

Prevalence and Characterization of Multi-Drug-Resistant Gram-Negative Bacilli Isolated From Lebanese Poultry: A Nationwide Study

Iman Dandachi, Elie S. Sokhn, Elias A. Dahdouh, Eid Azar, Bassel El-Bazzal,

Jean-Marc Rolain, Ziad Daoud

▶ To cite this version:

Iman Dandachi, Elie S. Sokhn, Elias A. Dahdouh, Eid Azar, Bassel El-Bazzal, et al.. Prevalence and Characterization of Multi-Drug-Resistant Gram-Negative Bacilli Isolated From Lebanese Poultry: A Nationwide Study. Frontiers in Microbiology, 2018, 9 (550), 10.3389/fmicb.2018.00550. hal-01780664

HAL Id: hal-01780664 https://hal.science/hal-01780664v1

Submitted on 22 Aug 2018

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers. L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.





Prevalence and Characterization of Multi-Drug-Resistant Gram-Negative Bacilli Isolated From Lebanese Poultry: A Nationwide Study

Iman Dandachi^{1,2}, Elie S. Sokhn¹, Elias A. Dahdouh¹, Eid Azar¹, Bassel El-Bazzal³, Jean-Marc Rolain² and Ziad Daoud^{1*}

¹ Clinical Microbiology Laboratory, Faculty of Medicine and Medical Sciences, University of Balamand, Beirut, Lebanon, ² IRD, APHM, MEPHI, IHU-Méditerranée Infection, Aix-Marseille Université, Marseille, France, ³ The Lebanese Ministry of Agriculture, Beirut, Lebanon

OPEN ACCESS

Edited by:

Miklos Fuzi, Semmelweis University, Hungary

Reviewed by:

Sebastian Guenther, University of Greifswald, Germany Djamel Drider, Lille University of Science and Technology, France

> *Correspondence: Ziad Daoud ziad.daoud@balamand.edu.lb

Specialty section:

This article was submitted to Antimicrobials, Resistance and Chemotherapy, a section of the journal Frontiers in Microbiology

Received: 02 December 2017 Accepted: 12 March 2018 Published: 23 March 2018

Citation:

Dandachi I, Sokhn ES, Dahdouh EA, Azar E, El-Bazzal B, Rolain J-M and Daoud Z (2018) Prevalence and Characterization of Multi-Drug-Resistant Gram-Negative Bacilli Isolated From Lebanese Poultry: A Nationwide Study. Front. Microbiol. 9:550. doi: 10.3389/fmicb.2018.00550 Currently, antimicrobial resistance is one of the most prominent public health issues. In fact, there is increasing evidence that animals constitute a reservoir of antimicrobial resistance. In collaboration with the Lebanese Ministry of Agriculture, the aim of this study was to determine the prevalence of intestinal carriage of multi-drug-resistant Gram-negative Bacilli in poultry farms at the national level. Between August and December 2015, 981 fecal swabs were obtained from 49 poultry farms distributed across Lebanon. The swabs were subcultured on MacConkey agar supplemented with cefotaxime (2 µg/ml). Isolated strains were identified using MALDI-TOF mass spectrometry. Multilocus sequence typing analysis was performed for Escherichia coli. Phenotypic detection of extended spectrum β-lactamases (ESBL) and AmpC production was performed using double disk synergy and the ampC disk test, respectively. β-lactamase encoding genes bla_{CTX-M}, bla_{TEM}, bla_{SHV}, bla_{FOX}, bla_{MOX}, bla_{EBC}, bla_{ACC}, bla_{DHA}, and bla_{CMY} using PCR amplification. Out of 981 fecal swabs obtained, 203 (20.6%) showed bacterial growth on the selective medium. Of the 235 strains isolated, 217 were identified as E. coli (92%), eight as Klebsiella pneumoniae (3%), three as Proteus mirabilis (1%) and three as Enterobacter cloacae (1%). MLST analysis of E. coli isolates showed the presence of ST156, ST5470, ST354, ST155, and ST3224. The phenotypic tests revealed that 43.5, 28.5, and 20.5% of the strains were ampC, ESBL, and ampC/ESBL producers, respectively. The putative TEM gene was detected in 83% of the isolates, SHV in 20%, CTX-M in 53% and CMY ampC β-lactamase gene in 65%. Our study showed that chicken farms in Lebanon are reservoirs of ESBL and AmpC producing Gram-negative bacilli. The level of antibiotic consumption in the Lebanese veterinary medicine should be evaluated. Future studies should focus on the risk factors associated with the acquisition of multi-drug-resistant organisms in farm animals in Lebanon.

Keywords: ampC, ESBL, E. coli, poultry, carriage

INTRODUCTION

Antibiotic resistance is currently a major topic of interest for researchers and physicians. In particular, the rise of multidrug resistance in Gram-negative bacteria is now a serious challenge encountered by healthcare professionals (Exner et al., 2017). Resistance in Gram-negative bacteria is mainly mediated via the production of extended spectrum β -lactamases (ESBL), ampC β -lactamases and carbapenemases (Schill et al., 2017). Genes encoding these enzymes are often located on plasmids carrying resistance genes to other commonly used antibiotics in clinical settings (Seiffert et al., 2013). Infections with these multidrug-resistant organisms (MDROs) will thus pose therapeutic challenges; the antibiotic pipeline is drying up, and no new antimicrobial agents are anticipated in the near future to treat infections caused by MDROs (Bettiol and Harbarth, 2015).

In fact, it has been generally accepted that the main driver for the rapid evolution of bacterial resistance is the uncontrolled usage of antibiotics in human medicine. It is suggested that this theory is also applicable to the veterinary sector (Kempf et al., 2015). The European Centre for Disease Prevention and Control/European Food Safety Authority/European Medicines Agency (ECDC/EFSA/EMA) joint report stated that in 2014, the average antibiotic consumption in animals (152 mg/kg) was higher than in humans (124 mg/kg). Univariate analysis showed a signification correlation between fluoroquinolone consumption and resistance in Escherichia coli in the human and animal sectors, between polymyxins and tetracyclines and E. coli in animals, and for 3rd/4th generation cephalosporins and E. coli in humans (ECDC/EFSA/EMA, 2017). Antibiotics are heavily administered for therapeutic and prophylaxis purposes in veterinary medicine. As growth promoters, this practice is no longer adapted in the European Union, whereas it persists in North America and other countries (Economou and Gousia, 2015). In their study, Chantziaras et al. (2014) found a significant correlation between the use of antibiotics in livestock and the corresponding level of resistance toward these antimicrobials in E. coli strains isolated from pigs, poultry and cattle. During the last years, the prevalence of ESBLs, ampC, and carbapenemase producing Gram-negative bacteria has become extensively reported in food producing animals (Ghodousi et al., 2015; Gonzalez-Torralba et al., 2016; Haenni et al., 2016). In their review paper, Schwarz et al. (2016) showed that studies describing the epidemiology of resistant organisms in livestock targeted mainly swine, cattle and poultry. The prevalence of resistance varied from one country to another (Alonso et al., 2017). Although the extent to which food of animal origin contributes to the zoonotic transmission of multi-drug-resistant organisms, i.e., ESBL and carbapenemase producers, has not yet been well established (Madec et al., 2017), it suggests that sharing the same ESBL genes, plasmids and strains constitutes possible evidence of zoonotic transmission of MDROs from animals to humans (Leverstein-van Hall et al., 2011; Dahms et al., 2014). Furthermore, the increased risk of ESBL fecal carriage in individuals with a high degree of contact with broiler chickens is an indicator of transmission (Huijbers et al., 2014). Entericresistant strains in livestock can be easily transferred to humans

through direct contact or through the handling/consumption of undercooked/uncooked animal products (Dahms et al., 2014).

In Lebanon, several studies addressing MDROs in hospital settings have been conducted. One study done at the American University of Beirut Medical Center between 2008 and 2011 reported that 1.07 and 2.45% of E. coli and Klebsiella pneumoniae clinical isolates, respectively, were ESBL producers and ertapenem-resistant (Baroud et al., 2013). Another study conducted in the north reported that over the period of 2009-2012, 9% and 28% of the bacteraemia episodes in febrile neutropenic patients were caused by carbapenem and third-generation cephalosporin-resistant Gram-negative bacilli, respectively (Moghnieh et al., 2015). However, very few studies have addressed this issue in the environment. One study showed that Acinetobacter baumannii was detected in 6.9% of water samples, 2.7% of milk samples, 8.0% of meat samples, 14.3% of cheese samples and 7.7% of animal samples (Rafei et al., 2015). Another study in which 115 stool samples were collected from livestock animals from different farms in north Lebanon reported the detection of four VIM-2 producing Pseudomonas aeruginosa, four OXA-23 producing A. baumannii and one OXA-23/OXA-58 coproducing A. baumannii (Al Bayssari et al., 2015a). Furthermore, Al Bayssari et al. (2015b) reported the isolation of an OXA-48 harboring E. coli isolate from fowl in Lebanon. More recently, Diab et al. (2016) detected a relatively high prevalence of CTX-M-15 producing E. coli in Lebanese cattle. In the above-mentioned studies in Lebanese livestock, MLST analysis revealed the presence of sequence types common to both humans and animals (Al Bayssari et al., 2015a; Rafei et al., 2015; Diab et al., 2016), which suggests that Lebanese farms are potent reservoirs of multi-drug-resistant organisms that could be transmitted to humans. In the present study and in collaboration with the Lebanese Ministry of Agriculture, our aim was to determine the national epidemiology of multi-drugresistant Gram-negative bacilli in Lebanese chicken farms in terms of intestinal carriage.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Ethics Statement

The Ministry of Agriculture in Lebanon granted approval to collect chicken samples from representative farms in the country as per the national norms for animal sampling and manipulation. This sampling was in conformity with the international regulations for animal safety. All of the involved farms officially received authorization from the Ministry of Agriculture, and this was considered, after undergoing an acceptance process, an official and legal document. Therefore, an Institutional Review Board (IRB) approval was obtained for the present study.

