

1 **Prevalence, associated factors and antimicrobial susceptibility patterns of**
2 ***Salmonella* species and pathogenic *Escherichia coli* isolated from broiler poultry**
3 **farms in Wakiso district, Uganda.**

4 **Thomas Ssemakadde¹, Nalumaga Pauline Petra¹, Jude Collins Busingye¹, Joel Bazira¹,**
5 **Kabanda Taseera¹**

6 ¹Department of Microbiology, Faculty of Medicine, Mbarara University of science and
7 technology

8 **Corresponding author; ppaulinenalumaga@must.ac.ug**

9

10 **ABSTRACT**

11

12 **Background:**

13 The emergence and re- emergence of zoonotic bacterial infections and the upsurge
14 reflected in current trends of antimicrobial-resistant bacteria is a major global concern.
15 *Salmonella* spp and *Escherichia coli* (*E. coli*) are the two most important food-borne
16 pathogens of public health interest incriminated in poultry products worldwide hence
17 necessitating constant monitoring of microbial food safety measures. The purpose of this
18 study was to determine the prevalence, associated factors and antimicrobial susceptibility
19 patterns of *Salmonella* and *E. coli* in poultry farms in Wakiso District to provide detailed
20 information of extent of spread to guide plans that influence safer poultry keeping practices
21 in this era.

22 **Methods:** This study was a cross sectional study that used a total of two hundred sixteen
23 (216) poultry samples from cloacae swabs and fecal swabs collected from broiler poultry
24 farms and cultured on Chromagar TM *Salmonella* and Sorbitol MacConkey agar for
25 pathogenic *E. coli*. Biochemical tests, minimum inhibitory concentration, and polymerase
26 chain reaction were utilized. Assessment of the correlations between the resistance
27 patterns of resistant and susceptible isolates was determined using mean, and multiple
28 logistic regression.

29 **Results:** A total of 40 (18.5%) *Salmonella* and 120 (55.6%) Pathogenic *E. coli* was
30 isolated. In this investigation, extended beta lactamase (ESBL) production was detected
31 in 18 isolates *Salmonella* and 57 pathogenic *E. coli*. Prevalence of *bla*TEM gene was
32 expressed in 7/18 (39%) *Salmonella* isolates and 42/57 (73.8%) Pathogenic *E. coli* isolates
33 The associated factors that predispose these farms to *Salmonella* and Pathogenic *E. coli*
34 identified in this study include: contact of poultry and wild birds (p -value =0.000), movement

35 from one pen to the other by farm-handlers (P-Value = 0.030), use of untreated water (P-
36 Value =0.005) and food contamination of commercial poultry feeds (P-Value= 0.0021)
37 **Conclusion:** *Salmonella* spp and *Escherichia coli* remain the two most important food-
38 borne pathogens of public health interest incriminated in the poultry field, and it is evident
39 from this study that these bacteria have resistant genes associated with them.

40

41 **Key words; associated factors; antimicrobial susceptibility; Salmonella species;**
42 **pathogenic Escherichia coli; broiler farms; Wakiso district; Uganda.**

43

44

45 INTRODUCTION

46 The emergence and re- emergence of zoonotic bacterial infections and the upsurge
47 reflected in current global trends of antimicrobial resistance is a major universal concern
48 (1). Presence of bacteria that have resistant genes decreases the efficacy of the few
49 available antibiotics culminating into infection and failure patterns in treatment which
50 sometimes are implicated in morbidity and mortality trends across the globe (2).

51 Globally poultry farming is one of the fast-growing low-cost investment ventures currently
52 on the rise and this is partly explained by the significant growth in the population size that
53 provides ready market for poultry products (3). As a result, poultry raised in rigorous, intense
54 circumstances using antimicrobial drugs to hasten growth and prevent disease as a result
55 of the method of raising the birds (4). Antibiotic-resistant bacteria in poultry could have
56 resistant genes that could potentially be passed on to humans posing threat such as
57 economic losses in animal production and treatment failure, leading to mortalities and
58 morbidities (5).

59 According to WHO nearly 33 million healthy years of life worldwide are lost each year as a
60 result of unsafe practices related to food handling leading to consumption of unsafe food
61 (6). In Africa today, over 91 million people fall ill due to food borne illnesses and
62 approximately 137,000 deaths are registered representing a third (1/3) of the global death
63 toll from food borne illnesses. Diarrheal diseases in the African continent are estimated to
64 account for 70% of the burden of food borne diseases (6).

65 Several studies done focusing on the disease trend patterns have highlighted the significant
66 role of *E.coli* as a contributing member to the diarrheal disease burden in humans and this
67 accounts for 4.0% of the global burden of disease daily thus contributing to an estimated

68 1.8 million fatalities each year, of which children account for roughly 90% (7, 8). In the
69 poultry industry, Avian pathogenic *Escherichia coli* (APEC) is a typical bacterium that is
70 proportionally linked to tremendous economic losses that is due to a number of conditions
71 which range from septicemia, salpingitis, chronic respiratory disease, and embryonic
72 death. For the recent colibacillosis outbreaks across the globe that represent 80% of the
73 disease cases worldwide, the strongly associated serotypes are O78 and O2 (9).

74 According to disease surveillance and outbreak data published in the MOH weekly
75 Epidemiological bulletin, there is an upsurge in the number of Typhoid cases seen in
76 Kampala and Wakiso districts (10). Owing to the upward increase in the human population,
77 the demand driven venture of poultry rearing and the increase in typhoid cases, there is
78 need to investigate whether these poultry products play a part in perpetuating these
79 infections. The existence of these food borne pathogens in poultry leads to negative effects
80 on both humans, animal, and environmental health sectors and as such calls for
81 investigations to draft better methods of eliminating potential AMR situations.

