



Sandilands, V; Whyte, F; Williams, L K; Wilkinson, T S; Sparks, N H C; Humphrey, T J (2018). Reliably colonising broiler chickens with *Campylobacter* spp. using a litter-based method. *British Poultry Science* 59(6), pp698-702 ESSN: 1466-1799 .

© 2018 The Author(s). Published by Informa UK Limited, trading as Taylor & Francis Group. This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution Non-Commercial License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>), which permits non-commercial re-use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited. For commercial re-use, please contact [journals.permissions@oup.com](mailto:journals.permissions@oup.com).

<http://hdl.handle.net/11262/11526>

<https://doi.org/10.1080/00071668.2018.1523538>

1 Submitted to British Poultry Science – short communication

2

3 **Reliably colonising broiler chickens with *Campylobacter* spp. using a litter-based**  
4 **method**

5

6

7 Authors: Victoria Sandilands<sup>1\*</sup>, Fraser Whyte<sup>1</sup>, Lisa K. Williams<sup>2</sup>, Thomas S.  
8 Wilkinson<sup>2</sup>, Nicholas H.C. Sparks<sup>1</sup>, Thomas J. Humphrey<sup>2</sup>

9

10 \*Corresponding author

11

12 Affiliations: <sup>1</sup> Monogastric Science Research Centre, Animal & Veterinary Science  
13 Group, SRUC, Ayr, UK

14 <sup>2</sup> Microbiology and Infectious Disease, Swansea University Medical School, Swansea  
15 University, Swansea UK

16

17 Email addresses:

18 Victoria Sandilands [Vicky.Sandilands@sruc.ac.uk](mailto:Vicky.Sandilands@sruc.ac.uk); Fraser Whyte

19 [Fraser.Whyte@sruc.ac.uk](mailto:Fraser.Whyte@sruc.ac.uk); Lisa Williams [L.K.Williams@swansea.ac.uk](mailto:L.K.Williams@swansea.ac.uk); Thomas

20 Wilkinson [T.S.Wilkinson@swansea.ac.uk](mailto:T.S.Wilkinson@swansea.ac.uk); Nicholas Sparks [Nick.Sparks@sruc.ac.uk](mailto:Nick.Sparks@sruc.ac.uk);

21 Thomas Humphrey [T.J.Humphrey@swansea.ac.uk](mailto:T.J.Humphrey@swansea.ac.uk)

22

23 **Abstract**

- 24 1. Chicken-associated *Campylobacter* spp. are the cause of most food poisoning  
25 cases in Europe. In order to study the host-pathogen interactions, a reliable  
26 and reproducible method of colonising chickens with the bacteria is required.
- 27 2. This study aimed to identify a more appropriate and less invasive method of  
28 colonisation (cf. gavaging) by seeding bedding material (litter) that  
29 commercial chickens are kept on with a mixture of *Campylobacter* spp., broth  
30 and faeces.
- 31 3. The first phase of the study tested the longevity of *Campylobacter* spp.  
32 recovery in seeded litter over 24 h: significantly more *Campylobacter* spp. was  
33 recovered at 0 or 3 h post-seeding than at 6 and 24 h post-seeding, indicating  
34 that the pathogen can survive to detectable levels for at least 3 h in this  
35 environment.
- 36 4. In the second phase, three groups of 10 broiler chickens (negative for  
37 *Campylobacter* spp. prior to exposure) were exposed at 21 days of age to one  
38 of three different *Campylobacter jejuni* and *C. coli* mixes (A, B, C), using the  
39 method above. At 28 days of age, birds were euthanised by overdose of  
40 barbiturate or cervical dislocation, and livers and caeca removed for  
41 *Campylobacte* spp. assessment.
- 42 5. All liver and 28/30 caeca samples tested positive for *Campylobacte* spp., with  
43 mix A and C giving higher counts in the caeca than mix B. The method of  
44 euthanasia did not affect *Campylobacter* spp. counts.
- 45 6. In conclusion, a successful method for reliably colonising broiler chickens  
46 with *Campylobacter* spp. has been developed which negates the need for  
47 gavaging and is more representative of how contamination occurs in the field.

