

Dissemination of *Salmonella enterica* subsp. *enterica* Serovar Typhimurium var. Copenhagen Clonal Types through a Contract Heifer-Raising Operation

Narasimha V. Hegde,¹ Michelle L. Cook,¹ David R. Wolfgang,¹ Brenda C. Love,¹ Carol C. Maddox,² and Bhushan M. Jayarao^{1*}

Department of Veterinary Science, Pennsylvania State University, University Park, Pennsylvania,¹ and College of Veterinary Medicine, University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign, Illinois²

Received 2 March 2005/Returned for modification 15 April 2005/Accepted 18 April 2005

***Salmonella enterica* subsp. *enterica* serovar Typhimurium var. Copenhagen isolates from a heifer-raising operation and from 11 dairy herds that had their calves contracted to the heifer-raising operation were examined for their phenotypic and genotypic characteristics. Results of the study showed that the heifer-raising operation could serve as a clearinghouse for *Salmonella* serovar Typhimurium var. Copenhagen and perhaps other *Salmonella* serotypes.**

Salmonella enterica subsp. *enterica* serovar Typhimurium var. Copenhagen is an O:5-negative variant of *Salmonella* serovar Typhimurium which was primarily reported to be found in pigeons. It is now frequently isolated from cattle, swine, and other animals (7). The U.S. Department of Agriculture's National Animal Health Monitoring System for Enteric Bacteria reported that over a 7-year period (1997 to 2003), *Salmonella* serovar Typhimurium, which includes variant Copenhagen, was the most predominant serotype and accounted for 16.9% of the total number of isolates ($n = 40,120$) examined. Over this period, 6,695 isolates were serotyped as *Salmonella* serovar Typhimurium, and of these isolates, 51% were determined to be *Salmonella* serovar Typhimurium var. Copenhagen (15).

In June of 1998, a heifer-raising operation in Pennsylvania with recurrent problems associated with calf mortality sought the assistance of the Field Investigation Group at Pennsylvania State University to address the issue. At the beginning of August of 1998, the veterinarians attending the heifer-raising operation and 18 dairy herds that received heifers from the heifer-raising operation were asked to submit samples (fecal and tissue samples) for bacteriological analysis from all clinical cases suggestive of salmonellosis. Between September 1998 and October 2000, samples from 324 calves, heifers, and lactating cattle from the heifer-raising operation and 11 dairy herds were cultured for *Salmonella* using the protocol followed by Pennsylvania Animal Diagnostic Laboratory for isolation and identification of *Salmonella*. *Salmonella* isolates were serotyped at the National Veterinary Services Laboratory, Ames, Iowa.

Salmonella serovar Typhimurium var. Copenhagen isolates ($n = 42$) were screened for antibiotic resistance using a disk diffusion assay, and antibiotic resistance or susceptibility was determined using the interpretive criteria defined by NCCLS (16). Genes for beta-lactam, tetracycline, and florfenicol resis-

tance and for class 1 integron were identified using techniques described previously (3, 4, 11, 17, 20, 23, 24). *Salmonella* serovar Typhimurium var. Copenhagen isolates were subtyped using the 1-day pulsed-field gel electrophoresis (PFGE) protocol reported by Gautom (8). Epi-info 2002 (Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, Atlanta, GA), a database and statistics system for epidemiology on microcomputers, was used for performing χ^2 tests and odds ratio analysis.

A total of 62 *Salmonella* isolates belonging to six serotypes, including *Salmonella* serovar Typhimurium, *Salmonella* serovar Typhimurium var. Copenhagen, *Salmonella enterica* serovar Muenchen, *Salmonella enterica* serovar Newport, *Salmonella enterica* serovar Heidelberg, and *Salmonella enterica* serovar Montevideo, were isolated in this study (Table 1). *Salmonella* serovar Typhimurium var. Copenhagen accounted for 42 of the 62 (68%) *Salmonella* isolates. These isolates have been previously isolated from calves, heifers, and lactating cows in Pennsylvania (6, 18).

