

Standardized Flow Chart for screening *mcr*-positive *E. coli* and *Salmonella* in animal caecal content and meat samples

Poster ohejp2021.0770308



Multicentre Evaluation Of Culture Based Methods To Selectively Isolate Colistin-resistant *Enterobacteriaceae* From Food Producing Animals And Food Products

A. Perrin-Guyomard¹, S. Granier¹, M. Haenni¹, J. S. Sletteå², H. K. Ilag², M. Anjum³, L. Randall³, M. AbuOun³, N. Pauly⁴, A. Irrgang⁴, J. A. Hammer⁴, C. A. Svendsen⁵, J. S. Kjeldgaard⁵, A. Hammerum⁶, A. Franco⁷, M. Skarżyńska⁸, E. Kamińska⁸, D. Wasyl⁸, C. Dierikx⁹, S. Börjesson¹⁰, Y. Geurts¹¹ and K. Veldman¹¹

¹Anses, France; ²NVI, Norway; ³APHA, United Kingdom; ⁴BfR, Germany; ⁵DTU, Denmark; ⁶SSI, Denmark; ⁷IZSLT, Italy; ⁸PIWET, Poland; ⁹RIVM, the Netherlands; ¹⁰SVA, Sweden; ¹¹WBVR, the Netherlands

Background: Colistin is considered as a highest priority critically important antimicrobial in human medicine. To evaluate the potential contribution of food-producing animals to colistin resistance in humans, **WP1** of the **OHEJP-IMPART** project aimed to standardize a methodology to **screen acquired-colistin resistance** in most frequent commensal and zoonotic *Enterobacteriaceae* as *E. coli* and *Salmonella* and evaluate this methodology in a **multicentre approach**.

Method: Panel composition provided to the participants is detailed in the table below and methodology to be applied is detailed in the Flow chart.

Sample / Matrix	Spiked species		
	<i>mcr</i> gene	Bacterial species	Colistin MIC (mg/L)
1 Pig caecal content	-	-	-
2 Pig caecal content	<i>mcr-1</i>	<i>E. coli</i>	4
3 Pig caecal content	<i>mcr-3</i>	<i>E. coli</i>	4
4 Turkey meat	-	-	-
5 Turkey meat	<i>mcr-4</i>	<i>Salmonella</i> 4,12:l	4
6 Turkey meat	<i>mcr-5</i>	<i>Salmonella</i> Schwarzengrund	8

Results: Twelve laboratories participated in the multicentre evaluation. The **specificity** and the **sensitivity** of the PCR were **100%** and **83%** respectively. In PCR-positive samples, the probability of selectively isolating a *mcr*-positive colistin-resistant *E. coli* or *Salmonella* was greater using **CHROMID® Colistin R (86%)** than **CHROMagar™ COL-APSE (75%)** and **COLISTIGRAM (70%)**.

Conclusions: Including a **pre-screening PCR** will save time and reduce costs due to discarding negative samples and **focusing only on positive** ones. The performance of the method was highly influenced by which **selective agar** used and which *mcr*-producing isolate was present in the sample. Further trials including a broader range of colistin-resistant strains and a larger panel of matrices would assess the robustness of the method.