48

49 **Keywords:** Contamination, food-borne illness, seeding, gavage, liver, caeca

50

## 51 **Introduction**

52 *Campylobacter* are Gram-negative microaerophilic bacteria that are frequently present  
53 in the digestive tract of pigs, cattle and poultry, and can be often found post-slaughter  
54 on and in poultry muscle and organs such as liver. *Campylobacter* is thought to  
55 cause approximately nine million cases of food-borne illness per year in the European  
56 Union, with an estimated loss of productivity of ~ €2.4 billion (European Food Safety  
57 Authority, 2014). Chicken meat is responsible for about 80% of *Campylobacter* spp.  
58 food-borne illness in the UK (Food Standards Agency, 2017) and, despite much  
59 research, carriage rates in chickens and human cases remain high. *Campylobacter*  
60 spp. has been shown to have an impact on the health and welfare of broiler chickens  
61 in both commercial (Bull *et al*, 2008; Rushton *et al*, 2009) and experimental studies  
62 (Williams *et al*, 2013). *Campylobacter* spp. colonisation has been linked to poor  
63 flock performance and economic losses (Smith *et al*, 2016). The human health threat  
64 from *Campylobacter*-positive chicken is not only from surface contamination, as  
65 edible tissues are also positive (Berndtson *et al*, 1992; Scherer *et al*, 2006; Whyte *et*  
66 *al*, 2006; Luber and Bartelt, 2007) and contaminated chicken liver is a major vehicle  
67 for human infection (Inns *et al*, 2010; Little *et al*, 2010), as is undercooked chicken  
68 meat.

69

70 In order to understand how *Campylobacter* spp. in broiler chickens is affected by  
71 husbandry practices (such as catching birds for slaughter or in-feed interventions), it  
72 is important to be able to study reliably-colonised chickens in a research environment.

73 Previous work studying poultry colonised with various organisms (e.g.  
74 *Campylobacter* and *Salmonella* spp.) have used oral gavaging techniques (Arsi *et al*,  
75 2015; Upadhyaya *et al*, 2015; Saint-Cyr *et al*, 2017). However, this is invasive,  
76 stressful and carries a risk of injury to the birds as well as not reproducing the  
77 conditions under which chickens would normally ingest the organism. In order to  
78 improve and refine techniques, this study aimed to determine if introducing  
79 *Campylobacter*-seeded litter to floor pens housing broiler chickens would result in  
80 reliable colonisation.

81

## 82 **Materials and Methods**

### 83 Phase 1: litter seeding

84 Used poultry litter (a mixture of wood shavings, broiler excreta, spilt feed and water)  
85 was collected from a previous trial at Scotland's Rural College (SRUC), Ayr. The  
86 litter was weighed and sterilised by drying in an oven at 80°C until a constant weight  
87 was obtained, and then divided into 400 g batches in six trays (approximately 38 x 28  
88 x 8 cm). Each dried litter tray was then reconstituted with 1 l of deionised water.

89

90 A *Campylobacter* strain that had been isolated previously from caecal samples taken  
91 from a commercial chicken farm and stored at -80°C in bead cryopreservation vials  
92 (Technical Service Consultants, UK) was used. The strain was resuscitated on Blood  
93 Agar No. 2 with Horse Blood (BA) plates (Oxoid, UK). These cultures were used to  
94 prepare lawn plates on further BA plates, incubated for 40-48 hrs at 41.5°C  
95 microaerobically (CampyGen, Oxoid, UK). The lawn plates were harvested by adding  
96 5 ml Mueller-Hinton (MH) broth (Sigma-Aldrich, UK), gently detaching the culture  
97 with a sterile spreader and decanting to a container. The suspension was then adjusted

98 with further MH broth to optical density<sub>600</sub> of 0.19 – 0.21 (approximately  $1.5 \times 10^5$   
99 cfu ml<sup>-1</sup>). The litter trays were seeded with a mixture of 20 ml MH broth, 10 ml  
100 *Campylobacter* spp. suspension and 10 g dried hen faeces (dried in the same way as  
101 the litter), by applying evenly to the surface of the litter.

102

103 The litter trays were incubated at 21°C. At 0, 3, 6 and 24 h after seeding, a different  
104 quarter of each tray was sampled. A sterile pot was filled with litter collected from the  
105 top 1 cm of the selected quadrant. Subsequently, a 5 g portion of the collected litter  
106 was mixed with 45 ml of MH broth. A swab was used to streak each litter/broth mix  
107 sample onto two modified Charcoal Cefoperazone Deoxycholate agar (mCCDA,  
108 Oxoid, UK) plates, which were incubated microaerobically at 41.5°C for 24 h.

