Further studies of *Escherichia coli* in babies after normal delivery

BY K. A. BETTELHEIM, CHING HAAN TEOH-CHAN,* MARY E. CHANDLER, SHEILA M. O'FARRELL, LAYLA RAHAMIN, ELIZABETH J. SHAW AND R. A. SHOOTER

Department of Medical Microbiology, St Bartholomew's Hospital, West Smithfield, London EC1A 7BE

(Received 1 April 1974)

SUMMARY

Previous work showed that on the basis of O serotyping alone of *Escherichia* coli, the majority of babies acquired the same O serotype as was found in the stools of their respective mothers. Further characterization of the *E. coli* by H serotyping, determination of their antibiotic resistance and ability to ferment six carbohydrates showed that in the majority of cases the previous results were confirmed. In a minority of cases this further testing showed that the strains were not identical. In some instances a number of strains isolated from the same pair showed different combinations of the markers used.

INTRODUCTION

Previous work (Bettelheim *et al.* 1974) showed that from the faecal flora from 22 out of 28 babies *Escherichia coli* carrying the same O antigen as that found amongst the *E. coli* of the maternal faeces were isolated. This work describes the further characterization of these 2525 strains. Strains were typed according to their H antigen, their ability to ferment six carbohydrate substrates and their antibiotic resistance. The maternal and baby strains were then again compared.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

The collection of strains and O serotyping has been described previously (Bettelheim *et al.* 1974). The numbers used to identify the mothers and their babies are the same as those used previously.

H antigen determination

The H antigens of all strains were determined after achieving full motility (Chandler & Bettelheim, 1974). Strains consistently unable to develop motility as judged by microscopical observation were considered non-motile.

* Present address: Department of Microbiology, University of Hong Kong, Queen Mary Hospital Compound, Hong Kong.

	Common strain in maternal and neonatal stool				
Patient no.	O antigen	H antigen	Antibiotic resistance	Carbohydrates fermented	
2	3	2	Su	Du, Ma	
	81	27	F/S	Ma, Rh	
21	18	14	F/S	Ma, Rf, Rh, Sc	
	58	40	F/S	Ma, Rf, Rh	
	R	14	F/S	Ma, Rf, Rh, Sc	
35	11	4	S, Su	Du, Ma, Rh	
	R	4	S, Su	Du, Ma, Rh	
37	25	1	F/S	Ma, Rh	
	NT	8	F/S	Du, Ma, Rf, Rh, Sc	
1	1	NM	\mathbf{F}/\mathbf{S}	Du, Ma, Rh, Ss	
26	1	NM	\mathbf{F}/\mathbf{S}	Ma, Ss	

Table 1. Isolation of identical types of Escherichia coli from mothers and their babies

Carbohydrate fermentation

The ability of the strains to ferment dulcitol (Du), maltose (Ma), raffinose (Rf), rhamnose (Rh), sorbose (Ss) and sucrose (Sc) were examined (hereafter the abbreviations in brackets are used to label these markers). Bettelheim & Taylor (1969) found that of 16 carbohydrates used, the above six gave most differentiation between strains. Strains were inoculated by a multiple point inoculator onto agar plates of Oxoid Blood Agar Base (CM 55) containing 1 % of the substrate (w/v) and neutral red (6×10^{-5} %, w/v, final concentration). Plates were incubated at 37° C. and examined after 24, 48 and 72 hr.

Antibiotic resistance

Approximately ten organisms of each strain were inoculated by a multiple point inoculator on agar plates (Oxoid DST agar, CM 261) containing 4 % lysed blood and one of the following drugs: ampicillin (A), 25 μ g./ml., streptomycin (S) 50 μ g./ml., tetracycline (T) 10 μ g./ml., chloramphenicol (C) 25 μ g./ml., kanamycin (K) 10 μ g./ml., sulphadimidine (Su) 100 μ g./ml., nalidixic acid (Nal) 25 μ g./ml., trimethoprim (Tr) 2 μ g./ml. and gentamicin (G) 8 μ g./ml. The characters shown in brackets are used as abbreviations throughout. Strains which are sensitive to all drugs tested are designated fully sensitive (F/S).

RESULTS

The further testing of the strains from six mothers and their babies showed no differences with respect to any of the characters tested (Table 1).

Strains from six further mothers and babies still showed that the majority of babies' stool strains were identical with the maternal ones. However, there were a minority of strains from the babies which differed from the maternal ones by one or more markers (Table 2).

numbers			Strain	is isolated	l from
Patient no.	Common O antigen	Strains isolated	Mother stool	Baby mucus	Baby stool
5	42	O42:H-:F/S:Du, Ma, Rf, Rh, Ss, Sc O42:H8:F/S:Du, Ma, Rf, Rh, Ss	1 0	0 2	1 0
	78	078:H-:F/S:Du, Ma, Rf, Rh, Ss, Sc 078:H8:F/S:Du, Ma, Rf, Rh, Ss 078:H18:S, Su:Du, Ma, Rf, Rh, Ss, Sc 078:H18:F/S:Du, Ma, Rf, Rh, Ss, Sc	30 0 0 1	11 1 2 0	48 0 0 0
17	71 81	O71:H11:F/S:Ma, Rh O81:H-:F/S:Ma, Sc O81:H-:F/S:Ma, Rh, Ss O81:H11:F/S:Ma, Rh	7 3 2 0	0 0 5 0	42 1 0 1
18	48	O48:H32:F/S:Du, Ma, Rf, Rh, Ss O48:H32:F/S:Ma	$2 \\ 0$	8 0	24 1
33	84	084:H2:Su:Du, Ma, Rf, Rh 084:H2:Su:Du, Ma, Rf, Sc	5 0	0 0	$5 \\ 2$
13	7 82	07:H30:F/S:Ma 07:H-:F/S:Ma, Rh 07:H-:F/S:Ma, Rf, Rh, Ss, Sc 082:H31:A:Du, Ma, Rf, Rh	1 1 6 1	NS* 	0 0 44 0
22	6	082:H31:F/S:Du, Ma, Rf, Rh 06:H1:F/S:Du, Ma, Rh, Ss 06:H-:A:Du, Ma, Rf, Rh	0 14 1	0 0	6 30 0

Table 2. Patients in whom the majority of strains of Escherichia coli isolated from mothers and their babies were identical but related strains were also isolated in small numbers

* NS = no specimen obtained.

Table 3. Mothers and their babies colonized with identical O serotypes of Escherichia coli. Further typing showed the majority of strains to be related but not identical

			No. of strains isolated from		
Patient no.	Common O antigen	Strains isolated	Mother stool	${f Baby} \\ {f stool}$	
6	38	O38:H25:F/S:Ma, Rf, Rh, Ss, Sc O38:H37:F/S:Du, Ma, Rh, Ss O38:H-:F/S:Du, Ma, Rh, Ss O38:H4:F/S:Du, Ma, Rh, Ss	1 9 1 0	0 0 4 56	
7	42	O42:H7:F/S:Du, Ma, Rf, Rh, Ss O42:H19:F/S:Du, Ma, Rf, Rh, Sc O42:H19:A:Du, Ma, Rf, Rh, Sc O42:H19:F/S:Du, Ma, Rh, Sc O42:H19:A:Du, Ma, Rh, Sc	1 1 7 12 1	0 68 0 0 0	
	R	R:H7:F/S:Du, Ma, Rf, Rh, Ss R:H19:F/S:Du, Ma, Rf, Rh, Sc	6 0	0 1	

No strains of *E. coli* were isolated from the mucus of these babies.

			NO. OI SU	rains isole	ated from
Patient no.	Common O antigen	Strain isolated	Mother stool	Baby mucus	Baby stool
15	R	R:H-:F/S:Ma, Rh, Ss R:H-:S:Ma, Rh, Ss R:H-:Su:Ma, Rh, Ss B:H7:F/S:Du, Ma, Bh, Ss	5 2 7	0 0 0	0 0 0 50
19	$\mathbf R$	R:H7:F/S:Du, Ma, Rh, Ss R:H7:F/S:Du, Ma, Rf, Rh, Ss R:H7:T:Du, Ma, Rf, Rh, Ss	0 8 1	0 0 0	50 50 0
10	NT	OX*:H10:F/S:Ma OX:H10:T:Ma	1 37	NS†	3 37
29	42	O42:H2:F/S:(strain died) O42:H37:F/S:Ma, Rh, Sc	1 0	0 0	0 1
	79	O79:H7:F/S:Ma, Rf, Rh, Sc O79:H7:F/S:Du, Ma, Rh, Sc	1 0	0 0	0 1
	R	R:H37:T:Ma R:H37:T:Ma, Rh, Sc R:H37:F/S:Ma, Rh, Sc R:H7:F/S:Ma, Rh, Sc	1 1 1 1	0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0
		R :H52 : F/S : Du, Ma, Rf, Rh R :H7 : F/S : Du, Ma, Rf, Rh R :H37 : F/S : Du, Ma, Rf, Rh	2 0 0	0 1 1	0 0 0
	NT	R:H7:F/S:Du, Ma, Rh, Sc R:H-:F/S:Ma, Rh, Ss	0 0 5	1 12	1 21
	NI	OY:H2:F/S:Ma, Rh, Sc OY:H2:F/S:Du, Ma, Rh, Sc OY:H2:F/S:Du, Ma, Rf, Rh OY:H-:F/S:Du, Ma, Rf, Rh OY:H-:F/S:Du, Ma, Rh, Sc NT:H2:F/S:Du, Ma, Rh, Sc	5 9 2 3 0 0	0 0 1 0 0 0	0 32 0 0 3 1
23	R	R:H7:F/S:Du, Ma, Rh R:H7:F/S:Du, Ma, Rf, Rh, Sc R:H52:F/S:Ma R:H5:F/S:Du, Ma R:H-:F/S:Du, Ma, Rf, Rh, Sc R:H-:F/S:Ma, Sc	7 0 1 1 4 1	4 1 0 0 0 2	0 0 0 1 0
	NT	NT:H4:F/S:Ma, Rh, Ss, Sc NT:H-:F/S:Du, Ma, Rf, Rh, Sc NT:H-:F/S:Du, Ma, Rf, Rh, Ss, Sc NT:H-:F/S:Du, Ma, Rf, Sc NT:H-:F/S:Du, Ma, Rf, Rh NT:H-:F/S:Ma OX:H10:F/S:Ma OX:H10:T:Ma	2 1 1 1 1 1 0 0	0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0 0 1 18
27	27	027:H-:F/S:Ma, Rh	1	2	35
	108	O108:H19:F/S:Du, Ma, Sc O108:H-:F/S:Du, Ma, Sc O108:H-:F/S:Du, Ma, Rf, Sc	2 0 0	0 1 0	0 1 1
	R	R:H4:F/S:Du, Ma, Sc R:H-:F/S:Ma, Rf, Rh, Sc R:H-:F/S:Ma	1 1 0	0 0 1	0 0 6

Table 4. Identification of rough and non-typable Escherichia coli from mothers and their babies

No. of strains isolated from

Patient no.	Common O. antigen	Strain isolated	, Mother stool	\mathbf{Baby} mucus	${\mathbf{Baby}}$ stool
27	NT	NT:H34:F/S:Ma, Sc	3	1	1
		NT:H4:F/S:Du, Ma, Sc	2	3	0
		NT: H-: F/S: Du, Ma, Sc	1	0	0
		NT:H4:F/S:Ma, Ss, Sc	1	1	6
		NT:H11:F/S:Ma, Sc	0	1	1
		NT:H8:F/S:Ma, Rh	0	1	0
		NT:H9:F/S:Ma, Ss, Sc	0	0	1
		NT:H-:F/S:Ma	0	0	2
30	141	0141:H2:F/S:Du, Ma, Rh, Sc	8	0	27
	\mathbf{NT}	NT:H30:F/S:Du, Ma, Rf, Rh, Sc	1	0	0
		NT:H12:F/S:Ma, Rf, Rh, Sc	1	0	0
		NT:H2:F/S:Du, Ma, Rh, Sc	0	0	3
		* $OX = O162 - see Discussion.$			

Table 4 (cont.)

No. of strains isolated from

+ OX = O162 - see Discussion.+ NS = no specimen obtained.

From another two mothers and babies identical strains were found but only in minority numbers. The majority of strains isolated varied from one another by one or more markers, although the O type was the same (Table 3).

In one case (patient 31) there were three strains all with the O9 antigen isolated from the mother: (i) O9:H14:F/S:Du, Ma, Rf, Rh; (ii) O9:H-:F/S:Du, Ma, Rf, Rh; and (iii) O9:H-:F/S:Du, Ma, Rh – no strains of *E. coli* were isolated from the baby's mucus and the only strain isolated from the baby's facees, although serotype O9 was O9:H10:F/S:Du, Ma, Rf, Rh. Many strains from both mother and baby were tested against both H antisera, which are not related (Edwards & Ewing, 1972) and no cross-reaction was found.