Samples Collection

Between August and December 2015, 981 rectal swabs were collected from 49 poultry farms distributed over the seven

districts of Lebanon. Six to seven farms were visited in each district. The average number of samples taken from each farm was 20 fecal swabs (**Table 1**). The 20 samples collected were randomly taken from each farm. Technical assistance, i.e., fecal swabs, gloves, costumes, and a portable refrigerator, were provided by the Ministry of Agriculture team. The collected swabs were directly placed in a portable refrigerator, and when they arrived at the University Laboratory, they were stored at -80° C until use. The farms visited were selected by considering their geographical location, presence or absence of a nearby community and the size of the farms (at least 3,000 chickens per breeding site). Eighty percent of the samples were gathered from broiler chickens, while 20% were taken from layers. The mean average age of the broilers and layers was 31 days and 14 months, respectively.

MALDI-TOF MS Identification

Rectal swabs were sub-cultured on a MacConkey agar supplemented with 2 μ g/ml of cefotaxime for the preliminary screening of antibiotic-resistant Gram-negative bacilli. After overnight incubation at 37°C, colonies showing different morphologies were picked up from each selective plate and tested separately with MALDI-TOF MS for identification using the Microflex LT spectrometer (Bruker Daltonics, Bremen, Germany) (Seng et al., 2010; Singhal et al., 2015). The spectra obtained for each strain were stored and downloaded into a MALDI Biotyper 3.0 system to create a single main spectrum for each bacterial isolate. Thereafter, a dendrogram was constructed using MALDI Biotyper 3.0 software.

Antibiotic Susceptibility Testing

Using the Kirby-Bauer disk diffusion method, antibiotic susceptibility testing was performed. The results were interpreted according to EUCAST guidelines 2017 (European Committee on Antimicrobial Susceptibility Testing, 2017). Sixteen antimicrobial agents were used including ampicillin, aztreonam, cefotaxime, ceftazidime, cefoxitin, cefepime, amoxicillin-clavulanic acid, piperacillin-tazobactam, meropenem, imipenem, ertapenem, colistin, tigecycline, ciprofloxacin, gentamicin and trimethoprimsulfamethoxazole (Bio-Rad, Marnes-la-Coquette, France). Phenotypic detection of ESBL was performed using the doubledisk synergy test by placing an amoxicillin-clavulanic acid disk in the center between aztreonam, cefepime and ceftazidime. The observation of a "key hole effect" was considered a positive test. On the other hand, ampC β -lactamase detection was performed using the ampC disk test (Black et al., 2005). In brief, a lawn of cefoxitin-susceptible E. coli ATCC 25922 was inoculated on the surface of a Mueller Hinton agar plate. A 30-µg cefoxitin disk was placed on the inoculated surface. A sterile filter paper disk was moistened by adding 20 µl of a 1:1 mixture of saline and 100 \times Tris-EDTA (catalog code T-9285; Sigma-Aldrich Corporation, St. Louis, MO, United States). Several colonies of the test isolate were then applied to the disk. The disk was then positioned with its inoculated face in contact with the agar surface. After overnight incubation, a flattening or indentation of the zone of inhibition around the cefoxitin disk was considered a positive result, while an absence of distortion was considered

a negative one. Furthermore, for the presumptive detection of carbapenemases, the carba NP test was performed as previously described (Bakour et al., 2015). A bacterium was characterized as being multi-drug-resistant when resistance to at least three classes of antibiotics was observed (Magiorakos et al., 2012).

Molecular Characterization of β-Lactamase Encoding Genes

All of the isolates that showed a key hole effect or had cefoxitin resistance with non-susceptibility to cefepime were subjected to real-time PCR analysis for the detection of SHV, TEM and CTX-M encoding genes (Roschanski et al., 2014). Simplex PCRs for the genes encoding AmpC β -lactamases FOX, MOX, ACC, EBC, DHA, and CMY were conducted for all strains showing non-susceptibility to cefoxitin (Dallenne et al., 2010). Simplex PCR was also used to test the ADC ampC β -lactamase gene in *A. ba*umannii (Liu and Liu, 2015). DNA extraction was performed according to the manufacturer's instructions using EZ1 DNA extraction kits (Qiagen, Courtaboeuf, France) with the EZ1 Advanced XL biorobot.

Multilocus Sequence Typing

One *E. coli* strain from each cluster shown in the MSP dendrogram was chosen, and MLST typing was performed based on allelic profiles to determine their evolutionary relationship (Peng and Zong, 2011). Seven housekeeping genes were used: *adk, fumC, gyrB, icd, mdh, purA,* and *recA.* Analysis of the genes' allelic profiles was performed on the MLST¹ to determine the sequence type (ST) to which each isolate belongs.

Statistical Analysis

The prevalence, identification, and resistance profiles of isolated strains are all presented as the number (percentage).

RESULTS

Bacterial Identification

Out of 982 collected fecal swabs, 203 (20.6%) showed growth on selective medium. In total, 235 strains were isolated. All 235 isolated Gram-negative bacilli were identified by MALDI TOF mass spectrometry with a score value ≥ 1.9 . The distribution at the species level was as follows: 217 were identified as E. coli (92%), eight as K. pneumoniae (3%), three as Proteus mirabilis (1%), three as Enterobacter cloacae (1%), two as E. albertii, one as E. fergusonii and one as A. baumannii. The MSP dendrogram of the 217 E. coli isolates revealed five clusters at a distance level of 500 (arbitrarily selected) (Figure 1). Cluster 1 was mainly formed by isolates from the Akkar District. Cluster 2 contained two isolates: one from Saida and the other from Baalbek. Cluster 3 was composed of three strains isolated from Jabal Lebnen District. Cluster 4 was mainly composed of isolates from the North Lebanon district, and Cluster 5 contained only one strain from Saida.

¹http://mlst.warwick.ac.uk/mlst/dbs/Ecoli

TABLE 1 | Distribution of MDROs per farm and district.

		Collection date	Farm size	Age	Туре	# of collected samples	# of positive samples	# of isolated strains
	FI		18000	35 d	В	27	11	11
	F2		11300	35 d	В	27	5	6
	F3		20000	45 d	В	27	2	2
North Leb	F4	27-Aug	23000	4 m	L	20	9	18
	F5		4000	35 d	В	20	14	23
	F6		20000	25 d	В	20	13	14
	F7		15000	35 d	В	20	8	9
	F8		5000	25 d	В	20	5	5
Akkar	F9	31-Aug	4000	25 d	В	20	5	5
	F10		6000	25 d	В	20	9	11
	F11		4600	4 m	L	20	11	14
	F12		15000	40 d	В	20	11	14
	F13		6000	45 d	В	20	1	1
	F14		10700	36 d	В	20	4	4
Bekaa	F15	15-Sep	5000	45 d	В	20	6	7
	F16		3000	18 m	L	20	3	3
	F17		6000	36 d	В	20	1	1
	F18		6000	43 d	В	20	6	7
	F19		6000	43 d	В	20	3	3
Baalbek	F20	21-Sep	5000	14 m	L	20	3	3
	F21		6500	27 d	В	20	3	3
	F22		6700	12 m	L	21	1	1
	F23		11800	26 d	В	20	4	4
Nabatieh	F24	21-Oct	10000	27 d	В	20	2	2
	F25		10000	25 d	В	20	1	1
	F26		5000	25 d	В	20	1	1
	F27		10000	27 d	В	20	8	8
	F28		5000	28 d	В	20	4	4
Jabal Leb	F29	9-Nov	5000	25 d	В	20	7	6
	F30		10000	27 d	В	20	2	2
	F31		10000	28 d	В	20	4	5
	F32		18000	25 d	В	20	5	5
	F33		6000	25 d	В	20	3	3
	F34		6000	25 d	В	20	6	6
Saida	F35	7-Dec	3300	32 d	В	20	10	10
	F36		10000	25 d	В	20	5	6
	F37		10000	30 d	В	20	1	1
	F38		10000	28 d	В	20	6	6

F, farm; Aug, August; Sept, September; Oct, October; Nov, November; Dec, December; d, days; m, month; B, broiler; L, layer.

Phenotypic Profiles of Resistance

The disk diffusion susceptibility testing results are summarized in **Table 2**. All of the isolates were susceptible to tigecycline, colistin and carbapenems. Phenotypic identification using the double disk synergy test, ampC disk test and carba NP test revealed that 102 (43.5%) of the isolated strains were ampC β lactamase producers, 67 (28.5%) were ESBL producers, and 48 (20.5%) were co-producers of ESBL and ampC β -lactamases. Both ESBL and ESBL/ampC production were detected in *E. coli*, *K. pneumoniae, E. fergusonii*, and *E. cloacae* (**Table 2**), whereas only AmpC production was detected in *E. coli*, *K. pneumoniae*, *P. mirabilis, E. albertii*, and *A. baumannii*. In addition, 18 *E. coli* strains (7.5%) did not show a key hole effect and were resistant to cefoxitin but tested negative with the ampC disk test. Moreover, 32% of the isolated strains were co-resistant to gentamicin, ciprofloxacin, and trimethoprim-sulfamethoxazole, whereas 40% were resistant to at least two non- β -lactam antibiotics, 19.5% were resistant to only one non- β -lactam, and 8% were susceptible to all of the non- β -lactam antibiotics tested.

Prevalence of MDR-GNB

The distribution of samples showing positive growth on the selective medium was as follows: 54 samples in the North District, 38 in the Akkar District, 37 in Saida, 26 in Bekaa, 24 in Jabal Lebnen, 16 in Baalbek and eight in Nabatieh.



