

Frozen chicken nuggets and strips and eggs are leading risk factors for *Salmonella* Heidelberg infections in Canada

A. CURRIE¹, L. MACDOUGALL^{2,3}, J. ARAMINI¹, C. GAULIN⁴, R. AHMED⁵
AND S. ISAACS¹

¹ Foodborne, Waterborne and Zoonotic Infections Division, Public Health Agency of Canada (formerly Health Canada), Guelph, Ontario, Canada

² Epidemiology Services, British Columbia Centre for Disease Control, Vancouver, British Columbia, Canada

³ Canadian Field Epidemiology Program, Public Health Agency of Canada, Ottawa, Ontario, Canada

⁴ Ministère de la Santé et des Services Sociaux, Direction de la protection de la santé publique, Québec City, Québec, Canada

⁵ National Microbiology Laboratory, Public Health Agency of Canada, Winnipeg, Manitoba, Canada

(Accepted 3 March 2005)

SUMMARY

A case-control study was conducted from 1 January to 31 May 2003 to identify risk factors for *S. Heidelberg* infection in Canada. Controls were pair-matched by age group and telephone exchange to 95 cases. Exposures in the 7 days before illness/interview were assessed using multivariate conditional logistic regression. Consumption of home-prepared chicken nuggets and/or strips [matched odds ratio (mOR) 4·0, 95% confidence interval (CI) 1·4–13·8], and undercooked eggs (mOR 7·5, 95% CI 1·5–75·5) increased the risk of illness. Exposure to a farm setting lowered the risk (mOR 0·22, 95% CI 0·03–1·00). The population-attributable fraction associated with chicken nuggets/strips was 34% and with undercooked eggs was 16%. One-third of study participants did not perceive, handle or prepare chicken nuggets and strips as high-risk products, although the majority of the products on the Canadian market are raw. These findings have prompted changes in product-labelling policy and consumer education.

INTRODUCTION

While the total number of *Salmonella* isolates reported in Canada declined from 1995 to 2003, the annual number of *Salmonella enterica* serovar Heidelberg isolates in 2002 and 2003 were the highest recorded since 1990 [1–3]. *S. Heidelberg* is currently the second most frequently isolated *Salmonella* serovar from human sources accounting for 19% of nationally reported *Salmonella* infections from 2002 to 2003 [2]. While most infections result in mild to moderate

self-limited diarrhoeal illness, severe invasive infections occur in ~11% of cases and may lead to complications including meningitis, reactive arthritis, and myocarditis, and in rare cases, death [4–9]. In addition to the distress and lost productivity of infected individuals, the burden of epidemic and sporadic *S. Heidelberg* infections on medical and public health systems is substantial [9–14]. Increasing rates of *S. Heidelberg* isolations despite declining rates of *Salmonella* infections in general urged more focused examination of risk factors for infections of this serotype in Canada.

S. Heidelberg is primarily a foodborne pathogen. Outbreaks have often been associated with foods of animal origin including chicken, turkey and ham

* Author for correspondence: Ms. A. Currie, Canadian Field Epidemiology Program, 130 Colonnade Rd, AL 6503A, Ottawa, Ontario, Canada K1A 0K9.
(Email: andrea_currie@phac-aspc.gc.ca)

(Health Canada, 1998, unpublished data), eggs and cheddar cheese, with few reports of person-to-person or animal-to-person transmission [15–21]. A case-control study conducted from 1996 to 1997 in the United States examined risk factors for sporadic *S. Heidelberg* infections [22]. The researchers concluded that eggs eaten outside the home were the leading risk factor, responsible for an estimated 37% of the population's infections.

The provinces of Québec and British Columbia recently conducted provincial investigations to identify sources of *S. Heidelberg* infection. A case-series investigation in 2002 (C. Gaulin, unpublished data) demonstrated that the proportion of Québec cases reporting consumption of chicken nuggets (26%), was higher ($P=0.07$) than would be expected among the general population based on an American food consumption survey (18.2%) [23]. In March 2003, investigation into a family cluster of *S. Heidelberg* phage type (PT) 26 infections in British Columbia led to the isolation of the pathogen from chicken nuggets recovered from the family's home and triggered a provincial case-control study. Results indicated a statistically significant association ($P<0.05$) between consumption of frozen chicken nuggets and/or strips prepared at home and *S. Heidelberg* infections of various phage types diagnosed between 1 January and 1 April 2003 [24].