82 This study will determine the antimicrobial susceptibility patterns, related variables, and
83 prevalence of *Salmonella* and pathogenic *E. coli* in poultry farms in Wakiso District to
84 provide detailed information of extent of spread, resistant genes and this will guide plans to
85 influence safer poultry keeping practices in this era of increasing population pressure for
86 poultry products.

87 **MATERIALS AND METHODS**

88 **Study Area**

89
90 This study was conducted in Wakiso district (as seen in figure 1) a metropolitan district in
91 the central region of Uganda that partly encircles Kampala district. The district coordinates
92 are: 00 24N, 32 29E. With a projected population of 2,915,200 million, Wakiso district is still
93 Uganda's most populous Higher Local Government (HLG) (11). There is an annual
94 population increase projected at 4.1% and this rapidly increasing population increases the
95 demand of food including poultry products. The district was regarded as the top producer
96 of poultry, producing 7.4% of all the chickens in the country (12).

97 **Study design**

98

99 This was a cross-sectional study focused on broiler farms based on the FAO
100 categorization sector level 3 farms whose chicken that was about to enter the food supply
101 chain, within selected counties in Wakiso district. Fresh fecal droppings plus cloacal
102 samples were collected during August to September period of the year 2021.

103

104 **Sample Size Determination**

105 The sample size was determined using Kish -Leslie's (1965) standard formula. The sample
106 size was derived using 83% prevalence (13).

$$107 \quad n = \frac{Z^2 P(1-P)}{d^2}$$

$$108 \quad d^2$$

109 n = study sample size required

110 Z= critical value associated with 95% confidence interval = 1.96

111 P = Estimated prevalence of 83% of *E coli* and salmonella d = margin of error = 0.05

$$112 \quad n = \frac{1.96^2 (0.83 \times 0.17)}{0.05^2}$$

$$113 \quad 0.05^2$$

114 n= 216 samples

115 Therefore, a minimum of 216 samples were collected from the various farms in the different
116 constituencies of Wakiso District. A subsequent number of farm managers with consent
117 from these 216 farms were interviewed to understand the associated factors that
118 predispose these pathogens to the farm.

119 **Sampling method**

120

121 The study employed a variety of methods including simple random sampling to select the
122 sub counties, purposive sampling using information provided by the district veterinary office
123 to identify the villages and the respective farms from which samples were picked.

124 For the selected and eligible farms, three swabs from fresh fecal droppings and two swabs
125 from the cloaca were collected while adhering to the appropriate bio safety measures at the
126 farm as stated in the WHO bio safety manual fourth Edition. Five swabs from one farm on
127 different chicken were considered to represent one sample (Pooling of samples).

128

129 **Sample Collection**

130 Three fresh fecal droppings of chicken from the target shed with oldest flock were randomly
131 selected. Using a sterile swab, adequate fecal material was obtained by swabbing the top
132 of the freshly deposited fecal matter.

133 Two random chickens from the target shed with oldest flock were randomly selected. Using
134 a sterile swab, adequate fecal material was obtained from the cloaca. The swabs were
135 placed into a plain tube containing Amies transport media without charcoal. A Stopper was
136 used to seal the tube, the sample containing tube was labeled with the sample identifier/
137 Farm research generated IDs, location and date and stored in a rack or zip lock bag. This
138 was then put into a cool box and transported to the laboratory within 24 hours.

139

140 **Isolation and identification of microorganisms**

141

142 **For Pathogenic *E. coli* and *Salmonella* spp**

143

144 The pooled samples were aseptically mixed into 9 ml of autoclaved Buffered Peptone Water
145 (BPW) (Hi Media M1494, Mubi, India) in a sterile 50ml falcon tube with a lid to generate a
146 pre- enriched sample, vortex, and incubated for 16-24 hours at 37°C aerobically.

147

148 The enriched sample was picked and inoculated onto a chromogenic agar (Chromagar™
149 Salmonella which contains Agar, Peptone and yeast extract +Chromagenic& selective mix)
150 which is a particular chromogenic culture medium designed for the presumptive
151 identification, qualitative direct detection, and differentiation of Salmonella (14). Incubation
152 of the plates was done for 24hrs at 37°C. Presumptive colonies for Salmonella (mauve-
153 pink, raised and smooth colonies) were selected for identification

154 For isolation of pathogenic *E.coli*, the pre-enriched sample was inoculated on Sorbitol
155 MacConkey agar plates and incubated at 37 °C ± 1°C for 24 hours. The colonies of
156 pathogenic *E. coli* were smooth, raised, had entire margins and were colorless on SMAC.

157 The presumptive organisms were subcultured on nutrient agar and identified through gram
158 staining, Triple Ion Sugar (TSI) test, the IMViC test, Methyl Red, Voges- Proskauer, Sulphur
159 indole motility, and Simmons citrate utilization. All reagents used were from (Oxoid,
160 England) (15).

161

162 **Bacterial antibiotic susceptibility testing**

163 Bacterial suspension that was adjusted to 0.5McFarland standard and inoculated on Muller
164 Hinton agar medium (Oxoid CM0337 Basingstoke, England) using surface spreading
165 method. The antibiotic discs listed in table 1 (all from Oxoid, England) were used. The plates

166 were incubated for 24 hours at 37°C. The results were read and interpreted according to
167 Clinical Laboratory Standards Institute standards Version 14th edition, 2020 (16).

168 *E. coli* ATCC 25922(American Type Culture collection, Rockville, MD, USA) was used as
169 reference control strain.