The number of positive samples from broilers exceeded the one obtained from Layers (176 vs. 27, respectively). Isolated strains (235) originated from 38 out of the 49 visited farms, i.e., 77.5% of the farms were positive for at least one multi-drug-resistant Gram-negative bacilli. As shown in **Figure 2**, the highest prevalence was detected in the northwest of the country, with 74 and 44 isolated strains for the North and Akkar Districts, respectively, whereas the lowest prevalence was detected in the north-east and south-east of Lebanon.

PCR Screening of CTX-M, SHV, TEM, and AmpC β -Lactamase Genes

One hundred and twelve isolates suspected to be ESBL producers were subjected to a real-time PCR assay for the detection of SHV, TEM, and CTX-M encoding genes. Of the 112 strains selected, 93 (83%) harbored the TEM gene, 59 (53%) the CTX-M gene and 22 (20%) the SHV gene. Overall, 49% (55) of the ESBL suspected isolates harbored only one gene, 46% (52) harbored at least two genes with the highest concordance being between the TEM and CTX-M genes, and 4% (five) showed the co-existence of all three genes together (**Table 3**). In parallel, 152 strains including 4 *K. pneumoniae*, 3 *P. mirabilis*, 2 *E. albertii*, and 143 *E. coli* were positive for bla_{CMY} ; whereas fifteen *E. coli* strains were negative fall ampC β -lactamase genes tested. Furthermore, in *A. baumannii* the ADC gene was detected.

MLST Typing

The MLST typing of the strains, each chosen from the major district-related isolates grouped in each cluster, revealed that they belong to five different STs: ST156 for Cluster 1, ST5470 for Cluster 2, ST354 for Cluster 3, ST155 for Cluster 4 and ST3224 for Cluster 5.

DISCUSSION

Many years ago, hospitals and health care settings were regarded as the sole source of antimicrobial resistance. However, recent evidence has shown that food producing animals constitute a potent reservoir of multi-drug-resistant organisms (Belmahdi et al., 2016; Bachiri et al., 2017). This was mainly linked to the over-use of antimicrobial agents in veterinary medicine for treatment, growth promotion and prophylaxis (Economou and Gousia, 2015). Although the zoonotic transmission of multidrug-resistant organisms from animals to humans remains controversial (Olsen et al., 2014), several studies have shown a direct link between direct contact with farm animals and the acquisition of bacterial resistance (Huijbers et al., 2014). One study conducted by Olaitan et al. (2015) demonstrated the zoonotic transmission of a colistin-resistant E. coli strain from a pig to its owner. This owner usually fed his pig without wearing any protective equipment. The two colistin-resistant isolates (in the pig and its owner) belonged to the same sequence type and

Species	AMP	AZT	СТХ	CAZ	FOX	FEP	AMC	TZP	SXT	CIP	GENT	% of ESBL producers	% of AmpC	% of ESBL/AmpC
													producers	co-producers
Escherichia coli $(n = 217)$	217 (100)	49 (23)	195 (90)	120 (55)	104 (48)	31 (14)	77 (35)	28 (13)	150 (59)	134 (62)	152 (70)	27	44	21
Klebsiella pneumonia $(n = 8)$	8 (100)	2 (25)	8 (100)	3 (38)	2 (25)	2 (25)	2 (25)	2 (25)	6(75)	7 (88)	7 (88)	50	37.5	12.5
Proteus mirabilis $(n = 3)$	3 (100)	(0) 0	2 (67)	0(0)	3 (100)	0(0)	3 (100)	0(0)	3 (100)	3 (100)	1 (33)		100	
Enterobacter cloacae $(n = 3)$	3 (100)	1 (33)	3 (100)	2 (67)	0) (0)	0(0)	0 (0)	0(0)	1 (33)	1 (33)	3 (100)	100		
Escherichia albertii (n = 2)	2 (100)	(0) 0	1 (50)	1 (50)	2 (100)	0()	(0) 0	(0) 0	0(0)	0 (0)	0(0)		100	
Escherichia fergusonii $(n = l)$	1 (100)	0(0)	1 (100)	0(0)	0) (0)	0(0)	0 (0)	0(0)	0(0)	1 (100)	(0) 0	100		
Acinetobacter baumannii ($n = l$)	1 (100)	(0) 0	1 (100)	1 (100)	1 (100)	0(0)	0(0)	(0) 0	0(0)	(0) 0	0)0		100	
Resistance profiles are μ acid; TZP, piperacillin-ta:	presented as a zobactam; SXT,	number (pe	ərcentage). N, rim-sulfameth	number; %, oxazole; CIP,	percentage; , ciprofloxacin	AMP, ampici ; GENT, geni	llin; AZT, aztre tamicin.	eonam; CTX,	cefotaxime;	CAZ, ceftazi	dime; FOX, o	cefoxitin; FEP, c	efepime; AMC	amoxicillin-clavulani

presented with the same virulence and PFGE pattern (Olaitan et al., 2015).

In Lebanon, very few studies have looked at the prevalence of MDROs in farm animals (Al Bayssari et al., 2015a). Our study is the first epidemiological study in Lebanon quantifying the prevalence of multi-drug-resistant Gram-negative bacilli in chicken farms in terms of intestinal carriage at the national level. The prevalence is similar to the one previously reported from cattle (84%) in Lebanon (Diab et al., 2016). The flock's size did not influence the prevalence of resistance in each farm (Table 1). On a global level, the prevalence found in our study is approximate to the one reported in Romania (69%) (Maciuca et al., 2015) and Ecuador (60%) (Ortega-Paredes et al., 2016) but is higher than the ones described in Germany (44%) (Kola et al., 2012), Japan (23%) (Kawamura et al., 2014), and Vietnam (3.2%) (Nguyen et al., 2015). Differences in the screening methodologies, sample size used and the level of antibiotic consumption in each country could explain these variations (Rhouma et al., 2016).

Escherichia coli was the most common multi-drug-resistant organism isolated; MALDI-TOF MSP dendrogram and MLST analysis revealed the presence of five clusters from which the representative strains belonged to different STs. Within each cluster, strains isolated from farms of the same district were grouped together; this is especially true for the Akkar and North Lebanon strains. This observation reveals that strains of the same region are closely related. Although PFGE is the standard method for the detection of clones, due to the large number of strains isolated in this study, PFGE typing was not performed; rather, we referred to the MSP dendrogram as a possible rapid tool for strain differentiation according to their geographical and/or phenotypic distribution in epidemiological studies as certain previous studies have suggested (Berrazeg et al., 2013; Khennouchi et al., 2015). With the exception of ST155, none of the sequence types identified in this study were among those frequently reported in chicken such as ST10, ST23, ST48, ST58, ST115, ST117, ST350, and ST648 (Olsen et al., 2014). However, looking at the Warwick E. coli MLST database, we found that the STs detected in our study were previously reported from livestock, cats and dogs, and humans. ST155 has been commonly reported in poultry (Pires-dos-Santos et al., 2013), and it appears to be associated with a zoonotic risk, which has been suggested by some studies (Lazarus et al., 2015). This emphasizes the hypothesis that MDROs in food-producing animals can be transmitted to humans and may be causative agents of infections with therapeutic challenges when high resistance is encountered. It should also be mentioned that clones in animals and humans are not always shared; some studies have shown that E. coli strains in food-producing animals differ from those reported in humans (Randall et al., 2012; Wu et al., 2013). This suggests that only some bacterial clones might be transmitted to the human population.

As our study showed, ESBL producers dominate the Lebanese poultry sector. The prevalence of ampC producers is also elevated (43.5%). ESBL and ampC-producing Gram-negative bacilli were previously reported in clinical and community settings in Lebanon (Dandachi et al., 2016). Molecular characterization revealed that 50% of isolated strains co-harbored at least two



TABLE 3 Characteristics of the different phenotypes/genotypes of ESBL and ESBL/AmpC producers found in this study.

