

31 **Abstract**

32 **Background**

33 On a Friday evening in July 2021, Public Health Wales received notification of two cases of
34 salmonella gastroenteritis. Both cases reported attending an Eid al-Adha celebration
35 barbecue in a public park in Cardiff, UK two days earlier. Case finding over the weekend
36 indicated further cases in those who had attended this event and an outbreak investigation
37 was initiated.

38 **Methods**

39 Cases were defined as an individual with diarrhoea and/or vomiting with date of onset on the
40 day of the barbecue, with an epidemiological link to the Eid-al Adha celebration meal. We
41 undertook a cohort study in 36 people attending the barbecue and an associated lunchtime
42 event, and a nested case-control study using Firth logistic regression. A communication
43 campaign that was sensitive towards cultural practices was developed in collaboration with
44 the community, community liaison staff and the Public Health Wales communications team.

45 **Results**

46 Consumption of a traditional raw liver dish, 'marrara', at the barbecue was the most likely
47 vehicle for infection (Firth logistic regression, aOR: 49.99, 95%CI 1.71-1461.54, p=0.02).
48 Meat came from two local butchers with the same supplier and food samples yielded
49 identical whole genome sequences to those from cases. This outbreak highlights the need
50 for appropriate food hygiene advice in communities preparing traditional dishes.

51 **Conclusions**

52 This outbreak identified a new vehicle of interest, a traditional raw offal dish. Future outbreak
53 investigations, particularly where cultural events are associated with particular foods, should

54 consider dishes beyond those on routine questionnaires to those which may be relevant to
55 the community in question.

56 **Introduction**

57 *Salmonella enterica* is a zoonotic, bacterial pathogen which is a common cause of
58 gastrointestinal disease in humans [1], which is usually self-limiting. The most commonly
59 reported serotypes of *Salmonella enterica* in the UK are *Salmonella Enteritidis* followed by
60 *Salmonella Typhimurium* [2]. These two serotypes account for half of all salmonella
61 laboratory reports in England and Wales [3]. Transmission of salmonella typically occurs
62 through consumption of contaminated food or water, or through contact with animals and
63 their environments [4]. Contamination of food and produce with salmonella can occur at any
64 point as a result of poor hygienic practices during the production, storage or preparation of
65 food. In the UK, an estimated 39,000 cases of non-typhoidal salmonellosis occur in the
66 community per year, of which, around 10,000 are notified [5].

67 Foodborne outbreaks caused by salmonella in the UK are usually attributed to poultry and
68 poultry products [6] . As a result, salmonella controls in livestock in the UK are targeted at
69 poultry, and data on salmonella in poultry are collected as part of statutory surveillance
70 systems [7]. Most Salmonella reports from cattle, sheep and pigs arise following
71 investigation of diseased animals.

72 On a Friday in July 2021, Public Health Wales (PHW) Microbiology reported two cases of
73 gastrointestinal disease with a positive PCR result for salmonella. Follow up by Public Health
74 Wales and Regulatory Services for Bridgend, Cardiff & Vale of Glamorgan Councils
75 established that both cases were in individuals from the same Cardiff North African
76 community who reported attending a barbecue in a public park two days earlier to celebrate
77 Eid al-Adha. Celebration lunches had also been held on the same day. We initiated an

78 epidemiological investigation in order to identify the source and extent of the outbreak, and
79 to implement control measures to prevent further spread.

80 **Methods**

81 **Case finding**

82 Initial case finding was carried out by the Public Health Wales out-of-hours health protection
83 service, in collaboration with environmental health and Public Health Microbiology. Cases
84 were defined as shown in table 1.

85 **Table 1. Case definitions used during the outbreak investigation**

Case definition	Rationale
Possible outbreak case	Gastroenteritis case (diarrhoea and/or vomiting) with date of onset on day of barbecue, WITH an epidemiological link (i.e. resident in same household as attendee) to the Eid-al Adha celebration barbecue or lunch
Probable outbreak case	Meets criteria for possible case AND has a PCR positive result for <i>Salmonella</i> Typhimurium with or without a positive culture result OR Gastroenteritis case (diarrhoea and/or vomiting) with date of onset on day of barbecue, AND attended the Eid-al Adha celebration barbecue or lunch
Confirmed outbreak case	Meets criteria for a probable case and has a culture positive result for <i>Salmonella</i> Typhimurium
Cohort study case	An individual who attended the Eid-al Adha barbecue, who became unwell with diarrhoea and/or vomiting within 8 hours - 72 hours following the event and for whom a completed questionnaire was available
Whole genome sequenced case	An individual with <i>Salmonella</i> Typhimurium t5.4574.%(1.26.136.634.2037.4574.%)

86

87 All cases identified were interviewed and risk of onward transmission was assessed.
88 Standard advice was given to cases and their contacts about infection prevention and
89 control, and where necessary, cases were excluded from work or school. Information was
90 collected about the personal characteristics of cases, their symptoms, food and travel

91 history, and a line list was maintained. All cases were asked to provide a stool sample for
92 microbiological analysis.

