

1 **Summary**

2 The epidemiology of subclinical salmonellosis in wild birds in a region of high
3 *Salmonella* prevalence in pigs was studied. Three hundred and seventy nine fecal
4 samples from 921 birds trapped in 31 locations nearby pig premises and 431 samples
5 from 581 birds of 10 natural settings far from pig farms were analyzed for the presence
6 of *Salmonella* spp. Positive samples were serotyped and analyzed for antimicrobial
7 resistance (AR). Phage typing and PFGE on *S. Typhimurium* isolates were also carried
8 out. The overall proportion of *Salmonella* positive samples was 1.85% (95%CI=0.93-
9 2.77). *Salmonella* isolation was positively associated with samples collected from birds
10 in the proximity of a pig operation (OR= 16.5; 95%CI=5.17, 52.65), and from non-
11 migratory (or short distance migration) birds (OR=7.6; 95%CI=1.20, 48.04), and
12 negatively related to mostly granivorous birds (OR=0.4; 95%CI=0.15, 1.13).
13 *Salmonella* Typhimurium was the most prevalent serotype and 4 different *XbaI* PFGE
14 patterns were observed that matched the 4 phage types identified (U310, U311, DT164,
15 DT56). Only 20% of the strains showed multi-AR. In 3 farms a high degree of
16 homogeneity among isolates from different birds was observed. These findings
17 suggested that pig farms may act as amplifiers of this infection among wild birds, and
18 the degree of bird density may have much to do on this transmission. Some of the
19 *Salmonella* serotypes isolated from bird feces were of potential zoonotic transmission
20 and associated with AR. Monitoring salmonellosis in wild bird is advised.

21

22

23 **KEY WORDS:** Salmonellosis; wild birds; prevalence; antimicrobial resistance;
24 bacteriology; Spain.

25

1 **Impacts**

- 2 • In areas where pig salmonellosis is highly prevalent pig farms may act as
3 amplifiers of salmonellosis among wild birds, regardless the origin (pig or bird)
4 of the *Salmonella* strains infecting the birds.
- 5 • Although prevalence of *Salmonella* spp. among wild birds is low, birds can
6 carry *Salmonella* serotypes of potential zoonotic transmission and sometimes
7 associated with antimicrobial resistance, thus monitoring of wild bird
8 salmonellosis in these areas is advised.
- 9 • Long-distance migration birds were less likely to carry *Salmonella* spp.,
10 although dispersion of this pathogen through this type of birds cannot be
11 discarded.

12

13 **Introduction**

14

15 Wild birds are considered as potential sources for zoonoses as they are natural hosts for
16 enteropathogens such as *Salmonella* or *Campylobacter* spp., leading zoonotic pathogens
17 in the developed world (Chomel et al., 2007). Birds can acquire these pathogens from
18 contaminated environments and spread it directly to humans or indirectly by
19 contaminating commercial livestock operations (Alley et al., 2002, Daniels et al., 2003).
20 They could also acquire drug-resistant microorganisms from livestock farms and
21 disseminate these strains into the human population, hence contributing to the global
22 spread of emerging infectious diseases (Guenther et al., 2011, Reed et al., 2003).

23

24 *Salmonella* is considered a ubiquitous agent that usually colonizes asymptotically the
25 guts of birds and can be further excreted through their feces (Connolly et al., 2006). It is

1 also relatively common to associate avian salmonellosis with die offs of back-yard
2 passerine birds (Alley et al., 2002, Refsum et al., 2003) or with sick birds arriving to
3 wildlife rehabilitation centers (Molina-Lopez et al., 2011, Reche et al., 2003). Reports
4 on unapparent *Salmonella* carriers are less common, although from a zoonotic point of
5 view, these birds would be the most problematic animals for people and livestock due to
6 the potential risk they pose. Wild birds have been implicated as source of human
7 infection and contamination of feed (Hoelzer et al., 2011), and of outbreaks of clinical
8 salmonellosis in livestock (Luque et al., 2009).

9

10 The prevalence of *Salmonella* infection among wild birds is variable but appears to be
11 low (Kobayashi et al., 2007, Kirk et al., 2002, Fallacara et al., 2001, Gaukler et al.,
12 2009, Brittingham et al., 1988, Cizek et al., 1994). Factors such as season, feeding
13 behavior or migration patterns, may influence on the prevalence of salmonellosis in
14 free-ranging birds (Skov et al., 2008). For instance, clinical salmonellosis has been
15 associated with winter months (Refsum et al., 2002). Raptors that usually prey on sick
16 or dead animals may be infected with *Salmonella* spp. at higher proportions than non-
17 predators birds (Millan et al., 2004, Molina-Lopez et al., 2011, Reche et al., 2003).
18 Likewise, birds feeding on the ground may have higher chances of getting infected than
19 those feeding from hanging feeders (Refsum et al., 2003). Long-distance migrations
20 may also enhance susceptibility to certain diseases (Reed et al., 2003). In addition,
21 environments with high levels of *Salmonella* contamination (urban settings, livestock
22 facilities, etc.) may be a potential source of infection for those species of wild birds
23 more adapted to these places (Cizek et al., 1994, Gaukler et al., 2009, Skov et al., 2008).

24

1 Thus, some aspects on the *Salmonella* infection in apparently healthy wild birds, i.e. its
2 relationship with migration patterns or other potential risk factors, the relatedness
3 among *Salmonella* strains isolated from different birds, or their levels of antimicrobial
4 resistance, are of utmost interest in order to gain further insight into the epidemiology of
5 subclinical salmonellosis in wild birds. In addition, this knowledge may help further in
6 identifying potential epidemic *Salmonella* strains (Brouwer et al., 2011), and in the
7 ensuing design and implementation of control measures against this infection both in
8 human and production animals.

9

10 **Materials and methods**

11

12 **Sample collection**

13

14 Birds were trapped between September 2009 and October 2011 in an area from the
15 Northeast of Spain (provinces of Zaragoza and Huesca) that had shown a high
16 prevalence of pig salmonellosis (Vico et al., 2011). Mist netting was the method used to
17 trap birds in 31 locations nearby pig premises (birds were trapped either from inside the
18 premises or within 200 m radius), hereafter “near pig premises site” (NPPS), and in 10
19 natural settings far (> 2km) from pig farms and mostly related to bank rivers and forests
20 (far from pig premises site -FPPS-).

21

22 Once birds were identified they were kept in sterilized cages under a dark environment
23 to reduce stress until they defecate. Bird droppings were collected through sterile swabs
24 for bacteriological processing. Afterwards, birds were released after being measured and
25 tagged by a licensed bander. When many birds were captured simultaneously, they were

1 grouped by species and kept together in the same cage. Thus, pooled samples of a
2 variable number of birds were obtained instead of individual samples.

3

4 *Salmonella* spp. isolation

5

6 Fecal samples were processed within the same day of collection. All samples were
7 cultured following the procedure described by the ISO 6579:2002/DAM 2005
8 (Anonymous, 2005a) after slight modifications. Briefly, approximately 0.1 or 1 grams
9 of, respectively, individual or pooled fecal samples were homogenized in, respectively,
10 0.9 or 9 ml (around a 1:10 dilution) of buffered peptone water (BPW) (Panreac Química
11 SAU, Castellar del Vallés, Spain) for 18±2 hours at 37±1 °C. To try to increase the
12 sensitivity of the ISO 6579:2002 method, 100 µl of the incubated BPW interface were
13 inoculated by triplicate onto Modified Semi-solid Rappaport Vassiliadis (MSRV)
14 (Oxoid Ltd., Hants, England) medium plates (3 plates containing 100 µl/plate
15 distributed in 3 drops of around 33.3 µl/drop) and plates were incubated for 24±3 h at
16 41.5±1 °C. If typical halo was observed on any of the plates at 24 or 48 hours, a 1 µl
17 loop of the growth area was plating on the surface of two selective media (Xylose
18 Lysine Desoxycolate -XLD- and Brilliant Green -BG-) (Laboratorios MICROKIT,
19 Valdemorillo, Spain). Suspected colonies were confirmed biochemically (Triple sugar
20 iron -TSI- agar, urea agar, L-Lysine decarboxylation broth, and indol reaction) (Panreac
21 Química SAU), and one representative colony was sent to the *Centro Nacional de*
22 *Salmonelosis Animales* (Madrid, Spain), for serotyping according to the White-
23 Kauffmann-Le Minor scheme (Grimont and Weill, 2007). Bacteriophage typing of all
24 *Salmonella* Typhimurium isolates was performed at *Instituto de Salud Carlos III*

1 Salmonellosis Reference Centre (Madrid, Spain) according to the methods previously
2 described (Anderson et al., 1977).

3

4 Antimicrobial resistance (AR)

5

6 *Salmonella* isolates were tested against a panel of 10 antimicrobials (i.e. nalidixic acid,
7 ciprofloxacin, cefotaxime, ampicillin, chloramphenicol, streptomycin, gentamicin,
8 sulfisoxazole, trimethoprim, and tetracycline) using the Kirby-Bauer disk diffusion
9 method (Murray *et al.*, 2003), and following the antimicrobial concentrations
10 recommended by the European Committee on Antimicrobial Susceptibility Testing
11 (Anonymous, 2007), and the Clinical and Laboratory Standards Institute (CLSI)
12 (Anonymous, 2005b). *Salmonella* strains were classified as resistant (R), intermediate
13 (I) or susceptible (S), according to the CLSI guidelines.

14

15 Genotyping

16

17 *Salmonella* isolates were genotyped by pulsed-field gel electrophoresis (PFGE)
18 according to the Pulse-Net protocol (Ribot et al., 2006). Briefly, genomic DNA was
19 prepared by embedding cells of *Salmonella* isolates in agarose plugs (Lonza, Rockland,
20 ME, USA) and lysing the cells using sarcosyl (Sigma-Aldrich Co., St. Louis, MO,
21 USA) and proteinase K (Ambion Inc., Austin, TX, USA). *Salmonella* Braenderup
22 H9812 (Culture Collection, University of Göteborg, Sweden) was used as molecular
23 size marker. After digestion of genomic DNA with the restriction enzyme *XbaI* (Roche
24 Diagnostics, Mannheim, Germany), the electrophoresis to separate fragments by size
25 was carried out using the CHEF-DR III system (BioRad, U.S.A.). The PFGE pulsing

1 and running conditions were an initial 2.2 sec to a final 64 sec for 17 hr and at 6 V/cm at
2 14°C. BioNumerics software (version 6, Applied Maths, Belgium) was used to compare
3 the PFGE patterns by cluster analysis using Dice coefficient and unweighted-pair group
4 method with arithmetic averages (UPGMA dendrogram type) with a position tolerance
5 of 1.5% and optimization of 2.0%.

6

7 Statistical analyses

8

9 Since fecal samples were collected either from individual birds or from birds in groups
10 (pooled samples), estimates of individual prevalence of *Salmonella* in birds were not
11 possible. Thus, only rough estimates (i.e. minimum and maximum possible values) of
12 *Salmonella* prevalence in birds were calculated. The overall proportion of *Salmonella*-
13 positive samples and their 95% confidence intervals was also estimated.

14

15 Unweighted chi-squared analyses were used to compare the proportion of *Salmonella*-
16 positive samples by factors such as location (NPPS vs. FPPS), season, type of feeding
17 (mostly granivorous vs. mostly insectivorous) and migration patterns (long vs. short
18 distances/no migration). Multivariable logistic regression was used further to determine
19 major factors associated to prevalence of subclinical salmonellosis. Since the number of
20 pooled samples and the number of animals contributing to a fecal pool may differ
21 among factor categories, a weight variable was included in the model. This weight
22 variable was computed as the inverse of the number of birds contributing to the sample.
23 Since few variables were considered and all of them could be potential confounders
24 regardless their univariable statistical significance, they all were included in the
25 multivariable model to reduce the likelihood of confounding. As birds captured in the

1 same site were expected to be more alike regarding probability of *Salmonella* infection
2 compared to birds coming from different capture sites, observations were clustered by
3 site of capture and robust estimates of the standard errors of the coefficients obtained.
4 The software Intercooler Stata 12.0 (StataCorp LP, College Station, Texas) was used for
5 all statistical analyses.

6

7 **Results**

8

9 Birds from 50 different species were captured during the two-year period of the study.
10 Most of them belonged to the order of passeriforms and a few to the columbiforms. The
11 number and species captured depended on factors such as the season of the year and the
12 bird habits (i.e. migration patterns, diet, etc.). For instance, blackcaps were trapped
13 mostly at the beginning of the autumn, when they crossed the areas sampled in their
14 way to southern locations for wintering. Around 50% of the birds trapped were
15 considered mostly granivorous. The variety of bird species captured in both locations
16 was quite similar (39 from FPPS vs. 42 from NPPS).

17

18 Investigation of the presence of *Salmonella* spp. was performed on a total of 810 fecal
19 samples corresponding to 1.502 birds. Three hundred and seventy nine samples (921
20 birds) were from NPPS and 431 (581 birds) from FPPS. On average each pooled sample
21 represented 3.7 (95% CI= 3.3 to 4.1) individual birds. *Salmonella* spp. was isolated in
22 15 (1.85%; 95%CI=0.93-2.77) of the fecal samples collected. The overall *Salmonella*
23 prevalence in the captured birds ranged between 1% (from a minimum of 15
24 *Salmonella*-positive birds out of 1.502) and 4.4% (from a maximum of 66 out of 1.502).

25

1 The proportion of *Salmonella* positive samples was significantly higher ($P<0.001$) when
2 collected from birds captured in NPPS (3.46%) than from birds in FPPS (0.46%) (Table
3 1). It was also significantly higher in samples collected in spring (4.44%) than in
4 samples from birds captured during the other seasons (average of 0.8%) (Table 1).
5 However, no significant differences were observed in the proportion of *Salmonella*-
6 positive samples regarding feeding diets (Table 1). In addition, samples from migratory
7 (long distance) birds presented lower proportion of *Salmonella* positive samples (0.6%)
8 than those from non-migratory or short distance migratory birds (2.17%), but this
9 difference was not significant in the univariable analysis (Table 1). Ranges of estimated
10 *Salmonella* prevalence in birds for the different factors considered in this study are
11 presented in Table 1.

12

13 In the multivariable analysis the proximity of the capture site to a pig operation
14 remained as the main significant factors associated with *Salmonella* positive samples,
15 followed by migration patterns (Table 2). Salmonellosis was much more prevalent in
16 samples from birds captured in the vicinity of pig premises (Odds Ratio (OR) = 16.5) or
17 when the birds were considered non-migratory (or travelled mostly short distances)
18 (OR= 7.6). Seed-feeder birds presented a lower probability of finding positive samples
19 compared to birds feeding mostly on insects or invertebrates (OR= 0.4; $P=0.087$).
20 Regarding season, despite that samples from birds captured during the spring time
21 appeared to have a higher proportion of *Salmonella* positivity (OR= 3.4), this variable
22 was not statistically significant (Tables 1 and 2). A model with possible two-way
23 interactions between significant factors could not be assessed as model convergence
24 could not be reached due to the low number of positive samples.

25

1 The characterization of all the *Salmonella* isolates is shown in Table 3. Out of the 13
2 positive fecal samples from NPPS birds, most came from house sparrows (30.8%),
3 European starlings (23.1%) and rock pigeons (15.4%). The two *Salmonella*-positive
4 fecal samples from FPPS originated both from house sparrows.

5
6 Among the isolates collected from NPPS birds *Salmonella* Typhimurium was the most
7 prevalent serotype (69.23%), followed by 4 other serotypes, 3 of which are seldom
8 observed in pigs (*S. enterica* subsp. *arizonae* –IIIa-, *S. enterica* subespecie *diarizonae* -
9 IIIb- and Mikawasima). The last positive sample in this group corresponded to *S.*
10 *Anatum*, a serotype very common in pigs. Interestingly, one of the two *Salmonella*
11 isolates from the FPPS was the emergent monophasic variant of the Typhimurium
12 serotype (1,4,[5],12:i:-) which showed a pattern of multi-AR to ampicillin,
13 streptomycin, sulfisoxazole, and tetracycline (ASSuT) (Table 3) considered of potential
14 zoonotic transmission.

15
16 Overall, the levels of AR were low, with only 3 isolates (20%) presenting multidrug
17 resistance. They belonged to two bird species well adapted to human environments,
18 namely, house sparrow and European starling. Out of these 3 only 1 (33%) come from a
19 FPPS bird (a house sparrow) and corresponded to the monophasic variant of
20 Typhimurium. The other two were serotypes frequently isolated from pigs and
21 presenting AR patterns commonly observed in this animal species (Table 3).

22
23 *Salmonella* Typhimurium isolates were further characterized by phage typing and
24 PFGE. Four clear different *Xba*I PFGE patterns (>90% genetic homology) were
25 observed among the 9 strains of Typhimurium isolated (Figure 1). Four isolates were

1 100% identical and belonged to samples from European starlings, barn swallows and
2 house sparrows captured around the same pig farm (farm C). Another two isolates
3 (96.8% homology) belonged to two rock pigeons also trapped within the same pig farm
4 (Farm B). Two more isolates (96.6% homology) came from a house sparrow and a
5 blackcap captured at different pig farms (B and D) located around 60 km each other.
6 The last genetic profile belonged to a single isolate from a European starling (farm D).

7

8 Four phage types were identified among the Typhimurium isolates, which matched
9 perfectly with the four PFGE profiles observed. The four isolates 100% identical from
10 one of the farms belonged to phage type U310. The phage types from the two pigeons
11 were DT164, and the last two PFGE-related isolated were DT56. The single phage type
12 corresponding to the starling from farm D was U311.

13

14 **Discussion**

15

16 The overall proportion of *Salmonella* positive samples from wild birds captured in this
17 area was low (1.85%). Likewise, the values for the expected *Salmonella* bird prevalence
18 ranged between 1% and 4.3%. These figures agreed with results from many other
19 surveys carried out in different countries on apparently healthy birds that show an
20 overall low *Salmonella* prevalence (Brittingham et al., 1988, Gaukler et al., 2009,
21 Kobayashi et al., 2007). In general, when higher prevalences have been observed, they
22 were usually related to contaminated places (Cizek et al., 1994, Kirk et al., 2002),
23 mortality outbreaks (Alley et al., 2002, Refsum et al., 2003), or birds held at
24 rehabilitation centers (Millan et al., 2004, Molina-Lopez et al., 2011, Reche et al.,

1 2003). In the surveyed area, no reports of bird die-offs had been noticed during the last
2 years.

3
4 As it happens is in other countries (Hudson et al., 2000, Kobayashi et al., 2007, Lawson
5 et al., 2011, Palmgren et al., 2006), *Salmonella* Typhimurium was the most prevalent
6 serotype in the bird samples. Interestingly, the monophasic variant of *S. Typhimurium*
7 (1,4,5,12:i:-) was also detected in one sample from sparrows. The monophasic variant
8 of *S. Typhimurium* was rarely identified before the mid-1990s and is now considered an
9 emerging serotype around the world (Soyer et al., 2009). Monophasic *S. Typhimurium*
10 strains have been shown to have similar virulence and AR characteristics to other strains
11 of *S. Typhimurium*. Recent studies worldwide confirm the rapid emergence and
12 dissemination of monophasic strains in animals and humans. The public health risk
13 posed by these emerging monophasic strains is therefore considered comparable to that
14 of other epidemic *S. Typhimurium* strains (Anonymous, 2010). Currently it is one of the
15 most common serotypes associated with human and swine infections in Spain (Echeíta-
16 Sarrionandia *et al.*, 2011, Vico et al., 2011), but there are no reports of this serotype in
17 passerines. Interestingly, the AR pattern showed by this serotype (ASSuT) matches the
18 one observed for a European clonal line first detected in Italy in the year 2000 and later
19 in Denmark and United Kingdom, which seems to be spreading to other European
20 countries (Lucarelli et al., 2010). This AR pattern is indeed one of the most prevalent in
21 *S. Typhimurium* and its monophasic variant strains isolated from pigs in the surveyed
22 area (Vico et al., 2011). The fact that this serotype has been now isolated from healthy
23 sparrows captured in an area where is prevalent in pigs strongly suggest a pig-to-bird
24 transmission.

25

1 The type of specimen collected (feces) and the diagnostic method used may have
2 influenced somewhat on the sample prevalence observed. Shedding *Salmonella* is
3 usually intermittent and infected non-shedders birds may have been overlooked. In
4 addition, the MSRV medium is designed to detect motile *Salmonella* spp. and some
5 serotypes that may affect birds (i.e. *S. Gallinarum* and *S. Pullorum*) are non-motile.
6 However these latter serotypes have not been detected either in previous surveys of wild
7 passerines where other less selective culture protocols were used (Kirk et al., 2002,
8 Kobayashi et al., 2007, Pennycott et al., 2010, Tizard, 2004). An additional drawback
9 was the expected limited sensitivity of bacteriology to detect *Salmonella* on feces (Hurd
10 et al., 2004, Mainar-Jaime et al., 2008). With the aim of reducing this detection bias,
11 samples were cultured by triplicate on MSRV (i.e. 3 plates of MSRV containing 100
12 μl /plate of BPW distributed in 3 drops of 33.3 μl /drop). All positive samples but one
13 (93%) yielded a positive result (i.e. the characteristic growth halo) on the three plates
14 (results not shown), suggesting that this approach did not have a significant impact on
15 prevalence results.

16
17 The weighted multivariable analysis showed that sample positivity appeared to be
18 related to some biological factors, mostly to the location where the birds were captured
19 and their migratory habits (Table 2). When birds were trapped in areas in the vicinity of
20 swine operations the proportion of *Salmonella* positive samples increased significantly,
21 up to 3.46%, from a mere 0.46% observed in samples from birds trapped in
22 environments apart from pig premises. After adjusting for other factors, the odds of
23 being *Salmonella*-positive for a sample from birds captured in a pig farm was more than
24 16 times higher than that for a sample from birds from areas far from pig operations
25 (Table 2). It is well recognized that livestock farms act as good providers of feed and

1 shelter for wild birds, and congregations of certain bird species such as house sparrows
2 or European starlings around them is common, provoking damages associated with feed
3 contamination and consumption (Carlson et al., 2011). A relationship between
4 contamination of the environment with enterobacteria and the incidence of this type of
5 infections in wild birds has been reported elsewhere (Cizek et al., 1994, Gaukler et al.,
6 2009). In the region where the birds were trapped almost 95% of the pig farms were
7 positive to *Salmonella* and 30% of the finishing pigs were estimated to be infected
8 (Vico et al., 2011). The magnitude of the relationship between the proportion of
9 *Salmonella* positive fecal samples and the proximity to pig premises suggested the
10 importance that contaminated environments along with bird congregations may have on
11 increasing the likelihood of infection in birds.

12

13 Migratory birds have the potential to carry certain pathogenic microorganisms over long
14 distances (Hubalek, 2004). However, in this study non-migratory (sedentary) passerines
15 presented a higher proportion of *Salmonella* positive samples than migratory ones (OR=
16 7.6; 95%CI: 1.2, 48) (Table 2), suggesting that the risk of transmission of *Salmonella*
17 infection would be higher for non-migrant birds or birds travelling short distances. In a
18 previous study in Denmark long-distance migrant birds were at some lower risk of
19 contracting *Salmonella* infections than nonmigrating (resident) birds (Skov et al., 2008),
20 supporting our findings.

21

22 While sedentary birds were repeatedly observed in the surroundings of the pig
23 operations, most of migratory birds trapped in the vicinity of the pig farms were in their
24 way to migration sites, likely spending less time around the pig premises and therefore
25 being less prone to become infected. Migratory passerines might thus play a minor role

1 in the long-distance transmission of *Salmonella* infection. Bearing in mind that stressors
2 can exert a suppressive effect on immunity, increasing infection virulence and the
3 likelihood of become sick (Holt, 2000), stress associated to migration may lead to
4 disease and the subsequent death of the sick migrating bird, therefore stopping the
5 potential transmission of the infection over long distances. The fact that *Salmonella* was
6 identified in a pool of feces from barn swallows may disagree with this hypothesis.
7 However, these migratory birds were in very close contact with the farm environment
8 for an extended period of time as they were nesting inside a pig fattening unit.

9
10 Although in the univariable analysis bird diet was not related to sample prevalence, after
11 adjusting by other variables it turned out close to significant ($P=0.08$) (Table 2),
12 showing the need for taking into account as many variables as possible when working
13 with wildlife data to avoid confounding effects from many unknown factors. Similar to
14 what was previously reported in Denmark (Skov et al., 2008), seed-feeder birds
15 appeared to have less chances of *Salmonella* infection (OR=0.4; 95%CI: 0.15, 1.1)
16 compared to mostly-insectivorous birds. Five out of the 7 (71.4%) bird species with
17 *Salmonella*-positive samples were considered mostly insectivorous. Some studies have
18 shown that flies and beetles, either as larval stages or adults, are carriers of *Salmonella*
19 spp. (Barber et al., 2002, Liebana et al., 2003, Wales et al., 2010), and this pathogen has
20 been isolated from insects from hen and pig farms (Holt et al., 2007, Olsen and
21 Hammack, 2000, Wang et al., 2011). Pig farms allow for high concentrations of insects
22 which would make *Salmonella* readily available for this type of birds, increasing
23 significantly their odds of getting infected.

24

1 Nevertheless, classifying birds according to their diet is difficult. Many bird species
2 change their diet following the availability of their main source of food according to
3 seasonal changes. Thus, insectivorous birds may feed on small seeds and fruits during
4 winter (i.e. European starling) which, in turn, will modify the intestinal flora and then
5 possibly its susceptibility to some infections such as those by *E. coli* (Gaukler et al.,
6 2009). Our classification as “insectivorous/mostly-insectivorous” and
7 “granivorous/mostly-granivorous” was a simplistic categorization of the real nature of
8 the bird diets. Thus these results should be further confirmed.

9

10 Evidences that pig farms may act as amplifiers of the *Salmonella* infection among
11 surrounding birds were further brought about by the *XbaI* PFGE patterns and the phage
12 types identified, and the AR profiles observed. For instance, in farm C, where barn
13 swallows were nesting inside a fattening unit, the *Salmonella* strain isolated from them
14 presented the same serotype (Typhimurium), the same phage type (U310) and 100%
15 pulse type homology than those from house sparrows and European starlings captured
16 in the same location (Table 3 and Figure 1). In addition, all isolates were susceptible to
17 all drugs tested. Similar results were observed for the two *Salmonella* strains isolated
18 from fecal samples from two rock pigeons from farm B (phage type DT164).

19

20 Interestingly, in the area surveyed AR to at least one drug was detected in 73% of the
21 swine *Salmonella* strains analyzed, and ≥ 1 resistant strains were recovered in 93% of
22 the pig herds analyzed. In addition, AR was significantly more frequent among the most
23 prevalent serotypes, i.e. Typhimurium (Vico et al., 2011). The fact that 89% (8 out of 9)
24 of the *S. Typhimurium* isolates from bird samples were susceptible to all the drugs
25 tested suggested that most bird infections would have not been acquired from pigs.

1 However, pig farms may have favored the transmission of these strains among birds
2 living in the surroundings of these farms.

3
4 It has been postulated that is more likely that pathogens from wildlife acquire AR
5 through horizontal transfer of resistance genes from clinical isolates or the intake of
6 already resistant bacteria from human waste, sewage and domesticated animal manure
7 than through new parallel mutations in the respective genes (Martinez, 2009). The
8 multi-AR patterns showed by the three of the *Salmonella* strains isolated here (Table 3)
9 matched those more commonly observed in the pig population (Vico et al., 2011),
10 supporting also a possible pig-to-bird pathway transmission.

11
12 Regarding the phage types identified, the U310 has been observed in retail pork and the
13 environment of meat cutting rooms, being able to persist for long time (Prendergast et
14 al., 2009). In Spain, this phage type has been isolated on a regular basis from clinical
15 human samples the last 6 years (*Instituto de Salud Carlos III*, data not published). The
16 phage type U311 was also one of the most commonly found from human isolates in
17 Europe in 2009 (Anonymous, 2011). Its prevalence in human samples in Spain has
18 shown a significant increase in the last two years, reaching up to 200 cases in 2009 and
19 150 in 2010 (*Instituto de Salud Carlos III*, data not published). It is worth noting that
20 the U311 was the only Typhimurium strain among all isolates that showed multi-AR in
21 this study (Table 3). On the contrary, the DT164 is an infrequent phage type that has not
22 been detected neither in humans or domestic animals in Spain in the last years. It may
23 represent a bird-adapted subtype of Typhimurium of limited risk to humans or livestock
24 (Hoelzer et al., 2011, Tizard, 2004).

25

1 The fourth phage type, the DT56, along with its variant DT56v are reported as the most
2 commonly *S. Typhimurium* phage types isolated from dead garden birds in England
3 since 1995 (Hughes et al., 2008, Lawson et al., 2011, Pennycott et al., 2010, Pennycott
4 *et al.*, 2006). It has been suggested that DT56 and its variant would be host-adapted
5 *Salmonella* phage types maintained within the British wild bird population (Hughes et
6 al., 2008, Hughes et al., 2010, Lawson et al., 2011). They lack the *sopE* gene associated
7 with some *S. Typhimurium* disease outbreaks in humans and livestock and therefore
8 they would not represent a large zoonotic risk in England (Hughes et al., 2010).
9 However, this phage type has been isolated from human clinical samples in Spain in the
10 last years although at very low frequency (*Instituto de Salud Carlos III*, data not
11 published), and thus the chances of a direct or indirect (through livestock) spill over
12 effect from wild birds to human beings, although low, would be plausible.

13

14 To these author's knowledge there are no reports of the phage type DT56 from birds
15 outside of England, thus this may likely be the first time this phage type is detected in
16 passerines from other country. Interestingly, one of the *S. Typhimurium* DT56 was
17 isolated from a migratory blackcap. It has been reported that, since the 1960s, and
18 favored by warmer climate and increasing food supply provided by humans in the
19 United Kingdom, blackcaps established a new northwestern migration route between
20 the breeding areas of southern Germany/Austria and the UK, besides the traditional
21 southwestern route between central Europe and Spain/north Africa (Berthold et al,
22 1992). This new route may have facilitated the arrival of this phage type to Spain and,
23 therefore, the passerines analyzed, although may not be considered common long-
24 distance carriers of *Salmonella*, should not be fully discarded as such.

25

1 Despite the difficulties associated with the isolation of *Salmonella* from wild birds, i.e.
2 low number of birds captured, low prevalence, limited culture sensitivity, etc., and the
3 fact that only one colony was serotyped from each positive sample, these findings
4 suggest that pig farms would act as potential amplifiers of this infection among wild
5 birds surrounding the farms, as it has been observed for other infections such as
6 influenza (Saenz et al., 2006). The degree of bird density (i.e. congregation) may have
7 much to do on the transmission of this infection among birds as phenotypic and
8 genotypic relatedness among isolates from different birds were observed only in farms
9 where abundant birds were seen. Some of the *Salmonella* serotypes isolated from bird
10 feces were of potential zoonotic transmission and associated with AR, therefore the
11 monitoring of wild birds salmonellosis is advised in order to have a good understanding
12 on the epidemiology of this infection in birds and their potential as transmitters of
13 infection either directly or indirectly to humans.

14

15 **Acknowledgements**

16

17 This study has been fully funded by the *Instituto Nacional de Investigación y*
18 *Tecnología Agraria y Alimentaria* -INIA- of Spain (research grant no. FAU2008-16).
19 VG postdoctoral fellowship was funded by UPNA. The authors are especially thankful
20 to the ornithologist Joaquín López who helped us to identify bird species and to Alberto
21 Cebollada for its technical assistance on PFGE data analyses. Also thanks are due to the
22 technical staff at the *Centro Nacional de Salmonelosis Animal* in Algete (Madrid,
23 Spain) for their thoroughly work on serotyping. Collaboration of farm workers and
24 veterinarians is acknowledged as well.

25

1 **References**

- 2 Anonymous, 2005a: ISO 6579:2002/DAM. 2005. Microbiology of food and animal
3 feeding stuffs. Horizontal method for the detection of *Salmonella* spp. Annex D:
4 Detection of *Salmonella* spp. in animal faeces and in samples from the primary
5 production stage. International Organisation for Standardisation, Geneva,
6 Switzerland.
- 7 Anonymous, 2005b: Approved standard M2-A7. In *Performance Standards for*
8 *Antimicrobial Disk Susceptibility Tests*. 7th ed. National Committee for Clinical
9 Laboratory Standards, Wayne, Pa, USA.
- 10 Anonymous, 2007: Commission decision of 12 June 2007 on a harmonised monitoring
11 of antimicrobial resistance in *Salmonella* in poultry and pigs. 2007/407/EC.
12 European Commission, Brussels.
- 13 Anonymous, 2010: Scientific Opinion on monitoring and assessment of the public
14 health risk of "*Salmonella* Typhimurium-like" strains. *EFSA Journal* 8(10):1826
- 15 Anonymous, 2011: The European Union Summary Report on Trends and Sources of
16 Zoonoses, Zoonotic Agents and Food-borne Outbreaks in 2009. *EFSA Journal*
17 9(3):2090.
- 18 Alley, M. R., J. H. Connolly, S. G. Fenwick, G. F. Mackereth, M. J. Leyland, L. E.
19 Rogers, M. Haycock, C. Nicol and C. E. Reed, 2002: An epidemic of
20 salmonellosis caused by *Salmonella* Typhimurium DT160 in wild birds and
21 humans in New Zealand. *N. Z. Vet. J.* 50, 170-176.
- 22 Anderson, E. S., L. R. Ward, M. J. Saxe and J. D. de Sa, 1977: Bacteriophage-typing
23 designations of *Salmonella* typhimurium. *J. Hyg. (Lond)* 78, 297-300.
- 24 Barber, D. A., P. B. Bahnsen, R. Isaacson, C. J. Jones and R. M. Weigel, 2002:
25 Distribution of *Salmonella* in swine production ecosystems. *J. Food Prot.* 65,
26 1861-1868.
- 27 Brittingham, M. C., S. A. Temple and R. M. Duncan, 1988: A survey of the prevalence
28 of selected bacteria in wild birds. *J. Wildl. Dis.* 24, 299-307.
- 29 Brouwer, A., A. Hill and M. J. Woodward, 2011: What makes a *Salmonella* strain
30 epidemic? An expert opinion workshop. *Vet. Rec.* 168, 98.
- 31 Carlson, J. C., R. M. Engeman, D. R. Hyatt, R. L. Gilliland, T. J. DeLiberto, L. Clark,
32 M. J. Bodenchuk and G. M. Linz, 2011: Efficacy of European starling control to
33 reduce *Salmonella enterica* contamination in a concentrated animal feeding
34 operation in the Texas panhandle. *BMC Vet. Res.* 7, 9.
- 35 Chomel, B. B., A. Belotto and F. X. Meslin, 2007: Wildlife, exotic pets, and emerging
36 zoonoses. *Emerg. Infect. Dis.* 13, 6-11.
- 37 Cizek, A., I. Literak, K. Hejlíček, F. Tremel and J. Smola, 1994: *Salmonella*
38 contamination of the environment and its incidence in wild birds. *Zentralbl.*
39 *Veterinarmed. B* 41, 320-327.
- 40 Connolly, J. H., M. R. Alley, G. J. Dutton and L. E. Rogers, 2006: Infectivity and
41 persistence of an outbreak strain of *Salmonella enterica* serotype Typhimurium
42 DT160 for house sparrows (*Passer domesticus*) in New Zealand. *N. Z. Vet. J.* 54,
43 329-332.
- 44 Daniels, M. J., M. R. Hutchings and A. Greig, 2003: The risk of disease transmission to
45 livestock posed by contamination of farm stored feed by wildlife excreta.
46 *Epidemiol. Infect.* 130, 561-568.
- 47 Echeíta-Sarrionandia, M. A., S. Herrera-León and C. S. Baamonde, 2011: Invasive
48 gastroenteritis, anything new? *Enferm. Infec. Micr. Cl.* 29, 55-60.

- 1 Fallacara, D. M., C. M. Monahan, T. Y. Morishita and R. F. Wack, 2001: Fecal
2 shedding and antimicrobial susceptibility of selected bacterial pathogens and a
3 survey of intestinal parasites in free-living waterfowl. *Avian Dis.* 45, 128-135.
- 4 Gaukler, S. M., G. M. Linz, J. S. Sherwood, N. W. Dyer, W. J. Bleier, Y. M.
5 Wannemuehler, L. K. Nolan and C. M. Logue, 2009: *Escherichia coli*,
6 *Salmonella*, and *Mycobacterium avium* subsp. *paratuberculosis* in wild
7 European starlings at a Kansas cattle feedlot. *Avian Dis.* 53, 544-551.
- 8 Grimont, P. A. D. and F. X. Weill, 2007: Antigenic formulae of *Salmonella* serovars.
9 WHO Collaborating Centre for Reference and Research on *Salmonella*. Institut
10 Pasteur, Paris.
- 11 Guenther, S., C. Ewers and L. H. Wieler, 2011: Extended-Spectrum Beta-Lactamases
12 Producing *E. coli* in Wildlife, yet Another Form of Environmental Pollution?
13 *Front. Microbiol.* 2, 246.
- 14 Hoelzer, K., A. I. Moreno Switt and M. Wiedmann, 2011: Animal contact as a source of
15 human non-typhoidal salmonellosis. *Vet. Res.* 42, 34.
- 16 Holt, P. S. 2000: Host Susceptibility, Resistance and Immunity to *Salmonella* in
17 Animals. In: Wray, C. and A. Wray (eds.), *Salmonella* in Domestic Animals, pp.
18 73-88. CABI Publishing, New York.
- 19 Holt, P. S., C. J. Geden, R. W. Moore and R. K. Gast, 2007: Isolation of *Salmonella*
20 *enterica* serovar Enteritidis from houseflies (*Musca domestica*) found in rooms
21 containing *Salmonella* serovar Enteritidis-challenged hens. *Appl. Environ.*
22 *Microbiol.* 73, 6030-6035.
- 23 Hubalek, Z., 2004: An annotated checklist of pathogenic microorganisms associated
24 with migratory birds. *J Wildl Dis.* 40, 639-659.
- 25 Hudson, C. R., C. Quist, M. D. Lee, K. Keyes, S. V. Dodson, C. Morales, S. Sanchez,
26 D. G. White and J. J. Maurer, 2000: Genetic relatedness of *Salmonella* isolates
27 from nondomestic birds in Southeastern United States. *J. Clin. Microbiol.* 38,
28 1860-1865.
- 29 Hughes, L. A., S. Shopland, P. Wigley, H. Bradon, A. H. Leatherbarrow, N. J.
30 Williams, M. Bennett, E. de Pinna, B. Lawson, A. A. Cunningham and J.
31 Chantrey, 2008: Characterisation of *Salmonella enterica* serotype Typhimurium
32 isolates from wild birds in northern England from 2005 - 2006. *BMC Vet. Res.* 4,
33 4.
- 34 Hughes, L. A., P. Wigley, M. Bennett, J. Chantrey and N. Williams, 2010: Multi-locus
35 sequence typing of *Salmonella enterica* serovar Typhimurium isolates from wild
36 birds in northern England suggests host-adapted strain. *Lett. Appl. Microbiol.* 51,
37 477-479.
- 38 Hurd, H. S., J. D. McKean, R. D. Griffith and M. H. Rostagno, 2004: Estimation of the
39 *Salmonella enterica* prevalence in finishing swine. *Epidemiol. Infect.* 132, 127-
40 135.
- 41 Kirk, J. H., C. A. Holmberg and J. S. Jeffrey, 2002: Prevalence of *Salmonella* spp in
42 selected birds captured on California dairies. *J. Am. Vet. Med. Assoc.* 220, 359-
43 362.
- 44 Kobayashi, H., M. Kanazaki, Y. Shimizu, H. Nakajima, M. M. Khatun, E. Hata and M.
45 Kubo, 2007: *Salmonella* isolates from cloacal swabs and footpads of wild birds
46 in the immediate environment of Tokyo Bay. *J. Vet. Med. Sci.* 69, 309-311.
- 47 Lawson, B., L. A. Hughes, T. Peters, E. de Pinna, S. K. John, S. K. Macgregor and A.
48 A. Cunningham, 2011: Pulsed-Field Gel Electrophoresis Supports the Presence
49 of Host-Adapted *Salmonella enterica* subsp. *enterica* Serovar Typhimurium

- 1 Strains in the British Garden Bird Population. *Appl. Environ. Microbiol.* 77,
2 8139-8144.
- 3 Liebana, E., L. Garcia-Migura, C. Clouting, F. A. Clifton-Hadley, M. Breslin and R. H.
4 Davies, 2003: Molecular fingerprinting evidence of the contribution of wildlife
5 vectors in the maintenance of *Salmonella* Enteritidis infection in layer farms. *J.*
6 *Appl. Microbiol.* 94, 1024-1029.
- 7 Lucarelli, C., A. M. Dionisi, M. Torpdahl, L. Villa, C. Graziani, K. Hopkins, J.
8 Threlfall, A. Caprioli and I. Luzzi, 2010: Evidence for a second genomic island
9 conferring multidrug resistance in a clonal group of strains of *Salmonella*
10 enterica serovar Typhimurium and its monophasic variant circulating in Italy,
11 Denmark, and the United Kingdom. *J. Clin. Microbiol.* 48, 2103-2109.
- 12 Luque, I., A. Echeita, J. Leon, S. Herrera-Leon, C. Tarradas, R. Gonzalez-Sanz, B.
13 Huerta and R. J. Astorga, 2009: *Salmonella Indiana* as a cause of abortion in
14 ewes: Genetic diversity and resistance patterns. *Vet. Microbiol.* 134, 396-399.
- 15 Mainar-Jaime, R. C., N. Atashparvar and M. Chirino-Trejo, 2008: Estimation of the
16 diagnostic accuracy of the invA-gene-based PCR technique and a bacteriological
17 culture for the detection of *Salmonella* spp. in caecal content from slaughtered
18 pigs using Bayesian analysis. *Zoonoses Public Health* 55, 112-118.
- 19 Martinez, J. L., 2009: The role of natural environments in the evolution of resistance
20 traits in pathogenic bacteria. *Proc. Biol. Sci.* 276, 2521-2530.
- 21 Millan, J., G. Aduriz, B. Moreno, R. A. Juste and M. Barral, 2004: *Salmonella* isolates
22 from wild birds and mammals in the Basque Country (Spain). *Rev. Sci. Tech.* 23,
23 905-911.
- 24 Molina-Lopez, R. A., N. Valverde, M. Martin, E. Mateu, E. Obon, M. Cerda-Cuellar
25 and L. Darwich, 2011: Wild raptors as carriers of antimicrobial-resistant
26 *Salmonella* and *Campylobacter* strains. *Vet. Rec.* 168, 565.
- 27 Murray, P. R., E. J. Baron, J. H. Jorgensen, M. A. Phaller and R. H. Tenover, 2003:
28 Manual of clinical microbiology. 8th edition. ASM Press, Washington, DC.
- 29 Olsen, A. R. and T. S. Hammack, 2000: Isolation of *Salmonella* spp. from the housefly,
30 *Musca domestica* L., and the dump fly, *Hydrotaea aenescens* (Wiedemann)
31 (Diptera: Muscidae), at caged-layer houses. *J. Food. Prot.* 63, 958-960.
- 32 Palmgren, H., A. Aspan, T. Broman, K. Bengtsson, L. Blomquist, S. Bergstrom, M.
33 Sellin, R. Wollin and B. Olsen, 2006: *Salmonella* in Black-headed gulls (*Larus*
34 *ridibundus*); prevalence, genotypes and influence on *Salmonella* epidemiology.
35 *Epidemiol. Infect.* 134, 635-644.
- 36 Pennycott, T. W., H. A. Mather, G. Bennett and G. Foster, 2010: Salmonellosis in
37 garden birds in Scotland, 1995 to 2008: geographic region, *Salmonella enterica*
38 phage type and bird species. *Vet. Rec.* 166, 419-421.
- 39 Pennycott, T. W., A. Park and H. A. Mather, 2006: Isolation of different serovars of
40 *Salmonella enterica* from wild birds in Great Britain between 1995 and 2003.
41 *Vet. Rec.* 158, 817-820.
- 42 Prendergast, D. M., S. J. Duggan, U. Gonzales-Barron, S. Fanning, F. Butler, M.
43 Cormican and G. Duffy, 2009: Prevalence, numbers and characteristics of
44 *Salmonella* spp. on Irish retail pork. *Int. J. Food Microbiol.* 131, 233-239.
- 45 Reche, M. P., P. A. Jimenez, F. Alvarez, J. E. Garcia de los Rios, A. M. Rojas and P. de
46 Pedro, 2003: Incidence of salmonellae in captive and wild free-living raptorial
47 birds in central Spain. *J. Vet. Med. B Infect. Dis. Vet. Public Health* 50, 42-44.
- 48 Reed, K. D., J. K. Meece, J. S. Henkel and S. K. Shukla, 2003: Birds, migration and
49 emerging zoonoses: west nile virus, lyme disease, influenza A and
50 enteropathogens. *Clin. Med. Res.*, 1, 5-12.

- 1 Refsum, T., E. Heir, G. Kapperud, T. Vardund and G. Holstad, 2002: Molecular
2 epidemiology of *Salmonella enterica* serovar typhimurium isolates determined
3 by pulsed-field gel electrophoresis: comparison of isolates from avian wildlife,
4 domestic animals, and the environment in Norway. *Appl. Environ. Microbiol.*
5 68, 5600-5606.
- 6 Refsum, T., T. Vikoren, K. Handeland, G. Kapperud and G. Holstad, 2003:
7 Epidemiologic and pathologic aspects of *Salmonella* typhimurium infection in
8 passerine birds in Norway. *J. Wildl. Dis.* 39, 64-72.
- 9 Ribot, E. M., M. A. Fair, R. Gautom, D. N. Cameron, S. B. Hunter, B. Swaminathan
10 and T. J. Barrett, 2006: Standardization of pulsed-field gel electrophoresis
11 protocols for the subtyping of *Escherichia coli* O157:H7, *Salmonella*, and
12 *Shigella* for PulseNet. *Foodborne Pathog. Dis.* 3, 59-67.
- 13 Saenz, R. A., H. W. Hethcote and G. C. Gray, 2006: Confined animal feeding
14 operations as amplifiers of influenza. *Vecto-Borne Zoon. Dis.* 6, 338-346.
- 15 Skov, M. N., J. J. Madsen, C. Rahbek, J. Lodal, J. B. Jespersen, J. C. Jorgensen, H. H.
16 Dietz, M. Chriel and D. L. Baggesen, 2008: Transmission of *Salmonella*
17 between wildlife and meat-production animals in Denmark. *J. Appl. Microbiol.*
18 105, 1558-1568.
- 19 Soyer, Y., A. Moreno Switt, M. A. Davis, J. Maurer, P. L. McDonough, D. J.
20 Schoonmaker-Bopp, N. B. Dumas, T. Root, L. D. Warnick, Y. T. Grohn and M.
21 Wiedmann, 2009: *Salmonella enterica* serotype 4,5,12:i:-, an emerging
22 *Salmonella* serotype that represents multiple distinct clones. *J. Clin. Microbiol.*
23 47, 3546-3556.
- 24 Tizard, I., 2004: Salmonellosis in wild birds. *Seminars in Avian and Exotic Pet*
25 *Medicine* 13, 50-66.
- 26 Vico, J. P., I. Rol, V. Garrido, B. San Roman, M. J. Grillo and R. C. Mainar-Jaime,
27 2011: Salmonellosis in finishing pigs in Spain: prevalence, antimicrobial agent
28 susceptibilities, and risk factor analysis. *J. Food Prot.* 74, 1070-1078.
- 29 Wales, A. D., J. J. Carrique-Mas, M. Rankin, B. Bell, B. B. Thind and R. H. Davies,
30 2010: Review of the carriage of zoonotic bacteria by arthropods, with special
31 reference to *Salmonella* in mites, flies and litter beetles. *Zoonoses Public Health*
32 57, 299-314.
- 33 Wang, Y. C., Y. C. Chang, H. L. Chuang, C. C. Chiu, K. S. Yeh, C. C. Chang, S. L.
34 Hsuan, W. H. Lin and T. H. Chen, 2011: Transmission of *Salmonella* between
35 Swine Farms by the Housefly (*Musca domestica*). *J. Food Prot.* 74, 1012-1016.
- 36
37

38

- 1 Table 1. Prevalence of *Salmonella*-positive wild-bird fecal samples according to different factors
2 in Northeast Spain.
3
- 4 Table 2. Variables associated by weighted multivariable logistic regression* with *Salmonella*
5 prevalence in wild-bird fecal samples from Northeast Spain.
6
- 7 Table 3. Characterization of the 15 *Salmonella* strains isolated from wild-bird fecal samples in
8 Northeast Spain.
9
- 10 Figure 1. Dendrogram showing the 4 *XbaI* patterns (>90% homology) of the 9 *S. Typhimurium*
11 strains identified from wild-bird fecal samples.
12
13