Eacherichie coli ESEL Escherichie coli EsteL Escherichie coli ESEL Escherichie coli ESEL EsteL E	Species	Phenotype		β -lactamase gene	!S	Co-resistance to non $\boldsymbol{\beta}$ -lactams
bia TM bia TM SRT CIP bia TM bia CTX-M CIP-GNT bia TM bia TM SRT CIP bia SHV bia TM SRT CIP bia TM SRT CIP SRT CIP bia TM bia TM SRT CIP	Escherichia coli	ESBL		bla TEM	bla CTX-M	SXT-CIP-GNT
bia TEM bia CTX-M OF-ONT bia STM bia TEM SXT-CIP-CNT bia SHV bia TEM SXT-CIP-CNT bia SHV bia TEM SXT-CIP bia TEM SXT-CIP				bla TEM	bla CTX-M	SXT-CIP
bla FM bla FM bla FM SAT-ONT bla SHV bla FM SAT-ONT CP bla SHV bla TEM SAT-ONT bla SHV bla TEM SAT-OP bla TEM SAT-OP SAT-OP bla TEM Bla TEM SAT-OP bl				bla TEM	bla CTX-M	CIP-GNT
bis SHV bis TEM SXTCIP-GNT bis SHV bis TEM SXTCIP bis TEM SXTCIP SXTCIP bis TEM bis TEM SXTCIP bis TEM bis TEM SXTCIP				bla TEM	bla CTX-M	SXT-GNT
bia SHV bia TM CIP bia SHV bia TM SXT-GNT bia SHV bia TM SXT-GP bia STV bia TM SXT-GP bia GTX-M SXT-GP Bia GTX-M bia GTX-M SXT-GP Bia GTX-M bia GTX-M SXT-GP Bia GTX-M bia GTX-M SXT-GP SXT-GP bia TEM bia CTX-M SXT-GP bia SHV <td< td=""><td></td><td></td><td>bla SHV</td><td>bla TEM</td><td></td><td>SXT-CIP-GNT</td></td<>			bla SHV	bla TEM		SXT-CIP-GNT
bla SHV bla TEM SAT-CRIT bla SHV bla TEM SAT-CIP bla SHV bla TEM SAT-CIP bla CTX-M SAT-CIP SAT-CIP bla CTX-M N.R SAT-CIP bla TEM SAT-CIP-CNT SAT-CIP bla TEM SAT-CIP SAT-CIP bla TEM SAT-CIP-CNT SAT-CIP bla TEM SAT-CIP SAT-CIP bla TEM SAT-CIP-CNT SAT-CIP-CNT bla TEM bla CTX-M SAT-CIP-CNT			bla SHV	bla TEM		CIP
bia SHV bia TEM SAT-CIP-GNT bia CTX-M SAT-CIP-GNT bia CTX-M SAT-CIP-GNT bia TEM GNT bia TEM SAT-CIP-GNT bia TEM Bia TEM bia TEM SAT-CIP-GNT bia TEM bia TEM bia TEM bia TEM bia TEM bia CTX-M SAT-CIP-GNT SAT bia TEM bia TEM bia TEM bia TEM bia TEM bia TEM bia TEM bia CTX-M bia TEM bia TEM bia TEM bia TEM bia TEM <td></td> <td></td> <td>bla SHV</td> <td>bla TEM</td> <td></td> <td>SXT-GNT</td>			bla SHV	bla TEM		SXT-GNT
bia SHV bia TEM SXT-CIP-GNT bia CTX-M SXT-CIP-GNT bia TEM SXT-CIP-GNT bia TEM SXT-CIP-GNT bia TEM SXT-CIP-GNT bia TEM GNT bia TEM SXT-CIP-GNT bia TEM SXT-CIP-GNT bia TEM SXT-CIP-GNT bia TEM SXT-CIP-GNT bia TEM bia TEM bia SHV			bla SHV	bla TEM		SXT-CIP
bla CTX-M SXT-CIP-GNT bla CTX-M SXT-CIP-GNT bla TEM SXT-CIP-GNT bla TEM SXT-CIP-GNT bla TEM GP-GNT bla TEM GP-GNT bla TEM GP-GNT bla TEM GP-GNT bla TEM GNT bla TEM GNT bla TEM Ba TEM bla TEM GNT bla TEM bla TEM bla TEM Ba TCOP-GNT bla SHV bla TEM SXT-CIP-GNT bla TEM SXT-CIP-GNT bla TEM Bla TTM SXT-CIP-GNT <			bla SHV	bla TEM		SXT
killer killer killer bia Kif-CP-GNT bia SXT-CP-GNT bia BTEM SXT-CP-GNT bia BTEM GNT bia BTEM Bia bia BTEM SXT-CP-GNT bia BTEM Bia bia TEM SXT-CP-GNT bia BTEM SXT-CP-GNT bia TEM SXT-CP-GNT bia TEM SXT-CP-GNT bia TEM SXT-CP-GNT bia TEM Bia bia TEM SXT-CP-GNT bia BTEM Bia bia TEM Bia bia TEM Bia bia BTEM Bia bia BTEM Bia bia BTEM Bia bia BTEM Bia					bla CTX-M	SXT-CIP-GNT
kis classes kis classes kis classes kis class					bla CTX-M	SXT-CIP
bia TEM SXT-CIP-GNT bia TEM SXT-GP bia TEM CIP-GNT bia TEM bia TEM bia TEM Bia TEM bia TEM CIP-GNT bia SHV bia TEM bia TEM SXT-CIP-GNT bia SHV bia TEM bia TEM STT-CIP-GNT bia TEM bia CTX-M STT-CIP-GNT STT-CIP-GNT bia TEM bia CTX-M bia TEM bia CTX-M STT-CIP-GNT bia TEM bia TEM bia CTX-M bia TEM bia CTX-M STT-CIP-GNT bia TEM bia TEM bia CTX-M bia TEM bia CTX-M STT-CIP-GNT bia TEM bia TEM bia CTX-M bia TEM bia CTX-M STT-CIP-GNT bia TEM bia SHV bia TEM bia SHV bia TEM bia SHV bia TEM bia SHV </td <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>bla CTX-M</td> <td>N.R</td>					bla CTX-M	N.R
bia TEM SXT-GNT bia TEM SXT-CIP bia TEM GNT bia TEM GNT bia TEM Battem bia TEM SXT-CIP-GNT bia SHV bia TEM SXT-CIP-GNT bia SHV bia TEM SXT-GIP-GNT bia SHV bia TEM SXT-GIP-GNT bia TEM SXT-GIP-GNT SXT-GIP-GNT bia TEM bia TEM SXT-GIP-GNT bia TEM bia TEM SXT-GIP-GNT bia TEM bia CTX-M SXT-GIP-GNT bia SHV bia TEM <				bla TEM		SXT-CIP-GNT
bia TEM SXT-CIP bia TEM CIP-CNT bia TEM GNT bia TEM bia TEM SXT-CIP-CNT bia SHV bia TEM bia CTX-M SXT-CIP-CNT bia SHV bia TEM bia CTX-M SXT-CIP-CNT bia SHV bia TEM SXT-CIP-CNT GNT bia TEM bia TEM SXT-CIP-CNT SXT-CIP-CNT bia TEM bia TEM SXT-CIP-CNT SXT-CIP-CNT bia TEM bia TEM SXT-CIP-CNT SXT-CIP-CNT bia TEM bia CTX-M SXT-CIP-CNT SXT-CIP-CNT bia TEM bia CTX-M SXT-CIP-CNT Bia TEM Bia CTX-M SXT-CIP-CNT bia TEM bia CTX-M SXT-CIP-CNT Bia TEM Bia CTX-M SXT-CIP-CNT bia SHV bia TEM bia CTX-M SXT-CIP-CNT Bia CTX-M SXT-CIP-CNT bia SHV bia TEM bia CTX-M SXT-CIP-CNT Bia CTX-M SXT-CIP-CNT bia SHV bia TEM bia CTX-M SXT-CIP-CNT Bia CTX-M <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>bla TEM</td> <td></td> <td>SXT-GNT</td>				bla TEM		SXT-GNT
kie bia TEM CIP-GNT bia TEM GNT bia TEM N.R bia SHV bia CTX-M SXT-CIP-GNT bia SHV Bia TEM SXT-CIP-GNT bia TEM bia TEM SXT-CIP-GNT bia TEM SXT-CIP-GNT SXT-CIP-GNT bia TEM SXT-CIP-GNT SXT-CIP-GNT bia TEM SXT-CIP-GNT SXT-CIP-GNT bia TEM SXT-CIP-GNT SXT-CIP-GNT bia TEM bia CTX-M SXT-CIP-GNT bia SHV bia TEM bia CTX-M SXT-CIP-				bla TEM		SXT-CIP
bia TEM GNT bia SHV bia TEM N.R bia SHV Bia TEM SXT-CIP_GNT bia SHV Bia TEM SXT-CIP_GNT bia TEM SXT-CIP_GNT SXT-CIP_GNT bia TEM bia CTX-M SXT-CIP_GNT bia SHV bia TEM bia CTX-M SXT-CIP_GNT bia SHV bia TEM bia CTX-M SXT-CIP_GNT bia SHV bia TEM CIP_CNT SXT-CIP_GNT bia SHV bia TEM SXT-CIP_GNT SXT-CIP_GNT bia SHV bia TEM CIP_CNT SXT-CIP_GNT bia SHV bia TE				bla TEM		CIP-GNT
bia SHV bia TEM bia CTX-M SXT-CIP-GNT bia SHV bia TEM SXT-CIP-GNT bia TEM SXT-CIP-GNT bia TEM SXT-GNT bia TEM CIP-GNT bia TEM SXT-CIP-GNT bia TEM bia CTX-M SXT-CIP-GNT SXT-CIP-GNT bia TEM bia CTX-M SXT-CIP-GNT SXT-CIP-GNT bia TEM bia CTX-M bia TEM bia CTX-M SXT-CIP-GNT SXT-CIP-GNT bia TEM bia CTX-M bia SHV bia TEM bia SHV				bla TEM		GNT
bla SHV bla TEM bla CTX-M SXT-CIP-GNT GNT GNT GNT GNT GNT SNT-CIP-GNT GNT GNT GNT GNT GNT SNT-CIP-GNT GNT GNT GNT GNT GNT				bla TEM		N.R
kie SHV GNT AmpC/ESBL bia TEM SXT-GP-GNT bia TEM GP-GNT bia TEM CP-GNT bia TEM SXT-GP-GNT bia TEM SXT-GP-GNT bia TEM SXT-GP-GNT bia TEM SXT-GP-GNT bia TEM bia CTX-M SXT-GP-GNT bia TEM bia CTX-M GP-GNT bia TEM bia CTX-M GP-GNT bia TEM bia CTX-M SXT-GP-GNT bia TEM bia CTX-M SXT-GP-GNT bia TEM bia CTX-M SXT-GP-GNT bia SHV bia TEM bia CTX-M SXT-GP-GNT			bla SHV	bla TEM	bla CTX-M	SXT-CIP-GNT
AmpC/ESBL bia TEM SXT-CP-GNT bia TEM SXT-GNT bia TEM CIP-GNT bia TEM SXT bia TEM NR bia TEM NR bia TEM bia CTX-M bia SHV bia TEM bia CTX-M NR cip-GNT bia SHV bia SHV bia TEM			bla SHV			GNT
klebsiella pneumoniae ESBL bia TFM SXT-GNT bia TEM GIP-GNT SXT bia TEM bia TEM SXT-CIP-GNT bia TEM bia CTX-M SXT-CIP-GNT bia TEM bia CTX-M SXT-CIP bia SHV bia TEM bia CTX-M SXT-CIP bia SHV bia TEM bia CTX-M SXT-CIP-GNT		AmpC/ESBL		bla TEM		SXT-CIP-GNT
klebsiella pneumoniae CIP-GNT bia TEM SXT bia TEM N.R bia TEM bia CTX-M bia SHV bia TEM bia SHV bia TEM bia SHV bia TEM bia SHV bia TEM bia SHV bia CTX-M bia SHV bia TEM bia SHV bia TEM bia SHV bia CTX-M bia SHV bia TEM bia SHV bia TEM bia SHV bia TEM bia SHV bia CTX-M bia SHV bia CTX-M bia SHV bia CTX-M bia SHV bia CTX-M bia SHV bia CTX-M <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>bla TEM</td> <td></td> <td>SXT-GNT</td>				bla TEM		SXT-GNT
