การติดตามเฝ้าระวังแบบแผนความไวรับต่อยาปฏิชีวนะ และยืนดื้อยาของเชื้อ เอสเซอร์ริเซีย คอลัย ในระหว่างระบบการผลิตสุกร



# จุฬาลงกรณ์มหาวิทยาลัย

บทคัดย่อและแฟ้มข้อมูลฉบับเต็มของวิทยานิพนธ์ตั้งแต่ปีการศึกษา 2554 ที่ให้บริการในคลังปัญญาจุฬาฯ (CUIR) เป็นแฟ้มข้อมูลของนิสิตเจ้าของวิทยานิพนธ์ ที่ส่งผ่านทางบัณฑิตวิทยาลัย

The abstract and full text of theses from the academic year 2011 in Chulalongkorn University Intellectual Repository (CUIR) are the thesis authors' files submitted through the University Graduate School.

วิทยานิพนธ์นี้เป็นส่วนหนึ่งของการศึกษาตามหลักสูตรปริญญาวิทยาศาสตรดุษฎีบัณฑิต สาขาวิชาพยาธิชีววิทยาทางสัตวแพทย์ ภาควิชาพยาธิวิทยา คณะสัตวแพทยศาสตร์ จุฬาลงกรณ์มหาวิทยาลัย ปีการศึกษา 2560 ลิขสิทธิ์ของจุฬาลงกรณ์มหาวิทยาลัย Monitoring of antibiogram and resistance gene profiles among *Escherichia coli* in pig production system



A Dissertation Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy Program in Veterinary Pathobiology Department of Veterinary Pathology Faculty of Veterinary Science Chulalongkorn University Academic Year 2017 Copyright of Chulalongkorn University

Thesis Title	Monitoring of antibiogram and resistance gene profiles among
	Escherichia coli in pig production system
Ву	Mr. Kittitat Lugsomya
Field of Study	Veterinary Pathobiology
Thesis Advisor	Associate Professor Doctor Nuvee Prapasarakul, D.V.M., Ph.D.,
	D.T.B.V.P.
Thesis Co-Advisor	Professor Doctor Padet Tummaruk, D.V.M., Ph.D., D.T.B.T.
	Instructor Doctor Tanittha Chatsuwan, Ph.D.

Accepted by the Faculty of Veterinary Science, Chulalongkorn University in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Doctoral Degree

Dean of the Faculty of Veterinary Science (Professor Doctor Roongroje Thanawongnuwech, D.V.M., Ph.D., D.T.B.V.P.)

THESIS COMMITTEE

\_\_\_\_\_Chairman

(Associate Professor Doctor Anudep Rungsipipat, D.V.M., Ph.D., D.T.B.V.P.)

\_\_\_\_\_Thesis Advisor

(Associate Professor Doctor Nuvee Prapasarakul, D.V.M., Ph.D., D.T.B.V.P.)

\_\_\_\_\_Thesis Co-Advisor

(Professor Doctor Padet Tummaruk, D.V.M., Ph.D., D.T.B.T.)

(Instructor Doctor Tanittha Chatsuwan, Ph.D.)

### \_\_\_\_\_Examiner

(Instructor Doctor Taradon Luangtongkum, D.V.M., Ph.D., D.T.B.V.P.H.)

\_\_\_\_\_Examiner

(Assistant Professor Doctor Channarong Rodkhum, D.V.M., Ph.D., D.T.V.B.P.)

Examiner

(Associate Professor Doctor Kampon Kaeoket, D.V.M., Ph.D., D.T.B.T.)

External Examiner

(Associate Professor Doctor Chanwit Tribuddharat, M.D., Ph.D.)

กิตติธัช ลักษณ์สมยา : การติดตามเฝ้าระวังแบบแผนความไวรับต่อยาปฏิชีวนะ และยีนดี้อยาของเชื้อ*เอสเซอร์ริเซีย* คอลัย ในระหว่างระบบการผลิตสุกร (Monitoring of antibiogram and resistance gene profiles among *Escherichia coli* in pig production system) อ.ที่ปรึกษาวิทยานิพนธ์หลัก: รศ. น.สพ. ดร. ณุวีร์ ประภัสระกูล, อ.ที่ ปรึกษาวิทยานิพนธ์ร่วม: ศ. น.สพ. ดร. เผด็จ ธรรมรักษ์, ดร. ธนิษฐา ฉัตรสุวรรณ, หน้า.

เชื้อแบคทีเรียดี้อยาที่พบในฟาร์มสกรเชื่อว่าเป็นแหล่งของการกระจายเชื้อดี้อยาที่สำคัณในทางสาธารณสข ข้อมลจาก การศึกษาในฟาร์มสกรทั้งระบบจะทำให้ทราบถึงชนิดของการดื้อยาและปัจจัยที่เกี่ยวข้องกับการเกิดการดื้อยา การศึกษานี้มี ้วัตถุประสงค์เพื่อสำรวจชนิดและคุณลักษณะทางฟีโนไทป์และพันธุกรรมเฉพาะของเชื้อดี้อยาต่อยาปฏิชีวนะ 18 ชนิด ในระบบการ ผลิตสุกรแบบ ณ ช่วงเวลาหนึ่ง (cross sectional study) และการศึกษาแบบติดตาม (longitudinal study) ตั้งแต่แรกเกิดจนถึงส่ง ้โรงฆ่าสัตว์ รวมถึงผลของการใช้สารต้านจลชีพชนิดฟลาโวมัยซินต่อระดับการดื้อยาในฟาร์ม โดยใช้เชื้อ*เอสเซอร์ริเซีย คอลัย* ใน ้อจจาระเป็นตัวแทน ผลการศึกษาพบว่าเชื้อที่ได้จากสกรระยะขนมีอัตราการดื้อยาแบบหลายชนิด (multiple drug resistance) จาก ฟาร์มสุกรในประเทศไทยอยู่ในระดับที่สูงมาก แต่เมื่อพิจารณาจากชนิดของยาปฏิชีวนะที่เชื้อดื้อแบ่งได้เป็นสองแบบ คือ เชื้อดื้อยาที่ พบได้ทั่วไป ได้แก่การดื้อต่อยากลุ่มแบต้าแลคแตม และเตตร้าซัยคลิน ซึ่งพบทั้งในฟาร์มที่ใช้ยาปฏิชีวนะผสมอาหาร (อะมอกซิซิลิน และ ไทอะมูลิน)และฟาร์มที่ไม่ใช้ยา อีกแบบหนึ่งคือเชื้อดื้อยาแบบที่เกี่ยวข้องกับการใช้ยาปฏิชีวนะผสมอาหาร โดยเฉพาะเชื้อที่ สร้างเอนไซม์ extended-spectrum beta-lactamase (ESBL) และการดื้อต่ออะมิโนไกลโคไซด์พบมากขึ้นอย่างมีนัยสำคัญ ในขณะ ที่ฟาร์มที่ใช้ยาปฏิชีวนะในรูปแบบการฉีดแต่ไม่ใช้ในการผสมอาหารไม่พบการเพิ่มขึ้นของการดื้อยากลุ่ม ESBL และอะมิโนไกลโค ใชด์ รูปแบบการดื้อยา (antibiogram) ของเชื้อมีความสอดคล้องกับลักษณะทางพันธุกรรมจากยีนบนโครโมโซมและพลาสมิด โดยเฉพาะกลุ่ม ESBL จะพบยืน *bla<sub>ctx...</sub>.* และ/หรือ *bla<sub>ctx...</sub>.* การศึกษาแบบติดตามแบ่งเป็น 5 ระยะได้แก่ ระยะแรกเกิดถึงหย่า ้นม ระยะหลังหย่านม ระยะอนุบาล ระยะขุน และเนื้อสุกรในโรงฆ่าสัตว์ การศึกษาแบบติดตามยืนยันว่าการใช้ยาปฏิชีวนะผสม ้อาหารชนิดอะมอกซิซิลินร่วมกับไทอะมูลินทำให้เกิดปริมาณและรูปแบบการดื้อยาเช่นเดียวกับการศึกษาแบบ ณ ช่วงเวลาหนึ่ง แต่ พบเชื้อการดื้อยากลุ่ม ESBL และ อะมิโนไกลโคไซด์เพิ่มสูงขึ้นอย่างมีนัยสำคัญในช่วงระยะอนุบาลและระยะขุนช่วงต้น แต่อัตรา การดื้อยานี้จะลดลงในช่วงก่อนเข้าโรงฆ่า ในขณะมีการดื้อต่อที่ยาปฏิชีวนะอื่นๆในระดับน้อยถึงปานกลางซึ่งไม่พบความสัมพันธ์ กับระยะการเลี้ยง จากการติดตามชนิดของสายพันธุ์ (clone type) ด้วยวิธี multilocus sequence typing และ วิธี pulsed-field gel electrophoresis พบว่า เชื้อ*เอสเซอรีเซีย คอลัย* สายพันธุ์ ST10 พบในฟาร์มมากที่สุดแต่ไม่พบในเนื้อสุกร ชนิดของสายพันธุ์ จากเนื้อสุกรส่วนใหญ่แตกต่างจากที่พบในฟาร์ม มีเพียงสายพันธุ์ ST 44 117 638 ที่พบได้จากทั้งสุกรมีชีวิตและเนื้อสุกร แต่เชื้อ ี้เหล่านั้นไม่แสดงคณลักษณะการดื้อต่อยากล่ม ESBLและอะมิโนไกลโคไซด์ ในฟาร์มที่ใช้ยาฟลาโวมัยซินเข้มข้น 10 พีพีเอ็ม ผสม ้อาหารพบการดื้อต่อยาในกลุ่ม ESBLP จะลดลงในระยะสุกรอนุบาลและสุกรขุนอย่างในระดับ 20.0-23.3% เมื่อเปรียบเทียบกับ ฟาร์มที่ให้ยาอะมอกซิซิลินและไทอะมูลินผสมอาหาร จากการศึกษาในห้องปฏิบัติการยืนยันได้ว่าฟลาโวมัยซินความเข้มข้น 8 และ 16 ไมโครกรัมต่อมิลลิลิตรสามารถลดการส่งผ่านของยืน *bla<sub>ctxm-1</sub>* และ *bla<sub>ctxm-9</sub>* ได้ 10 เท่า จากการศึกษาปริมาณและคุณลักษณะ ของเชื้อดื้อยาทั้งระบบการผลิตทำให้ทราบถึงปัจจัยการจัดการ ชนิดของยาผสมอาหาร และระยะการเลี้ยง มีผลต่อการเพิ่มขึ้นของ เชื้อดื้อยา รวมถึงรปแบบการดื้อยาจำเพาะที่ควรมีการเฝ้าระวังในฟาร์ม การศึกษานี้ไม่พบความสัมพันธ์ด้านการถ่ายทอดสายพันธ์ เชื้อดื้อยาที่สำคัญโดยเฉพาะเชื้อทีดื้อต่อกล่มเซฟาโรสปอร์วินในร่นที่สาม และเชื้อที่ดื้อต่อยากล่มอะมิโนไกลโคไซด์จากสกรมีชีวิตใน ฟาร์มไปสู่เนื้อสุกรในโรงฆ่าสัตว์

ภาควิชา	พยาธิวิทยา	ลายมือชื่อนิสิต
สาขาวิชา	พยาธิชีววิทยาทางสัตวแพทย์	ลายมือชื่อ อ.ที่ปรึกษาหลัก
ปีการศึกษา	2560	ลายมือชื่อ อ.ที่ปรึกษาร่วม
		0.001 and a state

#### # # 5575404131 : MAJOR VETERINARY PATHOBIOLOGY

KEYWORDS: ANTIMICROBIALS / ESCHERICHIA COLI / PIG FARM / RESISTANCE GENE

KITTITAT LUGSOMYA: Monitoring of antibiogram and resistance gene profiles among *Escherichia coli* in pig production system. ADVISOR: ASSOC. PROF. DR. NUVEE PRAPASARAKUL, D.V.M., Ph.D., D.T.B.V.P., CO-ADVISOR: PROF. DR. PADET TUMMARUK, D.V.M., Ph.D., D.T.B.T., INS. DR. TANITTHA CHATSUWAN, Ph.D., pp.

The antimicrobial resistant (AMR) bacteria in pig farms have been believed as an important source in food chain with public health concern. While some studies suggested transmission of AMR from pigs to humans may occur, but there was still needing to combine high resolution genomic data analysis with systematically collected epidemiological evidence to reconstruct patterns of AMR transmission between pigs and humans. The objectives of this study were to determine the occurrence and characterization the AMR phenotypes against 18 antimicrobials in pig producing system in both cross-sectional from fattening and longitudinal studies from newborn to slaughtering pigs and to evaluate the effect of flavomycin to reduce AMR rate in pig farms. The commensal enteric Escherichia coli were used as a proxy to estimate the overall extent of AMR. Altogether, Multiple Drug Resistance (MDR) E. coli were highly found from fattening pigs. Interestingly, some resistant phenotypes ( $\beta$ -lactam resistance and tetracycline resistance) were commonly detected in the isolates either from farm with and without antimicrobial usage in feed however extendedspectrum  $\beta$ -lactamase producing (ESBLP) and aminoglycosides resistance were detected in farms with antimicrobial usage in feed (amoxicillin and tiamulin) while farm using only antimicrobial by injection for therapeutic purpose had ESBLP and aminoglycosides resistance in very low rate. All ESBLP E. coli relatively possessed blaction and/or bla<sub>CTXM9</sub> genes. For longitudinal study, AMR situations were monitored through pigs producing system in 5 periods; pre-weaning, nursery, growing, fattening and slaughtering periods. ESBLP E. coli and aminoglycosides resistance significantly increased in nursery and growing periods in the farm with antimicrobial usage in feed (amoxicillin and tiamulin) but the resistant rate decreased in slaughtering. For clonal typing analysis, the most common clonal type of E. coli in live pigs was ST10 that were non-ESBLP strain and could not find in all meat samples. ST44, 117 and 638 shared between both live pigs and meats but none was ESBLP or aminoglycosides resistant strains. The resistant isolates recovered from pig meat largely differed from those detected in the feces of the same live pigs sampled during the production period. In vitro, flavomycin at 8 µg/ml and 16 µg/ml concentrations could reduce the conjugative rates of the plasmids carrying bla<sub>CTX-M-1</sub> and bla<sub>CTX-M-9</sub> 10 times. In vivo, use of flavomycin at 10 ppm in feed could reduce antimicrobial resistance rates of third generation cephalosporins resistance phenotypes and genotypes at 20.0-23.3% in nursery and growing periods. This study provided the insight of AMR type, distribution and their characteristics in pig farms in the relation of antimicrobial use and supported the indication of flavomycin mixed in feed. The molecular typing limited to identify a direct clonal relationship between critically important antimicrobial resistant strains, especially the third generation cephalosporins resistance and aminoglycosides resistance in meat and those found in the corresponding live animals during their production cycle. Further work is required to identify the source of resistant E. coli in pig meat following slaughter.

Department: Veterinary Pathology Field of Study: Veterinary Pathobiology Academic Year: 2017

Student's Signature
Advisor's Signature
Co-Advisor's Signature
Co-Advisor's Signature

#### ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to express my deepest gratitude to my principal advisor, Assoc. Professor Dr. Nuvee Prapasarakul, who provides many good opportunities in my Ph.D. study, scientific thinking, English writing skill and livelihood guidance with the good attitudes. This dissertation would have not been success without his assistance.

I would like to thank Professor David J. Hampson for supporting the scientific idea and teaching writing skill.

I gratefully thank Professor David J. Hampson, Dr Sam Abraham and all stuff in Murdoch University for invaluable and wonderful experiences in Australia.

I would like to acknowledge my co-advisors and committee members, Professor Padet Tummaruk, Dr. Tanittha Chatsuwan, Assistant Professor Channarong Rodkhum, Associate. Professor Kampon Kaeoket, Dr. Taradon Luangtongkum, Associate Professor Chanwit Tribuddharat for their suggestions and encouragements to fulfill this dissertation.

I would like to thank Associate. Professor Dr. Chanwit Tribuddharat, Mr. Thanakorn Watcharasupat and all Dr Chanwit's stuff for supporting 454 sequencing technique and high-through put multilocus sequence typing technique.

Thanks are due to Dr. Thanittha Chatsuwan and Mrs. Sirirat Luk-in for their helpful guides for blaCTX-M gene detection and plasmid conjugation technique.

Many thanks also go to all staffs of Department of Microbiology, all committees of Veterinary Pathobiology Program, Faculty of Veterinary Science, Chulalongkorn University for all assistance and recommendations.

Most of all, I would like to express my deepest gratitude to my parents and my brother who love me endlessly and always provide every good thing for my life. This doctoral dissertation is dedicated to my father and my mother.

Finally, I would like to acknowledge Graduate School, Chulalongkorn University for the Scholarships supporting this dissertation including the Chulalongkorn University 90th Year Anniversary Ratchdapisek Somphot Endowment Fund, Chulalongkorn University, Diagnosis and Monitoring of Animal Pathogen Research Unit (DMAP RU), Center of Excellence in Emerging and Re-emerging Infectious Diseases in Animals (EIDAs), Research and Researcher for Industrials Funds (PHD5610005), and Huvepharma (Thailand) Ltd.

### CONTENTS

Page
THAI ABSTRACT iv
ENGLISH ABSTRACTv
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTSvi
CONTENTSvii
LIST OF TABLES1
LIST OF FIGURES
Chapter I: Introduction
Chapter II: Literature reviews7
Escherichia coli (E. coli)
The antimicrobial resistance mechanisms7
1. Enzymatic modification7
2. Active drug efflux
3. Outer membrane (OM) permeability alteration
4. Deoxyribonucleic acid (DNA) synthesis interference
The emerging and acquiring of resistance gene9
1. Alteration in the genome via mutation9
2. Acquisition resistance gene from mobile genetic element (Horizontal
transfer)
Horizontal gene transfer in <i>E. coli</i> 11
<i>E. coli</i> identification and strain typing12
The concordance of animal production in the emergence of antimicrobial
resistance13

Pa	age
The pressure which influence AMR emergence in animal production	14
Relation between of AMU in animal production and AMR detection	. 16
Categories of AMU in animal production in relation AMR detection	20
Antimicrobial growth promoters (AGPs)	20
Prophylaxis	21
Metaphylaxis	22
Therapeutic use	22
Biocide use	23
Animal feed preservatives	25
Heavy Metals	26
Other environmental factor which associated resistance emergence and	
maintenance	26
Risks of agricultural antimicrobial usage, other than AMR selection	27
AMR emergence and AMU within different animal production systems	27
Extensive systems	29
Organic systems	29
Pig production cycle and management in Thailand	30
Risk factors for the emergence of AMR in agriculture at national and international	
level	31
Route of spread of antimicrobial resistance between animals and humans	32
Risk pathways for the spread of AMR via the environment	32
Resistant <i>E. coli</i> transmissible chance from pig to human	33
Resistance of <i>E. coli</i> in pigs in the foreign country	34

F	⊃age
Resistance of <i>E. coli</i> in pigs in Thailand	34
Effect of flavomycin to resistance <i>E. coli</i> in pigs	35
CHAPTER III: Research question, Hypothesis, objectives, keywords and conceptual	
framework	36
Chapter IV: Materials and methods	38
Part 1. Distribution of resistance characteristics of <i>E. coli</i> isolated from pigs in	
different antibiotic using status in Thailand	38
1.1 Study area and animal selection	38
1.2 Sample collection and bacterial identification	39
1.3 Phylogenetic grouping	39
1.4 Phenotypic resistance characterization and ESBLP confirmation	40
1.5 ESBL phenotypic screening and confirmatory test	41
1.6 <i>bla<sub>ctx-M</sub></i> gene detection	41
1.7 <i>bla<sub>ctx-M</sub></i> conjugative assay	42
1.8 Genes encoding antimicrobial resistance	42
<b>CHULALONGKORN UNIVERSITY</b> 1.9 Plasmid replicon typing and intl detection	44
1.10 Data analysis	46
Part 2. Longitudinal monitoring of molecular resistance genotypic of <i>E. coli</i>	
monitoring from pig in the production cycle	47
2.1 Farm selection criteria	47
2.2 Animal selection	47
2.3 Sample collection and bacterial identification	47

2.4 Antibiogram and extended spectrum beta-lactamase phenotype confirmation	48
2.5 Extended Spectrum Beta-lactamase (ESBL) phenotypic screening and confirmatory test	49
2.6 Gene encoding antimicrobial resistance detection	49
2.7 Plasmid replicon characterization	50
2.8 Molecular strain typing by pulse field gel electrophoresis (PFGE)	50
2.9 Molecular strain typing by Multilocus sequence typing (MLST)	51
Part 3 The evaluation of flavomycin to reduce resistance characteristics and	
plasmid transfer. in vitro and in vivo	52
3.1 in vitro reduction of plasmid transferability test	52
3.1.1 bacterial donor strains	52
3.1.2 bacterial recipient strains	53
3.1.3 Resistance gene transfer	53
3.2 in vivo reduction of plasmid transferability test	54
3.2.1 Animal selection	54
3.2.2 Sample collection and bacterial identification	54
3.2.3 Antibiogram and extended spectrum beta-lactamase phenotype confirmation	54
3.2.4 Extended Spectrum Beta-lactamase (ESBL) phenotypic screening	
and confirmatory test	55
3.2.5 Gene encoding antimicrobial resistance detection	55
3.2.6 Plasmid replicon characterization	56

Х

	Page
3.2.7 Data analysis	56
CHAPTER V: Results	57
Part 1. Distribution of resistance characteristics of <i>E. coli</i> isolated from pigs in	
different antibiotic using status in Thailand	57
1.1 Distribution of phylogroups	57
1.2 Distribution of phenotypic AMR rates	60
1.3 Antimicrobial resistance genotypes	63
1.4 Plasmid replicon types and confirmation of bla <sub>CTX-M</sub> gene conjugation	64
Part 2. Longitudinal monitoring of molecular resistance genotypic of <i>E. coli</i>	
monitoring of from pig in the production cycle	68
2.1 Resistant phenotypic characterizations	68
2.2 Genotypic resistant characterization	69
2.3 Plasmid replicon type detection	70
2.4 Molecular genotypic characterization	72
Part 3 The evaluation of flavomycin to reduce resistance characteristics and	
plasmid transfer. in vitro and in vivo	82
3.1 Reduction of plasmid transferability in invitro test	82
3.2 in vivo reduction of plasmid transferability test	86
3.2.1 Resistant phenotypic characterizations	86
3.2.2 Genotypic resistant characterization	88
3.2.3 Plasmid replicon type detection	89
CHAPTER VI: Discussions	91

Part 1. Distribution of resistance characteristics of <i>E. coli</i> isolated from pigs in	
different antibiotic using status in Thailand	91
1.1 Background	91
1.2 Rates of phenotypic resistance	91
1.3 Genotypic resistance	93
1.4 ESBLP E. coli	93
1.5 Plasmid replicon type detection	94
Part 2. Longitudinal monitoring of molecular resistance genotypic of <i>E. coli</i>	
monitoring of from pig in the production cycle	95
2.1 Backgrounds	95
2.2 Resistant phenotypic and genotypic characterizations	96
2.3 Plasmid replicon type detection	97
2.4 Molecular genotypic characterization	97
Part 3 The evaluation of Flavomycin to reduce resistance characteristics and	
plasmid transfer. in vitro and in vivo	98
3.1 Reduction of plasmid transferability in vitro test	98
3.2 in vivo reduction of plasmid transferability test	99
CHAPTER VII: Conclusions, future recommendation and executive summary	101
Conclusions from Part 1: Distribution of resistance characteristics of E. coli	
isolated from pigs in different antibiotic using status in Thailand	101
Future recommendation from part 1: Distribution of resistance characteristics of	E.
coli isolated from pigs in different antibiotic using status in Thailand	101
Conclusions from Part 2: Longitudinal monitoring of molecular resistance	
genotypic of <i>E. coli</i> monitoring of from pig in the production cycle	102

xii

Future recommendation from part 2: Longitudinal monitoring of molecular
resistance genotypic of <i>E. coli</i> monitoring of from pig in the production cycle103
Conclusions from Part 3 The evaluation of Flavomycin to reduce resistance
characteristics and plasmid transfer. in vitro and in vivo
Future recommendation from part 3: The evaluation of flavomycin efficacy to
reduce the resistance rates and plasmid transfer via conjugative mechanism 104
Executive summary
REFERENCES
APPENDIX
VITA
จุฬาลงกรณ์มหาวิทยาลัย
Chulalongkorn University

xiii

## LIST OF TABLES

Table 1 Antibiotics and their target gene of mutation
Table 2 Mobile genetic element and their specific characters
Table 3 Primer list for Phylogenetic grouping
Table 4 Primer lists for bla <sub>CTX-M</sub> genes detection41
Table 5 Primer lists for resistance gene detection 42
Table 6 Primer lists for characterization of plasmid replicons
Table 7 Primer list for characterization of cassette in integron 1.    46
Table 8 Primer lists for E. coli HiMLST 50
Table 9 Bacterial strains which were used in in vitro reduction of plasmid
transferability test
Table 10 Incidence, phenotypic and genetic characteristics of ESBLP E. coli derived
from farms routinely used prophylactic antimicrobials (prophylactic antimicrobials:
PA), only used antimicrobials therapeutically (therapeutic antimicrobials: TA) and
never used antimicrobials (no antimicrobials: NA)67
Table 11 Distribution of ST data of E. coli isolated represented in individual pig in NF
farm types76
Table 12 Distribution of ST data of E. coli isolated represented in individual pig in AF
farm types77
Table 13 The numbers of transconjugants colonies forming unit/ml in control and
flavomycin treatment group83

## LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1 The relative abundance of phylogroup in porcine commensal E. coli from
the three categories of farms. Vertical bar, PA, TA, and NA. PAs, prophylactic
antimicrobials; TAs, therapeutic antimicrobials and NAs, no antimicrobials;57
Figure 2 The relative abundance of antibiotic resistance rate in each farms and
comparison resistance rate between farms in the same group using the Kruskal-
Wallis test
Figure 3 Phylogenetic grouping PCR product in 1% agarose gel electrophoresis.
Legend : lane 1, 100 base pair marker (Solis BioDyne, Estonia) ; [lane 2-9 :
quadruplex pcr]: lane 2, group A : (+) ; lane 3, group B1 : (+ +) ; lane 4,
group B2 : (- + + -) ; lane 5, group E : (+ + + -) ; lane 6, group F : (- +) ; lane 7,
group A or C : (+ - + -) ; lane 8, group E or D : (+ +) ; lane 9, Escherichia
fergusonii strain CU MIC427 (negative control) : () , [lane 10,11 : specific pcr
for clarifying between group A and C] : lane 10, group C : (+) ; lane 11, group A : (-)
, [lane 12,13 : specific pcr for clarifying between group E and D] : lane 12, group E :
(+) ; lane 13, group D : (-)60
Figure 4 Comparison of rates of antimicrobial resistance in porcine commensal E.
coli from three categories of farms Legend: Open horizontal bar, no antimicrobials
(NA); grey bar, therapeutic antimicrobials (TA); black bars, prophylactic
antimicrobials (PA)
Figure 5 Comparison of antimicrobial resistance genes of porcine commensal E. coli
from the three categories farms Legend: Open horizontal bar, no antimicrobials
(NA); grey bar, therapeutic antimicrobials (TA); black bars, prophylactic
antimicrobials (PA)64
Figure 6 Comparison of plasmid replicon types detected in porcine commensal E.
coli among the three categories of farm. Legend: Open horizontal bar, no
antimicrobials (NA); grey bar, therapeutic antimicrobials (TA); black bars,
prophylactic antimicrobials (PA)66

Figure 7 Eighteen antimicrobial resistance rates of and ESBLP E. coli which were
individually collected from pigs in each growing period and meat period at abattoir
in AF farm type and NF farm type. [* significant difference (p<0.05) between the
concatenating period performed by Chi-square test]69
Figure 8 Twenty antimicrobial resistance gene detecting rates which were
individually collected from pigs in each growing period and meat period at abattoir
in AF farm type and NF farm type. [* significant difference (p<0.05) between the
concatenating period performed by Chi-square test]70
Figure 9 Eighteen plasmid replicon types detecting rates which were individually
collected from pigs in each growing period and meat period at abattoir in AF farm
type and NF farm type. [* significant difference (p<0.05) between the concatenating
period performed by Chi-square test]
Figure 10 Molecular genetic relatedness of overall E. coli strains analyzed by pulsed
field gel electrophoresis (PFGE) and multilocus sequence typing (MLST) in NF farm
type (A). Pink round spot indicates the clones that were found in pork
Figure 11 Melecular constituted according to yoursell Figure 11 Melecular devices of a yoursell Figure 11 Melecular
figure 11 Molecular genetic relatedness of overall E. coll strains analyzed by pulsed
time (D). Disk second as at is directed to share the target to the second formation and the second s
type (B). Pink round spot indicates the clones that were found in pork
Figure 12 Datasets of genetic relatedness, antibiogram, resistant gene profiles and
replicon profiles among E. coli that found clone type similarity between pigs and
pork. from individual pig number 5 from NF farm78
Figure 13 Datasets of genetic relatedness, antibiogram, resistant gene profiles and
replicon profiles among E. coli that found clone type similarity between pigs and
pork from individual pig number 2 from AF farm79
Figure 14 Datasets of genetic relatedness, antibiogram, resistant gene profiles and
replicon profiles among E. coli that found clone type similarity between pigs and
pork individual pig number 5 from AF farm80

Figure 15 Longitudinal monitoring of the frequency of ST and distribution of ESBLP
and aminoglycoside resistance among carriage E. coli. Black circle indicates the
detection of ESBLP <i>E. coli</i>
Figure 16 The numbers of transconjugants colonies in control and flavomycin
treatment group. (The comparison of numbers of colonies determine by Wilcoxon
Sign ranked test)
Figure 17 Eighteen antimicrobials resistance rates of and ESBLP E. coli which were
individually collected from pigs in each growing period and meat period at abattoir
in AF farm type and FF farm type. [* significant difference (p<0.05) in each growing
period between farm performed by Chi-square test]87
Figure 18 Twenty antimicrobial resistance gene detecting rates which were
individually collected from pigs in each growing period and meat period at abattoir
in AF farm type and FF farm type. [* significant difference (p< $0.05$ ) in each growing
period between farm performed by Chi-square test]
Figure 19 Eighteen plasmid replicon types detecting rates which were individually
collected from pigs in each growing period and meat period at abattoir in AF farm
type and FF farm type. [* significant difference ( $p<0.05$ ) in each growing period
between farm performed by Chi-square test.

#### Chapter I: Introduction

Antimicrobial resistance (AMR) in bacteria is an important critical problem in veterinary public health. The major cause of emerging resistance is due to the abuse of antimicrobials in a shorter period and lower concentration than their recommendations (Paphitou, 2013). Regarding to pig farming, intensive use of antimicrobials is a common tool for reducing infectious diseases throughout production cycle except at late fattening period prior to slaughtering. Moreover, use of antimicrobials without prescription is also practically carried out by farmers and consultant decisions beneath their chemical company propaganda. Thus, increasing of resistance bacteria in pig farms has been reported, especially among gastrointestinal tract pathogens (Nogrady et al., 2006). These findings can enhance the chances of farm animal to human transmission (Szmolka and Nagy, 2013). Relation between bacteria from human and animal sources was based on genetic conserveness. For example, sharing of E. coli sequence type (ST) 7 [by multilocus sequence typing (MLST)] contained *bla*<sub>CTX-M-1</sub> located on plasmid incompatibility group II was recovered from pig and human feces (Leverstein-van Hall et al., 2011a). However, there has still been lack of data uncovering the background or concrete relationship between bacteria sourced from pigs and human.

By susceptibility determination surveillance, the most gastrointestinal bacteria resistant to first generation antibiotics such as beta-lactam, quinolone and tetracycline group used in production cycle, and fecal carriage of multiple drug resistant (MDR) bacteria seem to be very common in our areas (Prapasarakul et al., 2010). Thus, whether the researchers are going to a right solution or not if they still find the problems by report of ambiguous resistant bacteria. Although all parameters in farms have been investigated their associations to the crisis, there was still lack of a specific parameter benefit to strategic management which reduces emerging of bacteria presenting multidrug resistance. Numerous reports have still reported rising of MDR in livestock and meats without evident connection (Fernandes et al., 2016; Rehman et al., 2017; Strom et al.,

2018). Pig production cycle in Thailand is a major section where antibiotics are highly used for both therapeutic and feed additive indication. Previously, reports described the critical AMR situation were investigated in certain particular period of production such as piglets (Prapasarakul et al., 2010) or fattening (Lugsomya et al., 2017) and these were randomized sampling in any farms in the area of study. This study hypothesized that some antimicrobial resistance traits might be a consequence of routine use of antimicrobials and inappropriate management but some of them became the common traits in our country. However, in one production cycle, type and frequency of AMR bacteria in fecal carriage may vary due to duration of consumption and growing period. We believe that some resistance strains were able to be maintained their crisis AMR traits and transferable neither to slaughter period nor to the next batch of pig cycles. By contrast, certain reported resistance isolates may reconsider as a bacterial persistent, wild type-liked, that was able to be something blindfold for monitoring and surveillance. In the study, we attempt to fully investigates antimicrobial situation through pig cycles by using phenotype and genotype characterization following by longitudinal monitoring (newborn piglets to slaughtering) of antimicrobial resistance genes by using fecal carriage Escherichia coli in healthy in standard pig farms with the historical different antibiotic use.

> จุฬาลงกรณ์มหาวิทยาลัย Chulalongkorn University

#### Chapter II: Literature reviews

#### Escherichia coli (E. coli)

*Escherichia coli* (*E. coli*) is a rod bacterial member in family *Enterobacteriaceae*, phylum *Gamma Proteobacteria*. These facultative anaerobic bacteria are commonly found along alimentary tract which act as both commensal and pathogen in human and animals. Pathogenic *E. coli* are tentatively characterized by hemolysin together with particular genes encoding enterotoxins such as STa ,STb, Stx2e (Souza et al., 2010) causing colibacillosis or edema diseases in piglets to nursery pigs, respectively (Prapasarakul et al., 2010). The pigs infected with enterotoxigenic *E. coli* (ETEC) and enterohemorrhagic *E. coli* (EHEC) generally suffer with mild diarrhea to bloody diarrhea (Casey and Bosworth, 2009). In pig industries, the diseases can be controlled by oral antimicrobial use such as colistin, amoxicillin, tetracycline, or enrofloxacin in the recommendation of farm consultants or empirical use (Straw et al., 2006). Not only the problem in veterinary field but the emerging of resistance and new genotype *E. coli* contaminated in food chain has been sporadically reported with high mortality and cause of kidney failure and death in human (Mehrgan and Rahbar, 2008).

The antimicrobial resistance mechanisms

Four general mechanisms of antibiotic resistance in *E. coli* are controlled by the expression of specific genes, all of which are listed as below,

1. Enzymatic modification

Antibiotic target modification is reported as two major mechanisms dividing as inactivation and modification enzymes.  $\beta$ -lactamases is an inactivate enzymes gain by chromosomes and plasmids, which hydrolyze beta-lactam structure molecule of antibiotic.  $\beta$ -lactamases can be gained from the particular genetic element called "transposons". One of the most importance of beta-lactamase is metallo- $\beta$ -lactamases (MBLs), which is the inactivate enzyme for resistance to imipenem, new-generation

cephalosporins and penicillins. MBLs also inactivates the inhibitors of  $\beta$ -lactamases (clavulanic acid) but is still sensitive to aztreonam (Thomson and Bonomo, 2005; Vatopoulos, 2008). Esterase is another hydrolysis enzyme which inactivates to erythromycin via esterase II protein expressed from *ereB* gene by hydrolyse lactone ring of erythromycin A and oleandomycin (Kim et al., 2002).

On the other hand, the group of modification enzymes called "transferase" can resist to streptogramin, macrolides, or rifampicin by binding adenylyl, phosphoryl, or acetyl groups of the antibiotic molecules. In addition, aminoglycosides are overwhelmed by the enzymes; phosphoryltransferases (APHs), adenylyltransferases (ANTs), and acetyltransferases (AACs). These enzymes reduce affinity of the drug at 30S ribosomal binding site (Strateva and Yordanov, 2009). Genes encoding antimicrobial resistance phenotypes are transferred by transposons (Martinez and Baquero, 2002). For chloramphenicol resistance, bacteria produce chloramphenicol transacetylase that acetylates hydroxyl groups of chloramphenicol cause a low affinity at ribosomal 50S subunit binding (Tolmasky, 2000).

2. Active drug efflux

Efflux pump is a function for exporting antibiotics away from cell resulting in of antibiotic uptake (Hawkey, 1998). The mechanisms are associated with interactions between the inner and outer membrane components of the tri-partite multidrug efflux pump AcrAB-ToIC. Especially, the efflux pump of *E. coli* is AcrAB-ToIc, which associates with fluoroquinolones,  $\beta$ -lactams, tetracycline, chloramphenicol and trimethoprim resistance (Walsh, 2004).

#### 3. Outer membrane (OM) permeability alteration.

In general, the outer membrane of gram-negative bacteria contains phospholipids layer and a lipid A layer. Some part of outer membrane composition reduces drug uptake to a cell and transfer through the OmpF in *E. coli*. In low outer membrane permeability, small hydrophilic molecules ( $\beta$ -lactams and quinolones) can cross the OM only through

porins but aminoglycosides and colistin cannot be transferred to the cell through porins. Therefore, self-promoted uptake to bacterial cell is initiated by binding to lipopolysaccharides of the outer side of the OM (Lambert, 2012). Acquired resistance is characteristic of high resistance to almost all aminoglycosides (especially to tobramycin and gentamicin) (Walsh, 2004).

#### 4. Deoxyribonucleic acid (DNA) synthesis interference.

Enzymatic modifications during DNA synthesis are the major mechanism of resistance by DNA interference. There are two common enzyme groups, which cooperate during DNA synthesis, DNA gyrase (topoisomerase II : *gyrA* and *gyrB*) (Levy, 1998) and topoisomerase IV : *parC* and parE). Mutations in genes *gyrA* and *parC* cause replication failure resulting low affinity of fluoroquinolones to bacteria DNA modified-DNA complex. The most common resistance mechanism is mutation on *E. coli gyrA*. (Martinez-Martinez et al., 1998).

#### The emerging and acquiring of resistance gene

Management error in veterinary field is an important inducer for bacterial resistance. Use of subtherapeutic antibiotic in farm or inappropriate administration time can induce emerging of AMR bacteria. In general, the emerging and acquiring of antibiotic resistance are induced from two mechanisms (Normark and Normark, 2002).

#### **UHULALONGKORN UNIVERSIT**

1. Alteration in the genome via mutation

In common, a mutation usually affect only one class of antibiotics (Roberts, 2003) except the mutation of efflux and impermeability associated genes. The mutation of chromosomal genes associating antibiotic resistance are showed in Table 1.

Table 1 Antibiotics and their target gene of mutation

Antibiotics	Target of mutations	References
Aminoglycosides	16S rRNA	(Melancon et al.,
		1988)
Fluoroquinolones	DNA gyrase	(Fluit et al., 2001)
and quinolones	DNA topoisomerase IV	(Drlica and Zhao,
		1997)
Macrolide	23S rRNA	(Sigmund et al., 1984)
Rifampicin	eta-subunit of RNA polymerase	(Telenti et al., 1997)
Sulfonamide	Dihydropteroate synthetase	(Huovinen et al.,
4	(dhps gene)	1995)
Tetracyclines	16S rRNA	(Ross et al., 1998)
Trimethoprim	dihydrofolate reductase	(Powell et al., 1991)
	(dhfr gene)	
β-lactams	Penicillin binding protein (PBP)	(Fluit et al., 2001)

2. Acquisition resistance gene from mobile genetic element (Horizontal transfer)

Horizontal transfer gains by mobile genetic element (MGE) set as a free interchangeable unit between the intraspecies and interspecies bacteria in microenvironmental system (Roberts, 2003). The horizontal transfer can be occurred via self-replicating plasmids, bacteriophages, transposons, integrons and pathogenicity islands (Fluit et al., 2001; Salyers and Amabile-Cuevas, 1997) (Table 2).

Mobile genetic	Characters of mobile genetic	Role in resistance gene
elements	element	spreading
Integron	DNA segment composes 3	Form the cassette of different
	components: integrase,	resistance gene (gene in
	promoter and integration site	cassette can use promoter
	of gene	for expression)
Self-transmissible	Self-replicating element which	Transfer resistance gene
conjugative plasmid	carries the gene for conjugal	
	transfer	
Mobilizable plasmid	Self-replicating element which	Transfer resistance gene
	can use conjugal apparatus	
	from self-transmissible	
	plasmid for transferring	
Transposon	Mobile from DNA segment to	Transfer resistance gene
	another place in the same cell	between chromosome and
	จุฬาลงกรณ์มหาวิทยาลัง	plasmid
Bacteriophage	Viral vector for DNA	Transfer resistance gene
	transferring	

Table 2 Mobile genetic element and their specific characters

Horizontal gene transfer in E. coli

Generally, most of genes encoding resistance traits can be transferred horizontally cause wide-spreading of the genetic element transfect to other bacteria in microenvironment (Angulo et al., 2004a; Angulo et al., 2004b; Deng et al., 2011; Yao et al., 2011). By horizontal transmission, the extra-intestinal *E. coli* in farm animals possess class 1 integrons and *iss, tsh* and *colV* gene via using conjugative process that encode

certain virulence and resistance as well as those of commensal *E. coli.* (Nogrady et al., 2006). Thus, occurrence of integron and certain other MGE have usually been investigated for explanation of AMR situation between food animals and consumers.

Integrons are genetic elements that participate in site-specific recombination system of bacterial DNA. The elements majorly play a role in spreading antibiotic resistance genes in a clinical and animal farm setting. Integrons function as gene caption and expression system containing three main structures; (i) integration site (*attl*) for site specific insertion of gene cassettes (Partridge et al., 2000), (ii) integrase encoding gene for excising and arranging the gene cassette (Collis et al., 1993) and (iii) promoter session for expression (Levesque et al., 1995). Integrons are highly variable in type, number and gene function. (Recchia and Hall, 1995).

Class 1 integron is widely disseminated in bacterial strains within family *Enterobacteriaceae*. In animals and human. Class I integrons is composed of specific recombination site *attl1*, integrase gene *intl1* and the promoter Pc. At each end of class 1 integron gene possesses CSs site. 5'-CS with *intl1* gene (Hall and Vockler, 1987) and promoter towards to integration site and also 3'-CS with *qacE* $\Delta$ *1 (Paulsen et al., 1993)*(Paulsen et al., 1993) *sul1, orf5* (Stokes and Hall, 1989).

E. coli identification and strain typing

*E. coli* has much potential to harbor in wide-range host and environment. As its role to host is both resident and transient microorganism. It is needed not only to identify species but realize its role is also a need for controlling and management. *E. coli* strain typing is helpful for classify strength of enteric enemy and their violent situation, for example; toxin gene screening (Ostroff et al., 1989), plasmid profiling (Ostroff et al., 1989), phage typing (Ahmed et al., 1987), restriction fragment length polymorphism with bacteriophage (Paros et al., 1993), ribotyping (Dalla-Costa et al., 1998), pulse-field gel electrophoresis (PFGE) (Bohm and Karch, 1992), PCR using randomly amplified fragment length polymorphism analysis (RFLP) (Zhao et al., 2004), enterobacterial repetitive intergenic consensus sequence polymerase chain reaction (ERIC-PCR) (Versalovic et al., 1,

1991) and multilocus sequence typing (MLST) (Tartof et al., 2005). A variety of *E. coli* subpopulation in microenvironment is much feasible, thus major clone during investigation should be distinguished by number of clone together with approved genetic evidence. The MLST method is a gold standard to discriminate the strain typing (Maiden et al., 1998) especially from *E. coli* in term of molecular epidemiological study but MLST are relatively expensive when compare with other protocol because of laborious process of DNA sequencing. Nowaday, there are the cost effective high-throughput MLST (HiMLST) is performed by next-generation sequencing (NGS) to generate the sequence data. The HiMLST consists by 4 steps as follow target gene amplifling, individual barcode Incorporating, PCR Sample Pooling. Emulsion PCR and *454* Sequencing (Boers et al., 2012).

The concordance of animal production in the emergence of antimicrobial resistance

There was many roughly evidence to support the view that the emergence of antimicrobial resistant bacteria in livestock populations was connected to the emergence of AMR in bacterial populations that colonized and infect humans (EFSA, 2015; Singer et al., 2003), For example, a AMR review found that "proportion of human extra-intestinal extended-spectrum  $\beta$ -lactamases producing *Escherichia coli* (ESBLP) infections originate from food-producing animals", with poultry as a probable source (Lazarus et al., 2015; Leverstein-van Hall et al., 2011a). Regardless of this other recent study claim that most of the emergence of AMR in bacteria in humanity appears to originate from AMU (Antimicrobial usage) in humans, while the majority of AMR bacteria in livestock seem to originate from AMU in livestock. For example, whole genome sequence analysis of other Enterobacteriaceae bacteria, Salmonella enterica serovar Typhimurium phage type (PT) or definitive type (DT) 104 in human and livestock productions i has shown a greater diversity of AMR genes in human S. Typhimurium DT104, by comparison with those isolated in local livestock populations (Mather, 2013; Mather et al., 2013). The indication was that there were contributing sources other than foods of animal origin or livestock (Mather et al., 2013). In addition, a systematic review reported that usage of critically important antimicrobials for human treatment (such as fluoroquinolones and third- and fourth-generation cephalosporins) was higher in humans than in food-production animals (EFSA, 2015). Commonly, in both animals and humans, a positive association was found between the volume of antimicrobial consumption and prevalence of resistance in the exposed bacterial populations (Burow et al., 2014; EFSA, 2015). Nonetheless, there was consensus within the scientific literature that there are routes for spillover of AMR between the bacterial populations of human and food-producing animals in both directions (Lazarus et al., 2015; Leverstein-van Hall et al., 2011a). The most recently mentioned route is via AMR bacteria passed through food distribution and consumption, the majority of which were colonizing bacteria of the host gastrointestinal tract (Lazarus et al., 2015). Such bacteria might be commensal in animals but pathogenic in humans, or may be commensal in both (Singer et al., 2003). Basically, the reflection of crossover events, in terms of human disease, appeared to be the outbreak form (Mather et al., 2013), although this apparent pattern might be a result of reporting bias, as a result of a relatively high abundance of research into the evidence generated through outbreak investigations. The strong and direct evidence for AMR transmission via food was stilled limited (Lazarus et al., 2015). For example, a study in The Netherland reported increased levels of (extendedspectrum  $\beta$ -lactamases producing) ESBLP bacterial isolates with similar resistance genes in poultry meat and humans (Overdevest et al., 2011a; Overdevest et al., 2011b). Moreover, there was evidence of AMR occurrence not only in foodstuffs from animals (Duong et al., 2006; EFSA, 2015; Muriuki et al., 2001; Raufu et al., 2014; Thai et al., 2012) but also in other types of foodstuffs like vegetable (Allen et al., 2013). The recent detection of colistin resistance in food-borne pathogens in humans, livestock, pork and vegetables in many countries raises the issue of the potential role of the global travel and trade in the transboundary dissemination of resistance genes (Doumith et al., 2016; Liu et al., 2016; Skov and Monnet, 2016; Zurfuh et al., 2016).

The pressure which influence AMR emergence in animal production

Even though, antimicrobial resistance occurs basically as a consequence of selective pressure which placed on susceptible microbes by the usage of antimicrobial agents (Dione et al., 2009; Glynn et al., 2004; Koningstein et al., 2010), a diversity of other factors also affected to the emergence and spread of resistance. Standards such as restricted comingling, vaccination, house managing, adequate ventilation, temperature controls, biosecurity and appropriate nutrition were basically used in the new-fashion animal production to reduce the risk of introduction and spread on bacterial infection in animal herds. But this risk assessment required strongly and hugely financial investment, as well as practicing and incentivizing staff. Regardless, these standards were implemented suitably, a residual disease risk would continue (Adelaide et al., 2008; Cerniglia and Kotarski, 2005). The antimicrobials were regularly used in livestock production as a kind of insurance in addition to animal diseases risk-management standard. The tetracyclines, penicillins and sulfonamides resistance had been regularly observed in chicken and swine bacterial isolates in Enterobacteriaceae family, and MDR had been reported as significantly higher in these isolates than those from cattle. The intensively growing conditions under which pigs and chickens were often housed might be associated with higher disease potential and therefore a greater AMU in order to control sub-clinical infection (Duff and Galyean, 2007). In some developing countries, antimicrobials were widely utilized by swine farmers without veterinary recommendation due to their low prize and ready availability for sale over the counter (Laxminarayan et al., 2013). In some African countries, 55 percent of tetracyclines accounting used in food animals (Mitema et al., 2001). Harmonizingly, oxytetracycline was commonly used in small-scale livestock farm, while antimicrobial used included fluoroquinolones, erythromycin, sulfonamides and trimethoprim in Kenya (Kariuki et al., 2013). Antimicrobials were mostly purchased over the counter or from animal health assistants, without veterinarian advice. Some of drug quality was also an issue, as approximately one third of the drugs failed quality tests carried out by the National Quality Control Laboratory. The enteric bacterial isolates detected in food producing animals and meat were commonly resistant to ampicillin, tetracycline, sulfamethoxazole-trimethoprim and streptomycin with notable additional resistance to quinolones and third-generation cephalosporins, which were critically important in human medicine (FAO, 2016). Food from animal's meat was likely to still be

an important fomite for transmission of AMR bacteria from animals to humans. Other factors that could drive AMR include environmental contamination with antimicrobials from feces or their metabolites, residue concentrations of antimicrobials in eatable tissues, and direct zoonotic transmission (Aarestrup et al., 2006; Marshall and Levy, 2011; Padungtod and Kaneene, 2006; Padungtod et al., 2006). The ruin of effective antimicrobials to treat unhealthy animals undergo effects of livestock production (Cerniglia and Kotarski, 2005). Harmonizingly, there was risk for anyone involved in the meat production chain which exposed to resistant bacteria (Garcia-Alvarez et al., 2012; Lewis et al., 2008).