170 **Table 1: Commonly used antibiotics at NaLIRRI, 2022 obtained from Oxoid Ltd**
171 **suppliers and the discs were selected based on CLSI (28th Edition, 2020) and their**
172 **availability at NALIRRI Microbiology laboratory.**

Antibiotic Class	Antibiotic used for both <i>E. coli</i> and <i>Salmonella</i> isolates
Aminoglycosides	Gentamicin (GM) (10 µg/ml)
Carbapenem	Meropenem (MEM) (10 µg/ml)
Cephalosporins class III	Ceftriaxone (CRO) (30 µg/ml)
Amphenicol	Chloramphenicol (CHL) (30 µg/ml)
Cephalosporins class IV	Cefepime (CPM) (30 µg/ml), Cefotaxime (CTX)(30µg/ml), Ceftazidime (CTZ) (30µg/ml)
Quinolones	Ciprofloxacin (CIP) (5 µg/ml)
Macrolides	Erythromycin (EM) (30 µg/ml)
Penicillin	Ampicillin (AMP) (10 µg/ml)
Tetracyclines	Tetracycline (OXT) (30 µg/ml)
Sulphonamides/ Trimethoprim	Co-trimoxazole (CTX) (25 µg/ml)

173
174 **Phenotypic Screening of *Enterobacteriaceae* for Extended-spectrum β-lactamases**
175 **(ESBLs) production**
176

177 Cefotaxime (30µg) and Ceftazidime (30µg) antibiotic discs were used to phenotypically test
178 *Enterobacteriaceae* for the development of ESBLs and incubated overnight at 37 °C on
179 Muller Hinton agar (16).

180
181 **Confirmation of ESBL producing *Enterobacteriaceae***

182
183 ***Double Disc Synergy method***

184
185 A sterile cotton swab was used to surface spread an *Enterobacteriaceae* suspension on to
186 a Mueller Hinton agar plate after turbidity was set to the 0.5 McFarland standards. The
187 antibiotic discs used were Ceftazidime (CAZ) (30µg) alone and Ceftazidime in combination
188 with Clavulanic acid (CAL) (30/10µg) (17). The discs were spaced approximately 30 mm

189 apart, and the discs and plates containing the test organism were incubated at 37° C
190 overnight. Both the single disc and the combined disc's zones of inhibition were measured.
191 Clavulanic acid-containing discs with an increase in zone diameter of ≥5mm in comparison
192 to those without Clavulanic acid were deemed to have an ESBL (17).

193

194 **Genomic DNA extraction**

195

196 Bacterial genomic DNA extraction was conducted on all the 18 Salmonella and 57
197 Pathogenic E coli from the pure plate colonies that were extracted. The Bio line ISOLATE
198 II genomic DNA kit (Cat No. Bio-52065 Lot No. IS502-B054750) was used for the bacterial
199 extraction following manufacturer's instruction. The presence of genes encoding for ESBL
200 (*bla*-TEM gene) was detected using conventional PCR amplification using primers listed in
201 (table 2).

202

203 **Table 2: Primers used in the PCR reaction.**

Resistanc e Gene	Primer Sequence (5'→3' Direction)	Amplicon Size (bp)	Annealing Temperature (°C)	Reference
<i>bla</i> _{TEM}	(F) TGG GTG CAC GAG TGG GTT	526	58	Tenover et al., 1994
	AC			
	(R) TTA TCC GCC TCC ATC CAG TC			

204

205 **The PCR master Mix reagents was prepared as follows:**

- 206 • 12.5 µL master mix consisting of One Taq quick load two times master mix/w standard
207 buffer,
- 208 • dNTPs&Taq polymerase (M0486S),
- 209 • 1.5 µL forward (100 µM),
- 210 • 1.5 µL primary reverse (one hundred µM),
- 211 • 5 µL DNA template and RNase-free dH2O up to 25 µL.

212 **PCR Cycling:** The PCR process was carried out in a thermo cycler (Perkin Elmer,
213 Wellesley, MA, USA) with a pre-denaturation cycle of 95°C for 15 min, followed by DNA
214 amplification stage with 30 cycles (94°C for 1 min, 58°C for 1 min, and 72°C for 1 min)
215 and final extension cycle of 72°C for 5 min.

216 DNA Amplicons were electrophoresed using 1.5% agarose gel, in Tris-Borate EDTA
217 buffer (TBE) 1×concentration, Safe View Classic™ DNA stain, 6x loading dye (Thermo

218 Scientific), and DNA ladder/marker 100 bp (Sigma-Aldrich, Inc., Saint Louis, MI,
219 USA)DNA Bands were visualized on a Dark reader Transilluminator.

220

221 **Data Management and Analysis**

222

223 All records of the analysis were recorded in the lab register as a hard copy back up.
224 Samples were assigned codes and excel spreadsheets were used to enter the raw data,
225 which were then exported to Stata (Version 12, Special Edition, College Station, Texas
226 USA) software for statistical analysis. Frequency tables, graphs were used to present
227 descriptive statistics. This was done at a univariate analysis level.

228 Bivariate and multivariate analyses was carried out for the study objectives, quantitative
229 data evaluations was made in relation to the 95% level of significance/confidence, the
230 Pearson value (*p-value*) to determine the objective variables' statistical significance,
231 statistics were judged to be significant for any $p < 0.05$.

232

233 **Ethical Consideration**

234 Approval was obtained from Mbarara University of Science and Technology ;Institutional
235 Ethical Review Committee (MUST-2021-141), and at the ministry level, permanent
236 secretary Ministry of Agriculture, Animal Industries, and Fisheries, district's chief
237 administrative officer, and district veterinarian.