93 **Cohort study**

94 Those attending the barbecue or a celebration lunch were included in a cohort study. The
95 names and household residence of attendees was cross-referenced and verified by
96 discussing who was present with cases and their household. We tested the hypothesis that
97 being a case was associated with consumption of sheep meat products served at the
98 barbecue and/or celebration lunch. We designed and administered a questionnaire survey to
99 all those attending a celebration lunch and/or the evening barbecue. This questionnaire was
100 administered by face-to-face field interviews (as the preferred option), telephone interview
101 (second preference) or by the online questionnaire tool 'SmartSurvey' [8]. The majority of
102 interviews were conducted in English, but for one telephone interview, an Arabic interpreter
103 was used by utilising the Language Line service [9]. We asked about specific dishes
104 consumed and the portion size of each. These details were checked with those who
105 prepared the dishes and using online recipes. Information on demographics, clinical
106 features, outcomes and exposures were collected, as was travel history, contact with
107 animals and contact with infectious individuals in the 48 hours prior to the celebration lunch
108 and barbecue events.

109 **Statistical analysis**

110 We described the characteristics of cases and their exposure history, and constructed an
111 epidemic curve. Using our cohort of people attending the barbecue and/or celebration lunch,
112 we compared likelihood of being a case in those consuming specific food items. All analysis
113 was undertaken using STATA 15.

114 We examined whether those who ate more of an implicated food were more likely to have
115 severe illness. This dose-response analysis was conducted by asking survey respondents

116 how much of each food they ate (a small, normal or large portion). Severity of disease was
117 assess by using their responses about seeking medical care. Those attending hospital were
118 considered more ill than those who did not (no cases contacted their GP) and those who
119 were admitted to hospital were considered most ill of all.

120 In order to allow for zero-cell counts or unanimous consumption of certain food types, and in
121 particular examine lamb consumption further, we conducted a Firth logistic regression using
122 a case-control design. Significant odds ratios ($P < 0.05$) calculated in the univariate results
123 were included in the Firth regression.

124 **Microbiology and whole genome sequencing of human samples**

125 Stool samples were sent to Public Health Wales Microbiology Cardiff for PCR testing. Those
126 returning a positive PCR result for *Salmonella Spp* were cultured and subtyped locally.
127 Samples of positive cultures were also sent to the UK reference laboratory (Gastro Bacterial
128 Reference Unit (GBRU) in Colindale, UK Health Security Agency (UKHSA)) for whole
129 genome sequencing (WGS). Full SNP addresses are reported by this service, with the 5
130 SNP level used for cluster designation and public health action.

131 **Food microbiology**


132 Households containing a case were asked to provide samples of any leftover food products
133 from the barbecue or lunches. Environmental and food samples were taken from the
134 premises, local butchers and supplying abattoir. Samples were sent initially to Public Health
135 Wales's Food, Water and Environment (FEW) laboratories (University Hospital Llandough,
136 Cardiff) for detection, enumeration and serotyping of *Salmonella*, before referring isolates to
137 GBRU for whole genome sequencing.

138 **Results**

139 ***The outbreak***


140 In total, 22 cases were identified in this outbreak, all of whom were symptomatic. All cases
141 were part of a social network (n=43; attack rate = 51%), the majority of whom attended the
142 barbecue (22 cases in 32 attendees) or celebration lunch. The epidemic curve (figure 2) is
143 suggestive of a point source, with the majority of cases reporting symptom onset in the day
144 following the barbecue (n=14), with two further cases developing symptoms the day after
145 this. A further five cases developed symptoms in the following eight days, which is
146 suggestive of person-to-person transmission.

147 The discussion with cases and their households about celebration event attendance also
148 gave valuable insight into the wider community network and those visiting specifically for
149 these events. We received 36 completed surveys, of which 19 were male respondents
150 (figure 1a). Of these survey respondents, 20 individuals were cases (12 male and 8 female,
151 figure 1b). There were no cases in the 0-9 years age group but men were affected in all
152 other age groups, notably the 30-49 years strata. Females had no cases in all but two strata,
153 but the female 10-19 years age group was the worst affected strata of all respondents. All
154 survey respondents identified were of non-white ethnicity and 30 identified a family
155 connection to the same North African country.