In the previous study (Bettelheim *et al.* 1974) rough or non-typable strains were considered similar if they were found in specimens from one mother and her baby. There were two patients (15 and 19) where rough strains were the only strains common to mother and baby. Further studies showed that in patient 19 the strains were in fact similar but in patient 15 the strains were quite different (Table 4). In two patients (10 and 29), whose predominant strains were non-typable by O serotyping, it was noted that the strains carried the same H antigen. O antiserum was, therefore, raised to an isolate from each of these patients and all other nontypable strains tested against them. This led to the identification of two more O serotypes called X and Y for the purpose of this paper. In the other patients (23, 27, 30) with non-typable strains, the other markers were too dissimilar (Table 4) to warrant preparing further sera.

DISCUSSION

O serotyping has been extensively used in the study of the spread of *Escherichia* coli in man (Linzenmeier, Freislederer, Apak & Metz, 1961; Linzenmeier, 1962; Ewing, 1962; Turck, Petersdorf & Fournier, 1962; Nejedla, Srajbr & Lanc, 1967;

		No. of isolate	
Patient no.	Strains isolated	${ m Mother \ stool}$	$\begin{array}{c} \mathbf{Baby} \\ \mathbf{stool} \end{array}$
18	O48:H32:F/S:Du, Ma, Rf, Rh, Ss R:H32:F/S:Du, Ma, Rf, Rh, Ss O48:H32:F/S:Ma R:H32:F/S:Ma	2 0 0 1	24 32 1 1
35	011:H4:S, Su:Du, Ma, Rh R:H4:S, Su:Du, Ma, Rh	16 13	$54 \\ 6$

Table 5. Examples in which further typing indicated that strains thought to bedifferent merely showed O-R variation

Gruneberg, Leigh & Brumfitt, 1968; Cooke, Ewins & Shooter, 1969), animals (Sojka & Carnagham, 1961; Glantz, Narotsky & Bubash, 1962; Soderlind, 1965; Gossling & Rhoades, 1966; Hemsley, Barnum & Ingram, 1967; Shooter, Cooke, Rousseau & Breaden, 1970) and the environment (Muller, 1967; Cooke *et al.* 1970). At first only a limited number of O antisera were available but nevertheless this initiated these studies. As more types were identified, the studies could be extended. Recently, with 152 O antisera, it seemed that extensive epidemiological investigation might be more successful. This study shows that although O serotyping alone gave meaningful answers in a majority of cases and no further information was obtained from examining strains in more detail, there was a significant minority of cases in which a common O serotype was found but this did not indicate spread of the same strain.

The use of further O antisera prepared against untypable wild strains led to further differentiation of strains. Both X and Y antisera were tested against all known O antigens and no significant cross-reactions were detected. Strain X, representatives of which were found in a number of patients, has been forwarded to Dr F. Ørskov (International Escherichia Centre, Copenhagen) who has confirmed that it is a new serological type and will be designated O162. Strain Y, which was only found in one patient, has not been sent to Dr F. Ørskov, as current policy of the International Centre is not to put up new antigen numbers unless these are of special importance in clinical medicine or science (Ørskov, Ørskov & Rowe, 1973).

Furthermore, the use of both H and biotyping of some rough strains showed them to have the same markers as O types isolated from the same mother or baby. This O-R variation is well established and therefore the further typing enabled the detection of further common strains. Examples of this (patients 35 and 18) are shown in Table 5.

In other cases a number of strains isolated from the same pair showed different combinations of markers (Table 6). Furthermore, the same phenomenon was seen in strains isolated in a 10-day period from several patients (Table 7). In the latter case the markers H38 and H52 in our experience are most unusual (Bettelheim, 1969, Ph.D. thesis; Bettelheim, in preparation). On the other hand, there have been a number of instances of colonization of different mothers and babies with