On the dairy farm, the likelihood of isolating *Salmonella* from a sick heifer was 2.6-fold higher than that for isolation from sick calves. With regard to *Salmonella* serovar Typhimurium var. Copenhagen, the likelihood of isolating *Salmonella* serovar Typhimurium var. Copenhagen from calves on the heifer-raising operation was 5.3-fold higher than that for isolation from heifers, while on the dairy farm, *Salmonella* serovar Typhimurium var. Copenhagen was more likely (2.3-fold higher likelihood) to be isolated from heifers than from calves (Table 1). Transition of animals from one environment to another (e.g., from dairy farm to heifer-raising operation and vice versa), change in nutrition (protein and energy content), and interaction with other animals (access to stall, water, and feed troughs) in the cohort could result in a cascade of events that could induce stress, making the animal more susceptible to infectious diseases (5, 9, 10, 12, 13). These sets of complex interactions could perhaps explain the higher *Salmonella* infection rates of calves that were transferred to the heifer-raising operation and of heifers that returned to their dairy herds.

The 42 isolates of *Salmonella* serovar Typhimurium var.

* Corresponding author. Mailing address: Department of Veterinary Science, Pennsylvania State University, University Park, PA 16802. Phone: (814) 863-5939. Fax: (814) 863-6140. E-mail: bmj3@psu.edu.

TABLE 1. *Salmonella* serotypes isolated from calves and cows

Source of isolates	Cattle group (no. of animals tested)	No. of isolates (no. of farms)					Total no. of isolates	
		Serovar Typhimurium	Serovar Typhimurium var. Copenhagen	Serovar Muenchen	Serovar Newport	Serovar Heidelberg		Serovar Montevideo
Heifer-raising operation ^a	Calves (71)	2	8	0	1	2	0	13
	Heifers (86)	0	2	1	0	1	2	6
	Total	2	10	1	1	3	2	19
Dairy farms ^b	Calves (91)	1	12	0	1	1	1	16
	Heifers (76)	2	20	1	0	0	4	27
	Total	3 (2)	32 (11)	1 (1)	1 (1)	1 (1)	5 (3)	43
Total isolates		5	42	2	2	4	7	62

^a For all isolates from animals in the heifer-raising operation, the χ^2 value was 4.67, the *P* value was 0.0307 (a *P* value less than 0.05 is statistically significant), and the odds ratio was 2.99 (confidence interval, 0.98 to 9.45). For the serovar Typhimurium var. Copenhagen isolates from animals in the heifer-raising operation, the χ^2 value was 5.18, the *P* value was 0.0228, and the odds ratio was 5.33 (confidence interval, 1.00 to 37.76).

^b For all isolates from animals on dairy farms, the χ^2 value was 6.93, the *P* value was 0.0084 (a *P* value less than 0.05 is statistically significant), and the odds ratio was 2.58 (confidence interval, 1.19 to 5.63). For the serovar Typhimurium var. Copenhagen isolates from animals on dairy farms, the χ^2 value was 4.61, the *P* value was 0.0318, and the odds ratio was 2.35 (confidence interval, 1.00 to 5.61).

Copenhagen belonged to seven PFGE profiles. Of the 7 PFGE profiles, types STC1 and STC2 accounted for 12 (28.5%) and 21 (50%) of the isolates, respectively (Table 2). Twenty-eight of 42 *Salmonella* serovar Typhimurium var. Copenhagen isolates showed the presence of the *bla*_{TEM} gene and 12 isolates showed the presence of *bla*_{PSE}, while 2 isolates showed the presence of the *bla*_{CMY} gene; *tetA*, *tetG*, and *tetB* were detected in 26, 12, and 4 isolates, respectively. Twenty-five isolates, including 15 isolates with *floST* and 10 isolates with the *floR* gene, harbored genes for florfenicol resistance (Table 2). Integron 1 was present in 36 of 42 *Salmonella* serovar Typhimurium var. Copenhagen isolates. DNA sequence analysis showed that PCR-amplified DNA fragments of ~1,000, 1,100, and 1,300 bp were genes coding for spectinomycin resistance (*aadA1*), beta-lactamase (*bla*_{PSE}), and trimethoprim resistance (*dhfrA*), respectively (Table 2).