The Foodborne, Waterborne and Zoonotic Infections Division of Health Canada (FWZID) initiated a national case-control study in April 2003 to identify risk factors for *S. Heidelberg* infections in Canada. Investigators were particularly interested in the potential association between infection and consumption of frozen chicken nuggets and strips because of the earlier findings in Québec and British Columbia. This report summarizes the study implicating consumption of undercooked eggs and home-prepared frozen chicken nuggets and strips as leading risk factors for *S. Heidelberg* infections in Canada.

METHODS

In April 2003, all provinces and territories were invited to participate in a national case-control study. Cases were defined as Canadian residents with laboratory-confirmed *S. Heidelberg* infections diagnosed since 1 January 2003 and prospectively to 31 May 2003. Cases were excluded if they had travelled outside of Canada in the week prior to becoming ill, were unable to communicate in English or French, or

if they had been eligible for the British Columbia case-control study conducted from 1 January to 1 April 2003 [24]. One control was selected for each case using forward/backward digit dialling from the case's home telephone number. Controls were matched to cases by age group (0–6, 7–17, ≥ 18 years). Controls were excluded if they had been ill with diarrhoea in the month prior to interview or were unable to communicate in English or French.

The case and control questionnaires created for the British Columbia study were augmented and translated into French [24]. The questionnaire addressed demographic information, case illness, 25 food exposures in the week prior to symptom onset (cases) or interview (controls), brand, date, location of purchase and cooked state (fully cooked or not) of food items consumed, information about how processed chicken products were perceived (raw *vs.* pre-cooked), handled, stored and prepared, and exposure to other potential risk factors including pets, pet foods, farms, petting zoos and day-care settings. Food exposures considered included eggs, processed chicken products, various other forms of chicken and beef, turkey, pork, deli meats, nuts, cheese, milk and juice. Interviews were conducted by telephone. Parents/guardians were used as proxies for cases/controls under 18 years of age, except where cases/controls were 16 or 17 years of age and the parent/guardian requested that the case/control respond on their own behalf.

Data were managed using Epi-Info version 6.04d (CDC, Atlanta, GA, USA) and analysed using Statistical Analysis System version 8.02 (SAS Institute Inc., Cary, NC, USA). Matched case-control data were analysed by conditional logistic regression using the SAS procedure 'Logistic'. Exposures demonstrating P values <0.25 in univariate analyses were further analysed by multivariate modelling using a manual stepwise approach. P values and likelihood ratio tests were used to confirm the significance of variables and potential interactions between variables. Exact methods were employed wherever cell counts were less than 5 and estimates were adjusted for gender where inclusion of gender in a model altered parameter estimates by more than 10%. To explore the potential effect of recall bias, the final model was also fitted excluding matched pairs where cases reported symptom onset more than 2 weeks prior to the study start date. Population attributable fractions were calculated using matched odds ratios (mORs) derived from multivariate conditional logistic regression and the prevalence of exposure among all cases interviewed [25].

Table 1. *Provincial/territorial participation in the Salmonella Heidelberg national case-control study, Canada, 1 January to 31 May 2003*

Province/territory	No. of case-control pairs interviewed	<i>S. Heidelberg</i> isolates identified from 1 January to 31 May 2003*	
		Total	% Enrolled in study
Québec	66 (plus 16 unmatched cases)	141	58
Alberta†	14	53	26
British Columbia‡	8	39	21
New Brunswick	3	16	19
Saskatchewan	2	10	20
Newfoundland	1	4	25
Northwest Territories	1	1	100
All other provinces§	—	186	—
Canada	95 (plus 16 unmatched cases)	450	25

* Source: National Enteric Surveillance Program, Health Canada.

† Alberta enrolled cases with phage type 26 infections only from 1 January to 31 March.

‡ British Columbia participated from 1 April to 31 May. The province reported 15 cases to the National Enteric Surveillance Program from 1 April to 31 May.

§ Four other provinces identified 186 isolates but did not participate in the study: Ontario (162 isolates), Manitoba (15 isolates), Nova Scotia (8 isolates) and Prince Edward Island (1 isolate).