156

157 **Figure 1a. Age-sex profile of survey respondents, n=36**



158

159 **Figure 1b. Age-sex profile of survey respondent cases, n=20**



160

161 **Figure 2. Epidemic curve: Day of symptom onset in confirmed cases (n=22) by**
162 **barbecue attendance**

163 **Cohort study**

164 Of the 36 surveys completed, 31 lived in Cardiff, and five were visiting Cardiff (from other
165 regions of the UK). These latter five individuals were staying with friends and family in Cardiff
166 for the Eid celebrations and cited this trip as the only stay outside home in the three days
167 before the barbecue. Only one other respondent mentioned travel in the three days before
168 the barbecue, where they had visited a local beach with friends for another barbecue. Of all
169 survey responses, 29 attended the barbecue (cases=17) and 27 attended a lunch event
170 (cases=16). There were seven people attending only a lunch event (cases=3) and nine
171 people attending only the barbecue (cases=4). We defined our cohort as those attending the
172 barbecue (n=32), giving a survey response rate of 91%, but also examined what these
173 individuals ate at lunch where applicable. There were 19 male respondents (cases=12) and
174 16 female respondents (cases=8). Twelve respondents reported attending emergency
175 health services (A&E) because of their symptoms, six of these were admitted and four were
176 kept overnight. One patient required intensive care (ITU) to manage an acute electrolyte
177 disturbance and renal function. The two initial cases reported were part of a group from the
178 same Cardiff North African community who had purchased jointed whole lamb carcasses
179 and offal from two local butchers. This was prepared at home to consume together at an
180 evening barbecue, along with a number of traditional dishes. These included “marara”, made
181 from raw liver, usually cut into strips, washed in lemon juice and vinegar and marinated in
182 herbs, spices and peanut butter. One respondent noted GI sickness in a barbecue attendee,
183 resident in their household, with symptoms starting before the barbecue.

184 *Univariate analysis*

185 Univariate analysis showed an association between consumption of raw liver at the
186 barbecue on 20 July 2021 and being a case (RR = 2.5, 95% CI: 1.46 – 4.28, p<0.05).
187 Because all cases attending the barbecue reported consuming barbecued lamb and no non-
188 cases ate the lamb, it was not possible to calculate a risk ratio for lamb consumption in
189 univariate analysis. There was some evidence for an association between consumption of

190 raw kidney and raw liver at lunchtime and being a case (RR = 1.8, 95% CI: 1.28 – 2.52, p =
 191 0.5), although the p-value was above the cut off for significance. The full list of foods
 192 consumed at the lunch and barbecue events, and their associated risk ratios from the
 193 univariate analysis, are detailed in table 2. In the univariate analysis, there were no foods
 194 consumed at lunchtime that were significantly associated with being a case.

195 **Table 2. Cohort study univariate results, barbeque and/or lunch attendees (n=29), July**
 196 **2021**

Exposure	Exposed			Unexposed			Risk Ratio	95% (CI)	P-value
	N	Cases	AR ¹ %	N	Cases	AR%			
Raw liver (BBQ)	9	9	100	20	8	40	2.5	[1.46 - 4.28]	0.00
Lamb (BBQ) ²	26	17	65	3	0	0	-	[-]	0.06
Pepsi (BBQ)	9	3	33	20	14	70	0.48	[0.18 - 1.25]	0.11
Lemonade with yoghurt (BBQ)	10	8	80	19	9	47	1.69	[0.96 - 2.98]	0.13
Watermelon (BBQ)	16	7	44	13	10	77	0.57	[0.30 - 1.07]	0.13
Stew (BBQ)	8	3	38	21	14	67	0.56	[0.22 - 1.45]	0.22
Kisra (bread) (BBQ)	8	3	38	21	14	67	0.56	[0.22 - 1.45]	0.22
Fresh tea (BBQ)	3	3	100	26	14	54	1.86	[1.30 - 2.65]	0.25
Cooked liver dish (BBQ)	3	3	100	26	14	54	1.86	[1.30 - 2.65]	0.25
Lamb (Lunch)	12	9	75	17	8	47	1.59	[0.87 - 2.91]	0.25
Kunafa (pastry dessert) (BBQ)	15	7	47	14	10	71	0.65	[0.35 - 1.23]	0.26
Lemonade alone (BBQ)	5	4	80	24	13	54	1.48	[0.83 - 2.62]	0.37
Mixed green salad (BBQ)	14	7	50	15	10	67	0.75	[0.40 - 1.41]	0.46
Raw kidney (Lunch)	2	2	100	27	15	56	1.8	[1.28 - 2.52]	0.50
Raw liver (Lunch)	2	2	100	27	15	56	1.8	[1.28 - 2.52]	0.50
Carrot salad (Lunch)	4	3	75	25	14	56	1.34	[0.69 - 2.60]	0.62
Other drink (BBQ)	12	8	67	17	9	53	1.26	[0.69 - 2.30]	0.70
Spicy sauce (BBQ)	14	9	64	15	8	53	1.21	[0.65 - 2.23]	0.71
Mixed carrot salad (BBQ)	3	2	67	26	15	58	1.16	[0.49 - 2.75]	1.00
Other meat (Lunch)	4	2	50	25	15	60	0.83	[0.30 - 2.34]	1.00
Pickled salad (BBQ)	4	2	50	25	15	60	0.83	[0.30 - 2.34]	1.00
Hummus (BBQ)	4	2	50	25	15	60	0.83	[0.30 - 2.34]	1.00
Basbousa (BBQ)	10	6	60	19	11	58	1.04	[0.55 - 1.96]	1.00
Aubergine salad (BBQ)	7	4	57	22	13	59	0.97	[0.47 - 2.01]	1.00

197 ¹AR – Attack rate

198 ²Risk ratio not calculable due to no unexposed cases

199

200 **Firth regression results**

201 Further analysis was carried out using Firth regression to investigate whether lamb or raw
 202 offal consumption was important. Firth regression is based on case-control design and we
 203 used the same 29 barbecue and/or lunch attendees for our analysis.

204 Again, due to the fact that no controls ate raw liver and that all cases ate the lamb, univariate
 205 odds ratios could not be calculated, but a significant association was found (table 3). Firth
 206 regression was used to analyse these two variables of interest. We also examined the effect
 207 of the consumption of spicy sauce in our model because field reports had indicated that
 208 some people might have interpreted this to mean dipping cooked lamb into the marinade
 209 juices from the raw liver dish.

210 **Table 3. Case-control study univariate results, barbeque attendees (n=29), July 2021**

Exposure	Cases			Controls			Odds ratio	95%CI	p-value
	Total	Exposed	%	Total	Exposed	%			
Raw liver	17	9	52.94	12	0	0	.	[3.01-.]	0.002
Lamb	17	17	100	12	9	75	.	[1.27-.]	0.029
Pepsi	17	3	17.65	12	6	50	0.21	[0.03-1.5]	0.064
Watermelon	17	7	41.18	12	9	75	0.23	[0.03-1.5]	0.071
Lemonade-yoghurt drink	17	8	47.06	12	2	16.67	4.44	[0.61-51.2]	0.09
Tea	17	3	17.65	12	0	0	.	[0.58-.]	0.124
Cooked liver	17	3	17.65	12	0	0	.	[0.58-.]	0.124
Stew	17	3	17.65	12	5	41.67	0.3	[0.04-2.2]	0.154
Kisra (bread)	17	3	17.65	12	5	41.67	0.3	[0.04-2.2]	0.154
Kunafa (pastry dessert)	17	7	41.18	12	8	66.67	0.35	[0.06-2.04]	0.176
Lemonade	17	4	23.53	12	1	8.33	3.38	[0.27-181.5]	0.286
Mixed green salad	17	7	41.18	12	7	58.33	0.5	[0.09-2.8]	0.362
Other drink	17	8	47.06	12	4	33.33	1.78	[0.31-11.2]	0.46
Carrot salad	17	3	17.65	12	1	8.33	2.36	[0.16-134.8]	0.474
Spicy sauce	17	9	52.94	12	5	41.67	1.58	[0.28-9.1]	0.55
Pickled salad	17	2	11.76	12	2	16.67	0.67	[0.04-10.8]	0.706
Hummus	17	2	11.76	12	2	16.67	0.67	[0.04-10.8]	0.706
Mixed carrot salad	17	2	11.76	12	1	8.33	1.47	[0.07-94.3]	0.765
Basbousa (cake)	17	6	35.29	12	4	33.33	1.09	[0.18-7.1]	0.913
Aubergine salad	17	4	23.53	12	3	25	0.92	[0.12-7.9]	0.927

212 Firth regression revealed that there was no dose response evident from the consumption of
 213 raw liver, (table 4), but it was evident for lamb; those eating a large portion were 77 times
 214 (95%CI 1.2-4848.8; p=0.04) more likely to be cases than non-cases. When examining
 215 dichotomous variables for lamb and raw liver consumption, lamb was not a significant risk
 216 factor but those eating raw liver were 28 times (1.4-546.9; p=0.03) more likely to be cases
 217 than non-cases. Stratification of the three foods revealed that the lamb and spicy sauce were
 218 not significant risk factors for illness and confounded the effect of consuming raw liver.
 219 Those eating raw liver were 50 times (1.7-1461.5; p=0.02) more likely to be cases than non-
 220 cases (table 5). Neither lamb nor spicy sauce improved the fit of our model but raw liver did
 221 (LR Chi² = 7.93; p=0.005). We also tested for interaction with sex and age because
 222 barbecue attendees reported than males and females sat in separate groups and had
 223 differential access to food items. Children were mostly with their mothers. These factors
 224 yielded no significant interactions; sex and age did not adjust the likelihood of being a case.

225

226 **Table 4. Firth univariate regression result for food consumed at lunch and barbecue**

Food	Cases	Controls	OR	p-value	95%CI
Lunch					
Raw liver					
small portion	2	0	4.31	0.36	[0.19-98.5]
Raw kidney					
small portion	2	0	4.31	0.36	[0.19-98.1]
Barbecue					
Raw liver					
any portion	9	0	27.94	0.03	[1.43-546.9]
small portion	3	0	10.29	0.14	[0.47-225.9]
medium portion	2	0	7.35	0.22	[0.31-173.1]
large portion	4	0	13.24	0.1	[0.63-279.2]
BBQ lamb					
any portion	17	9	12.89	0.1	[0.60-276.9]
small portion	20	16	8.87	0.17	[0.39-199.6]
medium portion	3	2	9.8	0.19	[0.33-287.4]
large portion	5	0	77	0.04	[1.22-4848.8]
Spicy sauce					

any portion	16	12	1.52	0.57	[0.36-6.4]
small portion	5	4	1.22	0.81	[0.25-6.1]
medium portion	0	1	0.33	0.52	[0.01-9.6]
large portion	4	0	9	0.16	[0.41-198.2]

227

228 **Table 5. Stratified Firth multivariable regression results of suspected transmission**
 229 **vehicle food items consumed at barbecue**

Food (barbecue)	OR	p-value	95%CI
BBQ lamb	6.87	0.24	[0.28-165.9]
Raw liver	49.99	0.02	[1.71-1461.5]
Spicy sauce	0.26	0.21	[0.03-2.2]

230

231 **Microbiology and WGS results**

232 Microbiological results were available for ten individuals. Nine were PCR positive for
 233 *Salmonella* Spp., and five were cultured. All five were confirmed as *Salmonella*
 234 *Typhimurium*. Additionally, these five cases were identified as being genetically
 235 indistinguishable from one another (0 SNP difference) based on WGS undertaken by the
 236 GBRU. There were three cases with more than one pathogen in their stool sample (including
 237 two co-infections with Shiga-toxin producing *Escherichia Coli* (STEC) and one with
 238 *Campylobacter* Spp.)

239 **Food microbiology results**

240 Environmental Health Officers retrieved 55 samples of leftover raw lamb, of which 11 were
 241 sent for culture testing and genomic sequencing at the GBRU. Samples for other food
 242 products used at the barbecue, including raw sheep's liver, were unavailable. Sequences
 243 obtained from all 11 samples of raw lamb were genetically indistinguishable from one
 244 another, and those in human isolates from barbecue attendees (0 SNP). Identical genetic

245 sequences to those in this outbreak's cases were also returned from samples taken from the
246 local butchers and supplying abattoir.

247

248 **Discussion**

249 The traditional raw liver dish 'marara' was the primary vehicle of transmission in this
250 outbreak. Microbiological evidence suggests that there was widespread contamination of
251 sheep meat consumed at the barbecue, and that cross-contamination with other dishes
252 occurred. However, consumption of infected raw sheep's liver was likely to have resulted in
253 a high infective dose and therefore an unusually high rate of severe illness. Many cases in
254 this outbreak were severely unwell, with over half (54%, 12/22) of cases seeking emergency
255 hospital care and 27% (6/22) being admitted overnight. Whilst we could not find a statistically
256 significant association between raw liver consumption and hospital attendance, this may
257 have been due to the small sample size. Two cases were also co-infected with STEC, both
258 of whom were hospitalised due to their symptoms. The dual infection might explain the
259 severity of their symptoms but field interview notes also revealed the high quantity of meat
260 reported in their diets and also cross-contamination issues around food preparation
261 practices.

262

263 It was not possible to establish where this contamination occurred in the food chain. Whilst
264 genetically indistinguishable sequences were returned from human, meat and environmental
265 samples, it is possible that the cooking of the lamb was enough to reduce the infective dose
266 present in the meat at the barbecue, thus affecting people differently through quantity
267 consumed and thoroughness of cooking.

268 The day of the barbecue was also very hot and there could have been an amplification effect
269 due to the raw liver and lamb being unchilled for a long period. Our questionnaire responses
270 also indicated that some of the lamb cooked on the barbecue was pink inside and that the
271 marinade from the raw liver was used as a dip for other food and that one person used the
272 plate the raw liver was served on as their plate to eat their meal from. All of this offers
273 multiple opportunity for cross contamination. Another factor might be the preference of
274 eating older animals in some cultures due to its flavour. This might be associated with a
275 cumulative increase in pathogens in their organs (especially liver) and increased stress at
276 slaughter, which exacerbates this phenomenon further.

277

278 *Public health messaging implications*

279 Whilst there are many studies focusing on foodborne outbreaks of *Salmonella* infection, the
280 majority of the outbreaks of salmonella which occur in the UK are associated with
281 consumption of poultry and egg products [10]. This outbreak is one of few reported
282 *Salmonella Typhimurium* outbreaks associated with consumption of lamb in the UK [11] [12].
283 Similarly, whilst dishes made from poultry liver, such as chicken and duck, are well known
284 for being high risk foods for campylobacter across the UK and Europe [1] [2] there are very
285 few studies describing outbreaks of salmonella linked to offal [15]. We identified one
286 outbreak study from Australia, which identified an association between consumption of both
287 raw and cooked lamb's liver and *Salmonella Typhimurium* PT 197 in members of the
288 Lebanese community [16]. *Salmonella Typhimurium* has been identified in samples taken
289 from swabs of pig's livers and tongue in pigs slaughtered for human offal consumption in
290 Portugal, though were not linked to any human cases [17]. Frequently mararra also includes
291 boiled sheep's intestines, though this ingredient was not reported on this occasion.

292 This point source outbreak acted as a sentinel event, which through further case finding and
293 sequencing led to the identification of samples genetically identical to the outbreak cases, in
294 individuals who were resident of, or visitors to, Cardiff, who had not attended the barbeque
295 or the lunch. Investigations are ongoing, following non-attendee cases also reporting
296 consumption of lamb in Cardiff around the same time.

297 In addition to the 0-SNP cluster identified, in the five sequenced cases in this outbreak were
298 identified as being part of a larger ongoing 5 SNP level cluster; 1.26.136.634.2037.4574. %.
299 Cases in this cluster date back to 2018 and are currently spread across Wales, with cases
300 also in Scotland, London and the South West and Midlands of England. At least two of these
301 cases in this wider cluster were in people with occupational contact with sheep farms,
302 suggesting the possibility of a transmission chain with a farm origin. Cases in this cluster
303 have continued to be identified following the close of the barbeque investigation, and
304 investigations continue into the source of these infections and food supply chains.

305 **Community Engagement**

306 Eid al-Adha ('Festival of Sacrifice') is one of the most important festivals in the Muslim
307 calendar. The festival remembers the prophet Ibrahim's willingness to sacrifice his son when
308 God ordered him to. In some countries, Muslims sacrifice a sheep or goat (in Britain the
309 animal is killed at a slaughter house) and the meat is shared equally between family, friends
310 and the poor. Eid usually starts with Muslims going to the Mosque for prayer and is a time
311 when they visit family and friends and also give money to charity.

312 As part of the outbreak response, Public Health Wales sought engagement advice from
313 experts in its service user experience team. Options were considered for engaging the North
314 African community in Cardiff, but also the various communities in Wales, on food safety
315 whilst remaining culturally sensitive and maintaining anonymity. With the support of an
316 engagement coordinator from Cardiff council, an educational session was conducted during

317 the Eid-al-Adha festival which included members of the community that consume the
318 traditional “marrara” dish and other communities that celebrate Eid al-Adha. Key food safety
319 and hygiene messages were presented followed by an open conversation. The session
320 received positive verbal feedback from the participants. Learning from this engagement
321 helped Public Health Wales develop a universal response (box 1), available in several
322 languages, to food safety that is now programmed into annual communications for World
323 Food Safety Day in June and ahead of specific festivals and events such as Eid al-Adha.
324 The approach consisted of two phases:

325 **Phase one:** general food safety messages shared via social media on World Food
326 Safety Day in June 2022, available in several languages (figure 3).

327 **Phase two:** Food safety infographics tailored for the Eid al Adha festival in July 2022.
328 Infographics were shared via Public Health Wales’s social media platforms, external
329 partners and the WhatsApp group established for sharing pandemic information with
330 communities.

331

Box 1. Lessons learnt from community engagement:

1. Setting clear and realistic engagement objectives from the project outset
2. Ensure resources are adequate to deliver on objectives
3. Allow enough time for translations of materials.
4. Ensure partnership working with other statutory partners and align the engagement where possible
5. Establishing early contact with communities and partners in plenty of time to ensure maximum publicity and participation
6. Ensure networks are maintained regularly so there is willingness to help when you need support in the future

332



333

334 **Figure 3. Public health messaging developed through community engagement and**
335 **feedback as part of the outbreak**

336

337 **Conclusions**

338 Whilst the consumption of raw or undercooked meats is associated with salmonellosis
339 outbreaks in Europe [6] [7], this outbreak in a minority ethnic community in South Wales
340 identified a new vehicle of interest, a traditional raw offal dish. Future outbreak
341 investigations, particularly where cultural events are associated with particular foods, should
342 consider dishes beyond those on routine questionnaires to those which may be relevant to
343 the community in question.

344 Consumption of raw and undercooked meat and offal continues to be an ongoing public
345 health risk. Improving awareness and proactive messaging, especially to communities who
346 consume raw/undercooked meat or offal either regularly, or during specific religious or
347 cultural events, may help reduce this risk.