238 Prior engaging the farms, the researcher sought for clearance from the farm owners to
239 access and collect samples from their farms. This consent was requested voluntarily to
240 participate in the study. The researcher treated all Farm's data and bacterial isolates
241 obtained for this investigation in strict confidence.

242

243 **COVID19 Prevention and Management Plan**

244

245 The researcher received the recommended two doses of COVID-19 vaccination. In addition
246 to this, the researcher adhered to the government recommended standard operating
247 procedures such as avoiding touching surfaces at the poultry farms on any place while
248 carrying out this study, frequent washing/cleaning of the hands with soap or sanitizers, strict
249 face masking while carrying out this study and the respondents will also be encouraged to
250 put on their face masks. Social distancing was also adhered while interacting with persons
251 at the time of data collection.

252

253 **Quality assurance and Quality control procedure:**

254

255 Involved the use of reference controls (both positive and negative). During the data entry
256 and analysis, the researcher ensured double entry of data to rule out clerical errors.

257 **RESULTS**

258 **Prevalence of Salmonella and E. coli from the cultured samples:**

259

260 Of the total of 216 samples collected, a total of 40 (18.5%) *Salmonella* and 120
261 (55.6%) Pathogenic *E. coli* was isolated as seen in the flow chart (figure 2).

262

263 **Demographic and socio-economic characteristics of the respondents**

264

265 Out of 216 farm managers selected from ten (10) different sub counties in Wakiso district
266 that took part in the research and were interviewed, 87 (40.28%) were Males and 129
267 (59.72%) were females. The age group of 31-45 years had the most participants at
268 113 (52.31%) while the age group of 46 and older had the fewest 50 (23.15%). In regards
269 Education level training; at least all the farm managers had some basic training.
270 Participants who completed primary level were 58 (26.85%), Secondary level were 80
271 (37.04%), vocational training were 33 (15.28%) and University level were 45 (20.83%).
272 When examining the various farm managers' sources of income, the survey discovered
273 that 146 participants (67.59%) relied primarily on poultry, others had mixed agricultural
274 practices like livestock farming (including either cattle, Sheep, Goats or Piggery) alongside
275 poultry 22 (10.18%), crop farming with poultry 17 (5.56%) and others had
276 additional funds arising from self-employment in other sectors alongside the
277 poultry 31 (14.35%) as seen in table 3.

278

279 **Table 3: Farm characteristics and demographics:**

Characteristics (Variable)	Category	Frequency (N=216)	Percentage (%)
Gender	Male	87	40.28
	Female	129	59.72
Age(years)	15-30	53	24.54
	31-45	113	52.31
	>=46	50	23.15
Education level	Primary	58	26.85
	Secondary	80	37.04

	Vocational Training	33	15.28
	University	45	20.83
Sub counties	Kitabi	25	11.57
	Namugongo	28	12.96
	Kiira	32	14.81
	Makindye	28	12.96
	Nabweru	19	8.79
	Kakiri	21	9.72
	Busukuma	11	5.09
	Wakiso TC	16	7.40
	Masulita	12	5.55
	Nsangi	24	11.11
	Source of income	Poultry alone	146
Livestock farming (Cattle, goats, sheep, or Pigs) with poultry		22	10.18
Crop farming with Poultry		17	5.56
Self-employed off-farm. (Others)		31	14.35
hygiene/rate of cleaning of the farm	Once per Month	13	6.02
	Once per week	117	54.17
	Daily	86	39.81
Presence of other animals (Pigs, Cows, Ducks and Turkey)	Other Birds (Ducks, Turkey, and Geese)	68	31.48
	Livestock	148	68.52
Type of production system used	Deep Litter	103	47.69
	Battery Cage system	82	37.96
	mixed farming with turkey and ducks	19	8.76
	Semi intensive (Free range system)	12	5.56

281 **Factors associated with Salmonella and Pathogenic E. coli in broiler poultry farms**
 282 **in Wakiso District.**

283
 284 *Salmonella* and pathogenic *E. coli* were most frequently found in broiler poultry farms where
 285 there was contact between poultry and other bird species like turkeys and geese (*P-value*=
 286 0.019), contamination of commercial poultry feeds (*P-value*=0.012), movement of farm
 287 workers between pens (*P-value*=0.167) and use of untreated water (*P-value*=0.117).
 288 Therefore, there is a significant association between the above variables and the presence
 289 of the organisms of interest in the research (table 4).

290

291 **Table 4: Showing factors associated with Salmonella and E. coli in poultry**
 292 **farms in Wakiso District**

293

Variable	Category	Salmonella		E. coli	
		Frequency (n)=40	P-value	Frequency (n)=120	P-value
Contact of poultry and other bird species	Livestock	83 (69.2)	0.384	65 (81.25%)	0.020
	Other birds	25 (20.8)		15 (18.75%)	
Frequency of cleaning and disinfection of the Bird's Housing.	Daily	96 (80)	0.498	49 (61)	0.113
	Once a week	21 (17)		26 (33)	
	Once a Month	03 (3)		05 (6)	
contamination of commercial poultry	Mixed with Water	95 (79.2)	0.242	56 (70)	0.002
	Mixed with other materials	25 (20.8)		24 (30)	
movement from one pen to the other by farm-handlers	From one pen	58 (48.3)	0.244	55 (68.75%)	0.017
	From more than one pen	62 (51.7)		25 (31.25%)	
use of untreated water	Use of well water	38 (31.7)	0.392	32 (40)	0.018
	Use of tap water	82 (68.3)		48 (60)	
Source of poultry feeds	Home made	46 (38.3)	0.066	25 (31)	0.237
	Commercial	74 (61.7)		55 (69)	