klebsiella pneumoniae ESBL bia TEM SXT bia TEM bia CTX-M SXT-CIP-GNT bia TEM bia CTX-M N.R bia SHV bia TEM bia CTX-M bia SHV bia TEM bia CTX-M bia SHV bia TEM bia CTX-M bia SHV bia TEM SXT-CIP-GNT bia SHV bia TEM bia CTX-M N.R Klebsiella pneumoniae ESBL bia SHV bia TEM bia CTX-M SXT-CIP-GNT klebsiella pneumoniae ESBL bia SHV bia TEM bia CTX-M SXT-CIP-GNT bia SHV bia TEM bia CTX-M SXT-CIP-GNT bia TEM SXT-CIP-GNT bia SHV bia TEM bia CTX-M SXT-CIP-GNT bia TEM SXT-CIP-GNT				bla TEM		CIP-GNT
klebsiella pneumoniae KB N.R klebsiella pneumoniae KB KB klebsiella pneumoniae ESBL bla SHV bla TEM bla CTX-M SXT-CIP-GNT bla SHV bla TEM GNT bla SHV bla TEM CIP-GNT bla SHV bla TEM CIP-GNT bla SHV bla TEM CIP-GNT bla SHV bla TEM SXT-CIP-GNT bla SHV bla TEM CIP-GNT bla SHV bla TEM SXT-CIP-GNT bla SHV bla TEM bla CTX-M SXT-CIP-GNT bla SHV				bla TEM		SXT
klebsiella pneumoniae ESBL bla TEM bla CTX-M SXT-CIP-GNT bla TEM bla CTX-M SXT-CIP bla TEM bla CTX-M N.R bla SHV bla TEM bla CTX-M OIP-GNT bla SHV bla TEM bla CTX-M SXT-CIP-GNT bla SHV bla TEM bla CTX-M OIP-GNT bla SHV bla TEM bla CTX-M SXT-CIP-GNT				bla TEM		N.R
klebsiella pneumoniae ESBL bla SHV bla TEM bla CTX-M CIP-GNT bla TEM bla CTX-M SXT-CIP bla TEM bla CTX-M SXT-GNT bla SHV bla TEM bla CTX-M N.R bla SHV bla TEM bla CTX-M SXT-GNT bla SHV bla TEM bla CTX-M N.R bla SHV bla TEM CIP-GNT CIP-GNT bla SHV bla TEM bla CTX-M N.R bla SHV bla TEM bla CTX-M SXT-CIP-GNT bla SHV bla TEM bla CTX-M SXT-CIP-GNT <				bla TEM	bla CTX-M	SXT-CIP-GNT
bla TEM bla CTX-M CIP-GNT bla TEM bla CTX-M SXT-CIP bla TEM bla CTX-M SXT-GNT bla SHV bla TEM bla CTX-M N.R bla SHV bla TEM bla CTX-M N.R bla SHV bla TEM bla CTX-M N.R bla SHV bla TEM CIP-GNT CIP-GNT bla SHV bla TEM bla CTX-M SXT-CIP-GNT bla SHV bla TEM				bla TEM	bla CTX-M	SXT
bla TEM bla CTX-M SXT-CIP bla TEM bla CTX-M SXT-GNT bla TEM bla CTX-M N.R bla SHV bla TEM bla CTX-M bla SHV bla TEM CIP-GNT bla SHV bla TEM SXT-CIP-GNT bla SHV bla TEM SXT-CIP-GNT bla SHV bla TEM SXT-CIP-GNT bla SHV bla TEM bla CTX-M SXT-CIP-GNT SXT-CIP-GNT bla SHV bla TEM bla CTX-M SXT-CIP-GNT SXT-CIP-GNT bla SHV bla TEM bla CTX-M bla SHV bla TEM bla CTX-M bla SHV bla TEM bla CTX-M bla TEM bla TEM SXT-CIP-GNT				bla TEM	bla CTX-M	CIP-GNT
kia TEM bia CTX-M SXT-GNT bia TEM bia CTX-M N.R bia SHV bia TEM bia CTX-M GNT bia SHV bia TEM GNT GNT bia SHV bia TEM CIP-GNT bia CTX-M SXT-CIP-GNT bia SHV bia TEM bia CTX-M CIP-GNT bia SHV bia TEM bia CTX-M CIP-GNT bia SHV bia TEM bia CTX-M CIP-GNT bia SHV bia TEM bia CTX-M SXT-CIP-GNT bia TEM bia TEM bia CTX-M SXT-CIP-GNT bia SHV bia TEM bia CTX-M SXT-CIP-GNT				bla TEM	bla CTX-M	SXT-CIP
bla TEM bla CTX-M N.R bla SHV bla TEM GNT bla SHV bla TEM CIP-GNT bla SHV bla TEM SXT-CIP-GNT bla CTX-M SXT-CIP-GNT N.R bla SHV bla CTX-M N.R bla SHV bla CTX-M N.R Klebsiella pneumoniae ESBL bla SHV bla TEM Dla CTX-M SXT-CIP-GNT Klebsiella pneumoniae ESBL bla SHV bla TEM bla CTX-M SXT-CIP-GNT Klebsiella pneumoniae ESBL bla SHV bla TEM bla CTX-M SXT-CIP-GNT bla SHV bla TEM bla CTX-M CIP-GNT CIP-GNT bla SHV bla TEM bla CTX-M SXT-CIP-GNT bla SHV bla TEM bla CTX-M CIP-GNT bla SHV bla TEM bla CTX-M SXT-CIP-GNT bla SHV bla TEM b				bla TEM	bla CTX-M	SXT-GNT
bla SHV bla TEM GNT bla SHV bla TEM CIP-GNT bla CTX-M SXT-CIP-GNT bla CTX-M N.R bla SHV bla TEM Dia CTX-M bla SHV bla TEM Dia CTX-M bla SHV bla CTX-M CIP-GNT bla SHV bla TEM Dia CTX-M bla SHV bla TEM SXT-CIP-GNT bla SHV bla TEM SXT-CIP-GNT bla SHV bla TEM SXT-CIP-GNT bla SHV bla TEM bla CTX-M SXT-CIP-GNT bla SHV <				bla TEM	bla CTX-M	N.R
bla SHV bla TEM CLP-GNT bla CTX-M SXT-CIP-GNT bla CTX-M N.R bla CTX-M N.R bla SHV bla TEM bla CTX-M bla CTX-M CIP-GNT bla SHV bla TEM bla CTX-M Klebsiella pneumoniae ESBL bla SHV bla TEM bla SHV bla TEM bla CTX-M SXT-CIP-GNT Klebsiella pneumoniae ESBL bla SHV bla TEM bla CTX-M Klebsiella pneumoniae ESBL bla SHV bla TEM bla CTX-M Klebsiella pneumoniae ESBL bla SHV bla TEM bla CTX-M Klebsiella pneumoniae ESBL bla SHV bla TEM bla CTX-M Klebsiella pneumoniae ESBL bla SHV bla TEM bla CTX-M Klebsiella pneumoniae ESBL bla SHV bla TEM bla CTX-M Klebsiella pneumoniae ESBL bla SHV bla TEM bla CTX-M Klebsiella pneumoniae ESBL bla SHV bla TEM bla CTX-M Klebsiella pneumoniae ESBL bla SHV bla TEM bla CTX-M Klebsiella pneumoniae ESBL SKT-CIP-GNT SKT-CIP-GNT Klebsiella pneumoniae			bla SHV	bla TEM		GNT
klebsiella pneumoniae ESBL bla SHV bla TEM bla CTX-M N.R klebsiella pneumoniae ESBL bla SHV bla TEM bla CTX-M CIP-GNT klebsiella pneumoniae ESBL bla SHV bla TEM bla CTX-M SXT-CIP-GNT klebsiella pneumoniae ESBL bla SHV bla TEM bla CTX-M SXT-CIP-GNT bla SHV bla TEM bla CTX-M SXT-CIP-GNT SXT-CIP-GNT bla SHV bla TEM bla CTX-M CIP-GNT bla SHV bla TEM bla CTX-M SXT-CIP-GNT bla SHV bl			bla SHV	bla TEM		CIP-GNT
bla SHV bla CTX-M CIP-GNT bla SHV bla TEM bla CTX-M CIP-GNT bla SHV bla TEM bla CTX-M SXT-CIP-GNT bla SHV bla TEM bla CTX-M SXT-CIP-GNT bla SHV bla TEM bla CTX-M SXT-CIP-GNT bla SHV bla TEM bla CTX-M CIP-GNT bla SHV bla TEM bla CTX-M CIP-GNT bla SHV bla TEM bla CTX-M SXT-CIP-GNT bla SHV bla TEM bla CTX-M					bla CTX-M	SXT-CIP-GNT
bla SHV bla CTX-M CIP-GNT bla SHV bla TEM bla CTX-M SXT-CIP-GNT bla SHV bla TEM bla CTX-M CIP-GNT bla TEM bla CTX-M CIP-GNT bla SHV bla TEM bla CTX-M SXT-CIP-GNT Escherichia fergusonii ESBL SXT-CIP-GNT SXT-CIP-GNT Enterobacter cloacae ESBL bla TEM					bla CTX-M	N.R
Klebsiella pneumoniae ESBL bla SHV bla TEM bla CTX-M SXT-CIP-GNT klebsiella pneumoniae ESBL bla SHV bla TEM bla CTX-M SXT-CIP-GNT bla SHV bla TEM bla CTX-M SXT-CIP-GNT SXT-CIP-GNT bla SHV bla TEM bla CTX-M SXT-CIP-GNT bla SHV bla TEM bla CTX-M CIP-GNT bla SHV bla TEM bla CTX-M SXT-CIP-GNT Essel- bla TEM bla CTX-M CIP Enterobacter cloacae ESBL bla TEM bla CTX-M GNT			bla SHV		bla CTX-M	CIP-GNT
Klebsiella pneumoniae ESBL bla SHV bla TEM SXT-CIP-GNT bla SHV bla TEM bla CTX-M SXT-CIP-GNT bla SHV bla TEM bla CTX-M CIP-GNT bla TEM bla CTX-M CIP-GNT bla SHV bla TEM bla CTX-M SXT-CIP-GNT Escherichia fergusonii ESBL SXT-CIP-GNT SXT-CIP-GNT Enterobacter cloacae ESBL bla TEM bla CTX-M CIP			bla SHV	bla TEM	bla CTX-M	SXT-CIP-GNT
bla SHV bla TEM bla CTX-M SXT-CIP-GNT bla TEM bla CTX-M CIP-GNT bla TEM bla CTX-M CIP-GNT bla TEM bla CTX-M SXT-CIP-GNT bla TEM bla CTX-M SXT-CIP-GNT bla TEM bla CTX-M SXT-CIP-GNT bla TEM bla CTX-M CIP-GNT Escherichia fergusonii ESBL ST-CIP-GNT	Klebsiella pneumoniae	ESBL	bla SHV	bla TEM		SXT-CIP-GNT
bla TEM bla CTX-M CIP-GNT AmpC/ESBL bla SHV bla TEM bla CTX-M SXT-CIP-GNT bla TEM bla CTX-M SXT-CIP-GNT bla CTX-M SXT-CIP-GNT bla SHV bla TEM bla CTX-M SXT-CIP-GNT bla SHV bla TEM bla CTX-M SXT-CIP-GNT Esscherichia fergusonii ESBL bla TEM bla CTX-M CIP Enterobacter cloacae ESBL bla TEM bla CTX-M GNT	,		bla SHV	bla TEM	bla CTX-M	SXT-CIP-GNT
AmpC/ESBL bla SHV bla TEM bla CTX-M SXT-CIP-GNT bla TEM bla CTX-M SXT-CIP-GNT bla SHV bla TEM bla CTX-M SXT-CIP-GNT bla SHV bla TEM bla CTX-M SXT-CIP-GNT Escherichia fergusonii ESBL bla TEM bla CTX-M Enteropacter cloacae ESBL bla TEM bla CTX-M				bla TEM	bla CTX-M	CIP-GNT
bla TEM bla CTX-M SXT-CIP-GNT bla SHV bla TEM SXT-GNT Escherichia fergusonii ESBL bla TEM bla CTX-M CIP Enterobacter cloacae ESBL bla CTX-M GNT		AmpC/ESBI	bla SHV	bla TEM	bla CTX-M	SXT-CIP-GNT
bla SHV bla TEM SXT-GNT Escherichia fergusonii ESBL bla TEM bla CTX-M Enterobacter cloacae ESBL bla CTX-M GNT				bla TEM	bla CTX-M	SXT-CIP-GNT
Escherichia fergusonii ESBL bla TEM bla CTX-M CIP			bla SHV	bla TFM		SXT-GNT
Enterobacter cloacae ESBL bla CTX-M GNT	Escherichia fergusonii	ESBL	214 0114	bla TEM	bla CTX-M	CIP
	Enterobacter cloacae	ESBL			bla CTX-M	GNT