To assess whether study cases were representative of all cases identified nationally over the study period, enrolled cases were compared to those reported to the Canadian Integrated Program for Antimicrobial Resistance Surveillance (CIPARS) pilot project. Laboratory and basic demographic data were available from CIPARS for *S. Heidelberg* cases identified in Ontario, Québec, British Columbia and Alberta in the first 15 days of each month and for all other cases in Canada over the study period (CIPARS, Canadian Public Health Laboratory Network and Health Canada, 2004, unpublished data). Comparisons were based on age, gender and severity of infection (using the type of clinical specimen obtained as a marker).

Local and provincial public health laboratories confirmed cases by routine culture methods and serotyping [26]. Phage-typing analysis was performed on case isolates forwarded to the National Laboratory for Enteric Pathogens, Health Canada [27].

RESULTS

Six provinces and one territory participated in the study (Table 1). A total of 95 matched pairs were interviewed, as well as 16 unmatched cases from

Québec. The dates of symptom onset among 95% of interviewed cases ranged from 1 January to 28 May 2003. The remaining 5% of cases reported symptom onset between 15 October and 31 December 2002. The median age of cases was 14 years (range 0–95 years) and 31% of cases were <6 years old. Fifty-six per cent of cases were male. The median length of illness was 10 days (range 1–90 days) and 47% of cases were admitted to a hospital as a result of the infection for a median stay of 5 days (range 1–60 days). Symptoms included diarrhoea (88%), fever (80%), abdominal cramps (65%), nausea (42%), vomiting (35%) and headache (29%). Thirty-three per cent of cases experienced bloody diarrhoea. Phage typing information was provided for 72% of case isolates. The most common types were PT19 (29 cases), PT26 (16 cases), PT29 (9 cases), PT4 (7 cases) and PT35 (4 cases). There was no significant clustering of phage types over time or by province.

Cases accounted for 25% of the 450 isolates identified through routine national laboratory surveillance over the study period (National Enteric Surveillance Program, Health Canada, 2003, unpublished data). Enrolled cases did not differ significantly by age or gender from cases reported nationally through

Table 2. Potential risk factors for *Salmonella Heidelberg* infection among participants of a national case-control study, Canada, 1 January to 31 May, 2003 (only exposure variables with univariate *P* values <0.05 are listed)

Exposure	Exposure in the week before onset/interview						
	Cases		Controls		OR*	95% CI	<i>P</i> value
	No.	%	No.	%			
Chicken nuggets	51	49.5	22	24.4	3.2	1.5–6.8	0.0009
Chicken nuggets prepared at home	40	38.8	13	14.4	3.5	1.6–7.7	0.0006
Chicken strips	24	23.5	8	9.0	6.8	1.9–38.1	0.0009
Chicken strips prepared at home	23	22.6	6	6.7	21.3	3.0–947.3	<0.0001
Chicken nuggets and/or strips prepared at home	47	45.2	18	19.8	3.8	1.7–8.2	0.0002
Chicken wings	18	18.0	6	7.0	3.8	1.2–15.5	0.0192
Undercooked eggs	16	18.6	2	2.4	5.5	1.2–51.1	0.0225
Deli chicken	19	21.6	6	7.1	6.9	1.8–41.4	0.0020
Roast beef	27	28.7	11	12.6	2.2	1.0–4.9	0.0386

* Odds ratios from univariate conditional logistic regression comparing cases to controls matched by age group (<7, 7–17, >17 years) and geographic area as defined by home telephone exchange. Exact methods were employed where cell counts were less than five and estimates adjusted for gender where inclusion of gender in the model altered parameter estimates by more than 10%.

CIPARS (median age 18 years, range 0–97 years, *P*=0.32, 51% male). Blood samples were drawn from a significantly higher proportion of enrolled cases (29%) than from those reported through CIPARS (12%, *P*<0.001).

Univariate analysis results for exposure variables with statistically significant *P* values are presented in Table 2. Chicken nuggets and strips were both significantly (*P*<0.05) associated with illness. For both products, the mORs increased when only store-bought, home-prepared strips or nuggets were considered. Consumption of chicken strips was more strongly associated with illness than chicken nuggets, however, 15 (65%) of the cases that ate chicken strips also ate chicken nuggets, and more cases reported eating chicken nuggets (38.8%) than chicken strips (22.6%). Both variables remained significant when entered into a model together. A single variable was created to represent consumption of either or both types of products prepared at home and this variable was significantly associated with illness (mOR 3.8, 95% confidence interval (CI) 1.7–8.2). Thirteen variables with *P* values <0.25 were included in subsequent multivariate analyses.