294
 295

296

297 **Antibiotic susceptibility patterns of Salmonella and Pathogenic E. coli towards**
 298 **commonly used antimicrobials in poultry:**

299

300 The phenotypic resistance profile for Salmonella organisms from broiler poultry samples
 301 when subjected to the selected antibiotics demonstrates that ampicillin 32 (80%) is the drug
 302 with the highest level of resistance, followed by erythromycin 28 (70%), tetracycline 27
 303 (67.5%), and ciprofloxacin 25 (62.5%). On the contrary, low resistance was observed to
 304 ceftazidime 10 (15%), Gentamicin 3 (8%), Chloramphenicol 3 (8%), cefepime 2 (5%) and
 305 meropenem2 (5.0%) as shown in table 5.

306

307 **Table 5: showing antibiotic susceptibility patterns of Salmonella towards commonly**
 308 **used antimicrobials in Poultry:**

Antibiotics	Resistant n (%)	Intermediate Resistance n (%)	Susceptible n (%)
Gentamicin (GM) (10 µg/ml)	3 (7.5)	7 (17.5)	30 (75.0)
Meropenem (MEM) (10 µg/ml)	1 (2.5)	2 (5.0)	37 (92.5)
Ceftriaxone (CRO) (30 µg/ml)	18(45)	4 (10)	18 (45)
Chloramphenicol (CHL) (30 µg/ml)	3 (7.5)	3 (7.5)	34 (85)
Cefepime (CPM) (30 µg/ml)	2 (5.0)	3 (7.5)	35 (87.5)
Ciprofloxacin (CIP) (5 µg/ml)	25 (62.5)	10 (25)	5 (12.0%)
Erythromycin (EM) (30 µg/ml)	28 (70)	7 (17.5)	5 (12.5)
Ampicillin (AMP) (10 µg/ml)	32 (80)	2 (5)	6 (15)
Tetracycline (OXT) (30 µg/ml)	27 (67.5)	6 (15)	7 (17.5)
Sulfamethoxazole-trimethoprim (SXT) (25 µg/ml)	20 (50)	5 (12.5)	15 (37.5)
Cefotaxime (CTX)(30µg/ml)	10 (25)	2 (5)	28(70)
Ceftazidime (CTZ) (30µg/ml)	15 (37.5)	5 (12.5)	20 (50)

309

310 E. coli exhibited the highest resistance to Erythromycin at 88 (73%), followed by Ampicillin
 311 86 (72%), Chloramphenicol 85 (71%), Tetracycline at 82 (68%) and sulfamethoxazole-
 312 trimethoprim at 78 (65%). However, it's worth noting that there was observed very low
 313 resistance to Ciprofloxacin 9 (8%), meropenem 4 (3%), and cefipime 3 (2.5%) as seen in
 314 table 6.

315

316 **Table 6: showing antibiotic susceptibility patterns of pathogenic *E. coli* Spp**
 317 **towards commonly used antimicrobials in Poultry.**

Antibiotics	Resistant n (%)	Intermediate Resistance n (%)	Susceptible n (%)
Gentamicin (GM) (10 µg/ml)	10 (8.0)	7 (6.0)	103 (86.0)
Meropenem (MEM) (10 µg/ml)	4 (3)	6 (2.5)	110 (92.0)
Ceftriaxone (CRO) (30 µg/ml)	57 (47.5)	5 (4.2%)	58 (48.3)
Chloramphenicol (CHL) (30 µg/ml)	85 (71.0)	25 (21.0)	10 (8.0)
Cefepime (CPM) (30 µg/ml)	3 (2.5)	8 (6.5)	109 (91)
Ciprofloxacin (CIP) (5 µg/ml)	9 (7.5)	66 (55)	45(37.5)
Erythromycin (EM) (30 µg/ml)	88 (73)	15(12.5)	17 (14.5%)
Ampicillin (AMP) (10 µg/ml)	86(72)	12 (10)	18 (15)
Tetracycline (OXT) (30 µg/ml)	82 (68.0)	18 (15)	20 (17.0)
sulfamethoxazole-trimethoprim (SXT) (25 µg/ml)	78(65)	32 (27.0)	10 (8.0)
Cefotaxime (CTX)(30µg/ml)	51(42.5)	10(8.3)	59(49.2)
Ceftazidime (CTZ)(30µg/ml)	48(40)	8(6.7)	64(53.3)

318

319 **Detection of ESBL (*bla*TEM), gene encoding resistance to commonly used antibiotics**
 320 **used in poultry in Salmonella and Pathogenic *E. coli***

321
 322 Out of the 18 *Salmonella* samples analyzed for genotypic expression, 7/18 (39%) samples
 323 expressed presence of the *bla* TEM genes while 11 (61.1%) samples did not have this
 324 gene.

325 Out of the 57 Pathogenic *E. coli* samples analyzed for genotypic expression, 42/57
 326 (73.8%) samples expressed presence of the *bla* TEM genes while fifteen (26.3%) samples
 327 did not have this gene.

328 **DISCUSSION**

329 **The prevalence of selected Salmonella and pathogenic *E. coli* in selected poultry**
 330 **farms**

331
 332 According to this study, a prevalence of 18% and 56%, respectively, was identified for
 333 *Salmonella* and pathogenic *E. coli* in broiler poultry farms in the Wakiso district. In line with
 334 other studies carried out, this result was comparable to a study conducted by (18). This

335 revealed the prevalence of *Salmonella* and pathogenic *E. coli* as 21.1% and 56.3% in
336 Uganda.