SXT, trimethoprim-sulfamethoxazole; GNT, gentamicin; CIP, ciprofloxacin; N.R, no resistance.

 β -lactamase genes with the most common being CTX-M and TEM. Moreover, the only AmpC β -lactamase encoding gene was the CMY ampC β -lactamase. This gene was previously reported in poultry (Dierikx et al., 2013; El-Shazly et al., 2017) as well as in food producing animals (Sato et al., 2014; Aguilar-Montes de Oca et al., 2015) and healthy pets (Donati et al., 2014; Liu et al., 2016). As per the phenotypic and genotypic detection of

AmpC production, these showed that there are some strains that were negative with the ampC disk test but positive for an ampC β -lactamase gene and vice-versa. Phenotypically false negatives shows the importance of the molecular testing in the detection of AmpC production. On the other hand, in the 15 *E. coli* strains that were negative for plasmidic ampC β -lactamase genes; one explanation for this might be due to an overexpression

of the chromosomal ampC gene mediated by a mutation in the promoter/attenuator region as described in previous studies (Escudero et al., 2010; Haenni et al., 2014). Regarding non-\beta-lactam co-resistance in ESBL and/or ampC producers, antimicrobial resistance toward gentamicin was relatively high in this study. In fact, 66% of ESBL and/or ampC producing Gram-negative bacilli were gentamicin resistant. This could possibly be linked to the frequent use of this antibiotic in Lebanese farms as several studies have reported (El-Rami et al., 2012; Diab et al., 2016). One study conducted by Abdelnoor et al. (2013) found a significant association between gentamicin resistance in E. coli isolates and the use of this antimicrobial agent as a food additive in poultry in Lebanon. Another study launched a questionnaire-based survey on the most common antibiotics used in Lebanese livestock and found that gentamicin and streptomycin are the most common and heavily used antimicrobial agents (Kassaify et al., 2013). Another thing to mention is that in this study, no carbapenemase producers were detected. There might be two possible explanations for this: the first one is that carbapenemase producers are really scarce in Lebanese chicken farms; the second one is that these isolates were missed due to the medium used for the screening of multi-drug-resistant organisms. As has been reported, OXA-48 carbapenemase producers are frequently found in hospitals and nursing homes and in fowls in Lebanon (Al Bayssari et al., 2015b). OXA-48 carbapenemases do not always confer resistance to third-generation cephalosporins unless there is another mechanism of resistance that co-exists in the same bacterial cell (Poirel et al., 2012). Therefore, Oxacillinase producers could have been missed or under-estimated in our study.

Our study has two main limitations. The first one is that the primers used for blaTEM and blaSHV screening were universal, and thus, the possibility of having non-ESBL variants cannot be ruled out. However, as the strains presented with a typical ESBL phenotype, i.e., the key hole effect and resistance to penicillin, monobactams and third-generation cephalosporins with susceptibility to carbapenems, the TEM-positive strains were considered as ESBL producers and were included in the description of the MDR-GNB prevalence in this study. The second limitation is the low number of isolates subjected to MLST typing. MLST and PFGE analysis remain the gold standard for clone/cluster detection in epidemiological studies regardless of

REFERENCES

- Abdelnoor, A. M., Chokr, S., Fayad, L., and Al-Akl, N. (2013). Review study on external-hospital bacteria as a source of infection and antimicrobial resistance in lebanon. *Int. Arab. J. Antimicrob. Agents* 3, 1–6.
- Aguilar-Montes de Oca, S., Talavera-Rojas, M., Soriano-Vargas, E., Barba-Leon, J., and Vazquez-Navarrete, J. (2015). Determination of extended spectrum betalactamases/AmpC beta-lactamases and plasmid-mediated quinolone resistance in *Escherichia coli* isolates obtained from bovine carcasses in mexico. *Trop. Anim. Health Prod.* 47, 975–981. doi: 10.1007/s11250-015-0818-3
- Al Bayssari, C., Dabboussi, F., Hamze, M., and Rolain, J. M. (2015a). Emergence of carbapenemase-producing *Pseudomonas aeruginosa* and *Acinetobacter baumannii* in livestock animals in lebanon. J. Antimicrob. Chemother. 70, 950–951. doi: 10.1093/jac/dku469

the number of strains (McGregor and Spratt, 2005; Zou et al., 2010).

CONCLUSION

Our study illustrates the current epidemiology of multi-drugresistant Gram-negative bacilli in Lebanese chicken farms. ESBL and ampC producers cross-resistant to antibiotics used in human medicine are highly prevalent across the territory. Our study suggests that poultry farms are potent reservoirs of antimicrobial resistance in Lebanon. Although very few studies have reported the detection of carbapenemase producers in Lebanese Livestock (Al Bayssari et al., 2015a,b), it will likely only be a matter of time before these organisms become prevalent in Lebanese animal farms. This is especially true if no strict rules are implemented to control the overuse and misuse of antibiotics for treatment, growth promotion and prophylaxis in Lebanese agriculture. We believe that the prescription of antibiotics often used in human medicine should be reduced or even banned in the veterinary sector.

AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS

ID, ES, and ED conducted the phenotypic and molecular work. BE-B was responsible for the collection of the samples. EA, J-MR, and ZD reviewed and edited the manuscript.

FUNDING

This study was funded by the Lebanese Council for Research and the French Government under the "Investissements d'Avenir" (Investments for the Future) program managed by the Agence Nationale de la Recherche (ANR, fr: National Agency for Research) (reference: Méditerranée Infection 10-IAHU-03).

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We would like to thank Dr. Hervé Chaudet for his assistance in the construction of the MSP dendrogram.