The final model contained three variables. Cases were more likely than controls to have consumed home-prepared chicken nuggets and/or strips (mOR

4.0, 95% CI 1.4–13.8), to have consumed undercooked eggs (mOR 7.5, 95% CI 1.5–75.5), and were less likely than controls to either live on or have visited a farm (mOR 0.22, 95% CI 0.03–1.00). Similar results were obtained excluding matched pairs where cases reported symptom onset more than 2 weeks prior to the study start date. Assuming cases enrolled are representative of all cases in the Canadian population, 34% of all *S. Heidelberg* infections are attributable to consumption of chicken nuggets and strips prepared at home, and 16% are attributable to eating undercooked eggs.

Thirteen different phage types were identified among chicken nugget and strip consumers and six were identified among those reporting consumption of undercooked eggs. Cases purchased 15 different brands of chicken nuggets and strips, with several popular brand names comprising the majority of case purchases. Cases also reported various different sources of eggs.

Sample sizes for individual provinces/territories were insufficient to analyse individually with the exception of Québec. Québec data accounted for 69% of all matched pairs. Results of multivariate analysis were similar to the national findings except that farm exposure was not associated with a lower risk of illness. Québec cases were 5.9 (95% CI 1.2–57.6) times

more likely to have consumed undercooked eggs and although not statistically significant ($P=0.058$), cases were 3.1 (95% CI 1.0–12.0) times more likely to have eaten chicken nuggets and/or strips prepared at home than controls. Multiple sources were named for both risk factors.

When participants (cases and controls combined) were asked who in the household typically eats frozen, processed chicken products such as chicken nuggets, 40% reported their whole family, 23% indicated the children or teenagers in the home, 13% said that only adults eat these products and 25% reported that nobody in the household eats these products. Forty per cent of participants considered frozen, processed chicken products to be pre-cooked. This proportion was similar among case and control households ($P=0.58$). Cases (or case parents/guardians) were slightly less likely than controls to always wash their hands after handling raw, uncooked chicken, although this difference was not statistically significant (67% compared to 85%, $P=0.20$). Participants were also asked how frequently they washed their hands after handling processed chicken products such as chicken nuggets and strips. Thirty per cent of both cases and controls reported washing their hands less often after handling processed chicken products than after handling raw, whole chicken. Eleven per cent of participants reported using the microwave for cooking chicken nuggets or strips. One quarter (82 participants) of chicken nugget and/or strip consumers reported repackaging large boxes of the product into smaller freezer portions at least some of the time, of whom 32% did not retain the box instructions. Québec study subjects were also asked how often they read cooking instructions before cooking chicken nuggets. Among cases and controls, 57% always read the instructions, 31% read the cooking instructions often or sometimes and 12% never read them.

DISCUSSION

The results of this study indicate that home-prepared chicken nuggets and strips, and undercooked eggs are leading risk factors for endemic *S. Heidelberg* infections in Canada. Cases were 4.0 times more likely than controls to have consumed home-prepared chicken nuggets and/or strips (95% CI 1.4–13.8), were 7.5 times more likely to have consumed undercooked eggs (95% CI 1.5–75.5), and were less likely than controls to be exposed to a farm setting (mOR 0.22, 95% CI 0.03–1.00). Cases enrolled in this study were more

likely to have been laboratory confirmed through blood culture compared to all nationally reported cases of *S. Heidelberg*. Some provinces were unable to participate due to resource limitations and no information was requested for those cases not enrolled within participating provinces who may have not been contacted, refused to participate or were excluded for some other reason. Nevertheless, these findings suggest that 34 and 16% of laboratory-confirmed *S. Heidelberg* infections in Canada are attributable to home-prepared chicken nuggets and strips, and undercooked eggs respectively.

The findings of this study suggest that persons exposed to a farm setting may be less likely to become ill as a result of *S. Heidelberg* exposure. Previous studies have demonstrated that farm animals are sources of *Salmonella* infection [28, 29]. Detailed information regarding the type of farm operation, history of illness among the farm animals and the participants reporting farm exposure was not available for analysis; however, it is hypothesized that the protective effect observed here is the result of immunity acquired by previous exposure to infected farm animals.