337 However, it can be argued that this prevalence rate is low when compared to a study done
338 by (19) found an overall prevalence of 83%, of which 90.8% and 73% were from chicken
339 in Lira and Kampala districts from the antibiotic susceptibility profiles of fecal *Escherichia*
340 *coli* isolates from Dip-Litter broiler chicken in Northern and Central Uganda.

341 This discrepancy can be due to the different study sites, sample methods, poultry sector,
342 and sampling times used during the research.

343 It is worth noting that this study had a lower prevalence of *Salmonella* spp compared to
344 other studies such as one done by (20) in Ruiru Sub-County, Kenya which was at 28% with
345 almost similar prevalence of pathogenic *E. coli* of 58%. Another study on antimicrobial
346 resistance in *Salmonella* and *Escherichia coli* isolates from chicken droppings in Nairobi
347 (21) found lower levels of *Salmonella* (12% vs. 57% in our study) and nearly similar
348 prevalence of *E. coli* (57%) in the analyzed samples.

349 The differences in environmental contamination levels, poultry management practices,
350 breed, sample size, sampling, testing methodologies, and challenges in *Salmonella*
351 detection methods may account for this similar trend of reduced *Salmonella* isolation and
352 prevalence (22) or further still the practice of better bio safety and bio security practices at
353 farms overseen by the established of Kenya Accreditation society (KENAS), competitive
354 exclusion of sick birds, breeding for genetic resistance and vaccination.

355 In Uganda as evidenced from the essential veterinary medicines list, vaccines exist only in
356 private practitioners' clinics and cannot be accessed freely by the Bio security level three
357 farmers that were of interest in this study.

358

359 **The factors associated with *Salmonella* and Pathogenic *E. coli* in poultry farms in** 360 **Wakiso District.**

361 Presence of *Salmonella* and pathogenic *E. coli* in the poultry farms was significantly
362 correlated with contact of poultry with other avian bird species such as ducks, geese, and
363 guinea fowls in the same farms and pens, as well as not frequently cleaning the poultry
364 farms by removing the manure or beddings.

365 The study further investigated other factors associated with proper poultry practices such
366 as the implementation of strict bio security interventions such as having restricted access

367 to the farmers by visitors and handling of these birds, implementation of a solid well
368 established sewer system. These, however, did not significantly increase the risk of
369 *Salmonella* and *E. coli*. This is comparable to a study conducted in Nigeria that
370 focused on the risk factors related to *Salmonella* spp. In broiler and layer flocks, it
371 was discovered that the presence of rodents, farm workers moving between pens, running
372 and parking trucks close to poultry farms ($p < 0.05$) and drinking untreated water ($p < 0.05$)
373 were all independently associated with a higher risk of *Salmonella* infection (23).

374 Broilers are known for consuming large amounts of feed, and this habit encourages constant
375 feces loss, raising the possibility of their environment becoming contaminated with various
376 bacterial strains (18).

377 Furthermore, many broiler farms had high stock densities, which could make environmental
378 management efforts to reduce bacteria in the houses more difficult. As a result, workers
379 (especially those handling large flocks) must be strictly supervised because it is claimed
380 that they may neglect their responsibilities for maintaining hygiene. Therefore, poor
381 management of poultry could lead to increased transmission of *Salmonella* and *E.*
382 *coli* in poultry.

383

384 **The antimicrobial Susceptibility patterns of *Salmonella* and *E. coli* in poultry farms**

385

386 The highest resistance to ampicillin was found in both *Salmonella* and *E. coli* isolates, 32
387 (80%) and 86(72%), followed by erythromycin (28%) and 88(73%) and tetracycline (27)
388 and 82(68.0%).

389 Our research was comparable to a study published by (24) and (18). Therefore, there is
390 great increase in antimicrobial resistance to the different drugs most especially ciprofloxacin
391 in Uganda.

392 According to reports from Uganda and other nations (25), tetracyclines are frequently used
393 to treat bacterial illnesses and promote animal growth (26). Therefore, it is not surprising
394 that pathogens have developed broad resistance to them. Bacteria like commensal *E. coli*
395 experience selection pressure as a result of ongoing exposure to antimicrobials (27).

396 In most nations, the rise in human cases of antimicrobial resistance is attributed to the
397 increase and spread of infections from poultry to humans. In this work, we discovered that
398 pathogenic *E. coli* and *Salmonella* spp. isolated from chicken in the Wakiso district had
399 high resistance to widely used antibiotics used in both people and animals. As a result,

400 greater research on AMR in *Salmonella* spp. and *E. coli* clinical isolates from poultry is
401 needed.

402
403 **ESBL producing genes present among *Salmonella* and pathogenic *E. coli* isolated**
404 **from poultry farms.**

405
406 The majority of studies on poultry have noted the presence of genes such as; *bla*TEM,
407 AmpC like lactamase gene, for antibiotic resistance (28), (29) and (30). A study conducted
408 in Malaysia reported a lower prevalence of *bla*TEM (31) while a study in British Columbia,
409 2007 reported slightly higher levels of the *bla*TEM gene, being 81.5 and 80% of
410 amoxicillin and ampicillin resistant *E.coli* and *Salmonella* spp. isolates (32).

411 Therefore, the community's health is at risk because of the possibility that antimicrobial
412 resistance genes in poultry waste will spread to humans and other fowl.

413
414 **CONCLUSION**

415
416 The two most significant food-borne pathogens of public health concern linked to poultry
417 are still *Salmonella* spp. and *Escherichia coli*, and it is evident from this study with a
418 prevalence of 18% and 56% respectively. These bacteria have resistant genes associated
419 with them seen in 38.9% and 73.8% *Salmonella* and pathogenic *E. coli* samples.