Analysis of beta-lactamase, tetracycline-resistant, florfenicol-resistant, and integron 1 genes resulted in the identification of 14 resistance genotypes (Table 2). The PCR-generated antibiotic resistance genes *floR* and *floST*, which confer resistance to florfenicol and chloramphenicol, have previously been identified in *S. enterica* serovar Typhimurium DT104 and *Escherichia coli* (3, 22). In our study, isolates that had *tetG* also had the *floR* gene. A similar observation was made by Baucheron et al. (1). The characteristic ACSSuT and ACSuT resistance profiles were observed in 38 and 19% of the isolates, respectively (Table 2). The ACSSuT and ACSuT resistance profiles have been used as diagnostic markers for monitoring multidrug resistance of *Salmonella* serovar Typhimurium DT104 from animal and human sources (2, 14, 23).

Based on phenotypic and genotypic characteristics, the 42 isolates were classified into 19 clonal types (Tables 2 and 3). Six

TABLE 2. Phenotypic and genotypic characteristics of *Salmonella* serovar Typhimurium var. Copenhagen isolated from dairy cattle with salmonellosis

Resistance genotype	PFGE profile	Antibiogram profile	Clonal type	No. of isolates in:		Total no. of isolates
				Dairy herd (no. of herds in which isolates were found)	Heifer-raising operation	
<i>bla</i> _{PSE} <i>tetG floR aadA1</i>	STC1	ACTSpF	1	1 (1)		1
<i>bla</i> _{PSE} <i>tetG floR aadA1 dhfrA</i>	STC1	ACSSuTSpF	2	1 (1)	1	2
<i>bla</i> _{PSE} <i>tetG floR aadA1</i>	STC1	ACSuTSpF	3	1 (1)	1	3
<i>bla</i> _{PSE} <i>tetG aadA1</i>	STC1	ATSp	4	4 (3)	1	5
<i>bla</i> _{PSE} <i>tetG floST aadA1 dhfrA</i>	STC1	ACSSuTSpF	5	1 (1)		1
<i>bla</i> _{TEM} <i>tetA floR aadA1 dhfrA</i>	STC2	ACSSuTSpF	6	1 (1)		1
<i>bla</i> _{TEM} <i>tetA aadA1</i>	STC2	ATSp	7	1 (1)		1
<i>bla</i> _{TEM} <i>tetA aadA1</i>	STC2	ASTSp	8	3 (3)	2	5
<i>bla</i> _{TEM} <i>tetA aadA1</i>	STC2	ASSuTSp	9	2 (1)		2
<i>bla</i> _{TEM} <i>tetA floST aadA1</i>	STC2	ACSTSpF	10	1 (1)	2	3
<i>bla</i> _{TEM} <i>tetA floST aadA1 dhfrA</i>	STC2	ACSSuTSpF	11	5 (4)	3	8
<i>bla</i> _{TEM} <i>tetA floST aadA1</i>	STC2	ACSuTSpF	12	1 (1)		1
<i>bla</i> _{TEM} <i>tetA floST</i>	STC3	ACSSuTF	13	1 (1)		1
<i>bla</i> _{TEM} <i>tetA aadA1</i>	STC4	ASSuTSp	14	1 (1)		1
<i>bla</i> _{TEM} <i>tetA floR</i>	STC5	ACSSuTF	15	1 (1)		1
<i>bla</i> _{TCMY} <i>tetA floR aadA1 dhfrA</i>	STC6	ACSSuTSpFCe	16	1 (1)		2
<i>bla</i> _{TEM} <i>tetB</i>	STC7	ASSuT	17	1 (1)		1
<i>bla</i> _{TEM} <i>tetB</i>	STC7	ASuT	18	1 (1)		2
<i>bla</i> _{TEM} <i>tetB floST</i>	STC7	ACSSuTF	19	1 (1)		1