109

#### 110 Phase 2: colonising birds

111 Forty-three Ross 308 male broiler chicks (*Gallus gallus domesticus*) were housed  
112 from day old in a single litter-floor pen with a brooding heat lamp. The ambient air  
113 temperature was 32°C on arrival, and was gradually reduced to 21°C at 21 days of  
114 age. At 7 days of age, all chicks were wing tagged and weighed, and the 13 lightest  
115 chicks (mean weight 170 g) were removed from further study. The remaining 30  
116 chicks (mean weight 208 g, range 187-239 g) were distributed to three pens of ten  
117 chicks each, according to weight in order to reduce variation within pen (i.e. ten  
118 lightest chicks to pen 1, ten middle weight chicks to pen 2, ten heaviest chicks to pen  
119 3) with 0.66 m<sup>2</sup> total floor space per bird. Chicks were reared until 28 days of age.  
120 Birds were fed a standard commercial starter crumb from arrival to 14 days of age,  
121 and then a grower pellet from 14-28 days of age. Food and water were provided *ad*  
122 *libitum* from a circular food hopper and bell drinker.

123

124 At 21 days of age, one litter sample per pen and one cloacal swab per bird were  
125 collected to check for the presence of *Campylobacter* spp. All samples were  
126 processed on the day of collection. For litter samples, a sterile pot was filled with  
127 litter collected from the top 1 cm of the pen. For cloacal swabs, a viscose-tipped  
128 Amies charcoal transport swab (12 cm long, Deltalab, Spain) was gently inserted 2  
129 cm into the vent of each bird and rotated back and forth for approximately 5 sec, then  
130 sealed inside the integrated holder. Litter samples were processed as described  
131 previously using MH broth, and plated in duplicate onto mCCDA plates. Each cloacal  
132 sample was streak plated onto mCCDA plates in duplicate. All plates were incubated  
133 for 40-48 h at 41.5°C microaerobically as before.

134

135 On the same day, subsequent to the initial sample collection, three trays of dried  
136 reconstituted litter were seeded with ten *Campylobacter* strains, identified either as  
137 mix A, B or C (Table 1), which were added to pen 1, 2, or 3 respectively, using the  
138 method described in Part 1. Each mix used five strains common among all three  
139 mixes (1-5) and five unique strains (A6-A10, B6-B10, and C6-C10). Mix A used  
140 known strains that have been previously used in colonisation studies, mix B used  
141 systemic isolates that were previously isolated from the liver of commercial broiler  
142 chickens, and mix C used non-systemic isolates that were previously isolated from the  
143 gut of commercial broiler chickens, but were unique in genotype to the systemic  
144 isolates. The trays were sunk into the existing floor litter of the pens, close to the  
145 feeder tubes, and some broiler feed was sprinkled on top to encourage foraging at the  
146 seeded litter and subsequent ingestion of the bacteria.

147

148 --Insert Table 1 approximately here--

149

150 On day 28, all 30 birds were humanely killed, half by manual cervical dislocation and  
151 the other half by overdose of barbiturate (pentobarbital sodium administered IV at 1  
152 ml kg<sup>-1</sup> body weight) to assess if either method affected the recovery of  
153 *Campylobacter spp.* The caecum and a sample of the liver were aseptically removed  
154 and placed into separate sterile bags with the *Campylobacter* mix (A, B or C) noted.  
155 Samples were stored on ice in a polystyrene box until processing 2 hours later.

156

157 A 1 g sample of caecal contents were removed from the caecum and placed into a  
158 universal, to which 9 ml of saline was added and vortexed to mix. Subsequent  
159 dilutions (1:10) were performed using saline in a microtitre plate, 100 µl of the -2, -4  
160 and -6 dilutions were spread plated onto mCCDA, then plates were incubated at 42°C  
161 for 24 h microaerobically as described above. Numbers of suspect colonies were  
162 counted to yield cfu g<sup>-1</sup> and a subset confirmed as *Campylobacter spp.* using growth  
163 on duplicate BA plates, one incubated aerobically and one microaerobically at 42 °C  
164 for 24 h. If there was any growth on the aerobic plate the results were discounted.  
165 Colonies from the microaerobic plate were stored on cyrobeads at -80 °C.