- Al Bayssari, C., Olaitan, A. O., Dabboussi, F., Hamze, M., and Rolain, J. M. (2015b). Emergence of OXA-48-producing *Escherichia coli* clone ST38 in fowl. *Antimicrob. Agents Chemother.* 59, 745–746. doi: 10.1128/AAC.03 552-14
- Alonso, C. A., Zarazaga, M., Ben Sallem, R., Jouini, A., Ben Slama, K., and Torres, C. (2017). Antibiotic resistance in *Escherichia coli* in husbandry animals: the African perspective. *Lett. Appl. Microbiol.* 64, 318–334. doi: 10.1111/lam. 12724
- Bachiri, T., Bakour, S., Ladjouzi, R., Thongpan, L., Rolain, J. M., and Touati, A. (2017). High rates of CTX-M-15-producing *Escherichia coli* and *Klebsiella pneumoniae* in wild boars and barbary macaques in algeria. J. Glob. Antimicrob. Resist. 8, 35–40. doi: 10.1016/j.jgar.2016.10.005
- Bakour, S., Garcia, V., Loucif, L., Brunel, J. M., Gharout-Sait, A., Touati, A., et al. (2015). Rapid identification of carbapenemase-producing *Enterobacteriaceae*,

Pseudomonas aeruginosa and *Acinetobacter baumannii* using a modified Carba NP test. *New Microbes New Infect.* 7, 89–93. doi: 10.1016/j.nmni.2015.07.001

- Baroud, M., Dandache, I., Araj, G. F., Wakim, R., Kanj, S., Kanafani, Z., et al. (2013). Underlying mechanisms of carbapenem resistance in extended-spectrum betalactamase-producing *Klebsiella pneumoniae* and *Escherichia coli* isolates at a tertiary care centre in lebanon: role of OXA-48 and NDM-1 carbapenemases. *Int. J. Antimicrob. Agents* 41, 75–79. doi: 10.1016/j.ijantimicag.2012.08.010
- Belmahdi, M., Bakour, S., Al Bayssari, C., Touati, A., and Rolain, J. M. (2016). Molecular characterisation of extended-spectrum beta-lactamase- and plasmid AmpC-producing *Escherichia coli* strains isolated from broilers in bejaia, algeria. J. Glob. Antimicrob. Resist. 6, 108–112. doi: 10.1016/j.jgar.2016.04.006
- Berrazeg, M., Diene, S. M., Drissi, M., Kempf, M., Richet, H., Landraud, L., et al. (2013). Biotyping of multidrug-resistant *Klebsiella pneumoniae* clinical isolates from france and algeria using MALDI-TOF MS. *PLoS One* 8:e61428. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0061428
- Bettiol, E., and Harbarth, S. (2015). Development of new antibiotics: taking off finally? Swiss Med. Wkly. 145:w14167. doi: 10.4414/smw.2015.14167
- Black, J. A., Moland, E. S., and Thomson, K. S. (2005). AmpC disk test for detection of plasmid-mediated AmpC disk test for detection of plasmidmediated AmpC beta-lactamases in *Enterobacteriaceae* lacking chromosomal AmpC beta-lactamases. J. Clin. Microbiol. 43, 3110–3113. doi: 10.1128/JCM.43. 7.3110-3113.2005
- Chantziaras, I., Boyen, F., Callens, B., and Dewulf, J. (2014). Correlation between veterinary antimicrobial use and antimicrobial resistance in food-producing animals: a report on seven countries. *J. Antimicrob. Chemother.* 69, 827–834. doi: 10.1093/jac/dkt443
- Dahms, C., Hubner, N. O., Wilke, F., and Kramer, A. (2014). Mini-review: epidemiology and zoonotic potential of multiresistant bacteria and clostridium difficile in livestock and food. *GMS Hyg. Infect. Control* 9:Doc21. doi: 10.3205/ dgkh000241
- Dallenne, C., Da Costa, A., Decre, D., Favier, C., and Arlet, G. (2010). Development of a set of multiplex PCR assays for the detection of genes encoding important beta-lactamases in *Enterobacteriaceae. J. Antimicrob. Chemother.* 65, 490–495. doi: 10.1093/jac/dkp498
- Dandachi, I., Salem Sokhn, E., Najem, E., Azar, E., and Daoud, Z. (2016). Carriage of beta-lactamase-producing *Enterobacteriaceae* among nursing home residents in north lebanon. *Int. J. Infect. Dis.* 45, 24–31. doi: 10.1016/j.ijid.2016.02.007
- Diab, M., Hamze, M., Madec, J. Y., and Haenni, M. (2016). High prevalence of non-ST131 CTX-M-15-producing *Escherichia coli* in healthy cattle in lebanon. *Microb. Drug Resist.* 23, 261–266. doi: 10.1089/mdr.2016.0019
- Dierikx, C. M., van der Goot, J. A., Smith, H. E., Kant, A., and Mevius, D. J. (2013). Presence of ESBL/AmpC-producing *Escherichia coli* in the broiler production pyramid: a descriptive study. *PLoS One* 8:e79005. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone. 0079005
- Donati, V., Feltrin, F., Hendriksen, R. S., Svendsen, C. A., Cordaro, G., Garcia-Fernandez, A., et al. (2014). Extended-spectrum-beta-lactamases, AmpC betalactamases and plasmid mediated quinolone resistance in klebsiella spp. from companion animals in italy. *PLoS One* 9:e90564. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone. 0090564
- ECDC/EFSA/EMA (2017). ECDC/EFSA/EMA second joint report on the integrated analysis of the consumption of antimicrobial agents and occurrence of antimicrobial resistance in bacteria from humans and food-producing animals. *Sci. Rep.* 15:e04872. doi: 10.2903/j.efsa.2017.4872/epdf
- Economou, V., and Gousia, P. (2015). Agriculture and food animals as a source of antimicrobial-resistant bacteria. *Infect. Drug Resist.* 8, 49–61. doi: 10.2147/IDR. S55778
- El-Rami, F. E., Sleiman, F. T., and Abdelnoor, A. M. (2012). Identification and antibacterial resistance of bacteria isolated from poultry. *Pol. J. Microbiol.* 61, 323–326.
- El-Shazly, D. A., Nasef, S. A., Mahmoud, F. F., and Jonas, D. (2017). Expanded spectrum beta-lactamase producing *Escherichia coli* isolated from chickens with colibacillosis in Egypt. *Poult. Sci.* 96, 2375–2384. doi: 10.3382/ps/pew493
- Escudero, E., Vinue, L., Teshager, T., Torres, C., and Moreno, M. A. (2010). Resistance mechanisms and farm-level distribution of fecal *Escherichia coli* isolates resistant to extended-spectrum cephalosporins in pigs in spain. *Res. Vet. Sci.* 88, 83–87. doi: 10.1016/j.rvsc.2009.05.021
- European Committee on Antimicrobial Susceptibility Testing (2017). Breakpoint Tables for Interpretation of MICs and Zone Diameters, Version 7.1.

Available at: http://www.eucast.org/fileadmin/src/media/PDFs/EUCAST_files/ Breakpoint_tables/v_7.1_Breakpoint_Tables.pdf

- Exner, M., Bhattacharya, S., Christiansen, B., Gebel, J., Goroncy-Bermes, P., Hartemann, P., et al. (2017). Antibiotic resistance: What is so special about multidrug-resistant gram-negative bacteria? *GMS Hyg. Infect. Control* 12:Doc05. doi: 10.3205/dgkh000290
- Ghodousi, A., Bonura, C., Di Noto, A. M., and Mammina, C. (2015). Extended-spectrum ß-lactamase, AmpC-producing, and fluoroquinoloneresistant *Escherichia coli* in retail broiler chicken meat, Italy. *Foodborne Pathog. Dis.* 12, 619–625. doi: 10.1089/fpd.2015.1936
- Gonzalez-Torralba, A., Oteo, J., Asenjo, A., Bautista, V., Fuentes, E., and Alos, J. I. (2016). Survey of carbapenemase-producing *Enterobacteriaceae* in companion dogs in madrid, spain. *Antimicrob. Agents Chemother.* 60, 2499–2501. doi: 10.1128/AAC.02383-15
- Haenni, M., Chatre, P., and Madec, J. Y. (2014). Emergence of Escherichia coli producing extended-spectrum AmpC beta-lactamases (ESAC) in animals. *Front. Microbiol.* 5:53. doi: 10.3389/fmicb.2014.00053
- Haenni, M., Saras, E., Ponsin, C., Dahmen, S., Petitjean, M., Hocquet, D., et al. (2016). High prevalence of international ESBL CTX-M-15-producing *Enterobacter cloacae* ST114 clone in animals. J. Antimicrob. Chemother. 71, 1497–1500. doi: 10.1093/jac/dkw006
- Huijbers, P. M., Graat, E. A., Haenen, A. P., van Santen, M. G., van Essen-Zandbergen, A., Mevius, D. J., et al. (2014). Extended-spectrum and AmpC beta-lactamase-producing *Escherichia coli* in broilers and people living and/or working on broiler farms: prevalence, risk factors and molecular characteristics. *J. Antimicrob. Chemother.* 69, 2669–2675. doi: 10.1093/jac/dku178
- Kassaify, Z., Abi-Khalil, P., and Sleiman, F. (2013). Quantification of antibiotic residues and determination of antimicrobial resistance profiles of microorganisms isolated from bovine milk in lebanon. *Food Nutr. Sci.* 4, 1–9. doi: 10.4236/fns.2013.47A001
- Kawamura, K., Goto, K., Nakane, K., and Arakawa, Y. (2014). Molecular epidemiology of extended-spectrum beta-lactamases and *Escherichia coli* isolated from retail foods including chicken meat in Japan. *Foodborne Pathog. Dis.* 11, 104–110. doi: 10.1089/fpd.2013.1608
- Kempf, I., Jouy, E., Granier, S. A., Chauvin, C., Sanders, P., Salvat, G., et al. (2015). Comment on "impact of antibiotic use in the swine industry", by Mary D. Barton [Curr. Opin. Microbiol. 19 (June 2014) 9–15]. Curr. Opin. Microbiol. 26, 137–138. doi: 10.1016/j.mib.2015.06.013
- Khennouchi, N. C., Loucif, L., Boutefnouchet, N., Allag, H., and Rolain, J. M. (2015). MALDI-TOF MS as a tool to detect a nosocomial outbreak of extended-spectrum-beta-lactamase- and ArmA methyltransferase-producing *Enterobacter cloacae* clinical isolates in algeria. *Antimicrob. Agents Chemother*. 59, 6477–6483. doi: 10.1128/AAC.00615-15
- Kola, A., Kohler, C., Pfeifer, Y., Schwab, F., Kuhn, K., Schulz, K., et al. (2012). High prevalence of extended-spectrum-beta-lactamase-producing *Enterobacteriaceae* in organic and conventional retail chicken meat, Germany. *J. Antimicrob. Chemother.* 67, 2631–2634. doi: 10.1093/jac/dks295
- Lazarus, B., Paterson, D. L., Mollinger, J. L., and Rogers, B. A. (2015). Do human extraintestinal *Escherichia coli* infections resistant to expanded-spectrum cephalosporins originate from food-producing animals? A systematic review. *Clin. Infect. Dis.* 60, 439–452. doi: 10.1093/cid/ciu785
- Leverstein-van Hall, M. A., Dierikx, C. M., Cohen Stuart, J., Voets, G. M., van den Munckhof, M. P., van Essen-Zandbergen, A., et al. (2011). Dutch patients, retail chicken meat and poultry share the same ESBL genes, plasmids and strains. *Clin. Microbiol. Infect.* 17, 873–880. doi: 10.1111/j.1469-0691.2011.03497.x
- Liu, X., Thungrat, K., and Boothe, D. M. (2016). Occurrence of OXA-48 carbapenemase and other beta-lactamase genes in ESBL-producing multidrug resistant *Escherichia coli* from dogs and cats in the United States, 2009-2013. *Front. Microbiol.* 7:1057. doi: 10.3389/fmicb.2016.01057
- Liu, Y., and Liu, X. (2015). Detection of AmpC beta-lactamases in Acinetobacter baumannii in the Xuzhou region and analysis of drug resistance. Exp. Ther. Med. 10, 933–936. doi: 10.3892/etm.2015.2612
- Maciuca, I. E., Williams, N. J., Tuchilus, C., Dorneanu, O., Guguianu, E., Carp-Carare, C., et al. (2015). High prevalence of *Escherichia coli*-producing CTX-M-15 extended-spectrum beta-lactamases in poultry and human clinical isolates in romania. *Microb. Drug Resist.* 21, 651–662. doi: 10.1089/mdr.2014.0248
- Madec, J. Y., Haenni, M., Nordmann, P., and Poirel, L. (2017). Extended-spectrum beta-lactamase/AmpC- and carbapenemase-producing *Enterobacteriaceae* in

