztl. Wschr.* 112, 41-43.
65. Mandal, S., Mandal, M.D. and Pal, N.K. (2004): Reduced minimum inhibitory concentration of chloramphenicol for *Salmonella enterica* serovar Typhi. *Indian Journal of Medical Sciences* 58: 16-23.
66. Mandal, S., Mandal, M.D. and Pal, N.K. ( 2006): Antibiotic resistance of *Salmonella enterica* serovar Paratyphi A in India; Emerging and reemerging problem. *Indian Journal of Medical Sciences* 52: 163-166.50.

67. Martin, D., Stanley F., Eugene R., Karl-Heinz S. and Erko S. (2006): The genus *Salmonella*, in: *The Prokaryotes 3rd Edition*. A Handbook on the Biology of Bacteria. Springer Science+Business Media, Inc, Singapore 6: 123-158.
68. Maria, G. (2010): Prevalence, Resistance Patterns and Risk Factors for Antimicrobial Resistance in Poultry Farms. Dissertation submitted in partial satisfaction of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy to office of graduate studies of California University, Pp: 42-60.
69. Molla, B. and Mesfin, A. (2003): A survey of *Salmonella* contamination in chicken carcass and giblets in central Ethiopia. *Revue Méd Vét* 154 (4): 267-270.
70. Molla, B., Mesfin, A. and Alemayehu, D. (2003): Multiple antimicrobial-resistant *Salmonella* serotypes isolated from chicken carcass and giblets in Debre Zeit and Adis Ababa, Ethiopia. *Ethiopian Journal of Health Development* 17 (2): 131-149.
71. Molla, B., Salah, W., Alemayehu, D. and Mohammed, A. (2004): Antimicrobial resistance pattern of *Salmonella* serovars isolated from apparently healthy slaughtered camels (*Camelus dromedarius*) in eastern Ethiopia. *Berl. Munch. Tierarztl. Wochenschr* 117: 39-45.51.
72. Molla, B., Berhanu, A., Muckle, A., Cole, L., Wilkie, E., Kleer, J. and Hildebrandt, G. (2006): Multi drug Resistance and Distribution of *Salmonella* Serovars in Slaughtered Pigs. *J. Vet. Med.* 53: 28-33.
73. Molla, W., Molla, B., Alemayehu, D., Muckle, A., Cole, L. and Wilkie, E. (2006): Occurrence and antimicrobial resistance of *Salmonella* serovars in apparently healthy slaughtered sheep and goats of central Ethiopia, *Tropical Animal health and production*, 38: 455-462.
74. Morita, M., Mori, K., Tominaga, K., Terajima, J., Hirose, K., Watanabe, H. and Izumiya, H. (2006): Characterization of lysine decarboxylase-negative strains of *Salmonella enterica* serovar Enteritidis disseminated in Japan. *FEMS Immunology and Medical Microbiology* 46: 381-385.
75. Muleta, D. and Ashenafi, M. (2001): *Salmonella*, *Shigella* and growth potential of other Foodborne pathogens in Ethiopian street vended foods. *East Afr Med.*, 78: 576- 580.
76. Murchie, L., Whyte, P., Xia, B., Horrigan, S., Kelly, L. and Madden, R. H. (2007): Prevalence of *Salmonella* in Grade A whole shell eggs in the island of Ireland. *J. Food Protection* 70: 238-1240.
77. Murugkar, H. V., Rahman, H., and Kumar, A. (2005): Isolation, phage typing and antibiogram of *Salmonella* from man and animals in northern India. *Indian Journal of Medical Research* 122: 237-242.
78. Majowicz, E., J. Musto, E. Scallan, J. Angulo, M. Kirk, J.O' Brien. 2010. International Collaboration on Enteric Disease 'Burden of Illness' Studies. The global burden of non-typhoidal *Salmonella* gastroenteritis. *Clinical Infectious Diseases*,50:882-889.
79. Nagappa, K., Shantanu, T., Brajmadhur, Saxena, M. K. and Singh, S. P. (2007): Isolation of *Salmonella* Typhimurium from poultry eggs and meat of Tarai regio of Uttaranchal. *Indian Journal of Biotechnology* 6: 407-409.
80. National Committee for Clinical Laboratory Standards (NCCLS). (2005): Performance standards for antimicrobial susceptibility testing; 15th informational supplement. NCCLS document M100-S10., Wayne, Pa.