		No. of strains isolated from			
Patient no.	Strains isolated	Mother stool	Baby mucus	Baby stool	
5	078:H-:F/S:Du, Ma, Rf, Rh, Ss, Sc	30	11	48	
	078:H18:F/S:Du, Ma, Rf, Rh, Ss, Sc	1	0	0	
	078:H18:S, Su:Du, Ma, Rf, Rh, Ss, Sc	0	2	0	
	O78:H8:F/S:Du, Ma, Rf, Rh, Ss	0	1	0	
	O42:H-:F/S:Du, Ma, Rf, Rh, Ss, Sc	1	0	1	
	O42:H8:F/S:Du, Ma, Rf, Rh, Ss	0	2	1	
	R:H-:F/S:Du, Ma, Rf, Rh, Ss, Sc	3	0	0	
	R:H18:A:Du, Ma, Rf, Rh, Ss, Sc	1	0	0	
7	O42:H19:F/S:Du, Ma, Rf, Rh, Sc	1	0	68	
	O42:H19:A:Du, Ma, Rf, Rh, Sc	7	0	0	
	O42:H19:F/S:Du, Ma, Rh, Sc	12	0	0	
	O42:H19:A:Du, Ma, Rh, Sc	1	0	0	
	O42:H7:F/S:Du, Ma, Rf, Rh, Ss	1	0	0	
	O20:H19:F/S:Du, Ma, Rf, Rh, Sc	0	0	1	
	096:H19:A:Du, Ma, Rf, Rh, Sc	1	0	0	
	R:H19:F/S:Du, Ma, Rf, Rh, Sc	0	0	1	
Λ.	R:H7:F/S:Du, Ma, Rf, Rh, Ss	6	0	0	
17	071:H11:F/S:Ma, Rh	7	0	4 2	
	O81:H-:F/S:Ma , Rh, Ss	2	5	0	
	O81:H–:F/S:Ma, Sc	3	0	1	
	081:H11:F/S:Ma, Rh	0	0	1	
	O147:H-:F/S:Ma, Rh, Ss	0	1	0	
	R:H-:F/S:Ma, Sc	0	0	2	

Table 6. Examples of strains showing some markers in common from mother and baby pairs

Table 7. Complex variation of selected strains isolated during a ten-day period

Date	Patient	Strain
8 May 1972	24 mother	09:H38:F/S:Du, Ma, Rf, Rh
13 May 1972	24 mother	R:H52:F/S:Du, Ma, Rf, Rh, Sc
13/15 May 1972	24 mother	O46:H52:F/S:Du, Ma, Rf, Rh, Sc
14 May 1972	23 mother	O46:H52:F/S:Du, Ma, Rf, Sc
14 May 1972	23 mother	R:H52:F/S:Ma
14/16 May 1972	26 mother	O46:H38:F/S:Du, Ma, Rf, Sc
15 May 1972	30 mother	R:H52:F/S:Du, Ma, Rh, Sc
15 May 1972	24 mother	R:H52:F/S:Du, Ma, Rf, Rh, Ss, Sc
15 May 1972	29 mother	R:H52:F/S:Du, Ma, Rf, Rh
16 May 1972	27 mother	O46:H52:F/S:Du, Ma, Rf, Sc
18 May 1972	30 mother	O46:H52:F/S:Du, Ma, Sc
18 May 1972	30 mother	R:H52:F/S:Du, Ma, Sc

strains possessing identical markers indicating classical cross-infection (Bettelheim et al. 1974).

To date, it has been assumed from epidemiological investigation of *E. coli* spread that the antigenic markers exhibit only limited variations, e.g. O–R and H + /H -. There has been one report of serial study of serological typing of organisms causing chronic urinary infection which showed complex variations of sero- and biotypes

(Bettelheim & Taylor, 1969). The present study suggests that this phenomenon may be more widespread than previously assumed. The genetic basis for this is under investigation.

We are indebted to the Wellcome Trust and to the Board of Governors of St Bartholomew's Hospital for a grant in support of this work. The expert technical assistance of Mrs E. Blackburn is gratefully acknowledged. We would also like to express our thanks to Dr P. Cox for allowing us to study patients under his care and to Miss M. Pollack and her staff in the Department of Midwifery for their diligent help in the collection of specimens.