animals: a threat for humans? *Clin. Microbiol. Infect.* 23, 826–833. doi: 10.1016/j.cmi.2017.01.013

- Magiorakos, A. P., Srinivasan, A., Carey, R. B., Carmeli, Y., Falagas, M. E., Giske, C. G., et al. (2012). Multidrug-resistant, extensively drug-resistant and pandrug-resistant bacteria: an international expert proposal for interim standard definitions for acquired resistance. *Clin. Microbiol. Infect.* 18, 268–281. doi: 10.1111/j.1469-0691.2011.03570.x
- McGregor, K. F., and Spratt, B. G. (2005). Identity and prevalence of multilocus sequence typing-defined clones of group A streptococci within a hospital setting. J. Clin. Microbiol. 43, 1963–1967. doi: 10.1128/JCM.43.4.1963-1967. 2005
- Moghnieh, R., Estaitieh, N., Mugharbil, A., Jisr, T., Abdallah, D. I., Ziade, F., et al. (2015). Third generation cephalosporin resistant *Enterobacteriaceae* and multidrug resistant gram-negative bacteria causing bacteremia in febrile neutropenia adult cancer patients in lebanon, broad spectrum antibiotics use as a major risk factor, and correlation with poor prognosis. *Front. Cell Infect. Microbiol.* 5:11. doi: 10.3389/fcimb.2015.00011
- Nguyen, V. T., Carrique-Mas, J. J., Ngo, T. H., Ho, H. M., Ha, T. T., Campbell, J. I., et al. (2015). Prevalence and risk factors for carriage of antimicrobial-resistant *Escherichia coli* on household and small-scale chicken farms in the mekong delta of Vietnam. *J. Antimicrob. Chemother.* 70, 2144–2152. doi: 10.1093/jac/ dkv053
- Olaitan, A. O., Thongmalayvong, B., Akkhavong, K., Somphavong, S., Paboriboune, P., Khounsy, S., et al. (2015). Clonal transmission of a colistin-resistant *Escherichia coli* from a domesticated pig to a human in laos. *J. Antimicrob. Chemother.* 70, 3402–3404.
- Olsen, R. H., Bisgaard, M., Lohren, U., Robineau, B., and Christensen, H. (2014). Extended-spectrum beta-lactamase-producing *Escherichia coli* isolated from poultry: a review of current problems, illustrated with some laboratory findings. *Avian Pathol.* 43, 199–208. doi: 10.1080/03079457.2014.907866
- Ortega-Paredes, D., Barba, P., and Zurita, J. (2016). Colistin-resistant *Escherichia* coli clinical isolate harbouring the *mcr-1* gene in Ecuador. *Epidemiol. Infect.* 144, 2967–2970. doi: 10.1017/S0950268816001369
- Peng, C., and Zong, Z. (2011). Sequence type 38 Escherichia coli carrying bla_{CTX-M-14}. J. Med. Microbiol. 60(Pt 5), 694–695. doi: 10.1099/jmm.0. 028316-0
- Pires-dos-Santos, T., Bisgaard, M., and Christensen, H. (2013). Genetic diversity and virulence profiles of *Escherichia coli* causing salpingitis and peritonitis in broiler breeders. *Vet. Microbiol.* 162, 873–880. doi: 10.1016/j.vetmic.2012. 11.008
- Poirel, L., Potron, A., and Nordmann, P. (2012). OXA-48-like carbapenemases: the phantom menace. J. Antimicrob. Chemother. 67, 1597–1606. doi: 10.1093/jac/ dks121
- Rafei, R., Hamze, M., Pailhories, H., Eveillard, M., Marsollier, L., Joly-Guillou, M. L., et al. (2015). Extrahuman epidemiology of *Acinetobacter baumannii* in lebanon. *Appl. Environ. Microbiol.* 81, 2359–2367. doi: 10.1128/AEM. 03824-14
- Randall, L., Wu, G., Phillips, N., Coldham, N., Mevius, D., and Teale, C. (2012). Virulence genes in *bla_{CTX-M} Escherichia coli* isolates from chickens and humans. *Res. Vet. Sci.* 93, 23–27. doi: 10.1016/j.rvsc.2011.06.016

- Rhouma, M., Beaudry, F., and Letellier, A. (2016). Resistance to colistin: What is the fate for this antibiotic in pig production? *Int. J. Antimicrob. Agents* 48, 119–126. doi: 10.1016/j.ijantimicag.2016.04.008
- Roschanski, N., Fischer, J., Guerra, B., and Roesler, U. (2014). Development of a multiplex real-time PCR for the rapid detection of the predominant beta-lactamase genes CTX-M, SHV, TEM and CIT-type AmpCs in *Enterobacteriaceae. PLoS One* 9:e100956. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0100956
- Sato, T., Okubo, T., Usui, M., Yokota, S., Izumiyama, S., and Tamura, Y. (2014). Association of veterinary third-generation cephalosporin use with the risk of emergence of extended-spectrum-cephalosporin resistance in *Escherichia coli* from dairy cattle in Japan. *PLoS One* 9:e96101. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone. 0096101
- Schill, F., Abdulmawjood, A., Klein, G., and Reich, F. (2017). Prevalence and characterization of extended-spectrum beta-lactamase (ESBL) and AmpC betalactamase producing *Enterobacteriaceae* in fresh pork meat at processing level in germany. *Int. J. Food Microbiol.* 257, 58–66. doi: 10.1016/j.ijfoodmicro.2017. 06.010
- Schwarz, S., Enne, V. I., and van Duijkeren, E. (2016). 40 years of veterinary papers in JAC – what have we learnt? J. Antimicrob. Chemother. 71, 2681–2690. doi: 10.1093/jac/dkw363
- Seiffert, S. N., Hilty, M., Perreten, V., and Endimiani, A. (2013). Extendedspectrum cephalosporin-resistant gram-negative organisms in livestock: an emerging problem for human health? *Drug Resist. Updat.* 16, 22–45. doi: 10. 1016/j.drup.2012.12.001
- Seng, P., Rolain, J. M., Fournier, P. E., La Scola, B., Drancourt, M., and Raoult, D. (2010). MALDI-TOF-mass spectrometry applications in clinical microbiology. *Future Microbiol.* 5, 1733–1754. doi: 10.2217/fmb.10.127
- Singhal, N., Kumar, M., Kanaujia, P. K., and Virdi, J. S. (2015). MALDI-TOF mass spectrometry: an emerging technology for microbial identification and diagnosis. *Front. Microbiol.* 6:791. doi: 10.3389/fmicb.2015.00791
- Wu, G., Day, M. J., Mafura, M. T., Nunez-Garcia, J., Fenner, J. J., Sharma, M., et al. (2013). Comparative analysis of ESBL-positive *Escherichia coli* isolates from animals and humans from the UK, the Netherlands and Germany. *PLoS One* 8:e75392. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0075392
- Zou, W., Lin, W. J., Foley, S. L., Chen, C. H., Nayak, R., and Chen, J. J. (2010). Evaluation of pulsed-field gel electrophoresis profiles for identification of *Salmonella* serotypes. *J. Clin. Microbiol.* 48, 3122–3126. doi: 10.1128/JCM. 00645-10

Conflict of Interest Statement: The authors declare that the research was conducted in the absence of any commercial or financial relationships that could be construed as a potential conflict of interest.

Copyright © 2018 Dandachi, Sokhn, Dahdouh, Azar, El-Bazzal, Rolain and Daoud. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (CC BY). The use, distribution or reproduction in other forums is permitted, provided the original author(s) and the copyright owner are credited and that the original publication in this journal is cited, in accordance with accepted academic practice. No use, distribution or reproduction is permitted which does not comply with these terms.