348 **Acknowledgements**

349 We wish to thank the IMT for their work on the outbreak and on the subsequent wider
350 investigation of linked cases. We are grateful for the Public Health Wales health protection
351 team and the local environmental health team for their contribution to the investigation of the
352 outbreak, in particular Rachel Andrew and Su Mably. We would like to thank Katie Allen from
353 the Public Health Wales Communications Teams for their advice on and assistance on
354 producing specific food safety resources for community engagement. To Anais Painset from
355 UKHSA's Gastro-bacterial Reference Unit (GBRU) for the microbiological analysis of human
356 and food samples associated with the incidents described in the paper and subsequent
357 whole genome sequencing; and to the APHA for their investigations into the food chain that
358 the meat followed.

359 **Authors' contributions**

360 DT designed and led the epidemiological investigation. JA, CS, GH and DT drafted the
361 manuscript. JI, IM and GK provided information on the steps of community engagement. CS,
362 GH, EC, JA, CW, LF, OO, AP, RS, AJ and DT carried out epidemiological investigations and
363 undertook interviews with the cohort, compiled the descriptive analysis and contributed to

364 the epidemiological investigation. HH led the microbiological investigation. All authors
365 contributed to the writing and revision of this manuscript and approved the final version.

366

367 **Conflict of interest**

368 The authors report no conflict of interest.

369

370 **Ethics**

371 Ethical oversight of the project was provided by the PHW Research and Development
372 Division. As this work was carried out as part of the health protection response to a public
373 health emergency in Wales, using routinely collected surveillance data, PHW Research and
374 Development Division advised that NHS research ethics approval was not required. The use
375 of named patient data in the investigation of communicable disease outbreaks and
376 surveillance of notifiable disease is permitted under PHW's Establishment Order. Data were
377 held and processed under PHW's information governance arrangements, in compliance with
378 the Data Protection Act, Caldicott Principles and PHW guidance on the release of small
379 numbers. No data identifying protected characteristics of an individual were released outside
380 of the IMT.

381 **Funding**

382 No additional funding was received to undertake the outbreak investigation; outbreaks
383 represent part of the core duties of the Public Health Wales Health Protection Division.

384

385 **Data Availability Statement**

386 The data used in this investigation contains personal identifiable information. Anonymised
387 information, including that contained in the supplementary information, required to reproduce
388 these results is available from the corresponding author on reasonable request.