166

167 With each liver sample, 5 g was removed from the bag, dipped in 70% ethanol and  
168 flamed using a Bunsen burner to surface sterilise. The liver was placed in a stomacher  
169 bag with 45 ml of saline, and samples were homogenised in a Colworth stomacher for  
170 1 min or until an even homogenate was created. A 2 ml sample of each homogenate  
171 was placed in a universal and 20 ml of modified Exeter enrichment broth (Mattick et  
172 al., 2003) was added to produce a minimal headspace, lids were tightly capped and



173 the enrichments were aerobically incubated at 42°C for 24 hours. After incubation, a  
174 10 µl loopful of the enrichment was plated onto mCCDA, plates were incubated at  
175 42°C for 24 hours microaerobically as described above. Results were interpreted as  
176 presence or absence of *Campylobacter* spp. depending on growth. Colonies were  
177 picked on duplicate BA plates, one incubated aerobically and one microaerobically at  
178 42°C for 24 hours. If there was any growth on the aerobic plate the results were  
179 discounted. Colonies from the microaerobic plate were stored on cyrobeads at -80 °C.

180

#### 181 Ethical note

182 The study was conducted in the UK under a Home Office licence (PPL 60/4505) and  
183 was approved by SRUC's Animal Welfare and Ethical Review Body. The study  
184 fulfils the EU requirements on the protection of animals used for scientific purposes  
185 (European Commission, 2010).

186

#### 187 Statistical analysis

188 Data were analysed using Genstat (Release 16.1, 2013). For litter seeding data, log<sub>10</sub>  
189 of counts (cfu g<sup>-1</sup>) were calculated and analysed by one-way ANOVA for the time  
190 effect (degrees of freedom (d.f.) = 3) on counts, with 'tray' designated as the block.  
191 Binary data for liver samples (presence of *Campylobacter* = yes/no) were generated,  
192 but because all samples gave the same result, no statistical test was undertaken. For  
193 caecal data, log<sub>10</sub> of counts (cfu g<sup>-1</sup>) were calculated and analysed by two-way  
194 ANOVA to examine the effect of *Campylobacter* strain mix (d.f.) = 2), kill method  
195 (d.f. = 1), and their interaction (d.f. = 2).

196

#### 197 **Results**

198 Phase 1: litter seeding

199 Samples from all six trays had a measurable amount of *Campylobacter* spp. growth at  
200 0, 3 and 6 h after seeding. No *Campylobacter* spp. were recovered from samples  
201 taken 24 hours after seeding (Table 2). Significantly ( $P < 0.001$ ) more *Campylobacter*  
202 spp. was recovered from litter samples taken at 0 or 3 hours than at 6 and 24 hours  
203 after seeding.

204

205 **--Insert Table 2 approximately here--**

206

207 Phase 2: colonising birds

208 At day 21, all litter and cloacal swabs were found to be negative for *Campylobacter*  
209 spp. At 28 days of age, birds weighed on average 1653-1782 g (SD: 76-157 g), and  
210 birds killed by cervical dislocation were on average 20 g lighter (mean  $\pm$  SD: 1696  $\pm$   
211 160.6 g) than those killed by overdose of barbiturate (1716  $\pm$  125.6 g).

212

213 *Campylobacter* spp. were detected in all 30 liver samples using enrichment culture;  
214 thus, there was no effect of strain mix on recovery. On further identification, the  
215 strains were found to be *Campylobacter jejuni* multilocus sequence type 257 (n=22)  
216 and *C. coli* multilocus sequence type 828 (n=8). All birds exposed to mixes A and B  
217 had livers that contained *C. jejuni* multilocus sequence type 257 whereas mix C had  
218 eight birds with livers that contained *C. jejuni* multilocus sequence type 257 and two  
219 birds with livers containing *C. coli* multilocus sequence type 828.

220

221 *Campylobacter* spp. were detected in the caeca of 28/30 birds. Both negative results  
222 came from birds exposed to mix B (one culled by overdose of barbiturate, one killed

223 by cervical dislocation). *Campylobacter* spp. counts from the caeca were  
224 significantly affected by the strain mix ( $P < 0.001$ ), but not by the cull method  
225 ( $P = 0.308$ ), nor was there an interaction between strain mix and cull method ( $P = 0.711$ ;  
226 Table 3). Excluding the two birds from strain mix B where no *Campylobacter* spp.  
227 counts were obtained did not greatly alter the results (i.e. effect of strain mix:  
228  $P = 0.002$ , effect of cull method:  $P = 0.308$ , interaction:  $P = 0.745$ ).

229

230 --Insert Table 3 approximately here--

231

## 232 Discussion

233 Litter seeding with a mixture of *Campylobacter* spp., broth and chicken faeces was  
234 successful in that measurable amounts of *Campylobacter* spp. were recovered up to 3  
235 h after seeding. Recovered *Campylobacter* spp. at 6 h was significantly lower than at  
236 0 and 3 h, and did not differ from 24 h (where counts were always zero), suggesting  
237 that the organism is viable in this environment for less than 6 h, but at least for 3 h.  
238 This is important, as the organism must survive long enough for some birds to ingest  
239 it via foraging in the seeded litter.

240

241 When three different *Campylobacter* spp. mixtures were presented using litter  
242 seeding to naïve broiler chickens, the method worked successfully in that all liver  
243 samples and 93% of caeca samples tested positive for at least one of the relevant  
244 *Campylobacter* strains seven days after bird exposure. The negative caecal results  
245 could have been due to inhibition of *Campylobacter* spp. by other bacterial species or  
246 that these strains did not establish themselves in the caecal niche. Nevertheless, these  
247 results indicated that the organism survived long enough for at least some birds to

248 ingest it, presumably due to foraging on the seeded trays. Even if only a few chickens  
249 ingested the organism in the first instance from the trays, the subsequent production of  
250 colonised faeces and frequent foraging behaviour, in which chickens scratch and peck  
251 at the floor litter (which has the faeces in it), will recycle the organism until it has  
252 spread to birds throughout the pen. This could be confirmed by doing sequential  
253 sampling of birds on seeded litter, as opposed to sampling all birds at one time point  
254 (as was done in this experiment), and investigating variation in organism counts over  
255 time. However, previous studies have shown that inoculating just a few birds in a  
256 group leads to successful colonisation of the organism in the naïve birds (Shanker *et*  
257 *al*, 1990; Line *et al*, 1998). Foraging behaviour tends to decline with increasing age  
258 in broilers (Bessei, 1992; Wallenbeck *et al*, 2016), so colonisation rate using litter  
259 seeding may be affected by bird age.

260

261 It was notable that the two caeca in which *Campylobacter* spp. Were not detected  
262 came from mix B, so this may be a less reliable mix compared to mix A or C. Neither  
263 mix A nor C had a greater count of *Campylobacter* spp. in the caeca, so they may be  
264 equally suitable for use, depending on whether or not the point of study is to  
265 investigate effects of mainly *C. jejuni* strains, which predominated in mix A, but were  
266 roughly equal with *C. coli* in mix C.

267

268 The method of killing did not affect the mean counts of *Campylobacter* spp. in the  
269 caeca, which indicated that either method can be used without affecting data. This is  
270 important, as studies carried out on *e.g.* commercial broiler farms are more likely to  
271 use cervical dislocation as a method of killing, as opposed to using controlled  
272 medicines.

273

274 Previous studies (Stern *et al.*, 1991; Young *et al.*, 1999; Dhillon *et al.*, 2006; de los  
275 Santos *et al.*, 2008; Arsi *et al.*, 2015) have used oral gavage as a reliable method of  
276 introducing *Campylobacter* spp. to chickens. A study of colonisation over time  
277 (Stern, 2008) demonstrated that the caeca of broiler chicks were colonised with *C.*  
278 *jejuni* within four days of inoculation, and that the numbers generally increased with  
279 time up to week four (ranging from  $10^6$ - $10^8$  cfu g<sup>-1</sup>), regardless of *C. jejuni* challenge  
280 levels ( $10^4$ - $10^7$  cfu). Similarly, McCrea *et al.* (2006) found that 20-day old broiler  
281 chickens inoculated with *C. jejuni* isolates from either squabs, ducks, or chickens by  
282 oral gavage had average colonisation rates of  $10^6$ - $10^7$  cfu g<sup>-1</sup> 10 days post-inoculation.  
283 Here, the litter seeding method gave comparable results seven days post exposure, but  
284 with the advantage of refining the method to avoid invasive gavage techniques and to  
285 more accurately represent how chickens would pick up the organism naturally in a  
286 commercial poultry shed environment.

287

288 In conclusion, this method of litter seeding with different mixtures of *Campylobacter*  
289 spp. was successful at colonising 21-day old broilers by 28 days of age, with  
290 *Campylobacter* spp. reliably recovered in the liver and caeca (but less so with mix B).  
291 It is therefore proposed that this is a suitable technique for colonising broiler chickens  
292 for the study of *Campylobacter* spp. in a commercially-relevant manner, without the  
293 need to gavage. The method might also be used successfully with other organisms,  
294 but this would require further study.

295

296 **Acknowledgements**

297 We are grateful to the support of stock workers at SRUC for their assistance with the  
298 study, and to Jackie Ferrie for assistance in the lab.

299

### 300 **Disclosure**

301 No potential conflict of interest was reported by the authors

302

### 303 **Funding**

304 This work was funded by the UK's Biotechnology and Biological Sciences Research  
305 Council (BBSRC), grant reference BB/M008096/1.

306

### 307 **References**

308

309 ARSI, K., DONOGHUE, A. M., WOO-MING, A., BLOKE, P. J., & DONOGHUE,  
310 D. J. (2015) Intraoecal inoculation, an effective screening method for  
311 determining the efficacy of probiotic bacterial isolates against *Campylobacter*  
312 colonization in broiler chickens. *Journal of Food Protection*, **78**: 209-213.

313 BERNDTSON, E., TIVEMO, M., & ENGVALL, A. (1992) Distribution and  
314 numbers of *Campylobacter* in newly slaughtered broiler chickens and hens.  
315 *International Journal of Food Microbiology*, **15**: 45-50.

316 BESSEI, W. (1992) Das Verhalten von Broilern unter intensiven  
317 Haltungsbedingungen. *Archiv für Geflügelkunde*, **56**: 1-7.

318 BULL, S. A., THOMAS, A., HUMPHREY, T., ELLIS-IVERSEN, J., COOK, A. J.,  
319 LOVELL, R., & JORGENSEN, F. (2008) Flock health indicators and  
320 *Campylobacter* spp. in commercial housed broilers reared in Great Britain.  
321 *Applied and Environmental Microbiology*, **74**: 5408-5413.

322 DE LOS SANTOS, F. S., DONOGHUE, A. M., VENKITANARAYANAN, K.,  
323 DIRAIN, M. L., REYES-HERRERA, I., BLORE, P. J., & DONOGHUE, D. J.  
324 (2008) Caprylic acid supplemented in feed reduces enteric *Campylobacter*  
325 *jejuni* colonization in ten-day-old broiler chickens. *Poultry Science*, **87**: 800-  
326 804.

327 DHILLON, A. S., SHIVAPRASAD, H. L., SCHABERG, D., WIER, F., WEBER, S.,  
328 & BANDLI, D. (2006) *Campylobacter jejuni* infection in broiler chickens.  
329 *Avian Diseases*, **50**: 55-58.

330 EUROPEAN COMMISSION (2010) Directive 2010/63/EU of the European  
331 Parliament and of the Council of 22 September 2010 on the Protection of

- 332 Animals Used for Scientific Purposes. pp.1-47. [http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-](http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/PDF/?uri=CELEX:32010L0063&from=EN)  
333 [content/EN/TXT/PDF/?uri=CELEX:32010L0063&from=EN](http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/PDF/?uri=CELEX:32010L0063&from=EN)
- 334 EUROPEAN FOOD SAFETY AUTHORITY (2014) EFSA explains zoonotic  
335 diseases: Campylobacter.  
336 [http://www.efsa.europa.eu/sites/default/files/corporate\\_publications/files/facts-](http://www.efsa.europa.eu/sites/default/files/corporate_publications/files/factsheetcampylobacter.pdf)  
337 [heetcampylobacter.pdf](http://www.efsa.europa.eu/sites/default/files/corporate_publications/files/factsheetcampylobacter.pdf)
- 338 FOOD STANDARDS AGENCY (2017) Campylobacter.  
339 [https://www.food.gov.uk/science/microbiology/campylobacterevidenceprogra-](https://www.food.gov.uk/science/microbiology/campylobacterevidenceprogramme)  
340 [mme](https://www.food.gov.uk/science/microbiology/campylobacterevidenceprogramme)
- 341 INNS, T., FOSTER, K., & GORTON, R. (2010) Cohort study of a  
342 campylobacteriosis outbreak associated with chicken liver parfait, United  
343 Kingdom, June 2010. *Euro Surveillance*, **15**: 2-5.
- 344 LINE, J. E., BAILEY, J. S., COX, N. A., STERN, N. J., & TOMPKINS, T. (1998)  
345 Effect of yeast-supplemented feed on *Salmonella* and *Campylobacter*  
346 populations in broilers. *Poultry Science*, **77**: 405-410.
- 347 LITTLE, C. L., GORMLEY, F. J., RAWAL, N., & RICHARDSON, J. F. (2010) A  
348 recipe for disaster: outbreaks of campylobacteriosis associated with poultry  
349 liver pate in England and Wales. *Epidemiology and Infection*, **138**: 1691-  
350 1694.
- 351 LUBER, P. & BARTELT, E. (2007) Enumeration of Campylobacter spp. on the  
352 surface and within chicken breast fillets. *Journal of Applied Microbiology*,  
353 **102**: 313-318.
- 354 MCCREA, B. A., TONOOKA, K. H., VANWORTH, C., ATWILL, E. R., &  
355 SCHRADER, J. S. (2006) Colonizing capability of *Campylobacter jejuni*  
356 genotypes from low-prevalence avian species in broiler chickens. *Journal of*  
357 *Food Protection*, **69**: 417-420.
- 358 RUSHTON, S. P., HUMPHREY, T. J., SHIRLEY, M. D. F., BULL, S., &  
359 JORGENSEN, F. (2009) Campylobacter in housed broiler chickens: a  
360 longitudinal study of risk factors. *Epidemiology and Infection*, **137**: 1099-  
361 1110.
- 362 SAINT-CYR, M. J., HADDAD, N., TAMINIAU, B., POEZEVARA, T., QUESNE,  
363 S., AMELOT, M., DAUBE, G., CHEMALY, M., DOUSSET, X., &  
364 GUYARD-NICODEME, M. (2017) Use of the potential probiotic strain  
365 *Lactobacillus salivarius* SMXD51 to control *Campylobacter jejuni* in broilers.  
366 *International Journal of Food Microbiology*, **247**: 9-17.
- 367 SCHERER, K., BARTELT, E., SOMMERFELD, C., & HILDEBRANDT, G. (2006)  
368 Quantification of Campylobacter on the surface and in the muscle of chicken  
369 legs at retail. *Journal of Food Protection*, **69**: 757-761.
- 370 SHANKER, S., LEE, A., & SORRELL, T. C. (1990) Horizontal transmission of  
371 *Campylobacter jejuni* amongst broiler chicks; experimental studies.  
372 *Epidemiology and Infection*, **104**: 101-110.

- 373 SMITH, S., MESSAM, L. L. M., MEADE, J., GIBBONS, J., MCGILL, K.,  
374 BOLTON, D., & WHYTE, P. (2016) The impact of biosecurity and partial  
375 depopulation on *Campylobacter* prevalence in Irish broiler flocks with  
376 differing levels of hygiene and economic performance.  
377 *Infect.Ecol.Epidemiol.*, **6**. doi: 10.3402/iee.v6.31454
- 378 STERN, N. J. (2008) *Salmonella* species and *Campylobacter jejuni* cecal  
379 colonization model in broilers. *Poultry Science*, **87**: 2399-2403.
- 380 STERN, N. J., BAILEY, J. S., MEINERSMANN, R. J., COX, N. A., &  
381 BLANKENSHIP, L. C. (1991) Simultaneous colonization of *Campylobacter*  
382 *jejuni* and *Salmonella typhimurium* in day-old chicks. *Poultry Science*, **70**:  
383 790-795.
- 384 UPADHYAYA, I., UPADHYAY, A., YIN, H. B., NAIR, M. S., BHATTARAM, V.  
385 K., KARUMATHIL, D., KOLLANOOR-JOHN, A., KHAN, M. I., DARRE,  
386 M. J., CURTIS, P. A., & VENKITANARAYANAN, K. (2015) Reducing  
387 colonization and eggborne transmission of *Salmonella enteritidis* in layer  
388 chickens by in-feed supplementation of caprylic acid. *Foodborne Pathogens*  
389 *and Disease*, **12**: 591-597.
- 390 WALLENBECK, A., WILHELMSSON, S., JONSSON, L., GUNNARSSON, S., &  
391 YNGVESSON, J. (2016) Behaviour in one fast-growing and one slower-  
392 growing broiler (*Gallus gallus domesticus*) hybrid fed a high- or low-protein  
393 diet during a 10-week rearing period. *Acta Agriculturae Scandinavica Section*  
394 *A-Animal Science*, **66**: 168-176.
- 395 WHYTE, R., HUDSON, J. A., & GRAHAM, C. (2006) *Campylobacter* in chicken  
396 livers and their destruction by pan frying. *Letters in Applied Microbiology*,  
397 **43**: 591-595.
- 398 WILLIAMS, L. K., SAIT, L. C., TRANTHAM, E. K., COGAN, T. A., &  
399 HUMPHREY, T. J. (2013) *Campylobacter* infection has different outcomes in  
400 fast- and slow-growing broiler chickens. *Avian Dis.*, **57**: 238-241.
- 401 YOUNG, C. R., ZIPRIN, R. L., HUME, M. E., & STANKER, L. H. (1999) Dose  
402 response and organ invasion of day-of-hatch leghorn chicks by different  
403 isolates of *Campylobacter jejuni*. *Avian Diseases*, **43**: 763-767.  
404  
405