81. Olasunbo, A., J. Ajayi, L. Oluwoye, and K. Williams. 2014. Policy Options on Reduction of Foodborne Diseases. *Food and Public Health*,4: 266-271.
82. Oosterom, J. (1991): Epidemiological studies and proposed preventive measures in the fight against human salmonellosis. *Int J Food Microbiology* 12: 41-51.
83. Papagrigorakis, M.J., Synodinos, P.N. and Yapijakis, C. (2007): Short communication. Ancient typhoid reveals possible ancestral strain of *Salmonella enterica* serovar Typhi. *Infection, Genetics and Evolution* 7: 126-127.
84. Phillips, I., Casewell, M., Cox, T., Groot, B., Friis, C., Jones, R., Nightingale, C., Preston, R. and Waddell, J. (2004): Does the use of antibiotics in food animals pose a risk to human health? A critical review of published data. *Journal of Antimicrobia Chemotherapy* 53: 28-52.
85. Popoff, M., Bockemuhl J., Brenner., *et al.* (2001): Supplement 2000 (no. 44) to the Kauffmann- White scheme. *Research in Microbiology*152: 907-909.
86. Popoff, M., Bockemuhl, J. and Gheesling, L. (2003): Supplement 2001 (no. 45) to the Kauffmann-White scheme. *Research in Microbiology*154: 173-174.
87. Popoff, M., Bockemuhl J. and Gheesling L. (2004): Supplement 2002 (no.46) to the Kauffmann-White scheme. *Research in Microbiology*155: 568-570.
88. Poppe, C., Martin, L., Muckle, A., Archambault, M., McEwen, S. and Weir, E. (2006): Characterization of antimicrobial resistance of



- Salmonella* Newport isolated from animals, the environment, and animal food products in Canada. *The Canadian Journal of Veterinary Research* 70: 105-114.
89. Tabo, C., S. Granier, F. Moury, A. Brisabois, R. Elgroud, and Y. Millemann. (2013): Prevalence and antimicrobial resistance of nontyphoidal *Salmonella* serotypes isolated from laying hens and broiler chicken farms in N'Djamena, Chad. *Veterinary Microbiology*, 166: 293–298.
  90. Rao, P.V. (2004): *Essential of Microbiology*. Satish Kumar Jain for CBS publishers and Distributors, New Delhi, India. 146-148.
  91. Schlundt, J., Toyofuku, H. and Herbst, S. A. (2004): Emerging food-borne *Salmonella enteritidis* zoonosis. *Rev. Sci. Tech. Off. Epiz.* 23: 513-519.
  92. Singh, R., A. Yadav, V. Tripathi, and R. Singh. (2013): Antimicrobial resistance profile of *Salmonella* present in poultry and poultry environment in north India. *Food Control*, 33:545-548.
  93. Shea, K. M. (2003): Antibiotic Resistance: What Is the Impact of Agricultural Uses of Antibiotics on Children's Health? *Pediatrics* 112: 253-258.
  94. Sibhat B., Molla B. Zewde, Zerihun A., Muckle A., Cole L., Boerlin P., Wilkie E., Perets A., Mistry K. and Gebreyes W. A. (2011): *Salmonella* Serovars and Antimicrobial Resistance Profiles in Beef Cattle, Slaughterhouse Personnel and Slaughterhouse Environment in Ethiopia. *Zoonoses public health* 58: 102–109.
  95. Silbergeld, E. K., Graham, J. and Price, L. B. (2008): Industrial Food Animal Production, Antimicrobial Resistance and Human Health. *Annual Review of Public Health* 29: 151-169.
  96. Smeltzer, T., Thomas, R., and Collis, G. (1980a): *Salmonellae* on posts, hand-rails and hands in a beef abattoir. *Aust. Vet. J.* 56: 184 – 186.
  97. Smeltzer, T.I, Peel, B., and Collis, G. (1979): The role of equipment that has direct contact with the carcass in the spread of *Salmonella* in a beef abattoir. *Aust. Vet. J.* 55: 275 – 277.
  98. Pegram, R. G., Roeder, P. L., Hall, M. L. M., Rowe, B. (1981): *Salmonella* in livestock and animal byproducts in Ethiopia. *Trop. Anim. Hlth. Prod.* 13, 203-207.
  99. Thrusfield, M. (2005): *Veterinary Epidemiology*. 3 ed., Blackwell science Ltd., London, pp: 228 - 246.
  100. Živković, J., Jaksic, S., and Miokovic, B. (1997): *Salmonella* serovars in chicken meat and chicken meat products in Zagreb, Croatia. *Vet. Arh.* 67 (4): 169 – 175.
  101. Urji, M., H. Onuigbo, and T. Mbata. (2005): Isolation of *Salmonella* from poultry droppings and other environmental sources in Awka, Nigeria. *International Journal of Infectious Diseases*, 9:86-89.
  102. Varnman A H, Evans MG (1991): Food borne pathogens: An Illustrated Text. England: Wolf publishers Ltd. pp. 51-85.
  103. Yan, S.S., Pandrak, M.L., Abela-Rider, B., Punderson, J.W., Fedorko, D.P. and Foley, S.L. (2003): An overview of *Salmonella* typing public health perspectives. *Clinical and Applied Immunology Reviews* 4: 189-204.
  104. Plummer, R.A.S., Blissett, S.J. and Dodd, C.E.R. (1995): *Salmonella* contamination of retail chicken products sold in the UK. *J. Food Prot.* 58 (8): 843 – 846. *science* 6: 270-279.
  105. Rusal, G., Khair, J., Radu, S., Cheah, C.T., and Yassin, R.Md. (1996): Prevalence of *Salmonella* in broiler at retail outlets, processing plants and farms in Malaysia. *Int. J. Food Microbiol.* 33: 183 – 194.
  106. Quinn O. K., Carter M.E., Markey B. and Carter G.R. (1999): *Clinical Veterinary Microbiology*. USA, Elsevier Limited, pp 35-65.
  107. Quinn P.J., Carter M.E., Markey B.K. and Carter G.R. (1994): *Clinical Veterinary Microbiology*, 6th edition, Wolfe Publishing, pp 21-67.
  108. Quinn P.J., Carter ME., Markey B. and Carter GR. (2002): *Veterinary Microbiology Microbial Diseases- Bacterial causes of Bovine Mastitis*, 8th edition. Mosby international Limited, London, pp 465-475.
  109. WHO (2010): Isolation of salmonella species from Food and Animal faces, pp., 1-18.
  110. Wigley P, Berchieri A, Page KL, Smith MH, Barrow PA (2001): *Salmonella entericaserovar Pullorum* persists in Splenic Macrophages and in the Reproductive Tract during Persistent, Disease-Free Carriage in Chickens. *Infect Immun.* 69: 7873-7879.
  111. Wray C and Davies, R.H. (2000): *Salmonella* Infections in Cattle. In: Wray, C. and A. Wray. (eds.). *Salmonella* in Domestic Animals. New York, CABI Publishing. Pp 169 – 190.
  112. White, D.G., Zhao, S., Sudler, R. (2001): In: The road to resistance: Antibiotics as growth promoters for animals: The isolation of antibiotic resistant *Salmonella* from retail ground meats. *New England Journal of Medicine* 345: 1147-1154.
  113. Whyte, P., Mc Gill, K., Collins, J.D., and Gormley, E. (2002): The prevalence and PCR detection of *Salmonella* contamination in raw poultry. *Vet. Microbiol.* 89: 53 – 60.

114. Weill, F. X., Guesnier, F., Guibert, V., Timinouni, M., Demartin, M., Polomack, L. and Grimont, P. A. D. (2006): Multidrug resistance in *Salmonella enterica* serotype Typhimurium from human in France (1993-2003). *J. Clin. Microbiol.*, 44: 700-708.
115. Zewdu E (2004): Prevalence, distribution and antimicrobial resistance profile of *Salmonella* isolated from food items and personnel in Addis Ababa, Ethiopia. MSc thesis, Addis Ababa University, Faculty of Veterinary Medicine, Debre Zeit, Ethiopia.
116. Zhao S, White DG, Friedman SL, Glenn A, Blickenstaff K, *et al.* (2008): Antimicrobial resistance in *Salmonella enterica* serovar Heidelberg isolates from retail meats, including poultry, from 2002 to 2006. *Appl Environ Microbiol.* 74: 6656-6662.
117. Zewdu Endrias. (2008): Prevalence, distribution and antimicrobial resistance profile of *Salmonella* isolated from food items and personnel in Addis Ababa, Ethiopia. *Trop Anim Health Prod* 41: 241-249.
118. Zewdu, E, and Cornelius, P. (2009): Antimicrobial resistance pattern of *Salmonella* serotypes isolated from food items and personnel in Addis Ababa, Ethiopia. *Tropical Animal Health and Production* 41(2): 241-24.

9/24/2020