389 **References**

- 390 1. **Hawker J, et al.** (2005) *Communicable Disease Control and Health Protection*
391 *Handbook*, 2nd edn. Oxford: Blackwell, pp. 193.
- 392 2. **UK Health Security Agency.** (2020) UK SMI ID 24: identification of Salmonella
393 species. Published online December 2020:
394 [https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachm](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/936585/ID_24_do+.pdf)
395 [ent_data/file/936585/ID_24_do+.pdf](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/936585/ID_24_do+.pdf).
- 396 3. **Public Health England.** (2019) Routine reports of gastrointestinal infections in
397 humans, England and Wales: September and October 2019.” London, 2019.
398 Published online November 2019:
399 [https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachm](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/845643/hpr4019_GIs.pdf)
400 [ent_data/file/845643/hpr4019_GIs.pdf](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/845643/hpr4019_GIs.pdf).
- 401 4. **Silva C, Calva E, Maloy S.** (2014) One Health and Food-Borne Disease: Salmonella
402 Transmission between Humans, Animals, and Plants. *Journal of Microbiology*
403 *Spectrum*. **2**; ePub DOI: 10.1128/microbiolspec.oh-0020-2013.
- 404 5. **Public Health Wales.** (2022) Laboratory reports of SALMONELLA in Wales 2018-
405 2021,” Published online January 2021:
406 [https://public.tableau.com/app/profile/public.health.wales.health.protection/viz/Labora](https://public.tableau.com/app/profile/public.health.wales.health.protection/viz/LaboratoryreportsSALMONELLAinWales2014-2017/Dashboard2)
407 [toryreportsSALMONELLAinWales2014-2017/Dashboard2](https://public.tableau.com/app/profile/public.health.wales.health.protection/viz/LaboratoryreportsSALMONELLAinWales2014-2017/Dashboard2).
- 408 6. **Ashton P M, et al.** (2015) Whole genome sequencing for the retrospective
409 investigation of an outbreak of Salmonella Typhimurium DT 8. *PLoS Currents*
410 *OUTBREAKS*. Published online February 2015:
411 [10.1371/currents.outbreaks.2c05a47d292f376afc5a6fcdd8a7a3b6](https://doi.org/10.1371/currents.outbreaks.2c05a47d292f376afc5a6fcdd8a7a3b6).
- 412 7. **Animal and Plant Health Agency.** (2021) Salmonella in Livestock Production in
413 Great Britain. Published online September 2022:
414 [https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachm](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/1060634/salm-livestock-prod-gb20.pdf)
415 [ent_data/file/1060634/salm-livestock-prod-gb20.pdf](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/1060634/salm-livestock-prod-gb20.pdf).
- 416 8. **SmartSurvey. SmartSurvey overview** ([https://www.smartsurvey.co.uk/survey-](https://www.smartsurvey.co.uk/survey-software/)
417 [software.](https://www.smartsurvey.co.uk/survey-software/)) Accessed 16 October 2021
- 418 9. **Language Line.** Language Line services ([https://www.language.com/uk.](https://www.language.com/uk/))
419 Accessed August 2022)
- 420 10. **Public Health England.** (2021) Non-typhoidal Salmonella data 2010 to 2019.
421 Published online October 2021:
422 [https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachm](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/1026208/salmonella-annual-report-2019.pdf)
423 [ent_data/file/1026208/salmonella-annual-report-2019.pdf](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/1026208/salmonella-annual-report-2019.pdf)
- 424 11. **Evans MR, et al.** (1999) An outbreak of Salmonella typhimurium DT170 associated
425 with kebab meat and yoghurt relish. *Journal of Epidemiology and Infection*. **122**: 377–
426 383. DOI: 10.1017/S0950268899002253.
- 427 12. **Food Safety News.** (2018) Almost 300 sick and one dead due to Salmonella in UK.
428 Published online October 2018: [https://www.foodsafetynews.com/2018/10/almost-](https://www.foodsafetynews.com/2018/10/almost-300-sick-and-one-dead-due-to-salmonella-in-uk/#:~:text=Authorities%20in%20England%20and%20Scotland,had%20been%20detected%20in%20England)
429 [300-sick-and-one-dead-due-to-salmonella-in-](https://www.foodsafetynews.com/2018/10/almost-300-sick-and-one-dead-due-to-salmonella-in-uk/#:~:text=Authorities%20in%20England%20and%20Scotland,had%20been%20detected%20in%20England)
430 [uk/#:~:text=Authorities%20in%20England%20and%20Scotland,had%20been%20det](https://www.foodsafetynews.com/2018/10/almost-300-sick-and-one-dead-due-to-salmonella-in-uk/#:~:text=Authorities%20in%20England%20and%20Scotland,had%20been%20detected%20in%20England)
431 [ected%20in%20England](https://www.foodsafetynews.com/2018/10/almost-300-sick-and-one-dead-due-to-salmonella-in-uk/#:~:text=Authorities%20in%20England%20and%20Scotland,had%20been%20detected%20in%20England).
- 432 13. **Little CL, et al.** (2010) A recipe for disaster: Outbreaks of campylobacteriosis
433 associated with poultry liver pâté in England and Wales. *Journal of Epidemiology and*
434 *Infection*. **138**: 1691–1694. DOI: 10.1017/S0950268810001974.
- 435 14. **Bintsis T,** (2017) Foodborne pathogens. *AIMS Microbiology*. **3**: 529–563. DOI:
436 [10.3934/microbiol.2017.3.529](https://doi.org/10.3934/microbiol.2017.3.529).
- 437 15. **Cornell J, Neal KR.** (1998) Protracted outbreak of Salmonella typhimurium definitive
438 phage type 170 food poisoning related to tripe, ‘pig bag’, and chitterlings. *Journal of*
439 *Communicable Disease and Public Health* **1**: 28–30. DOI:
440 <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/9718834/>
- 441 16. **Heiss J, et al.** (2008) A Salmonella Typhimurium 197 outbreak linked to the
442 consumption of lambs’ liver in Sydney, NSW. *Journal of Epidemiology and Infection*.
443 **136**: 461–467. DOI: 10.1017/S0950268807008813.
- 444 17. **Vieira-Pinto M, et al.** (2018) Salmonella sp. in edible offal (liver and tongue) from

- 445 pigs slaughtered for consumption. In: *International Conference on the Epidemiology*
446 *and Control of Biological, Chemical and Physical Hazards in Pigs and Pork,*” pp.
447 202–205. DOI: 10.31274/safepork-180809-621.
- 448 18. **Ethelberg S, et al.** (2007) Outbreak with multi-resistant Salmonella Typhimurium
449 DT104 linked to carpaccio , Denmark , 2005. *Journal of Epidemiology and Infection*
450 **135**: 900–907. DOI: 10.1017/S0950268807008047.
- 451 19. **Brandwagt D et al.** (2018) Outbreak of Salmonella Bovismorbificans associated with
452 the consumption of uncooked ham products , the Netherlands , 2016 to 2017.
453 *Eurosurveillance* **23**: 1–6. DOI: 10.2807/1560-7917.ES.2018.23.1.17-00335.
- 454