#### Relation between of AMU in animal production and AMR detection

Globalizing of antimicrobial use was considered to be the major factor associated with resistance in bacterial populations (Aarestrup et al., 2008; Acar and Moulin, 2012). The antimicrobial usage in health care, agriculture, aquaculture and industries had an impact on the expression, persistence, selection and transfer of resistance phenotypes and genotypes in bacterial populations (Aminov and Mackie, 2007; Courvalin, 2008; Mathew et al., 2007). Redundant use and misuse of antimicrobials were commonly recognized as two of the main factors for acquired AMR, both directly and indirectly, due to the selection pressure placed on human and animal microbiota (Martinez and Baquero, 2009; Novo et al., 2013; WHO, 2014) and on environmental bacteria (Martinez and Baquero, 2009). In European Union (EU) and Southeast Asian countries, many of the antimicrobial drugs licensed for veterinary use matched to antimicrobial classes or groups routinely used in humans (FAO, 2016). Third-generation cephalosporins (e.g. ceftiofur), regarded as critically important antimicrobials in humans (WHO, 2016) had been associated with the selection of co-resistance to different antimicrobials such as tetracycline and chloramphenicol in E. coli isolated from feces (Lowrance et al., 2007). This situation had been observed in health care unit, farms, effluent and sewage environments and in the intestinal tract of treated animals and humans (Martinez and Baguero, 2009). The constancy of antimicrobial residues in animal feed and animal waste contaminant also affected the aquatic and environmental microbiota (You and Silbergeld, 2014). Colistin was good example for drug which had controversial issue between veterinary medicine

and human medicine. Colistin which was the polymyxin E had been use in veterinary medicine for several decades and was used across several food producing animal species (e.g. pigs, poultry, sheep, goats, calves and adult cattle) including farming fish. Indications for use ranged from gastrointestinal tract infections by bacteria in Enterobacteriaceae family to topical treatment of mastitis. Colistin was regularly utilized in feed and water in intensive growing systems, not only for therapeutic purposes but also for prophylactic and metaphylactic purposes in flock of animals (Catry et al., 2015). Colistin was also often used in human medicine for the cure of infections caused by MDR carbapenemases producing Gram-negative bacteria, in combination with tigecycline, which had brought colistin to be re-justified as a highly important antimicrobial by WHO (Catry et al., 2015; WHO, 2011). In 2016, the detection of mobilized colistin resistance in food-borne pathogens in animals (Liu et al., 2016), foods and humans (associated with infection), observed worldwide, raises serious and urgent public health awareness (Skov and Monnet, 2016). At now, there were at least five allotypes of plasmid borne genes associated with this resistant phenotype (Borowiak et al., 2017; Carattoli et al., 2017; Liu et al., 2016; Xavier et al., 2016; Yin et al., 2017). It was strictly recommended that, for veterinary purposes, colistin should only be used for treatment (Catry et al., 2015; EMA, 2015). Nevertheless, there were currently confined data on the range and pattern of antimicrobial usage from food-producing animals, particularly in Southeast Asian countries. Only a few countries in Europe (e.g. Denmark, Sweden and Netherlands) regularly conducted systemic surveillance of AMU and AMR in humans, animals and food products of animal origin. At European Union level, the ESVAC (European Surveillance of Veterinary Antimicrobial Consumption) program assessed antimicrobial sales, adjusted by biomass of livestock populations, across different European countries (ESVAC, 2015). The emergence of AMR bacterial strains was dependent on various factors relating to the antimicrobial (e.g. amount, dosage, frequency and duration of selection pressure) and the bacterial organism (e.g. appearance of genes conferring resistance to that antimicrobial substance, and advantage gained by the expression of these to the survival of the bacteria) (McEwen, 2006). Usage of antimicrobials might unblock gene expression,

affecting the development of resistance genes in bacteria (Courvalin, 2008; Lambert, 2012) or inducing the occurrence of mutation (Limoli et al., 2014). Type, frequency and duration of antimicrobial therapy were the important factor in dissemination of resistance. Commonly, it had been estimated that more than 75 percent of antimicrobials used in livestock were excreted, mostly unmetabolized (Marshall and Levy, 2011). The antimicrobial residues in these farm environments was likely to be high. This was a crucial risk factor for the emergence of AMR. AMU also impacted on the competition for nutrients between bacterial populations in ecosystems through the elimination of susceptible bacteria (Aarestrup et al., 2008). In recently previous study, plasmid-mediated resistance to third generation cephalosporin in E. coli in livestock was affected by the reduction of numbers of susceptible bacteria in the gut microbiome (Volkova et al., 2012). Antimicrobial usage also appeared to reduce the infective dose required by resistant pathogens to cause infection, causing a serious risk for hosts exposed to, these bacteria (da Costa et al., 2013). Even though, there was evidence of prevalence of resistance in gut commensal bacteria (especially E. coli) in food-producing animals and foods of animal origin (Chantziaras et al., 2014). there were currently limited data on the role of these bacteria as potential sources of resistance genes for human. This same issues had been discussed in humans carrying resistant strains and undertaking antimicrobial therapy (da Costa et al., 2013). In E. coli, transfer of resistance determinants between bacteria had been mainly caused by the selection pressure imposed by AMU (da Costa et al., 2013). Usage of third-generation cephalosporins in livestock had been associated with emergence and spread of ESBL P Gram-negative bacteria, which caused a serious risk to public health (Aarestrup et al., 2008). The occasional isolation of carbapenemresistant Gram-negative bacteria in livestock animals was also believed as a serious risk public health, as carbapenems were considered "last-resource" to **β**-lactam antimicrobials for cure of life-threatening infections in humans. Carbapenems were not regularly used in food-producing animals and were predominantly used in human hospital settings. Nevertheless, there could be a risk of co-resistance through usage of other antimicrobials in agriculture or through horizontal transferred from human pathogens. Transfer of resistance traits within the bacterial cells could be induced by AMU and had been detected in macrolides in bacteria in Enterobacteriaceae family. Erythromycin promoted the transposition of erythromycin-resistant genes from a non-conjugative to a conjugative plasmid, which can then became mobile between bacteria (Courvalin, 2008). Controversially, in countries where use of particular antimicrobials (e.g. fluoroquinolones) were not allowed in livestock, low levels of, or no resistance to, these antimicrobials were observed in foodborne zoonotic bacteria (Aarestrup et al., 2008). Antimicrobials at low dosages (i.e. residual levels, sub-therapeutic dosages) were also contributing to resistance as they promoted genetic and phenotypic variability in exposed bacteria (Andersson and Hughes, 2014; Martinez, 2008; You and Silbergeld, 2014), however they were less likely to kill susceptible bacteria leading to selection bias than antimicrobials administered at higher dosages. In addition, sub-lethal doses also appeared to increase gene expression, formation of biofilms that were also indirectly responsible for resistance due to the close proximity of bacteria, which might favour the horizontal transfer of mobile resistance determinants (Andersson and Hughes, 2014; Lupo et al., 2012). Soil (Forsberg et al., 2012; Mathew et al., 2007) and water bacteria (Lupo et al., 2012) had been reported as reservoirs for resistance genes, and were exposed to antimicrobial residues derived from human, industrial, and agricultural use (Forsberg et al., 2012). Existence of antimicrobial residues derived from human, industrial and agricultural usage in the aquatic and terrestrial environments also contributed to selective pressure on environmental bacteria (Forsberg et al., 2012; Lupo et al., 2012; You and Silbergeld, 2014) and commensals and pathogens presented in the gut microbiome of farm animals (You and Silbergeld, 2014). It should be noted that antimicrobials differed in how efficiently they were processed in animal guts (and thus in the amount of residue excreted) (Kemper, 2008) and in how long the residues remain bioavailability in the environment (e.g. how long they were adsorbed to soil) (Kemper, 2008; Kumar et al., 2005). Therefore different type of antimicrobials caused different levels of public health risk (ASM, 2009). For example, sulfonamides did not strongly adsorb to soil, thus remaining bioavailability in the environment for long periods (Wegst-Uhrich et al., 2014). Excretion rates were dependent on the type of antimicrobial, mode of administration, animal species and period since administration. Excretion rates for tetracyclines and sulfonamides might vary between 40 and 90 percent when they were comparing (Kemper, 2008). There was currently a lack of data on concentrations of antimicrobials in soil, manure and surface water, perhaps due to insufficiently sensitive analytical methods (Thanner et al., 2016). Importantly, antimicrobials which were concentration-dependent, such as aminoglycosides, were more likely to rapidly exert selection pressure on bacteria in soil or water before they were diluted, in comparison to time-dependent antimicrobials (such as  $\beta$ -lactams) which required sustained high concentrations in order to had an effect on bacterial viability (Amábile-Cuevas, 2016). The growing occurrence of MDR organisms enabled coselection, which reduced the removal of all antimicrobials in order to achieve a useful reduction in the prevalence of resistance. However, reduction of numbers of resistant bacteria might only be possible if these were outnumbered by susceptible bacteria in an antimicrobial-free environment in which only a small number of individuals had been exposed to antimicrobials, or in the presence of a limited "selective density" (Levy and Marshall, 2004). This would not be the case in high-selective-density environments such as hospitals and conventional intensive farms (Levy and Marshall, 2004; PHE, 2014).

Categories of AMU in animal production in relation AMR detection

Antimicrobial growth promoters (AGPs)

Exposure of bacteria to subtherapeutic concentrations of antimicrobials was important role in AMR evolution (Andersson and Hughes, 2014). The usage of AGPs as feed additives in intensively produced animals had been found to alter the gut microbiome of treated animals and promoted resistance transfer within the animal and the environmental microbiome (You and Silbergeld, 2014). AGPs were administered at subtherapeutic dosages to groups of animals via drinking water or feed for prolonged periods to improve growth rates (Capita and Alonso-Calleja, 2013; Castanon, 2007; Wielinga et al., 2014). AGPs were sold and used in many countries without veterinary recommendations or supervision (Laxminarayan et al., 2013). There was still contrasting evidence, however, as to whether the improvement in animal production due to the use of

AGPs was significant, and the mechanism behind any such effect was still largely unknown (Lee et al., 2012). It was important to state that the impact of AGPs on productivity could be as little less than 1 percent, if nutrition, hygienic practices and health care of the herd or flock was also improved (Laxminarayan et al., 2015). However, such necessary improvements might not always be easy to achieve, especially in developing countries, where money were limited. The banning of AGPs in Europe in 2006 (EC, 2006) led to a reduction in the levels of vancomycin-resistant *enterococci* (VRE) previously observed in chicken in Denmark (Singer et al., 2003). Vancomycin was not licensed for use in poultry, but their resistance had emerged as result of the use of avoparcin (also in glycopeptides group) as an AGP in poultry production (Singer et al., 2003; Wielinga et al., 2014).Even though sub-therapeutic dosages had been linked to the emergence of antimicrobial resistance, AGPs continued to be used in many non-EU countries in intensive animal production, although the extent of this was currently unknown (Capita and Alonso-Calleja, 2013; Castanon, 2007; Singer et al., 2003). There had been a recent move in the United States to reduce their use. Animal feed is supplemented by other, nonantimicrobial compounds, which might, in turn, affected microorganisms. Sepiolite, for example, had been used as an additive in animal feed since 1990 in the EU. It slowed the passage of food through the intestinal tract, enabling a better absorption of nutrients. Sepiolite was not an antimicrobial, nor does it exerted any antimicrobial effect, but it promoted the horizontal transfer of resistance plasmids between bacteria, which could be aggravated if there was concomitant presence of AGPs (Rodriguez-Beltran et al., 2013).

#### Prophylaxis

This was defined as the antimicrobial usage to susceptible but healthy animals to prevent the occurrence of infectious disease. A regular example was the infiltration of the mammary glands of dairy cattle with antimicrobials such as penicillins, cephalosporins, or other lactams after cessation of lactation (Capita and Alonso-Calleja, 2013; Landers et al., 2012). Such AMU was likely to have a similar effect to that of growth promoters, although therapeutic levels of dosing, if adhered to, should be less likely to induce resistance in exposed bacterial populations. Nonetheless, it might not be the case when the administration occurred in animal groups through water and feed (e.g. pigs, chicken) due to the variations in consumption by individual animals and the number of animals exposed. It was noted that particularly in countries where antimicrobial production and storage chains were inadequate (due to environmental or infrastructure-related issues) antimicrobials might be susceptible to degradation through oxidation-reduction reactions, hydrolysis, biodegradation or photodegradation (Osei, 2014). These antimicrobial preparations might reduce concentration and bactericidal activity when used, allowing for the survival of exposed bacteria and the generation of resistance (Osei, 2014).

#### Metaphylaxis

Defined as the administration of an antimicrobial at therapeutic doses to all animals within a group in which some individuals exhibited infection. Metaphylaxis acted both as a treatment for those animals currently infected and a preventive measure against infection in those animals who are healthy but risk becoming infected. The administration of oxytetracycline in the flock water supplied, as treatment and prevention against *Mycoplasma* infections in poultry, was a common example. The number of animals exposed to metaphylaxis was often large: in poultry production, medicated water or feed could be used to treat more than 30,000 poultry in the same flock. In addition, even if precise dosing is used for example where antimicrobials were administered to all members of a herd in injectable form such widespread AMU inevitably increased the risk of resistance emergence, due to the increased probability of bacteria with natural resistance which encountered the antimicrobial and potentially selected for within the affected microbiome (FAO, 2016).

#### Therapeutic use

This described treatment of active bacterial infection in a single animal, or a group, via antimicrobial administration. Whereas even a single dose of antimicrobial administered to a single animal had the propensity to generate AMR within bacterial populations resident in that animal, the repeated and continued usage of antimicrobials, for example to treat recurrent infections, compounds this risk (Harada and Asai, 2010; Usui et al.,

2014). Commonly, broad-spectrum antimicrobials were used in livestock before, or in place of, a confirmed diagnosis (for example before undertaking any antimicrobial susceptibility testing) due to economic considerations. The administration of macrolide antimicrobials such as erythromycin to pigs (Harada and Asai, 2010). The duration of systemic treatment should only be long enough to ensure elimination of infection in the affected animal or animal populations as this could result in further selective pressure on the gut microbiota (EMA, 2015). Correct dosing was very important for the reasons stated above. In addition, for antimicrobial substances that had been licensed for veterinary use for many years, recommended dosages by manufacturers in the Summaries of Products Characteristics (SPCs) might not be adequate as these may had not been calculated in accordance with updated pharmacokinetics and pharmacodynamics principles, or might not had taken account of the evolution of antimicrobial susceptibility in bacterial populations (EMA, 2015). It was important to note that when antimicrobials were administered via largely unregulated vehicles such as feed or water, whether for therapeutic, metaphylactic or prophylactic purposes, the exact intake of individual animals would be hard to ensure and define, and suboptimal dosing might occur (particularly of sick animals within a group housing and/or an ad lib feed and water system), which increased the risk of AMR emergence.

### จุหาลงกรณ์มหาวิทยาลัย

#### Biocide use

These were substances which, through chemical or biological action, hinder the activity of a broad spectrum of microorganisms (IFT, 2006; SCENIHR, 2009). Not only were they commonly used in agricultural settings. Their use was also frequent in human health-care systems and at community level. They might lead to emergence of AMR through cross-resistance, co-resistance and mutating mechanisms, and by activating an SOS response in bacteria leading to the repair and integration of DNA, some of which might include resistance genes (Capita and Alonso-Calleja, 2013). Biocide usage within the agricultural industry could be divided into two broad categories: a) animal feed preservatives and b) disinfectants and antiseptics. Within the food-production industry, biocides might also be used as food preservatives or decontaminants. For examples
including sulfites, lactic acid, trisodium phosphate or acidified sodium chlorate. Such compounds inhibited the growth of microorganisms in, or on, foodstuffs and produce (Capita and Alonso-Calleja, 2013). Lower susceptibility and resistance to biocides has been reported in bacterial populations since the 1950s, plasmids, transposons and integrons often also carry genes which conferred resistance to biocides (e.g. disinfectants and antiseptics) and to heavy metals, provided an evolutionary advantage to the resistant bacteria even in the absence of antimicrobial pressure (Acar and Moulin, 2012; Martinez and Baquero, 2009). Resistance mechanisms were similar for biocides and antimicrobial substances: selective pressure from biocide use in food production, industrial, agricultural and human health care settings, and water and wastewater treatment facilities. They could result in cross- or co-selection for AMR (SCENIHR, 2009). Biocides and antimicrobial substances might share common target sites and could be located closely together in mobile units (e.g. plasmids), leaded to co-resistance (Levy and Marshall, 2004). Efflux pumps coded at chromosomal level was involved in resistance to both antimicrobials and biocides (e.g. quaternary ammonium compound) due to their non-specific mechanism. Resistance to biocides had been associated with stress responses in bacteria, particularly when in the presence of sub-lethal doses but also in the presence of other stressors in the environment (e.g. osmotic and oxidative pressure, pH, nutrient availability) (IFT, 2006). Non-compliance with recommended dilution, preparation and storage of biocides might explain the increased tolerance to these products at low or sub-lethal concentrations and changed in phenotypic expression (e.g. membrane permeability, changes in membrane charge, efflux pumps and biofilm formation) of exposed bacterial populations (SCENIHR, 2009). There was currently a paucity of data relating to the extent of biocide use, presence of environmental residues and environmental stability (SCENIHR, 2009). Although risk assessment for AMR occurrence due to exposure to biocides was now a mandatory requirement for registration and licensing of these substances in European countries (ECHA, 2014), there was still little information on the correlation between biocides and antimicrobial resistance (Oggioni et al., 2015). Quaternary ammonium compounds or ethanol were used to destroy or inhibit microorganisms in animal husbandry and food production and processing facilities like abattoir. In a recent study, Salmonella enterica strains exhibited reduced susceptibility to chlorine dioxide and peroxyacids when exposed to increase concentrations of these chemicals over time. In addition, the resistance of these bacterial species to various antimicrobials also increased after disinfectant exposure. Prior exposure to acidic disinfectants also increased the percentage of bacteria surviving subsequent acid treatments (SCENIHR, 2009). Although several existing studies provided evidence of a role of biocides in the emergence of AMR, exceptions exist where only weak or moderate correlations were observed between phenotypic biocide resistance and AMR in some bacteria (Oggioni et al., 2015). Therefore, further research was needed to assess the impact of biocides on pathogens relevant to public health. Since such substances were used ubiquitously and in large quantities throughout the food chain, it might be surmised that their relative impact on AMR emergence within agriculture and food industries might be important. Regardless, in order to quantify further the repercussions of biocide usage on the emergence of AMR within and outside the agricultural industry, further in-field surveillance of biocide use, and research into potential causal associations, was warranted (Fraise, 2002). It was noted that the usage of biocides was very widespread in many industries, and the disease burden to humans and domestic animals without their use would need to be weighed against any potential benefits from their reduced use.

# Animal feed preservatives

Preservatives such as citric acid or sodium benzoate protect animal feed against decay caused by microorganisms. Such organic acids when ingested by food-producing animals might induce a selective pressure on gut bacteria (SCENIHR, 2009). In addition, these preservatives were often added in large quantities to feed such as silage, an increasing trend globally. This silage, if stored in such a manner that effluent could contaminate the environment, might potentially extend selective pressure to environmental bacteria.

Heavy Metals

Heavy metals might be used in agriculture as part of livestock feed supplements, and in a East Asia study were detected in manure from pig farms (Zhu et al., 2013). Heavy metals associated with the emergence and spread of AMR in environmental bacteria due to co-selection. The presence of heavy metals associated with the reduction of susceptibility of bacterial populations in soil (Aminov and Mackie, 2007) and commensal bacteria (e.g. *Enterococci*) (Werner et al., 2013) to antimicrobials. Heavy metals in soil could be derived from mining and industrial activities but also from agriculture and health care (Aminov and Mackie, 2007). AGPs use in livestock production could also contain heavy metals as trace elements (e.g. copper, zinc), or medication (e.g. arsenic in coccidiostatics) (You and Silbergeld, 2014). These metals could co-select for AMR not only in the gut microbiota but also in the environment through their persistence in animal waste (You and Silbergeld, 2014). Commensals and pathogens in the gut microbiota of animals could also be exposed to heavy metals through contaminated feed (e.g. mercury in fishmeal) (Defra, 2014; You and Silbergeld, 2014).

Other environmental factor which associated resistance emergence and maintenance

The stress and resistance genes in the bacterial genome were located closely together, which would promote their co-expression under stressful conditions, even in the absence of AMU (Mathew et al., 2007). Stressors identified as associated with emergence and transfer of resistance include extreme temperatures and variations on osmotic pressure and pH that could have an impact on the integrity of the DNA and affect bacterial survival (Aarestrup et al., 2008). Lack of biodiversity in ecosystems seemed to drive the emergence of resistance determinants and bacteria (da Costa et al., 2013). Transfer of resistant bacterial clones to hosts (i.e. humans and animals) was dependent on the age and health status of the host, and the frequency of contacts between the host and the environment, and/or between humans and animals (Martinez and Baquero, 2009; Mathew et al., 2007). Host stressors such as weaning was described as influencing the occurrence of AMR as they might have an impact on the gut environment, either by

enhancing uptake of resistance genes by bacteria or by favoring the survival of resistant strains (Mathew et al., 2007). Finally, a number of stress conditions in urban areas, especially those in developing countries, was related to the selection or maintenance of AMR genes in potentially pathogenic bacteria. Conditions as apparently unrelated to antimicrobials as air pollution might foster the resistance of airborne bacteria to antimicrobials (Jimenez-Arribas et al., 2001).

Risks of agricultural antimicrobial usage, other than AMR selection

Antimicrobial usage of any kind implies a risk for AMR selection and spread. We currently lacked adequate risk-assessment models for exploring the impact of agricultural AMU, simply because we had a poor understanding of the complex processes that lead to the emergence and spread of AMR. Many such mechanisms, e.g. mutations and horizontal transfer between distantly-related bacteria, occurred at very low rates, often below our detection capabilities. Regardless, as bacterial populations were enormous and many of them still unknown (we had been able to culture less than 10 percent of the species of the human microbiome, and less than 1 percent of the soil microbiome), most of these very rare phenomena at individual organism level occurred frequently at population level. In addition, there were other unpredictable implications of AMU in livestock. The acceptable levels of oxytetracycline and erythromycin in meat, followed usage in food-producing animals, could disrupt the fermentation process of sausages, as they were able to inhibit microbial starter cultures, but might allow the growth of pathogens such as Salmonella Typhimurium and Escherichia coli serotype O157:H7 (Kjeldgaard et al., 2012). The use of antimicrobials in food-producing animals might lead to food-related outbreaks through unexpected pathways.

AMR emergence and AMU within different animal production systems

Intensive systems

The intensification of livestock production (e.g. large numbers of animals kept at high density and usually indoors) associated with the use of antimicrobials as prophylaxis

against infectious disease, often for prolonged periods and for large populations of animals. Pro- and metaphylactic usage of antimicrobials at different stages of livestock production could also had an impact on the emergence of resistance (Chang et al., 2015). In Eastern European countries, higher levels of resistance had been reported in E. coli isolates in piglets. This contrasted with the predominant E. coli isolates with susceptible phenotypes and genotypes reported in sows in the same study (Mazurek et al., 2013). It was associated with the prophylactic use of antimicrobials in younger animals to prevent and contain the spread of respiratory and gastrointestinal infectious diseases (Mazurek et al., 2013). Animals bred for intensive production also tended to have reduced variability in their microbiota and a similar susceptibility to colonization with particular bacterial species (Schokker et al., 2014). This, coupled with the close proximity of animals in such systems, could result in amplification of any resistant population(s) of bacteria, which might outcompete other bacterial populations. Due to the factors above, an intensive system processed with poor biosecurity and herd/flock health might run a high risk of being colonized by pathogenic strains of bacteria (Zhu et al., 2013). The poor animal health within such situations also necessitate the increased use of antimicrobials, this was likely to support the development of AMR (FAO, 2013b). Given ever-growing global demand for livestock products, it was expected that intensive production would continue to expand in the future. It might be hypothesized, however, that intensive systems with high biosecurity might, in fact, reducing requirements for AMU and thus reducing the risk of AMR emergence. Intensive farms might also be able to take practical steps to mitigate AMR transfer into and out of the system. But as the authors could find little evidence to substantiate these theories in the literature, further research was warranted. It was important to note that, while hypotheses could be made about the effect of agricultural practices on the emergence of AMR in food animals, biological factors needed to be considered in relation to the potential for transmission of resistance to human bacterial populations. The results from previous study, it found that livestock animals appeared to be a more likely source for a proportion of human infections than other food-producing animals (Lazarus et al., 2015). Genomic data demonstrated that human extraintestinal

pathogenic *E. coli* and avian pathogenic *E. coli* shared numerous virulence factors, and resistant strains that were able to infect avian sources were also more likely to possess the cellular machinery required to infect humans (Lazarus et al., 2015). Such findings were relevant from a public health perspective since the fractional proportion of poultry products consumed globally currently outstretches any other protein source, and was projected to continue to do so (due both to increasing global demand and the efficiency of poultry feed conversion, which surpasses that of other livestock) (FAO, 2013a).

#### Extensive systems

Extensive livestock farming systems, typically characterized by low inputs generating low out-puts (the converse of intensive systems) might potentially require lower inputs of antimicrobials, and thus by default, result in lower rates of AMR emergence. However, by comparison with intensive systems, extensive systems required higher animal numbers for the same output (FAO, 2013b). Extensive systems involving free-roaming animals in large numbers might exhibit high commensal and pathogenic bacterial transmission rates and exposure to multiple bacterial species (including environmental species such as soil bacteria) which might not be as prevalent in intensive systems (FAO, 2013a). These factors might result in promoting the generation and transmission of AMR genetic material and bacterial populations.

# Organic systems

Organic production systems in different countries could vary in the level of antimicrobial therapies allowed. In Europe, restrictions existed in the number of therapeutic courses allowed and the duration of withdrawal periods (Anon, 2007). Proand metaphylactic use of antimicrobials was prohibited. Alternative therapeutic plans were encouraged and use of antimicrobials was only permitted when necessary. Use of vaccines for disease prevention was permitted and encouraged (Anon, 2007). Recent studies comparing AMR levels in livestock reared in organic versus conventional production systems showed higher concentrations in the latter (Cui et al., 2005; Holtcamp, 2011; Mazurek et al., 2013). In Eastern European countries, Mazurek et al. (2013) reported that resistant E. coli isolates were mainly observed in livestock animals raised in barns in conventional farms rather than in animals having access to pasture and raised organically, with lower exposure to antimicrobials (Mazurek et al., 2013). In another study in the United States, MDR enteric bacteria spp. were detected in both antimicrobial-free and conventional pig farms. This was likely due to environmental reservoirs that could be a source of resistance genes and resistant bacteria (Quintana-Hayashi and Thakur, 2012). These results conformed to the reports from pig farms in Thailand (Lugsomya et al., 2017). A poorly managed organic system, the drive to reduce AMU might lead to the administration of doses of antimicrobials below the minimum inhibitory concentration (MIC), leading to an increased selection pressure for AMR bacteria and/or recurrent infections or extensive onward transmission, required repeating treatment of single or multiple animals and instigating selection pressure for AMR. In addition, in organic systems where livestock production was integrated with an extensive and/or a free-range or outdoor farming model, access to AMR genes or bacterial populations via soil bacteria and effluent might result in a propensity for organic/extensively-produced livestock to harbor AMR comparable with conventionally produced or indoor animals. More comparative research was required on this topic, though it might be suggested that high biosecurity, high herd/flock health and indoor, organic systems might potentially induce and harboured relatively less AMR than others. Despite this, it should be noted that biocide treatment of organically-produced animal feed and human foods might still potentially induce AMR in the food chain. The indiscriminate use of biocides should therefore be discouraged (Davin-Regli and Pagès, 2012; Fuentes et al., 2014).

# Pig production cycle and management in Thailand

The majority of pig farms in Thailand are raised on either an open or a closed housing system. An evaporative cooling system is defined as closed houses by literally wrapping up with plastic sheets. Pig farming systems can be classified based on period of animal ages; breeder, one site, two sites and multisite farm systems. In breeder farms, this produces only piglets and supplies among weaned pigs to fattening farms. In general, piglets are weaned at 18–28 days of age, and the sows are moved to mating unit on the same day. Sows are prepared in their quarantined-pen for 2 weeks. A week prior to delivery, sows are moved to farrowing units with well hygienic management, which are administrated with antibiotics at least two days after delivery for disease prevention and reduce stress. All-in-all-out system, in which all pigs enter and leave from the facility together at the same time, is applied in mating, farrowing, and nursery units. Animals raised under the same management system are considered to have a similar disease status. Therefore, any production compartments can claim freedom of disease for the animals produced regardless of where the animals actually are.

Risk factors for the emergence of AMR in agriculture at national and international level

It was important to highlight the fact that the extent and patterns of AMU in agriculture and other industries were likely to vary considerably between and within countries, due to the influence of various factors (e.g. legislative framework and governance, financial status and stability, degree of international imports and exports, human resources: population size, education and expertise, culture, structure and organization of the various agricultural production systems in use nationally). In many countries, particularly developing countries, there had been dramatic changes in agricultural systems in recent years, driven by both increasing local demand and new and emerging trade opportunities (FAO, 2013a, b; Otte et al., 2007; Rushton, 2010; Stiftung, 2014). A growing global population and increasing wealth in emerging economies, for example in China and India , had stimulated demand for animal protein and the development of global value chains (Otte et al., 2007). For example, new export opportunities for African countries (USDA, 2018) led to increased production and intensification of agricultural systems in the region (FAOSTAT, 2017). Globally, poultry production was growing this century at around 3 percent per year and seemed set to continue to grow as global diets and consumption patterns shift (FAO, 2013b). Changes to agricultural systems as a result of intensification

involved changes in livestock/fish numbers, feed type and quantity used, husbandry methods, and animal density. All of these factors could influence disease dynamics (Otte et al., 2007), which in turn might drive changes in AMU. The extent of the impact on AMU depended on the attitude of veterinary practitioners and farmers towards use of antimicrobials within particular legislative and governance frameworks, and alternative methods for maximizing animal productivity.

Route of spread of antimicrobial resistance between animals and humans

Both pathogenic and non-pathogenic resistant bacteria could be transmitted from livestock to humans via food consumption, or via direct contact with animals or their waste in the environment (Marshall and Levy, 2011). Fomites could also play an important role in the local and wider spread of resistant bacteria. In Denmark, farm-to-farm spread of multidrug-resistant Salmonella enterica serovar Typhimurium DT204 had been closely studied, and shared farm equipment (e.g. machinery) was identified as an important route (Aarestrup et al., 2006). The mechanism that helped spread bacteria had the potential to transfer resistant bacteria. Resistance might also be conferred by the exchange of genetic elements between bacteria of the same or different strain or species, and such transfer could occur in any environment where resistant bacteria had the opportunity to mix with a susceptible bacterial population, such as in the human or animal gut, in slurry spread on agricultural soil, or in aquatic environments (Aarestrup et al., 2006; Martinez and Baquero, 2002). If resistance developed in environmental bacteria, this could create an animal or human health problem when such bacteria contaminated water, food crops or animal feed, introducing the opportunity for bacterial mixing with commensal or pathogenic species in the animal or human gut (Aarestrup et al., 2006; Finley et al., 2013; Marti et al., 2013).

#### Risk pathways for the spread of AMR via the environment

Many antimicrobial preparations used for livestock were given orally so that antimicrobial residues excreted in animal faeces have the potential to exert selection pressure on bacterial populations in soil or water (AAM, 2009; Woolridge, 2012). However, evidence was scarce as to how important this mechanism was in transferring resistance (Hong et al., 2011; McEwen, 2006; Novo et al., 2013) and different antimicrobials had different fates in the environment (AAM, 2009; Kemper, 2008; Kumar et al., 2005). The residues resulted from human treatment with antimicrobials or from pharmaceutical manufacturing could also exert selection pressure on environmental bacteria (Baguero et al., 2008; Finley et al., 2013; Igbinosa et al., 2011; Novo et al., 2013; Wellington et al., 2013). Indeed, effluent from drug manufacturing was found to contain extremely high concentrations of antimicrobial residues, as previously reported in countries with large pharmaceutical industries such as India (Larsson et al., 2007; Sim et al., 2011). Water, including that treated for human consumption, was an important vehicle for the spread of AMR. Water was not only directly consumed by humans and animals but is used for irrigation of crops which were then consumed by humans or used as animal feed (Finley et al., 2013). Water spread antimicrobial residues, resistant bacteria and resistance genes far and wide through the flow of natural water bodies and anthropogenic influences such as irrigation. This was a significant concern in developing countries, where water was shown to be a major route for transmission of pathogenic bacteria to humans (Wellington et al., 2013). Recreational water use was linked to exposure to AMR bacteria (Leonard et al., 2015).

จุฬาลงกรณมหาวทยาลย

Resistant E. coli transmissible chance from pig to human

There were certain reports on resistance *E. coli* isolates from pigs and pork had some genotyping characteristics such as *E. coli* O2:HNM isolated from human which is the extra-intestinal pathogenic *E. coli* (ExPEC) had a genetic identical to that in pig feces in Spain. These pig and human isolates were the same sequence type (ST10) by MLST but differed when compared by pulsatypes by PFGE (Cortes et al., 2010). In addition, there were sharing of *E. coli* sequence type 7 by MLST contained  $bla_{CTX-M-1}$  located on plasmid incompatibility group from pig and human feces (Leverstein-van Hall et al., 2011a). In term of pig and pig associated farmer, only 11 strains (1.5%) of *E. coli* isolated from animals were identical clones to strains isolated from healthy farmers. These data suggest that the transmission of animal clones to livestock farmers or vice versa is less common (Cortes

et al., 2010). Additionally, *qnrS1* gene, the specific quinolones-mediated resistance plasmid, was independently presented in *E. coli* from human and farm animals with 99% similarity (Szmolka et al., 2011). In Thailand, the distribution of similar bacterial clone among diarrheal, healthy pigs and Thai farmers was noticed by existence of resistance cassette gene conferring MDR comprising tetracycline, ciprofloxacin, gentamicin, nalidixic acid, sulfamethoxazole-trimethoprim, sulfamethoxazole, kanamycin, ampicillin and streptomycin (Phongpaichit et al., 2007). However, this could not be consensual on direction of transmission, as long as those cross-section study did explain only existence in specific time and host investigation. There has been still lack of data uncovering a background and a concrete relationship between bacteria originated from pigs, pork and consumers. To date, there has not been defined why and when they initially emerge and whether they persisted or resisted during farming system.

Resistance of E. coli in pigs in the foreign country

In China, the high prevalence of MDR *E. coli* had the main antibiogram profile to ampicillin, ceftazidime, ciprofloxacin, sulfamethoxazole, chloramphenicol and tetracyclines (Xu et al., 2014). In European pig industrials, MDR appearance could not be concluded but the resistance patterns showed against penicillin, streptomycin, spectinomycin, doxycycline and sulfamethoxazole/trimethoprim (Schwaiger et al., 2012). Therefore, MDR incidences distributing in pig industrial area seem to be usual situation or certain strains might not be persistent resistance but a wild type.

## Resistance of E. coli in pigs in Thailand

From the previous studies, role of both of porcine pathogenic *E. coli* and commensal *E. coli* are likely as reservoirs of antimicrobial resistance. Up to 98% *E. coli* isolates from normal healthy pigs are multidrug resistance (MDR) *E. coli*. Most of porcine fecal *E. coli* strains are resistance to tetracyclines and ampicillin. A total of 73 % commensal *E. coli* isolates carried class 1 integron. The most prevalence of inserted-gene cassette was

*aadA2* (aminoglycoside adenyltransferase) gene. In term of pathogenic *E. coli*, porcine enterotoxigenic *E. coli* (ETEC) and enterohemorrhagic *E .coli* (EHEC) resisted to amoxicillin (100%) chlortetracycline (100%), streptomycin (100%), tetracycline (100%), sulfamethoxazole/ trimethoprim (100%) eventually in colistin (51.3%) and enrofloxacin (87.8%) (Prapasarakul et al., 2010). Moreover, the high incidence of resistance *E. coli* to streptomycin, sulfamethoxazole, amoxicillin, gentamicin and tetracycline was also reported in pork retail market in Khonkaen province, Thailand (Angkititrakul et al., 2005).

Effect of flavomycin to resistance E. coli in pigs

flavomycin is the phosphoglycolipid antimicrobial group. This flavophospholipol inhibits bacterial cell wall synthesis by interfere transglycosylase activity of the penicillinbinding proteins (Butaye et al., 2003). Flavomycin diminishes frequency of transferable plasmid conjugation encoding drug resistance among target pathogens, *in vitro* (Butaye et al., 2003). *In vivo* experiment, flavomycin at 9 mg/kg added to feed of fattening pigs could prevent either overgrowth by resistance strains or transmission of plasmids carrying resistance genes among intestinal *E. coli* of the pigs (van den Bogaard et al., 2002). By using molecular evidence, this can be explained by presence of sex pili promotes target of flavophospholipol into the bacterial cell (Pfaller, 2006). However, minimal inhibitory concentration (MIC) of *E. coli* direct against flavophospholipol was 64 ug/ml, but MICs range of these plasmid-bearing strains became 0.125 to 5 ug/ml (van den Bogaard et al., 2002).

# CHAPTER III: Research question, Hypothesis, objectives, keywords and conceptual framework

### Research questions

1: What is the situation of antimicrobial resistance (AMR) problems of enteric *E. coli* isolated from pig in Thai industrial farm during 2012-2014?

2: How does the antimicrobials using protocol affect the AMR problems in pig growing period and could they affect their pork at the end process at abattoir or not?3: Can flavomycin reduce AMR rate in *E. coli* in pig production cycles?

# Hypothesis

1. High rate of AMR in porcine fecal *E. coli* are commonly found in Thai pig production cycle at the time of investigation.

2. Phenotype and genotype associated AMR of fecal *E. coli* in pigs are different in each period of observation and can be altered by routine antibiotic used.

3. Use of flavomycin as feed additives in pig production cycle can reduce rate of AMR *E. coli* in term of genotype and phenotypes.

Objectives of the study จากลงกรณ์มหาวิทยาลัย

1. To determine AMR profile of porcine fecal *E. coli* isolated from pigs with routine antibiotic uses in Thai industrial farms.

2. To longitudinally monitor and compare AMR characteristics of porcine fecal *E. coli* difference between non-antibiotic uses and routine antibiotic uses in feed farms from creeping to fattening periods and their pork.

3. To determine efficacy of flavomycin using as feed additive to reduce AMR profile of porcine enteric *E. coli* in pig production cycles.

Keywords (Thai) : ยาต้านจุลชีพ เชื้อ*เอสเซอริเซีย คอลัย* ฟลาโวมัยซิน ฟาร์มสุกร ยีนดี้อยา Keywords (English) : antimicrobials, *Escherichia coli*, flavomycin, pig farm, resistance gene

Conceptual framework



37

# Chapter IV: Materials and methods

Part 1. Distribution of resistance characteristics of *E. coli* isolated from pigs in different antibiotic using status in Thailand

1.1 Study area and animal selection

Samples were collected from 28 farms across five Provinces of Thailand. Farms were selected based on their antimicrobial usage patterns. Twelve farms routinely used prophylactic antimicrobials (prophylactic antimicrobials: PA); two only used antimicrobials therapeutically (therapeutic antimicrobials: TA); and 11 small farms had never used antimicrobials (no antimicrobials: NA). The PA and TA farms had similar management systems, including open housing, the same vaccine program and multi-site production. They all had over 1,000 sows, had no pig replacement from outside sources and had consistent management for at least 2 years in terms of antimicrobial use, and sanitary and biosecurity measures taken. They were well managed and kept good records of production and antimicrobial use. The NA farms were all small (<50 sows) village-based enterprises, where the houses were open sided and contained pigs of different ages and stages of production. Feedstuffs were locally sourced. For the 12 PA farms a routine infeed antimicrobial use program had been followed for at least 2 years for endemic bacterial disease prophylaxis. This included incorporating tiamulin-fumarate at 100 parts per million (ppm) and amoxicillin at 250 ppm in the feed in the nursery (6-8 weeks) and grower (8-16 weeks) phases of production. Where individual pigs became sick they were isolated and treated with therapeutic antimicrobials as appropriate. A total of 102 fecal samples from individual 18-20 week-old fattening pigs with a normal appearance and no recent history of enteric or respiratory disease or therapeutic antimicrobial treatment were obtained from the farms (7-10 samples per farm). A total of 70 fecal samples were obtained from similar fattening pigs on two TA farms that did not use prophylactic antimicrobials and only used the injectable antimicrobials enrofloxacin or gentamicin under veterinary prescription for individual treatment of specific clinical cases where the

sick pigs were kept in isolation. Another 67 samples were collected from fattening pigs on the 11 NA farms, where there was no access to or use of antimicrobials or vaccination.

1.2 Sample collection and bacterial identification

The sampling protocol was approved by the Chulalongkorn University Animal Care and Use Committee (permit number 58/2558). For creeping and nursery pigs, rectal swabs were directly used and kept in Clary-Blair transport medium. For growing and finishing, at least 25 g of rectal feces were collected into sterile plastic container. For carcass, at least 25 g of pork at thigh area were cut by sterilized blade and kept into sterilized container. All samples were delivered to the laboratory at 4°C within 24 hours. The rectal swabs were soaked in 0.85% sodium chloride solution (normal saline solution:NSS) and directly spread on the Eosine Methylene Blue (EMB) (Oxoid, UK) agar (Renoux and Terdjman, 1951). For rectal feces, at least 5 g were diluted 10-fold dilution till 10<sup>-4</sup> and spread the solution EMB agar. (Demarco and Lim, 2002; Stampi et al., 2004; USDA, 2017). Colony presented metallic sheen on EMB plates to select the major population of bacteria. E. coli colonies were identified by their IMViC (Oxoid) biochemical reactions, comprising an indole test (+), a methyl red test (+), a Voges-Proskauer test (-), and a citrate test (-) (Clark et al., 1957). A representative pure colony from the highest dilution plate was randomly selected for further investigation. จหาลงกรณมหาวิทยาลัย

1.3 Phylogenetic grouping

All isolates were characterized into their phylogroups using a published multiplex polymerase chain reaction (PCR)-based method that identifies eight phylogroups (A, B1, B2, C, D, E, F, and cryptic clades).*E. coli* ATCC 25922 and *E. fergusonii* CUVET427 were used as the control strains (Clermont et al., 2013).

Target	Names	of	Nucleotides sequences	PCR product (bp)
chuA	chuA.1b		ATGGTACCGGACGAACCAAC	 288

Table 3 Primer list for Phylogenetic grouping

	chuA.2	TGCCGCCAGTACCAAAGACA	
viaA	yjaA.1b	CAAACGTGAAGTGTCAGGAG	211
ујаА	yjaA.2b	AATGCGTTCCTCAACCTGTG	
TsnF4 C.2	TspE4C2.1b	CACTATTCGTAAGGTCATCC	152
1002-102	TspE4C2.2b	AGTTTATCGCTGCGGGTCGC	
arnA1	AceK.f	AACGCTATTCGCCAGCTTGC	400
arpar	ArpA1.r	TCTCCCCATACCGTACGCTA	
arn∆2	ArpAgpE.f	GATTCCATCTTGTCAAAATATGCC	301
arpriz	ArpAgpE.r	GAAAAGAAAAAGAATTCCCAAGAG	
trnA1	trpAgpC.1	AGTTTTATGCCCAGTGCGAG	219
upru	trpAgpC.2	TCTGCGCCGGTCACGCCC	
trn∆2	trpBA.f	CGGCGATAAAGACATCTTCAC	489
uрлz	trpBA.r	GCAACGCGGCCTGGCGGAAG	
		V Discourd annually V	

1.4 Phenotypic resistance characterization and ESBLP confirmation

The minimal inhibitory concentration (MIC) of antimicrobials for the *E. coli* isolates was determined using the AST-GN 38 test kit in the Vitek2 compact automated susceptibility level detection apparatus (BioMérieux, France), excepted for tiamulin (Sigma-Aldrich, USA) where susceptibility testing was performed using an agar dilution test with results interpreted according to CLSI standards. The 19 antimicrobials or antimicrobial combinations tested were amikacin (AK), amoxicillin (AMX), amoxicillin-clavulanic acid (AMC), ampicillin (AMP), cefpirome (CPR), cefpodoxime (CPD), cefalexin (CEX), ceftiofur (XNL), chloramphenicol (C), enrofloxacin (ENR), gentamicin (GM), imipenem (IMP), marbofloxacin (MBR), nitrofurantoin (NIT), piperacillin (PIP), tetracycline (TET), tiamulin (TI), tobramycin (TM) and trimethoprim/Sulfamethoxazole (SXT). In the Vitek2 machine the set of antimicrobial arrays were harmonized to match with veterinary guidelines (Plumb, 2015b), including some drugs that were allowed for use in veterinary practice in the past (MoAC, 1999) *E. coli* ATCC 25922, *Pseudomonas aeruginosa* ATCC

40

27853 and *Staphylococcus aureus* ATCC 25913 were used as the control strains. The interpretation of susceptibility levels for AMP, CPD, XNL, GM, ENR, MBR, TET, C and TI followed the CLSI standards for antimicrobial disks and testing for bacteria isolated from animals lsi(VET1-0S3) (CLSI, 2015a), and interpretation for AMX, PIP, AMC, CEX, CPR, IMP, AK, TM, NT, SXT followed the CLSI standards for antimicrobial susceptibility testing (M100-S25) (CLSI, 2015b).

### 1.5 ESBL phenotypic screening and confirmatory test

The *E. coli* isolates were screen for ESBL production using the Vitek2 machine (BioMérieux, France) (Espinar et al., 2011). As a confirmation test for ESBLs the combination disk test (CDT) was performed for all isolates, as recommended (CLSI, 2015b).

# 1.6 *bla*<sub>CTX-M</sub> gene detection.

The gene  $bla_{CTX-M}$  comprising variants  $bla_{CTX-M-1}$  group,  $bla_{CTX-M-2}$  group,  $bla_{CTX-M-9}$  group  $bla_{CTX-M-8}$  group and  $bla_{CTX-M25/26}$  group were detected by multiplex PCR in all ESBLP *E. coli* strains (Xu et al., 2005). The identity of representative PCR amplicons was confirmed by DNA-sequencing and analyzed using BioEdit version 7.0.0 (Ibis Biosciences, Australia), with comparisons made to the GenBank database.

Table 4 Primer lists for <i>bla<sub>CTX-M</sub></i> genes detection	
---	--

Torgot sitos	Names of <b>MCKORN ONWERSITY</b> Nucleotides sequences primer		PCR product
rarget sites			(bp)
bla Croup 1	CTXM7	GCGTGATACCACTTCACCTC	540 –559
DIa <sub>CTX-M</sub> Group T	CTXM8	TGAAGTAAGTGACCAGAATC	780 –779
bla Croup 2	CTXM17	TGATACCACCACGCCGCTC	543 –561
DIa <sub>CTX-M</sub> GIOUP 2	CTXM18	TATTGCATCAGAAACCGTGGG	863 - 883
<i>bla</i> <sub>CTX-M</sub> Groups 8	CTXM19	CAATCTGACGTTGGGCAATG	582 –601
and 25/26	CTXM20	ATAACCGTCGGTGACAATT	855 –873
<i>bla<sub>ctx-M</sub></i> Group 9	CTXM11	ATCAAGCCTGCCGATCTGGTTA	298 –319

# 1.7 *bla*<sub>CTX-M</sub> conjugative assay

To determine whether  $bla_{CTX-M}$  genes were located on transmissible plasmids, a conjugation assay was performed using the broth mating technique, as recommended. The two selected donors used were *E. coli* PCU1 (positive for  $bla_{CTX-M-1}$  and a single F replicon) and *E. coli* PCU2 (positive for  $bla_{CTX-M-9}$  and a single FIB replicon). The recipient strain *E. coli* J53 was resistant to sodium azide: NaN<sub>3</sub><sup>r</sup>. Transconjugants were selected on Luria Bertani (LB) agar (Oxoid, UK) supplemented with cefotaxime (2 µg ml<sup>-1</sup>) and sodium azide (100 µg ml<sup>-1</sup>) (Oxoid, UK). Antimicrobial susceptibility, a confirmatory test for ESBL P phenotype, PCR detection, and DNA sequencing of  $bla_{CTX-M}$  genes were performed on the transconjugants.

# 1.8 Genes encoding antimicrobial resistance

Bacterial DNA was extracted using a Wizard<sup>®</sup> Genomic DNA Purification Kit (Promega, Germany). A total of 16 pairs of primers specific for resistance genes in the *Enterobacteriaceae* family were generated (First Base Laboratories Sdn Bhd, Malaysia) and PCR thermal cycling conditions followed previous recommendations (Chuanchuen et al., 2010). Amplified genes included *bla*<sub>TEM</sub> and *bla*<sub>PSE-1</sub> for ampicillin, amoxicillin and piperacillin resistance, *aadA1* and *aadA2* for streptomycin resistance, *aadB* for tobramycin and gentamicin resistance, *tetA* and *tetB* for tetracycline resistance, *dfrA1*, *dfrA10* and *dfrA12* for trimethoprim resistance, *sul1*, *sul2* and *sul3* for sulfomanide resistance and *catA*, *catB* and *cmlA* for chloramphenicol resistance. A representative positive PCR amplicon for each gene was submitted for DNA-sequencing and analyzed by Bioedit version 7.0.0 (Ibis Biosciences, Australia) using the GenBank database.