406 **Table 1: Mixes A ( $4.5 \times 10^7$  cfu ml<sup>-1</sup>), B ( $8.0 \times 10^7$  cfu ml<sup>-1</sup>) and C ( $7.0 \times 10^7$  cfu ml**  
 407 **<sup>-1</sup>) of different *Campylobacter* strains, with multilocus sequence type shown in**  
 408 **brackets. All mixes used five common strains (1-5).**

Mix A (pen 1)	Mix B (pen 2)	Mix C (pen 3)
	1. <i>C. jejuni</i> 11168 (43)	
	2. <i>C. jejuni</i> M1 (137)	
	3. <i>C. coli</i> RM 2228 (107)	
	4. <i>C. coli</i> (828)	
	5. <i>C. jejuni</i> 13126 (21)	
A6. <i>C. jejuni</i> 12662 (257)	B6. <i>C. coli</i> L4 (828)	C6. <i>C. coli</i> I4 (828)
A7. <i>C. jejuni</i> DBM1 (344)	B7. <i>C. jejuni</i> L8 (464)	C7. <i>C. coli</i> C8 (828)
A8. <i>C. jejuni</i> 12744 (658)	B8. <i>C. jejuni</i> L14 (464)	C8. <i>C. coli</i> C15 (828)
A9. <i>C. jejuni</i> hen (45)	B9. <i>C. coli</i> L24 (828)	C9. <i>C. jejuni</i> C24 (353)
A10. <i>C. jejuni</i> 3L44 (283)	B10. <i>C. coli/C. jejuni</i> L16*	C10. <i>C. coli/C. jejuni</i> C20*

409 \* typed as both *C. jejuni* and *C. coli*

410 **Table 2: Mean  $\log_{10}$  of counts ( $\text{cfu g}^{-1}$ ) of recovered *Campylobacter spp.* and**  
411 **standard deviation (SD) at 0, 3, 6, and 24 h after seeding litter ( $n=6$ ).  $P<0.001$**   
412 **where superscripts differ (by one-way ANOVA).**

Sample time	Mean	SD
0 h	2.22 <sup>a</sup>	1.79
3 h	1.85 <sup>b</sup>	1.74
6 h	0.85 <sup>c</sup>	0.74
24 h	0.00 <sup>c</sup>	0.00

413

414 *Table 3 Mean log<sub>10</sub> of counts (cfu g<sup>-1</sup>) of Campylobacter\_spp. from caeca samples,*  
 415 *according to cull method or Campylobacter\_spp\_mix, with standard deviation (SD)*  
 416 *shown. N=10 birds per mix; P<0.001 where superscripts differ (by two-way*  
 417 *ANOVA).*

<b>Mix</b>	<b>Cervical</b>		<b>Overdose of</b>		<b>Overall</b>	
	<b>Mean</b>	<b>SD</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>SD</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>SD</b>
<b>A</b>	6.12	5.68	5.98	5.63	6.06 <sup>a</sup>	5.67
<b>B</b>	5.39	5.51	5.21	5.53	5.31 <sup>b</sup>	5.50
<b>C</b>	5.99	5.82	5.96	5.56	5.97 <sup>a</sup>	5.70
<b>Overall</b>	5.93	5.82	5.83	5.71		

418