TABLE 3. Distribution of *Salmonella* serovar Typhimurium var. Copenhagen clonal types

Clonal type	Heifer-raising operation		Characteristic of heifer reception		
	Date (mo/yr)	Animal (age in days)	County (no. of farms)	Date (mo/yr)	Animal (age) ^a
1			A (2)	Aug., '99	Calf (35)
2	Sept., '98	Calf (15)	B (1)	June, '99	Heifer (c-5)
3	Oct., '98	Calf (21)	C (1)	Oct., '99	Heifer (1st lac., 3 DIM)
4	Nov., '98	Heifer (695)	D (1)	Sept., '99	Calf (28)
			D (2)	Sept., '99	Cow (2nd lac.)
			D (2)	Jan., '00	Heifer (1st lac., 10 DIM)
			E (1)	Sept., '99	Heifer (702)
			E (1)	Oct., '99	Heifer (120)
5			F (1)	Jan., '99	Heifer (1st lac., 2 DIM)
6			A (2)	Nov., '98	Calf (21)
7			D (1)	Feb., '99	Cow (3rd lac.)
8	Dec., '98	Calf (21)	G (1)	July, '99	Heifer (c-4)
	Jan., '99	Calf (35)	H (1)	July, '99	Cow (2nd lac.)
			H (1)	Aug., '99	Calf (28)
9			B (1)	June, '99	Cow (3rd lac.)
			B (1)	Sept., '99	Calf (28)
10	Nov., '98	Calf (7)	I (1)	Sept., '99	Heifer (c-0)
	Dec., '98	Calf (14)			
11	Dec., '98	Calf (14)	F (1)	Sept. '99	Heifer (c-1)
	Feb., '99	Heifer (684)	D (1)	July, '99	Calf (14)
	July, '99	Calf (14)	D (2)	Dec., '99	Heifer (1st lac., 14 DIM)
			D (2)	Feb., '00	Cow (3rd lac.)
			G (1)	Oct., '98	Heifer (1st lac., c-2)
12			J (1)	Oct., '98	Calf (23)
13			J (1)	Oct., '98	Cow (1st lac.)
14			F (1)	Mar., '99	Cow (2nd lac.)
15			C (1)	Oct., '99	Calf (21)
16			C (1)	Sept., '99	Calf (42)
			C (1)	Oct., '99	Cow (1st lac.)
17			D (1)	Sept., '99	Cow (3rd lac.)
18			A (2)	Aug., '99	Heifer (c-10)
			A (2)	Aug., '99	Cow (2nd lac.)
19			D (2)	Sept., '98	Calf (42)

^a Ages are given in days, in days before calving (e.g., c-5 is 5 days before calving), in days in milk (DIM), and/or by lactation (lac.).

of the 19 clonal types from animals on the heifer-raising operation were also observed in 9 of 11 dairy herds. It was observed that most of the isolates from the heifer-raising operation were from calves with salmonellosis, while the same clonal types on dairy herds were isolated mostly from heifers ($n = 10$) rather than from calves ($n = 3$) and lactating cows ($n = 3$). Clonal types that were detected in the heifer-raising operation were observed 6 to 12 months later in the dairy herds. Thirteen of the 19 clonal types were detected exclusively in dairy herds; these isolates were mostly from calves ($n = 7$) or lactating cattle ($n = 7$) rather than from heifers ($n = 2$) (Table 3). Recently, Hume et al. (13) observed multiple serotypes and genotypes in a herd, which suggested multiple sources of *Salmonella* contamination. The findings of their study revealed that dairy cows could serve as asymptomatic carriers of *Salmonella*.

Contract heifer raising requires meticulous planning and implementation of rigorous biosecurity practices. Biosecurity deals with management practices that protect the herd from the entry of new diseases and minimize the spread and/or adverse effects of diseases in the herd (21). A contract heifer-raising operation acquires calves from several farms that are commingled. This is the single most important risk factor for the introduction of new diseases on the premises. More im-

portantly, the organisms may leave the premises, with healthy heifers serving as vehicles. Biosecurity is one of the major issues facing professional heifer growers who have multiple clients. Most contract raising operations include biosecurity practices to address brucellosis, persistent bovine viral diarrhea disease, and Johne's disease (19). Based on the findings of our study, it is felt that biosecurity practices focused on the prevention and control of enteric pathogens yet remain to be addressed adequately.

This study has been supported in part by a grant from the Pennsylvania Department of Agriculture (Jayarao, 2000, PDA no. ME44918, Molecular Epidemiology of Bacterial Pathogens of Animal Health Significance).

REFERENCES

1. Baucheron, S., S. Tyler, D. Boyd, M. R. Mulvey, E. Chaslus-Dancla, and A. Cloeckaert. 2004. AcrAB-TolC directs efflux-mediated multidrug resistance in *Salmonella enterica* serovar Typhimurium DT104. *Antimicrob. Agents Chemother.* **48**:3729-3735.
2. Besser, T. E., M. Goldoft, L. C. Pritchett, R. Khakhria, D. D. Hancock, D. H. Rice, J. M. Gay, W. Johnson, and C. C. Gay. 2000. Multiresistant *Salmonella* Typhimurium DT104 infections of humans and domestic animals in the Pacific Northwest of the United States. *Epidemiol. Infect.* **124**:193-200.
3. Bolton, L. F., L. C. Kelley, M. D. Lee, P. J. Fedorka-Cray, and J. J. Maurer. 1999. Detection of multidrug-resistant *Salmonella enterica* serotype typhimurium DT104 based on a gene which confers cross-resistance to florfenicol and chloramphenicol. *J. Clin. Microbiol.* **37**:1348-1351.