Target genes	Names of primer	Nucleotide Sequences	Product sizes
aadA1	aadA1-F	CTCCGCAGTGGATGGCGG	631
	aadA1-R	GATCTGCGCGCGAGGCCA	

Table 5 Primer lists for resistance gene detection

Target genes	Names of primer	Nucleotide Sequences	Product sizes
aadA2	aadA2-F	CATTGAGCGCCATCTGGAAT	500
	aadA2-R	ACATTTCGCTCATCGCCGGC	
aadB	aadB-F	CTAGCTGCGGCAGATGAGC	300
	aadB-R	CTCAGCCGCCTCTGGGCA	
bla <sub>PSE-1</sub>	blaPSE1-F	GCAAGTAGGGCAGGCAATCA	422
	blaPSE1-R	GAGCTAGATAGATGCTCACAA	
bla <sub>TEM</sub>	blaTEM-F	ATCAGTTGGGTGCACGAGTG	608
	blaTEM-R	ACGCTCACCGGCTCCAGA	
catA	catA-F	CCAGACCGTTCAGCTGGATA	454
	catA-R	CATCAGCACCTTGTCGCCT	
catB	catB-F	CGGATTCAGCCTGACCACC	461
	catB-R	ATACGCGGTCACCTTCCTG	
cmlA	cmIA-F	TGGACCGCTATCGGACCG	641
	cmIA-R	CGCAAGACACTTGGGCTGC	
dfrA1	dfrA1-F	CAATGGCTGTTGGTTGGAC	254
	dfrA1-R	CCGGCTCGATGTCTATTGT	
dfrA10	dfrA10-F	TCAAGGCAAATTACCTTGGC	432
	dfrA10-R	ATCTATTGGATCACCTACCC	
dfrA12	dfrA12-F	TTCGCAGACTCACTGAGGG	330
	dfrA12-R	CGGTTGAGACAAGCTCGAAT	
sul1	sul1-F	CGGACGCGAGGCCTGTATC	591
	sul1-R	GGGTGCGGACGTAGTCAGC	
sul2	sul2-F	GCGCAGGCGCGTAAGCTGAT	514
	sul2-R	CGAAGCGCAGCCGCAATTC	
sul3	sul3-F	GGGAGCCGCTTCCAGTAAT	500
	sul3-R	CCGTGACACTGCAATCATTA	
tetA	tetA-F	GCTGTCGGATCGTTTCGG	658
	tetA-R	CATTCCGAGCATGAGTGCC	

Target genes	Names of primer	Nucleotide Sequences	Product sizes
tetB	tetB-F	CTGTCGCGGCATCGGTCAT	615
	tetB-R	CAGGTAAAGCGATCCCACC	

1.9 Plasmid replicon typing and intl detection

The presence of 18 plasmid replicons that are widespread in *Enterobacteriaceae*, comprising IncF (IncFIA, IncFIB, IncFIC, IncFIIA, IncF), IncI1-I $\gamma$ , IncN, IncP, IncW, IncHI1, IncHI2, IncL/M, IncT, IncA/C, IncK, IncB/O, IncX and IncY was investigated using five multiplex and three simplex polymerase chain reaction (PCR) tests. The PCR conditions and thermal cycles were performed according to a previous study (Carattoli et al., 2005). The *intl* gene representing integron I cassettes was detected by a simplex PCR following a previously published method (Goldstein et al., 2001). Representative positive PCR amplicons for each replicon were submitted for DNA-sequencing and analyzed as described above.

Torrat citos	Names of Nucleotide Sequences primers		Product	
rarget siles			sizes	
IncHI1(parA-			471	
parB)	GERLEVIG	GGAGCGATGGATTACTTCAGTAC	471	
	HI1 RV	TGCCGTTTCACCTCGTGAGTA		
la el UQ (iterene)		TTTCTCCTGAGTCACCTGTTAACA		
INCHIZ (ILEFONS)	HI2 FW C		644	
	HI2 RV	GGCTCACTACCGTTGTCATCCT		
Incl1 (RNAI)	I1 FW	CGAAAGCCGGACGGCAGAA	139	
	I1 RV	TCGTCGTTCCGCCAAGTTCGT		
looV (ori u)		AACCTTAGAGGCTATTTAAGTTG		
πολ (οη γ)	CTGAT		310	

Table 6 Primer lists for characterization of plasmid replicons

	Names of	Pro		
larget sites	primers	Nucleotide Sequences	sizes	
		TGAGAGTCAATTTTTATCTCATGT		
	X RV	TTTAGC	Product   sizes   785   559   462   702   242   765   534   262	
IncL/M		GGATGAAAACTATCAGCATCTGA	705	
(repA,B,C)	L/IVI FVV	AG	785	
	L/M RV	CTGCAGGGGCGATTCTTTAGG		
IncN (repA)	N FW	GTCTAACGAGCTTACCGAAG	559	
	N RV	GTTTCAACTCTGCCAAGTTC		
IncFIA (iterons)	FIA FW	CCATGCTGGTTCTAGAGAAGGTG	462	
	FIA RV	GTATATCCTTACTGGCTTCCGCA		
		G		
IncEIB (ori <b>v</b> )	FIB FW	GGAGTTCTGACACACGATTTTCT	702	
		G	102	
	FIB RV	CTCCCGTCGCTTCAGGGCATT		
IncW (repA)	W FW	CCTAAGAACAACAAAGCCCCCG	242	
	W RV	GGTGCGCGGCATAGAACCGT		
IncY (repA)	Y FW	AATTCAAACAACACTGTGCAGCC	765	
	จุหาลงกร	ณ์มหาวิทยาสัG	100	
	CHULALONG	GCGAGAATGGACGATTACAAAA		
		CTTT		
IncP (iterons)	P FW	CTATGGCCCTGCAAACGCGCCA	534	
		GAAA		
	P RV	TCACGCGCCAGGGCGCAGCC		
IncFIC (repA2)	FIC FW	GTGAACTGGCAGATGAGGAAGG	262	
	FIC RV	TTCTCCTCGTCGCCAAACTAGAT		
IncA/C (repA)	A/C FW	GAGAACCAAAGACAAAGACCTG	465	
		GA	400	

Torgot sitos	Names of	Nucleatida Caguanaca	Product	
Target sites	primers	Nucleolide Sequences	sizes	
		ACGACAAACCTGAATTGCCTCCT		
	A/C KV	Т		
		TTGGCCTGTTTGTGCCTAAACCA	750	
Inci (repA)	IFVV	Т	750	
	T RV	CGTTGATTACACTTAGCTTTGGAC		
IncFIIs (repA)	FIIs FW	CTGTCGTAAGCTGATGGC	270	
	FIIs RV	CTCTGCCACAAACTTCAGC		
IncFrepB			070	
(RNAI/repA)	FrepB FW	IGATCGTTAAGGAATTTIG	270	
	FrepB RV	GAAGATCAGTCACACCATCC		
IncK/B (RNAI)	K/B FW	GCGGTCCGGAAAGCCAGAAAAC	160	
	F/B RV	TCTTTCACGAGCCCGCCAAA		
IncB/O (RNAI)	B/O FW	GCGGTCCGGAAAGCCAGAAAAC	159	
	B/O RV	TGCGTTCCGCCAAGTTCGA		
	Q.			

Table 7 Primer list for characterization of cassette in integron 1.

Target sites	Names of primers	Sequences	Product size
intl1	Cintl1EALO	CCTCCCGCACGATGATC	280
	intl1R	TCCACGCATCGTCAGGC	

# 1.10 Data analysis

Resistance rates, replicon positivity rates, and resistance gene profiles were presented as percentages, and the antimicrobial resistance profiles were reported in antibiogram patterns for the three categories of farms. SPSS version 17.0 (IBM, USA) was used to calculate Odds ratios and 95% confidence intervals (CI) for each resistance phenotype and each replicon type, and each resistance gene between isolates from the three different categories of farm.

Part 2. Longitudinal monitoring of molecular resistance genotypic of *E. coli* monitoring from pig in the production cycle

# 2.1 Farm selection criteria

The two multisite industrial pig farms were chosen from Chainart and Nakhon Pathom provinces where run beneath Thai standard livestock farm criteria ruled by Department of Livestock Development. In Nakhon Pathom, farm with antimicrobial use in feed (AF) was screened by the farm routinely used combination of tiamulin and amoxicillin at 100 (part per million ppm and 250 ppm) respectively, mixed in feed during nursery and growing periods. Farm with non-antimicrobial use in feed (NF) in Chainart indicated by the farm had never used antimicrobials in feed additive over ten years at least. At creeping period, enrofloxacin injection was used in case of infection with apparent symptom however all treated pigs were excluded from this study. The selected farms had over 1,000 sows, had no pig replacement from outside sources, all in all out system, and had consistent management for at least 2 years in terms of antimicrobial use and sanitary and biosecurity measures taken. They were well managed and kept good records of production and antimicrobial use. The withdraw period of antimicrobial use was done before at least 30 days of slaughtering.

# **งหาลงกรณ์มหาวิทยาล**ัย

# 2.2 Animal selection

Ten clinical healthy pigs per farm from different litters were included and continuously observed at five periods: creeping period (0 to 28 days), nursery (>28days to 70 days) growing period (>70 days to 112 days) finishing (112 days until slaughtering) and slaughters were collected from thigh area of carcass at standard abattoirs.

### 2.3 Sample collection and bacterial identification

The sampling protocol was approved by the Chulalongkorn University Animal Care and Use Committee (permit number 58/2558). For creeping and nursery pigs, rectal swabs were directly used and kept in Clary-Blair transport medium. For growing and finishing, at least 25 g of rectal feces were collected into sterile plastic container. For carcass, at least 25 g of pork at thigh area were cut by sterilized blade and kept into sterilized container. All samples were delivered to the laboratory at 4°C within 24 hours. The rectal swabs were soaked in 0.85% sodium chloride solution (normal saline solution:NSS) and directly spread on the Eosine Methylene Blue (EMB) (Oxoid, UK) agar (Renoux and Terdjman, 1951). For rectal feces, at least 5 g were diluted 10-fold dilution till 10<sup>-4</sup> and spread the solution EMB agar. After grinding process, one gram of harmonized pork was drowned in 9 ml of sterile normal saline. After vigorously checking, the suspensions were spread on EMB agar at first dilution (Demarco and Lim, 2002; Stampi et al., 2004; USDA, 2017). Colony presented metallic sheen on EMB plates to select the major population of bacteria. *E. coli* colonies were identified by their IMViC (Oxoid) biochemical reactions, comprising an indole test (+), a methyl red test (+), a Voges-Proskauer test (-), and a citrate test (-) (Clark et al., 1957). A representative pure colony from the highest dilution plate was randomly selected for further investigation.

2.4 Antibiogram and extended spectrum beta-lactamase phenotype confirmation The minimal inhibitory concentration of antimicrobials for E. coli were determined using AST-GN 38 test kit in the Vitek2 compact automated susceptibility level detection apparatus (BioMérieux, France). The 19 antimicrobials or combination of antimicrobials were amikacin (AK), amoxicillin (AMX), ampicillin (AMP), cefalexin (CEX), cefpirome (CPR), cefpodoxime (CPD), ceftiofur (XNL), chloramphenicol (C), enrofloxacin (ENR), gentamicin (GEN), imipenem (IMP), marbofloxacin (MBR), nitrofurantoin (NIT), piperacillin (PIP), tiamulin (TI), tetracycline (TET), tobramycin (TOB) and trimethoprim/ Sulfamethoxazole (SXT) (Lugsomya et al., 2017). The set of antimicrobial array in card were harmonized to match with veterinary drug guidelines (Plumb, 2015a). E. coli ATCC 25922, Pseudomonas aeruginosa ATCC 27853 and Staphylococcus aureus ATCC 25913 were used as the control strains. The interpretation of the susceptibility levels for AMP, CPD, CPR, XNL, GEN, ENR, MBR, TE were performed following Clinical Laboratory Standards (CLSI) for antimicrobial disks and testing for bacteria isolated from animals (VET2-0S3)(CLSI, 2015a), and interpretation for AMX, PIP, AMC, CEX, IMP, AK, TM, NT,

SXT were followed the CLSI standards for antimicrobial susceptibility testing (M100-S25) (CLSI, 2015b).

2.5 Extended Spectrum Beta-lactamase (ESBL) phenotypic screening and confirmatory test

ESBL producing (ESBLP) E. coli was first screened by Vitek2 machine (BioMérieux, France) (Espinar et al., 2011) and confirmed by the combination disk test (CDT) by CLSI standard recommendation (CLSI, 2015b). The *bla*<sub>CTX-M</sub> genes comprising variant *bla*<sub>CTX-M</sub>-1, bla<sub>CTX-M-2</sub>, bla<sub>CTX-M-8</sub>, bla<sub>CTX-M-9</sub>, and bla<sub>CTX-M-25/26</sub>.were detected by multiplex PCR in all ESBLP strains (Xu et al., 2005). The identity of representative PCR amplicons was confirmed by DNA-sequencing and analyzed using Mega 7.0 (Kumar et al., 2016) with comparisons made to the GenBank database to confirm whether blacTX-M genes were located on transmissible plasmids, a conjugation assay was performed using the broth mating technique, as previous studies (Gray et al., 2006). The three representative selected donor clones, E. coli PCU12-4 (positive for bla<sub>CTX-M-1</sub>group with single Incl1-IV replicon), E. coli PCU12-5 (positive for bla<sub>CTX-M-1</sub>group with single IncHI2 replicon), PCU12-6 (positive for *bla*<sub>CTX-M-9</sub> group with single IncHI2 replicon) were selected. The recipient strain E. coli J53 was resistant to sodium azide: Azi<sup>r</sup> and susceptible to cefotaxime. The transconjugants were selected on Luria Bertani (LB) agar (Oxiod, UK) supplemented with cefotaxime (2 µg ml<sup>-1</sup>) and sodium azide (100 µg ml<sup>-1</sup>) (Oxoid, UK). Antimicrobial susceptibility, ESBL confirmatory phenotype, PCR detection and DNA sequencing of *bla*<sub>CTX-M</sub> genes were performed on the transconjugants (Gray et al., 2006).

# 2.6 Gene encoding antimicrobial resistance detection

Bacterial DNA was extracted using a Wizard <sup>®</sup> Genomic DNA Purification Kit (Promega, Germany). A total of 16 pairs of primers set specific for resistance genes in the bacteria in superfamily *Enterobacteriaceae* were generated (First Base Laboratoies. Sdn Bhd, Malaysia) and PCR thermal cycling conditions performed following the previous recommendations. The resistance genes were included *bla*<sub>TEM</sub> and *bla*<sub>PSE-1</sub> for ampicillin, amoxicillin and piperacillin resistance, *aadA1* and *aadA2* for streptomycin resistance, *aadB* for tobramycin and gentamicin resistance, *tet*(A) and *tet*(B) for tetracycline

resistance, *dfrA1*, *dfrA10* and *dfrA12* for trimethoprim resistance, *sul1*, *sul2*, *sul3* for sulfonamide resistance and *catA*, *catB* and *cmlA* for chloramphenicol resistance (Chuanchuen et al., 2010). A representative positive PCR amplicon for each gene was submitted for DNA-sequencing and analyzed by MEGA 7.0 (Kumar et al., 2016).

# 2.7 Plasmid replicon characterization

The plasmid replicons in *Enterobacteriaceae* composing IncF (IncFIA, IncFIB, IncFIC, IncFrep), IncI1-I**Y**, IncN, IncP, IncW, IncHI1, IncHI2, IncL/M, IncT, IncA/C, IncK, IncB/O, IncX and IncY was detected using five multiplexes and three simplexes PCR tests. The primers, PCR conditions and thermal cycles were proceeded as the previous studies (Carattoli et al., 2005). Representative positive PCR amplicons for each replicon were submitted for DNA sequencing and analyzed as described above.

2.8 Molecular strain typing by pulse field gel electrophoresis (PFGE)

Pulse field gel electrophoresis was performed following Centers of Diseases Control and Prevention (CDC) standard protocol (CDC, 2013). Briefly, whole *E. coli* DNA was randomly cut by *Xba*l restriction enzymes (Sibenzyme, Russia). Gel electrophoresis was run in 200 V field which included Angle: 120° for 18-19 hours and *Salmonella* serovar Braenderup H9812 were used as standard for proceeding protocol. The DNA band patterns were visualized by ethidium bromide staining. The dendrograms were computed by GeneTool program (Syngene, India) and analyzed by GeneDirectory program (Syngene, India).

Target	Names of	Soquences	Product size	
sites	primers	Sequences		
adk	adk_eF_univ_F	GACACTATAGATTCTGCTTGGCGCTCCGGG	601 bp	
adk	adk_eR_univ_R	CACTATAGGGCCGTCAACTTTCGCGTATTT	604 bp	
fumC	fumC_eF_univ_F	GACACTATAGGCGGCAAAAGTTAATGAAGA	580 bp	
iume	fumC_eR_univ_R	CACTATAGGGTCCGGATGGGTATTTAGTCC	900 ph	

Table 8 Primer lists for E. coli HiMLST

Target	Names of	Sequences	Product size	
sites	primers	·		
gyrB	gyrB_eF_univ_F	GACACTATAGAGTGATCATGACCGTTCTGC	567 bp	
	gyrB_eR_univ_R	CACTATAGGGCGGAATGTTGTTGGTAAAGC		
icd	icd_eF_univ_F	GACACTATAGAAGGTGATGGAATCGGTGTA	627 bp	
	icd_eR_univ_R	CACTATAGGGTTCATGATGTTGCCTTTGTG		
mdh	mdh_eF_univ_F	GACACTATAGGCGCAGATGTCGTTCTTATC	526 bp	
	mdh_eR_univ_R	020.00		
purA	purA_eF_univ_F	GACACTATAGATGTCCGCTGATCCTTGAT	605 bp	
	purA_eR_univ_R	CACTATAGGGAATTCGTTACCCTGCTTGC		
recA	recA_eF_univ_F	GACACTATAGGTTTATCGATGCTGAACACG	594 bp	
	recA_eR_univ_R	CACTATAGGGCTTCTCTTTTACGCCCAGGT	001.04	

2.9 Molecular strain typing by Multilocus sequence typing (MLST)

DNA sequence of 7 housekeeping genes [Adenylate kinase (adk), Adenylosuccinate dehydrogenase (purA), ATP/GTP binding motif (recA), DNA gyrase (gyrB), Fumarate Isocitrate/isopropylmalate hydratase (fumC),dehydrogenase (icd), Malate dehydrogenase (mdh)] were assigned to allelic profile for sequence type (STs) of E. coli (Adiri et al., 2003). By using HiMLST with 454 sequencing and multiplex identifier (MID), E. coli 300 isolates were sequenced and MLST profile of each individual isolate was generated by unique MID (Roche, Switzerland). The target genes were amplified by twostep PCR using primer sequence of target genes includes universal tail sequence primer at 5' end and MID sequence primer with 454 sequencing-specific nucleotides. The PCR products were pooled, clonally amplified by emulsion PCR (emPCR) (Roche, Switzerland) and sequencing using GS junior (Roche, Switzerland). Allele and sequence type (STs) assigned at the publicly accessible E. coli MLST database were at http://mlst.warwick.ac.uk/mlst/dbs/Ecoli.

Part 3 The evaluation of flavomycin to reduce resistance characteristics and plasmid transfer. in vitro and in vivo.

3.1 in vitro reduction of plasmid transferability test

3.1.1 bacterial donor strains

20 Bacterial strains were selected ESBL P producing *E. coli* which confirmed the *bla*  $_{CTX-M-1}$ group and plasmid replicon type existence by PCR (Carattoli et al., 2005; Xu et al., 2005).

Table 9 Bacterial strains which were used in in vitro reduction of plasmid transferability test

No	Strains Name	Resistance gene	Plasmid replicon types
1	E. coli PCU13	bla <sub>ctx-M-1</sub> group	single IncHI2
2	E. coli PCU14	<i>bla<sub>ctx-M-1</sub>group</i>	single Inc HI2
3	E. coli PCU15	<i>bla<sub>ctx-M-1</sub>group</i>	single Inc HI2
4	E. coli PCU16	<i>bla<sub>ctx-M-1</sub>group</i>	single IncHI2
5	E. coli PCU17	<i>bla<sub>ctx-M-1</sub>group</i>	single IncHI2
6	<i>E. coli</i> PCU18	<i>bla <sub>ctx-M-1</sub>group</i>	single IncHI2
7	E. coli PCU19	<i>bla<sub>ctx-M-1</sub>group</i>	single Inc HI2
8	E. coli PCU20	<i>bla<sub>ctx-M-1</sub>group</i>	single Inc HI2
9	E. coli PCU21	<i>bla</i> <sub>CTX-M-1</sub> group	single IncHI2
10	E. coli PCU22	<i>bla<sub>ctx-M-1</sub>gr</i> oup	single IncHI2
11	E. coli PCU23	<i>bla<sub>ctx-M-9</sub>gr</i> oup	single IncHI2
12	E. coli PCU24	<i>bla<sub>ctx-M-9</sub>gr</i> oup	single Inc HI2
13	E. coli PCU25	<i>bla<sub>ctx-M-9</sub>gr</i> oup	single Inc HI2
14	E. coli PCU26	<i>bla<sub>ctx-M-9</sub>gr</i> oup	single IncHI2
15	E. coli PCU27	<i>bla<sub>ctx-M-9</sub>group</i>	single IncHI2
16	E. coli PCU28	<i>bla<sub>ctx-M-9</sub>gr</i> oup	single IncHI2

17	E. coli PCU29	<i>bla<sub>ctx-M-9</sub>group</i>	single Inc HI2
18	E. coli PCU30	<i>bla<sub>ctx-M-9</sub>group</i>	single Inc HI2
19	E. coli PCU31	<i>bla<sub>ctx-M-9</sub>group</i>	single IncHI2
20	E. coli PCU32	<i>bla<sub>ctx-M-9</sub>group</i>	single IncHI2

# 3.1.2 bacterial recipient strains

*E. coli* strain J53 were induced to resisted sodium azide (MIC level >512) were used as the recipient. The recipients was confirmed that the susceptible to colistin ( $\leq 2$  ug/ml), cefatazidime ( $\leq 2$  ug/ml), and cefotaxime ( $\leq 2$  ug/ml), by agar dilution test

# 3.1.3 Resistance gene transfer

The donor and recipient bacteria mixed together in Luria Bertani (LB) broth (Oxoid, UK) with Flavomycin® 8 µg/ml, (experimental group I) 16 µg/ml (experimental group II) and non-added up (control group) and incubate for 24 hours in 37 °C The transconjugants will be selected on Bertani (LB) agar (Oxoid, UK) supplemented with cefotaxime (2 µg/ml)+sodium azide (100 µg/ml)  $bla_{CTX-M}$  plasmids (Gray et al., 2006). The number of colonies which were appeared on agar were counted and randomly sampled for confirmed the transferability by PCR method (Xu et al., 2005) The resistance gene transferability comparison between experimental group (group 1 : 10 *E. coli* strains which was detected  $bla_{CTX-M-9}$  group genes) and control group The resistance gene transferable ability were determined by detecting the efficacy of conjugation between experimental group and control group.

# $\label{eq:conjugation} \text{Conjugation efficiency} = \frac{\text{Numbers of transcojugants of selectve media}}{\text{Numbers od Donors}}$

# 3.1.4 Data analysis

The number of transconjugants colonies were compared between control group and two of experimental groups will be statistical analyze by Wilcoxon signed ranked test. The transconjugation efficiency were reported by descriptive analysis. 3.2 in vivo reduction of plasmid transferability test

#### 3.2.1 Animal selection

A total of 10 pigs from AF farm in part II were selected for longitudinally monitored at at four periods: creeping period (0 to 28 days), nursery (>28days to 70 days) growing period(>70 days to 112 days) and finishing (112 days before slaughtering). Bambermycin (flavomycin, trade name : Flavomycin<sup>®</sup>) was mixed in feed at 10 ppm feed also added the routine antimicrobials formula at nursery and grower periods (combination of tiamulin and amoxicillin at 100 ppm and 250 ppm).

3.2.2 Sample collection and bacterial identification

The sampling protocol was approved by the Chulalongkorn University Animal Care and Use Committee (permit number 58/2558). For creeping and nursery pigs, rectal swabs were directly used and kept in Clary-Blair transport medium. For growing and finishing, at least 25 g of rectal feces were collected into sterile plastic container. The rectal swabs were soaked in 0.85% sodium chloride solution (NSS) and directly spread on the Eosine Methylene Blue (EMB) (Oxoid, UK) agar (Renoux and Terdjman, 1951). For rectal feces, at least 5 g were diluted 10-fold dilution till 10<sup>-4</sup> and spread the solution EMB agar. After grinding process, one gram of harmonized pork was drowned in 9 ml of sterile normal saline. After vigorously checking, the suspensions were spread on EMB agar at first dilution (Demarco and Lim, 2002; Stampi et al., 2004; USDA, 2017). Colony presented metallic sheen on EMB plates to select the major population of bacteria. *E. coli* colonies were identified by their IMViC (Oxoid) biochemical reactions, comprising an indole test (+), a methyl red test (+), a Voges-Proskauer test (-), and a citrate test (-) (Clark et al., 1957). A representative pure colony from the highest dilution plate was randomly selected for further investigation.

3.2.3 Antibiogram and extended spectrum beta-lactamase phenotype

# confirmation

The minimal inhibitory concentration of antimicrobials for *E. coli* were determined using AST-GN 38 test kit in the Vitek2 compact automated susceptibility level

detection apparatus (BioMérieux, France). The 18 antimicrobials were amikacin (AK), amoxicillin (AMX), ampicillin (AMP), cefalexin (CEX), cefpirome (CPR), cefpodoxime (CPD), ceftiofur (XNL), chloramphenicol (C), enrofloxacin (ENR), gentamicin (GEN), imipenem (IMP), marbofloxacin (MBR), nitrofurantoin (NIT), piperacillin (PIP), tetracycline (T), tobramycin (TOB) and trimethoprim/ Sulfamethoxazole (SXT) (Lugsomya et al., 2017). The set of antimicrobial array in card were harmonized to match with veterinary drug guidelines (Plumb, 2015a). *E. coli* ATCC 25922, *Pseudomonas aeruginosa* ATCC 27853 and *Staphylococcus aureus* ATCC 29513 were used as the control strains. The interpretation of the susceptibility levels for AMP, CPD, CPR, XNL, GEN, ENR, MBR, TE were performed following Clinical Laboratory Standards (CLSI) for antimicrobial disks and testing for bacteria isolated from animals (VET2-0S3)(CLSI, 2015a), and interpretation for AMX, PIP, AMC, CEX, IMP, AK, TM, NT, SXT were followed the CLSI standards for antimicrobial susceptibility testing (M100-S25) (CLSI, 2015b).

3.2.4 Extended Spectrum Beta-lactamase (ESBL) phenotypic screening and confirmatory test

ESBL producing (ESBLP) *E. coli* was first screened by Vitek2 machine (BioMérieux, France) (Espinar et al., 2011) and confirmed by the combination disk test (CDT) by CLSI standard recommendation (CLSI, 2015b). The  $bla_{CTX-M}$  genes comprising variant  $bla_{CTX-M-1}$ ,  $bla_{CTX-M-2}$ ,  $bla_{CTX-M-8}$ ,  $bla_{CTX-M-9}$ , and  $bla_{CTX-M-25/26}$ .were detected by multiplex PCR in all ESBLP strains (Xu et al., 2005). The identity of representative PCR amplicons was confirmed by DNA-sequencing and analyzed using Mega 7.0 (Kumar et al., 2016) with comparisons made to the GenBank database To confirm whether  $bla_{CTX-M}$  genes were located on transmissible plasmids, a conjugation assay was performed using the broth mating technique, as previous studies (Gray et al., 2006).

3.2.5 Gene encoding antimicrobial resistance detection

Bacterial DNA was extracted using a Wizard <sup>®</sup> Genomic DNA Purification Kit (Promega, Germany). A total of 16 pairs of primers set specific for resistance genes in the bacteria in superfamily *Enterobacteriaceae* were generated (First Base Laboratoies. Sdn Bhd, Malaysia) and PCR thermal cycling conditions performed following the previous recommendations. The resistance genes were included *bla*<sub>TEM</sub> and *bla*<sub>PSE-1</sub> for ampicillin, amoxicillin and piperacillin resistance, *aadA1* and *aadA2* for streptomycin resistance, *aadB* for tobramycin and gentamicin resistance, *tet*(A) and *tet*(B) for tetracycline resistance, *dfrA1*, *dfrA10* and *dfrA12* for trimethoprim resistance, *sul1*, *sul2*, *sul3* for sulfonamide resistance and *catA*, *catB* and *cmlA* for chloramphenicol resistance (Chuanchuen et al., 2010). A representative positive PCR amplicon for each gene was submitted for DNA-sequencing and analyzed by MEGA 7.0 (Kumar et al., 2016).

# 3.2.6 Plasmid replicon characterization

The plasmid replicons in *Enterobacteriaceae* composing IncF (IncFIA, IncFIB, IncFIC, IncFrep), IncI1-Iγ, IncN, IncP, IncW, IncHI1, IncHI2, IncL/M, IncT, IncA/C, IncK, IncB/O, IncX and IncY was detected using five multiplexes and three simplexes PCR tests. The primers, PCR conditions and thermal cycles were proceeded as the previous studies (Carattoli et al., 2005), Representative positive PCR amplicons for each replicon were submitted for DNA sequencing and analyzed as described above.

3.2.7 Data analysis

Association of the resistance rates and genetic characteristics between pairs (Flavomycin® added up in feed) FF groups and NF group (non Flavomycin® added up in feed) data was retrieved in part II were compared between each growing period by Chi square test.

# **CHAPTER V: Results**

Part 1. Distribution of resistance characteristics of *E. coli* isolated from pigs in different antibiotic using status in Thailand



Figure 1 The relative abundance of phylogroup in porcine commensal *E. coli* from the three categories of farms. Vertical bar, PA, TA, and NA. PAs, prophylactic antimicrobials; TAs, therapeutic antimicrobials and NAs, no antimicrobials; .

# 1.1 Distribution of phylogroups

The distribution of phylogroups of the commensal *E. coli* tested from the three categories of farms is shown in Figure 1. The types and proportion of phylogroups of the selected *E. coli* colonies were quite similar in all farms (p = 0.894). Phylogroup A (PA:

47.1%, TA: 48.6%, NA:44.8%), B1 (PA: 29.4%, TA: 25.7%, NA: 29.9%), and E (PA: 13.7%, TA: 12.9%, NA: 14.9%) were the most commonly detected groups. Phylogroups B2, C, D, and F were minor components and in total were detected at <14% in each farm category (PA: 9.8%, TA: 12.9%, and NA:10.4%). Representatives of the cryptic clade group were not found.







farms in the same group using the Kruskal-Wallis test.


Figure 3 Phylogenetic grouping PCR product in 1% agarose gel electrophoresis. Legend : lane 1, 100 base pair marker (Solis BioDyne, Estonia) ; [lane 2-9 : quadruplex pcr]: lane 2, group A : (+ - -) ; lane 3, group B1 : (+ - - +) ; lane 4, group B2 : (- + + -) ; lane 5, group E : (+ + + -) ; lane 6, group F : (- + -) ; lane 7, group A or C : (+ - + -) ; lane 8, group E or D : (+ + -) ; lane 9, Escherichia fergusonii strain CU MIC427 (negative control) : (- - -) , [lane 10,11 : specific pcr for clarifying between group A and C] : lane 10, group C : (+) ; lane 11, group A : (-) , [lane 12,13 : specific pcr for clarifying between group E and D] : lane 12, group E : (+) ; lane 13, group D : (-)

### 1.2 Distribution of phenotypic AMR rates

The distribution of phenotypic resistance rates for the commensal *E. coli* against the antimicrobials tested in the three categories of farm is shown in Figure 4 Amikacin and imipenem resistant *E. coli* were not found in any of the farms, and resistance to amoxicillin/clavulanic and cefpirome was found only in the PA farms and was uncommon. The isolates from the three categories of farms all had very high rates of resistance to tetracycline, amoxicillin, ampicillin and piperacillin (over 83.6%), and these rates did not differ significantly between the farm categories. The isolates from the PA farms had

resistance rates to the other antimicrobials tested that varied from 52.9 to 100%, whilst rates were much lower (0 to 42.3%) for the various antimicrobials in the other two farm categories. The rates in the PA farms were statistically significantly higher than those in both the TA and NA farms but were not significantly different between the latter two categories. Within each of the three categories of farm, resistance rates for each of the drugs between farms did not reveal any significant farm related differences (Figure 2). Over 50% (64/102) of the PA isolates were resistant to gentamicin, tobramycin, enrofloxacin, marbofloxacin, nitrofurantoin, chloramphenicol and sulfamethoxazole/ trimethoprim. The antibiogram AMX-AMP-PIP-CEX-CPD-XNL-GM-TM-ENR-MBR-TET-NT-C-SXT-TI was the most prevalent type found (n=28, 27.5%) in the isolates from the PA farms. On the other hand, 18.6-41.4% of isolates from the TA farms were resistant to gentamicin, tobramycin, nitrofurantoin, enrofloxacin, marbofloxacin, chloramphenicol and sulfamethoxazole/ trimethoprim. The antibiogram AMX-AMP-PIP-ENR-MBR-TET-NT-C-SXT-TI was the most prevalent type found (n= 12, 17.1%) in E. coli from TA farms, whilst AMX-AMP-PIP-TE-C was the most prevalent type found in isolates from the NA farms (n=10, 14.9%).

**CHULALONGKORN UNIVERSITY** 

			P value			OR ratio (95% C	CI)
		PA x TA	PA x NA	TA x NA	PA x TA	PA x NA	TA x NA
amikacin	0.0 0.0 0.0			-	-	-	-
amoxicillin	97.0 98.6 100.0	0.23	0.08	0.53	z	-	2.1 (0.2-24.0)
amoxicillin/clavulonic acid	0.0 0.0 5.9	0.27	0.27		-	-	-
ampicillin	97.0	0.23	0.08	0.53	÷	-	2.1 (0.2-24.0)
cefalexin	<u>0</u> 0 8.6 62.7	<0.05	<0.05	0.11	18.0 (7.1-45.4)	-	2
cefpirome	0.0 0.0 5.9	0.27	0.27			-	- 8
cefpodoxime	0.0 7.1 52.9	<0.05	<0.05	0.03	15.8 (5.9-42.5)	-	-
ceftiofur	0.0 7.1 52.9	<0.05	<0.05	0.03	15.8 (5.9-42.5)	-	-
chloramphenicol	29.9 25.7	<0.05	<0.05	0.59	-	-	-
enrofloxacin	34.3 41.4 96.1	<0.05	<0.05	0.30	34.6 (11.4-104.8)	46.9 (15.5-143.6)	1.6 (0.7-2.7)
gentamicin	19.4 24.3 78.4	<0.05	<0.05	0.36	11.3 (5.5-23.3)	22.8 (7.0-32.5)	-
imipnem	0.0 0.0 0.0	-	-	•	-	-	-
marbofloxacin	35.8 41.4 76.5	<0.05	<0.05	0.39	4.6 (2.4-8.9)	5.8 (3.0-11.5)	1.3 (0.6-2.5)
nitrofurantoin	26.9 35.7 86.3	<0.05	<0.05	0.27	11.3 (5.4-23.9)	17.1 (7.8-37.3)	0.8 (0.4-1.7)
piperacillin	94.0 94.3 95.1	0.81	0.76	0.94	1.2 (0.3-4.5)	1.2 (0.3-4.8)	1.0 (0.3-4.4)
tetracycline	83.6 88.6 0.00	0.14	0.09	0.40	÷	-	1.5 (0.5-4.1)
tiamulin	37.3 42.3 93.1	<0.05	<0.05	0.51	18.1 (7.3-44.6)	15.3 (9.1-56.9)	1.3 (0.6-2.5)
tobramycin	20.9	<0.05	<0.05	0.58	11.1 (5.2-23.5)	8,7 (4.2-17.8)	0.8 (0.3-1.8)
trimethoprim /sulfamethoxazole	23.9	<0.05	<0.05	0.45	44.5 (18.2-109.2)	29.3 (12.4-69.4)	0.7 (0.3-1.5)
ESBP E. coli	0.0 7.1 52.9	<0.05	<0.05	0.45	44.5 (18.2-109.5)	29.3 (12.4-69.4)	0.7 (0.3-1.5)

□NA □TA ■PA

Figure 4 Comparison of rates of antimicrobial resistance in porcine commensal *E. coli* from three categories of farms Legend: Open horizontal bar, no antimicrobials (NA); grey bar, therapeutic antimicrobials (TA); black bars, prophylactic antimicrobials (PA).

## 1.3 Antimicrobial resistance genotypes

The resistance genes  $bla_{\text{TEM}}$  and tet(A) were the most common type found amongst *E. coli* isolates from pigs on all farms (over 82.9%), with no significant differences in rates between the three farm categories (Figure 5). The gene  $bla_{\text{CTX-M-9}}$  was only found in isolates from PA farms, and at a low rate. The other resistance genes, except for *dfrA*, were significantly more common in isolates from the PA farms than from the other two categories. Rates in TA and NA farms did not differ significantly from each other. The percentage of isolates containing *catA*, *catB*, *dfrA12*, *sul3*, *tet*(B) *aadA1*, *aadA2*, and *aadB* ranged from 47.1 to 67.6% in PA farms, whereas they were only present at 14.3-35.8% in isolates from the other two farm categories (Figure 5).



			P value			OR ratio (95% CI)	
		PA x TA	PA x NA	TA x NA	PA x TA	PA x NA	TA x NA
aadA1	25.4 63.7	<0.05	<0.05	0.34	8.9 (4.0-17.8)	5.2 (2.6-10.2)	0.6 (0.3-1.4)
aadA2	14.3 22.4 54.9	<0.05	<0.05	0.22	7.3 (3.4-15.9)	4.2 (2.1-8.5)	0.6 (0.2-1.4)
aadB	25.7 35.8 67.6	<0.05	<0.05	0.2	9.1 (4.4-18.6)	3.7 (2.0-7.2)	0.6 (0.3-1.3)
blaCTX-M-1	0.0 5.7 36.3	<0.05	<0.05	0.19	9.4 (3.2-27.9)	17.0 (5.0-28.0)	0.9 (0.4-36.8)
blaCTX-M-9	0.0 0.0 18.6	<0.05	<0.05	•			•
blaTEM	86.6 88.6 90.2	0.73	0.46	0.72	1.2 (0.4-3.2)	1.4 (0.5-3.7)	1.2 (0.4-3.3)
catA	28.4 32.9 52.0	<0.05	<0.05	0.57	2.2 (1.2-4.2)	2.7 (1.4-5.3)	1.2 (0.6-2.6)
catB	30.4 28.6 63.7	<0.05	<0.05	0.18	4.4 (2.3-8.5)	15.1 (6.2-36.3)	1.3 (0.7-5.4)
cmlA	1.5 1.4 19.6	<0.05	<0.05	0.98	16.9 (2.2-128.6)	16.1 (2.1-123.1)	0.9 (0.1-15.6)
dfrA1	16.4 17.1 18.6	0.83	0.71	0.91	1.1 (0.5-2.5)	1.1 (0.5-2.6)	1.0 (0.4-2.6)
dfrA10	9.0	<0.05	<0.05	0.94	2.8 (1.1-7.3)	2.6 (1.1-6.9)	1.0 (0.3-3.1)
dfrA12	14.9	<0.05	<0.05	0.57	3.9 (1.9-8.0)	5.1 (2.3-11.0)	1.5 (0.5-3.2)
sull	6.0 4.3 18.6	<0.05	<0.05	0.65	5.1 (1.5-18.0)	3.6 (1.2-11.1)	0.7 (0.2-3.3)
sul2	14.3 32.4	<0.05	<0.05	0.50	2.9 (1.3-6.3)	3.0 (1.5-5.7)	1.4 (0.5-4.0)
sul3	29.9 35.7 55.9	<0.05	<0.05	0.99	2.3 (1.2-4.3)	3.0 (1.5-5.7)	1.3 (0.6-2.7)
tetA	91.0 82.9 90.2	0.16	0.86	0.16	1.9 (0.8-4.7)	0.9 (0.3-2.6)	0.5 (0.2-1.4)
tetB	19.4	<0.05	<0.05	0.73	4.3 (2.1-8.9)	4.0 (1.9-8.4)	0.9 (0.4-2.0)
IntI	29.9 32.9	<0.05	<0.05				1.2 (0.6-2.4)
	0.0 10.0 20.0 30.0 40.0 50.0 60.0 70.0 80.0 90.0 100.0						
	DNA DIA PA						

Figure 5 Comparison of antimicrobial resistance genes of porcine commensal *E. coli* from the three categories farms Legend: Open horizontal bar, no antimicrobials (NA); grey bar, therapeutic antimicrobials (TA); black bars, prophylactic antimicrobials (PA).

1.4 Plasmid replicon types and confirmation of  $\text{bla}_{\text{CTX-M}}$  gene conjugation

Plasmid replicons IncX, IncW, IncP, IncT, IncL/M, IncK, IncFIIAs and IncB/O were not detected in this study. The two most common types that were found were IncF and IncFIB,

and there were no significant differences in their rates of occurrence between the three categories of farm (Figure 6). Rates for IncHI2 were low and were not significantly different between the three categories of farms. Replicon types IncFIC, IncN and IncA/C were only found in isolates from PA farms. All the other replicon types, whilst at a low prevalence, were significantly more common in isolates from the PA farms than in the other two categories, which did not differ significantly from each other. The intl gene was found at a significantly higher rate in isolates from the PA farms compared to amongst isolates from both the TA and NA farms, while the rates in TA and NA farms were similar (Figure 6). Conjugation assays showed that the IncF and IncFIB replicon plasmids from ESBLP were transferred with a frequency of  $1.36 \times 10^{-3}$  and  $8.67 \times 10^{-4}$  to transconjugants, respectively. The donor ESBLP strains E. coli PCU1 (positive for bla<sub>CTX-M-1</sub> group and with a single IncF replicon) and E. coli PCU2 (positive for bla<sub>CTX-M-9</sub> and with a single IncFIB replicon) transferred bla<sub>CTX-M-1</sub> group and bla<sub>CTX-M-9</sub> group to recipient E. coli strain J53, confirming the location of the genes on these conjugative plasmids. Using automated detection with confirmation by the combination disk assay, ESBLP E. coli were detected in 54 of the 102 (52.9%) E. coli from the PA farms, in 5 of 70 (7.1%) E. coli from the TA farms, and in none of the isolates from the NA farms (Table 10). Antibiograms, replicon type and bla<sub>CTX-M</sub> genes of 59 ESBLP E. coli are shown in Table 1. ESBLP strains derived from PA farms either contained *bla*<sub>CTX-M-1</sub> group (35, 64.8%), *bla*<sub>CTX-M-9</sub> group (17, 31.5%) or both groups of genes (2, 3.7%). The five ESBLP E. coli from the TA farms only contained bla<sub>CTX-M-1</sub>. The most common antibiogram for the ESBLP E. coli was AMX-AMP-PIP-CEX-CPD-XNL-GM-TM-ENR-MBR-TET-NT-C-SXT in the PA farms (n=28), and AMX-AMP-PIP-CEX-CPD-XNL-NT-SXT in the TA farms (n=2). The genes *bla*<sub>CTX-M-2</sub>, *bla*<sub>CTX-M-8</sub>, and *bla*<sub>CTX-M-25/26</sub> were not detected in this study. Replicons IncFIB (37.0%), F (22.1%) or IncN (18.5%) were commonly detected in the ESBLP E. coli from the PA farms, and FIB was the only replicon detected in ESBLP E. coli from the TA farms.

			P value			OR ratio (95%	% CI)
		PA x TA	PA x NA	TA x NA	PA x TA	PA x NA	TA x NA
A/C	0.0 0.0 4.9	0.06	0.06		-		-
F	64.2 75.7	0.25	0.64	0.14	0.7 (0.3-1.3)	1.2 (0.6-2.2)	1.7 (0.8-3.6)
FIA	4 <sup>6.0</sup> 6.9	0.09	0.82	0.16	5.0 (0.6-42.3)	1.2 (0.3-4.1)	0.2 (0.1-2.1)
FIB	50 61.2	0.71	0.15	0.33	0.9 (0.5-1.6)	0.6 (0.3-1.2)	0.7 (0.4-1.4)
FIC	0.0 0.0 18.6	<0.05	<0.05				
HI1	16.4 21.4 39.2	<0.05	<0.05	0.46	2.4 (1.2-4.7)	3.3 (1.5-7.0)	1.4 (0.6-3.3)
HI2	11.4 17.9 21.6	0.09	0.56	0.28	2.1 (0.9-5.1)	1.3 (0.3-2.8)	0.6 (0.2-1.6)
I1-Iy	1.5	<0.05	<0.05	0.19	4 (1.3-12.4)	16.1 (2.1-123.1)	4 (0.4-36.7)
Ν	0.0 0.0 24.5	<0.05	<0.05				-
Y	11.9	<0.05	<0.05	0.72	3.6 (1.5-8.7)	2.9 (1.2-6.9)	0.8 (0.3-2.4)
	0 10 20 30 40 50 60 70 80 90	100					

Figure 6 Comparison of plasmid replicon types detected in porcine commensal *E. coli* among the three categories of farm. Legend: Open horizontal bar, no antimicrobials (NA); grey bar, therapeutic antimicrobials (TA); black bars, prophylactic antimicrobials (PA).



prophylactic antimicrobials (prophylactic antimicrobials: PA), only used antimicrobials therapeutically (therapeutic Table 10 Incidence, phenotypic and genetic characteristics of ESBLP E. coli derived from farms routinely used antimicrobials: TA) and never used antimicrobials (no antimicrobials: NA)

				OR (95% CI)
	PA	TA	¥	between PA and
				TA
Incidence rate	52.996*	7.1%	960.0	32.1 (12.1 to 85.2)
Common antibiograms	AMX-AMP-PIP-CEX-CPD-XNL-GM-TM-ENR-MBR-TE-NT-C-SXT (28) AMX-AMP-PIP-CEX-CPD-XNL-GM-ENR-MBR-TE-NT-C-SXT (6) AMX-AMP-PIP-CEX-CPD-XNL-GM-TM-ENR-MBR-TE-NT-C (4) AMX-AMP-PIP-CEX-CPD-XNL-GM-TM-ENR-MBR-TE-NT-C (4) AMX-AMP-PIP-CEX-CPD-XNL-ENR-TE-NT-C-SXT (4)	AMX-AMP-PIP-CEX-CPD-XNL-ENR-NT-C-SXT (2) AMX-AMP-PIP-CEX-CPD-ENR-MBR-TE-NT-C-SXT (1) AMX-AMP-PIP-CEX-CPD-XNL-ENR-MBR-TE-NT (1) AMX-AMP-PIP-CEX-CPD-XNL-ENR-TE-NT-C-SXT (1)		
blacmun genes	$ble_{criterin}$ 64,8% (35/54) $ble_{criterin}$ 31,4% (17/54) both ble $c_{criterin}$ and $ble_{criterin}$ 3.7% (2/54)	bla <sub>crear-1</sub> 100% (5/5)	1	13.8 (5.2 – 36.8) ( <i>bla</i> <sub>CTXM-1)</sub>
Common replicon types	IncFIB 37.0% (20154) IncFrep 22.2% (12/54) IncN 18.5% (12/54) IncH11 5.5% (3/54) IncH11-Y 3.7% (2/54)	IncFIB 100% (5/6)	1	

\* ESBLP incidence rate of PA was significantly higher than TA and NA by Chi-square test at p<0.05

Part 2. Longitudinal monitoring of molecular resistance genotypic of *E. coli* monitoring of from pig in the production cycle

## 2.1 Resistant phenotypic characterizations

A total of 300 E. coli isolates were isolated from pigs in this study. Overall, MDR were high in AF (73.3%) and NF (64.7%). The most common antibiogram, AMP-AMX-PIP-TET, was detected in 18.0% and 14.7% from NF and AF, respectively. Overall, antimicrobial resistant phenotypes are described in Fig 7. For  $\beta$ -lactams groups and tetracycline, all isolates were highly resisted in all period of observations in both farm types while E. coli resisted to amoxicillin-clavulanate were found only from AF in creeping (6.7%) and finishing (6.7%). In AF farm, the *E. coli* producing ESBL and resisted to all cephalosporin group were 43% in nursery period and ranged from 40.0 to 46.7% in growing period. The rates were reduced to 16.7% in finishing periods, and constantly maintained in pork samples (16.7-20.0%) in AF farms. In NF farms, cephalosporin resistant and ESBLP E. coli were consistently detected in the lower rates at all period of observations (creeping period: 10%, nursery: 10.0-16.7%, growing: 16.7-20.0%, finishing: 10.0-16.7%, pork: 16.7%). Regarding aminoglycosides, amikacin resistance was not found in all pigs, while gentamicin and tobramycin resistance were obviously raised in nursery and growing periods in AF farm (GEN and TOB: 56.7-66.7%) and declined in finishing period (GEN and TOB: 30.0%), whereas, the rates were slightly higher in pork. On the other hand, gentamicin and tobramycin steadily detected through growing period, finishing and pork in NF (GEN: 13.3-23.3%, TOB: 13.3-23.3%).





### 2.2 Genotypic resistant characterization

The common resistance genes  $bla_{TEM}$  and tet(A) were found among *E. coli* from both types of farms. The genes resisted to sulfonamide; *sul1, sul2, sul3,* to trimethoprim; *drfA1, drfA10, drfA12* and to chloramphenicol *catA, catB* and *cmlA*, were presented in moderate levels without significant difference between the farm types and the observed periods (6.7-43.3%). Aminoglycoside resistant genes; *aadA1, aadA2* and *aadB* were raised to 46.7-66.7% in nursery and growing periods of AF whereas those of NF ranged only 13.3-20.7%. The significant difference of those genes was found between nursery-to-growing

and finishing (p<0.05). The frequency of  $bla_{CTX-M-1}$  group was highest in AF at growing (36.7%) followed by nursery (33.3%) and pork (23.3%), respectively. While, the detection of  $bla_{CTX-M2}$ ,  $bla_{CTX-M8}$ ,  $bla_{CTX-M9}$ ,  $bla_{CTX-M25/26}$  genes were not different between the both farms. (Fig. 8).



Figure 8 Twenty antimicrobial resistance gene detecting rates which were individually collected from pigs in each growing period and meat period at abattoir in AF farm type and NF farm type. [\* significant difference (p<0.05) between the concatenating period performed by Chi-square test]

# 2.3 Plasmid replicon type detection

The prevalence of 18 replicon types detected from *E. coli* are presenting in Fig 9. Plasmid replicons IncX, IncT, IncP, IncL/M, IncK, IncFIIAs, IncA/C and IncB/O were not

detected in this study. The IncFrep and IncFIB replicons were commonly found with nonsignificance between any period individually farm type AF (IncFrep; p values were between 0.43 to 1.0, IncFIB; p values were between 0.41 to 0.79) and NF (IncFrep; p values were between 0.59 to 0.79, IncFIB; p values were between 0.6 to 0.79). IncW replicon was only found in the isolates from AF. All the other replicon types were found at a low to moderate prevalence in both farms. Besides, the rates for all replicons from NF data had no a significant difference throughout the periods of observation. While the frequency of IncHI-2 and IncI1-I $\gamma$  replicons during nursery to growing were significantly higher than that of AF. For the conjugation assay, *E. coli* PCU12-4 (positive for *bla*<sub>CTX-M-1</sub> group with single IncI1-I $\gamma$  replicon) could transfer *bla*<sub>CTX-M-1</sub> group with the frequency of 3.8 x 10<sup>-5</sup>, while *E. coli* PCU12-5 (positive for *bla*<sub>CTX-M-1</sub> group with single IncHI2 replicon) and *E. coli* PCU12-6 (positive for *bla*<sub>CTX-M-9</sub> group with single IncHI2 replicon) could transfer *bla*<sub>CTX-M</sub> gene with the frequency of 4.1 x 10<sup>-6</sup> and 5.6 x 10<sup>-6</sup>, respectively. These results confirmed the location of the genes on these conjugative plasmids.





Figure 9 Eighteen plasmid replicon types detecting rates which were individually collected from pigs in each growing period and meat period at abattoir in AF farm type and NF farm type. [\* significant difference (p<0.05) between the concatenating period performed by Chi-square test]

### 2.4 Molecular genotypic characterization

All 300 isolates divided from 240 isolates from pigs and 60 isolates from pork were analyzed their fingerprinting by PFGE and MLST analysis. A diversity of clone types was found comprising 24 sequence types (ST) and 55 pulsotype in NF, whereas the 25 ST and 43 pulsatypes were detected in AF. The MLST results were perfectly relevant to those of PFGEs (Figure. 10,11). Three datasets obtained from 1 and 2 datasets from NF and AF, respectively, that showed the identical clone types between pigs and pork which could not be observed in the other 17 datasets. The dendrograms incorporated with antibiograms, resistant gene profiles and replicon types are presented in Figure 12,13. Interestingly, these strains did not present ESBLP trait and aminoglycoside resistance by genetic and phenotypic characterizations. On the other hand, the other datasets did not show cross-similarity of strain type between pig and pork samples and all ESBL and aminoglycoside resistant strains restricted only in pig samples. The synopsis of clonal relation of E. coli among each period of production and pork in slaughter house is presented in Figure 10,11. ST10 were the most common type to both groups; NF farm types (57/150) and AF farm types (40/150), while it was absent in pork. The ST604, ST877, ST1209 and ST2798 showed ESBLP characters. The clone type from pork samples in NF were found apart from farming periods except only ST638 that found in finishing and pork was non-ESBL and non-aminoglycoside resistance. On one hand, the strains from AF presenting ESBL and/or aminoglycoside resistance were highly distributed from nursery to finishing but there was no homologous clone linked from pigs to pork. However, the strains ST72, ST302 and ST402 performed ESBL and/or aminoglycoside resistance were found only in pork with no linkage between pork and farming period.

> จุฬาลงกรณ์มหาวิทยาลัย Chulalongkorn University



Figure 10 Molecular genetic relatedness of overall *E. coli* strains analyzed by pulsed field gel electrophoresis (PFGE) and multilocus sequence typing (MLST) in NF farm type (A). Pink round spot indicates the clones that were found in pork.



Figure 11 Molecular genetic relatedness of overall *E. coli* strains analyzed by pulsed field gel electrophoresis (PFGE) and multilocus sequence typing (MLST) in AF farm type (B). Pink round spot indicates the clones that were found in pork.

CHULALONGKORN UNIVERSITY

	Creeping period	Nursery period	Growing period	Finishing period	Pork
NF1 strain 1	ST10	ST31	ST31	ST31	ST604
NF1 strain 2	ST10	ST10	ST31	ST31	ST597
NF1 strain 3	ST10	ST10	ST10	ST10	ST69
NF2 strain 1	ST10	ST155	ST72	ST621	ST597
NF2 strain 2	ST48	ST93	ST10	ST10	ST619
NF2 strain 3	ST48	ST621	ST155	ST155	ST69
NF3 strain 1	ST31	ST393	ST648	ST31	ST405
NF3 strain 2	ST10	ST10	ST10	ST10	ST604
NF3 strain 3	ST48	ST93	ST648	ST31	ST2311
NF4 strain 1	ST484	ST621	ST393	ST393	ST2753
NF4 strain 2	ST10	ST648	ST72	ST621	ST619
NF4 strain 3	ST10	ST621	ST621	ST72	ST597
NF5 strain 1	ST48	ST10	ST10	ST638	ST597
NF5 strain 2	ST10	ST10	ST48	ST638	ST638
NF5 strain 3	ST10	ST10	ST10	ST638	ST597
NF6 strain 1	ST48	ST10	ST10	ST10	ST405
NF6 strain 2	ST48	ST10	ST10	ST10	ST877
NF6 strain 3	ST10	ST10	ST10	ST10	ST604
NF7 strain 1	ST393	ST621	ST648	ST648	ST597
NF7 strain 2	ST155	ST72	ST72	ST155	ST597
NF7 strain 3	ST48	ST484	ST72	ST648	ST597
NF8 strain 1	ST10	ST460	ST621	ST621	ST2333
NF8 strain 2	ST648	ST393	ST393	ST393	ST4198
NF8 strain 3	ST10	ST393	ST393	ST48	ST597
NF9 strain 1	ST953	ST10	ST10	ST10	ST604
NF9 strain 2	ST10	ST10	ST10	ST10	ST2311
NF9 strain 3	ST48	ST48	ST10	ST10	ST597
NF10 strain 1	ST963	ST31	ST31	ST31	ST597
NF10 strain 2	ST10	ST31	ST31	ST31	ST597
NF10 strain 3	ST10	ST10	ST10	ST10	ST619

Table 11 Distribution of ST data of *E. coli* isolated represented in individual pig in NF farm types

	Creeping period	Nursery period	Growing period	Finishing period	Pork
AF1 strain 1	ST56	ST648	ST621	ST69	ST405
AF1 strain 2	ST3379	ST656	ST365	ST656	ST72
AF1 strain 3	ST56	ST648	ST656	ST656	ST206
AF2 strain 1	ST10	ST56	ST56	ST44	ST44
AF2 strain 2	ST1119	ST621	ST621	ST69	ST72
AF2 strain 3	ST48	ST621	ST48	ST44	ST44
AF3 strain 1	ST10	ST10	ST1119	ST10	ST597
AF3 strain 2	ST10	ST10	ST10	ST10	ST402
AF3 strain 3	ST10	ST656	ST10	ST10	ST72
AF4 strain 1	ST10	ST648	ST69	ST10	ST571
AF4 strain 2	ST10	ST10	ST10	ST10	ST402
AF4 strain 3	ST656	ST621	ST621	ST10	ST597
AF5 strain 1	ST10	ST10	ST10	ST56	ST72
AF5 strain 2	ST48	ST56	ST10	ST117	ST117
AF5 strain 3	ST48	ST10	ST1119	ST10	ST402
AF6 strain 1	ST56	ST648	ST621	ST155	ST405
AF6 strain 2	ST1119	ST656	ST56	ST656	ST597
AF6 strain 3	ST48	ST648	ST69	ST69	ST405
AF7 strain 1	ST10	ST656	ST10	ST10	ST597
AF7 strain 2	ST10	ST10	ST69	ST365	ST402
AF7 strain 3	ST56	ST648	ST365	ST10	ST193
AF8 strain 1	ST378	ST69	ST621	ST10	ST597
AF8 strain 2	ST56	ST656	ST155	ST621	ST72
AF8 strain 3	ST10	ST656	ST155	ST10	ST597
AF9 strain 1	ST82	ST82	ST648	ST82	ST619
AF9 strain 2	ST56	ST648	ST56	ST10	ST206
AF9 strain 3	ST3379	ST648	ST648	ST10	ST405
AF10 strain 1	ST48	ST48	ST1119	ST48	ST302
AF10 strain 2	ST10	ST656	ST69	ST10	ST597
AF10 strain 3	ST48	ST10	ST10	ST10	ST402

Table 12 Distribution of ST data of *E. coli* isolated represented in individual pig in AF farm types

	Plasmid replicon type	FIB-Frep	FIB-Frep	Frep	FIB-HI2	FIB-Frep	FIB-Frep	FIB-Frep	FIB-Frep	Frep-Y	Frep	Frep	Frep-HI2	Frep-HI2	Frep-HI2	Frep-HI2	
	Resistance genes	bla TEM-tet (A)	bla TEM-tet (A)	bla TEM-tet (A)	<i>bla</i> TEM	bla TEM-tet (A)	<i>bla</i> TEM	<i>bla</i> TEM	bla TEM-tet (A)-catA	bla TEM-tet (A)-catA	bla TEM-tet (A)-catA	bla TEM-tet (A)-catA					
	Antibiogram	AMP-AMX-PIP-TET-NIT	AMP-AMX-PIP-TET-ENR-MBR-NIT	AMP-AMX-PIP-TET	AMP-AMX-PIP	AMP-AMX-PIP-TET	AMP-AMX-PIP-TET	AMP-AMX-PIP-TET	AMP-AMX-PIP-TET	AMP-AMX-PIP-TET-ENR	AMP-AMX	AMP-AMX	AMP-AMX-PIP-TET-C	AMP-AMX-PIP-TET-C	AMP-AMX-PIP-TET-C	AMP-AMX-PIP-TET-C	A A A
	ST	ST48	ST48	ST10	ST10	ST10	ST10	ST10	ST10	ST10	ST597	ST597	ST638	ST638	ST638	ST638	
	PFGE Profile	D3	D2	A1	A1	A1	A1	A1	A1	B2	U1	<b>U1</b>	Y1	Y1	Y1	Y1	A
	<b>Bacterial strains</b>	NF Pig 5 creeping strain 1	NF Pig 5 growing strain 2	NF Pig 5 creeping strain 2	NF Pig 5 creeping strain 3	NF Pig 5 nursery strain 1	NF Pig 5 nursery strain 3	NF Pig 5 growing strain 1	NF Pig 5 growing strain 3	NF Pig 5 nursery strain 2	NF Pig 5 meat strain 1	NF Pig 5 meat strain 3	NF Pig 5 finishing strain 1	NF Pig 5 finishing strain 2	NF Pig 5 finishing strain 3	NF Pig 5 meat strain 1	A CAR
. 0	Xba I PFGE pattern																ເລັ RS
90 100											T	mater	Annual		T		,
80																	
50 70																	
50 (																	
40 40								L									

Figure 12 Datasets of genetic relatedness, antibiogram, resistant gene profiles and replicon profiles among E. coli that

found clone type similarity between pigs and pork. from individual pig number 5 from NF farm.

78

		Plasmid replicon type	FIB-Frep	FI8-FIC-Frep	FIB-FIC-Frep	FIB-FIC-Frep	FIB-FIC-Frep	FIB-HI-2	FIB-Frep	FIA-HI-1-11-14-W-Y	FIA-FIB	FIA-FIB	FIA-FIB	FIA-FIC-11-IY-N-Y	FIA-FIC-HI-1-I1-IV-N-Y	frep-HI-1-HI-2-I1-ly	FIB-HI-2-11-ly	
		Resistance genes	bla TEM-sul1-sul2-dfrA10-dfrA12-cotA-cotB	bla TEM-tet (A)-tet (B)	bla TEM-tet (A)-tet (B)	bla TEM-tet (A)-tet (B)	blaTEM-tet (A)-tet (B)	blaTEM-sul1-sul2-dfrA1-dfrA10	blaTEM	bla TEM-bla CTX-M-1-tet (A)-tet (B)-cotA -cm/A	bla TEM-tet (A)-tet (B)-sul1-sul2-dfrA10-dfrA12-catA-catB	bla TEM-tet (A)-tet (B)-sul1-sul2-dfrA10-dfrA12-catA-catB	bla TEM-aadA1-aadA2-aadB-sul1-sul2-sul3-dfrA1-dfrA10	bla TEM-bla CTX-M-1-aodA1-oodA2-oodB-tet(A)-tet(B)-sul1-dfrA1-dfrA12	bla TEM-bla CTX-M-1-aodA1-aodA2-aodB-tet(A)-tet(B)-sul1-dfrA1-catA-catB	bla TEM-bla CTX-M-1-aodA1-aodA2-aodB-tet(A)-tet(B)-sul1-dfrA12	bla TEM-bla CTX-M-1-aadA1-aadA2-aadB-tet(A)-tet(B)	2
		Antibiogram	AMP-AMX-PIP-SXT-C	AMP-AMX-PIP-TET-ENR	AMP-AMX-PIP-TET-ENR	AMP-AMX-PIP-TET-ENR	AMP-AMX-PIP-TET-ENR	AMP-AMX-PIPTET-SXT	AMP-AMX-PIP	AMP-AMX-PIP-CEX-CPD-CPR-XNL-TET-C	AMP-AMX-PIP-TET-SXT-C-NIT	AMP-AMX-PIP-TET-SXT-C-NIT	AMP-AMX-PIP-GEN-SXT	AMP-AMX-PIP-CEX-CPD-CPR-GEN-TOB-TET-ENR-MAR-SXT-NIT	AMP-AMX-PIP-CEX-CPD-CPR-XNL-GEN-TOB-TET-C-NIT	AMP-AMX-PIP-CEX-CPD-CPR-XNL-TET-ENR-MBR-SXT	AMP-AMX-PIP-CEX-CPD-CPR-XNL-TET-ENR-MBR	
		ST	ST10	ST44	ST44	ST44	ST44	ST1119	ST48	ST48	ST56	ST56	ST72	ST621	ST621	ST621	ST69	
		PFGE Profile	BK1	BII	BII	BII	BII	B01	BL1	BL1	881	881	BZ3	BE1	BF1	8D1	CB1	
		Bacterial strains	AF Pig 2 creeping strain 1	AF Pig 2 finishing strain 1	AF Pig 2 finishing strain 3	AF Pig 2 meat strain 1	AF Pig 2 meat strain 3	AF Pig 2 creeping strain 2	AF Pig 2 creeping strain 3	AF Pig 2 growing strain 3	AF Pig 2 nursery strain 1	AF Pig 2 growing strain 1	AF Pig 2 meat strain 2	AF Pig 2 nursery strain 2	AF Pig 2 nursery strain 3	AF Pig 2 growing strain 2	AF Pig 2 finishing strain 2	אנ אנ
arity	0	Xbal PFGE pattern				STATE OF STREET, STATE		1 101 101 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10	1.									JN
Simil	40 50 60 70 80 90 10				L													-

Figure 13 Datasets of genetic relatedness, antibiogram, resistant gene profiles and replicon profiles among E. coli that

found clone type similarity between pigs and pork from individual pig number 2 from AF farm.

Similarity 30 40 50 60 70 80 90 100

	Xbal PFGE pattern	<b>Bacterial strains</b>	PFGE Profile	st	Antibiogram	Resistance genes	Plasmid replicon type
		AF Pig 5 creeping strain 1	BK3	STIO	AMP-AMX-PIP-TET-C-NIT	la TEM-tet (A)-catA-catB	FIB-Frep-Y
		AF Pig 5 nursery strain 1	BK3	ST10	AMP-AMX-PIP-TET-C-NIT	la TEM-tet (A)-catA-catB	FIB-Frep-Y
-		AF Pig 5 growing strain 1	BK3	ST10	AMP-AMX-PIP-TET-C-NIT	la TEM-tet (A)-catA-catB	FIB-Frep-Y
		AF Pig 5 growing strain 2	BK3	STIO	AMP-AMX-PIP-TET-C-NIT	la TEM-tet (A)-catA-catB	FIB-Frep-Y
		AF Pig 5 nursery strain 3	BK2	ST10	AMP-AMX-PIP-TET	fe TEM-tet (A)	Frep-HI-1
-		AF Pig 5 finishing strain 3	BK2	STID	AMP-AMX-PIP-TET	16 TEM-tet (A)	Frep-HI-1
		AF Pig 5 growing strain 3	BQ1 s	T1119	ret t	et (A)	Frep
		AF Pig 5 creeping strain 2	BL1	ST48	AMP-AMX-PIP	le TEM	FIB
		AF Pig 5 creeping strain 3	BL1	ST48	AMP-AMX-PIP	le TEM	FIB
		AF Pig 5 nursery strain 2	BA1	ST56	AMP-AMX-PIP-GEN-TOB-NIT	ia TEM-aadA1 -aadA2 -aadB	FIA-HI-1-11-IY-Y
		AF Pig 5 finishing strain 1	BA1	ST56	AMP-AMX-PIP-GEN-TOB-NIT	la TEM-aadA1 -aadA2 -aadB	FIA-HI-1-11-IV-Y
		AF Pig 5 meat strain 1	<b>BZ1</b>	ST72	AMP-AMX-PIP-GEN-TOB-TET-ENR-SXT-C-NIT	la TEM-aadA1 -aadA2 -aadB -tet (A)-tet (B)-sul1-sul2-dfrA1-dfrA10-catA	FIA-N
		AF Pig 5 meat strain 3	BZ1	ST402	AMP-AMX-PIP-CEX-CPD-CPR-XNL-TET-C-NIT	la TEM-bla CTX-M-1-aadA1 -aadA2 -aadB -tet (A)-tet (B)-catA -catB	FIA-FIC-HI-1-I1-IV-W
		AF Pig 5 finishing strain 2	CD1	ST117	AMP-AMX-PIP-TET-SXT-C-NIT	la TEM-tet (A)-tet (B)-sul1-sul2-catA-cmiA	FIA-FIC-Frep
		AF Pig 5 meat strain 2	CD1	ST117	AMP-AMX-PIP-TET-SXT-C-NIT	is TEM-tet (A)-tet (B)-sul1-sul2-cotA-cmiA	FIA-FIC-Frep



Figure 14 Datasets of genetic relatedness, antibiogram, resistant gene profiles and replicon profiles

among E. coli that found clone type similarity between pigs and pork individual pig number 5 from AF

farm.



Figure 15 Longitudinal monitoring of the frequency of ST and distribution of ESBLP and aminoglycoside resistance among

carriage E. coli. Black circle indicates the detection of ESBLP E. coli.

Part 3 The evaluation of flavomycin to reduce resistance characteristics and plasmid transfer. *in vitro* and *in vivo* 

3.1 Reduction of plasmid transferability in invitro test

For  $bla_{CTX-M-1}$ group, the number of transconjugants colonies in experimental groups I were significantly less than control group and the numbers of transconjugants colonies in experimental group II were also significantly less than control group. Controversially, there was not significant difference between numbers of transconjugants colonies in group I and group II (Figure 16). For  $bla_{CTX-M-9}$ group, the number of transconjugants colonies in experimental groups I were significantly less than control group and the numbers of transconjugants colonies in experimental groups. Controversially, there was not significant groups I were significantly less than control group and the numbers of transconjugants colonies in experimental group. Controversially, there was not significant difference between numbers of transconjugants colonies in group. Controversially, there was not significant difference between numbers of transconjugants colonies in group I and group II were also significantly less than control group. Controversially, there was not significant difference between numbers of transconjugants colonies in group I and group II (Figure 16). The transconjugation efficiency of  $bla_{CTX-M-1}$  were  $3.8 \times 10^{-4}$ ,  $3.4 \times 10^{-5}$  and  $5.6 \times 10^{-5}$  in control group, experimental group I and experimental group II, respectively (Table13,14).



Figure 16 The numbers of transconjugants colonies in control and flavomycin treatment group. (The comparison of numbers of colonies determine by Wilcoxon Sign ranked test)

						CFU/ml	
No	Strains Name	Resistance gene	Plasmid replicon types	Repeated time	Control	Experimental group I (Flavomycin 8 µg/ml)	Experimental group II (Flavomycin 16 µg/ml)
1	<i>E. coli</i> PCU13	bla <sub>ctx-M-</sub> 1group	single IncHI2	1	6.6x10 <sup>4</sup>	4.5x10 <sup>3</sup>	9.8x10 <sup>2</sup>
2	<i>E. coli</i> PCU13	bla <sub>ctx-m-</sub> 1group	single IncHl2	2	5.5x10 <sup>4</sup>	4.3x10 <sup>3</sup>	8.0x10 <sup>2</sup>
3	<i>E. coli</i> PCU13	bla <sub>ctx-m-</sub> 1group	single IncHl2	3	5.7x10 <sup>4</sup>	4.4x10 <sup>3</sup>	7.5x10 <sup>2</sup>
4	<i>E. coli</i> PCU14	bla <sub>ctx-m-</sub> 1group	single Inc HI2	1	5.5x10 <sup>4</sup>	4.5x10 <sup>3</sup>	7.2x10 <sup>2</sup>
5	<i>E. coli</i> PCU14	bla <sub>ctx-m-</sub> 1group	single Inc HI2	2	6.6x10 <sup>4</sup>	4.3x10 <sup>3</sup>	7.8x10 <sup>2</sup>
6	<i>E. coli</i> PCU14	bla <sub>ctx-m-</sub> 1group	single Inc HI2	3	5.5x10 <sup>4</sup>	4.4x10 <sup>3</sup>	7.6x10 <sup>2</sup>
7	<i>E. coli</i> PCU15	bla <sub>ctx-m-</sub> 1group	single Inc HI2	1	5.7x10 <sup>4</sup>	3.9x10 <sup>3</sup>	8.0x10 <sup>2</sup>
8	<i>E. coli</i> PCU15	bla <sub>ctx-m-</sub> 1group	single Inc HI2	2	5.5x10 <sup>4</sup>	5.0x10 <sup>3</sup>	7.5x10 <sup>2</sup>
9	<i>E. coli</i> PCU15	bla <sub>ctx-m-</sub> 1group	single Inc HI2	3	5.3x10 <sup>4</sup>	5.2x10 <sup>3</sup>	7.2x10 <sup>2</sup>
10	<i>E. coli</i> PCU16	bla <sub>ctx-M-</sub> 1group	single IncHl2	1	5.4x10 <sup>4</sup>	3.9x10 <sup>3</sup>	7.8x10 <sup>2</sup>
11	<i>E. coli</i> PCU16	bla <sub>ctx-M-</sub> 1group	single IncHl2	2	6.6x10 <sup>4</sup>	5.0x10 <sup>3</sup>	8.9x10 <sup>2</sup>
12	<i>E. coli</i> PCU16	bla <sub>ctx-m-</sub> 1group	single IncHl2	3	5.5x10 <sup>4</sup>	5.2x10 <sup>3</sup>	8.0x10 <sup>2</sup>
13	<i>E. coli</i> PCU17	bla <sub>ctx-m-</sub> 1group	single IncHl2	1	5.7x10 <sup>4</sup>	5.7x10 <sup>3</sup>	9.0x10 <sup>2</sup>
14	<i>E. coli</i> PCU17	bla <sub>ctx-M-</sub> 1group	single IncHl2	2	5.5x10 <sup>4</sup>	5.8x10 <sup>3</sup>	8.0x10 <sup>2</sup>
15	<i>E. coli</i> PCU17	bla <sub>ctx-M-</sub> 1group	single IncHl2	3	6.6x10 <sup>4</sup>	5.9x10 <sup>3</sup>	9.8x10 <sup>2</sup>

Table 13 The numbers of transconjugants colonies forming unit/ml in control and flavomycin treatment group

16	<i>E. coli</i> PCU18	bla <sub>cтx-м-</sub> ₁group	single IncHl2	1	5.5x10 <sup>4</sup>	5.0x10 <sup>4</sup>	9.6x10 <sup>2</sup>
17	<i>E. coli</i> PCU18	bla <sub>ctx-м-</sub> ₁group	single IncHl2	2	5.7x10 <sup>4</sup>	5.3x10 <sup>3</sup>	9.8x10 <sup>2</sup>
18	<i>E. coli</i> PCU18	bla <sub>CTX-M-</sub>	single IncHl2	3	5.5x10 <sup>4</sup>	5.7x10 <sup>3</sup>	9.4x10 <sup>2</sup>
19	<i>E. coli</i> PCU19	bla <sub>CTX-M-</sub> 1group	single Inc HI2	1	5.3x10 <sup>4</sup>	5.8x10 <sup>3</sup>	9.2x10 <sup>2</sup>
20	<i>E. coli</i> PCU19	bla <sub>ctx-M-</sub> 1group	single Inc HI2	2	5.4x10 <sup>4</sup>	5.2x10 <sup>3</sup>	8.0x10 <sup>2</sup>
21	<i>E. coli</i> PCU19	bla <sub>ctx-M-</sub> 1group	single Inc HI2	3	5.7x10 <sup>4</sup>	3.9x10 <sup>3</sup>	7.8x10 <sup>2</sup>
22	<i>E. coli</i> PCU20	bla <sub>ctx-M-</sub> 1group	single Inc HI2	1	5.5x10 <sup>4</sup>	5.0x10 <sup>3</sup>	6.4x10 <sup>2</sup>
23	<i>E. coli</i> PCU20	bla <sub>ctx-M-</sub> 1group	single Inc HI2	2	5.3x10 <sup>4</sup>	5.2x10 <sup>3</sup>	9.8x10 <sup>2</sup>
24	<i>E. coli</i> PCU20	bla <sub>ctx-M-</sub> 1group	single Inc HI2	3	5.4x10 <sup>4</sup>	5.7x10 <sup>3</sup>	9.6x10 <sup>2</sup>
25	<i>E. coli</i> PCU21	bla <sub>ctx-M-</sub> ₁group	single IncHl2	1	6.6x10 <sup>4</sup>	5.8x10 <sup>3</sup>	9.4x10 <sup>2</sup>
26	<i>E. coli</i> PCU21	bla <sub>ctx-M-</sub> 1group	single IncHl2	2	5.5x10 <sup>4</sup>	5.9x10 <sup>3</sup>	9.2x10 <sup>2</sup>
27	<i>E. coli</i> PCU21	bla <sub>ctx-M-</sub> 1group	single IncHl2	3	5.3x10 <sup>4</sup>	6.3x10 <sup>3</sup>	8.0x10 <sup>2</sup>
28	<i>E. coli</i> PCU22	bla <sub>ctx-M-</sub> ₁group	single IncHl2	1	5.4x10 <sup>4</sup>	6.0x10 <sup>3</sup>	9.0x10 <sup>2</sup>
29	<i>E. coli</i> PCU22	bla <sub>ctx-M-</sub> 1group	single IncHl2	2	6.6x10 <sup>4</sup>	5.7x10 <sup>3</sup>	8.0x10 <sup>2</sup>
30	<i>E. coli</i> PCU22	bla <sub>ctx-M-</sub>	single IncHl2	3	5.4x10 <sup>4</sup>	5.4x10 <sup>3</sup>	6.0x10 <sup>2</sup>
		Means of cf	u/ml		5.7x10 <sup>4</sup>	5.1x10 <sup>3</sup>	8.4x10 <sup>2</sup>
31	<i>E. coli</i> PCU23	bla <sub>ctx-M-</sub> <sub>9</sub> group	single IncHl2	1	7.5x10 <sup>4</sup>	3.5x10 <sup>4</sup>	6.0x10 <sup>2</sup>
32	<i>E. coli</i> PCU23	bla <sub>ctx-M-</sub>	single IncHl2	2	7.7x10 <sup>4</sup>	4.0x10 <sup>4</sup>	8.0x10 <sup>2</sup>
33	E. coli PCU23	bla <sub>CTX-M-</sub>	single IncHl2	3	7.8x10 <sup>4</sup>	2.8x10 <sup>3</sup>	9.8x10 <sup>2</sup>
34	E. coli PCU24	bla <sub>ctx-M-</sub> <sub>9</sub> group	single Inc HI2	1	8.x10 <sup>4</sup> 0	2.7x10 <sup>3</sup>	9.6x10 <sup>2</sup>

35	<i>E. coli</i> PCU24	bla <sub>ctx-M-</sub> ₀group	single Inc HI2	2	6.5x10 <sup>4</sup>	3.0x10 <sup>4</sup>	9.4x10 <sup>2</sup>
36	<i>E. coli</i> PCU24	bla <sub>ctx-M-</sub>	single Inc HI2	3	6.6x10 <sup>4</sup>	4.0x10 <sup>4</sup>	8.0x10 <sup>2</sup>
37	<i>E. coli</i> PCU25	bla <sub>CTX-M-</sub>	single Inc HI2	1	7.7x10 <sup>4</sup>	2.0x10 <sup>4</sup>	9.8x10 <sup>2</sup>
38	<i>E. coli</i> PCU25	bla <sub>CTX-M-</sub>	single Inc HI2	2	7.8x10 <sup>4</sup>	2.8x10 <sup>3</sup>	9.6x10 <sup>2</sup>
39	E. coli PCU25	bla <sub>CTX-M-</sub>	single Inc HI2	3	8.0x10 <sup>4</sup>	6.5x10 <sup>3</sup>	9.4x10 <sup>2</sup>
40	E. coli PCU26	bla <sub>CTX-M-</sub>	single IncHl2	1	6.5x10 <sup>4</sup>	6.0x10 <sup>3</sup>	8.0x10 <sup>2</sup>
41	E. coli PCU26	bla <sub>CTX-M-</sub>	single IncHI2	2	6.8x10 <sup>4</sup>	3.6x10 <sup>3</sup>	8.6x10 <sup>2</sup>
42	<i>E. coli</i> PCU26	bla <sub>CTX-M-</sub>	single IncHl2	3	8.0x10 <sup>4</sup> 0	4.0x10 <sup>3</sup>	9.6x10 <sup>2</sup>
43	E. coli PCU27	bla <sub>CTX-M-</sub>	single IncHl2	1	6.5x10 <sup>4</sup>	3.0x10 <sup>3</sup>	9.4x10 <sup>2</sup>
44	E. coli PCU27	bla <sub>CTX-M-</sub>	single IncHl2	2	6.6x10 <sup>4</sup>	4.0x10 <sup>3</sup>	8.0x10 <sup>2</sup>
45	E. coli PCU27	bla <sub>CTX-M-</sub>	single IncHl2	3	7.7x10 <sup>4</sup>	2.6x10 <sup>3</sup>	8.6x10 <sup>2</sup>
46	<i>E. coli</i> PCU28	bla <sub>CTX-M-</sub>	single IncHl2	1	7.8x10 <sup>4</sup>	2.8x10 <sup>3</sup>	9.8x10 <sup>2</sup>
47	<i>E. coli</i> PCU28	bla <sub>CTX-M-</sub>	single IncHl2	2	8.0x10 <sup>4</sup> 0	3.0x10 <sup>3</sup>	9.6x10 <sup>2</sup>
48	<i>E. coli</i> PCU28	bla <sub>CTX-M-</sub>	single IncHl2	3	6.5x10 <sup>4</sup>	2.8x10 <sup>3</sup>	9.4x10 <sup>2</sup>
49	<i>E. coli</i> PCU29	bla <sub>CTX-M-</sub>	single Inc HI2	1	5.8x10 <sup>4</sup>	3.0x10 <sup>3</sup>	9.2x10 <sup>2</sup>
50	<i>E. coli</i> PCU29	bla <sub>CTX-M-</sub>	single Inc HI2	2	5.9x10 <sup>4</sup>	2.0x10 <sup>3</sup>	8.0x10 <sup>2</sup>
51	<i>E. coli</i> PCU29	bla <sub>ctx-M-</sub>	single Inc HI2	3	6.5x10 <sup>4</sup>	2.8x10 <sup>3</sup>	7.8x10 <sup>2</sup>
52	<i>E. coli</i> PCU30	bla <sub>CTX-M-</sub>	single Inc HI2	1	8.7x10 <sup>4</sup>	2.6x10 <sup>3</sup>	8.0x10 <sup>3</sup>
53	<i>E. coli</i> PCU30	bla <sub>CTX-M-</sub>	single Inc HI2	2	8.8x10 <sup>4</sup>	2.8x10 <sup>3</sup>	8.0x10 <sup>2</sup>
54	<i>E. coli</i> PCU30	bla <sub>ctx-M-</sub> <sub>9</sub> group	single Inc HI2	3	8.6x10 <sup>4</sup>	3.6x10 <sup>3</sup>	7.5x10 <sup>2</sup>

55	E. coli	bla <sub>ctx-M-</sub>	single	1	8 4×10 <sup>4</sup>	$4.0 \times 10^{3}$	$7.2 \times 10^{2}$	
55	PCU31	<sub>9</sub> group	IncHI2		0.4710	4.0010	1.2X10	
56	E. coli	bla <sub>ctx-M-</sub>	single	2	8 6×10 <sup>4</sup>	3.0×10 <sup>3</sup>	$7.8 \times 10^{2}$	
57	PCU31	<sub>9</sub> group	IncHI2	Z	8.4×10 <sup>4</sup>	4.0×10 <sup>3</sup>	0.6×10 <sup>2</sup>	
	E. coli	bla <sub>ctx-M-</sub>	single	2				
57	PCU31	<sub>9</sub> group	IncHI2	5	0.4X10	4.0X10	9.0710	
EO	E. coli	bla <sub>ctx-M-</sub>	single	1	$4.2 \times 10^{4}$	$2.0 \times 10^{3}$	$0.4 \times 10^{2}$	
50	PCU32	<sub>9</sub> group	IncHI2	I	4.3810	2.0710	9.4×10	
50	E. coli	bla <sub>ctx-M-</sub>	single	2	$5.4 \times 10^{4}$	$2.9 \times 10^{3}$	$0.2 \times 10^2$	
-09	PCU32	<sub>9</sub> group	IncHI2	Z	5.4810	2.0X10	9.2810	
60	E. coli	bla <sub>ctx-M-</sub>	single	2	6 9×10 <sup>4</sup>	$2.6 \times 10^{3}$	$9.0 \times 10^{2}$	
60	PCU32	<sub>9</sub> group	IncHI2	3	0.0X10	2.0X10	0.0810	
Means of cfu/ml					7.2x10 <sup>4</sup>	3.3x10 <sup>3</sup>	8.7x10 <sup>2</sup>	

Table 14 Transconjugants efficiency of *bla*<sub>CTX-M-1</sub> group and *bla*<sub>CTX-M-9</sub> group in control group, experimental group I and experimental group II and control group.

	Transconjugation efficiency						
resistance genes	Control group	experimental group I	experimental group II (Flavomycin 16 <b>µ</b> g/ml)				
	Control group	(Flavomycin 8 <b>µ</b> g/ml)					
<i>bla<sub>ctx-M-1</sub>group</i>	3.8x10 <sup>4</sup> ±0.09	3.4x10 <sup>-5</sup> ±0.12	5.6x10 <sup>-5</sup> ±0.08				
<i>bla</i> <sub>cтx-м-9</sub> group	4.8x10 <sup>4</sup> ±0.08	2.2x10 <sup>-5</sup> ±0.21	1.2x10 <sup>-5</sup> ±0.15				
- PLANT VI UNIT							

3.2 in vivo reduction of plasmid transferability test

3.2.1 Resistant phenotypic characterizations

In FF, MDR rate were higher (63.3%) and NF (64.7%). The most common antibiogram, AMP-AMX-PIP-TET, was detected in 12.0%. Overall, antimicrobial resistant phenotypes are described in Fig 15. For  $\beta$ -lactams groups and tetracycline, all isolates were highly resisted in all period of observations in FF types while *E. coli* resisted to amoxicillin-clavulanate were found only from AF in creeping (3.3%). The *E. coli* producing ESBL and resisted to all cephalosporin group were 20.0 to 26.7% in nursery period which were significant less than AF in the same period. In the growing period, rate of cephalosporin resistance ranged from 23.3 to 30.0% in growing period which were significant less than AF in the same period. The rates were reduced to 16.7-23.3% in finishing periods. Regarding aminoglycosides, amikacin resistance was not found in all pigs, while gentamicin and tobramycin resistance were obviously raised in nursery and growing periods in the same rate as in AF (GEN and TOB: 60.0-66.7%) and declined in finishing period (GEN and TOB: 33.3%). The other resistance rates were not difference to AF (Figure 17).



Figure 17 Eighteen antimicrobials resistance rates of and ESBLP *E. coli* which were individually collected from pigs in each growing period and meat period at abattoir in AF farm type and FF farm type. [\* significant difference (p<0.05) in each growing period between farm performed by Chi-square test]

### 3.2.2 Genotypic resistant characterization

The common resistance genes were also  $bla_{\text{TEM}}$  and tet(A) genes. The genes resisted to sulfonamide; *sul1*, *sul2*, *sul3*, to trimethoprim; *drfA1*, *drfA10*, *drfA12* and to chloramphenicol *catA*, *catB* and *cmlA*, were presented in moderate levels without significant difference with AF and the observed periods (6.7-40.3%). Aminoglycoside resistant genes; *aadA1*, *aadA2* and *aadB* were raised to 30.0-60.0% in nursery and growing periods and decrease in finishing period (6.7-20.0%) and no significant difference with AF were observed. The significant difference of  $bla_{\text{CTX-M-1}}$  group genes was found between FF and AF in nursery period (16.7%) and growing period (20.0%). While, the detection of  $bla_{\text{CTX-M2}}$ group,  $bla_{\text{CTX-M3}}$ group,  $bla_{\text{CTX-M3}}$ group,  $bla_{\text{CTX-M25/26}}$ group genes were not different between the both farms (Figure 18).





Figure 18 Twenty antimicrobial resistance gene detecting rates which were individually collected from pigs in each growing period and meat period at abattoir in AF farm type and FF farm type. [\* significant difference (p<0.05) in each growing period between farm performed by Chi-square test]

## 3.2.3 Plasmid replicon type detection

The prevalence of 18 replicon types detected from *E. coli* are presenting in Figure 17. Plasmid replicons IncX, IncT, IncP, IncL/M, IncK, IncFIIAs, IncA/C and IncB/O were not detected in FF as in AF. The IncFrep and IncFIB replicons were commonly found FF (53.3-60.0%) While, the frequency of IncHI-2 (10.0-16.7%) and IncI1-I $\gamma$  replicons (16.7%) during nursery to growing were significantly lower in FF when compared with AF(Figure 19).



Figure 19 Eighteen plasmid replicon types detecting rates which were individually collected from pigs in each growing period and meat period at abattoir in AF farm type and FF farm type. [\* significant difference (p<0.05) in each growing period between farm performed by Chi-square test.

# **CHAPTER VI: Discussions**

Part 1. Distribution of resistance characteristics of *E. coli* isolated from pigs in different antibiotic using status in Thailand

#### 1.1 Background

Antimicrobial are commonly used in the Thai pig industry to control endemic bacterial diseases in intensive farms. Many large intensive farms in Thailand use antimicrobials prophylactically in specific age groups of pigs, in anticipation of regular bacterial disease outbreaks, whilst some only use targeted antimicrobials for treatment of individual sick pigs. This study aimed to investigate and compare antimicrobial resistance rates in commensal E. coli from fattening pigs on farms that had different patterns of antimicrobial usage: farms routinely using prophylactic antimicrobials; farms only using antimicrobials for specific therapy; and farms not using antimicrobials at all. Similarly, sized and managed farms in the first two categories were included in this study. The two farms that only administered therapeutic antimicrobials to sick pigs were somewhat unusual in that they only used injectable enrofloxacin or gentamicin, and this choice might limit development of resistance compared to the more typical use of a broader range of targeted antimicrobials on many farms. Unfortunately, it was not possible to match the husbandry and conditions in the third category of farm with those in the first two categories, as the only farms that could be identified as not using antimicrobials at all were small village-based piggeries where they had neither access to nor the financial capacity to purchase antimicrobials. It is possible that other issues associated with factors such as stocking rates, nutrition or genetics may have had an influence on the findings on these farms.

### 1.2 Rates of phenotypic resistance

The rates of phenotypic resistance amongst the commensal *E. coli* from all three categories of farms for piperacillin, amoxicillin, ampicillin and tetracycline were similar and very high. This indicates that there is a widespread and almost universal set of resistances

to these drugs in *E. coli* from fattening pigs in Thailand, whether or not they have been exposed to antimicrobials in the past. This is disturbing since it implies that this resistance is not reversible, even in the absence of antimicrobial selection pressure. The resistance phenotypes found were associated with the common occurrence of tet(A) and  $bla_{TEM}$ , genes that frequently have been reported in porcine commensal E. coli in Southeast Asia (Changkaew et al., 2015; Khamsarn et al., 2016; Lay et al., 2012; Nhung et al., 2016; Trongjit et al., 2016). Our study suggests the existence of resistant clones that are widespread and persist in the environment. According to the fitness-cost model tet(A) and bla<sub>TEM</sub> might be maintained in E. coli in animals and the environment without needing selective pressure from the use of tetracyclines and  $\beta$ -lactams, respectively (Enne et al., 2005; Kirchner et al., 2014). As a consequence, resistance to  $\beta$ -lactams and tetracycline are not a useful proxy to reflect the overall trends in antimicrobial resistance in surveillance programs. In relation to the other antimicrobials tested, no resistance was found to amikacin and imipenem, and resistance to amoxicillin/clavulanic and cefpirome was found only in the PA farms, and only in a few isolates. On the other hand, high rates of resistance to all the other antimicrobials tested were commonly found in isolates from PA farms, but were less commonly found in isolates from the other farm categories; furthermore, the resistance rates for enrofloxacin, chloramphenicol, sulfamethozaxoletrimethroprim and nitrofurantoin were substantially higher than previously reported in the pig industry in Thailand (Lay et al., 2012; Prapasarakul et al., 2010; Trongjit et al., 2016). Importantly, apart from tiamulin-fumarate and amoxicillin the other antimicrobials had not been used in the pigs in the PA farms, including chloramphenicol and nitrofurantoin that have been banded from use in Thai livestock since 1999 (MoAC, 1999). From this it seems that the regular prophylactic use of tiamulin-fumarate and/or amoxicillin has selected for commensal E. coli that are resistance to these two antimicrobials in the PA farms, but also for co-resistance in these isolates to the other antimicrobials that were tested. For example, co-selection for resistance to these antimicrobials may have occurred with resistance to amoxicillin on the same mobile genetic elements or adjacent genes (Johnson et al., 2016). Resistance to tiamulin mainly derives from chromosomal mutations

in the 23S rRNA and *rplC* genes that result in reduced drug binding, and consequently may lead to cross-resistance to other antimicrobials that target the bacterial ribosome (van Duijkeren et al., 2014). In addition, genes such as *cfr* that encode rRNA methyltransferase which methylates position A2503 on the 23S rRNA and confers resistance to chloramphenicol, florfenicol, clindamycin, pleuromutilins (tiamulin), oxazolidinones, and streptogramin can be located on plasmids or transposons which are transferable between bacterial species (Long et al., 2006). Their transfer potentially also could co-select for resistance to tiamulin in these isolates, and potential cross-resistance to other drugs, will be the subject of a future study.

### 1.3 Genotypic resistance

The genes *aadA1*, *aadA2*, *aadB*, *sul1*, *sul2*, *sul3*, *dfrA12*, *catA*, *catB* and *cmlA*, as well as the integron gene *intl* were detected in isolates from the PA group at a significantly higher rate than in isolates from the TA and NA groups. This group of resistance genes usually is located on class I integrons (Kadlec and Schwarz, 2008; Povilonis et al., 2010; Szmolka and Nagy, 2013), and especially *dfrA1*, *dfrA12*, *aadA1* and *aadA2* are commonly found on class I integron gene cassettes in isolates from Southeast Asia (Lay et al., 2012; Trongjit et al., 2016). This group of resistance genes might be class 1 integron-borne resistance determinants that were co-selected with integron I and have become widely spread amongst isolates from PA farms under ongoing antimicrobial selection pressure.

## 1.4 ESBLP E. coli

Generally, the occurrence of ESBL-producing bacteria in pigs varies depending on micro-environmental factors and the growth phase of the pigs (Schmithausen et al., 2015). Commensal strains of *E. coli* are considered to represent an important reservoir of ESBLs (Zheng et al., 2012). This study found a high rate of commensal ESBLP *E. coli* in pigs close to slaughter age on PA farms, and this rate was greater than in younger pigs that previously have been tested in Thailand [48.4% (Boonyasiri et al., 2014); 44.3% (Changkaew et al., 2015)]. The high frequency of ESBLP E. coli supports the suggestion that amoxicillin may select for these strains in pig farms and is consistent with the results of a previous study (Cavaco et al., 2008). Whilst no ESBLP E. coli were found in the farms that did not use antimicrobials (NA), it was unclear what resulted in ESBLP also being present in the two farms that only used therapeutic enrofloxacin or gentamicin by injection. Infrequent use of these antimicrobials for sick pigs would not be predicted to select for ESBLP E. coli. The strains are unlikely to have been acquired from other PA farms, as they would have been expected to be resistant to a greater range of antimicrobials than was found. Over 50% of the E. coli from the PA farms showed ESBL properties, commonly possessing bla<sub>CTX-M-1</sub> group or bla<sub>CTX-M-9</sub> group genes that have a worldwide distribution in both healthy and ill humans in Southeast and East Asia.<sup>38-40</sup> By contrast, only a few ESBLP E. coli were detected in the TA farms, and none in the farms that did not use antimicrobials. Previously, ESBL phenotypes were reported in 2.4%-75% of porcine E. coli, but in those studies, there was lack of historical data, especially relating to antimicrobial use (Kiratisin et al., 2008; Nhung et al., 2016; Trongjit et al., 2016). This study demonstrated a relationship between the use of prophylactic in-feed antimicrobials in pig farms and a high risk of finding ESBLP E. coli. Moreover, all ESBLP E. coli in this study were resistant to enrofloxacin, which has been on the list of WHO concerns for monitoring programs (WHO, 2011). However, as indicated previously, the prevalence of ESBL related genes like bla<sub>TEM-1</sub> variants (bla<sub>TEM-25</sub>), bla<sub>SHV-1</sub> variants (bla<sub>SHV-12</sub>) and bla<sub>VEB-1</sub> should be confirmed by PCR and sequencing. Resistant strains from pigs could represent a potential risk to human health, and this requires more detailed investigation. The genes bla<sub>CTX-M-1</sub> and bla<sub>CTX-M-9</sub> that were detected with single FIB and F replicons, and that could be transfer in a conjugation assay, had the potential to undergo horizontal transfer to other strains and the associated environment (Moodley and Guardabassi, 2009; Zurfluh et al., 2014).

1.5 Plasmid replicon type detection

IncFIB and IncF plasmids are narrow host range genetic elements which have been reported worldwide in human and avian *Enterobacteriaceae*, associated with tet(A), bla<sub>TEM</sub> group and bla<sub>CTX-M</sub> group genes (Johnson et al., 2007; Mshana, 2009). The IncFIB and IncF plasmid encoded plasmid addiction systems are self-beneficial for their maintenance and spread, both with and without antibiotic selection pressure. On the other hand, in our study broad-host range plasmids N and HI1 contained bla<sub>CTX-M-1</sub>group and bla<sub>CTX-M-9</sub> group and these are known to have epidemiological significance in humans and livestock in Europe, Asia and the USA (Carattoli et al., 2005; Cottell et al., 2013; Jakobsen et al., 2015). Plasmid IncN was only detected in isolates from the PA group: this distribution might have from a high fitness cost of the plasmid such that it is less well maintained in an environment lacking antibiotic selective pressure (Humphrey et al., 2012) Some other potential plasmid-mediated resistance genes were not investigated in the current study, and these included floR and ampC that previously have only been detected at very low rates in studies in Southeast Asia and East Asia (Huang et al., 2012; Humphrey et al., 2012; Lee et al., 2014). Other resistance genes including plasmid-mediated quinolones resistance (PMQR) genes that have been associated with resistant strains from human patients in this area also need to be studied to see if they may have an origin in isolates from pigs.



Part 2. Longitudinal monitoring of molecular resistance genotypic of *E. coli* monitoring of from pig in the production cycle

# 2.1 Backgrounds GHULALONGKORN UNIVERSITY

Eventhough, a number of AMR researches in pigs and pork products have been attempting to reveal on prevalence, characterization and clonal analysis using the bacterial carrier *E. coli*, but there was still no evidence verified the linkage between belief of AMR bacteria from farm to meat product (Jakobsen et al., 2011; Kaesbohrer et al., 2012; Thorsteinsdottir et al., 2010). By longitudinal monitoring, the AMR in production cycle to slaughtering could illustrate the possible clonal linkage between intestinal *E. coli* in production cycle and in pork. This study could provide the complete datasets of AMR distribution using clone typing, antimicrobial characterizations especially ESBLP and aminoglycoside resistance in carriage *E. coli* in along the process. The farm
managements contained with and without antibiotic feed additive yielded the variety rate of AMR and antibiogram but both still showed the non-relation of clone types between farms and slaughter samples. In general, the management and geographical differences closely effected to the genetic diversity and existence of antimicrobial resistance genes of porcine isolated *E. coli* (Leistner et al., 2013; Richards et al., 2006). Use of antibiotic in feed additive was also included the major impact to clone selection directly based on selective pressure (Lugsomya et al., 2017; Makita et al., 2016). The high clonal diversity of *E. coli* was undoubtedly found in individual pig to pen levels (Herrero-Fresno et al., 2017) but outstanding strains ST10 became a dominant clone and acted as a persister along pig growing periods (Ahmed et al., 2017). However, the 3 selected colonies per sample from high dilution  $(10^{-4})$ , this criteria could enhance the recruitment of variety of *E. coli* strains in intestine and ST10 was still the major population at over 50% of observation in our study (Lautenbach et al., 2008; Lugsomya et al., 2017).

### 2.2 Resistant phenotypic and genotypic characterizations

The amino penicillin resistance (ampicillin and amoxicillin) and urevido-penicillin (piperacillin) conferring  $bla_{TEM}$  gene and tetracycline resistance conferring tet(A) gene in *E. coli* were the most common AMR in both farms and all observation periods was consistent to all cross-sectional studies in Southeast Asian (Lugsomya et al., 2017; Nhung et al., 2016). The persistent  $bla_{TEM}$  and tet(A) genes in *E. coli* may not cause by the selective pressure but it may imply abundance of  $bla_{TEM}$  and tet(A) in *Enterobacteriaceae* bacteria in the area (Assawatheptawee et al., 2017; Honda et al., 2016). Despite cephalosporins and aminoglycosides were not involved in farm management but tiamulin and ampicillin, the frequency of ESBLP *E. coli* contained  $bla_{CTX-M-1}$  group and aminoglycosides resistant *E. coli* contained *aadA1*, *aadA2* and *aadB* were high in nursery period in only AF farm. This evidence confirmed the finding of the previous study (Lugsomya et al., 2017) that might be explained by coharboring the multi-resistance genes including *cfr* and  $bla_{CTX-M}$  genes on the conjugative plasmid (Zhang et al., 2015). Thus, the significant frequency of ESBLP and aminoglycoside resistance were used as the monitoring marker in this study. From this study, tiamulin and amoxicillin in feed might

associating with multidrug resistance selection. From previous study, tiamulin resistant genes were located on the same third generation cephalosporin resistant genes which were co-resistance between tiamulin and third generation cephalosporin. Moreover, *cfr* genes which were resist to pleuromutilin also resist to chloramphenicol.

#### 2.3 Plasmid replicon type detection

The replicons IncFrep and IncFIB were the most common spread in human and animal sources including both groups in this study. These plasmids encoding factors e.g. iron uptake, toxin enzyme and variety of resistance genes e.g.  $bla_{CTX-M}$  were mostly spread in *Enterobacteriaceae* (Kim et al., 2011; Lugsomya et al., 2017; Naseer and Sundsfjord, 2011; Rozwandowicz et al., 2018). In AF farm, the high frequency of IncI1-I $\gamma$ , IncHI2 in nursery periods were strongly relevent to detection of ESBLP and  $bla_{CTX-M-1}$ group gene. Previously, IncHI2 carried not only *esbl* gene but also included a variety of genes encoding sulfonamides, aminoglycosides, tetracycline and streptomycin resistance (Dierikx et al., 2010; Doublet et al., 2014). IncI1-I $\gamma$  was also the common plasmids in *E. coli* from livestock carrying  $bla_{CTX-M-1}$  (Borjesson et al., 2013; Shaheen et al., 2011). Thus, the nursery pigs in from antibiotic used farm could act as the important reservoir of AMR source possibly impact to public health.

# 2.4 Molecular genotypic characterization

The fingerprinting analysis by MLST and PFGE were performed as tracking marker presenting the diversity of clone type making the linkage throughout the observations and they showed the consensal outcomes (Bae et al., 2014; El Garch et al., 2017; Nemoy et al., 2005). Most of clone types in pork were not detected in pigs except STs 44, 117, 155, 638 that were non-ESBPL *E. coli* and negative for  $bla_{CTX-M}$  genes. The most common ST10 carriage *E. coli* in pig was also reported in human, chicken and other animals, (Herrero-Fresno et al., 2017; Herrero-Fresno et al., 2015; Leverstein-van Hall et al., 2011b; Toval et al., 2014) whereas pork was not a source of origin in this study. Interestingly, the ST597 became the predominate clone in pork derived from both farms which previously reported as enteric pathogen in human patients (Hasman et al., 2014; Khong et al., 2016). However,

neither this clone could be observed in pig samples from any farming periods nor presence of ESBLP and aminoglycoside resistance. Thus, the source of food-poisoning might be from non-farming process. Our study found no relation of the molecular clone contained genes encoding ESBLP and aminoglycoside resistance from farm toward slaughter house as well as the evidences from cross section surviellances (Boonyasiri et al., 2014; Sunde et al., 2015; Thorsteinsdottir et al., 2010). The high distribution of multidrug resistant *E. coli* was found in all tested farms and periods of collection. The aminoglycoside resistant and ESBLP *E. coli* were predominant at nursery period in antibiotic used farm. The complete molecular characteristics and clone typing indicates that the pig production should not be accused as the origin of AMR bacterial distribution to consumers. The standard slaughtering process, meat trimming and packaging should be more investigated using harzard analysis critical control point in the further study.

Part 3 The evaluation of Flavomycin to reduce resistance characteristics and plasmid transfer. *in vitro* and *in vivo* 

3.1 Reduction of plasmid transferability in vitro test

flavomycin at 8  $\mu$ g/ml and 16  $\mu$ g/ml could decreased transconjugation efficiency and number of transconjugants of  $bla_{CTX-M-1}$  with IncHI2 positive and  $bla_{CTX-M-9}$  with IncHI2 positive *E. coli* were conformed to the previous study which reported that Flavomycin at 8  $\mu$ g/ml could reduce transconjugation efficiency *in vitro* horizontal gene transfer in *E. coli*. (Poole et al., 2006). The *vivo* test, the results from previous were variable (Riedl et al., 2000; van den Bogaard et al., 2002) might depend on flavomycin resistance mechanism of targeting bacteria and others in surrounding context. Species of animals which influenced to their intestinal conditions. Normally, the transconjugation efficiency and number of transconjugants depended on many factors like mating pair formation (MPF) factor especially, *traY* (Cottell et al., 2014); the one type of pilus encoding genes and mobilization families (MOB) (Smillie et al., 2010). Flavomycin inhibit the bacterial transglycosylases reaction which catalyze the bond between disaccharide pentapeptide subunits into nascent peptidoglycan during cell wall synthesis (Riedl et al., 2000). Flavomycin also interacted with lytic transglycosylases encoded on conjugative plasmids (Hoskins et al., 1999; Mani et al., 1998) which was found in both Gram-positive and Gramnegative bacteria. These enzymes were capable of locally enlarging gaps in the peptidoglycan meshwork to allow the efficient assembly and anchoring of supramolecular transport complexes in the cell envelope. These was the positive effect to facilitate the passage of plasmid DNA through the peptidoglycan layer during conjugation (Bayer et al., 1995; Koonin and Rudd, 1994). The hindering effect of Flavomycin against plasmid transferring also conformed to the results of previous studies(Poole et al., 2006; Riedl et al., 2000; van den Bogaard et al., 2002), flavomycin usage in pig farms can reduce bacterial conjugation rate at 20-23.3% in vivo study, however the antimicrobial usage in field should concern. The flavomycin susceptibility against *E. coli* and other *Enterobacteriaceae* should be performed and co-resistance against flavomycin with other antimicrobials should be investigated.

#### 3.2 in vivo reduction of plasmid transferability test

The cephalosporins resistance phenotypes and ESBL P *E. coli* phenotypes detected in lower rates in nursery period and growing periods when comparing with AF. However, the ESBL P *E. coli* and cephalosporins resistance were also encoded in chromosomal DNA, they were commonly found in conjugative plasmid and mobilizable plasmid in *Enterobacteriaceae* (Brolund and Sandegren, 2016; Carattoli, 2009; Day et al., 2016; Freitag et al., 2017; Schaufler et al., 2016). These data might represent potential of flavomycin which can reduce the resistance phenotypes in *in vivo* study in pigs like Corpet and colleagues which found that chlortetracycline resistant rates reduced in *Enterobacteriaceae* after using Flavomycin 5  $\mu$ g/ml in water (Corpet,1984). For the resistant genes, *bla*<sub>CTX-M-1</sub> group detecting rates in FF were lower in nursery and growing period than in the same period in AF. Even though there were many scientific articles show that flavomycin could reduce the appearance of resistance genes in both Gram-positive and Gram-negative bacteria like *vanA* and *bla*<sub>TEM</sub> (Pfaller, 2006; Poole et al., 2006; Riedl et al., 2000), no one reported the effect of Flavomycin against ESBL genes like *bla*<sub>CTX-M-1</sub> group before. The reducing rates *in vivo* might depend on the summation of reducing rate

of R plasmid conjugation (Poole et al., 2006). For replicon types of plasmid data, we found that IncHI2 and IncI1-I $\gamma$  detecting rates were lower in nursey and growing period in FF than in AF. There was first report which described antimicrobial alternative substance against plasmid replicon resistance profiles before. Overalls, the evidence of ESBLs phenotypes, third generation cephalosporins resistant rates,  $bla_{CTX-M-1}$  group detecting rates and IncHI2 and IncI1-I $\gamma$  detecting rates in nursery and growing period in FF were lower than AF were represent the effect of flavomycin when use 10 ppm in feed in nursery and growing period could reduce important resistance genes like  $bla_{CTX-M-1}$  group and IncHI2 and IncI1-I $\gamma$  plasmid replicon types.

## CHAPTER VII: Conclusions, future recommendation and executive summary

Conclusions from Part 1: Distribution of resistance characteristics of *E. coli* isolated from pigs in different antibiotic using status in Thailand

The data from this study proved the hypothesis that there was high rate of AMR in porcine fecal E. coli are commonly found in Thai pig production cycle. The percentage of resistance and types of resistance were quite depended on antimicrobial usage form in farm. The AMR rate, resistant genotypic detecting rates in farm which used routine antimicrobial for prophylactic purpose were higher than farm which use antimicrobial for therapeutic propose and non-antimicrobial usage farms. The antimicrobial resistance rates were quite high even the critically important drugs in human like <sup>3rd</sup> generation cephalosporin in E. coli isolated common pig farms which were usage antimicrobials for prophylactic purpose in feeds. Some of resistance characteristic and genotypes were quite common in pig production cycle, it became as a common MDR *E. coli* in the study area showing  $\beta$ -lactam resistance and tetracycline resistance even in the farms did not use antimicrobials. The antimicrobial usage in therapeutic propose (especially by individual injected pigs) did not affect or had no association to antimicrobial resistance rates by phenotypes, genotypes and the mobile genetic elements. However, we still confirmed that use of antimicrobials mixed in feed generated the high resistance rate to aminoglycosides and third generation of cephalosporins represented ESBLP E. coli in fattening pigs. This is a crucial caution of antibiotic use in prophylactic purpose. A more holistic understanding should result from longitudinal surveillance at different points through the production cycle through to meat at slaughter, especially if exposure or lack of exposure to antimicrobials can be recorded.

Future recommendation from part 1: Distribution of resistance characteristics of *E. coli* isolated from pigs in different antibiotic using status in Thailand

The antimicrobial use in therapeutic propose had no association to antimicrobial resistance rate and could be still approved to use in swine practice but that in feed

additive must keep in consideration of emerging crucial MDR especially ESBL and aminoglycoside resistance in pig farms.

Conclusions from Part 2: Longitudinal monitoring of molecular resistance genotypic of *E. coli* monitoring of from pig in the production cycle

From the second hypothesis, the phenotype and genotype associated AMR of fecal E. coli in pigs were different in each period of observation and could be altered by routine antibiotic used (amoxycillin and tiamulin as feed additive). Our study confirmed that the antimicrobial usage in feed for prophylactic purpose was the crucial factor to rise the AMR rates in both phenotypes, genotypes and the mobile genetic elements when observed individually and longitudinally in this part. By cohort of pigs on farms, the commensal *E. coli* with AMR traits (especially resistance to  $\beta$ -lactam group antibiotics and to tetracycline) were still common in both farms and at all collection periods. The antimicrobial resistance rate especially the third generation cephalosporins and aminoglycosides, again increased in nursery periods and growing periods beneath antimicrobials selective pressure by feed additive. Interestingly, the resistance rates were temporal changes and decreasingly reverse in slaughtering periods. E. coli that were aminoglycoside resistant and ESBLP were predominant found in the nursery and grower periods and were significantly more common in antibiotic used farm than in feed additive free farm. Tiamulin and amoxicillin usage in animal feed selected the multidrug resistant E. coli especially in nursery and growing period even though bacterial clonal transfer between pig and pork were detected in very low rate, the antimicrobial usage should be awareness under veterinarian supervision. Pig in nursery and growing period were the risk growing period for AMR bacteria detecting especially third generation cephalosporin and aminoglycosides resistance. The farmers, veterinarians and pig relating people should be good sanitize after pig handling and bacterial contaminating from nursery pigs and growing pigs to environment should be concerned. The common molecular clonal type of E. coli in live pigs was ST10 that were non-ESBLP strain and could not found in meat. In contrast, ST597 was the most common clonal types of meat

in both farms. Molecular typing failed to identify a direct relationship between strains in meat and those found in the corresponding live animals during their production cycle. An investigation study in slaughtering process is helpful for AMR risk assessment in slaughterhouse.

Future recommendation from part 2: Longitudinal monitoring of molecular resistance genotypic of *E. coli* monitoring of from pig in the production cycle

Even though the high antimicrobial resistance rates in pig farms in Thailand was confirmed by both cross-sectional and longitudinal study. In nursery and growing periods were obviously demonstrated as the risk part for ESBLP *E. coli* existence. Thus, the farmers and veterinarians should pay attention to crucial AMR bacteria transmission and must deal this risky by the proper hygienic strategy. Clone ST597 could have been a cross-contaminant from the environment of the abattoir, from equipment, or from other carcasses, although the pigs from the two farms were killed in different abattoirs and so no single external source existed. The route for its appearance in pig meat in abattoirs is important. Further studies are required using hazard analysis critical control point analysis during the standard slaughtering process, meat trimming and packaging to identify the source of *E. coli* with AMR characteristics. The dominant types found in meat may have other attributes that could help to explain why they are present than other more common types found in the live animals.

Conclusions from Part 3 The evaluation of Flavomycin to reduce resistance characteristics and plasmid transfer. in vitro and in vivo

The flavomycin at 8  $\mu$ g/ml concentration and 16  $\mu$ g/ml concentration could confirm reduction of the conjugative rates of  $bla_{CTX-M-1}$  and  $bla_{CTX-M-9}$ , *in vitro*, and might have a potential to control the resistant *E. coli* spreading. *In vivo* study, use of flavomycin at 10 ppm in feed could reduce antimicrobial resistance rates in both phenotypes and genotypes especially the third generation cephalosporins resistance in nursery and growing periods. The *in vivo* outcome was strongly consistent to those of *in vitro* study. Future recommendation from part 3: The evaluation of flavomycin efficacy to reduce the resistance rates and plasmid transfer via conjugative mechanism.

This study suggested that use of flavomycin as feed additive in pig production cycle could reduce the rate of AMR *E. coli* in term of genotype and phenotypes especially the third generation cephalosporins and aminoglycosides resistance in both *in vitro* and *in vivo* studies, however flavomycin as a feed additive is still an alternative indication but is in curiosity for in other resistances via cross resistance selection. This hypothesis should be proved in detail by whole genome sequencing.



**CHULALONGKORN UNIVERSITY** 

#### Executive summary

To date most studies have only involved cross-sectional observations taken at specific periods of production, with the studied farms having a variety of management procedures, geographical locations and a lack of availability of historical data about antimicrobial use. Our results were able to confirm by the high AMR rate in fecal carriage *E. coli* in Thai pig production cycle especially in the farm where routinely used antimicrobials (amoxycillin and tiamulin) for prophylactic indication. *E. coli* resisted to  $\beta$ -lactam antibiotic and tetracycline in pig farms was very common trait and ubiguitous in the study area, no matter whether antimicrobial was used or not. This finding supported our research question that the high rate of AMR in porcine fecal *E. coli* are commonly found in Thai pig production cycle at the time of investigation. The antimicrobial resistance rates were composed of that to the third generation cephalosporins and aminoglycosides which are in the priority pathogen lists of world health organization and caution in human hospitals. Thus, at nursery and grower periods in pig production became the critical periods which could distribute the MDR bacteria to environment and farmers accelerating by antimicrobial in feed additive. This phenomenal was confirmed by cross-sectional and cohort pigs in farms. All observations consisting antibiogram, resistant gene profiles and plasmid profiles were proved their association to the high rate in fecal carriage *E. coli* in pigs which were dominant in that particular period of observation and altered by routine antibiotic used. Moreover, the complete clone type characterization in fecal carriage E. coli from live pigs to meat was the first comprehensive investigation. The unlink clones between live pigs and meat implied only farm management but the slaughtering standard should have also pay more attention to reduce the distribution of AMR bacteria from farms to consumers. This finding can be a caution for persons associated to pig farms and preventing of AMR bacterial cross contamination from pigs should pay attention on these stages. To reduce the AMR rate in practice, flavomycin is an alternative tool on the basis of their mechanism and scientific evidence supports. Use of flavomycin at 10 ppm in feed could support that final hypothesis described its possible reduction of AMR rate in live pigs especially aminoglycoside resistant and ESBLP E. coli at nursery and growing

periods. This finding was consistent to the *in vitro* outcome by plasmid conjugative assay. Altogether, these studies demonstrated the high incidence of AMR by using fecal carriage *E. coli* the proxy that revealed which part of production and type of antimicrobials should be ultimately crucial issue for an efficient monitoring and hygienic strategy in relation to swine management and veterinary public health.



#### REFERENCES

- AAM, 2009. Antibiotic Resistance: An ecological perspective on an old problem. Washington, DC: American Academy of Microbiology. 39.
- Aarestrup, F.M., Hasman, H., Agerso, Y., Jensen, L.B., Harksen, S., Svensmark, B.,
   2006. First description of *bla*<sub>CTX-M-1</sub>-carrying Escherichia coli isolates in Danish primary food production. J Antimicrob Chemother 57, 1258-1259.
- Aarestrup, F.M., Wegener, H.C., Collignon, P., 2008. Resistance in bacteria of the food chain: epidemiology and control strategies. Expert Rev Anti Infect Ther 6, 733-750.
- Acar, J.F., Moulin, G., 2012. Antimicrobial resistance: a complex issue. Rev Sci Tech 31, 23-31.
- Adelaide, O.A., Bii, C., Okemo, P., 2008. Antibiotic resistance and virulence factors in *Escherichia coli* from broiler chicken slaughtered at Tigoni processing plant in Limuru, Kenya. East Afr Med J 85, 597-606.
- Adiri, R.S., Gophna, U., Ron, E.Z., 2003. Multilocus sequence typing (MLST) of *Escherichia coli* O78 strains. FEMS Microbiol Lett 222, 199-203.
- Ahmed, R., Bopp, C., Borczyk, A., Kasatiya, S., 1987. Phage-typing scheme for *Escherichia coli* O157:H7. J Infect Dis 155, 806-809.
- Ahmed, S., Olsen, J.E., Herrero-Fresno, A., 2017. The genetic diversity of commensal *Escherichia coli* strains isolated from non-antimicrobial treated pigs varies according to age group. PLoS One 12, e0178623.
- Allen, K.J., Kovacevic, J., Cancarevic, A., Wood, J., Xu, J., Gill, B., Allen, J.K., Mesak, L.R., 2013. Microbiological survey of imported produce available at retail across Canada. Int J Food Microbiol 162, 135-142.
- Amábile-Cuevas, C., 2016. Antibiotics and Antibiotic Resistance in the Environment. The Netherlands. CRC Press. 126p.

- Aminov, R.I., Mackie, R.I., 2007. Evolution and ecology of antibiotic resistance genes. FEMS Microbiol Lett 271, 147-161.
- Andersson, D.I., Hughes, D., 2014. Microbiological effects of sublethal levels of antibiotics. Nat Rev Microbiol 12, 465-478.
- Angkititrakul, S., Chomvarin, C., Chaita, T., Kanistanon, K., Waethewutajarn, S., 2005. Epidemiology of antimicrobial resistance in Salmonella isolated from pork, chicken meat and humans in Thailand. Southeast Asian J Trop Med Public Health 36, 1510-1515.
- Angulo, F.J., Baker, N.L., Olsen, S.J., Anderson, A., Barrett, T.J., 2004a. Antimicrobial use in agriculture: controlling the transfer of antimicrobial resistance to humans. Semin Pediatr Infect Dis 15, 78-85.
- Angulo, F.J., Nunnery, J.A., Bair, H.D., 2004b. Antimicrobial resistance in zoonotic enteric pathogens. Rev Sci Tech 23, 485-496.
- Anon, 2007. Council Regulation (EC) No 834/2007 of 28 June 2007 on organic production and labelling of organic products and repealing Regulation (EEC) No 2092/91. In: UNION, E. (ed.) 834/2007. Luxembourg: Of **fi**cial Journal of the European Union.
- ASM, 2009. Antibiotic Resistance: An Ecological Perspective on an Old Problem. A report from the American academy of microbiology. 1-38.
- Assawatheptawee, K., Tansawai, U., Kiddee, A., Thongngen, P., Punyadi, P., Romgaew, T., Kongthai, P., Sumpradit, T., Niumsup, P.R., 2017. Occurrence of Extended-Spectrum and AmpC-Type beta-Lactamase Genes in *Escherichia coli* Isolated from Water Environments in Northern Thailand. Microbes Environ 32, 293-296.
- Bae, I.K., Kim, J., Sun, J.Y., Jeong, S.H., Kim, Y.R., Wang, K.K., Lee, K., 2014.
   Comparison of pulsed-field gel electrophoresis & repetitive sequence-based
   PCR methods for molecular epidemiological studies of *Escherichia coli* clinical isolates. Indian J Med Res 140, 679-685.
- Baquero, F., Martinez, J.L., Canton, R., 2008. Antibiotics and antibiotic resistance in water environments. Curr Opin Biotechnol 19, 260-265.

- Bayer, M., Eferl, R., Zellnig, G., Teferle, K., Dijkstra, A., Koraimann, G., Hogenauer, G.,
  1995. Gene 19 of plasmid R1 is required for both efficient conjugative DNA
  transfer and bacteriophage R17 infection. J Bacteriol 177, 4279-4288.
- Boers, S.A., van der Reijden, W.A., Jansen, R., 2012. High-throughput multilocus sequence typing: bringing molecular typing to the next level. PLoS One 7, e39630.
- Boonyasiri, A., Tangkoskul, T., Seenama, C., Saiyarin, J., Tiengrim, S., Thamlikitkul, V., 2014. Prevalence of antibiotic resistant bacteria in healthy adults, foods, food animals, and the environment in selected areas in Thailand. Pathog Glob Health 108, 235-245.
- Borjesson, S., Bengtsson, B., Jernberg, C., Englund, S., 2013. Spread of extendedspectrum beta-lactamase producing *Escherichia coli* isolates in Swedish broilers mediated by an incl plasmid carrying *bla*<sub>CTX-M-1</sub>. Acta Vet Scand 55, 3.
- Borowiak, M., Fischer, J., Hammerl, J.A., Hendriksen, R.S., Szabo, I., Malorny, B., 2017.
  Identification of a novel transposon-associated phosphoethanolamine transferase gene, *mcr-5*, conferring colistin resistance in d-tartrate fermenting Salmonella enterica subsp. enterica serovar Paratyphi B. J Antimicrob Chemother 72, 3317-3324.
- Brolund, A., Sandegren, L., 2016. Characterization of ESBL disseminating plasmids. Infect Dis (Lond) 48, 18-25.
- Burow, E., Simoneit, C., Tenhagen, B.A., Kasbohrer, A., 2014. Oral antimicrobials increase antimicrobial resistance in porcine *E. coli*--a systematic review. Prev Vet Med 113, 364-375.
- Butaye, P., Devriese, L.A., Haesebrouck, F., 2003. Antimicrobial growth promoters used in animal feed: effects of less well known antibiotics on gram-positive bacteria. Clin Microbiol Rev 16, 175-188.
- Capita, R., Alonso-Calleja, C., 2013. Antibiotic-resistant bacteria: a challenge for the food industry. Crit Rev Food Sci Nutr 53, 11-48.

- Carattoli, A., 2009. Resistance plasmid families in *Enterobacteriaceae*. Antimicrob Agents Chemother 53, 2227-2238.
- Carattoli, A., Bertini, A., Villa, L., Falbo, V., Hopkins, K.L., Threlfall, E.J., 2005. Identification of plasmids by PCR-based replicon typing. J Microbiol Methods 63, 219-228.
- Carattoli, A., Villa, L., Feudi, C., Curcio, L., Orsini, S., Luppi, A., Pezzotti, G., Magistrali, C.F., 2017. Novel plasmid-mediated colistin resistance mcr-4 gene in *Salmonella* and *Escherichia coli*, Italy 2013, Spain and Belgium, 2015 to 2016. Euro Surveill 22.
- Casey, T.A., Bosworth, B.T., 2009. Design and evaluation of a multiplex polymerase chain reaction assay for the simultaneous identification of genes for nine different virulence factors associated with *Escherichia coli* that cause diarrhea and edema disease in swine. J Vet Diagn Invest 21, 25-30.
- Castanon, J.I., 2007. History of the use of antibiotic as growth promoters in European poultry feeds. Poult Sci 86, 2466-2471.
- Catry, B., Cavaleri, M., Baptiste, K., Grave, K., Grein, K., Holm, A., Jukes, H., Liebana,
  E., Lopez Navas, A., Mackay, D., Magiorakos, A.P., Moreno Romo, M.A., Moulin,
  G., Munoz Madero, C., Matias Ferreira Pomba, M.C., Powell, M., Pyorala, S.,
  Rantala, M., Ruzauskas, M., Sanders, P., Teale, C., Threlfall, E.J., Torneke, K.,
  van Duijkeren, E., Torren Edo, J., 2015. Use of colistin-containing products within
  the European Union and European Economic Area (EU/EEA): development of
  resistance in animals and possible impact on human and animal health. Int J
  Antimicrob Agents 46, 297-306.
- Cavaco, L.M., Abatih, E., Aarestrup, F.M., Guardabassi, L., 2008. Selection and persistence of CTX-M-producing *Escherichia coli* in the intestinal flora of pigs treated with amoxicillin, ceftiofur, or cefquinome. Antimicrob Agents Chemother 52, 3612-3616.

- CDC, 2013. Standard Operating Procedure for PulseNet PFGE of *Escherichia coli* O157:H7, *Escherichia coli* non-O157 (STEC), *Salmonella* serotypes, *Shigella sonnei* and *Shigella flexneri*. 13.
- Cerniglia, C.E., Kotarski, S., 2005. Approaches in the safety evaluations of veterinary antimicrobial agents in food to determine the effects on the human intestinal microflora. J Vet Pharmacol Ther 28, 3-20.
- Chang, Q., Wang, W., Regev-Yochay, G., Lipsitch, M., Hanage, W.P., 2015. Antibiotics in agriculture and the risk to human health: how worried should we be? Evol Appl 8, 240-247.
- Changkaew, K., Intarapuk, A., Utrarachkij, F., Nakajima, C., Suthienkul, O., Y., S., 2015. Antimicrobial resistance, extended-spectrum beta-lactamase productivity, and class 1 integrons in *Escherichia coli* from healthy swine. J Food Prot 78, 1442-1450.
- Chantziaras, I., Boyen, F., Callens, B., Dewulf, J., 2014. Correlation between veterinary antimicrobial use and antimicrobial resistance in food-producing animals: a report on seven countries. J Antimicrob Chemother 69, 827-834.
- Chuanchuen, R., Ajariyakhajorn, K., Koowatananukul, C., Wannaprasat, W., Khemtong,
   S., Samngamnim, S., 2010. Antimicrobial resistance and virulence genes in
   Salmonella enterica isolates from dairy cows. Foodborne Pathog Dis 7, 63-69.
- Clark, H.F., Geldreich, E.E., Kabler, P.W., Bordner, R.H., Huff, C.B., 1957. The coliform group. I. The boric acid lactose broth reaction of coliform IMViC types. Appl Microbiol 5, 396-400.
- Clermont, O., Christenson, J.K., Denamur, E., Gordon, D.M., 2013. The Clermont *Escherichia coli* phylo-typing method revisited: improvement of specificity and detection of new phylo-groups. Environ Microbiol Rep 5, 58-65.
- CLSI, 2015a. Performance Standards for Antimicrobial Disk and Dilution Susceptibility test for Bacteria Isolated From Animals; 3rd VET01-S3. Clinical and Laboratory Standards Institute, Wayne, PA.

- CLSI, 2015b. Performance Standards for Antimicrobial Susceptibility Testing; 24th Informational Supplement. M100-S25. Clinical and Laboratory Standards Institute, Wayne, PA.
- Collis, C.M., Grammaticopoulos, G., Briton, J., Stokes, H.W., Hall, R.M., 1993. Sitespecific insertion of gene cassettes into integrons. Mol Microbiol 9, 41-52.
- Cortes, P., Blanc, V., Mora, A., Dahbi, G., Blanco, J.E., Blanco, M., Lopez, C., Andreu,
  A., Navarro, F., Alonso, M.P., Bou, G., Blanco, J., Llagostera, M., 2010. Isolation and characterization of potentially pathogenic antimicrobial-resistant *Escherichia coli* strains from chicken and pig farms in Spain. Appl Environ Microbiol 76, 2799-2805.
- Cottell, J.L., Kanwar, N., Castillo-Courtade, L., Chalmers, G., Scott, H.M., Norby, B., Loneragan, G.H., Boerlin, P., 2013. *bla*<sub>CTX-M-32</sub> on an IncN plasmid in *Escherichia coli* from beef cattle in the United States. Antimicrob Agents Chemother 57, 1096-1097.
- Cottell, J.L., Saw, H.T., Webber, M.A., Piddock, L.J., 2014. Functional genomics to identify the factors contributing to successful persistence and global spread of an antibiotic resistance plasmid. BMC Microbiol 14, 168.
- Courvalin, P., 2008. Predictable and unpredictable evolution of antibiotic resistance. J Intern Med 264, 4-16.
- Cui, S., Ge, B., Zheng, J., Meng, J., 2005. Prevalence and antimicrobial resistance of *Campylobacter* spp. and *Salmonella* serovars in organic chickens from Maryland retail stores. Appl Environ Microbiol 71, 4108-4111.
- da Costa, P.M., Loureiro, L., Matos, A.J., 2013. Transfer of multidrug-resistant bacteria between intermingled ecological niches: the interface between humans, animals and the environment. Int J Environ Res Public Health 10, 278-294.
- Dalla-Costa, L.M., Irino, K., Rodrigues, J., Rivera, I.N., Trabulsi, L.R., 1998.
   Characterisation of diarrhoeagenic *Escherichia coli* clones by ribotyping and ERIC-PCR. J Med Microbiol 47, 227-234.

Davin-Regli, A., Pagès, J.M., 2012. Cross-resistance between biocides and

antimicrobials: an emerging question. Rev Sci Tech Off Int Epiz 31, 89-104.

- Day, M.J., Rodriguez, I., van Essen-Zandbergen, A., Dierikx, C., Kadlec, K., Schink,
  A.K., Wu, G., Chattaway, M.A., DoNascimento, V., Wain, J., Helmuth, R., Guerra,
  B., Schwarz, S., Threlfall, J., Woodward, M.J., Coldham, N., Mevius, D.,
  Woodford, N., 2016. Diversity of STs, plasmids and ESBL genes among *Escherichia coli* from humans, animals and food in Germany, the Netherlands
  and the UK. J Antimicrob Chemother 71, 1178-1182.
- Defra, 2014. Antimicrobial Resistance (AMR) Systems Map Overview of the factors in **fl**uencing the development of AMR and the interactions between them. In: DEFRA (ed.) 1 ed. London: DEFRA.
- Demarco, D.R., Lim, D.V., 2002. Detection of *Escherichia coli* O157:H7 in 10- and 25gram ground beef samples with an evanescent-wave biosensor with silica and polystyrene waveguides. J Food Prot 65, 596-602.
- Deng, Y., Zeng, Z., Chen, S., He, L., Liu, Y., Wu, C., Chen, Z., Yao, Q., Hou, J., Yang, T., Liu, J.H., 2011. Dissemination of IncFII plasmids carrying rmtB and qepA in *Escherichia coli* from pigs, farm workers and the environment. Clin Microbiol Infect 17, 1740-1745.
- Dierikx, C., van Essen-Zandbergen, A., Veldman, K., Smith, H., Mevius, D., 2010. Increased detection of extended spectrum beta-lactamase producing *Salmonella enterica* and *Escherichia coli* isolates from poultry. Vet Microbiol 145, 273-278.
- Dione, M.M., Ieven, M., Garin, B., Marcotty, T., Geerts, S., 2009. Prevalence and antimicrobial resistance of Salmonella isolated from broiler farms, chicken carcasses, and street-vended restaurants in Casamance, Senegal. J Food Prot 72, 2423-2427.
- Doublet, B., Praud, K., Nguyen-Ho-Bao, T., Argudin, M.A., Bertrand, S., Butaye, P., Cloeckaert, A., 2014. Extended-spectrum beta-lactamase- and AmpC betalactamase-producing D-tartrate-positive *Salmonella enterica* serovar Paratyphi B

from broilers and human patients in Belgium, 2008-10. J Antimicrob Chemother 69, 1257-1264.

- Doumith, M., Godbole, G., Ashton, P., Larkin, L., Dallman, T., Day, M., Day, M., Muller-Pebody, B., Ellington, M.J., de Pinna, E., Johnson, A.P., Hopkins, K.L.,
  Woodford, N., 2016. Detection of the plasmid-mediated *mcr-1* gene conferring colistin resistance in human and food isolates of *Salmonella enterica* and *Escherichia coli* in England and Wales. J Antimicrob Chemother 71, 2300-2305.
- Drlica, K., Zhao, X., 1997. DNA gyrase, topoisomerase IV, and the 4-quinolones. Microbiol Mol Biol Rev 61, 377-392.
- Duff, G.C., Galyean, M.L., 2007. Board-invited review: recent advances in management of highly stressed, newly received feedlot cattle. J Anim Sci 85, 823-840.
- Duong, V.N., Paulsen, P., Suriyasathaporn, W., Smulders, F.J., Kyule, M.N., Baumann,M.P., Zessin, K.H., Pham, H.N., 2006. Preliminary analysis of tetracyclineresidues in marketed pork in Hanoi, Vietnam. Ann N Y Acad Sci 1081, 534-542.
- EC, 2006. Directive 2006/11/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 15 February 2006 on pollution caused by certain dangerous substances discharged into the aquatic environment of the community.
- ECHA, 2014. Biocidal Products Regulation (EU) No 528/2012 consolidated version
   25.04.2014 Implementing and delegated acts European Chemicals Agency. 1 244. CHULALONGKORN UNIVERSITY
- EFSA, 2015. ECDC/EFSA/EMA First joint report on the integrated analysis of the consumption of antimicrobial agents and occurrence of antimicrobial resistance in bacteria from humans and food-producing animals. EFSA Journal 13, 114.
- El Garch, F., Sauget, M., Hocquet, D., LeChaudee, D., Woehrle, F., Bertrand, X., 2017. *mcr-1* is borne by highly diverse *Escherichia coli* isolates since 2004 in foodproducing animals in Europe. Clin Microbiol Infect 23, 51 e51-51 e54.
- EMA, 2015. Committee for Medicinal Products for Veterinary Use (CVMP) strategy on antimicrobials 2016-2020. European Medicine Agency, 1-16.

- Enne, V.I., Delsol, A.A., Davis, G.R., Hayward, S.L., Roe, J.M., Bennett, P.M., 2005.
   Assessment of the fitness impacts on *Escherichia coli* of acquisition of antibiotic resistance genes encoded by different types of genetic element. J Antimicrob Chemother 56, 544-551.
- Espinar, M.J., Rocha, R., Ribeiro, M., Goncalves Rodrigues, A., Pina-Vaz, C., 2011. Extended-spectrum beta-lactamases of *Escherichia coli* and *Klebsiella pneumoniae* screened by the VITEK 2 system. J Med Microbiol 60, 756-760.
- ESVAC, 2015. Sales of veterinary antimicrobial agents in 26 EU/EEA countries in 2013 fifth ESVAC report (EMA/387934/2015). 1-162.
- FAO, 2013a. FAO Statistical Yearbook 2013: Feeding the World. Rome. 307.
- FAO, 2013b. World livestock 2013 Changing disease Landscapes. In: SLINGENBERGH, J. (ed.). Rome., 130.
- FAO, 2016. Drivers, dynamics and epidemiology of antimicrobial resistance in animal production. 1-68.
- FAOSTAT, 2017. Databases FAO stat. 278.
- Fernandes, L., Centeno, M.M., Couto, N., Nunes, T., Almeida, V., Alban, L., Pomba, C., 2016. Longitudinal characterization of monophasic Salmonella Typhimurium throughout the pig's life cycle. Vet Microbiol 192, 231-237.
- Finley, R.L., Collignon, P., Larsson, D.G., McEwen, S.A., Li, X.Z., Gaze, W.H., Reid-Smith, R., Timinouni, M., Graham, D.W., Topp, E., 2013. The scourge of antibiotic resistance: the important role of the environment. Clin Infect Dis 57, 704-710.
- Fluit, A.C., Visser, M.R., Schmitz, F.J., 2001. Molecular detection of antimicrobial resistance. Clin Microbiol Rev 14, 836-871, table of contents.
- Forsberg, K.J., Reyes, A., Wang, B., Selleck, E.M., Sommer, M.O., Dantas, G., 2012. The shared antibiotic resistome of soil bacteria and human pathogens. Science 337, 1107-1111.
- Fraise, A.P., 2002. Biocide abuse and antimicrobial resistance--a cause for concern? J Antimicrob Chemother 49, 11-12.

- Freitag, C., Michael, G.B., Kadlec, K., Hassel, M., Schwarz, S., 2017. Detection of plasmid-borne extended-spectrum beta-lactamase (ESBL) genes in *Escherichia coli* isolates from bovine mastitis. Vet Microbiol 200, 151-156.
- Fuentes, F.M.Á., Morente, O.E., Abriouel, H., Pulido, P.R., Gálvez, A., 2014.
   Antimicrobial resistance determinant in antibiotic and biocide-resistant gramnegative bacteria from organic foods. Food Control 37, 9-14.
- Garcia-Alvarez, L., Dawson, S., Cookson, B., Hawkey, P., 2012. Working across the veterinary and human health sectors. J Antimicrob Chemother 67 Suppl 1, i37-49.
- Glynn, M.K., Reddy, V., Hutwagner, L., Rabatsky-Ehr, T., Shiferaw, B., Vugia, D.J.,
  Segler, S., Bender, J., Barrett, T.J., Angulo, F.J., Emerging Infections Program
  FoodNet Working, G., 2004. Prior antimicrobial agent use increases the risk of
  sporadic infections with multidrug-resistant *Salmonella enterica* serotype
  Typhimurium: a FoodNet case-control study, 1996-1997. Clin Infect Dis 38 Suppl
  3, S227-236.
- Goldstein, C., Lee, M.D., Sanchez, S., Hudson, C., Phillips, B., Register, B., Grady, M., Liebert, C., Summers, A.O., White, D.G., Maurer, J.J., 2001. Incidence of class 1 and 2 integrases in clinical and commensal bacteria from livestock, companion animals, and exotics. Antimicrob Agents Chemother 45, 723-726.
- Gray, K.J., Wilson, L.K., Phiri, A., Corkill, J.E., French, N., Hart, C.A., 2006. Identification and characterization of ceftriaxone resistance and extended-spectrum betalactamases in Malawian bacteraemic *Enterobacteriaceae*. J Antimicrob Chemother 57, 661-665.
- Hall, R.M., Vockler, C., 1987. The region of the IncN plasmid R46 coding for resistance to beta-lactam antibiotics, streptomycin/spectinomycin and sulphonamides is closely related to antibiotic resistance segments found in IncW plasmids and in Tn21-like transposons. Nucleic Acids Res 15, 7491-7501.

Harada, K., Asai, T., 2010. Role of antimicrobial selective pressure and secondary factors on antimicrobial resistance prevalence in *Escherichia coli* from food-producing animals in Japan. J Biomed Biotechnol 2010, 180682.

- Hasman, H., Saputra, D., Sicheritz-Ponten, T., Lund, O., Svendsen, C.A., Frimodt-Moller,
  N., Aarestrup, F.M., 2014. Rapid whole-genome sequencing for detection and characterization of microorganisms directly from clinical samples. J Clin Microbiol 52, 139-146.
- Hawkey, P.M., 1998. The origins and molecular basis of antibiotic resistance. BMJ 317, 657-660.
- Herrero-Fresno, A., Ahmed, S., Hansen, M.H., Denwood, M., Zachariasen, C., Olsen,
  J.E., 2017. Genotype variation and genetic relationship among *Escherichia coli* from nursery pigs located in different pens in the same farm. BMC Microbiol 17, 5.
- Herrero-Fresno, A., Larsen, I., Olsen, J.E., 2015. Genetic relatedness of commensal *Escherichia coli* from nursery pigs in intensive pig production in Denmark and molecular characterization of genetically different strains. J Appl Microbiol 119, 342-353.
- Holtcamp, W., 2011. Poultry relief? organic farming may reduce drug resistance. Environmental Health Perspectives 119, 489.
- Honda, R., Watanabe, T., Sawaittayotin, V., Masago, Y., Chulasak, R., Tanong, K.,
  Chaminda, G.T., Wongsila, K., Sienglum, C., Sunthonwatthanaphong, V.,
  Poonnotok, A., Chiemchaisri, W., Chiemchaisri, C., Furumai, H., Yamamoto, K.,
  2016. Impacts of urbanization on the prevalence of antibiotic-resistant *Escherichia coli* in the Chaophraya River and its tributaries. Water Sci Technol
  73, 362-374.
- Hong, P.Y., Yannarell, A., Mackie, R.I., 2011. The contribution of antibiotic residues and antibiotic resistance genes from livestock operations to antibiotic resistance in the environment and food chain. CABI, 21.

- Hoskins, J., Matsushima, P., Mullen, D.L., Tang, J., Zhao, G., Meier, T.I., Nicas, T.I.,
  Jaskunas, S.R., 1999. Gene disruption studies of penicillin-binding proteins 1a,
  1b, and 2a in *Streptococcus pneumoniae*. J Bacteriol 181, 6552-6555.
- Huang, S.Y., Zhu, X.Q., Wang, Y., Liu, H.B., Dai, L., He, J.K., Li, B.B., Wu, C.M., Shen, J.Z., 2012. Co-carriage of *qnrS1*, *floR*, and *bla*<sub>CTX-M-14</sub> on a multidrug-resistant plasmid in Escherichia coli isolated from pigs. Foodborne Pathog Dis 9, 896-901.
- Humphrey, B., Thomson, N.R., Thomas, C.M., Brooks, K., Sanders, M., Delsol, A.A.,
  Roe, J.M., Bennett, P.M., Enne, V.I., 2012. Fitness of *Escherichia coli* strains
  carrying expressed and partially silent IncN and IncP1 plasmids. BMC Microbiol 12, 53.
- Huovinen, P., Sundstrom, L., Swedberg, G., Skold, O., 1995. Trimethoprim and sulfonamide resistance. Antimicrob Agents Chemother 39, 279-289.
- IFT, 2006. Report Antimicrobial Resistance implications for the food system. Comprehensive Reviews in Food Science and Food Safety. 5, 71-137.
- Igbinosa, E.O., Obi, L.C., Tom, M., Okoh, A.I., 2011. Detection of potential risk of wastewater effluents for transmission of antibiotic resistance from *Vibrio* species as a reservoir in a peri-urban community in South Africa. Int J Environ Health Res 21, 402-414.
- Jakobsen, L., Bortolaia, V., Bielak, E., Moodley, A., Olsen, S.S., Hansen, D.S., Frimodt-Moller, N., Guardabassi, L., Hasman, H., 2015. Limited similarity between plasmids encoding CTX-M-1 beta-lactamase in Escherichia coli from humans, pigs, cattle, organic poultry layers and horses in Denmark. J Glob Antimicrob Resist 3, 132-136.
- Jakobsen, L., Garneau, P., Kurbasic, A., Bruant, G., Stegger, M., Harel, J., Jensen, K.S., Brousseau, R., Hammerum, A.M., Frimodt-Moller, N., 2011. Microarray-based detection of extended virulence and antimicrobial resistance gene profiles in phylogroup B2 *Escherichia coli* of human, meat and animal origin. J Med Microbiol 60, 1502-1511.

- Jimenez-Arribas, G., Leautaud, V., Amabile-Cuevas, C.F., 2001. Regulatory locus *soxRS* partially protects *Escherichia coli* against ozone. FEMS Microbiol Lett 195, 175-177.
- Johnson, T.A., Stedtfeld, R.D., Wang, Q., Cole, J.R., Hashsham, S.A., Looft, T., Zhu, Y.G., Tiedje, J.M., 2016. Clusters of Antibiotic Resistance Genes Enriched Together Stay Together in Swine Agriculture. MBio 7, e02214-02215.
- Johnson, T.J., Wannemuehler, Y.M., Johnson, S.J., Logue, C.M., White, D.G., Doetkott, C., Nolan, L.K., 2007. Plasmid replicon typing of commensal and pathogenic *Escherichia coli* isolates. Appl Environ Microbiol 73, 1976-1983.
- Kadlec, K., Schwarz, S., 2008. Analysis and distribution of class 1 and class 2 integrons and associated gene cassettes among *Escherichia coli* isolates from swine, horses, cats and dogs collected in the BfT-GermVet monitoring study. J Antimicrob Chemother 62, 469-473.
- Kaesbohrer, A., Schroeter, A., Tenhagen, B.A., Alt, K., Guerra, B., Appel, B., 2012.
   Emerging antimicrobial resistance in commensal *Escherichia coli* with public health relevance. Zoonoses Public Health 59 Suppl 2, 158-165.
- Kariuki, S., Onsare, R., Mwituria, J., Ng'etich, R., Nafula, C., Karimi, K., Karimi, P.,Njeruh, F., Irungu, P., Mitema, E., 2013. FAO/WHO Project Report. ImprovingFood Safety in Meat Value Chains in Kenya. Food Protection Trends, 172-179.
- Kemper, N., 2008. Veterinary antibiotics in the aquatic and terrestrial environment. Ecological Indicators 8, 1-3.
- Khamsarn, S., Nampoonsak, Y., Busamaro, S., Tangkoskul, T., Seenama, C., Rattanaumpawan, P., Boonyasiri, A., Thamlikitkul, V., 2016. Epidemiology of antibiotic use and antimicrobial resistance in selected communities in Thailand. J Med Assoc Thai 99, 270-275.
- Khong, W.X., Xia, E., Marimuthu, K., Xu, W., Teo, Y.Y., Tan, E.L., Neo, S., Krishnan, P.U., Ang, B.S., Lye, D.C., Chow, A.L., Ong, R.T., Ng, O.T., 2016. Local transmission and global dissemination of New Delhi Metallo-Beta-Lactamase (NDM): a whole genome analysis. BMC Genomics 17, 452.

- Kim, J., Bae, I.K., Jeong, S.H., Chang, C.L., Lee, C.H., Lee, K., 2011. Characterization of IncF plasmids carrying the *bla*<sub>CTX-M-14</sub> gene in clinical isolates of *Escherichia coli* from Korea. J Antimicrob Chemother 66, 1263-1268.
- Kim, Y.H., Cha, C.J., Cerniglia, C.E., 2002. Purification and characterization of an erythromycin esterase from an erythromycin-resistant *Pseudomonas* sp. FEMS Microbiol Lett 210, 239-244.
- Kiratisin, P., Apisarnthanarak, A., Laesripa, C., Saifon, P., 2008. Molecular characterization and epidemiology of extended-spectrum-beta-lactamaseproducing *Escherichia coli* and *Klebsiella pneumoniae* isolates causing health care-associated infection in Thailand, where the CTX-M family is endemic. Antimicrob Agents Chemother 52, 2818-2824.
- Kirchner, M., Mafura, M., Hunt, T., Abu-Oun, M., Nunez-Garcia, J., Hu, Y., Weile, J., Coates, A., Card, R., Anjum, M.F., 2014. Antimicrobial resistance characteristics and **fi**tness of Gram-negative fecal bacteria from volunteers treated with minocycline or amoxicillin. Front Microbiol 5, 1-9.
- Kjeldgaard, J., Cohn, M.T., Casey, P.G., Hill, C., Ingmer, H., 2012. Residual antibiotics disrupt meat fermentation and increase risk of infection. MBio 3, e00190-00112.
- Koningstein, M., Simonsen, J., Helms, M., Molbak, K., 2010. The interaction between prior antimicrobial drug exposure and resistance in human *Salmonella* infections. J Antimicrob Chemother 65, 1819-1825.
- Koonin, E.V., Rudd, K.E., 1994. A conserved domain in putative bacterial and bacteriophage transglycosylases. Trends Biochem Sci 19, 106-107.
- Kumar, K., Gupta, S.C., Chander, Y., Singh, A.K., 2005. Antibiotic use in agriculture and its impact on the terrestrial environment. Advances in Agronomy 87, 1-54.
- Kumar, S., Stecher, G., Tamura, K., 2016. MEGA7: Molecular Evolutionary Genetics Analysis Version 7.0 for Bigger Datasets. Mol Biol Evol 33, 1870-1874.
- Lambert, T., 2012. Antibiotics that affect the ribosome. Rev Sci Tech 31, 57-64.
- Landers, T.F., Cohen, B., Wittum, T.E.L., E.I., 2012. A Review of Antibiotic Use in Food Animals: Perspective, Policy, and Potential. Public Health Rep 127, 4-22.

- Larsson, D.G.J., De Pedro, C., Paxeus, N., 2007. Ef**f**luent from drug manufactures contains extremely high levels of pharmaceuticals. J Hazardous Materials 148.
- Lautenbach, E., Bilker, W.B., Tolomeo, P., Maslow, J.N., 2008. Impact of diversity of colonizing strains on strategies for sampling *Escherichia coli* from fecal specimens. J Clin Microbiol 46, 3094-3096.
- Laxminarayan, R., Duse, A., Wattal, C., Zaidi, A.K., Wertheim, H.F., Sumpradit, N.,
  Vlieghe, E., Hara, G.L., Gould, I.M., Goossens, H., Greko, C., So, A.D., Bigdeli,
  M., Tomson, G., Woodhouse, W., Ombaka, E., Peralta, A.Q., Qamar, F.N., Mir, F.,
  Kariuki, S., Bhutta, Z.A., Coates, A., Bergstrom, R., Wright, G.D., Brown, E.D.,
  Cars, O., 2013. Antibiotic resistance-the need for global solutions. Lancet Infect
  Dis 13, 1057-1098.
- Laxminarayan, R., Van Boeckel, T., Teillant, A., 2015. The economic costs of withdrawing antimicrobial growth promoters from the livestock sector, OECD Food, Agriculture and Fisheries Papers, No. 78.
- Lay, K.K., Koowattananukul, C., Chansong, N., Chuanchuen, R., 2012. Antimicrobial resistance, virulence, and phylogenetic characteristics of *Escherichia coli* isolates from clinically healthy swine. Foodborne Pathog Dis 9, 992-1001.
- Lazarus, B., Paterson, D.L., Mollinger, J.L., Rogers, B.A., 2015. Do human extraintestinal *Escherichia coli* infections resistant to expanded-spectrum cephalosporins originate from food-producing animals? A systematic review. Clin Infect Dis 60, 439-452.
- Lee, K.E., Lim, S.I., Choi, H.W., Lim, S.K., Song, J.Y., An, D.J., 2014. Plasmid-mediated AmpC beta-lactamase (CMY-2) gene in *Salmonella* typhimurium isolated from diarrheic pigs in South Korea. BMC Res Notes 7, 329.
- Lee, K.W., Ho Hong, Y., Lee, S.H., Jang, S.I., Park, M.S., Bautista, D.A., Ritter, G.D., Jeong, W., Jeoung, H.Y., An, D.J., Lillehoj, E.P., Lillehoj, H.S., 2012. Effects of anticoccidial and antibiotic growth promoter programs on broiler performance and immune status. Res Vet Sci 93, 721-728.