Results from this study are consistent with the findings of other laboratory and epidemiological studies. *S. Heidelberg* is the most common *Salmonella* serovar isolated from poultry sources including broiler chickens and egg-producing flocks, has been isolated from eggshells and is able to grow inside eggs [30–33]. Undercooked eggs have been identified as important risk factors for sporadic infections of *S. Enteritidis*, *S. Typhimurium* and *S. Heidelberg* in the United States [23, 34]. The US study examining risk factors for sporadic *S. Heidelberg* infection did not identify chicken nuggets/strips as an important source of infection [23]. However, the questionnaire employed did not ask specifically about chicken nugget or strip consumption, only chicken consumption in general.

Other recent studies have implicated frozen processed chicken products as sources of salmonellosis in humans. The case-series investigation conducted in Québec in 2002 and discussed earlier is one example (C. Gaulin, unpublished data). Researchers in Québec also conducted a laboratory survey in 2002. They surveyed 106 chicken nugget samples originating from 14 different manufacturers and 30% were positive for *Salmonella*; 59% of the isolates were serotype Heidelberg of various phage types (D. Ramsay, unpublished data). While these laboratory findings are not unexpected given the prevalence of *S. Heidelberg* in raw poultry and the fact that chicken nuggets from



Fig. Photograph of raw processed chicken nuggets that have been breaded and par-fried to a golden state and packaged into a plastic bag and large box for freezer storage.

11 of the 14 manufacturers were raw products, results demonstrate the potential health risks associated with these products if not handled and cooked properly. An investigation into a 1998 outbreak of *S. Typhimurium* PT12 infections in Australia led to the recall of a particular brand of partially cooked frozen chicken nuggets [35]. Finally, the case-control study conducted in British Columbia in early 2003 found a significant association between consumption of frozen chicken nuggets and/or strips and *S. Heidelberg* infection, and food testing identified *S. Heidelberg* in opened and unopened products [24].

Participants' survey responses demonstrate that a substantial proportion of chicken nugget/strip consumers do not perceive, handle or prepare these products as they would raw, unprocessed chicken, although the majority of these products on the Canadian market are raw or only partially cooked (par-fried) (D. Ramsay, unpublished data). Both the Australian and British Columbia studies discussed previously highlight consumer misperceptions about the state of the frozen processed chicken products, and improper cooking and handling of raw products was identified as the root cause of case illnesses. Frozen, breaded and often par-fried products do not appear similar to raw, whole meat in terms of colour, juice and texture (see Fig.). Consumers' misperceptions may also extend to other frozen raw products that lack the cues people normally use to identify raw meat. Manufacturers of chicken nuggets/strips are required to include oven-cooking instructions on the product packaging but labelling seldom indicates whether the product is raw or fully cooked and does

not necessarily provide advice for safe handling, or the use or avoidance of microwave cooking.

Results of this study have contributed directly to policy change. Health Canada's Food Directorate is currently drafting an addition to the Food and Drug Regulations requiring mandatory safe handling labels to be applied to raw ground meat and poultry products that have a cooked appearance, including chicken nuggets/strips. The Canadian Food Inspection Agency (CFIA) has also recently proposed amendments to the Meat Inspection Regulations requiring products that have a cooked appearance but are raw to include the expression 'uncooked' or an equivalent term in the name of the product [36]. Findings from this study have also been shared with food safety educators to encourage development of effective consumer education strategies regarding the safe handling and preparation of these products, and with the poultry production and processing industry to encourage industry-led risk reduction strategies.

Finally, this study demonstrates the value of research examining sources for sporadic foodborne infections. Traditionally, public health has relied on the results of outbreak investigations to direct action, but outbreak-related cases often comprise a small proportion of all cases reported nationally [3]. The current endemic study indicated that a substantial proportion of *S. Heidelberg* infections in Canada can be attributed to consumption of home-prepared chicken nuggets and strips, and provides a target for high-impact intervention.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We thank Johanne Ismail (Laboratoire de santé publique du Québec, Ste-Anne de Bellevue, Québec), Lorraine McIntyre [Food Poisoning Section, Laboratory Services, British Columbia Centre for Disease Control (BCCDC), Vancouver, British Columbia], Ana Pacagnella (Enteric Section, Laboratory Services, BCCDC, Vancouver, British Columbia) and Keir Corder (Vancouver Island Health Authority, Victoria, British Columbia) for helping us to identify the need for this study. We thank the participating provincial/territorial public health professionals who assisted in coordinating the study and the regional/local public health authorities for collection of case data. We also thank the provincial public health laboratories and the National Microbiology Laboratory for supporting this study through serotype confirmation and phage typing analysis of clinical isolates. Finally,

we thank the Canadian Integrated Program for Antimicrobial Resistance Surveillance for the provision of laboratory and demographic data pertaining to national *S. Heidelberg* case isolates for comparison to cases enrolled in this study.

REFERENCES

1. **Bowman C, Flint J, Pollari F.** Canadian Integrated Surveillance Report: *Salmonella*, *Campylobacter*, pathogenic *E. coli* and *Shigella* from 1996–1999. *Can Commun Dis Rep* 2003; **29** (Suppl 1): 1–31.
2. **Health Canada.** National Enteric Surveillance Program Annual Summary Reports 2000–2003.
3. **Khakhria R, Woodward D, Johnson WM, Poppe C.** *Salmonella* isolated from humans, animals and other sources in Canada, 1983–92. *Epidemiol Infect* 1997; **119**: 15–23.
4. **Vugia DJ, Samuel M, Farley MM, et al.** Invasive *Salmonella* infections in the United States, FoodNet, 1996–1999: incidence, serotype distribution, and outcome. *Clin Infect Dis* 2004; **38** (Suppl 3): 149–156.
5. **Wilmshurst P, Sutcliffe H.** Splenic abscess due to *Salmonella* Heidelberg. *Clin Infect Dis* 1995; **21**: 1065.
6. **Thomson GT, Chiu B, DeRubeis D, Falk J, Inman RD.** Immunoepidemiology of post-*Salmonella* reactive arthritis in a cohort of women. *Clin Immunol Immunopathol* 1992; **64**: 227–232.
7. **Wanby P, Olsen B.** Myocarditis in a patient with *Salmonella* and *Campylobacter* enteritis. *Scand J Infect Dis* 2001; **33**: 860–862.
8. **Burt CR, Proudfoot JC, Roberts M, Horowitz RH.** Fatal myocarditis secondary to *Salmonella* septicemia in a young adult. *J Emerg Med* 1990; **8**: 295–297.
9. **Kennedy M, Villar R, Vugia DJ, et al.** Hospitalizations and deaths due to *Salmonella* infections, FoodNet, 1996–99. *Clin Infect Dis* 2004; **38** (Suppl 3): 142–148.
10. **Todd EC.** Costs of acute bacterial foodborne disease in Canada and the United States. *Int J Microbiol* 1989; **9**: 313–326.
11. **Voetsch AC, Van Gilder TJ, Angulo FJ, et al.** FoodNet Estimate of the burden of illness caused by nontyphoidal *Salmonella* infections in the United States, 2004; **38** (Suppl 3): 127–134.
12. **Barnass S, O'Mahoney M, Sockett PN, Garner J, Franklin J, Tabaqchali S.** The tangible cost implications of a hospital outbreak of multiply-resistant *Salmonella*. *Epidemiol Infect* 1989; **103**: 227–234.
13. **Choi M, Yoshikawa TT, Bridge J, et al.** *Salmonella* outbreak in a nursing home. *J Am Geriatr Soc* 1990; **38**: 531–534.
14. **Layton MC, Calliste SG, Gomez TM, Patton C, Brooks S.** A mixed foodborne outbreak with *Salmonella* Heidelberg and *Campylobacter jejuni* in a nursing home. *Infect Control Hosp Epidemiol* 1997; **18**: 115–121.
15. **Mead PS, Slutsker L, Dietz V, et al.** Food-related illness and death in the United States. *Emerg Infect Dis* 1999; **5**: 607–625.
16. **O'Mahony M, Barnes H, Stanwell-Smith R, Dickens T, Jephcott A.** An outbreak of *Salmonella* Heidelberg infection associated with a long incubation period. *J Public Health Med* 1990; **12**: 19–21.
17. **Center for Disease Control and Prevention.** *Salmonella* Heidelberg outbreak at a convention – New Mexico. *Morb Mortal Wkly Rep* 1986; **35**: 91.
18. **Fontaine RE, Cohen ML, Martin WT, Vernon TM.** Epidemic salmonellosis from cheddar cheese: surveillance and prevention. *Am J Epidemiol* 1980; **111**: 247–253.
19. **Lintz D, Kapila R, Pilgrim E, Tecson F, Dorn R, Louria D.** Nosocomial *Salmonella* Epidemic. *Arch Intern Med* 1976; **136**: 968–973.
20. **Rice PA, Craven C, Wells JG.** *Salmonella* Heidelberg enteritis and bacteremia. An epidemic on two pediatric wards. *Am J Med* 1976; **60**: 509–516.
21. **Lyons RW, Samples CL, DeSilva HN, Ross KA, Julian EM, Checko PJ.** An epidemic of resistant *Salmonella* in a nursery. Animal-to-human spread. *J Am Med Assoc* 1980; **243**: 546–47.
22. **Hennessy TW, Cheng LH, Kassenborg H, et al.** Egg consumption is the principal risk factor for sporadic *Salmonella* serotype Heidelberg infections: a case-control study in FoodNet sites. *Clin Infect Dis* 2004; **38** (Suppl 3): 237–243.
23. **CDC.** Foodborne diseases active surveillance network (FoodNet): population survey atlas of exposures: 1998–1999. Atlanta: Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC); 1999: 72.
24. **MacDougall L, Fyfe M, McIntyre L, et al.** Frozen chicken nuggets and strips – a newly identified risk factor for *Salmonella* Heidelberg infection in British Columbia. *J Food Prot* 2004; **67**: 1111–1115.
25. **Bruzzi P, Green SB, Byar DP, Brinton LA, Schairer C.** Estimating the population attributable risk for multiple risk factors using case-control data. *Am J Epidemiol* 1985; **122**: 904–914.
26. **Popoff MY, LeMinor L.** Antigenic formulas of the *Salmonella* serovars, 6th edn. World Health Organization Collaborating Centre for Reference and Research on *Salmonella*. Pasteur Institute, Paris, France. 1997.
27. **Demczuk W, Soule G, Clark C, et al.** Phage-based typing scheme for *Salmonella enterica* serovar Heidelberg, a causative agent of food poisonings in Canada. *J Clin Microbiol* 2003; **41**: 4279–4284.
28. **Gupta A, Fontana J, Crowe C, Bolstorff B, et al.** Emergence of multidrug-resistant *Salmonella enterica* serotype Newport infections resistant to expanded-spectrum cephalosporins in the United States. *J Infect Dis* 2003; **188**: 1707–1716.
29. **Doré K, Buxton J, Henry B, et al.** Risk factors for *Salmonella* Typhimurium DT104 and non-DT104 infection: a Canadian multi-provincial case-control study. *Epidemiol Infect* 2004; **132**: 485–493.
30. **Demczuk W, Ahmed R, Woodward D, Clark C, Rodgers F.** Laboratory surveillance for enteric pathogens in Canada, 2000 annual summary. National Laboratory for Enteric Pathogens, National Microbiology Laboratory, Health Canada. The Canadian Science Centre

- for Human and Animal Health, Winnipeg, Manitoba, Canada, 2000.
31. **Chambers JR, Bisailon JR, Labbe Y, Poppe C, Langford CF.** *Salmonella* prevalence in crops of Ontario and Quebec broiler chickens at slaughter. *Poult Sci* 1998; **77**: 1497–1501.
 32. **Jones FT, Rives DV, Carey JB.** *Salmonella* contamination in commercial eggs and an egg production facility. *Poult Sci* 1995; **74**: 753–757.
 33. **Schonei JL, Glass KA, McDermott JL, Wong AC.** Growth and penetration of *Salmonella* Enteritidis, *Salmonella* Heidelberg and *Salmonella* Typhimurium in eggs. *Int J Food Microbiol* 1995; **24**: 385–396.
 34. **Hedberg CW, David MJ, White KE, MacDonald KL, Osterholm MT.** Role of egg consumption in sporadic *Salmonella* Enteritidis and *Salmonella* Typhimurium infections in Minnesota. *J Infect Dis* 1993; **167**: 107–111.
 35. **Kenny B, Hall R, Cameron S.** Consumer attitudes and behaviours – key risk factors in an outbreak of *Salmonella* Typhimurium phage type 12 infection sourced to chicken nuggets. *Aust NZ J Public Health* 1999; **23**: 164–167.
 36. **Anon.** Regulations Amending the Meat Inspection Regulations, 1990. *Canada Gazette, Part I*. 2003 (23 Aug.); **137**: 2674–2697.