420
421
422 **Limitations**

- 423
424 i. Our focus in this study was strictly broiler poultry that were about to enter the food chain,
425 this does not paint a full picture in terms of the overall burden of the disease in poultry
426 including all other avian birds such as layers, geese, guinea fowls and ducks to
427 effectively understand the disease transmission dynamics and effect policies that will
428 effectively halt further spread.
- 429 ii. Only one gene *bla*TEM was focused on during this study and it would be vital to conduct
430 different genetic manipulations of the same bacterial DNA to targeting different ESBL
431 genes such as *bla* CTM, *bla* SHV etc.

432
433 **Recommendations**
434

435 Based on the above the study findings, its pertinent that government of Uganda should
436 strengthen the antimicrobial stewardship program and ensure that it is supported to carry
437 out its mandate of coordination that supports the proper use of antimicrobials (including
438 antibiotics), improves patient outcomes, lowers microbial resistance, and limits the spread
439 of diseases brought on by multidrug-resistant organisms, the organization needs help.
440 This should be achieved through the one health platform, a forum that brings together all
441 key stakeholders from the four different line ministries of Health, Ministry of Agriculture
442 Animal Industries and Fisheries, Ministry of Water and sanitation and Ministry of tourism,
443 trade, and antiquities.

444

445 **DECLARATION**

446

447 **Conflicts of Interest**

448 The authors confirm no conflicts of interest pertaining the publication of this article.

449

450 **Author contributions**

451 TS and KT developed the study concept, TS, JCB and NPP provided input in data collection.

452 TS and JCB analysed the data. KT and JB over saw the entire study. NPP, KT and JB wrote

453 the final manuscript. All authors read and commented on the paper and agreed on the final

454 version.

455 **Funding**

456 The authors received no financial support for the research, authorship, and publication of

457 this article.

458 **Availability of data and materials**

459 The analyzed datasets are available from the corresponding author upon request.

460 **Consent for publication**

461 Not applicable

462 REFERENCES

463

- 464 1. Mthembu TP, Zishiri OT, El Zowalaty ME. Molecular detection of multidrug-resistant Salmonella
465 isolated from livestock production systems in South Africa. *Infection and drug resistance*. 2019;3537-48.
- 466 2. Eng S-K, Pusparajah P, Ab Mutalib N-S, Ser H-L, Chan K-G, Lee L-H. Salmonella: a review on
467 pathogenesis, epidemiology and antibiotic resistance. *Frontiers in Life Science*. 2015;8(3):284-93.
- 468 3. Vernooij A, Masaki MN, Meijer-Willems D. Regionalisation in poultry developmen in Eastern
469 Africa. Wageningen livestock research; 2018.
- 470 4. Winckler C, Grafe A. Use of veterinary drugs in intensive animal production: evidence for
471 persistence of tetracycline in pig slurry. *Journal of soils and sediments*. 2001;1:66-70.
- 472 5. Mohammed Jajere S, Hassan L, Zakaria Z, Abu J, Abdul Aziz S. Antibiogram profiles and risk
473 factors for multidrug resistance of salmonella enterica recovered from village chickens (*Gallus gallus*
474 *domesticus* Linnaeus) and other environmental sources in the central and southern peninsular Malaysia.
475 *Antibiotics*. 2020;9(10):701.
- 476 6. Organization WH. Food Safety: What you should know. World Health Organization; 2015.
- 477 7. Yulistiani R, Praseptiangga, D., & Sudibya, S. Occurrences of Salmonella Spp. And Escherichia Coli
478 In Chicken Meat, Intestinal Contents And Rinse Water At Slaughtering Place From Traditional Market In
479 Surabaya, Indonesia;. 2019.
- 480 8. Yulistiani R, Praseptiangga D, Supyani, Sudibya, editors. Occurrences of Salmonella spp. and
481 Escherichia coli in chicken meat, intestinal contents and rinse water at slaughtering place from
482 traditional market in Surabaya, Indonesia. *IOP Conference Series: Materials Science and Engineering*;
483 2019: IOP Publishing.
- 484 9. Dziva F, Stevens MP. Colibacillosis in poultry: unravelling the molecular basis of virulence of
485 avian pathogenic Escherichia coli in their natural hosts. *Avian Pathology*. 2008;37(4):355-66.
- 486 10. Ismail K, Maiga G, Ssebuggwawo D, Nabende P, Mansourian A. Spatio-temporal trends and
487 distribution patterns of typhoid disease in Uganda from 2012 to 2017. *Geospatial health*. 2020;15(2).
- 488 11. Statistics UE. Uganda Bureau of Statistics. *Energy*. 2022;95(13.6):14.5.
- 489 12. Sebuliba-Mutumba R, Kibwika P, Kyazze F. Drivers of collective action and innovation adoption
490 in successful poultry farmer groups in Wakiso District in Uganda. *African Journal of Rural Development*.
491 2017;2(3):353-65.
- 492 13. Varga C, Guerin MT, Brash ML, Slavic D, Boerlin P, Susta L. Antimicrobial resistance in fecal
493 Escherichia coli and Salmonella enterica isolates: a two-year prospective study of small poultry flocks in
494 Ontario, Canada. *BMC Veterinary Research*. 2019;15(1):464.
- 495 14. Hoorfar J, Baggesen DL. Importance of pre-enrichment media for isolation of Salmonella spp.
496 from swine and poultry. *FEMS microbiology letters*. 1998;169(1):125-30.
- 497 15. Sarba EJ, Kelbesa KA, Bayu MD, Gebremedhin EZ, Borena BM, Teshale A. Identification and
498 antimicrobial susceptibility profile of Escherichia coli isolated from backyard chicken in and around
499 Ambo, Central Ethiopia. *BMC Veterinary Research*. 2019;15:1-8.
- 500 16. CLSI. Performance standards for antimicrobial susceptibility testing, document M100. Clinical
501 and Laboratory Standards Institute Wayne, PA; 2020.
- 502 17. Yılmaz M, Ak Ö, Haciseyitoğlu D, Alkan S. A comparative study of VITEK-2, Double Disc Synergy
503 and Combined Disc Methods for detection of ESBL (Extended Spectrum Beta-Lactamase) production in
504 Escherichia coli and Klebsiella pneumoniae strains. *Journal of Contemporary Medicine*. 2022;12(1):116-
505 20.