- Leistner, R., Meyer, E., Gastmeier, P., Pfeifer, Y., Eller, C., Dem, P., Schwab, F., 2013. Risk factors associated with the community-acquired colonization of extendedspectrum beta-lactamase (ESBL) positive *Escherichia Coli.* an exploratory casecontrol study. PLoS One 8, e74323.
- Leverstein-van Hall, M.A., Dierikx, C.M., Cohen Stuart, J., Voets, G.M., van den Munckhof, M.P., van Essen-Zandbergen, A., Platteel, T., Fluit, A.C., van de Sande-Bruinsma, N., Scharinga, J., Bonten, M.J., Mevius, D.J., National, E.s.g., 2011a. Dutch patients, retail chicken meat and poultry share the same ESBL genes, plasmids and strains. Clin Microbiol Infect 17, 873-880.
- Leverstein-van Hall, M.A., Dierikx, C.M., Cohen Stuart, J., Voets, G.M., van den Munckhof, M.P., van Essen-Zandbergen, A., Platteel, T., Fluit, A.C., van de Sande-Bruinsma, N., Scharinga, J., Bonten, M.J., Mevius, D.J., National, E.s.g., 2011b. Dutch patients, retail chicken meat and poultry share the same ESBL genes, plasmids and strains. Clin. Microbiol. Infect. 17, 873-880.
- Levesque, C., Piche, L., Larose, C., Roy, P.H., 1995. PCR mapping of integrons reveals several novel combinations of resistance genes. Antimicrob Agents Chemother 39, 185-191.
- Levy, S.B., 1998. The challenge of antibiotic resistance. Sci Am 278, 46-53.
- Levy, S.B., Marshall, B., 2004. Antibacterial resistance worldwide: causes, challenges and responses. Nat Med 10, S122-129.
- Lewis, H.C., Molbak, K., Reese, C., Aarestrup, F.M., Selchau, M., Sorum, M., Skov, R.L., 2008. Pigs as source of methicillin-resistant *Staphylococcus aureus* CC398 infections in humans, Denmark. Emerg Infect Dis 14, 1383-1389.
- Limoli, D.H., Rockel, A.B., Host, K.M., Jha, A., Kopp, B.T., Hollis, T., Wozniak, D.J., 2014. Cationic antimicrobial peptides promote microbial mutagenesis and pathoadaptation in chronic infections. PLoS Pathog 10, e1004083.
- Liu, Y.Y., Wang, Y., Walsh, T.R., Yi, L.X., Zhang, R., Spencer, J., Doi, Y., Tian, G., Dong,B., Huang, X., Yu, L.F., Gu, D., Ren, H., Chen, X., Lv, L., He, D., Zhou, H., Liang,Z., Liu, J.H., Shen, J., 2016. Emergence of plasmid-mediated colistin resistance

mechanism MCR-1 in animals and human beings in China: a microbiological and molecular biological study. Lancet Infect Dis 16, 161-168.

- Long, K.S., Poehlsgaard, J., Kehrenberg, C., Schwarz, S., Vester, B., 2006. The Cfr rRNA methyltransferase confers resistance to Phenicols, Lincosamides, Oxazolidinones, Pleuromutilins, and Streptogramin A antibiotics. Antimicrob Agents Chemother 50, 2500-2505.
- Lowrance, T.C., Loneragan, G.H., Kunze, D.J., Platt, T.M., Ives, S.E., Scott, H.M., Norby,
  B., Echeverry, A., Brashears, M.M., 2007. Changes in antimicrobial susceptibility
  in a population of *Escherichia coli* isolated from feedlot cattle administered
  ceftiofur crystalline-free acid. Am J Vet Res 68, 501-507.
- Lugsomya, K., Chatsuwan, T., Niyomtham, W., Tummaruk, P., Hampson, D.J., Prapasarakul, N., 2017. Routine prophylactic antimicrobial use is associated with Increased phenotypic and genotypic resistance in commensal *Escherichia coli* isolates recovered from healthy fattening pigs on farms in Thailand. Microb Drug Resist.
- Lupo, A., Coyne, S., Berendonk, T.U., 2012. Origin and evolution of antibiotic resistance: the common mechanisms of emergence and spread in water bodies. Front Microbiol 3, 18.
- Maiden, M.C., Bygraves, J.A., Feil, E., Morelli, G., Russell, J.E., Urwin, R., Zhang, Q.,
  Zhou, J., Zurth, K., Caugant, D.A., Feavers, I.M., Achtman, M., Spratt, B.G.,
  1998. Multilocus sequence typing: a portable approach to the identification of
  clones within populations of pathogenic microorganisms. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S
  A 95, 3140-3145.
- Makita, K., Goto, M., Ozawa, M., Kawanishi, M., Koike, R., Asai, T., Tamura, Y., 2016.
  Multivariable Analysis of the Association Between Antimicrobial Use and
  Antimicrobial Resistance in *Escherichia coli* Isolated from Apparently Healthy
  Pigs in Japan. Microb Drug Resist 22, 28-39.
- Mani, N., Sancheti, P., Jiang, Z.D., McNaney, C., DeCenzo, M., Knight, B., Stankis, M., Kuranda, M., Rothstein, D.M., 1998. Screening systems for detecting inhibitors of

cell wall transglycosylation in *Enterococcus*. Cell wall transglycosylation inhibitors in *Enterococcus*. J Antibiot (Tokyo) 51, 471-479.

- Marshall, B.M., Levy, S.B., 2011. Food animals and antimicrobials: impacts on human health. Clin Microbiol Rev 24, 718-733.
- Marti, R., Zhang, Y., Tien, Y.C., Lapen, D.R., Topp, E., 2013. Assessment of a new Bacteroidales marker targeting North American beaver (*Castor canadensis*) fecal pollution by real-time PCR. J Microbiol Methods 95, 201-206.
- Martinez-Martinez, L., Garcia, I., Ballesta, S., Benedi, V.J., Hernandez-Alles, S., Pascual,
  A., 1998. Energy-dependent accumulation of fluoroquinolones in quinoloneresistant *Klebsiella pneumoniae* strains. Antimicrob Agents Chemother 42, 1850-1852.
- Martinez, J.L., 2008. Antibiotics and antibiotic resistance genes in natural environments. Science 321, 365-367.
- Martinez, J.L., Baquero, F., 2002. Interactions among strategies associated with bacterial infection: pathogenicity, epidemicity, and antibiotic resistance. Clin Microbiol Rev 15, 647-679.
- Martinez, J.L., Baquero, F., 2009. Antibiotics and the evolution of antibiotic resistance. Encyclopedia of life sciences, 1-9.
- Mather, A.E., 2013. Study highlights differences in animal and human *Salmonella* populations. Vet Rec 173, 233.
- Mather, A.E., Reid, S.W., Maskell, D.J., Parkhill, J., Fookes, M.C., Harris, S.R., Brown,
  D.J., Coia, J.E., Mulvey, M.R., Gilmour, M.W., Petrovska, L., de Pinna, E.,
  Kuroda, M., Akiba, M., Izumiya, H., Connor, T.R., Suchard, M.A., Lemey, P.,
  Mellor, D.J., Haydon, D.T., Thomson, N.R., 2013. Distinguishable epidemics of
  multidrug-resistant *Salmonella Typhimurium* DT104 in different hosts. Science
  341, 1514-1517.
- Mathew, A.G., Cissell, R., Liamthong, S., 2007. Antibiotic resistance in bacteria associated with food animals: a United States perspective of livestock production. Foodborne Pathog Dis 4, 115-133.

- Mazurek, J., Pusz, P., Bok, E., Stosik, M., Baldy-Chudzik, K., 2013. The phenotypic and genotypic characteristics of antibiotic resistance in *Escherichia coli* populations isolated from farm animals with different exposure to antimicrobial agents. Pol J Microbiol 62, 173-179.
- McEwen, S.A., 2006. Antibiotic use in animal agriculture: what have we learned and where are we going? Anim Biotechnol 17, 239-250.
- Mehrgan, H., Rahbar, M., 2008. Prevalence of extended-spectrum beta-lactamaseproducing *Escherichia coli* in a tertiary care hospital in Tehran, Iran. Int J Antimicrob Agents 31, 147-151.
- Melancon, P., Lemieux, C., Brakier-Gingras, L., 1988. A mutation in the 530 loop of *Escherichia coli* 16S ribosomal RNA causes resistance to streptomycin. Nucleic Acids Res 16, 9631-9639.
- Mitema, E.S., Kikuvi, G.M., Wegener, H.C., Stohr, K., 2001. An assessment of antimicrobial consumption in food producing animals in Kenya. J Vet Pharmacol Ther 24, 385-390.
- MoAC, 1999. Copyright Division of Animal Feed and Veterinary Products Control 1999. Act of legislation: drugs for animals usage, The Department of Livestock Development (DLD), Ministry of Agriculture and Cooperatives (MoAC), Bangkok, Thailand.
- Moodley, A., Guardabassi, L., 2009. Transmission of IncN plasmids carrying *bla*<sub>CTX-M-1</sub> between commensal *Escherichia coli* in pigs and farm workers. Antimicrob Agents Chemother 53, 1709-1711.
- Mshana, S.E., 2009. State of the globe: evaluating the existence of extended spectrum Beta lactamases. J Glob Infect Dis 1, 85-86.
- Muriuki, F.K., Ogara, W.O., Njeruh, F.M., Mitema, E.S., 2001. Tetracycline residue levels in cattle meat from Nairobi salughter house in Kenya. J Vet Sci 2, 97-101.
- Naseer, U., Sundsfjord, A., 2011. The CTX-M conundrum: dissemination of plasmids and *Escherichia coli* clones. Microb Drug Resist 17, 83-97.

- Nemoy, L.L., Kotetishvili, M., Tigno, J., Keefer-Norris, A., Harris, A.D., Perencevich, E.N., Johnson, J.A., Torpey, D., Sulakvelidze, A., Morris, J.G., Jr., Stine, O.C., 2005.
  Multilocus sequence typing versus pulsed-field gel electrophoresis for characterization of extended-spectrum beta-lactamase-producing *Escherichia coli* isolates. J Clin Microbiol 43, 1776-1781.
- Nhung, N.T., Cuong, N.V., Thwaites, G., Carrique-Mas, J., 2016. Antimicrobial Usage and Antimicrobial Resistance in Animal Production in Southeast Asia: A Review. Antibiotics (Basel) 5.
- Nogrady, N., Paszti, J., Piko, H., Nagy, B., 2006. Class 1 integrons and their conjugal transfer with and without virulence-associated genes in extra-intestinal and intestinal *Escherichia coli* of poultry. Avian Pathol 35, 349-356.
- Normark, B.H., Normark, S., 2002. Evolution and spread of antibiotic resistance. J Intern Med 252, 91-106.
- Novo, A., Andre, S., Viana, P., Nunes, O.C., Manaia, C.M., 2013. Antibiotic resistance, antimicrobial residues and bacterial community composition in urban wastewater. Water Res 47, 1875-1887.
- Oggioni, M.R., Coelho, J.R., Furi, L., Knight, D.R., Viti, C., Orefici, G., Martinez, J.L., Freitas, A.T., Coque, T.M., Morrissey, I., consortium, B., 2015. Significant Differences Characterise the Correlation Coefficients between Biocide and Antibiotic Susceptibility Profiles in *Staphylococcus aureus*. Curr Pharm Des 21, 2054-2057.
- Osei, S.J., 2014. Antibiotic Types and Handling Practices in Disease Management among Pig Farms in Ashanti Region, Ghana. J Vet Med, 8.
- Ostroff, S.M., Tarr, P.I., Neill, M.A., Lewis, J.H., Hargrett-Bean, N., Kobayashi, J.M., 1989. Toxin genotypes and plasmid profiles as determinants of systemic sequelae in *Escherichia coli* O157:H7 infections. J Infect Dis 160, 994-998.
- Otte, J., Roland-Holst, D., Pfeiffer, D., Soares-Magalhaes, R., Rushton, J., Graham, J., Silbergeld, E., 2007. Industrial Livestock Production and Global Health Risks PPLPI Research Report. DFID, 21.

- Overdevest, I.T., Willemsen, I., Elberts, S., Verhulst, C., Kluytmans, J.A., 2011a. Laboratory detection of extended-spectrum-beta-lactamase-producing *Enterobacteriaceae*: evaluation of two screening agar plates and two confirmation techniques. J Clin Microbiol 49, 519-522.
- Overdevest, I.T., Willemsen, I., Elberts, S., Verhulst, C., Rijnsburger, M., Savelkoul, P., Kluytmans, J.A., 2011b. Evaluation of the DiversiLab typing method in a multicenter study assessing horizontal spread of highly resistant gram-negative rods. J Clin Microbiol 49, 3551-3554.
- Padungtod, P., Kaneene, J.B., 2006. *Salmonella* in food animals and humans in northern Thailand. Int J Food Microbiol 108, 346-354.
- Padungtod, P., Kaneene, J.B., Hanson, R., Morita, Y., Boonmar, S., 2006. Antimicrobial resistance in *Campylobacter* isolated from food animals and humans in northern Thailand. FEMS Immunol Med Microbiol 47, 217-225.
- Paphitou, N.I., 2013. Antimicrobial resistance: action to combat the rising microbial challenges. Int J Antimicrob Agents 42 Suppl, S25-28.
- Paros, M., Tarr, P.I., Kim, H., Besser, T.E., Hancock, D.D., 1993. A comparison of human and bovine *Escherichia coli* O157:H7 isolates by toxin genotype, plasmid profile, and bacteriophage lambda-restriction fragment length polymorphism profile. J Infect Dis 168, 1300-1303.
- Partridge, S.R., Recchia, G.D., Scaramuzzi, C., Collis, C.M., Stokes, H.W., Hall, R.M., 2000. Definition of the *attl1* site of class 1 integrons. Microbiology 146 (Pt 11), 2855-2864.
- Paulsen, I.T., Littlejohn, T.G., Radstrom, P., Sundstrom, L., Skold, O., Swedberg, G., Skurray, R.A., 1993. The 3' conserved segment of integrons contains a gene associated with multidrug resistance to antiseptics and disinfectants. Antimicrob Agents Chemother 37, 761-768.
- Pfaller, M.A., 2006. Flavophospholipol use in animals: positive implications for antimicrobial resistance based on its microbiologic properties. Diagn Microbiol Infect Dis 56, 115-121.

- PHE, 2014. New report reveals increase in use of antibiotics linked to rising levels of antibiotic resistance. . News Release London.
- Phongpaichit, S., Liamthong, S., Mathew, A.G., Chethanond, U., 2007. Prevalence of class 1 integrons in commensal *Escherichia coli* from pigs and pig farmers in Thailand. J Food Prot 70, 292-299.
- Plumb, 2015a. Plumb's Veterinary Drug Handbook. 8th ed. Wiley-Blackwell Press, Indianapolis 1586.
- Plumb, D.C., 2015b. Plumb's Veterinary Drug Handbook. 8th ed.Wiley-Blackwell Press, Indianapolis, IN. 434.
- Poole, T.L., McReynolds, J.L., Edrington, T.S., Byrd, J.A., Callaway, T.R., Nisbet, D.J.,
   2006. Effect of flavophospholipol on conjugation frequency between *Escherichia coli* donor and recipient pairs in vitro and in the chicken gastrointestinal tract. J
   Antimicrob Chemother 58, 359-366.
- Povilonis, J., Seputiene, V., Ruzauskas, M., Siugzdiniene, R., Virgailis, M., Pavilonis, A.,
  Suziedeliene, E., 2010. Transferable class 1 and 2 integrons in *Escherichia coli* and *Salmonella enterica* isolates of human and animal origin in Lithuania.
  Foodborne Pathog Dis 7, 1185-1192.
- Powell, M., Hu, Y., Livermore, D.M., 1991. Resistance to trimethoprim in *Haemophilus influenzae*. Infection 19, 174-177.
- Prapasarakul, N., Tummaruk, P., Niyomtum, W., Tripipat, T., Serichantalergs, O., 2010.
   Virulence genes and antimicrobial susceptibilities of hemolytic and nonhemolytic
   *Escherichia coli* isolated from post-weaning piglets in central Thailand. J Vet
   Med Sci 72, 1603-1608.
- Quintana-Hayashi, M.P., Thakur, S., 2012. Longitudinal study of the persistence of antimicrobial-resistant *Campylobacter* strains in distinct swine production systems on farms, at slaughter, and in the environment. Appl Environ Microbiol 78, 2698-2705.
- Raufu, I.A., Fashae, K., Ameh, J.A., Ambali, A., Ogunsola, F.T., Coker, A.O., Hendriksen, R.S., 2014. Persistence of fluoroquinolone-resistant *Salmonella enterica* serovar

Kentucky from poultry and poultry sources in Nigeria. J Infect Dev Ctries 8, 384-388.

- Recchia, G.D., Hall, R.M., 1995. Gene cassettes: a new class of mobile element. Microbiology 141 ( Pt 12), 3015-3027.
- Rehman, M.U., Zhang, H., Huang, S., Iqbal, M.K., Mehmood, K., Luo, H., Li, J., 2017.
  Characteristics of Integrons and Associated Gene Cassettes in AntibioticResistant *Escherichia coli* Isolated from Free-Ranging Food Animals in China. J
  Food Sci 82, 1902-1907.
- Renoux, G., Terdjman, A., 1951. Clinical value of the precise identification of gramnegative urinary bacilli; practical value of the medium eosine-methylene blue (E.M.B.). Presse Med 59, 203-206.
- Richards, H.A., Perez-Conesa, D., Doane, C.A., Gillespie, B.E., Mount, J.R., Oliver, S.P.,
  Pangloli, P., Draughon, F.A., 2006. Genetic characterization of a diverse *Escherichia coli* O157:H7 population from a variety of farm environments.
  Foodborne Pathog Dis 3, 259-265.
- Riedl, S., Ohlsen, K., Werner, G., Witte, W., Hacker, J., 2000. Impact of flavophospholipol and vancomycin on conjugational transfer of vancomycin resistance plasmids. Antimicrob Agents Chemother 44, 3189-3192.
- Roberts, M.C., 2003. Acquired tetracycline and/or macrolide-lincosamidesstreptogramin resistance in anaerobes. Anaerobe 9, 63-69.
- Rodriguez-Beltran, J., Rodriguez-Rojas, A., Yubero, E., Blazquez, J., 2013. The animal food supplement sepiolite promotes a direct horizontal transfer of antibiotic resistance plasmids between bacterial species. Antimicrob Agents Chemother 57, 2651-2653.
- Ross, J.I., Eady, E.A., Cove, J.H., Cunliffe, W.J., 1998. 16S rRNA mutation associated with tetracycline resistance in a gram-positive bacterium. Antimicrob Agents Chemother 42, 1702-1705.

- Rozwandowicz, M., Brouwer, M.S.M., Fischer, J., Wagenaar, J.A., Gonzalez-Zorn, B., Guerra, B., Mevius, D.J., Hordijk, J., 2018. Plasmids carrying antimicrobial resistance genes in *Enterobacteriaceae*. J Antimicrob Chemother.
- Rushton, J., 2010. Poultry sector development, highly pathogenic avian in**fl**uenza and the smallholder production systems. CAB Reviews: Perspectives in Agriculture, Veterinary Science. Nutrition and Natural Resource, 5.
- Salyers, A.A., Amabile-Cuevas, C.F., 1997. Why are antibiotic resistance genes so resistant to elimination? Antimicrob Agents Chemother 41, 2321-2325.
- SCENIHR, 2009. Assessment of the antibiotic resistance effects of biocides. Brussels. European Commission. 1-87.
- Schaufler, K., Semmler, T., Pickard, D.J., de Toro, M., de la Cruz, F., Wieler, L.H., Ewers,
  C., Guenther, S., 2016. Carriage of extended-spectrum beta-lactamase-plasmids
  Does not reduce fitness but enhances virulence in some strains of pandemic *E. coli* lineages. Front Microbiol 7, 336.
- Schmithausen, R.M., Schulze-Geisthoevel, S.V., Stemmer, F., El-Jade, M., Reif, M.,
  Hack, S., Meilaender, A., Montabauer, G., Fimmers, R., Parcina, M., Hoerauf, A.,
  Exner, M., Petersen, B., Bierbaum, G., Bekeredjian-Ding, I., 2015. Analysis of
  Transmission of MRSA and ESBL-E among Pigs and Farm Personnel. PLoS One
  10, e0138173.
- Schokker, D., Zhang, J., Zhang, L.L., Vastenhouw, S.A., Heilig, H.G., Smidt, H., Rebel,
  J.M., Smits, M.A., 2014. Early-life environmental variation affects intestinal
  microbiota and immune development in new-born piglets. PLoS One 9,
  e100040.
- Schwaiger, K., Huther, S., Holzel, C., Kampf, P., Bauer, J., 2012. Prevalence of antibiotic-resistant enterobacteriaceae isolated from chicken and pork meat purchased at the slaughterhouse and at retail in Bavaria, Germany. Int J Food Microbiol 154, 206-211.
- Shaheen, B.W., Nayak, R., Foley, S.L., Kweon, O., Deck, J., Park, M., Rafii, F., Boothe, D.M., 2011. Molecular characterization of resistance to extended-spectrum

cephalosporins in clinical *Escherichia coli* isolates from companion animals in the United States. Antimicrob Agents Chemother 55, 5666-5675.

- Sigmund, C.D., Ettayebi, M., Morgan, E.A., 1984. Antibiotic resistance mutations in 16S and 23S ribosomal RNA genes of *Escherichia coli*. Nucleic Acids Res 12, 4653-4663.
- Sim, W.J., Lee, J.W., Lee, E.S., Shin, S.K., Hwang, S.R., Oh, J.E., 2011. Occurrence and distribution of pharmaceuticals in wastewater from households, livestock farms, hospitals and pharmaceutical manufactures. Chemosphere 82, 179-186.
- Singer, R.S., Finch, R., Wegener, H.C., Bywater, R., Walters, J., Lipsitch, M., 2003. Antibiotic resistance--the interplay between antibiotic use in animals and human beings. Lancet Infect Dis 3, 47-51.
- Skov, R.L., Monnet, D.L., 2016. Plasmid-mediated colistin resistance (*mcr-1* gene): three months later, the story unfolds. Euro Surveill 21, 30155.
- Smillie, C., Garcillan-Barcia, M.P., Francia, M.V., Rocha, E.P., de la Cruz, F., 2010. Mobility of plasmids. Microbiol Mol Biol Rev 74, 434-452.
- Souza, M.R., Klassen, G., Toni, F.D., Rigo, L.U., Henkes, C., Pigatto, C.P., Dalagassa Cde, B., Fadel-Picheth, C.M., 2010. Biochemical properties, enterohaemolysin production and plasmid carriage of Shiga toxin-producing *Escherichia coli* strains. Mem Inst Oswaldo Cruz 105, 318-321.
- Stampi, S., Caprioli, A., De Luca, G., Quaglio, P., Sacchetti, R., Zanetti, F., 2004. Detection of *Escherichia coli* O157 in bovine meat products in northern Italy. Int J Food Microbiol 90, 257-262.
- Stiftung, H.B., 2014. Meat Atlas. Fact and figures about animals we eat. 68.
- Stokes, H.W., Hall, R.M., 1989. A novel family of potentially mobile DNA elements encoding site-specific gene-integration functions: integrons. Mol Microbiol 3, 1669-1683.
- Strateva, T., Yordanov, D., 2009. *Pseudomonas aeruginosa* a phenomenon of bacterial resistance. J Med Microbiol 58, 1133-1148.
- Straw, B.E., Dewey, C.E., Wilson, M.R., 2006. Differential diagnosis of disease. In: Disease of Swine 9th ed edited by Straw. B.E., Zimmerman, J.J., D'Allaire, S., Taylor, D.J. . 241-263.
- Strom, G., Boqvist, S., Albihn, A., Fernstrom, L.L., Andersson Djurfeldt, A., Sokerya, S., Sothyra, T., Magnusson, U., 2018. Antimicrobials in small-scale urban pig farming in a lower middle-income country - arbitrary use and high resistance levels. Antimicrob Resist Infect Control 7, 35.
- Sunde, M., Simonsen, G.S., Slettemeas, J.S., Bockerman, I., Norstrom, M., 2015.
   Integron, Plasmid and Host Strain Characteristics of *Escherichia coli* from Humans and Food Included in the Norwegian Antimicrobial Resistance Monitoring Programs. PLoS One 10, e0128797.
- Szmolka, A., Fortini, D., Villa, L., Carattoli, A., Anjum, M.F., Nagy, B., 2011. First report on IncN plasmid-mediated quinolone resistance gene *qnrS1* in porcine *Escherichia coli* in Europe. Microb Drug Resist 17, 567-573.
- Szmolka, A., Nagy, B., 2013. Multidrug resistant commensal *Escherichia coli* in animals and its impact for public health. Front Microbiol 4, 258.
- Tartof, S.Y., Solberg, O.D., Manges, A.R., Riley, L.W., 2005. Analysis of a uropathogenic *Escherichia coli* clonal group by multilocus sequence typing. J Clin Microbiol 43, 5860-5864.
- Telenti, A., Honore, N., Bernasconi, C., March, J., Ortega, A., Heym, B., Takiff, H.E., Cole, S.T., 1997. Genotypic assessment of isoniazid and rifampin resistance in *Mycobacterium tuberculosis*: a blind study at reference laboratory level. J Clin Microbiol 35, 719-723.
- Thai, T.H., Hirai, T., Lan, N.T., Yamaguchi, R., 2012. Antibiotic resistance profiles of Salmonella serovars isolated from retail pork and chicken meat in North Vietnam. Int J Food Microbiol 156, 147-151.
- Thanner, S., Drissner, D., Walsh, F., 2016. Antimicrobial Resistance in Agriculture. American Society for Microbiology 7, 2.

- Thomson, J.M., Bonomo, R.A., 2005. The threat of antibiotic resistance in Gram-negative pathogenic bacteria: beta-lactams in peril! Curr Opin Microbiol 8, 518-524.
- Thorsteinsdottir, T.R., Haraldsson, G., Fridriksdottir, V., Kristinsson, K.G., Gunnarsson,
   E., 2010. Prevalence and genetic relatedness of antimicrobial-resistant
   *Escherichia coli* isolated from animals, foods and humans in Iceland. Zoonoses
   Public Health 57, 189-196.
- Tolmasky, M.E., 2000. Bacterial resistance to aminoglycosides and beta-lactams: the Tn1331 transposon paradigm. Front Biosci 5, D20-29.
- Toval, F., Kohler, C.D., Vogel, U., Wagenlehner, F., Mellmann, A., Fruth, A., Schmidt,
   M.A., Karch, H., Bielaszewska, M., Dobrindt, U., 2014. Characterization of
   *Escherichia coli* isolates from hospital inpatients or outpatients with urinary tract
   infection. J Clin Microbiol 52, 407-418.
- Trongjit, S., Angkittitrakul, S., Chuanchuen, R., 2016. Occurrence and molecular characteristics of antimicrobial resistance of *Escherichia coli* from broilers, pigs and meat products in Thailand and Cambodia provinces. Microbiol Immunol 60, 575-585.
- USDA, 2017. Isolation and identification of *Salmonella* from meat, poultry, pasteurized egg, and siluriformes (fish) products and carcass and environmental sponges. QD-F-Micro-0004.07 MLG 4.09 19.
- USDA, 2018. Livestock and Poultry: World Markets and Trade 2018. 30.
- Usui, M., Uchida, I., Tamura, Y., 2014. Selection of macrolide-resistant Campylobacter in pigs treated with macrolides. Vet Rec 175, 430.
- van den Bogaard, A.E., Hazen, M., Hoyer, M., Oostenbach, P., Stobberingh, E.E., 2002. Effects of flavophospholipol on resistance in fecal *Escherichia coli* and *Enterococci* of fattening pigs. Antimicrob Agents Chemother 46, 110-118.
- van Duijkeren, E., Greko, C., Pringle, M., Baptiste, K.E., Catry, B., Jukes, H., Moreno, M.A., Pomba, M.C., Pyorala, S., Rantala, M., Ruzauskas, M., Sanders, P., Teale, C., Threlfall, E.J., Torren-Edo, J., Torneke, K., 2014. Pleuromutilins: use in food-

producing animals in the European Union, development of resistance and impact on human and animal health. J Antimicrob Chemother 69, 2022-2031.

- Vatopoulos, A., 2008. High rates of metallo-beta-lactamase-producing *Klebsiella pneumoniae* in Greece--a review of the current evidence. Euro Surveill 13.
- Versalovic, J., Koeuth, T., McCabe, E.R., Lupski, J.R., 1991. Use of the polymerase chain reaction for physical mapping of *Escherichia coli* genes. J Bacteriol 173, 5253-5255.
- Volkova, V.V., Lanzas, C., Lu, Z., Grohn, Y.T., 2012. Mathematical model of plasmidmediated resistance to ceftiofur in commensal enteric *Escherichia coli* of cattle. PLoS One 7, e36738.
- Walsh, C., 2004. Molecular mechanisms that confer antibacterial drug resistance. Nature 6797, 775-781.
- Wegst-Uhrich, S.R., Navarro, D.A., Zimmerman, L., Aga, D.S., 2014. Assessing antibiotic sorption in soil: a literature review and new case studies on sulfonamides and macrolides. Chem Cent J 8, 5.
- Wellington, E.M., Boxall, A.B., Cross, P., Feil, E.J., Gaze, W.H., Hawkey, P.M., Johnson-Rollings, A.S., Jones, D.L., Lee, N.M., Otten, W., Thomas, C.M., Williams, A.P., 2013. The role of the natural environment in the emergence of antibiotic resistance in gram-negative bacteria. Lancet Infect Dis 13, 155-165.
- Werner, G., Coque, T.M., Franz, C.M., Grohmann, E., Hegstad, K., Jensen, L., van Schaik, W., Weaver, K., 2013. Antibiotic resistant enterococci-tales of a drug resistance gene trafficker. Int J Med Microbiol 303, 360-379.
- WHO, 2011. Critically important antimicrobials for human medicine 3<sup>rd</sup> revision. 38.
- WHO, 2014. Antimicrobial Resistance Global Report On Surveillance. Geneva. Switzerland. 256.
- WHO, 2016. Critically important antimicrobials for human medicine 5<sup>th</sup> revision : Ranking of medically important antimicrobials for risk management of antimicrobial resistance due to non-human use 1-48.

- Wielinga, P.R., Jensen, V.F., Aarestrup, F.M., Schlundt, J., 2014. Evidence-based policy for controlling antimicrobial resistance in the food chain in Denmark. Food Control 40, 185-192.
- Woolridge, M., 2012. Evidence for the circulation of antimicrobial-resistant strains and genes in nature and especially between humans and animals. Rev sci tech Off int Epiz 31, 231-247.
- Xavier, B.B., Lammens, C., Ruhal, R., Kumar-Singh, S., Butaye, P., Goossens, H.,
  Malhotra-Kumar, S., 2016. Identification of a novel plasmid-mediated colistinresistance gene, *mcr-2*, in *Escherichia coli*, Belgium, June 2016. Euro Surveill
  21.
- Xu, L., Ensor, V., Gossain, S., Nye, K., Hawkey, P., 2005. Rapid and simple detection of *bla*<sub>CTX-M</sub> genes by multiplex PCR assay. J Med Microbiol 54, 1183-1187.
- Xu, X., Cui, S., Zhang, F., Luo, Y., Gu, Y., Yang, B., Li, F., Chen, Q., Zhou, G., Wang, Y., Pang, L., Lin, L., 2014. Prevalence and characterization of cefotaxime and ciprofloxacin co-resistant *Escherichia coli* isolates in retail chicken carcasses and Ground Pork, China. Microb Drug Resist 20, 73-81.
- Yao, Q., Zeng, Z., Hou, J., Deng, Y., He, L., Tian, W., Zheng, H., Chen, Z., Liu, J.H.,
  2011. Dissemination of the *rmtB* gene carried on IncF and IncN plasmids among *Enterobacteriaceae* in a pig farm and its environment. J Antimicrob Chemother
  66, 2475-2479.
- Yin, W., Li, H., Shen, Y., Liu, Z., Wang, S., Shen, Z., Zhang, R., Walsh, T.R., Shen, J.,
  Wang, Y., 2017. Novel Plasmid-Mediated Colistin Resistance Gene *mcr-3* in *Escherichia coli*. MBio 8.
- You, Y., Silbergeld, E.K., 2014. Learning from agriculture: understanding low-dose antimicrobials as drivers of resistome expansion. Front Microbiol 5, 284.
- Zhang, W.J., Wang, X.M., Dai, L., Hua, X., Dong, Z., Schwarz, S., Liu, S., 2015. Novel conjugative plasmid from *Escherichia coli* of swine origin that coharbors the multiresistance gene *cfr* and the extended-spectrum-beta-lactamase gene *bla*<sub>CTX-M-14b</sub>. Antimicrob Agents Chemother 59, 1337-1340.

- Zhao, S., Mitchell, S.E., Meng, J., Kresovich, S., Doyle, M.P., Dean, R.E., Casa, A.M., Weller, J.W., 2004. Genomic typing of *Escherichia coli* O157:H7 by semiautomated fluorescent AFLP analysis. Microbes Infect 2.
- Zheng, H., Zeng, Z., Chen, S., Liu, Y., Yao, Q., Deng, Y., Chen, X., Lv, L., Zhuo, C., Chen, Z., Liu, J.H., 2012. Prevalence and characterisation of CTX-M betalactamases amongst *Escherichia coli* isolates from healthy food animals in China. Int J Antimicrob Agents 39, 305-310.
- Zhu, Y.G., Johnson, T.A., Su, J.Q., Qiao, M., Guo, G.X., Stedtfeld, R.D., Hashsham, S.A., Tiedje, J.M., 2013. Diverse and abundant antibiotic resistance genes in Chinese swine farms. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A 110, 3435-3440.
- Zurfluh, K., Jakobi, G., Stephan, R., Hachler, H., Nuesch-Inderbinen, M., 2014. Replicon typing of plasmids carrying *bla*<sub>CTX-M-1</sub> in *Enterobacteriaceae* of animal, environmental and human origin. Front Microbiol 5, 555.
- Zurfuh, K., Poirel, L., Nordmann, P., Nuesch-Inderbinen, M., Hachler, H., Stephan, R., 2016. Occurrence of the plasmid-borne *mcr-1* colistin resistance gene in extended-spectrum β-lactamase-producing *Enterobacteriaceae* in river water and imported vegetable samples in Switzerland. Antimicrob Agents Chemother 60, 2594-2595.

จุฬาลงกรณ์มหาวิทยาลัย Chulalongkorn University

## APPENDIX

#### Preparation of media, solution and buffers

#### 1. Media for biochemical test

1.1 Cary-Blair Transport medium Disodium hydrogen phosphate 1.1 g Sodium thioglycolate 1.5 g Sodium chloride 5.0 g Calcium chloride 0.09 g Agar 5.6 g Add water to 1000 ml Adjusted pH 8.4 ± 0.2 and sterilized at 121 °C 15 minutes 1.2 0.85 % NaCl Sodium chloride 8.5 g Add water to 1000 ml Adjusted pH 8.4  $\pm$  0.2 and sterilized at 121  $^{\circ}\text{C}$  15 minutes Eosine Methylene Blue agar medium 1.3 Nutrient agar medium 1.4 Peptone 5.0 g Sodium chloride 5.0 g Peptone 1.5 g Yeast extract 1.500 Agar 15.000 Final pH ( at 25°C) 7.4±0.2 Pancreatic Digest of Gelatin 10.0 g 5.0 g Lactose 5.0 g Sucrose Dipotassium Phosphate 2.0 g Agar 13.5 g Eosin Y 0.4 g Methylene Blue 0.065 g Add water to 1000 ml Adjusted pH 7.4 ± 0.2 and sterilized at 121 °C 15 minutes

#### 1.5 Methyl Red- Voges Proskauer (MR-VP) broth medium

Buffered peptone	7.0 g
Dextrose	5.0 g
Dipotassium phosphate	5.0 g

	Add water to		1000 ml
	Adjusted pH 6.9 $\pm$ 0.2 and sterilized at 121 $^\circ C$ 15	minutes	
1.6	MR reagents		
	Methyl Red		0.02 g
	Ethyl Alcohol		60.0 ml
	Add water to		100 ml
1.7	VP reagent A		
	Alpha-Naphthol 5%	50.0 g	
	Absolute Ethanol	1000 ml	
1.8	VP reagent B		
	Potassium Hydroxide		400.0 g
	Water		1000 ml
1.9	Indole broth medium		
	Casein Peptone	20.0 g	
	Potassium Hydroxide		400.0 g
	Water		1000 ml
	Adjusted pH 7.0 $\pm$ 0.2 and sterilized at 121 $^\circ C$ 15	minutes	
1.10	Indole Kovacs reagents		
	p-Dimethylaminobenzaldehyde	50.0 g	
	Hydrochloric Acid, 37%	250 ml	
	Amyl Alcohol	B	750 ml
1.11	Simmon Citrate agar medium		
	Magnesium sulphate		0.2 g
	Ammonium dihydrogen phosphate	1.0 g	
	Dipotassium phosphate	1.0 g	
	Sodium citrate	ERSITY	2.0 g
	Sodium chloride	5.0 g	
	Bromothymol blue	0.08 g	
	Agar		15.0 g
	Adjusted pH 6.8 ± 0.2 and sterilized at 121 $^\circ\text{C}$ 15	minutes	

### 2. Buffer for PFGE

2.1 1M Tris-HCl, pH 8.0

Tris base	121.0 g
Ultrapure water	700.0 ml
Adjust pH to 8.0 by 6 N HCI	
Add ultrapure water to be 1000 ml and sterilize b	y autoclaving

138

2.2 10 N NaoH

		NaOH		400.0 g	
		Add sterile ultrapure water	800.0 ml		
		Cool solution to room temperature			
		Add sterile ultrapure water to be 1000 ml			
2.3	0.5 M ED	TA, pH 8.0			
		Na <sub>2</sub> EDTA.2H <sub>2</sub> O		186.1 g	
		Ultrapure water	800.0 ml		
		Adjust pH to 8.0 by 10 N NaoH			
		Add ultrapure water to be 1000 ml and sterilize by	autoclavin	g	
2.4	20% SDS				
		SDS		20.0 g	
		Sterile ultrapure water		80.0 ml	
2.5	20 mg/ml	Proteinase K stock solution			
		Proteinase K	>	100.0 mg	
		Sterile ultrapure water		5.0 ml	
		Mix and dispense in 500 µl in microcentrifuge tube	sand store	e at -20°C	
2.6	10% N-la	uryl sarcosine, Sodium salt (Sarcosyl)			
		Sodium lauryl sarcosine	10.0 g		
		Sterile ultrapure water		90.0 ml	
2.7	10X Tris-I	Borate EDTA (TBE) buffer, pH 8.3			
		Tris base	108.0 g		
		Boric acid	55.0 g		
		0.5 M EDTA, pH 8.0	40.0 ml		
		Dilute to 1000 ml with sterile ultrapure water and st	erilize by a	autoclaving	
2.8	Ethidium	Bromide stock solution			
		Ethidium bromide	10.0 mg		
		Sterile ultrapure water		1.0 ml	
		For staining, dilute 10 $\mu I$ in 100 ml distilled water			
2.9	Tris-EDTA	A (TE) buffer, pH 8.0			
		1M Tris-HCl, pH 8.0	10.0 ml		
		0.5 M EDTA, pH 8.0	2.0 ml		
		Dilute to 1000 ml with sterile ultrapure water			
2.10	Cell susp	ension buffer, pH 8.0			
		1M Tris-HCl, pH 8.0	10.0 ml		
		0.5 M EDTA, pH 8.0	20.0 ml		
		Dilute to 100 ml with sterile ultrapure water			
2.11 Cell lysis buffer					
			25.0 ml		

0.5 M EDTA. pH 8.0	50.0 ml
10% Sodium lauryl sarcosine	50.0 ml
Dilute to 500 ml with sterile ultrapure water	

#### Script for MLST data analysis

Adenylate kinase (ADK)

#### Fumarate hydratase (Fumc)

(gyrB) DNA gyrase B

#### gyrase B จุฬาลงกรณมหาวิทยาลย

(1)AGTGATCATGACCGTTCTGCACGCAGGCGGTAAATTTGACGATAACTCCTATAAAGTGTCCGGCGGTCTGCACGG CGTTGGTGTTTCGGTAGTAAACGCCCTGTCGCAAAAACTGGAGCTGGTTATCCAGCGCGAGGGTAAAATTCACCGTC AGATCTACGAACACGGTGTACCGCAGGCTCCGCTGGCGGTTACCGGCGAGACTGAAAAAACCGGCACCATGGTGC GTTTCTGGCCCAGCCTCGAAACCTTCACCAATGTGACCGAGTTCGAATATGAAATTCTGGCGAAACGTCTGCGTGAG TTGTCGTTCCTCAACTCCGGCGTTTCCATTCGTCTGCGCGATAAGCGCGACGGCAAAGAAGACCACTTCCACTATGA AGGCGGCATCAAGGCGTTCGTTGAATATCTGAACAAGAACAAAACGCCGATCCACCCGAATATCTTCTACTTCTCCA CTGAAAAAGACGGTATTGGCGTCGAAGTGGCGTTGCAGTGGAACGATGGCTTCCAGGAAAACATCTACTGCTTTACC AACAACATTCCG(547)

#### ICD (isocitrate dehydrogenase)

TGCGCCAGGAGCTGGATCTTTACATCTGCCTACGTCCGGTACGTTACTACCAGGGCACTCCAAGCCCGGTTAAACA CCCTGAACTGACCGATATGGTTATCTTCCGTGAAAACTCGGAAGACATTTATGCGGGTATCGAATGGAAAGCTGACT CTGCCGACGCAGAGAAAGTGATTAAATTCCTGCGTGAAGAAGATGGGCGTGAAGAAAATTCGTTTCCCGGAACATTGT GGTATCGGCATTAAGCCGTGTTCTGAAGAAGGCACCAAACGTCTGGTTCGTGCAGCGATCGAATACGCAATTGCTAA TGATCGAGACTCTGTGACTCTGGTGCACAAAGGCAACATCATGAA(657)ATTCACCGAAGGTGCGTTTAAAGACTGG GGCTACCAGTTAGCGCGTGAAGAGTTTGGCGGAGAATTGATCGACGGCGGCCCGTGGCTGAAAGTCAAAAACCCG AACACCGGCAAAGAGATCGTCATTAAAGACGTGATCGCTGATGCGT

#### MDH (malate dehydrogenase)

# purA (adenylate synthase)

Sequence data from HiMLST ST10 Clonal complex (Cplx) = ST10 Cplx

#### Allelic profiles

#### adk 11

#### fumC 11

#### gyrB 4

GGTCTGCACGGCGTTGGTGTTTCGGTAGTAAACGCCCTGTCGCAAAAACTGGAGCTGGTTATCCAGCGCGAGGGTA AAATTCACCGTCAGATCTACGAACACGGTGTACCGCAGGCCCCGCTGGCGGTTACCGGCGAGACTGAAAAAACCG GCACCATGGTGCGTTTCTGGCCCAGCCTCGAAACCTTCACCAATGTGACCGAGTTCGAATATGAAATTCTGGCGAAA CGTCTGCGTGAGTTGTCGTTCCTCAACTCCGGCGTTTCCATTCGTCTGCGCGACAAGCGCGACGGCAAAGAAGAACAC ACTTCCACTATGAAGGCGGCATCAAGGCGTTCGTTGAATATCTGAACAAGAACAAAACGCCGATCCACCCGAATATC TTCTACTTCTCCACTGAAAAAGACGGTATTGGCGTCGAAGTGGCGTTGCAGTGGAACGATGGCTTCCAGGAAAACAT CT

## icd 8 CHULALONGKORN UNIVERSITY

TTACCATTCTGCCGCTGCTGTCACAGGTTCCTGGCGTTAGTTTTACCGAGCAGGAAGTGGCTGATCTGACCAAACGC ATCCAGAACGCGGGTACTGAAGTGGTTGAAGCGAAGGCCGGTGGCGGGTCTGCAACCCTGTCTATGGG purA 8

#### recA 2

CGCACGTAAACTGGGCGTCGATATCGACAACCTGCTGTGCTCCCAGCCGGACACCGGCGAGCAGGCACTGGAAAT CTGTGACGCCCTGGCGCGTTCTGGCGCAGTAGACGTTATCGTCGTTGACTCCGTGGCGGCACTGACGCCGAAAGC GGAAATCGAAGGCGAAATCGGCGACTCTCACATGGGCCTTGCGGCACGTATGATGAGGCCAGGCGATGCGTAAGCT GGCGGGTAACCTGAAGCAGTCCAACACGCTGCTGATCTTCATCAACCAGATCCGTATGAAAATTGGTGTGATGTTCG GTAACCCGGAAACCACTACCGGTGGTAACGCGCTGAAATTCTACGCCTCTGTTCGTCTCGACATCCGTCGTATCGGC GCGGTGAAAGAGGGCGAAAACGTGGTGGGTAGCGAAACCCGCGTGAAAGTGGTGAAGAACAAAATCGCTGCGCC GTTTAAACAGGCTGAATTCCAGATCCTCTACGGCGAAGGTATCAACTTCTACGGCGA

ST31

Clonal complex (Cplx) = ST31 Cplx Allelic profiles

adk 18

#### fumC 22

gyrB 17

GGTCTGCACGGCGTTGGTGTTTCGGTAGTAAACGCCCTGTCGCAAAAACTGGAGCTGGTTATCCAGCGCGAGGGTA AAATTCACCGTCAGATCTACGAACACGGTGTACCGCAGGCCCCGCTGGCGGTTACCGGCGAGACTGAAAAAACCG GCACCATGGTGCGTTTCTGGCCTAGCCTCGAAACCTTCACCAATGTGACCGAGTTCGAATATGAAATTCTGGCGAAA CGTCTGCGTGAGTTGTCGTTCCTCAACTCCGGCGTTTCCATTCGTCTGCGCGACAAGCGTGACGGCAAAGAAGAAC ACTTCCACTATGAAGGCGGCATCAAAGCGTTCGTTGAATATCTGAACAAGAACAAAACGCCGATCCACCCAAATATC TTCTACTTCTCCACCGAAAAAGATGGTATTGGCGTTGAAGTGGCGTTGCAGTGGAACGATGGCTTCCAGGAAAACAT CT

icd 6

recA 4

TGCACGTAAACTGGGCGTCGATATCGACAACCTGCTGTGCTCCCAGCCGGACACTGGCGAGCAGGCACTGGAAAT CTGTGACGCCCTGGCGCGTTCTGGCGCAGTAGACGTTATCGTCGTTGACTCCGTGGCGGCGCACTGACGCCGAAAGC GGAAATCGAAGGCGAAATCGGCGACTCTCACATGGGCCTTGCGGCACGTATGATGAGGCCAGGCGATGCGTAAGCT GGCGGGTAACCTGAAGCAGTCCAACACGCTGCTGATCTTCATCAACCAGATCCGTATGAAAATTGGTGTGGTGATGTTCG GTAACCCGGAAACCACTACCGGTGGTAACGCGCTGAAATTCTACGCCTCTGTTCGTCTCGACATCCGTCGTATCGGC GCGGTGAAAGAGGGCGAAAACGTGGTGGGTAGCGAAACCCGTGTGAAAGTGGTGAAGAACAAAATCGCTGCGCC GTTTAAACAGGCTGAATTCCAGATCCTCTACGGCGAAGGTATCAACTTCTATGGCGA

#### ST44

Clonal complex (Cplx) = ST10 Cplx Allelic profiles

### adk 10

GGGGAAAGGGACTCAGGCTCAGTTCATCATGGAGAAATATGGTATTCCGCAAATCTCCACTGGCGATATGCTGCGTG CTGCGGTCAAATCTGGCTCCGAGCTGGGTAAACAAGCAAAGGACATTATGGATGCTGGCAAACTGGTCACCGACGA ACTGGTGATCGCGCTGGTTAAAGAGCGCATTGCTCAGGAAGACTGCCGTAATGGTTTCCTGTTGGACGGCTTCCCG CGTACCATTCCGCAGGCAGACGCGATGAAAGAAGCGGGGCATCAATGTTGATTACGTTCTGGAATTCGACGTACCGG ACGAACTGATCGTTGACCGTATCGTCGGTCGCCGCGTTCATGCGCCGTCTGGTCGTGTTTATCACGTTAAATTCAATC CGCCGAAAGTAGAAGGCAAAGACGACGTTACCGGTGAAGAACTGACTACCCGTAAAGATGATCAGGAAGAGACGCG TACGTAAACGTCTGGTTGAATACCATCAGATGACAGCAGCACCGCTGATCGGCTACTACTCCCAAAGAAGCAGAAGCAGGGG TA

fumC 11

GGGGAAAGGGACTCAGGCTCAGTTCATCATGGAGAAATATGGTATTCCGCAAATCTCCACTGGCGATATGCTGCGTG CTGCGGTCAAATCTGGCTCCGAGCTGGGTAAACAAGCAAAGGACATTATGGATGCTGGCAAACTGGTCACCGACGA ACTGGTGATCGCGCTGGTTAAAGAGCGCATTGCTCAGGAAGACTGCCATAATGGTTTCCTGTTGGACGGCTTCCCGC GTACCATTCCGCAGGCAGACGCGATGAAAGAAGCGGGGCATCAATGTTGATTACGTTCTGGAATTCGACGTACCGGA CGAACTGATCGTTGACCGTATCGTCGGTCGCCGCGTTCACGCGCCGTCTGGTCGTGTTTATCACGTTAAATTCAATC CGCCGAAAGTAGAAGGCAAAGACGACGTTACCGGTGAAGAACTGACTACCCGTAAAGATGATCAGGAAGAGACGGG TACGTAAACGTCTGGTTGAATACCATCAGATGACAGCACCGCTGATCGGCTACTACTCCAAAGAAGACGGAAGCGGGA TA

gyrB 4

GGTCTGCACGGCGTTGGTGTTTCGGTAGTAAACGCCCTGTCGCAAAAACTGGAGCTGGTTATCCAGCGCGAGGGTA AAATTCACCGTCAGATCTACGAACACGGTGTACCGCAGGCCCCGCTGGCGGTTACCGGCGAGACTGAAAAAACCG GCACCATGGTGCGTTTCTGGCCCAGCCTCGAAACCTTCACCAATGTGACCGAGTTCGAATATGAAATTCTGGCGAAA CGTCTGCGTGAGTTGTCGTTCCTCAACTCCGGCGTTTCCATTCGTCTGCGCGACAAGCGCGACGGCAAAGAAGAACAC ACTTCCACTATGAAGGCGGCATCAAGGCGTTCGTTGAATATCTGAACAAGAACAAAACGCCGATCCACCCGAATATC TTCTACTTCTCCACTGAAAAAGACGGTATTGGCGTCGAAGTGGCGTTGCAGTGGAACGATGGCTTCCAGGAAAACAT CT

icd 8

recA 7

CGCACGTAAACTGGGCGTCGATATCGATAACCTGCTGTGCTCCCAGCCGGACACCGGCGAGCAGGCACTGGAAAT CTGTGACGCCCTGGCGCGTTCTGGCGCAGTAGACGTTATCGTCGTTGACTCCGTGGCGGCACTGACGCCGAAAGC GGAAATCGAAGGCGAAATCGGCGACTCTCACATGGGCCTTGCGGCACGTATGATGAGGCCAGGCGATGCGTAAGCT GGCGGGTAACCTGAAGCAGTCCAACACGCTGCTGATCTTCATCAACCAGATCCGTATGAAAATTGGTGTGATGTTCG GTAACCCGGAAACCACTACCGGTGGTAACGCGGCTGAAATTCTACGCCTCTGTTCGTCTCGACATCCGTCGTATCGGC GCGGTGAAAGAGGGCGAAAACGTGGTGGGTAGCGAAACCCGCGTGAAAGTGGTGAAGAACAAAATCGCTGCACC GTTTAAACAGGCTGAATTTCAGATCCTCTACGGCGAAGGTATCAACTTCTACGGCGA