REFERENCES

- BETTELHEIM, K. A. (1969). Investigations into the pathogenicity of *Escherichia coli* in human infections. Ph.D. Thesis, University of London.
- BETTELHEIM, K. A., BREADEN, A., FAIERS, M. C., O'FARRELL, S. M. & SHOOTER, R. A. (1974). The origin of O serotypes of *Escherichia coli* in babies after normal delivery. *Journal of Hygiene* 72, 67-70.
- BETTELHEIM, K. A. & TAYLOR, J. (1969). A study of *Escherichia coli* isolated from chronic urinary infection. *Journal of Medical Microbiology* 2, 225–36.
- BETTELHEIM, K. A., TEOH-CHAN, C. H., CHANDLER, M. E., O'FARRELL, S. M., RAHAMIN, L., SHAW, E. J. & SHOOTER, R. A. (1974). Spread of *Escherichia coli* colonizing newborn babies and their mothers. *Journal of Hygiene* 73 (in the Press).
- CHANDLER, M. E. & BETTELHEIM, K. A. (1974). A rapid method of identifying Escherichia coli H antigens. Zentralblatt für Bakteriologie, Infektionskrankheiten und Hygiene (in the Press).
- COOKE, E. M., EWINS, S. & SHOOTER, R. A. (1969). Changing faecal population of *Escherichia* coli in hospital medical patients. British Medical Journal iv, 593–5.
- COOKE, E. M., SHOOTER, R. A., KUMAR, P. J., ROUSSEAU, S. A. & FOULKES, A. L. (1970). Hospital food as a possible source of *Escherichia coli* in patients. *Lancet* i, 436-7.
- EDWARDS, P. R. & EWING, W. H. (1972). Identification of Enterobacteriaceae. Minneapolis, Minnesota: Burgess Publishing Company.
- EWING, W. H. (1962). Sources of *Escherichia coli* cultures that belonged to O antigen groups associated with infantile diarrhoeal disease. *Journal of Infectious Diseases* 110, 114–20.
- GLANTZ, P. J., NAROTSKY, S. & BUBASH, G. (1962). Escherichia coli serotypes isolated from salpingitis and chronic respiratory disease of poultry. Avian diseases 6, 322-8.
- GossLING, J. & RHOADES, H. E. (1966). Serologic types of *Escherichia coli* isolated from certain pigs with enteric disorders. *The Cornell Veterinarian* 56, 344-53.
- GRUNEBERG, R. N., LEIGH, D. A. & BRUMFITT, W. (1968). Escherichia coli serotypes in urinary tract infection: studies in domiciliary ante-natal and hospital practice. In Urinary Tract Infection (ed. F. O'Grady and W. Brumfitt), pp. 68–79. Oxford University Press.
- HEMSLEY, R. V., BARNUM, D. A. & INGRAM, D. G. (1967). Biochemical and serological studies of avian strains of *Escherichia coli*. Avian Diseases 11, 90–97.
- LINZENMEIER, G. (1962). Wandel im Auftreten und Verhalten enteropathogener Colitypen. Zentralblatt für Bakteriologie, Parasitemkunde, Infektionskrankheiten und Hygiene 1, Abt., Orig. 184, 74–83.
- LINZENMEIER, G., FREISLEDERER, W., APAK, S. & METZ, H. (1961). Bakteriologische und therapeutische Beobachtungen bei Sauglingsdyspepsien verursacht durch klassische und neue Serotypen von E. coli. Münchner Medizinische Wochenschrift 103, 1398-402.
- MÜLLER, G. (1967). Das Vorkommen von agglutinierenden E. coli-Typen in Trink- und Oberflächenwässern. Zentralblatt für Bakteriologie, Parasitenkunde, Infektionskrankheiten und Hygiene 1, Abt., Orig. 203, 464–8.
- NEJEDLA, Z., SRAJBR, E. & LANC, A. (1967). Über die Typenbestimmung von E. coli-Stammen in Stuhlen von Sauglingen wahrend des ersten Lebenshalbjahres und über die Antikörperbildung gegen die festgestellten Typen. Zeitschrift für Immunitätsforschung, Allergie und klinische Immunologie 133, 134–43.

- ØRSKOV, I., ØRSKOV, F. & ROWE, B. (1973). Three new Escherichia coli O antigens O154, O155 and O156, and one new K antigen, K94. Acta pathologica et microbiologica scandinavica, B 81, 59-64.
- SHOOTER, R. A., COOKE, E. M., ROUSSEAU, S. A. & BREADEN, A. L. (1970). Animal sources of common serotypes of *Escherichia coli* in the food of hospital patients. *Lancet* ii, 226–8.
- SODERLIND, O. (1965). Serological investigations of O-antigen in Escherichia coli strains isolated from calves with coli septicaemia. Zentralblatt für Veterinärmedizin 12, 13-17.
- SOJKA, W. J. & CARNAGHAN, R. B. A. (1961). Escherichia coli infection in poultry. Research in Veterinary Science 2, 340-52.
- TURCK, M., PETERSDORF, R. G. & FOURNIER, M. R. (1962). The epidemiology of non-enteric Escherichia coli infections: prevalence of serological groups. Journal of Clinical Investigation 41, 1760-5.