4. Cloeckaert, A., K. S. Boumedine, G. Flaujac, H. Imberechts, I. Hooghe, and E. Chaslus-Dancla. 2000. Occurrence of a *Salmonella enterica* serovar Typhimurium DT104-like antibiotic gene cluster including the *floR* gene in *S. enterica* serovar Agona. *Antimicrob. Agents Chemother.* **44**:1359–1361.
5. Corrier, D. E., C. W. Purdy, and J. R. Loach. 1990. Effects of marketing stress on fecal excretion of *Salmonella* spp. in feeder calves. *Am. J. Vet. Res.* **51**:866–869.
6. Ferris, K. E., A. M. Aalsburg, T. A. Palmer, and M. M. Hostetler. 2003. Serotypes from animals and related sources reported during July 2002–June 2003, p. 463–469. Proceedings of the 107th Annual Meeting of the United States Animal Health Association. 2003. San Diego, Calif.
7. Frech, G., C. Kehrenberg, and S. Schwarz. 2003. Resistance phenotypes and genotypes of multiresistant *Salmonella enterica* subsp. *enterica* serovar Typhimurium var. Copenhagen isolates from animal sources. *J. Antimicrob. Chemother.* **51**:180–182.
8. Gautom, R. K. 1997. Rapid pulsed-field gel electrophoresis protocol for typing of *Escherichia coli* O157:H7 and other gram-negative organisms in 1 day. *J. Clin. Microbiol.* **35**:2977–2980.
9. Glickman, L. T., P. L. McDonough, S. J. Shin, J. M. Fairbrother, R. L. LaDue, and S. E. Ki. 1981. Bovine salmonellosis attributed to *Salmonella anatum*-contaminated haylage and dietary stress. *J. Am. Vet. Med. Assoc.* **178**:1268–1272.
10. Gronstol, H., A. D. Osborne, and S. Pethiyagoda. 1974. Experimental *Salmonella* infection in calves. 1. The effect of stress factors on carrier state. *J. Hyg.* **72**:155–162.
11. Guerra, B., S. M. Soto, J. M. Arguelles, and C. Mendoza. 2001. Multidrug resistance is mediated by large plasmids carrying class 1 integron in the emergent *Salmonella enterica* serotype. *Antimicrob. Agents Chemother.* **45**:1305–1308.
12. Hartmann, H., J. Gunther, H. Meyer, B. Kreutzer, and A. Henniger. 1980. Studies of carbohydrate absorption in clinically healthy and diarrheal calves. *Arch. Exp. Vetmed.* **34**:527–541. (In German.)
13. Hume, M. E., T. S. Edrington, M. L. Loofer, T. D. Callaway, K. J. Genovese, and D. J. Nisbet. 2004. *Salmonella* genotype diversity in nonlactating and lactating dairy cows. *J. Food Prot.* **67**:2280–2283.
14. McEvoy, J. M., A. M. Doherty, J. J. Sheridan, I. S. Blair, and D. A. McDowell. 2003. The prevalence of *Salmonella* spp. in bovine faecal, rumen and carcass samples at a commercial abattoir. *J. Appl. Microbiol.* **94**:693–700.
15. National Antimicrobial Resistance Monitoring System-Enteric Bacteria (NARMS-EB). 2003. Report. [Online.] <http://www.cdc.gov/narms/>.
16. National Committee for Clinical Laboratory Standards. 2000. Performance standards for antimicrobial disk and dilution susceptibility tests for bacteria isolated from animals, 2nd ed. NCCLS document M31-A2. NCCLS, Wayne, Pa.
17. Ng, L.-K., I. Martin, M. Alfa, and M. Mulvey. 2001. Multiplex PCR for the detection of tetracycline resistant genes. *Mol. Cell. Probes* **15**:209–215.
18. Rankin, S. C., H. Aceto, J. Cassidy, J. Holt, S. Young, B. Love, D. Tewari, D. S. Munro, and C. E. Benson. 2002. Molecular characterization of cephalosporin-resistant *Salmonella enterica* serotype Newport isolates from animals in Pennsylvania. *J. Clin. Microbiol.* **40**:4679–4684.
19. Tomsche, D. S. 1997. Co-mingling—a herd health time bomb? p. 173–181. In Proceedings of First National Professional Dairy Heifer Growers. Professional Dairy Heifer Growers, Stratford, Iowa.
20. Vahaboglu, H., M. Fuzi, S. Cetin, S. Gunds, E. Ujhelyi, F. Coskuncan, and O. Tansel. 2001. Characterization of extended-spectrum β -lactamase (TEM-52)-producing strains of *Salmonella enterica* serovar Typhimurium with diverse resistance phenotypes. *J. Clin. Microbiol.* **39**:791–793.
21. Wells, S. J. 2000. Biosecurity on dairy operations: hazards and risks. *J. Dairy Sci.* **83**:2380–2386.
22. White, D. G., C. Hudson, J. J. Maurer, S. Ayers, S. Zhao, M. D. Lee, L. Bolton, T. Foley, and J. Sherwood. 2000. Characterization of chloramphenicol and florfenicol resistance in *Escherichia coli* associated with bovine diarrhea. *J. Clin. Microbiol.* **38**:4593–4598.
23. Yang, S. J., K. Y. Park, S. H. Kim, K. M. No, T. E. Besser, H. S. Yoo, B. K. Lee, and Y. H. Park. 2002. Antimicrobial resistance in *Salmonella enterica* serovars Enteritidis and Typhimurium isolated from animals in Korea: comparison of phenotypic and genotypic resistance characterization. *Vet. Microbiol.* **86**:295–301.
24. Zhao, S., D. G. White, P. F. McDermott, S. Friedman, L. English, S. Ayers, J. Meng, J. J. Maurer, R. Holland, and R. D. Walker. 2001. Identification and expression of cephalosporinase *bla*_{CMY} genes in *Escherichia coli* and *Salmonella* isolates from food animals and ground meat. *Antimicrob. Agents Chemother.* **45**:3647–3650.