ST48

Clonal complex (Cplx) = ST10 Cplx

Allelic profiles

adk 6

## **ิจุหาลงกรณ์มหาวิทยาล**ัย

fumC 11

#### gyrB 4

GGTCTGCACGGCGTTGGTGTTTCGGTAGTAAACGCCCTGTCGCAAAAACTGGAGCTGGTTATCCAGCGCGAGGGTA AAATTCACCGTCAGATCTACGAACACGGTGTACCGCAGGCCCCGCTGGCGGTTACCGGCGAGACTGAAAAAACCG GCACCATGGTGCGTTTCTGGCCCAGCCTCGAAACCTTCACCAATGTGACCGAGTTCGAATATGAAATTCTGGCGAAA CGTCTGCGTGAGTTGTCGTTCCTCAACTCCGGCGTTTCCATTCGTCTGCGCGACAAGCGCGACGGCAAAGAAGACC ACTTCCACTATGAAGGCGGCATCAAGGCGTTCGTTGAATATCTGAACAAGAACAAAACGCCGATCCACCCGAATATC TTCTACTTCTCCACTGAAAAAGACGGTATTGGCGTCGAAGTGGCGTTGCAGTGGAACGATGGCTTCCAGGAAAAACAT CT

icd 8

mdh 8

recA 2

CGCACGTAAACTGGGCGTCGATATCGACAACCTGCTGTGCTCCCAGCCGGACACCGGCGAGCAGGCACTGGAAAT CTGTGACGCCCTGGCGCGTTCTGGCGCAGTAGACGTTATCGTCGTTGACTCCGTGGCGGCACTGACGCCGAAAGC GGAAATCGAAGGCGAAATCGGCGACTCTCACATGGGCCTTGCGGCACGTATGATGAGCCAGGCGATGCGTAAGCT GGCGGGTAACCTGAAGCAGTCCCAACACGCTGCTGATCTTCATCAACCAGATCCGTATGAAAATTGGTGTGATGTTCG GTAACCCGGAAACCACTACCGGTGGTAACGCGCTGAAATTCTACGCCTCTGTTCGTCTCGACATCCGTCGTATCGGC GCGGTGAAAGAGGGCGAAAACGTGGTGGGTAGCGAAACCCGCGTGAAAGTGGTGAAGAACAAAATCGCTGCGCC GTTTAAACAGGCTGAATTCCAGATCCTCTACGGCGAAGGTATCAACTTCTACGGCGA

ST56

Clonal complex (Cplx) = ST155 Cplx Allelic profiles

adk 6

fumC 4

gyrB 4

### จุหาลงกรณ์มหาวิทยาลัย

GGTCTGCACGGCGTTGGTGTTTCCGTAGTAAAACGCCCTGTCGCAAAAACTGGAGCTGGTTATCCAGCGCGAGGGTA AAATTCACCGTCAGATCTACGAACACGGTGTACCGCAGGCCCCGCTGGCGGTTACCGGCGAGACTGAAAAAACCG GCACCATGGTGCGTTTCTGGCCCAGCCTCGAAACCTTCACCAATGTGACCGAGTTCGAATATGAAATTCTGGCGAAA CGTCTGCGTGAGTTGTCGTTCCTCAACTCCGGCGTTTCCATTCGTCTGCGCGACAAGCGCGACGGCAAAGAAGAACAC ACTTCCACTATGAAGGCGGCATCAAGGCGTTCGTTGAATATCTGAACAAGAACAAAACGCCGATCCACCCGAATATC TTCTACTTCTCCACTGAAAAAGACGGTATTGGCGTCGAAGTGGCGTTGCAGTGGAACGATGGCTTCCAGGAAAAACAT CT

icd 18

ATTCCTGCGTGAAGAGATGGGCGTGAAGAAAATTCGCTTCCCGGAACATTGCGGTATCGGTATCAAGCCGTGTTCTG AAGAAGGCACCAAACGTCTGGTCCGTGCCGCGATTGAATACGCAATTGCCAACGACC

#### mdh 20

recA 14

CGCACGTAAACTGGGCGTCGATATTGATAACCTGCTGTGCTCCCAGCCGGACACCGGCGAGCAGGCACTGGAAAT CTGTGACGCCCTGGCGCGTTCTGGCGCAGTAGACGTTATCGTCGTGACTCCGTGGCGGCACTGACGCCGAAAGC GGAAATCGAAGGCGAAATCGGCGACTCTCACATGGGCCTTGCGGCACGTATGATGAGCCAGGCGATGCGTAAGCT GGCGGGTAACCTGAAGCAGTCCAACACGCTGCTGATCTTCATCAACCAGATCCGTATGAAAATTGGTGTGATGTTCG GTAACCCGGAAACCACTACCGGTGGTAACGCGCTGAAATTCTACGCCTCTGTTCGTCTCGACATCCGTCGTATCGGC GCGGTGAAAGAGGGCGAAAACGTGGTGGGTAGCGAAACCCGCGTGAAAGTGGTGAAGAACAAAATCGCTGCACC GTTTAAACAGGCTGAATTTCAGATCCTCTACGGCGAAGGTATCAACTTCTACGGCGA

ST69

## **CHULALONGKORN UNIVERSITY**

Clonal complex (Cplx) = ST69 Cplx Allelic profiles

adk 21

fumC 35

gyrB 27

GGTCTGCACGGCGTTGGTGTTTCGGTAGTAAACGCCCTGTCGCAAAAACTGGAGCTGGTTATCCAGCGCGAGGGTA AAATTCACCGTCAGATCTACGAACACGGTGTACCGCAGGCTCCGCTGGCGGTTACCGGCGAGACTGAAAAAACCG GCACCATGGTGCGTTTCTGGCCAAGCCTCGAAACCTTCACCAATGTGACCGAGTTCGAATATGAAATTCTGGCGAAA CGTCTGCGTGAGTTGTCGTTCCTCAACTCCGGCGTTTCCATTCGTCTGCGCGACAAGCGCGACGGTAAAGAAGACC ACTTCCACTATGAAGGCGGCATCAAGGCGTTCGTTGAATATCTGAACAAGAACAAAACGCCGATCCACCCGAATATC TTCTACTTCTCCACCGAAAAAGATGGTATCGGCGTCGAAGTGGCGTTGCAGTGGAACGATGGCTTCCAGGAAAACAT CT

icd 6

recA 4

TGCACGTAAACTGGGCGTCGATATCGACAACCTGCTGTGCTCCCAGCCGGACACTGGCGAGCAGGCACTGGAAAAT CTGTGACGCCCTGGCGCGTTCTGGCGCAGTAGACGTTATCGTCGTTGACTCCGTGGCGGCACTGACGCCGAAAGC GGAAATCGAAGGCGAAATCGGCGACTCTCACATGGGCCTTGCGGCACGTATGATGAGGCCAGGCGATGCGTAAGCT GGCGGGTAACCTGAAGCAGTCCAACACGCTGCTGATCTTCATCAACCAGATCCGTATGAAAAATTGGTGTGATGTTCG GTAACCCGGAAACCACTACCGGTGGTAACGCGCTGAAAATTCTACGCCTCTGTTCGTCTCGACATCCGTCGTATCGGC GCGGTGAAAGAGGGCGAAAACGTGGTGGGTAGCGAAACCCGTGTGAAAGTGGTGAAGAACAAAATCGCTGCGCC GTTTAAACAGGCTGAATTCCAGATCCTCTACGGCGAAGGTATCAACTTCTATGGCGA

ST72

Clonal complex (Cplx) = ST405 Cplx

Allelic profiles

adk 35

GGGGAAAGGGACTCAGGCTCAGTTCATCATGGAGAAATATGGTATTCCGCAAATCTCCACTGGCGATATGCTGCGTG CTGCGGTCAAATCTGGCTCCGAGCTGGGTAAACAAGCAAAGGACATTATGGATGCTGGCAAACTGGTCACTGACGA ACTGGTGATCGCGCTGGTTAAAGAGCGCATTGCTCAGGAAGACTGCCGTAATGGTTTCCTGTTGGACGGCTTCCCG CGTACCATTCCGCAGGCAGACGCGATGAAAGAAGCGGGGCATCAATGTTGATTACGTTCTGGAATTCGACGTACCGG ACGAACTGATCGTTGACCGTATCGTCGGTCGCCGCGTTCACGCGCCGTCTGGTCGTGTTTATCACGTTAAATTCAATC CGCCGAAAGTAGAAGGCAAAGACGACGTTACCGGTGAAGAACTGACTACCCGTAAAGACGATCAGGAAGAAACCG TACGTAAACGTCTGGTTGAATACCATCAGATGACTGCACCGCTGATCGGCTACTACTCCAAAGAAGCGGAAGCGGGA TA

fumC 37

gyrB 29

GGTCTGCACGGCGTTGGTGTTTCGGTAGTAAACGCCCTGTCGCAAAAACTGGAGCTGGTTATCCAGCGCGAGGGTA AAATTCACCGTCAGATCTACGAACACGGTGTACCGCAGGCTCCGCTGGCGGTTACCGGCGAGACTGAAAAAACCG GCACCATGGTGCGTTTCTGGCCCAGCCTCGAAACCTTCACCAATGTGACCGAGTTCGAATATGAAATTCTGGCGAAA CGTCTGCGTGAGTTGTCGTTCCTCAACTCCGGCGTTTCCATTCGTCTGCGCGACAAGCGCGACGGTAAAGAAGAAC ACTTCCACTATGAAGGCGGCATCAAGGCGTTCGTTGAATATCTGAACAAGAACAAAACGCCGATCCACCCGAATATC TTCTACTTCTCCACCGAAAAAGATGGTATCGGCGTCGAAGTGGCGTTGCAGTGGAACGATGGCTTCCAGGAAAACAT CT

icd 25

GGCCCTCTGACCACTCCGGTTGGTGGCGGGTATTCGTTCTCTGAACGTTGCCCTGCGCCAGGAACTGGATCTCTACAT CTGCCTGCGTCCGGTACGTTACTATCAGGGCACCCCAAGCCCGGTTAAACATCCTGAACTGACCGATATGGTTATCT TCCGTGAAAACTCGGAAGACATTTATGCGGGTATCGAATGGAAAGCTGACTCTGCCGACGCCGAGAAAGTGATTAAA TTCCTGCGTGAAGAGATGGGCGTGAAGAAAATTCGCTTCCCGGAACATTGCGGTATCGGTATTAAGCCGTGTTCGGA AGAAGGCACCAAACGTCTGGTTCGTGCAGCGATCGAATACGCAATTGCTAACGATC mdh 4

#### recA 18

TGCACGTAAACTGGGCGTCGATATCGACAACCTGCTGTGCTCCCAGCCGGACACTGGCGAGCAGGCACTGGAAAT CTGTGACGCCCTGGCGCGTTCTGGTGCAGTAGACGTTATCGTCGTTGACTCCGTGGCGGCACTGACGCCGAAAGC GGAAATCGAAGGCGAAATCGGCGACTCTCACATGGGCCTTGCGGCACGTATGATGAGCCAGGCGATGCGTAAGCT GGCGGGTAACCTGAAGCAGTCCAACACGCTGCTGATCTTCATCAACCAGATCCGTATGAAAATTGGTGTGATGTTCG GTAACCCGGAAACTACTACCGGTGGTAACGCGCTGAAATTCTACGCCTCTGTTCGTCTCGACATCCGTCGTATCGGC GCGGTGAAAGAGGGCGAAAACGTGGTGGGTAGCGAAACCCGTGTGAAAGTGGTGAAGAACAAAATCGCTGCTCCG TTTAAACAGGCTGAATTCCAGATCCTCTACGGCGAAGGTATCAACTTCTATGGCGA

#### ST82

Clonal complex (Cplx) = none

#### Allelic profiles

adk 38

GGGGAAAGGGACTCAGGCTCAGTTCATCATGGAGAAATATGGTATTCCGCAAATCTCCACTGGCGATATGCTGCGTG CTGCGGTCAAATCAGGCTCCGAGCTGGGTAAACAAGCAAAGGACATTATGGATGCTGGCAAACTGGTCACCGACGA ACTGGTGATCGCGCTGGTTAAAGAGCGCATTGCTCAGGAAGACTGCCGCAACGGTTTCCTGTTGGACGGCTTCCCG CGTACCATTCCGCAGGCAGACGCGATGAAAGAAGCGGGGCATCAATGTTGATTACGTTCTGGAATTCGACGTACCGG ACGAACTGATTGTTGACCGTATCGTAGGCCGCCGCGTTCATGCGCCGTCTGGTCGTGTTTATCACGTTAAATTCAATC CGCCGAAAGTAGAAGGCAAAGACGACGTTACCGGTGAAGAACTGACTACCCGTAAAGACGATCAGGAAGAAACCG TGCGTAAACGTCTGGTTGAATACCATCAGATGACTGCACCGCTGATCGGCTACTACTCCAAAGAAGCGGAAGCGGG TA

#### fumC 39

#### gyrB 30

GGTCTGCACGGCGTTGGTGTTTCGGTAGTAAACGCCCTGTCGCAAAAACTGGAGCTGGTTATCCAGCGCGAGGGTA AAATTCACCGTCAGATCTACGAACACGGTGTACCGCAGGCTCCGCTGGCGGTTACCGGCGAGACTGAAAAAACAG GCACCATGGTGCGTTTCTGGCCCAGCCTCGAAACCTTCACCAATGTGACCGAGTTCGAATATGAAATTCTGGCGAAA CGTCTGCGTGAGTTGTCGTTCCTCAACTCCGGCGTTTCCATTCGTCTGCGCGACAAGCGCGACGGCAAAGAAGAACAC ACTTCCACTATGAAGGCGGCATCAAGGCGTTCGTTGAATATCTGAACAAGAACAAAACGCCGATCCACCCGAATATC TTCTACTTCTCCACTGAAAAAGACGGTATTGGCGTCGAAGTGGCGTTGCAGTGGAACGATGGCTTCCAGGAAAACAT CT

icd 13

GGCGTAGCGCGTAAACCGGGTATGGATCGTTCCGACCTGTTTAACGTTAACGCCGGCATCGTGAAAAACCTGGTAC AGCAAGTTGCGAAAACCTGCCCGAAAGCGTGCATTGGTATTATCACTAACCCGGTTAACACTACAGTTGCGATTGCT GCTGAAGTGCTGAAAAAAGCCGGTGTTTATGACAAAAACCCACTGTTCGGCGTTACCACGCTGGATATCATTCGTTC CAACACCTTTGTTGCGGAACTGAAAGGCAAACAGCCAGGCGAAGTTGAAGTGCCGGTTATTGGTGGTCACTCTGGT GTTACCATTCTGCCGCTGCTGTCACAGGTTCCTGGCGTTAGTTTTACCGAGCAGGAAGTGGCTGATCTGACCAAACG TATCCAGAACGCGGGTACTGAGGTGGTTGAAGCGAAAGCCGGTGGCGGGTCTGCAACCCTGTCTATGGG purA 25

CACCACTGCTGGTGGCGTGGCGACCGGTTCCGGCCTGGGCCCGCGTTATGTTGATTACGTTCTGGGTATCCTCAAA GCTTACTCCACTCGTGT

#### recA 28

CGCACGTAAACTGGGCGTCGATATTGACAACCTGCTGTGCTCCCAGCCGGATACCGGCGAGCAGGCACTGGAAAT CTGTGATGCCCTGGCACGTTCTGGCGCAGTAGACGTTATCGTCGTTGACTCCGTGGCGGCACTGACGCCGAAAGCG GAAATCGAAGGCGAAATCGGCGACTCTCACATGGGCCTTGCGGCACGTATGATGAGGCCAGGCGATGCGTAAGCTG GCGGGTAACCTGAAGCAGTCCAACACGCTGCTGATCTTCATCAACCAGATCCGTATGAAAATTGGTGTGATGTTCGG TAACCCGGAAACCACTACTGGTGGTAACGCGCTGAAATTCTACGCCTCTGTTCGTCTCGATATCCGTCGTATCGGCG CGGTGAAAGAGGGCGAAAACGTGGTGGGTAGCGAAACCCGCGTGAAAGTGGTGAAGAACAAAATCGCTGCGCCGT TTAAACAGGCTGAATTCCAGATCCTCTACGGCGAAGGTATCAACTTCTACGGCGA

#### ST93

Clonal complex (Cplx) = ST168 Cplx Allelic profiles

adk 6

ΤA

fumC 11

#### gyrB 4

GGTCTGCACGGCGTTGGTGTTTCGGTAGTAAACGCCCTGTCGCAAAAACTGGAGCTGGTTATCCAGCGCGAGGGTA AAATTCACCGTCAGATCTACGAACACGGTGTACCGCAGGCCCCGCTGGCGGTTACCGGCGAGACTGAAAAAACCG GCACCATGGTGCGTTTCTGGCCCAGCCTCGAAACCTTCACCAATGTGACCGAGTTCGAATATGAAATTCTGGCGAAA CGTCTGCGTGAGTTGTCGTTCCTCAACTCCGGCGTTTCCATTCGTCTGCGCGACAAGCGCGACGGCAAAGAAGAACAC ACTTCCACTATGAAGGCGGCATCAAGGCGTTCGTTGAATATCTGAACAAGAACAAAACGCCGATCCACCCGAATATC TTCTACTTCTCCACTGAAAAAGACGGTATTGGCGTCGAAGTGGCGTTGCAGTGGAACGATGGCTTCCAGGAAAACAT CT

#### icd 10

#### mdh 7

#### recA 6

CGCACGTAAACTGGGCGTCGATATCGATAACCTGCTGTGCTCCCAGCCGGACACCGGCGAGCAGGCACTGGAAAT CTGTGACGCCCTGGCGCGTTCTGGCGCAGTAGACGTTATCGTCGTTGACTCCGTGGCGGCACTGACGCCGAAAGC GGAAATCGAAGGCGAAATCGGCGACTCTCACATGGGCCTTGCGGCACGTATGATGAGGCCAGGCGATGCGTAAGCT GGCGGGTAACCTGAAGCAGTCCAACACGCTGCTGATCTTCATCAACCAGATCCGTATGAAAATTGGTGTGATGTTCG GTAACCCGGAAACCACTACCGGTGGTAACGCGCTGAAATTCTACGCCTCTGTTCGTCTCGACATCCGTCGTATCGGC GCGGTGAAAGAGGGCGAAAACGTGGTGGGTAGCGAAACCCGCGTGAAAGTGGTGAAGAACAAAATCGCTGCGCC GTTTAAACAGGCTGAATTCCAGATCCTCTACGGCGAAGGTATCAACTTCTACGGCGA

ST117

Clonal complex (Cplx) = none Allelic profiles

#### adk 20

GGGGAAAGGGACTCAGGCTCAGTTCATCATGGAGAAATATGGTATTCCGCAAATCTCCACTGGCGATATGCTGCGTG CTGCGGTCAAATCTGGCTCCGAGCTGGGTAAACAAGCAAAAGACATTATGGATGCTGGCAAACTGGTCACCGACGA

fumC 45

gyrB 41

GGTCTGCACGGCGTTGGTGTTTCGGTAGTAAACGCCCTGTCGCAAAAACTGGAGCTGGTTATCCAGCGCGAGGGTA AAATTCACCGTCAGATCTACGAACACGGTGTACCGCAGGCCCCGCTGGCGGTTACCGGCGAGACTGAAAAAACCG GCACCATGGTGCGTTTCTGGCCAAGCCTCGAAACCTTCACCAATGTGACCGAGTTCGAATATGAAATTCTGGCGAAA CGTCTGCGTGAGTTGTCGTTCCTCAACTCCGGCGTTTCCATTCGTCTGCGCGACAAGCGCGACGGCAAAGAAGACC ACTTCCACTATGAAGGCGGCATCAAGGCGTTCGTTGAATATCTGAACAAGAACAAAACGCCGATCCACCCGAATATC TTCTACTTCTCCACCGAGAAAGACGGTATTGGCGTCGAAGTGGCGTTGCAGTGGAACGATGGCTTCCAGGAAAACAT CT

icd 43

recA 2

CGCACGTAAACTGGGCGTCGATATCGACAACCTGCTGTGCTCCCAGCCGGACACCGGCGAGCAGGCACTGGAAAT CTGTGACGCCCTGGCGCGTTCTGGCGCAGTAGACGTTATCGTCGTTGACTCCGTGGCGGCACTGACGCCGAAAGC GGAAATCGAAGGCGAAATCGGCGACTCTCACATGGGCCTTGCGGCACGTATGATGAGGCCAGGCGATGCGTAAGCT GGCGGGTAACCTGAAGCAGTCCAACACGCTGCTGATCTTCATCAACCAGATCCGTATGAAAATTGGTGTGATGTTCG GTAACCCGGAAACCACTACCGGTGGTAACGCGCTGAAATTCTACGCCTCTGTTCGTCTCGACATCCGTCGTATCGGC GCGGTGAAAGAGGGCGAAAACGTGGTGGGTAGCGAAACCCGCGTGAAAGTGGTGAAGAACAAAATCGCTGCGCC GTTTAAACAGGCTGAATTCCAGATCCTCTACGGCGAAGGTATCAACTTCTACGGCGA

#### ST155

Clonal complex (Cplx) = ST155 Cplx

Allelic profiles

adk 6

fumC 4

#### gyrB 14

GGTCTGCACGGCGTTGGTGTTTCGGTAGTAAACGCCCTGTCGCAAAAACTGGAGCTGGTTATCCAGCGCGAGGGTA AAATTCACCGTCAGATCTACGAACACGGTGTACCGCAGGCCCCGCTGGCGGTTACCGGCGAGACTGAAAAAACCG GCACCATGGTGCGTTTCTGGCCTAGCCTCGAAACCTTCACCAATGTGACCGAGTTCGAATATGAAATTCTGGCGAAA CGTCTGCGTGAGTTGTCGTTCCTCAACTCCGGCGTTTCCATTCGTCTGCGCGACAAGCGTGACGGCAAAGAAGAACAC ACTTCCACTATGAAGGCGGCATCAAGGCGTTCGTTGAATATCTGAACAAGAACAAAACGCCGATCCACCCGAATATC TTCTACTTCTCCACCGAAAAAGACGGTATTGGCGTCGAAGTGGCGTTGCAGTGGAACGATGGCTTCCAGGAAAACAT CT

icd 16

#### recA 14

CGCACGTAAACTGGGCGTCGATATTGATAACCTGCTGTGCTCCCAGCCGGACACCGGCGAGCAGGCACTGGAAAT CTGTGACGCCCTGGCGCGTTCTGGCGCAGTAGACGTTATCGTCGTTGACTCCGTGGCGGCACTGACGCCGAAAGC GGAAATCGAAGGCGAAATCGGCGACTCTCACATGGGCCTTGCGGCACGTATGATGAGGCCAGGCGATGCGTAAGCT GGCGGGTAACCTGAAGCAGTCCAACACGCTGCTGATCTTCATCAACCAGATCCGTATGAAAATTGGTGTGATGTTCG GTAACCCGGAAACCACTACCGGTGGTAACGCGCTGAAATTCTACGCCTCTGTTCGTCTCGACATCCGTCGTATCGGC GCGGTGAAAGAGGGCGAAAACGTGGTGGGTAGCGAAACCCGCGTGAAAGTGGTGAAGAACAAAATCGCTGCACC GTTTAAACAGGCTGAATTCCAGATCCTCTACGGCGAAGGTATCAACTTCTACGGCGA

Clonal complex (Cplx) = ST10 Cplx

#### Allelic profiles

#### adk 10

GGGGAAAGGGACTCAGGCTCAGTTCATCATGGAGAAATATGGTATTCCGCAAATCTCCACTGGCGATATGCTGCGTG CTGCGGTCAAATCTGGCTCCGAGCTGGGTAAACAAGCAAAGGACATTATGGATGCTGGCAAACTGGTCACCGACGA ACTGGTGATCGCGCTGGTTAAAGAGCGCATTGCTCAGGAAGACTGCCGTAATGGTTTCCTGTTGGACGGCTTCCCG CGTACCATTCCGCAGGCAGACGCGATGAAAGAAGCGGGCATCAATGTTGATTACGTTCTGGAATTCGACGTACCGG ACGAACTGATCGTTGACCGTATCGTCGGTCGCCGCGTTCATGCGCCGTCTGGTCGTGTTTATCACGTTAAATTCAATC CGCCGAAAGTAGAAGGCAAAGACGACGTTACCGGTGAAGAACTGACTACCCGTAAAGATGATCAGGAAGAAGAAGCGGG TACGTAAACGTCTGGTTGAATACCATCAGATGACAGCAGCACCGCTGATCGGCTACTACTCCAAAGAAGAAGCAGAAGCGGG TA

#### fumC 7

#### gyrB 4

GGTCTGCACGGCGTTGGTGTTTCGGTAGTAAACGCCCTGTCGCAAAAACTGGAGCTGGTTATCCAGCGCGAGGGTA AAATTCACCGTCAGATCTACGAACACGGTGTACCGCAGGCCCCGCTGGCGGTTACCGGCGAGACTGAAAAAACCG GCACCATGGTGCGTTTCTGGCCCAGCCTCGAAACCTTCACCAATGTGACCGAGTTCGAATATGAAATTCTGGCGAAA CGTCTGCGTGAGTTGTCGTTCCTCAACTCCGGCGTTTCCATTCGTCTGCGCGACAAGCGCGACGGCAAAGAAGAACAC ACTTCCACTATGAAGGCGGCATCAAGGCGTTCGTTGAATATCTGAACAAGAACAAAACGCCGATCCACCCGAATATC TTCTACTTCTCCACTGAAAAAGACGGTATTGGCGTCGAAGTGGCGTTGCAGTGGAACGATGGCTTCCAGGAAAACAT CT

icd 12 CHULALONGKORN UNIVERSITY

TTACCATTCTGCCGCTGCTGTCACAGGTTCCTGGCGTTAGTTTTACCGAGCAGGAAGTGGCTGATCTGACCAAACGC ATCCAGAACGCGGGTACTGAAGTGGTTGAAGCGAAGGCCGGTGGCGGGTCTGCAACCCTGTCTATGGG purA 8

#### recA 2

CGCACGTAAACTGGGCGTCGATATCGACAACCTGCTGTGCTCCCAGCCGGACACCGGCGAGCAGGCACTGGAAAT CTGTGACGCCCTGGCGCGTTCTGGCGCAGTAGACGTTATCGTCGTGACTCCGTGGCGGCACTGACGCCGAAAGC GGAAATCGAAGGCGAAATCGGCGACTCTCACATGGGCCTTGCGGCACGTATGATGAGCCAGGCGATGCGTAAGCT GGCGGGTAACCTGAAGCAGTCCAACACGCTGCTGATCTTCATCAACCAGATCCGTATGAAAATTGGTGTGATGTTCG GTAACCCGGAAACCACTACCGGTGGTAACGCGCTGAAATTCTACGCCTCTGTTCGTCTCGACATCCGTCGTATCGGC GCGGTGAAAGAGGGCGAAAACGTGGTGGGTAGCGAAACCCGCGTGAAAGTGGTGAAGAACAAAATCGCTGCGCC GTTTAAACAGGCTGAATTCCAGATCCTCTACGGCGAAGGTATCAACTTCTACGGCGA

#### ST206

Clonal complex (Cplx) = ST206 Cplx Allelic profiles

adk 6

fumC 7

gyrB 5

GGTCTGCACGGCGTTGGTGTTTCGGTAGTAAACGCCCTGTCGCAAAAACTGGAGCTGGTTATCCAGCGCGAGGGTA AAATTCACCGTCAGATCTACGAACACGGTGTACCGCAGGCTCCGCTGGCGGTTACCGGCGAGACTGAAAAAACCG GCACCATGGTGCGTTTCTGGCCCAGCCTCGAAACCTTCACCAATGTGACCGAGTTCGAATATGAAATTCTGGCGAAA CGTCTGCGTGAGTTGTCGTTCCTCAACTCCGGCGTTTCCATTCGTCTGCGCGACAAGCGCGACGGCAAAGAAGAACAC ACTTCCACTATGAAGGCGGCATCAAGGCGTTCGTTGAATATCTGAACAAGAACAAAACGCCGATCCACCCGAATATC TTCTACTTCTCCACTGAAAAAGACGGTATTGGCGTCGAAGTGGCGTTGCAGTGGAACGATGGCTTCCAGGAAAAACAT CT

icd 1

recA 2

CGCACGTAAACTGGGCGTCGATATCGACAACCTGCTGTGCTCCCAGCCGGACACCGGCGAGCAGGCACTGGAAAT CTGTGACGCCCTGGCGCGTTCTGGCGCAGTAGACGTTATCGTCGTTGACTCCGTGGCGGCACTGACGCCGAAAGC GGAAATCGAAGGCGAAATCGGCGACTCTCACATGGGCCTTGCGGCACGTATGATGAGGCCAGGCGATGCGTAAGCT GGCGGGTAACCTGAAGCAGTCCAACACGCTGCTGATCTTCATCAACCAGATCCGTATGAAAATTGGTGTGATGTTCG GTAACCCGGAAACCACTACCGGTGGTAACGCGCTGAAATTCTACGCCTCTGTTCGTCTCGACATCCGTCGTATCGGC GCGGTGAAAGAGGGCGAAAACGTGGTGGGTAGCGAAACCCGCGTGAAAGTGGTGAAGAACAAAATCGCTGCGCC GTTTAAACAGGCTGAATTCCAGATCCTCTACGGCGAAGGTATCAACTTCTACGGCGA

#### ST302

Clonal complex (Cplx) = none Allelic profiles adk 79

#### auk /

GGGGAAAGGGACTCAGGCTCAGTTCATCATGGAGAAATATGGTATTCCGCAAATCTCCACTGGCGATATGCTGCGTG CTGCGGTCAAATCTGGCTCCGAGCTGGGTAAACAAGCAAAGGACATTATGGATGCTGGCAAACTGGTTACCGACGA ACTGGTGATCGCGCTGGTTAAAGAGCGCATTGCTCAGGAAGACTGCCGTAATGGTTTCCTGTTGGACGGCTTCCCG CGTACCATTCCGCAGGCAGACGCGATGAAAGAAGCGGGGCATCAATGTTGATTACGTTCTGGAATTCGACGTACCGG ACGAACTGATCGTTGACCGTATCGTCGGTCGCCGCGTTCACGCGCCGTCTGGTCGTGTTTATCACGTTAAATTCAATC CGCCGAAAGTAGAAGGCAAAGACGACGTTACCGGTGAAGAACTGACTACCCGTAAAGACGATCAGGAAGAAACCG TACGTAAACGTCTGGTTGAATACCATCAGATGACTGCACCGCTGATCGGCTACTACTCCCAAAGAAGCGGAAGCGGGG TA

fumC 84

gyrB 71

GGTCTGCACGGCGTTGGTGTTTCGGTAGTAAACGCCCTGTCGCAAAAACTGGAGCTGGTTATTCAGCGCGAGGGTA AAATTCACCGTCAGATCTACGAACACGGTGTACCGCAGGCTCCGCTGGCGGTTACCGGCGAGACTGAAAAAACCG GCACCATGGTGCGTTTCTGGCCCAGCCTCGAAACCTTCACCAATGTGACCGAGTTCGAATATGAAATTCTGGCGAAA CGTCTGCGTGAGTTGTCGTTCCTCAACTCCGGCGTTTCCATTCGTCTGCGCGACAAGCGTGACGGCAAAGAAGAACAC ACTTCCACTATGAAGGCGGCATCAAGGCGTTCGTTGAATATCTGAACAAGAACAAAACGCCGATCCACCCGAATATC TTCTACTTCTCCACCGAAAAAGACGGTATTGGCGTCGAAGTGGCGTTGCAGTGGAACGATGGCTTCCAGGAAAACAT CT

#### icd 78

recA 2

CGCACGTAAACTGGGCGTCGATATCGACAACCTGCTGTGCTCCCAGCCGGACACCGGCGAGCAGGCACTGGAAAT CTGTGACGCCCTGGCGCGTTCTGGCGCAGTAGACGTTATCGTCGTGACTCCGTGGCGGCACTGACGCCGAAAGC GGAAATCGAAGGCGAAATCGGCGACTCTCACATGGGCCTTGCGGCACGTATGATGAGCCAGGCGATGCGTAAGCT GGCGGGTAACCTGAAGCAGTCCAACACGCTGCTGATCTTCATCAACCAGATCCGTATGAAAATTGGTGTGATGTTCG GTAACCCGGAAACCACTACCGGTGGTAACGCGCTGAAATTCTACGCCTCTGTTCGTCTCGACATCCGTCGTATCGGC GCGGTGAAAGAGGGCGAAAACGTGGTGGGTAGCGAAACCCGCGTGAAAGTGGTGAAGAACAAAATCGCTGCGCC GTTTAAACAGGCTGAATTCCAGATCCTCTACGGCGAAGGTATCAACTTCTACGGCGA

#### ST365

Clonal complex (Cplx) = ST101 Cplx Allelic profiles adk 43

GGGGAAAGGGACTCAGGCTCAGTTCATCATGGAGAAATATGGTATTCCGCAAATCTCCACTGGCGATATGCTGCGTG CTGCGGTCAAATCTGGCTCCGAGCTGGGTAAACAAGCAAAGGACATTATGGATGTTGGCAAACTGGTCACCGACGA ACTGGTGATCGCGCTGGTTAAAGAGCGCATTGCTCAGGAAGACTGCCGTAATGGTTTCCTGTTGGACGGCTTCCCG CGTACCATTCCGCAGGCAGACGCGATGAAAGAAGCGGGGCATCAATGTTGATTACGTTCTGGAATTCGACGTACCGG ACGAACTGATCGTTGACCGTATCGTAGGCCGCCGCGCGTCATGCGCCGTCTGGTCGTGTTTATCACGTTAAATTCAATC CGCCGAAAGTAGAAGGCAAAGACGACGTTACCGGTGAAGAACTGACTACCCGTAAAGACGATCAGGAAGAAACCG TGCGTAAACGTCTGGTTGAATACCATCAGATGACTGCACCGCTGATCGGCTACTACTCCAAAGAAGCGGAAGCAGCGGG TA

fumC 41

CGAGCGCCATTCGGCAGGCAGCGGATGAAGTACTGGCAGGACAGCATGACGACGAATTCCCGCTGGCTATCTGGC AGACCGGCTCCGGCACGCAAAGTAACATGAACATGAACGAAGTGCTGGCTAACCGGGCCAGTGAATTACTCGGCG GCGTGCGCGGGATGGAACGTAAAGTTCACCCTAACGACGACGACGAAAAAGCCAAAAGTTCCAACGATGTCTTTCC

gyrB 15

icd 18

recA 6

CGCACGTAAACTGGGCGTCGATATCGATAACCTGCTGTGCTCCCAGCCGGACACCGGCGAGCAGGCACTGGAAAT CTGTGACGCCCTGGCGCGTTCTGGCGCAGTAGACGTTATCGTCGTTGACTCCGTGGCGGCACTGACGCCGAAAGC GGAAATCGAAGGCGAAATCGGCGACTCTCACATGGGCCTTGCGGCACGTATGATGAGCCAGGCGATGCGTAAGCT GGCGGGTAACCTGAAGCAGTCCAACACGCTGCTGATCTTCATCAACCAGATCCGTATGAAAATTGGTGTGATGTTCG GTAACCCGGAAACCACTACCGGTGGTAACGCGCTGAAATTCTACGCCTCTGTTCGTCTCGACATCCGTCGTATCGGC GCGGTGAAAGAGGGCGAAAACGTGGTGGGTAGCGAAACCCGCGTGAAAGTGGTGAAGAACAAAATCGCTGCGCC GTTTAAACAGGCTGAATTCCAGATCCTCTACGGCGAAGGTATCAACTTCTACGGCGA

#### ST378

Clonal complex (Cplx) = ST10 Cplx Allelic profiles

adk 10

fumC 11

gyrB 4

GGTCTGCACGGCGTTGGTGTTTCGGTAGTAAACGCCCTGTCGCAAAAACTGGAGCTGGTTATCCAGCGCGAGGGTA AAATTCACCGTCAGATCTACGAACACGGTGTACCGCAGGCCCCGCTGGCGGTTACCGGCGAGACTGAAAAAACCG GCACCATGGTGCGTTTCTGGCCCAGCCTCGAAACCTTCACCAATGTGACCGAGTTCGAATATGAAATTCTGGCGAAA CGTCTGCGTGAGTTGTCGTTCCTCAACTCCGGCGTTTCCATTCGTCTGCGCGACAAGCGCGACGGCAAAGAAGAACAC ACTTCCACTATGAAGGCGGCATCAAGGCGTTCGTTGAATATCTGAACAAGAACAAAACGCCGATCCACCCGAATATC TTCTACTTCTCCACTGAAAAAGACGGTATTGGCGTCGAAGTGGCGTTGCAGTGGAACGATGGCTTCCAGGAAAACAT CT

icd 1

ATTCCTGCGTGAAGAGATGGGGGGTGAAGAAAATTCGCTTCCCGGAACATTGTGGTATCGGTATTAAGCCGTGTTCGG AAGAAGGCACCAAACGTCTGGTTCGTGCAGCGATCGAATACGCAATTGCTAACGATC

#### mdh 8

recA 2

CGCACGTAAACTGGGCGTCGATATCGACAACCTGCTGTGCTCCCAGCCGGACACCGGCGAGCAGGCACTGGAAAT CTGTGACGCCCTGGCGCGTTCTGGCGCAGTAGACGTTATCGTCGTGACTCCGTGGCGGCACTGACGCCGAAAGC GGAAATCGAAGGCGAAATCGGCGACTCTCACATGGGCCTTGCGGCACGTATGATGAGCCAGGCGATGCGTAAGCT GGCGGGTAACCTGAAGCAGTCCAACACGCTGCTGATCTTCATCAACCAGATCCGTATGAAAATTGGTGTGATGTTCG GTAACCCGGAAACCACTACCGGTGGTAACGCGCTGAAATTCTACGCCTCTGTTCGTCTCGACATCCGTCGTATCGGC GCGGTGAAAGAGGGCGAAAACGTGGTGGGTAGCGAAACCCGCGTGAAAGTGGTGAAGAACAAAATCGCTGCGCC GTTTAAACAGGCTGAATTCCAGATCCTCTACGGCGAAGGTATCAACTTCTACGGCGA

ST393

## Chulalongkorn University

Clonal complex (Cplx) = ST31 Cplx

Allelic profiles

adk 18

fumC 106

gyrB 17

GGTCTGCACGGCGTTGGTGTTTCGGTAGTAAACGCCCTGTCGCAAAAACTGGAGCTGGTTATCCAGCGCGAGGGTA AAATTCACCGTCAGATCTACGAACACGGTGTACCGCAGGCCCCGCTGGCGGTTACCGGCGAGACTGAAAAAACCG GCACCATGGTGCGTTTCTGGCCTAGCCTCGAAACCTTCACCAATGTGACCGAGTTCGAATATGAAATTCTGGCGAAA CGTCTGCGTGAGTTGTCGTTCCTCAACTCCGGCGTTTCCATTCGTCTGCGCGACAAGCGTGACGGCAAAGAAGAACC ACTTCCACTATGAAGGCGGCATCAAAGCGTTCGTTGAATATCTGAACAAGAACAAAACGCCGATCCACCCAAATATC TTCTACTTCTCCACCGAAAAAGATGGTATTGGCGTTGAAGTGGCGTTGCAGTGGAACGATGGCTTCCAGGAAAACAT CT

icd 6

recA 4
TGCACGTAAACTGGGCGTCGATATCGACAACCTGCTGTGCTCCCAGCCGGACACTGGCGAGCAGGCACTGGAAAAT CTGTGACGCCCTGGCGCGTTCTGGCGCAGTAGACGTTATCGTCGTTGACTCCGTGGCGGCACTGACGCCGAAAGC GGAAATCGAAGGCGAAATCGGCGACTCTCACATGGGCCTTGCGGCACGTATGATGAGGCCAGGCGATGCGTAAGCT GGCGGGTAACCTGAAGCAGTCCAACACGCTGCTGATCTTCATCAACCAGATCCGTATGAAAAATTGGTGTGATGTTCG GTAACCCGGAAACCACTACCGGTGGTAACGCGCTGAAAATTCTACGCCTCTGTTCGTCTCGACATCCGTCGTATCGGC GCGGTGAAAGAGGGCGAAAACGTGGTGGGTAGCGAAACCCGTGTGAAAGTGGTGAAGAACAAAATCGCTGCGCC GTTTAAACAGGCTGAATTCCAGATCCTCTACGGCGAAGGTATCAACTTCTATGGCGA

ST402

Clonal complex (Cplx) = ST405 Cplx

Allelic profiles

adk 35

GGGGAAAGGGACTCAGGCTCAGTTCATCATGGAGAAATATGGTATTCCGCAAATCTCCACTGGCGATATGCTGCGTG CTGCGGTCAAATCTGGCTCCGAGCTGGGTAAACAAGCAAAGGACATTATGGATGCTGGCAAACTGGTCACTGACGA ACTGGTGATCGCGCTGGTTAAAGAGCGCATTGCTCAGGAAGACTGCCGTAATGGTTTCCTGTTGGACGGCTTCCCG CGTACCATTCCGCAGGCAGACGCGATGAAAGAAGCGGGCATCAATGTTGATTACGTTCTGGAATTCGACGTACCGG ACGAACTGATCGTTGACCGTATCGTCGGTCGCCGCGTTCACGCGCCGTCTGGTCGTGTTTATCACGTTAAATTCAATC CGCCGAAAGTAGAAGGCAAAGACGACGTTACCGGTGAAGAACTGACTACCCGTAAAGACGATCAGGAAGAAACCG TACGTAAACGTCTGGTTGAATACCATCAGATGACTGCACCGCTGATCGGCTACTACTCCAAAGAAGCGGAAGCGGGA TA

fumC 35

gyrB 29

GGTCTGCACGGCGTTGGTGTTTCGGTAGTAAACGCCCTGTCGCAAAAACTGGAGCTGGTTATCCAGCGCGAGGGTA AAATTCACCGTCAGATCTACGAACACGGTGTACCGCAGGCTCCGCTGGCGGTTACCGGCGAGACTGAAAAAACCG GCACCATGGTGCGTTTCTGGCCCAGCCTCGAAACCTTCACCAATGTGACCGAGTTCGAATATGAAATTCTGGCGAAA CGTCTGCGTGAGTTGTCGTTCCTCAACTCCGGCGTTTCCATTCGTCTGCGCGACAAGCGCGACGGTAAAGAAGAAC ACTTCCACTATGAAGGCGGCATCAAGGCGTTCGTTGAATATCTGAACAAGAACAAAACGCCGATCCACCCGAATATC TTCTACTTCTCCACCGAAAAAGATGGTATCGGCGTCGAAGTGGCGTTGCAGTGGAACGATGGCTTCCAGGAAAACAT CT

icd 25

GGCCCTCTGACCACTCCGGTTGGTGGCGGGTATTCGTTCTCTGAACGTTGCCCTGCGCCAGGAACTGGATCTCTACAT CTGCCTGCGTCCGGTACGTTACTATCAGGGCACCCCAAGCCCGGTTAAACATCCTGAACTGACCGATATGGTTATCT TCCGTGAAAACTCGGAAGACATTTATGCGGGTATCGAATGGAAAGCTGACTCTGCCGACGCCGAGAAAGTGATTAAA TTCCTGCGTGAAGAGATGGGCGTGAAGAAAATTCGCTTCCCGGAACATTGCGGTATCGGTATTAAGCCGTGTTCGGA AGAAGGCACCAAACGTCTGGTTCGTGCAGCGATCGAATACGCAATTGCTAACGATC mdh 4

### recA 73

TGCACGTAAACTGGGCGTCGATATCGACAACCTGCTGTGCTCCCAGCCGGACACTGGCGAGCAGGCACTGGAAAT CTGTGACGCCCTGGCGCGTTCTGGTGCAGTAGACGTTATCGTCGTGACTCCGTGGCGGCGCACTGACGCCGAAAGC GGAAATCGAAGGCGAAATCGGCGACTCTCACATGGGCCTTGCGGCACGTATGATGAGGCCAGGCGATGCGTAAGCT GGCGGGTAACCTGAAGCAGTCCCAACACGCTGCTGATCTTCATCAACCAGATCCGTATGAAAATTGGTGTGATGTTCG GTAACCCGGAAACCACTACCGGTGGTAACGCGCTGAAATTCTACGCCTCTGTTCGTCTCGACATCCGTCGTATCGGC GCGGTGAAAGAGGGCGAAAACGTGGTGGGTAGCGAAACCCGTGTGAAAGTGGTGAAGAACAAAATCGCTGCTCCG TTTAAACAGGCTGAATTCCAGATCCTCTACGGCGAAGGTATCAACTTCTATGGCGA

ST405

Clonal complex (Cplx) = ST405 Cplx

Allelic profiles

adk 35

GGGGAAAGGGACTCAGGCTCAGTTCATCATGGAGAAATATGGTATTCCGCAAATCTCCACTGGCGATATGCTGCGTG CTGCGGTCAAATCTGGCTCCGAGCTGGGTAAACAAGCAAAGACATTATGGATGCTGGCAAACTGGTCACTGACGA ACTGGTGATCGCGCTGGTTAAAGAGCGCATTGCTCAGGAAGACTGCCGTAATGGTTTCCTGTTGGACGGCTTCCCG CGTACCATTCCGCAGGCAGACGCGATGAAAGAAGCGGGGCATCAATGTTGATTACGTTCTGGAATTCGACGTACCGG ACGAACTGATCGTTGACCGTATCGTCGGTCGCCGCGTTCACGCGCCGTCTGGTCGTGTTTATCACGTTAAATTCAATC CGCCGAAAGTAGAAGGCAAAGACGACGTTACCGGTGAAGAACTGACTACCCGTAAAGACGATCAGGAAGAAACCG TACGTAAACGTCTGGTTGAATACCATCAGATGACTGCACCGCTGATCGGCTACTACTCCAAAGAAGCGGAAGCGGG TA

## fumC 37

### gyrB 29

GGTCTGCACGGCGTTGGTGTTTCGGTAGTAAACGCCCTGTCGCAAAAACTGGAGCTGGTTATCCAGCGCGAGGGTA AAATTCACCGTCAGATCTACGAACACGGTGTACCGCAGGCTCCGCTGGCGGTTACCGGCGAGACTGAAAAAACCG GCACCATGGTGCGTTTCTGGCCCAGCCTCGAAACCTTCACCAATGTGACCGAGTTCGAATATGAAATTCTGGCGAAA CGTCTGCGTGAGTTGTCGTTCCTCAACTCCGGCGTTTCCATTCGTCTGCGCGACAAGCGCGACGGTAAAGAAGAAC ACTTCCACTATGAAGGCGGCATCAAGGCGTTCGTTGAATATCTGAACAAGAACAAAACGCCGATCCACCCGAATATC TTCTACTTCTCCACCGAAAAAGATGGTATCGGCGTCGAAGTGGCGTTGCAGTGGAACGATGGCTTCCAGGAAAACAT CT

### icd 25

ACACCACTGCTGGTGGCGTGGCGACCGGTTCCGGCCTGGGCCCGCGTTATGTTGATTACGTTCTGGGTATCCTCAA AGCTTACTCCACTCGTGT

# recA 73

TGCACGTAAACTGGGCGTCGATATCGACAACCTGCTGTGCTCCCAGCCGGACACTGGCGAGCAGGCACTGGAAAT CTGTGACGCCCTGGCGCGTTCTGGTGCAGTAGACGTTATCGTCGTTGACTCCGTGGCGGCACTGACGCCGAAAGC GGAAATCGAAGGCGAAATCGGCGACTCTCACATGGGCCTTGCGGCACGTATGATGAGGCCAGGCGATGCGTAAGCT GGCGGGTAACCTGAAGCAGTCCCAACACGCTGCTGATCTTCATCAACCAGATCCGTATGAAAATTGGTGTGATGTTCG GTAACCCGGAAACCACTACCGGTGGTAACGCGCTGAAATTCTACGCCTCTGTTCGTCTCGACATCCGTCGTATCGGC GCGGTGAAAGAGGGCGAAAACGTGGTGGGTAGCGAAACCCGTGTGAAAGTGGTGAAGAACAAAATCGCTGCTCCG TTTAAACAGGCTGAATTCCAGATCCTCTACGGCGAAGGTATCAACTTCTATGGCGA

#### ST460

Clonal complex (Cplx) = ST168 Cplx Allelic profiles

adk 56

ΤA

fumC 11

# gyrB 4

GGTCTGCACGGCGTTGGTGTTTCGGTAGTAAACGCCCTGTCGCAAAAACTGGAGCTGGTTATCCAGCGCGAGGGTA AAATTCACCGTCAGATCTACGAACACGGTGTACCGCAGGCCCCGCTGGCGGTTACCGGCGAGACTGAAAAAACCG GCACCATGGTGCGTTTCTGGCCCAGCCTCGAAACCTTCACCAATGTGACCGAGTTCGAATATGAAATTCTGGCGAAA CGTCTGCGTGAGTTGTCGTTCCTCAACTCCGGCGTTTCCATTCGTCTGCGCGACAAGCGCGACGGCAAAGAAGAACAC ACTTCCACTATGAAGGCGGCATCAAGGCGTTCGTTGAATATCTGAACAAGAACAAAACGCCGATCCACCCGAATATC TTCTACTTCTCCACTGAAAAAGACGGTATTGGCGTCGAAGTGGCGTTGCAGTGGAACGATGGCTTCCAGGAAAACAT CT

icd 10

recA 2

CGCACGTAAACTGGGCGTCGATATCGACAACCTGCTGTGCTCCCAGCCGGACACCGGCGAGCAGGCACTGGAAAT CTGTGACGCCCTGGCGCGTTCTGGCGCAGTAGACGTTATCGTCGTTGACTCCGTGGCGGCACTGACGCCGAAAGC GGAAATCGAAGGCGAAATCGGCGACTCTCACATGGGCCTTGCGGCACGTATGATGAGGCCAGGCGATGCGTAAGCT GGCGGGTAACCTGAAGCAGTCCAACACGCTGCTGATCTTCATCAACCAGATCCGTATGAAAATTGGTGTGATGTTCG GTAACCCGGAAACCACTACCGGTGGTAACGCGCTGAAATTCTACGCCTCTGTTCGTCTCGACATCCGTCGTATCGGC GCGGTGAAAGAGGGCGAAAACGTGGTGGGTAGCGAAACCCGCGTGAAAGTGGTGAAGAACAAAATCGCTGCGCC GTTTAAACAGGCTGAATTCCAGATCCTCTACGGCGAAGGTATCAACTTCTACGGCGA