- 506 18. Kakooza S, Muwonge A, Nabatta E, Eneku W, Ndoboli D, Wampande E, et al. A retrospective
507 analysis of antimicrobial resistance in pathogenic *Escherichia coli* and *Salmonella* spp. isolates from
508 poultry in Uganda. *International Journal of Veterinary Science and Medicine*. 2021;9(1):11-21.
- 509 19. Majalija S, Francis O, Sarah W, Musisi-Lubowa M-L, Vudriko P, Nakamya F. Antibiotic
510 susceptibility profiles of fecal *Escherichia coli* isolates from dip-litter broiler chickens in Northern and
511 Central Uganda. 2010.
- 512 20. Ngai DG, Nyamache AK, Ombori O. Prevalence and antimicrobial resistance profiles of
513 *Salmonella* species and *Escherichia coli* isolates from poultry feeds in Ruiru Sub-County, Kenya. *BMC*
514 *research notes*. 2021;14:1-6.
- 515 21. Langata LM, Maingi JM, Musonye HA, Kiiru J, Nyamache AK. Antimicrobial resistance genes in
516 *Salmonella* and *Escherichia coli* isolates from chicken droppings in Nairobi, Kenya. *BMC research notes*.
517 2019;12:1-6.
- 518 22. Mdemu S, Mathara JM, Makondo ZE. Isolation of *Salmonella* in commercial chicken feeds in Ilala
519 district. *Am Sci Res J Eng Technol Sci*. 2016;19(1):1-8.
- 520 23. Agada G, Abdullahi I, Aminu M, Odugbo M, Chollom S, Okeke L, et al. Risk factors associated
521 with salmonella species contamination of commercial poultry farms in jos, plateau state, Nigeria. *Int J*
522 *Curr Res*. 2014;6(4):6292-301.
- 523 24. Mohanta MK, Islam MS, Saha AK, Khatun S, Khatun Z. Antibigram profiles of bacterial isolates
524 from poultry feeds and moribund hens in Rajshahi, Bangladesh. *Imperial J Interdis Res*. 2016;2(5):41-6.
- 525 25. Okubo T, Yossapol M, Maruyama F, Wampande EM, Kakooza S, Ohya K, et al. Phenotypic and
526 genotypic analyses of antimicrobial resistant bacteria in livestock in Uganda. *Transboundary and*
527 *emerging diseases*. 2019;66(1):317-26.
- 528 26. Basulira Y, Olet SA, Alele PE. Inappropriate usage of selected antimicrobials: Comparative
529 residue proportions in rural and urban beef in Uganda. *PLoS One*. 2019;14(1):e0209006.
- 530 27. Oz T, Guvenek A, Yildiz S, Karaboga E, Tamer YT, Mumcuyan N, et al. Strength of selection
531 pressure is an important parameter contributing to the complexity of antibiotic resistance evolution.
532 *Molecular biology and evolution*. 2014;31(9):2387-401.
- 533 28. Sultana N, Haque MA, Rahman MM, Akter MR, Begum MD, Fakhruzzaman M, et al.
534 Microbiological quality of commercially available poultry feeds sold in Bangladesh. *Asian Journal of*
535 *Medical and Biological Research*. 2017;3(1):52-60.
- 536 29. Shilangale RP, Di Giannatale E, Chimwamurombe PM, Kaaya GP. Prevalence and antimicrobial
537 resistance pattern of *Salmonella* in animal feed produced in Namibia. *Vet Ital*. 2012;48(2):125-32.
- 538 30. Adesiyun A, Offiah N, Seepersadsingh N, Rodrigo S, Lashley V, Musai L. Antimicrobial resistance
539 of *Salmonella* spp. and *Escherichia coli* isolated from table eggs. *Food Control*. 2007;18(4):306-11.
- 540 31. Aklilu E, Harun A, Singh KKB. Molecular characterization of blaNDM, blaOXA-48, mcr-1 and
541 blaTEM-52 positive and concurrently carbapenem and colistin resistant and extended spectrum beta-
542 lactamase producing *Escherichia coli* in chicken in Malaysia. *BMC Veterinary Research*. 2022;18(1):190.
- 543 32. Diarrassouba F, Diarra MS, Bach S, Delaquis P, Pritchard J, Topp E, et al. Antibiotic resistance and
544 virulence genes in commensal *Escherichia coli* and *Salmonella* isolates from commercial broiler chicken
545 farms. *Journal of food protection*. 2007;70(6):1316-27.

546





Figure 1; Highlighting Wakiso district and its position on the Map of Uganda.



medRxiv preprint doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.08.16.24312101>; this version posted August 16, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a [CC-BY 4.0 International license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).

Figure 2: Flow chart: