FOODBORNE PATHOGENS AND DISEASE Volume 11, Number 4, 2014 © Mary Ann Liebert, Inc. DOI: 10.1089/fpd.2013.1661

Towards a Typing Strategy for *Arcobacter* Species Isolated from Humans and Animals and Assessment of the *In Vitro* Genomic Stability

Laid Douidah, Lieven De Zutter, Julie Baré, and Kurt Houf

Abstract

Arcobacter species have a widespread distribution with a broad range of animal hosts and environmental reservoirs, and are increasingly associated with human illness. To elucidate the routes of infection, several characterization methods such as pulsed-field gel electrophoresis (PFGE), amplified fragment-length polymorphism, and enterobacterial repetitive intergenic consensus (ERIC)-PCR have already been applied, but without proper validation or comparison. At present, no criterion standard typing method or strategy has been proposed. Therefore, after the validation of PFGE, those commonly applied typing methods were compared for the characterization of six human- and animal-associated Arcobacter species. With a limited number of isolates to be characterized, PFGE with restriction by KpnI is proposed as the first method of choice. However, ERIC-PCR represents a more convenient genomic fingerprinting technique when a large number of isolates is involved. Therefore, a first clustering of similar patterns obtained after ERIC-PCR, with a subsequent typing of some representatives per ERIC cluster by PFGE, is recommended. As multiple genotypes are commonly isolated from the same host and food, genomic plasticity has been suggested. The *in vitro* genomic stability of Arcobacter butzleri and A. cryaerophilus was assessed under two temperatures and two oxygen concentrations. Variability in the genomic profile of A. cryaerophilus was observed after different passages for different strains at 37°C under microaerobic conditions. The bias due to these genomic changes must be taken into account in the evaluation of the relationship of strains.

Introduction

SINCE THE DESCRIPTION OF THE GENUS, Arcobacter-associated human and animal illness has been reported worldwide (Vandamme et al., 1992b). Predominantly the species A. butzleri, and also to a lesser extent the species A. cryaerophilus and A. skirrowii, are implicated in enteritis and occasionally septicemia in humans (Vandenberg et al., 2004; Wybo et al., 2004). Clinical symptoms are similar to a *Campylobacter jejuni* infection but a more persistent, watery diarrhea has been reported (Kiehlbauch et al., 1991; On et al., 1995; Hsueh et al., 1997; Yan et al., 2000; Woo et al., 2001; Lau et al., 2002; Fernandez et al., 2004; Vandenberg et al., 2004; Wybo et al., 2004). Infection probably occurs through the consumption of contaminated food, in particular poultry products, pork, beef, and drinking water (Jacob et al., 1998; Ho et al., 2006; Van Driessche and Houf, 2007). Other potential risk factors are contact with pets and person-to-person transmission (Vandamme et al., 1992a; Houf et al., 2008; Fera et al., 2009). Arcobacter differs from closely related *Campylobacter* spp. by the abilities to grow at lower temperatures and in higher oxygen concentrations (Vandamme *et al.*, 1992b).

One of the main challenges in Arcobacter research is to identify the different transmission routes. Various studies reported multiple species and moreover several strains present in the same host and on food products (Houf et al., 2002; Van Driessche et al., 2004; Van Driessche et al., 2005), hampering correct identification of vectors and reservoirs. Currently, genotypic methods are commonly applied, but not all have been validated (e.g., pulsed-field gel electrophoresis [PFGE]) or used (e.g., multilocus sequence typing) for all Arcobacter species (Hume et al., 2001; Son et al., 2006; Miller et al., 2009; Giacometti et al., 2013). At present, no criterion standard typing method or strategy has been proposed. Furthermore, strain or genotype delineation is currently arbitrary without guidelines specified. Besides the interpretation challenges due to different typing methods, the possibility of genomic rearrangements, as also described in C. jejuni (Wassenaar et al., 1998; Ridley et al., 2008;

Department of Veterinary Public Health and Food Safety, Faculty of Veterinary Medicine, Ghent University, Merelbeke, Belgium.

Leblanc-Maridor *et al.*, 2011), may have their basis in the large strain diversity. However, whether or not these rearrangements are induced by *in vitro* manipulation is currently unknown.

The aims of this study were to validate PFGE for its use with six human- and animal-associated *Arcobacter* species, and to propose a typing strategy for arcobacters based on the comparison of PFGE with two other previously validated and commonly used typing methods: amplified fragment gel polymorphism (AFLP) and enterobacterial repetitive intergenic consensus (ERIC)-PCR. Finally, the *in vitro* genomic stability of *A. butzleri* and *A. cryaerophilus* was evaluated by multiple cultivations under different temperature and atmosphere conditions.

Materials and Methods

Bacterial strains and growth conditions

For the validation and comparison of the typing methods, 46 A. butzleri, 33 A. cryaerophilus, 33 A. skirrowii, 38 A. thereius, 11 A. cibarious, and 12 A. trophiarum isolates as well as 25 Arcobacter collection strains (Table 1) were included. The Arcobacter isolates were obtained from food, human stool, and feces from food-producing animals by the Department of Veterinary Public Health, Ghent University, Belgium, using Arcobacter selective isolation methods for food and feces (Houf et al., 2001; Van Driessche et al., 2003; Houf and Stephan, 2007). For the in vitro genomic stability assays, 24 arcobacters were included: 6 A. butzleri and 7 A. cryaerophilus strains recently isolated from pig feces (De Smet et al., 2011), 5 A. butzleri and 4 A. cryaerophilus isolates recently isolated from human stool (Saint-Lucas Hospital, Ghent), as well as 2 A. cryaerophilus collection strains LMG 9904^T and LMG 9947.

All strains and isolates were grown on Mueller–Hinton agar (CM 0337, Oxoid, Basingstoke, UK) supplemented with 5% defibrinated horse blood (E&O Laboratories Ltd., Bonnybridge, Scotland) and incubated for 48 h at 30°C under microaerobic conditions by evacuating 80% of the normal atmosphere and introducing a gas mixture of 8% CO_2 , 8% H_2 , and 84% N_2 into the jar.

TABLE 1. ARCOBACTER COLLECTION STRAINS INCLUDED

Strains	Reference numbers
A. butzleri	LMG 10828^{T} (=ATCC 49616),
	LMG 10900, LMG 11932, LMG 6620,
	LMG 10223, LMG 11120, LMG 9906,
	LMG 9910
A. thereius	LMG 24486 ^T
A. cibarious	LMG 21996, LMG 219 <u>9</u> 7
A. cryaerophilus	LMG 9865, LMG 9904 ^T , LMG 10210,
	LMG 9863, LMG 9065, LMG 9947,
	LMG 9867, LMG 10230, LMG 10237
A. skirrowii	LMG 6621 ^T , LMG 9912, LMG 14985,
	LMG 10234
A. trophiarum	LMG 25534^{T}

LMG, Culture Collection of the Laboratory for Microbiology, Ghent University, Belgium; ^T, type strain; ATCC, American Type Culture Collection.

Validation of PFGE

Different protocols, based on the PulseNet protocol for Campylobacter jejuni, were tested (PulseNet 2009: http:// www.cdc.gov/pulsenet/protocols.htm). The two restriction enzymes, EagI and KpnI (New England Biolabs Inc., Beverly, MA) previously used in Arcobacter characterization studies were included (Hume et al., 2001; Son et al., 2006). Other restriction enzymes were evaluated in silico using the software program FastPCR (Kalendar et al., 2011) on the whole genome sequence of the A. butzleri strain ATCC 49616 (=LMG 10828^T), deposited in GeneBank[®] (Miller et al., 2007). To evaluate the typeability, repeatability, and discriminatory power, 25 Arcobacter collection strains (Table 1) were cultivated in triplicate, and a cell suspension with an optical density of 1.5 measured at 610 nm with a biophotometer (Eppendorf AG, Hamburg, Germany) was prepared in 10 mL of phosphate buffered saline (PBS) (Sigma-Aldrich, Irvine, Ayrshire, UK). Plugs were prepared by adding the adjusted cell suspension $(400 \,\mu\text{L})$ in a sterile microcentrifuge tube containing $20 \,\mu\text{L}$ of a 20 mg/mL stock solution of proteinase K (Invitrogen, Carlsbad, CA), to which an equal volume of 1% SeaKem Gold agarose (Cambrex, Rockland, ME) was added. Plug slices were digested for 5 h at 37°C with 40 U of the different restriction enzymes in single digestion reactions. In order to assess the reproducibility, the 25 strains were recultivated twice at different points of time, and the corresponding fingerprints were compared.

Subsequently, 173 *Arcobacter* isolates, comprising the six human- and animal-related species and identified by an *Arcobacter* species-specific multiplex-PCR (Douidah *et al.*, 2010) were characterized with the validated PFGE protocol, using the most discriminatory restriction enzymes.

Comparison of different typing techniques

Preparation of DNA templates. The 25 collection strains and 173 *Arcobacter* isolates used in the validation of PFGE were cultivated as described above. A cell suspension of each strain with an optical density of 0.074 ± 0.002 (measured at 660 nm [Biophotometer, Eppendorf]), corresponding to approximately 10^7 colony-forming units/mL was prepared in 10 mL of PBS. Template DNA of each strain was extracted from a 0.5-mL cell suspension by the guanidinium thiocyanate method (Pitcher *et al.*, 1989). Five microliters of each DNA template was size separated by electrophoresis to evaluate their integrity. The concentration as well as the purity of each DNA template was determined spectrophotometrically. The DNA templates were adjusted to $50 \text{ ng}/\mu\text{L}$ and stored at -20°C until further analysis.

AFLP. For AFLP analysis, the validated protocol for *Arcobacter* species by Debruyne *et al.* (2010) was applied, using *Hind*III and *Hha*I as restriction enzymes (New England Biolabs Inc.) and analysis performed by capillary gel electrophoresis using an automated 16-capillary sequencer (3130xl Genetic Analyzer, Applied Biosystems, Carlsbad, CA).

ERIC-PCR. ERIC-PCR assay was exactly performed according to the previously validated protocol for *Arcobacter* by Houf *et al.* (2002).

Assessment of the in vitro genomic stability of A. butzleri and A. cryaerophilus

In a first experiment, the A. cryaerophilus strains LMG 9947 and LMG 9904^T, and four isolates—A. butzleri R643, A. cryaerophilus R637 and R671 from pig feces, and A. cryaerophilus R206 from human stool—were included. Strains were cultivated on Mueller-Hinton agar supplemented with 5% defibrinated horse blood at 30°C under microaerobic conditions for 48 h. One colony was picked and recultivated on Mueller-Hinton agar plates under the same conditions. To avoid subjective selection of specific colonies, further subcultivations were performed by picking a loopful of bacterial growth, striking them on blood plates, and incubating them at 30°C and 37°C, each under aerobic and microaerobic conditions. The strains were further subcultivated in the same way twice a week for 8 weeks (=16)passages). At the start and on even-numbered passages, PFGE was performed as described above. A second experiment was performed based on the results obtained in the first experiment but with an at-random selection of 10 A. butzleri and 8 A. crvaerophilus strains isolated from humans and pigs. as well as again strain R671. The strains were now cultivated for three generations at 30°C and 37°C under microaerobic conditions as described above and subsequently characterized by PFGE.

Data analysis. The PFGE and ERIC profiles were analyzed with GelCompar 3.0 (Applied Maths, Sint-Martems-Latem, Belgium). For PFGE, the Salmonella serovar Braenderup H9812 strain was restricted with XbaI enzyme and used as a molecular size standard. Computer-based normalization and interpolation of the ERIC-PCR profiles was performed using TrackItTM 100-bp DNA Ladder (Cat. No. 10488-058, Invitrogen). AFLP profiles were collected with the Data Collection software v 3.0 (Applied Maths). Profiles were imported in BioNumerics v 4.61 (Applied Maths) for further analysis using the CrvConv filter. Similarities between fingerprints were calculated using the Dice coefficient for PFGE, and Pearson correlation coefficient for ERIC-PCR. AFLP normalization was performed using the internal LIZ-600 standard, after which similarities between profiles were determined by the Pearson and product moment correlation coefficient. PFGE, ERIC, and AFLP dendrograms were constructed by numerical analysis of obtained profiles using the unweighted-pair group method using arithmetic means algorithm. Profiles were automatically assigned to groups according to (restriction) pattern similarities, which were visually controlled and edited if needed. The relationship between Arcobacter strains was expressed as a percentage of similarity.

Unrelated strains were included to compare the discriminatory ability of the three typing methods using the Simpson's index of diversity (Hunter and Gaston, 1988; Simpson, 1949). This index indicates the probability of two strains sampled randomly from a population belonging to two different types. Furthermore, the Adjusted Rand (*AR*) and the adjusted Wallace (*AW*) were calculated in order to compare the congruence between typing methods (Severiano *et al.*, 2011). Online tools were used for calculation of these indexes (http://darwin.phyloviz.net/ComparingPartitions/index.php? link = Tool#).

Results

Validation of PFGE

Besides the two restriction enzymes *EagI* and *KpnI* previously used in Arcobacter typing (Hume et al., 2001; Son et al., 2006), only the restriction enzymes NruI and StuI generated the required minimum of 10 and a maximum of 30 fragments after in silico restriction of the A. butzleri genome ATCC 49616 (van Belkum et al., 2007). In the characterization of the 25 Arcobacter collection strains, fingerprints for all strains were obtained with all enzymes, but the enzymes *EagI* and *StuI* were shown to be less discriminative, since for some strains low numbers of fragments (<5) were obtained (data not shown). Furthermore, they generated identical fingerprints for some strains of different Arcobacter species (data not shown). For further experiments, the restriction enzyme KpnI was selected as first choice as it generated an average number of 15.5 fragments (ranging from 10 to 30), in contrast to an average of 8 bands (ranging from 5 to 13) with the NruI (data not shown). Optimal analyses were achieved with PFGE carried out in a 1% SeaKem (wt/vol) gold agarose (Cambrex) in a PFGE apparatus (Bio-Rad, Hercules, CA) for 18 h with a pulse time of 6.676-13.68 s for KpnI (Son et al., 2006), and 5.2 s-42.3 s for NruI under a constant temperature of 14°C, a gradient of 6 V/cm, an angle of 120°, and a range of 30 kbp-400 kbp. A 100% repeatability and reproducibility of the PFGE protocol, both with KpnI and NruI, was obtained.

Comparison of different typing techniques

Similarities between fingerprints were calculated as described above, with an optimization of 1.0% and a position tolerance of 1.0% for PFGE. For ERIC-PCR, an optimization of 0.5% and 0.5% position tolerance was applied. Due to the high resolution of capillary migration, an optimization and a position tolerance of 0.01% was used for AFLP (Debruyne *et al.*, 2010).

All 198 Arcobacter collection strains and isolates could be characterized by ERIC-PCR and AFLP. With PFGE, no fragment patterns were obtained for one A. cryaerophilus, one A. skirrowii, and nine A. thereius isolates using restriction with both KpnI and NruI. The inability to type all Ar*cobacter* strains resulted in a 94.5% typeability for PFGE, to 100% for ERIC-PCR and AFLP. The discriminatory powers of the three typing methods were determined by calculating the Simpson's index of the unrelated A. butzleri and A. cryaerophilus isolates typed by these methods. Due to the large diversity of Arcobacter isolates, all three methods showed high discriminatory power, with a discriminatory index of 1. AR and AW coefficients were also calculated to explore the correlation between the typing methods; however, the same result of 1 was obtained. Weighing the results of the three typing methods for the unrelated Arcobacter isolates showed comparatively high discriminatory power, revealing no difference between the methods.

In general, ERIC-PCR generated the lowest number of bands with an average between 12 and 15 bands per profile for the six *Arcobacter* species, except for *A. thereius* and *A. trophiarum*, which generated in AFLP the lowest number of bands (i.e., six and nine bands per AFLP profile, respectively). The number of bands generated by PFGE and AFLP

ARCOBACTER TYPING AND STABILITY

was quite similar, except for *A. thereius* and *A. trophiarum*, as explained above. Cluster analysis per method of the DNA patterns showed no clear distinction at *Arcobacter* species level. A large heterogeneity between the isolates was observed, with related or identical strains clustering more closely with all three methods than nonrelated strains. However, no clear relationship between sources of origin or between isolates from animal and human origin was observed. Isolates with similar profiles generated by one method were compared with the corresponding profiles obtained by the other two typing methods. For *A. butzleri*, two isolates from the Italian outbreak (Vandamme *et al.*, 1992a) (LMG 10900 and 11120) with an identical PFGE profile also generated high similar (>97.57%) ERIC-PCR and AFLP profiles (Fig. 1A). Furthermore, two *A. skirrowii* isolated from the feces of related cows (R392, R393) showed similar PFGE profiles and highly similar AFLP (96.95% similarity), but less similar (>91%) ERIC-PCR profiles (Fig. 1B). The isolates R396 and R411, isolated from feces of cattle from the same farm, generated both ERIC-PCR and AFLP profiles that were more than 91%

PFGE Kpn A butleri LMG10900 Human A butleri LMG10900 Human A butleri LMG10900 Human A butleri LMG10900 Human A butleri LMG11120 Human Perso correlation (0pt 0596)[22 66-80 76] Correction (0pt 0 10%)[4 39-52 26][60 76-85 0%] Dece (0pt 1 0%)[7 1 1 0%-1 0%) Ib 0 0% S>0 0%)[16 2%-88 4%] Person correlation (0pt 0 5%)[22 6%-80 7%] Eric Per Feric Per	4	Dice (Opt: 1.00%) (Tol 1.0%-1.0%) (H>0.0% S>0.0%) [16.2%-88.4%]
A butzleri LMG10900 Human A butzleri LMG1120 Human Deceopti 1 00%) (1 a 1 0%-10%) (1 a 2%-88.4%) mean PFGE Kpn Frie Per A skirrowii R392 Feces Cattle A skirrowii R393 Feces Cattle A skirrowii R393 Feces Cattle A skirrowii R393 Feces Cattle A skirrowii R393 Feces Cattle Person correlation (Opt 0.01%) (1 3%-58.2%) (2 0%-80.7%) ML or ABL curves A skirrowii R392 Feces Cattle A skirrowii R393 Feces Cattle Person correlation (Opt 0.01%) (1 3%-58.2%) (2 0%-80.7%) ML or ABL curves A skirrowii R393 Feces Cattle Person correlation (Opt 0.01%) (1 3%-58.2%) (2 0%-80.7%) ML or ABL curves A skirrowii R393 Feces Cattle Person correlation (Opt 0.01%) (1 3%-58.2%) (2 0%-80.7%) ML or ABL curves A skirrowii R393 Feces Cattle Person correlation (Opt 0.01%) (1 3%-58.2%) (2 0%-80.7%) A skirrowii R393 Feces Cattle Person correlation (Opt 0.01%) (1 3%-58.2%) (2 0%-80.7%) ML or ABL curves A skirrowii R396 Feces Cattle Person correlation (Opt 0.01%) (1 3%-58.2%) (0 7%-80.7%) ML or ABL curves A skirrowii R396 Feces Cattle Person correlation (Opt 0.01%) (2 3%-80.7%) ML or ABL curves A skirrowii R396 Feces Cattle Person correlation (Opt 0.01%) (2 3%-80.7%) ML or ABL curves A skirrowii R396 Feces Cattle Person correlation (Opt 0.01%) (2 3%-58.2%) (0 7%-50.7%) ML or ABL curves A skirrowii R396 Feces Cattle A sk		PFGE Kpn
Person correlation (Opt 0.096) (2.2.6%-0.096) The Person correlation (Opt 0.096) (2.6%-0.096) (16.2%-0.8.6%) PFGE Kpn PFGE Kpn A skirrowii R392 Feces Cattle A skirrowii R393 Feces Cattle A skirrowii R393 Feces Cattle A skirrowii R393 Feces Cattle Person correlation (Opt 0.096) (16.2%-0.096) (16.2%-0.65.0%) R0, correlation (Opt 0.096) (16.2%-0.0		A. butzleri LMG10900 Human A. butzleri LMG11120 Human
Image: Second		Pearson correlation (Opt.0.50%) [22.0%-80.7%]
A butzleri LMG10900 Human A butzleri LMG1120 Human Person correlation (Opt 001%) (43%-59.2%] (42%-58.5%) A butzleri LMG10900 Human A butzleri LMG10900 H		Eric Pcr
Person correlation (QcD 001%) [43%+32.%] [60.7%+35.0%] Muminiper PFGE Kpn PFGE Kpn PFGE Kpn Fritze PGE Kpn Fritze PGE Kpn Fritze PGE Kpn A skirrowii R392 Feces Cattle A skirrowii R392 Feces Cattle A skirrowii R392 Feces Cattle Person correlation (QcD 0.01%) [4.3%+58.2%] [60.7%+35.0%] MU_enves A skirrowii R392 Feces Cattle Person correlation (QcD 0.01%) [4.3%+58.2%] [60.7%+35.0%] MU_enves A skirrowii R392 Feces Cattle Person correlation (QcD 0.01%) [4.3%+58.2%] [60.7%+35.0%] MU_enves A skirrowii R392 Feces Cattle Person correlation (QcD 0.01%) [4.3%+58.2%] [60.7%+35.0%] MU_enves A skirrowii R392 Feces Cattle Person correlation (QcD 0.01%) [4.3%+58.2%] [60.7%+35.0%] MU_enves A skirrowii R392 Feces Cattle Person correlation (QcD 0.01%) [4.3%+58.2%] [60.7%+35.0%] MU_enves A skirrowii R392 Feces Cattle Person correlation (QcD 0.01%) [4.3%+58.2%] [60.7%+35.0%] MU_enves A skirrowii R393 Feces Cattle Person correlation (QcD 0.01%) [4.3%+58.2%] [60.7%+35.0%] MU_enves A skirrowii R395 Feces Cattle Person correlation (QcD 0.01%) [4.3%+58.2%] [60.7%+55.0%] MU_enves A skirrowii R396 Feces Cattle Person correlation (QcD 0.01%) [4.3%+58.2%] A skirrowii R396 Feces Cattle Person correlation (QcD 0.01%) [4.3%+58.2%] [60.7%+55.0%] Mu enves A skirrowii R396 Feces Cattle A skirrowii R311 Feces Cattle A skirrowii R411 Feces Cattle A skirrowii R411 Feces Cattle		A. butzleri LMG10900 Human A. butzleri LMG1120 Human
A buttleri LMG10900 Human A buttleri LMG1090 H		Pearson correlation (Opt 0.01%) [4, 3%-58.2%] [60.7%-85.0%]
A butleri LMG10900 Human A butleri LMG11120 Human A butleri LMG10900 Human A butleri LMG11120 Human A butleri LMG11120 Human A butleri LMG10900 Human A butleri LMG10900 Human A butleri LMG10900 Human A butleri LMG1090 Human		ADI_CUrves
Dice (Opt: 100%) (To 1 10%-10%) (H>0.0% S>0.0%) [16.2%-88.4%] Present correlation (Opt: 0.50%) [22.6%-80.7%] The correlation (Opt: 0.50%) [4.3%-58.2%] [60.7%-85.0%] All_curves The correlation (Opt: 0.50%) [16.2%-88.4%] The correlation (Opt: 0.50%) [16.2%-80.4%] The correlation (Opt: 0.50%) [16.2%-80.4%] The correlation (O		A. butzleri LMG10900 Human A. butzleri LMG11120 Human
A. skirrowii R392 Feces Cattle A. skirrowii R393 Feces Cattle Pearson correlation (Opt. 0.50%) [22.8%+80.7%] A. skirrowii R392 Feces Cattle Pearson correlation (Opt. 0.50%) [22.8%+80.7%] A. skirrowii R393 Feces Cattle Pearson correlation (Opt. 0.1%) [4.3%+58.2%] [60.7%+85.0%] A. skirrowii R392 Feces Cattle Pearson correlation (Opt. 0.0%) [62.6%8.6%] A. skirrowii R392 Feces Cattle Pearson correlation (Opt. 0.0%) [62.6%8.6%] A. skirrowii R393 Feces Cattle Dise (Opt. 10%) (Tol.10%-10%) (ED.0%-50.0%] [62.6%8.6%] A. skirrowii R393 Feces Cattle Piarson correlation (Opt.0.0%) [2.6%-80.7%] FFCE Kpn A. skirrowii R396 Feces Cattle Piarson correlation (Opt.0.0%) [2.6%-80.7%] Fic Pcr A. skirrowii R396 Feces Cattle Piarson correlation (Opt.0.0%) [2.6%-80.7%] A. skirrowii R396 Feces Cattle Piarson correlation (Opt.0.0%) [2.6%-80.7%] A. skirrowii R396 Feces Cattle Piarson correlation (Opt.	3	Dice (Opt:1.00%) (Tol 1.0%-1.0%) (H>0.0% S>0.0%) [16.2%-88.4%]
Pearson correlation (Opt 0.50%) [22.6%-80.7%] Teric Pcr		A. skirrowii R392 Feces Cattle A. skirrowii R393 Feces Cattle
Bit Mining Conversion (Opt 0.01%) [4.3%-58.2%] [60.7%-85.0%] ABL_curves A. skirrowii R.392 Feces Cattle Pearson correlation (Opt 0.01%) [4.3%-58.2%] [60.7%-85.0%] ABL_curves A. skirrowii R.392 Feces Cattle Pierson correlation (Opt 0.01%) [4.3%-58.2%] [60.7%-85.0%] ABL_curves A. skirrowii R.392 Feces Cattle Dise (Opt 1.0%) (Tol 10%-10%) (ED-0% S>0.0%) [162%-88.4%] A. skirrowii R.393 Feces Cattle Parson correlation (Opt 0.0%) (ED-0% S>0.0%) [162%-88.4%] Person correlation (Opt 0.0%) (ED-0% S>0.0%) [162%-88.4%] A. skirrowii R.396 Feces Cattle Parson correlation (Opt 0.0%) (ED-0% S>0.0%) [162%-88.4%] Person correlation (Opt 0.0%) (ED-0% S>0.0%) [162%-88.4%] A. skirrowii R.396 Feces Cattle Person correlation (Opt 0.0%) (ED-0% S>0.0%) [162%-88.4%] A. skirrowii R.396 Feces Cattle Person correlation (Opt 0.0%) (ED-0.0% S>0.0%] A. skirrowii R.396 Feces Cattle Person correlation (Opt 0.01%) (43%-58.2%) [60.7%-65.0%] A. skirrowii R.396 Feces Cattle Person correlation (Opt 0.01%) (43%-58.2%) [60.7%-65.0%] A. skirrowii R.396 Fe		Pearson correlation (Opt: 0.50%) [22.6%-80.7%]
A. skirrowii R392 Feces Cattle A. skirrowii R393 Feces Cattle Pearson correlation (Opt. 0.01%) [4.3%-58.2%] [60.7%-85.0%] ABI_curves A. skirrowii R392 Feces Cattle ABI_curves ABI_curves A. skirrowii R392 Feces Cattle Diee(Opt.10%)(Tol.10%-10%)(B>0.% 5>0.0%)[16.2%-88.4%] A. skirrowii R393 Feces Cattle Diee(Opt.10%)(Tol.10%-10%)(B>0.% 5>0.0%)[16.2%-88.4%] A. skirrowii R396 Feces Cattle Person correlation (Opt.050%)[12.6%-80.7%] Eric Per A. skirrowii R396 Feces Cattle Pearson correlation (Opt.00%)[4.3%-58.2%][60.7%-85.0%] A. skirrowii R396 Feces Cattle Person correlation (Opt.00%)[4.3%-58.2%][60.7%-85.0%] A. skirrowii R396 Feces Cattle		BIG PAY Eric Pcr
Pearson correlation (Opt 0.01%) [4.3%-58.2%] [60.7%-85.0%] ABL_curves ABL_curves A. skirrowii R392 Feces Cattle Dice (Opt 1.0%)(Tol 1.0%-1.0%)(Tol 0.0% S>0.0%)[16.2%-88.4%] Ferror PFGE Kpn A. skirrowii R396 Feces Cattle Pearson correlation (Opt 0.01%) [4.3%-58.2%] [60.7%-85.0%] Ferror correlation (Opt 0.01%) [4.3%-58.2%] [60.7%-85.0%] All curves A. skirrowii R396 Feces Cattle Pearson correlation (Opt 0.01%) [4.3%-58.2%] [60.7%-85.0%] All curves A. skirrowii R396 Feces Cattle A. skirrowii R411 Feces Cattle A. skirrowii R41		A. skirrowii R392 Feces Cattle A. skirrowii R393 Feces Cattle
ABI_curves ABI_curves \$\$		- Pearson correlation (Opt:0.01%) [4.3%-58.2%] [60.7%-85.0%]
Pure A. skirrowii R392 Feces Cattle Dice (Opt 1 00%)(Tol 1 0%-1 0%)(HD 0 0% SD 0 0%)[162%+88.4%] A. skirrowii R393 Feces Cattle Dice (Opt 1 00%)(Tol 1 0%-1 0%)(HD 0 0% SD 0 0%)[162%+88.4%] PFGE Kpn A. skirrowii R396 Feces Cattle Pearson correlation (Opt 0 50%)[22.0%+80.7%] Fric Pcr A. skirrowii R396 Feces Cattle Pearson correlation (Opt 0 01%)[4 3%-58.2%][60.7%+85.0%] A. skirrowii R396 Feces Cattle Pearson correlation (Opt 0 01%)[4 3%-58.2%][60.7%+85.0%] A. skirrowii R396 Feces Cattle		ABI_curves ABI_curves
Dice (Opt:1.00%) (Tol 1.0%-1.0%) (E>0.0% S>0.0%) [162%+88.4%] WTT- PFGE Kpn A. skirrowii R396 Feces Cattle A. skirrowii R411 Feces Cattle Pearson correlation (Opt 0.50%) [22.6%+80.7%] Eric Pcr A. skirrowii R396 Feces Cattle A. skirrowii R396 Feces Cattle A. skirrowii R396 Feces Cattle A. skirrowii R396 Feces Cattle A. skirrowii R411 Feces Cattle		A. skirrowii R392 Feces Cattle A. skirrowii R393 Feces Cattle A. skirrowii R393 Feces Cattle
A.skirrowii R396 Feces Cattle A.skirrowii R411 Feces Cattle Pearson correlation (Opt 0.50%) [22.6%-80.7%] BY: Eric Per A.skirrowii R396 Feces Cattle A.skirrowii R411 Feces Cattle A.skirrowii R411 Feces Cattle A.skirrowii R411 Feces Cattle A.skirrowii R411 Feces Cattle A.skirrowii R396 Feces Cattle	;	Dice (Opt: 1.00%)(Tol 1.0%-1.0%)(H>0.0% S>0.0%)[16.2%-88.4%]
Pearson correlation (Opt 0.50%) [22.6%+80.7%] By: Eric Pcr A.skirrowii R396 Feces Cattle A.skirrowii R411 Feces Cattle A.skirrowii R396 Feces Cattle A.skirrowii R411 Feces Cattle		A.skirrowii R396 Feces Cattle A.skirrowii R411 Feces Cattle
Pearson correlation (Opt 0.01%) [4 3%-58.2%] [60 7%-85.0%] ABI_curves ABI_curves A.skirrowii R396 Feces Cattle A.skirrowii R396 Feces Cattle A.skirrowii R396 Feces Cattle A.skirrowii R396 Feces Cattle		Pearson correlation (Opt 0 50%) [22.6%-80.7%]
Askirrowii R396 Feces Cattle Pearson correlation (Opt 0.01%)[4.3%-58.2%][60.7%-85.0%] ABL_curves ABL_curves Askirrowii R396 Feces Cattle Askirrowii R396 Feces Cattle		Eric Pcr
Pearson correlation (Opt 0.01%) [4.3%-58.2%] [60.7%-85.0%] ABI_curves ABI_curves		A.skirrowii R396 Feces Cattle A.skirrowii R411 Feces Cattle
ABI_curves x x x ABI_curves A.skirrowii R396 Feces Cattle A.skirrowii R411 Feces Cattle		Pearson correlation (Opt. 0.01%) [4 3%-58 2%] [60.7%-85.0%]
A.skirrowii R396 Feces Cattle A.skirrowii R411 Feces Cattle		ABI_curves
		A.skirrowii R396 Feces Cattle A.skirrowii R411 Feces Cattle

FIG. 1. Comparison of PFGE, ERIC-PCR, and AFLP patterns of different Arcobacter species.

	Dice (Ont: 1.00%)(Tol 1.0%-1.0%)(H>0.0% S>0.0%)[16.2%-84.0%]		
υ	PFGE Kpn . PFGE Kpn		
	A thereius	A31 Feces	Pig
	A thereius	A6 Feces	Pig
	A. thereius	A27 Feces	Pig
	A. thereius	A20 Feces	pig
1	Pearson correlation (Opt 0 50%) [22.0%-80.7%]		
	EntePer 2 2 Eric Per		
- 28	A thereins	A27 Feces	Pig
	A thereius	A31 Feces	Pig
ſ	A thereius	A6 Feces	Dig
l	A thereins	A0 Feees	nig
	A merenis	A20 reces	pig
	Pearson correlation (Opt.0.01%) [4.3%-58.2%] [60.7%-85.0%]		
	ABI_curves ABI_curves		
		127 E.m.	Dia
	A. merenis	A27 Fece	s Pig
	A. there us	A6 Fece	s Pig
	A. thereius	A20 Fece	s pig
	A. thereius	A31 Fece	s Pig
F	Dice (Opt: 1 00%) (Tol 1 0%-1 0%) (H>0 0% S>0 0%) [16 2%-88 4%]		
	PEGE Knn		
	A thereius	A46 Fece	s Pig
	A thereius	A49 Fece	s Pig
	A thereius 4 thereius	th4 Fece	s Pig
		44 1000	
	Pearson correlation (Opt 0.50%) [22. 6%-80.7%]		
	Eric Per		
			D *
	A thereius A thereius	A49 Fece	s Pig
	A thereius A thereius	th4 Fece	s Pig
	A thereius	A46 Fece	s Pig
- 1	Pearson correlation (Opt 0.01%) [4.3%-58.2%] [60.7%-85.0%]		-
- 1	ABI_curves ABI_curves		
9			1223
	A thereius	A46 Fece	s Pig
Ĩ	A merenis A thereius	A34 Fece	s Pig
	A thereius A thereius	th4 Fece	s Pig
- 33			
E	Dice (Opt: 1.00%) (Tol 1.0%-1.0%) (H>0.0% S>0.0%) [16.2%-88.4%]		
* 3	PFGF Knn		
- 24	I FOE KM		
ſ	A. butzleri R279 I	eces Pi	g
l	A. butzleri R280 H	eces Ph	g
	P. 001-001 K1/0 1	cces m	0150
1	Berler Berler		
	Eric Per		
	A hut-lari R270	Facas D	ia
	A buttleri R280	Feces P	12
- 11	A. butzleri R176	Feces H	lorse
- 84	Pearson correlation (Opt 0.01%) [4.3%-58.2%] [60.7%-85.0%]		
- 34	All curves 8 ABI curves		
8			
- 34	A. butzleri R279	Feces P	'ng
	A. butzleri R280	reces P	lor
9	A. butzieri K1/6	reces F	torse

FIG. 1. (Continued)



FIG. 1. (Continued)

and 93% similar, respectively. In contrast, PFGE patterns showed only 85% similarity (Fig. 1C).

Examining four closely related A. thereius isolates (A6, A20, A27, and A31) from pig feces, PFGE showed profiles with more than 96% similarity (Fig. 1D) (De Smet et al., 2011). The isolates A20 and A27 generated different PFGE profiles in comparison to the other profiles, due to the presence of an additional band. In AFLP, all four isolates were similar when applying a 96% cut-off value. In addition, isolates A27 and A6 generated more than 99.5% similar AFLP patterns. In contrast to the PFGE and AFLP patterns, ERIC-PCR analyses showed a similarity of 95% for isolates A27 and A31, but a lower similarity between those two and isolates A6 and A20 (Fig. 1D). Also for the related A. thereius isolates A46, A49, and A54 from pig feces (De Smet et al., 2011), identical PFGE profiles were obtained, and ERIC-PCR and AFLP discriminated them at a 98% and 95% similarity level, respectively. Although a similarity of 97.8% was observed with isolate Th4 by ERIC-PCR, both AFLP and PFGE profiles showed a discordance for the same isolate compared to the A46, A49, and A54 profile (<85%) (Fig. 1E).

A. butzleri R176 and R280, isolated from horse and pig feces, respectively, generated PFGE profiles with less than 70% similarity, while more than 97% similarity was obtained by AFLP and ERIC analyses (Fig. 1F). *A. trophiarum* strains with highly similar PFGE profiles (96.8%; strains R490, R497) showed almost 90% and 95% similarity by ERIC-PCR and AFLP, respectively (Fig. 1G).

Assessment of the in vitro genomic stability of A. butzleri and A. cryaerophilus

The genomic stability of six *Arcobacter* strains was evaluated by PFGE after 16 subcultivations under two different temperature and two oxygen conditions. In general, PFGE profiles of all strains were identical throughout the experiment under aerobic conditions both at 30°C and 37°C. However, variations in PFGE profiles were seen under microaerobic conditions at 37°C, except for *A. butzleri* R643 and *A. cryaerophilus* LMG 9904T (data not shown). From passage 4 on, an additional band in *A. cryaerophilus* strain R206 and a displacement of a single fragment in



FIG. 2. UPGMA dendrograms from PFGE profiles using restriction with *KpnI* showing the assessment of the *in vitro* genomic stability of *A. cryaerophilus* strain (LMG 9947) isolated from bovine fetus.

A. cryaerophilus strain R637 were detected. For strain LMG 9947, two bands disappeared while a smaller band became visible from passage 12 on (Fig. 2). From passage 2 on, a large band disappeared and an additional smaller band became visible in the profiles of *A. cryaerophilus* strain R671 at 37°C, both under microaerobic and aerobic conditions. The strains showing changing PFGE patterns were also screened by ERIC-PCR, but no differences in ERIC-PCR profiles could be observed.

This first experiment showed that exposure to environmental conditions of 30°C and 37°C together with microaerobic oxygen levels can induce changes in PFGE patterns. To assess whether this genomic instability already occurs at earlier passages, 10 *A. butzleri* and 8 *A. cryaerophilus* strains were cultivated for 3 generations at 30°C or 37°C under microaerobic conditions. No variations in band profiles were obtained for any of the *A. butzleri* strains (data not shown). With *A. cryaerophilus*, identical fingerprints were obtained for all strains, except for strain R861, where in both passages identical PFGE profiles at 30°C were obtained, while two new PFGE profiles were generated at 37°C, with a difference of five and seven bands on passages 1 and 3, respectively (data not shown).

Discussion

In the present study, the molecular typing methods ERIC-PCR, PFGE, and AFLP were compared in their ability with six *Arcobacter* species for the first time. Analysis of a set of 198 *Arcobacter* isolates confirmed once again the large strain diversity existing in the six *Arcobacter* species. No correlation between typing patterns from strains isolated from humans, animals, or food was noticed. These findings are similar to those in the multilocus sequence typing study, where no association with either host or geographical source was observed (Miller *et al.*, 2009).

In general, with a limited number of isolates to be characterized and taking into account the recommendations by van Belkum et al. (2007), PFGE with restriction by KpnI is proposed as the first method of choice. When identical fragments for apparently unrelated isolates occur, a second PFGE analysis with the restriction enzyme NruI is recommended. The reason no fingerprints were obtained for some strains could be due to an excessive restriction by endogenous endonucleases or by DNA methylation activities (van Belkum et al., 2007). However, as PFGE is time consuming and labor intensive, ERIC-PCR represents a more convenient genomic fingerprinting technique, and has already been used for a limited number of species in the past (Houf et al., 2002; Aydin et al., 2007) and in an A. butzleri outbreak investigation (Vandamme et al., 1993). This method has the advantage of being rapid and easy to perform compared to the other two typing methods. The reproducibility of this method is often questioned, though, as shown in previous studies, the fingerprints as such cannot be exchanged but the interpretation is reliable. Nevertheless, delineation of genotypes or strains remains challenging when PCR-based methods are applied. No guidelines for genotype delineation have been proposed, and a fixed percentage above which isolates are considered identical is not possible. Within each fingerprint cluster generated by PCR-based methods, three classes of fingerprints are obtained: isolates clearly

different, isolates clearly identical, and a group of fingerprints with minor variations in the presence or intensity of some amplicons. The intensity of the amplicons is often not interlaboratory reproducible, in contrast to their presence or absence (Houf *et al.*, 2002; Van Driessche *et al.*, 2004; Van Driessche *et al.*, 2005). Therefore, in the case that genotype delineation is strictly necessary, isolates differing in one or two amplicons in PCR-generated fingerprints should be further examined by PFGE.

Though analysis by AFLP generates comparable results as obtained by ERIC-PCR, it is more expensive, demands specific equipment, and has been shown to be less discriminative for both *A. thereius* and *A. trophiarum*, and therefore, less recommended for *Arcobacter* typing.

In the present study, genomic instability due to in vitro manipulation was only observed in some strains of A. cryaerophilus, especially under microaerobic conditions at 37°C, partly explaining the enormous heterogeneity reported in this species. During transmission and the colonization of the intestinal tract of humans and animals, Arcobacter undergoes different stress factors comparable to those in the experiments, such as temperature and oxygen concentration. The Arcobacter genome seems to be exposed to relatively rapid genomic changes in vitro, but data on in vivo conditions, as performed for *Campylobacter* (Wassenaar et al., 1998; Ridley et al., 2008; Leblanc-Maridor et al., 2011), are lacking. One should keep in mind that these differences in profiles were not picked up by ERIC-PCR, meaning that the variation in PFGE profiles are probably caused by (point) mutations. Nevertheless, the present study showed once again that the large heterogeneity is not artificial or completely induced by laboratory actions of the typing methods applied. This still leaves the question on the origin of this diversity and the impact on epidemiological studies. Genetic alteration, if occurring in vivo, may explain the high diversity of Arcobacter present in different hosts. This variation may be caused by mutations or rearrangements in genes that are needed under stress conditions, which may increase the survival capacity of Arcobacter, but this hypothesis needs confirmation in future studies.

Disclosure Statement

No competing financial interests exist.

References

- Aydin F, Gumussoy KS, Atabay HI, Ica T, Abay S. Prevalence and distribution of *Arcobacter* species in various sources in Turkey and molecular analysis of isolated strains by ERIC-PCR. J Appl Microbiol 2007;103:27–35.
- Debruyne L, Houf K, Douidah L, De Smet S, Vandamme P. Reassessment of the taxonomy of *Arcobacter cryaerophilus*. Syst Appl Microbiol 2010;33:7–14.
- De Smet S, De Zutter L, Debruyne L, Vangroenweghe F, Vandamme P, Houf K. Arcobacter population dynamics in pigs on farrow-to-finish farms. Appl Environ Microb 2011;77:1732– 1738.
- Douidah L, De Zutter L, Vandamme P, Houf K. Identification of five human and mammal associated *Arcobacter* species by a novel multiplex-PCR assay. J Microbiol Meth 2010;80:281–286.
- Fera MT, La CE, Carbone M, Malara D, Pennisi MG. Pet cats as carriers of *Arcobacter* spp. in Southern Italy. J Appl Microbiol 2009;106:1661–1666.

ARCOBACTER TYPING AND STABILITY

- Fernandez H, Krause S, Villanueva MP. *Arcobacter butzleri* an emerging enteropathogen: Communication of two cases with chronic diarrhea. Braz J Microbiol 2004;35:216–218.
- Giacometti F, Lucchi A, Manfreda G, Florio D, Zanoni RG, Serraino A. Occurrence and genetic diversity of *Arcobacter butzleri* in an artisanal dairy plant in Italy. Appl Environ Microbiol 2013;79:6665–6669.
- Ho HTK, Lipman LJA, Gaastra W. *Arcobacter*, what is known and unknown about a potential foodborne zoonotic agent! Vet Microbiol 2006;115:1–13.
- Houf K, De Smet S, Bare J, Daminet S. Dogs as carriers of the emerging pathogen *Arcobacter*. Vet Microbiol 2008;130: 208–213.
- Houf K, De Zutter L, Van Hoof J, Vandamme P. Assessment of the genetic diversity among arcobacters isolated from poultry products by using two PCR-based typing methods. Appl Environ Microb 2002;68:2172–2178.
- Houf K, Devriese LA, De Zutter L, Van Hoof J, Vandamme P. Susceptibility of Arcobacter butzleri, Arcobacter cryaerophilus, and Arcobacter skirrowii to antimicrobial agents used in selective media. J Clin Microbiol 2001;39:1654–1656.
- Houf K, Devriese LA, De Zutter L, Van Hoof J, Vandamme P. Development of a new protocol for the isolation and quantification of Arcobacter species from poultry products. Int J Food Microbiol 2001;71:189–196.
- Houf K, Stephan R. Isolation and characterization of the emerging foodborne pathogen *Arcobacter* from human stool. J Microbiol Meth 2007;68:408–413.
- Hsueh PR, Teng LJ, Yang PC, Wang SK, Chang SC, Ho SW, Hsieh WC, Luh KT. Bacteremia caused by *Arcobacter cryaerophilus* 1B. J Clin Microbiol 1997;35:489–491.
- Hume ME, Harvey RB, Stanker LH, Droleskey RE, Poole TL, Zhang HB. Genotypic variation among *Arcobacter* isolates from a farrow-to-finish swine facility. J Food Protect 2001;64:645–651.
- Hunter PR, Gaston MA. Numerical index of the discriminatory ability of typing systems: An application of Simpson's index of diversity. J Clin Microbiol 1988;26: 2465–2466.
- Jacob J, Woodward D, Feuerpfeil I, Johnson WM. Isolation of Arcobacter butzleri in raw water and drinking water treatment plants in Germany. ZBL Hyg Umweltmed 1998;201: 189–198.
- Kalendar R, Lee D, Schulman AH. Java web tools for PCR, *in silico* PCR, and oligonucleotide assembly and analysis. Genomics 2011;98:137–144.
- Kiehlbauch JA, Brenner DJ, Nicholson MA, Baker CN, Patton CM, Steigerwalt AG, Wachsmuth IK. *Campylobacter butzleri* sp. nov. isolated from humans and animals with diarrheal illness. J Clin Microbiol 1991;29:376–385.
- Lau SKP, Woo PC, Teng JL, Leung KW, Yuen KY. Identification by 16S ribosomal RNA gene sequencing of *Arcobacter butzleri* bacteraemia in a patient with acute gangrenous appendicitis. Mol Pathol 2002;55:182–185.
- Leblanc-Maridor M, Denis M, Chidaine B, Rossero A, Seegers H, Beaudeau F, Bello C. Genetic instability of *Campylobacter coli* in the digestive tract of experimentally infected pigs. Vet Microbiol 2011;154:171–179.
- Miller WG, Parker CT, Rubenfield M, Mendz GL, Wosten MM, Ussery DW, Stolz JF, Binnewies TT, Hallin PF, Wang G, Malek JA, Rogosin A, Stanker LH, Mandrell RE. The complete genome sequence and analysis of the epsilonproteobacterium *Arcobacter butzleri*. PLoS ONE 2007;2:e1358.

- Miller WG, Wesley IV, On SLW, Houf K, Megraud F, Wang GL, Yee E, Srijan A, Mason CJ. First multi-locus sequence typing scheme for *Arcobacter* spp. BMC Microbiol 2009;9:196.
- On SLW, Stacey A, Smyth J. Isolation of *Arcobacter butzleri* from a neonate with bacteremia. J Infect 1995; 31:225–227.
- Pitcher DG, Saunders NA, Owen RJ. Rapid extraction of bacterial genomic DNA with guanidium thiocyanate. Lett Appl Microbiol 1989;8:151–156.
- Ridley AM, Toszeghy MJ, Cawthraw SA, Wassenaar TM, Newell DG. Genetic instability is associated with changes in the colonization potential of *Campylobacter jejuni* in the avian intestine. J Appl Microbiol 2008;105:95–104.
- Severiano A, Pinto FR, Ramirez M, Carrico JA. Adjusted Wallace coefficient as a measure of congruence between typing methods. J Clin Microbiol 2011;49:3997–4000.
- Simpson EH. Measurement of species diversity. Nature 1949;163:688.
- Son I, Englen MD, Berrang ME, Fedorka-Cray PJ, Harrison MA. Genetic diversity of *Arcobacter* and *Campylobacter* on broiler carcasses during processing. J Food Prot 2006;69: 1028–1033.
- van Belkum A, Tassios PT, Dijkshoorn L, Haeggman S, Cookson B, Fry NK, Fussing V, Green J, Feil E, Gerner-Smidt P, Brisse S, Struelens M. Guidelines for the validation and application of typing methods for use in bacterial epidemiology. Clin Microbiol Infec 2007;13:1–46.
- Vandamme P, Giesendorf BAJ, Vanbelkum A, Pierard D, Lauwers S, Kersters K, Butzler JP, Goossens H, Quint WGV. Discrimination of epidemic and sporadic isolates of *Arcobacter butzleri* by polymerase chain reaction-mediated DNAfingerprinting. J Clin Microbiol 1993;31:3317–3319.
- Vandamme P, Pugina P, Benzi G, Vanetterijck R, Vlaes L, Kersters K, Butzler JP, Lior H, Lauwers S. Outbreak of recurrent abdominal cramps associated with *Arcobacter butzleri* in an Italian school. J Clin Microbiol 1992a;30:2335–2337.
- Vandamme P, Vancanneyt M, Pot B, Mels L, Hoste B, Dewettinck D, Vlaes L, Vandenborre C, Higgins R, Hommez J, Kersters K, Butzler JP, Goossens H. Polyphasic taxonomic study of the emended genus Arcobacter with Arcobacter butzleri comb-nov and Arcobacter skirrowii sp-nov, an aerotolerant bacterium isolated from veterinary specimens. Int J Syst Bacteriol 1992b;42:344–356.
- Vandenberg O, Dediste A, Houf K, Ibekwem S, Souayah H, Cadranel S, Douat N, Zissis G, Butzler JP, Vandamme P. *Arcobacter* species in humans. Emerg Infect Dis 2004;10: 1863–1867.
- Van Driessche E, Houf K, Van Hoof J, De Zutter L, Vandamme P. Isolation of *Arcobacter* species from animal feces. FEMS Microbiol Lett 2003;229:243–248.
- Van Driessche E, Houf K, Vangroenweghe F, De Zutter L, Van Hoof J. Prevalence, enumeration and strain variation of *Arcobacter* species in the faeces of healthy cattle in Belgium. Vet Microbiol 2005;105:149–154.
- Van Driessche E, Houf K, Vangroenweghe F, Nollet N, De Zutter L, Vandamme P, Van Hoof J. Occurrence and strain diversity of *Arcobacter* species isolated from healthy Belgian pigs. Res Microbiol 2004;155:662–666.
- Van Driessche E, Houf K. Characterization of the Arcobacter contamination on Belgian pork carcasses and raw retail pork. Int J Food Microbiol 2007;118:20–26.
- Wassenaar TM, Geilhausen B, Newell DG. Evidence of genomic instability in *Campylobacter jejuni* isolated from poultry. Appl Environ Microb 1998;64:1816–1821.

DOUIDAH ET AL.

- Woo PC, Chong KT, Leung KW, Que T, Yuen K. Identification of *Arcobacter cryaerophilus* isolated from a traffic accident victim with bacteremia by 16S ribosomal RNA gene sequencing. Diagn Microbiol Infect Dis 2001;40:125–127.
- Wybo I, Breynaert J, Lauwers S, Lindenburg F, Houf K. Isolation of *Arcobacter skirrowii* from a patient with chronic diarrhea. J Clin Microbiol 2004;42:1851–1852.
- Yan JJ, Ko WC, Huang AH, Chen HM, Jin YT, Wu JJ. *Arcobacter butzleri* bacteremia in a patient with liver cirrhosis. J Formos Med Assoc 2000;99:166–169.

Address correspondence to: Kurt Houf, PhD Department of Veterinary Public Health and Food Safety Faculty of Veterinary Medicine Ghent University Salisburylaan 133 9820 Merelbeke, Belgium

E-mail: Kurt.Houf@UGent.be