ST484

Clonal complex (Cplx) = ST168 Cplx

Allelic profiles

adk 6

GGGGAAAGGGACTCAGGCTCAGTTCATCATGGAGAAATATGGTATTCCGCAAATCTCCACTGGCGATATGCTGCGTG CTGCGGTCAAATCTGGCTCCGAGCTGGGTAAACAAGCAAAAGACATTATGGATGCTGGCAAACTGGTCACCGACGA ACTGGTGATCGCGCTGGTTAAAGAGCGCATTGCTCAGGAAGACTGCCGTAATGGTTTCCTGTTGGACGGCTTCCCG CGTACCATTCCGCAGGCAGACGCGATGAAAGAAGCGGGCATCAATGTTGATTACGTTCTGGAATTCGACGTACCGG ACGAACTGATTGTTGATCGTATCGTAGGCCGCCGCGCGTTCATGCGCCGTCTGGTCGTGTTTATCACGTTAAATTCAATC CGCCGAAAGTAGAAGGCAAAGACGACGTTACCGGTGAAGAACTGACTACCCGTAAAGACGATCAGGAAGAAACCG TGCGTAAACGTCTGGTTGAATACCATCAGATGACTGCACCGCTGATCGGCTACTACTCCAAAGAAGCGGAAGCGGG TA

fumC 11

gyrB 4

GGTCTGCACGGCGTTGGTGTTTCGGTAGTAAACGCCCTGTCGCAAAAACTGGAGCTGGTTATCCAGCGCGAGGGTA AAATTCACCGTCAGATCTACGAACACGGTGTACCGCAGGCCCCGCTGGCGGTTACCGGCGAGACTGAAAAAACCG GCACCATGGTGCGTTTCTGGCCCAGCCTCGAAACCTTCACCAATGTGACCGAGTTCGAATATGAAATTCTGGCGAAA CGTCTGCGTGAGTTGTCGTTCCTCAACTCCGGCGTTTCCATTCGTCTGCGCGACAAGCGCGACGGCAAAGAAGAACAC ACTTCCACTATGAAGGCGGCATCAAGGCGTTCGTTGAATATCTGAACAAGAACAAAACGCCGATCCACCCGAATATC TTCTACTTCTCCACTGAAAAAGACGGTATTGGCGTCGAAGTGGCGTTGCAGTGGAACGATGGCTTCCAGGAAAACAT CT

icd 10

ATAACGCGCGTGAGAAAGCGCGTGGCGCGAAAGCGATCGGCACCACCGGTCGTGGTATCGGGCCTGCTTATGAAG ATAAAGTAGCACGTCGCGGTCTGCGTGTTGGCGACCTTTTCGACAAAGAAACCTTCGCTGAAAAACTGAAAGAAGTG ATGGAATATCACAACTTCCAGTTGGTTAACTACTACAAAGCTGAAGCGGTTGATTACCAGAAAGTTCTGGATGATACG

# recA 6

CGCACGTAAACTGGGCGTCGATATCGATAACCTGCTGTGCTCCCAGCCGGACACCGGCGAGCAGGCACTGGAAAT CTGTGACGCCCTGGCGCGTTCTGGCGCAGTAGACGTTATCGTCGTTGACTCCGTGGCGGCACTGACGCCGAAAGC GGAAATCGAAGGCGAAATCGGCGACTCTCACATGGGCCTTGCGGCACGTATGATGAGGCCAGGCGATGCGTAAGCT GGCGGGTAACCTGAAGCAGTCCAACACGCTGCTGATCTTCATCAACCAGATCCGTATGAAAATTGGTGTGATGTTCG GTAACCCGGAAACCACTACCGGTGGTAACGCGCTGAAATTCTACGCCTCTGTTCGTCTCGACATCCGTCGTATCGGC GCGGTGAAAGAGGGCGAAAACGTGGTGGGTAGCGAAACCCGCGTGAAAGTGGTGAAGAACAAAATCGCTGCGCC GTTTAAACAGGCTGAATTCCAGATCCTCTACGGCGAAGGTATCAACTTCTACGGCGA

## ST571

Clonal complex (Cplx) = ST10 Cplx

Allelic profiles

adk 112

fumC 11

# จุหาลงกรณมหาวิทยาลัย

# gyrB 4

GGTCTGCACGGCGTTGGTGTTTCGGTAGTAAACGCCCTGTCGCAAAAACTGGAGCTGGTTATCCAGCGCGAGGGTA AAATTCACCGTCAGATCTACGAACACGGTGTACCGCAGGCCCCGCTGGCGGTTACCGGCGAGACTGAAAAAACCG GCACCATGGTGCGTTTCTGGCCCAGCCTCGAAACCTTCACCAATGTGACCGAGTTCGAATATGAAATTCTGGCGAAA CGTCTGCGTGAGTTGTCGTTCCTCAACTCCGGCGTTTCCATTCGTCTGCGCGACAAGCGCGACGGCAAAGAAGACC ACTTCCACTATGAAGGCGGCATCAAGGCGTTCGTTGAATATCTGAACAAGAACAAAACGCCGATCCACCCGAATATC TTCTACTTCTCCACTGAAAAAGACGGTATTGGCGTCGAAGTGGCGTTGCAGTGGAACGATGGCTTCCAGGAAAACAT CT

icd 1

mdh 8

CGCACGTAAACTGGGCGTCGATATCGACAACCTGCTGTGCTCCCAGCCGGACACCGGCGAGCAGGCACTGGAAAT CTGTGACGCCCTGGCGCGTTCTGGCGCAGTAGACGTTATCGTCGTTGACTCCGTGGCGGCGCACTGACGCCGAAAGC GGAAATCGAAGGCGAAATCGGCGACTCTCACATGGGCCTTGCGGCACGTATGATGAGGCCAGGCGATGCGTAAGCT GGCGGGTAACCTGAAGCAGTCCAACACGCTGCTGATCTTCATCAACCAGATCCGTATGAAAATTGGTGTGATGTTCG GTAACCCGGAAACCACTACCGGTGGTAACGCGCTGAAATTCTACGCCTCTGTTCGTCTCGACATCCGTCGTATGGCG GCGGTGAAAGAGGGCGAAAACGTGGTGGGTAGCGAAACCCGCGTGAAAGTGGTGAAGAACAAAATCGCTGCGC GTTTAAACAGGCTGAATTCCAGATCCTCTACGGCGAAGGTATCAACTTCTACGGCGA

ST597 Clonal complex (Cplx) = ST69 Cplx Allelic profiles adk 21

fumC 35

gyrB 115

GGTCTGCACGGCGTTGGTGTTTCGGTAGTAAACGCCCTGTCGCAAAAACTGGAGCTGGTTATCCAGCGCGAGGGTA AAATTCACCGTCAGATCTACGAACACGGTGTACCGCAGGCTCCGCTGGCGGTTACCGGCGAGACTGAAAAAACCG GCACCATGGTGCGTTTCTGGCCAAGCCTCGAAACCTTCACCAATGTGACCGAGTTCGAATATGAAATTCTGGCGAAA CGTCTGCGTGAGTTGTCGTTCCTCAACTCCGGCGTTTCCATTCGTCTGCGCGACAAGCGCGACGGTAAAGAAAACC ACTTCCACTATGAAGGCGGCATCAAGGCGTTCGTTGAATATCTGAACAAGAACAAAACGCCGATCCACCCGAATATC TTCTACTTCTCCACCGAAAAAGATGGTATCGGCGTCGAAGTGGCGTTGCAGTGGAACGATGGCTTCCAGGAAAACAT CT

icd 6

# จุหาลงกรณ์มหาวิทยาลัย

ACCATTCTGCCGCTGCTGTCACAGGTTCCTGGCGTTAGCTTTACCGAGCAGGAAGTGGCTGATCTGACCAAACGTAT CCAGAACGCGGGTACTGAGGTGGTTGAAGCGAAAGCCGGTGGCGGGTCTGCAACCCTGTCTATGGG purA 5

### recA 4

TGCACGTAAACTGGGCGTCGATATCGACAACCTGCTGTGCTCCCAGCCGGACACTGGCGAGCAGGCACTGGAAAT CTGTGACGCCCTGGCGGCGTTCTGGCGCAGTAGACGTTATCGTCGTTGACTCCGTGGCGGCACTGACGCCGAAAGC GGAAATCGAAGGCGAAATCGGCGACTCTCACATGGGCCTTGCGGCACGTATGATGAGCCAGGCGATGCGTAAGCT GGCGGGTAACCTGAAGCAGTCCAACACGCTGCTGATCTTCATCAACCAGATCCGTATGAAAATTGGTGTGATGTTCG GTAACCCGGAAACCACTACCGGTGGTAACGCGCTGAAATTCTACGCCTCTGTTCGTCTCGACATCCGTCGTATCGGC GCGGTGAAAGAGGGCGAAAACGTGGTGGGTAGCGAAACCCGTGTGAAAGTGGTGAAGAACAAAATCGCTGCGCC GTTTAAACAGGCTGAATTCCAGATCCTCTACGGCGAAGGTATCAACTTCTATGGCGA

### ST604

Clonal complex (Cplx) = ST101 Cplx Allelic profiles

adk 43

GGGGAAAGGGACTCAGGCTCAGTTCATCATGGAGAAATATGGTATTCCGCAAATCTCCACTGGCGATATGCTGCGTG CTGCGGTCAAATCTGGCTCCGAGCTGGGTAAACAAGCAAAGACATTATGGATGTTGGCAAACTGGTCACCGACGA ACTGGTGATCGCGCGGTGGTTAAAGAGGCGCATTGCTCAGGAAGACTGCCGTAATGGTTTCCTGTTGGACGGCCTTCCCG CGTACCATTCCGCAGGCAGACGCGATGAAAGAAGCGGGGCATCAATGTTGATTACGTTCTGGAATTCGACGTACCGG ACGAACTGATCGTTGACCGTATCGTAGGCCGCCGCGTTCATGCGCCGTCTGGTCGTGTTTATCACGTTAAATTCAATC CGCCGAAAGTAGAAGGCAAAGACGACGTTACCGGTGAAGAACTGACTACCCGTAAAGACGATCAGGAAGAAACCG TGCGTAAACGTCTGGTTGAATACCATCAGATGACTGCACCGCTGATCGGCTACTACTCCAAAGAAGCGGAAGCAGGG TA

fumC 41

gyrB 15

icd 18

recA 6

CGCACGTAAACTGGGCGTCGATATCGATAACCTGCTGTGCTCCCAGCCGGACACCGGCGAGCAGGCACTGGAAAT CTGTGACGCCCTGGCGCGTTCTGGCGCAGTAGACGTTATCGTCGTTGACTCCGTGGCGGCACTGACGCCGAAAGC GGAAATCGAAGGCGAAATCGGCGACTCTCACATGGGCCTTGCGGCACGTATGATGAGGCCAGGCGATGCGTAAGCT GGCGGGTAACCTGAAGCAGTCCAACACGCTGCTGATCTTCATCAACCAGATCCGTATGAAAATTGGTGTGATGTTCG GTAACCCGGAAACCACTACCGGTGGTAACGCGCTGAAATTCTACGCCTCTGTTCGTCTCGACATCCGTCGTATCGGC GCGGTGAAAGAGGGCGAAAACGTGGTGGGTAGCGAAACCCGCGTGAAAGTGGTGAAGAACAAAATCGCTGCGCC GTTTAAACAGGCTGAATTCCAGATCCTCTACGGCGAAGGTATCAACTTCTACGGCGA

#### ST619

Clonal complex (Cplx) = ST101 Cplx Allelic profiles

# adk 43

fumC 41

gyrB 15

### icd 18

recA 6

CGCACGTAAACTGGGCGTCGATATCGATAACCTGCTGTGCTCCCAGCCGGACACCGGCGAGCAGGCACTGGAAAT CTGTGACGCCCTGGCGCGTTCTGGCGCAGTAGACGTTATCGTCGTTGACTCCGTGGCGGCACTGACGCCGAAAGC GGAAATCGAAGGCGAAATCGGCGACTCTCACATGGGCCTTGCGGCACGTATGATGAGGCCAGGCGATGCGTAAGCT GGCGGGTAACCTGAAGCAGTCCAACACGCTGCTGATCTTCATCAACCAGATCCGTATGAAAATTGGTGTGATGTTCG GTAACCCGGAAACCACTACCGGTGGTAACGCGCTGAAATTCTACGCCTCTGTTCGTCTCGACATCCGTCGTATCGGC GCGGTGAAAGAGGGCGAAAACGTGGTGGGTAGCGAAACCCGCGTGAAAGTGGTGAAGAACAAAATCGCTGCGCC GTTTAAACAGGCTGAATTCCAGATCCTCTACGGCGAAGGTATCAACTTCTACGGCGA

# ST621

Clonal complex (Cplx) = ST155 Cplx Allelic profiles adk 6

fumC 4

CGAGCGCCATTCGGCAGGCGGCGGATGAAGTACTGGCAGGACAGCATGACGACGAATTCCCGCTGGCTATCTGGC AGACCGGCTCCGGCACGCAAAGTAACATGAACATGAACGAAGTGCTGGCTAACCGGGCCAGTGAATTACTCGGCG GCGTGCGCGGGATGGAACGTAAAGTTCACCCTAACGACGACGTGAACAAAAGCCAAAGTTCCAACGATGTCTTTCC

gyrB 12

GGTCTGCACGGCGTTGGTGTTTCGGTAGTAAACGCCCTGTCGCAAAAACTGGAGCTGGTTATCCAGCGCGAGGGTA AAATTCACCGTCAGATCTACGAACACGGTGTACCGCAGGCCCCGCTGGCGGTTACCGGCGAGACTGAAAAAACCG GCACCATGGTGCGTTTCTGGCCTAGCCTCGAAACTTTCACCAATGTGACCGAGTTCGAATATGAAATTCTGGCGAAA CGTCTGCGTGAGTTGTCGTTCCTCAACTCCGGCGTTTCCATTCGTCTGCGCGACAAGCGCGACGGCAAAGAAGAACAC ACTTCCACTATGAAGGCGGCATCAAGGCGTTCGTTGAATATCTGAACAAGAACAAAACGCCGATCCACCCGAATATC TTCTACTTCTCCACTGAAAAAGACGGTATTGGCGTCGAAGTGGCGTTGCAGTGGAACGATGGCTTCCAGGAAAACAT CT

icd 16

recA 14

GGCGGGTAACCTGAAGCAGTCCAACACGCTGCTGATCTTCATCAACCAGATCCGTATGAAAATTGGTGTGATGTTCG GTAACCCGGAAACCACTACCGGTGGTAACGCGCTGAAATTCTACGCCTCTGTTCGTCTCGACATCCGTCGTATCGGC GCGGTGAAAGAGGGCGAAAACGTGGTGGGTAGCGAAACCCGCGTGAAAGTGGTGAAGAACAAAATCGCTGCACC GTTTAAACAGGCTGAATTTCAGATCCTCTACGGCGAAGGTATCAACTTCTACGGCGA

### ST638

Clonal complex (Cplx) = ST73 Cplx Allelic profiles

adk 76

GGGGAAAGGGACTCAGGCTCAGTTCATCATGGAGAAATATGGTATTCCGCAAATCTCCACTGGCGATATGCTGCGTG CTGCGGTCAAATCTGGCTCCGAGCTGGGTAAACAAGCAAAGGACATTATGGATGCTGGCAAACTGGTCACCGACGA ACTGGTGATCGCGCTGGTTAAAGAGCGCATTGCTCAGGAAGACTGCCGCAACGGTTTCCTGTTGGACGGCGTTCCCG CGTACCATTCCGCAGGCAGACGCGATGAAAGAAGCGGGGCATCAATGTTGATTACGTTCTGGAATTCGACGTACCGG ACGAACTGATTGTTGACCGTATCGTAGGCCGCCGCGTTCACGCGCCGTCTGGTCGTGTTTATCACGTTAAATTCAATC CGCCGAAAGTAGAAGGCAAAGACGACGTTACCGGTGAAGAACTGACTACCCGTAAAGACGATCAGGAAGAAGACGG TACGTAAACGTCTGGTTGAATACCATCAGATGACTGCACCGCTGATCGGCTACTACTCCAAAGAAGCGGAAGCGGG TA

fumC 24

GGTCTGCACGGCGTTGGTGTTTCGGTAGTAAACGCCCTGTCGCAAAAACTGGAGCTGGTTATCCAGCGCGAGGGTA AAATTCACCGTCAGATCTACGAACACGGTGTACCGCAGGCCCCGCTGGCGGTTACCGGCGAGACTGAAAAAACCG GCACTATGGTGCGTTCTGGCCAAGCCTTGAAACCTTCACCAATGTGACCGAGTTCGAATATGACATTCTGGCGAAA CGTCTGCGTGAGTTGTCGTTCCTCAACTCCGGCGTTTCCATTCGTCTGCGCGACAAGCGCGATGGCAAAGAAGACC ACTTCCACTATGAAGGCGGCATCAAGGCATTCGTTGAATATCTGAACAAGAACAAAACGCCGATCCACCCGAATATC TTCTACTTCTCCACCGAAAAAGACGGTATTGGCGTCGAAGTGGCGTTGCAGTGGAACGATGGCTTCCAGGAAAACAT CT

icd 13

ATTCCTGCGTGAAGAGATGGGCGTGAAGAAAATTCGCTTCCCGGAACATTGCGGTATCGGTATTAAGCCGTGTTCGG AAGAAGGCACCAAACGTCTGGTTCGTGCAGCGATCGAATACGCAATTGCTAACGATC

# mdh 17

recA 25

### ST648

Clonal complex (Cplx) = ST468 Cplx Allelic profiles adk 92

## fumC 4

gyrB 87

GGTCTGCACGGCGTTGGTGTTTCGGTAGTAAACGCCCTGTCGCAAAAACTGGAGCTGGTTATCCAGCGCGAGGGTA AAATTCACCGTCAGATCTACGAACACGGTGTACCGCAGGCTCCGCTGGCGGTTACCGGCGAGACTGAAAAAACCG GCACCATGGTGCGTTTCTGGCCCAGCCTCGAAACCTTCACCAATGTGACCGAGTTCGAATATGAAATTCTGGCGAAA CGTCTGCGTGAGTTGTCGTTCCTCAACTCCGGCGTTTCCATTCGTCTGCGCGATAAGCGCGACGGCAAAGAAGACC ACTTCCACTATGAAGGCGGCATCAAGGCGTTCGTTGAATATCTGAACAAGAACAAAACGCCGATCCACCCGAATATC TTCTACTTCTCCACTGAAAAAGACGGTATTGGCGTCGAAGTGGCGTTGCAGTGGAACGATGGCTTCCAGGAAAACAT CT

icd 96

recA 2

CGCACGTAAACTGGGCGTCGATATCGACAACCTGCTGTGCTCCCAGCCGGACACCGGCGAGCAGGCACTGGAAAT CTGTGACGCCCTGGCGCGTTCTGGCGCAGTAGACGTTATCGTCGTTGACTCCGTGGCGGCACTGACGCCGAAAGC GGAAATCGAAGGCGAAATCGGCGACTCTCACATGGGCCTTGCGGCACGTATGATGAGGCCAGGCGATGCGTAAGCT GGCGGGTAACCTGAAGCAGTCCAACACGCTGCTGATCTTCATCAACCAGATCCGTATGAAAATTGGTGTGATGTTCG GTAACCCGGAAACCACTACCGGTGGTAACGCGCTGAAATTCTACGCCTCTGTTCGTCTCGACATCCGTCGTATCGGC GCGGTGAAAGAGGGCGAAAACGTGGTGGGTAGCGAAACCCGCGTGAAAGTGGTGAAGAACAAAATCGCTGCGCC GTTTAAACAGGCTGAATTCCAGATCCTCTACGGCGAAGGTATCAACTTCTACGGCGA

#### ST656

Clonal complex (Cplx) = ST10 Cplx Allelic profiles

# adk 10

GGGGAAAGGGACTCAGGCTCAGTTCATCATGGAGAAATATGGTATTCCGCAAATCTCCACTGGCGATATGCTGCGTG CTGCGGTCAAATCTGGCTCCGAGCTGGGTAAACAAGCAAAGGACATTATGGATGCTGGCAAACTGGTCACCGACGA ACTGGTGATCGCGCTGGTTAAAGAGCGCATTGCTCAGGAAGACTGCCGTAATGGTTTCCTGTTGGACGGCTTCCCG CGTACCATTCCGCAGGCAGACGCGATGAAAGAAGCGGGGCATCAATGTTGATTACGTTCTGGAATTCGACGTACCGG ACGAACTGATCGTTGACCGTATCGTCGGTCGCCGCGTTCATGCGCCGTCTGGTCGTGTTTATCACGTTAAATTCAATC CGCCGAAAGTAGAAGGCAAAGACGACGTTACCGGTGAAGAACTGACTACCCGTAAAGATGATCAGGAAGAGACGCG TACGTAAACGTCTGGTTGAATACCATCAGATGACAGCACCGCTGATCGGCTGCTACTCCCAAAGAAGCAGAAGCAGGGG TA

fumC 7

gyrB 4

GGTCTGCACGGCGTTGGTGTTTCGGTAGTAAACGCCCTGTCGCAAAAACTGGAGCTGGTTATCCAGCGCGAGGGGTA AAATTCACCGTCAGATCTACGAACACGGTGTACCGCAGGCCCCGCTGGCGGTTACCGGCGAGACTGAAAAAACCG GCACCATGGTGCGTTTCTGGCCCAGCCTCGAAACCTTCACCAATGTGACCGAGTTCGAATATGAAATTCTGGCGAAA CGTCTGCGTGAGTTGTCGTTCCTCAACTCCGGCGTTTCCATTCGTCTGCGCGACAAGCGCGACGGCAAAGAAGAACAC ACTTCCACTATGAAGGCGGCATCAAGGCGTTCGTTGAATATCTGAACAAGAACAAAACGCCGATCCACCCGAATATC TTCTACTTCTCCACTGAAAAAGACGGTATTGGCGTCGAAGTGGCGTTGCAGTGGAACGATGGCTTCCAGGAAAACAT CT

icd 8

recA 2

CGCACGTAAACTGGGCGTCGATATCGACAACCTGCTGTGCTCCCAGCCGGACACCGGCGAGCAGGCACTGGAAAT CTGTGACGCCCTGGCGCGTTCTGGCGCAGTAGACGTTATCGTCGTGACTCCGTGGCGGCACTGACGCCGAAAGC GGAAATCGAAGGCGAAATCGGCGACTCTCACATGGGCCTTGCGGCACGTATGATGAGCCAGGCGATGCGTAAGCT GGCGGGTAACCTGAAGCAGTCCAACACGCTGCTGATCTTCATCAACCAGATCCGTATGAAAATTGGTGTGATGTTCG GTAACCCGGAAACCACTACCGGTGGTAACGCGCTGAAATTCTACGCCTCTGTTCGTCTCGACATCCGTCGTATCGGC GCGGTGAAAGAGGGCGAAAACGTGGTGGGTAGCGAAACCCGCGTGAAAGTGGTGAAGAACAAAATCGCTGCGCC GTTTAAACAGGCTGAATTCCAGATCCTCTACGGCGAAGGTATCAACTTCTACGGCGA

# ST877

Clonal complex (Cplx) = none a what have a solution of the sol

GGGGAAAGGGACTCAGGCTCAGTTCATCATGGAGAAATATGGTATTCCGCAAATCTCCACTGGCGATATGCTGCGTG CTGCGGTCAAATCTGGCTCCGAGCTGGGTAAACAAGCAAAGGACATTATGGATGCTGGCAAACTGGTCACCGACGA ACTGGTGATCGCGCTGGTTAAAGAGCGCCATTGCTCAGGAAGACTGCCATAATGGTTTCCTGTTGGACGGCTTCCCGC GTACCATTCCGCAGGCAGACGCGATGAAAGAAGCGGGGCATCAATGTTGATTACGTTCTGGAATTCGACGTACCGGA CGAACTGATCGTTGACCGTATCGTCGGTCGCCGCGTTCACGCGCCGTCTGGTCGTGTTTATCACGTTAAATTCAATC CGCCGAAAGTAGAAGGCAAAGACGACGTTACCGGTGAAGAACTGACTACCCGTAAAGATGATCAGGAAGAAGCAGCG TACGTAAACGTCTGGTTGAATACCATCAGATGACAGCAGCACCGCTGATCGGCTACTACTCCCAAAGAAGCGGAAGCGGGG TA

fumC 175

CGAGCGCCATTCGGCAGGCGGCGGATGAAGTACTGGCAGGACAGCATGACGACGAATTCCCGCTGGCTATCTGGC AGACCGGCTCCGGCACGCAAAGTAACATGAACATGAACGAAGTGCTGGCTAACCGGGCCAGTGAATTACTCGGCG GCGTGCGCGGGATGGAACGTAAAGTTCACCCTAACGATGACGTGAACAAAAGCCAAAGTTCCAACGATGTCTTTCC

# gyrB 33

GGTCTGCACGGCGTTGGTGTTTCGGTTGTAAACGCCCTGTCGCAAAAACTGGAGCTGGTTATCCAGCGCGAGGGTA AAATTCACCGTCAGATCTACGAACACGGTGTACCGCAGGCTCCGCTGGCGGTTACCGGCGAGACTGAAAAAACCG GCACCATGGTGCGTTTCTGGCCCAGCCTCGAAACCTTCACCAATGTGACCGAGTTCGAATATGAAATTCTGGCGAAA CGTCTGCGTGAGTTGTCGTTCCTCAACTCCGGCGTTTCCATTCGTCTGCGCGACAAGCGTGACGGCAAAGAAGAACAC ACTTCCACTATGAAGGCGGCATCAAGGCGTTCGTTGAATATCTGAACAAGAACAAAACGCCGATCCACCCGAATATC TTCTACTTCTCCACCGAAAAAGACGGTATTGGCGTCGAAGTGGCGTTGCAGTGGAACGATGGCTTCCAGGAAAACAT CT

icd 131

## recA 7

CGCACGTAAACTGGGCGTCGATATCGATAACCTGCTGTGCTCCCAGCCGGACACCGGCGAGCAGGCACTGGAAAT CTGTGACGCCCTGGCGCGTTCTGGCGCAGTAGACGTTATCGTCGTTGACTCCGTGGCGGCACTGACGCCGAAAGC GGAAATCGAAGGCGAAATCGGCGACTCTCACATGGGCCTTGCGGCACGTATGATGAGCCAGGCGATGCGTAAGCT GGCGGGTAACCTGAAGCAGTCCAACACGCTGCTGATCTTCATCAACCAGATCCGTATGAAAATTGGTGTGATGTTCG GTAACCCGGAAACCACTACCGGTGGTAACGCGCTGAAATTCTACGCCTCTGTTCGTCTCGACATCCGTCGTATCGGC GCGGTGAAAGAGGGCGAAAACGTGGTGGGTAGCGAAACCCGCGTGAAAGTGGTGAAGAACAAAATCGCTGCACC GTTTAAACAGGCTGAATTTCAGATCCTCTACGGCGAAGGTATCAACTTCTACGGCGA

### ST953

Clonal complex (Cplx) = none Allelic profiles

adk 8

GGGGAAAGGGACTCAGGCTCAGTTCATCATGGAGAAATATGGTATTCCGCAAATCTCCACTGGCGATATGCTGCGTG CTGCGGTCAAATCTGGCTCCGAGCTGGGTAAACAAGCAAAGGACATTATGGATGCTGGCAAACTGGTCACCGACGA ACTGGTGATCGCGCGGGTGAAAGAGCGCGATTGCTCAGGAAGACTGCCGTAATGGTTTCCTGTTGGACGGCTTCCCG CGTACCATTCCGCAGGCAGACGCGATGAAAGAAGCGGGCATCAATGTTGATTACGTTCTGGAATTTGATGTACCGGA CGAACTGATCGTTGACCGTATCGTGGGTCGCCGTGTTCACGCGCCGTCTGGCCGTGTTTATCACGTTAAATTCAATC CGCCGAAAGTAGAAGGTAAAGACGACGTTACCGGTGAAGAGCTGACCACCCGTAAAGATGATCAGGAAGAAACCG TACGTAAACGTCTGGTTGAATATCATCAGATGACTGCGCCGCGTGTTGGCTACTATTCAAAGAAGCTGAAGCGGGT A

fumC 7

icd 8

gyrB 1

ATTCCTGCGTGAAGAGATGGGGGTGAAGAAAATTCGCTTCCCGGAACATTGTGGTATCGGTATTAAGCCGTGTTCGG AAGAAGGCACCAAACGTCTGGTTCGTGCAGCGATCGAATACGCAATTGCTAACGATC

# mdh 125

recA 6

ST963

# **CHULALONGKORN UNIVERSITY**

Clonal complex (Cplx) = none Allelic profiles

adk 4

GGGGAAAGGGACTCAGGCTCAGTTCATCATGGAGAAATATGGTATTCCGCAAATCTCCACTGGCGATATGCTGCGTG CTGCGGTCAAATCTGGCTCCGAGCTGGGTAAACAAGCAAAGGACATTATGGATGCTGGCAAACTGGTTACCGACGA ACTGGTGATCGCGCTGGTTAAAGAGCGCATTGCTCAGGAAGACTGCCGTAATGGTTTCCTGTTGGACGGCTTCCCG CGTACCATTCCGCAGGCAGACGCGATGAAAGAAGCGGGGCATCAATGTTGATTACGTTCTGGAATTCGACGTACCGG ACGAACTGATCGTTGACCGTATTGTCGGTCGCCGCGTTCACGCGCCGTCTGGTCGTGTTTATCACGTTAAATTCAACC CGCCGAAAGTAGAAGGCAAAGACGACGTTACCGGTGAAGAACTGACTACCCGTAAAGACGATCAGGAAGAAACCG TACGTAAACGTCTGGTTGAATACCATCAGATGACTGCACCGCTGATCGGCTACTACTCCAAAGAAGCGGAAGCGGG TA

fumC 26

gyrB 151

GGTCTGCACGGCGTTGGTGTTTCGGTAGTAAACGCCCTGTCGCAAAAACTGGAGCTGGTTATCCAGCGCGAGGGTA ATATTCACCGTCAGATCTACGAACACGGTGTACCGCAGGCTCCGCTGGCGGTTACCGGCGAGACTGAAAAAACCGG CACCATGGTGCGTTTCTGGCCAAGCCTCGAAACCTTCACCAATGTGACCGAGTTCGAATATGAAATTCTGGCGAAAC GTCTGCGTGAGTTGTCGTTCCTCAACTCCGGCGTTTCCATTCGTCTGCGAGACCAAGCGCGACGGTAAAGAAGAACAA CTTCCACTATGAAGGCGGCATCAAGGCGTTCGTTGAATATCTGAACAAGAACAAAACGCCGATCCACCCGAATATCT TCTACTTCTCCACCGAGAAAGACGGTATTGGCGTCGAAGTGGCGTTGCAGTGGAACGATGGCTTCCAGGAAAACAT CT

icd 25

recA 19

TGCACGTAAACTGGGCGTCGATATCGACAACCTGCTGTGCTCCCAGCCGGACACTGGCGAGCAGGCACTGGAAAT CTGTGACGCCCTGGCGCGTTCTGGTGCAGTAGACGTTATCGTCGTTGACTCCGTGGCGGCACTGACGCCGAAAGC GGAAATCGAAGGCGAAATCGGCGACTCTCACATGGGCCTTGCGGCACGTATGATGAGGCCAGGCGATGCGTAAGCT GGCGGGTAACCTGAAGCAGTCCAACACGCTGCTGATCTTCATCAACCAGATCCGTATGAAAATTGGTGTGATGTTCG GTAACCCGGAAACCACTACCGGTGGTAACGCGCTGAAATTCTACGCCTCTGTTCGTCTCGACATCCGTCGTATCGGC GCGGTGAAAGAGGGCGAAAACGTGGTGGGTAGCGAAACCCGTGTGAAAGTGGTGAAGAACAAAATCGCTGCGCC GTTTAAACAGGCTGAATTCCAGATCCTCTACGGCGAAGGTATCAACTTCTATGGCGA

ST1119

Clonal complex (Cplx) = ST468 Cplx

Allelic profiles

adk 92

fumC 4

gyrB 87

GGTCTGCACGGCGTTGGTGTTTCGGTAGTAAACGCCCTGTCGCAAAAACTGGAGCTGGTTATCCAGCGCGAGGGTA AAATTCACCGTCAGATCTACGAACACGGTGTACCGCAGGCTCCGCTGGCGGTTACCGGCGAGACTGAAAAAACCG GCACCATGGTGCGTTTCTGGCCCAGCCTCGAAACCTTCACCAATGTGACCGAGTTCGAATATGAAATTCTGGCGAAA CGTCTGCGTGAGTTGTCGTTCCTCAACTCCGGCGTTTCCATTCGTCTGCGCGATAAGCGCGACGGCAAAGAAGAAC ACTTCCACTATGAAGGCGGCATCAAGGCGTTCGTTGAATATCTGAACAAGAACAAAACGCCGATCCACCCGAATATC TTCTACTTCTCCACTGAAAAAGACGGTATTGGCGTCGAAGTGGCGTTGCAGTGGAACGATGGCTTCCAGGAAAACAT CT

icd 96

GGCCCGCTGACCACTCCGGTTGGTGGTGGTGGTATTCGCTCTCCAACGTTGCTCTGCGCCAGGAACTGGATCTCTACAT CTGCCTGCGTCCGGTACGTTACTATCAGGGCACTCCAAGCCCGGTTAAACACCCTGAACTGACCGATATGGTTATCT TCCGTGAAAACTCGGAAGACATTTATGCGGGTATCGAATGGAAAGCAGACTCTGCCGACGCTGAGAAAGTGATTAAA TTCCTGCGTGAAGAGATGGGCGTGAAGAAAATTCGCTTCCCGGAACATTGCGGCATCGGTATTAAGCCGTGTTCTGA AGAAGGCACCAAACGTCTGGTTCGTGCAGCGATCGAATACGCAATTGCTAACGATC mdh 70

### recA 2

CGCACGTAAACTGGGCGTCGATATCGACAACCTGCTGTGCTCCCAGCCGGACACCGGCGAGCAGGCACTGGAAAT CTGTGACGCCCTGGCGCGTTCTGGCGCAGTAGACGTTATCGTCGTTGACTCCGTGGCGGCACTGACGCCGAAAGC GGAAATCGAAGGCGAAATCGGCGACTCTCACATGGGCCTTGCGGCACGTATGATGAGGCCAGGCGATGCGTAAGCT GGCGGGTAACCTGAAGCAGTCCAACACGCTGCTGATCTTCATCAACCAGATCCGTATGAAAATTGGTGTGATGTTCG GTAACCCGGAAACCACTACCGGTGGTAACGCGCTGAAATTCTACGCCTCTGTTCGTCTCGACATCCGTCGTATCGGC GCGGTGAAAGAGGGCGAAAACGTGGTGGGTAGCGAAACCCGCGTGAAAGTGGTGAAGAACAAAATCGCTGCGCC GTTTAAACAGGCTGAATTCCAGATCCTCTACGGCGAAGGTATCAACTTCTACGGCGA

### ST2311

Clonal complex (Cplx) = ST468 Cplx Allelic profiles

adk 92

GCGTAAACGTCTGGTTGAATACCATCAGATGACTGCACCGCTGATCGGCTACTACTCCAAAGAAGCGGAAGCAGGT

# A fumC 4

# gyrB 87

GGTCTGCACGGCGTTGGTGTTTCGGTAGTAAACGCCCTGTCGCAAAAACTGGAGCTGGTTATCCAGCGCGAGGGTA AAATTCACCGTCAGATCTACGAACACGGTGTACCGCAGGCTCCGCTGGCGGTTACCGGCGAGACTGAAAAAACCG GCACCATGGTGCGTTTCTGGCCCAGCCTCGAAACCTTCACCAATGTGACCGAGTTCGAATATGAAATTCTGGCGAAA CGTCTGCGTGAGTTGTCGTTCCTCAACTCCGGCGTTTCCATTCGTCTGCGCGATAAGCGCGACGGCAAAGAAGACC ACTTCCACTATGAAGGCGGCATCAAGGCGTTCGTTGAATATCTGAACAAGAACAAAACGCCGATCCACCCGAATATC TTCTACTTCTCCACTGAAAAAGACGGTATTGGCGTCGAAGTGGCGTTGCAGTGGAACGATGGCTTCCAGGAAAACAT CT

# icd 96

CACCACTGCTGGTGGCGTGGCGACCGGTTCCGGCCTGGGCCCACGTTATGTTGATTACGTTCTGGGTATCCTCAAA GCTTACTCCACTCGTGT

# recA 18

TGCACGTAAACTGGGCGTCGATATCGACAACCTGCTGTGCTCCCAGCCGGACACTGGCGAGCAGGCACTGGAAAT CTGTGACGCCCTGGCGCGTTCTGGTGCAGTAGACGTTATCGTCGTTGACTCCGTGGCGGCGCACTGACGCCGAAAGC GGAAATCGAAGGCGAAATCGGCGACTCTCACATGGGCCTTGCGGCACGTATGATGAGGCCAGGCGATGCGTAAGCT GGCGGGTAACCTGAAGCAGTCCCAACACGCTGCTGATCTTCATCAACCAGATCCGTATGAAAATTGGTGTGGTGATGTTCG GTAACCCGGAAACTACTACCGGTGGTAACGCGCTGAAATTCTACGCCTCTGTTCGTCTCGACATCCGTCGTATCGGC GCGGTGAAAGAGGGCGAAAACGTGGTGGGTAGCGAAACCCGTGTGAAAGTGGTGAAGAACAAAATCGCTGCTCCG TTTAAACAGGCTGAATTCCAGATCCTCTACGGCGAAGGTATCAACTTCTATGGCGA

### ST2753

Clonal complex (Cplx) = none Allelic profiles adk 10

GGGGAAAGGGACTCAGGCTCAGTTCATCATGGAGAAATATGGTATTCCGCAAATCTCCACTGGCGATATGCTGCGTG

CTGCGGTCAAATCTGGCTCCGAGCTGGGTAAACAAGCAAAAGACATTATGGATGCTGGCAAACTGGTCACCGACGA ACTGGTGATCGCGCTGGTTAAAGAGCGCATTGCTCAGGAAGACTGCCGTAATGGTTTCCTGTTGGACGGCTTCCCG CGTACCATTCCGCAGGCAGACGCGATGAAAGAAGCGGGGCATCAATGTTGATTACGTTCTGGAATTCGACGTACCGG ACGAACTGATCGTTGACCGTATCGTCGGTCGCCGCGTTCATGCGCCGTCTGGTCGTGTTTATCACGTTAAATTCAATC CGCCGAAAGTAGAAGGCAAAGACGACGTTACCGGTGAAGAACTGACTACCCGTAAAGATGATCAGGAAGAAGAAGCGGG TACGTAAACGTCTGGTTGAATACCATCAGATGACAGCAGCACCGCTGATCGGCTACTACTCCAAAGAAGCAGAAGCAGAAGCGGG

TA fumC 11

# gyrB 5

GGTCTGCACGGCGTTGGTGTTTCGGTAGTAAACGCCCTGTCGCAAAAACTGGAGCTGGTTATCCAGCGCGAGGGTA AAATTCACCGTCAGATCTACGAACACGGTGTACCGCAGGCTCCGCTGGCGGTTACCGGCGAGACTGAAAAAACCG GCACCATGGTGCGTTTCTGGCCCAGCCTCGAAACCTTCACCAATGTGACCGAGTTCGAATATGAAATTCTGGCGAAA CGTCTGCGTGAGTTGTCGTTCCTCAACTCCGGCGTTTCCATTCGTCTGCGCGACAAGCGCGACGGCAAAGAAGAACAC ACTTCCACTATGAAGGCGGCATCAAGGCGTTCGTTGAATATCTGAACAAGAACAAAACGCCGATCCACCCGAATATC TTCTACTTCTCCACTGAAAAAGACGGTATTGGCGTCGAAGTGGCGTTGCAGTGGAACGATGGCTTCCAGGAAAACAT CT icd 10

mdh 8

recA 6

CGCACGTAAACTGGGCGTCGATATCGATAACCTGCTGTGCTCCCAGCCGGACACCGGCGAGCAGGCACTGGAAAT CTGTGACGCCCTGGCGCGTTCTGGCGCAGTAGACGTTATCGTCGTGACTCCGTGGCGGCACTGACGCCGAAAGC GGAAATCGAAGGCGAAATCGGCGACTCTCACATGGGCCTTGCGGCACGTATGATGAGCCAGGCGATGCGTAAGCT GGCGGGTAACCTGAAGCAGTCCAACACGCTGCTGATCTTCATCAACCAGATCCGTATGAAAATTGGTGTGATGTTCG GTAACCCGGAAACCACTACCGGTGGTAACGCGCTGAAATTCTACGCCTCTGTTCGTCTCGACATCCGTCGTATCGGC GCGGTGAAAGAGGGCGAAAACGTGGTGGGTAGCGAAACCCGCGTGAAAGTGGTGAAGAACAAAATCGCTGCGCC GTTTAAACAGGCTGAATTCCAGATCCTCTACGGCGAAGGTATCAACTTCTACGGCGA

ST3379

Clonal complex (Cplx) = none Allelic profiles adk 6

GGGGAAAGGGACTCAGGCTCAGTTCATCATGGAGAAATATGGTATTCCGCAAATCTCCACTGGCGATATGCTGCGTG CTGCGGTCAAATCTGGCTCCGAGCTGGGTAAACAAGCAAAAGACATTATGGATGCTGGCAAACTGGTCACCGACGA

fumC 95

gyrB 3

GGTCTGCACGGCGTTGGTGTTTCGGTAGTAAACGCCCTGTCGCAAAAACTGGAGCTGGTTATCCAGCGCGAGGGTA AAATTCACCGTCAGATCTACGAACACGGTGTACCGCAGGCCCCGCTGGCGGTTACCGGCGAGACTGAAAAAACCG GCACCATGGTGCGTTTCTGGCCCAGCCTCGAAACCTTCACCAATGTGACCGAGTTCGAATATGAAATTCTGGCGAAA CGTCTGCGTGAGTTGTCGTTCCTCAACTCCGGCGTTTCCATTCGTCTGCGCGACAAGCGCGACGGCAAAGAAGAACAC ACTTCCACTATGAAGGTGGCATCAAGGCGTTCGTTGAATATCTGAACAAGAACAAAACGCCGATCCACCCGAATATC TTCTACTTCTCCACCGAAAAAGACGGTATTGGCGTCGAAGTGGCGTTGCAGTGGAACGATGGCTTCCAGGAAAACAT CT

icd 18

recA 14

CGCACGTAAACTGGGCGTCGATATTGATAACCTGCTGTGCTCCCAGCCGGACACCGGCGAGCAGGCACTGGAAAT CTGTGACGCCCTGGCGCGTTCTGGCGCAGTAGACGTTATCGTCGTTGACTCCGTGGCGGCACTGACGCCGAAAGC GGAAATCGAAGGCGAAATCGGCGACTCTCACATGGGCCTTGCGGCACGTATGATGAGGCCAGGCGATGCGTAAGCT GGCGGGTAACCTGAAGCAGTCCAACACGCTGCTGATCTTCATCAACCAGATCCGTATGAAAATTGGTGTGATGTTCG GTAACCCGGAAACCACTACCGGTGGTAACGCGCTGAAATTCTACGCCTCTGTTCGTCTCGACATCCGTCGTATCGGC GCGGTGAAAGAGGGCGAAAACGTGGTGGGTAGCGAAACCCGCGTGAAAGTGGTGAAGAACAAAATCGCTGCACC GTTTAAACAGGCTGAATTTCAGATCCTCTACGGCGAAGGTATCAACTTCTACGGCGA

#### ST4198

Clonal complex (Cplx) = none

Allelic profiles

adk 137

GGGGAAAGGGACTCAGGCTCAGTTCATCATGGAGAAATATGGTATTCCGCAAATCTCCACTGGCGATATGCTGCGTG CTGCGGTCAAATCTGGCTCCGAGCTGGGTAAACAAGCAAAAGACATTATGGATGCTGGCAAACTGGTTACCGACGA ACTGGTGATCGCGCTGGTTAAAGAGCGCATTGCTCAGGAAGACTGCCGTAATGGTTTCCTGTTGGACGGCTTCCCG CGTACCATTCCGCAGGCAGACGCGATGAAAGAAGCGGGGCATCAATGTTGATTACGTTCTGGAATTCGACGTACCGG ACGAACTGATCGTTGACCGTATCGTCGGTCGCCGCGTTCACGCGCCGTCTGGTCGTGTTTATCACGTTAAATTCAATC CGCCGAAAGTAGAAGGCAAAGACGACGTTACCGGTGAAGAACTGACTACCCGTAAAGACGATCAGGAAGAAACCG TACGTAAACGTCTGGTTGAATACCATCAGATGACTGCACCGCTGATTGGCTACTACTCCAAAGAAGCGGAAGCAGGGG A

# fumC 4

## gyrB 5

GGTCTGCACGGCGTTGGTGTTTCGGTAGTAAACGCCCTGTCGCAAAAACTGGAGCTGGTTATCCAGCGCGAGGGTA AAATTCACCGTCAGATCTACGAACACGGTGTACCGCAGGCTCCGCTGGCGGTTACCGGCGAGACTGAAAAAACCG GCACCATGGTGCGTTTCTGGCCCAGCCTCGAAACCTTCACCAATGTGACCGAGTTCGAATATGAAATTCTGGCGAAA CGTCTGCGTGAGTTGTCGTTCCTCAACTCCGGCGTTTCCATTCGTCTGCGCGACAAGCGCGACGGCAAAGAAGAACAC ACTTCCACTATGAAGGCGGCATCAAGGCGTTCGTTGAATATCTGAACAAGAACAAAACGCCGATCCACCCGAATATC TTCTACTTCTCCACTGAAAAAGACGGTATTGGCGTCGAAGTGGCGTTGCAGTGGAACGATGGCTTCCAGGAAAAACAT CT

icd 1

### recA 7

CGCACGTAAACTGGGCGTCGATATCGATAACCTGCTGTGCTCCCAGCCGGACACCGGCGAGCAGGCACTGGAAAT CTGTGACGCCCTGGCGCGTTCTGGCGCAGTAGACGTTATCGTCGTTGACTCCGTGGCGGCACTGACGCCGAAAGC GGAAATCGAAGGCGAAATCGGCGACTCTCACATGGGCCTTGCGGCACGTATGATGAGGCCAGGCGATGCGTAAGCT GGCGGGTAACCTGAAGCAGTCCAACACGCTGCTGATCTTCATCAACCAGATCCGTATGAAAATTGGTGTGATGTTCG GTAACCCGGAAACCACTACCGGTGGTAACGCGCTGAAATTCTACGCCTCTGTTCGTCTCGACATCCGTCGTATCGGC GCGGTGAAAGAGGGCGAAAACGTGGTGGGTAGCGAAACCCGCGTGAAAGTGGTGAAGAACAAAATCGCTGCACC GTTTAAACAGGCTGAATTTCAGATCCTCTACGGCGAAGGTATCAACTTCTACGGCGA

# VITA

NAME: Kitttitat Lugsomya

DATE OF BIRTH: 7 September 1984

# EDUCATION: Doctor of Philosophy Program in Veterinary Pathobiology (2011 - present)

: Master of Science Program in Veterinary Pathobiology (2009 – 2011)

: Doctor of Veterinary Medicine (D.V.M.) (2002 - 2008)

Faculty of Veterinary Science, Chulalongkorn University

# PUBLICATIONS:

1.Routine prophylactic antimicrobial use is associated with increased phenotypic and genotypic resistance in commensal Escherichia coli isolates recovered from healthy fattening pigs on farms in Thailand Lugsomya K, Chatsuwan T, Niyomtham W, Tummaruk P, Hampson DJ and Prapasarakul N Microb Drug Resist. (Page Proofs) 23 MDR-2017-0042.

2.Molecular detection and isolation of pathogenic Leptospira from asymptomatic humans, domestic animals and water sources in Nan Province, a rural area of Thailand Kurilung A. Chanchaithong P Lugsomya K, Niyomtham W, Wuthiekanun V, Prapasarakul. Res Vet Sci. 2017 Mar:115:146-154.

3.Prevalence of Plasmid-mediated colistin resistance genes (mcr-1) in commensal Escherichia coli from fattening pigs in Thailand. Lugsomya K, Chanchaithong P, Tribuddharat C, Thanawanh N, Niyomtham W and Prapasarakul N Thai J Vet supple 2016 46:327-8.

4.Salmonella serovar distribution in cobras (Naja kaouthia), snake-food species, and farm workers at Queen Saovabha Snake Park, Thailand.Prapasarakul N, Pulsrikarn C, Vasaruchapong T, Lekcharoen P, Chanchaithong P, Lugsomya K, Keschumras N, Thanomsuksinchai N, Tanchiangsai K, Tummaruk P.J Vet Diagn Invest. 2012 Mar;24(2):288-94.

5.Development of a modified selective medium to enhance the recovery rate of Brachyspira hyodysenteriae and other porcine intestinal spirochaetes from faeces. Lugsomya K, Tummaruk P, Hampson DJ, Prapasarakul N. Lett Appl Microbiol. 2012 Apr;54(4):330-5.

6.Faecal excretion of intestinal spirochaetes by urban dogs, and their pathogenicity in a chick model of intestinal spirochaetosis.Prapasarakul N, Lugsomya K, Disatian S, Lekdumrongsak T, Banlunara W, Chetanachan P, Hampson DJ.Res Vet Sci. 2011 Dec;91(3):e38-43.