3

4 5

6

DETECTION OF PLASMID-MEDIATED AmpC BETA-LACTAMASE ENZYME AMONG Escherichia coli ISOLATES IN LIVESTOCK.

ABSTRACT

AmpC beta-lactamases are bacterial enzymes that hydrolyse third generation extended 7 spectrum cephalosporins and cephamycins engendering resistance to these categories 8 of antibiotic and is a serious threat to the currently available antibiotic armory both in 9 10 human and veterinary medicine. In this study, the detection of AmpC beta-lactamaseproducing E. coli in some common livestock animals was studied. A total of 196 11 faecal samples were aseptically collected from cattle, chicken, goat and swine from 12 different parts of Uyo Metropolis into sterile universal containers. Samples were 13 processed by inoculating onto macConkey agar using streak plate technique and 14 incubated at 37°C for 18-24 hours after which growth were identified using standard 15 identification procedures. Susceptibility profile of each of the identified E. coli isolate 16 17 to some antibiotics was determined using the agar disk diffusion method. Resistant E. coli isolates to third and fourth generation cephalosporins were screened to detect 18 ESBL producers using the modified double disk synergy test while AmpC beta-19 lactamse production was done by the modified disk test. The result shows that out of a 20 21 total number of 123 E. coli isolates, 55.68% were potential ESBL producers while 30.68% were confirmed to be AmpC producers. The highest percentage of 5.37% 22 came from Chicken, while the least percentage of 3.23% was from Pig and Goat 23 respectively. The result of this study shows the presence of AmpC beta-lactamase 24 producing E. coli in all the groups of animal tested. Therefore, improved surveillance 25 26 of antibiotic use and antibiotic-resistant bacteria in farm animals should be given an urgent attention. Application of biosecurity and hygiene programs in the livestock 27 28 breeding sector should be considered as a favorable effect on the restriction transfer of 29 antibiotic resistance

- 30
- 31 32

Keywords: Detection, ESBL, AmpC, Escherichia coli, Livestock

33 34

3536 INTRODUCTION

37

Antibiotic resistance among microorganisms is a major problem, both in human and in the 38 39 livestock industry. The persistent exposure of bacterial strains to a multitude of β -lactams 40 antibiotics has induced dynamic and continuous production and mutation of certain enzymes in these bacteria, thereby expanding their activity against the newly developed B-lactam 41 antibiotics. These enzymes are known as extended-spectrum β -lactamases (ESBL)^{1,2}. This 42 problem is further compounded by the over-expression of another type of enzyme that 43 44 preferentially hydrolyzes narrow-, broad-, and expanded-spectrum cephalosporins and cephamycins. They are also capable of resisting inhibition by clavulanate, sulbactam, and 45 tazobactam. These enzymes are referred to as AmpC β-lactamases. AmpC β-lactamases are 46 clinically important cephalosporinases encoded on the chromosome of many 47

Enterobacteriaceae and a few other organisms where they mediate resistance to cephalothin, 48 49 cefazolin, cefoxitin, most penicillins, and β -lactamase inhibitor/ β -lactam combinations. In many bacteria, AmpC enzymes are inducible and can be expressed at high levels by mutation. 50 Over-expression confers resistance to broad-spectrum cephalosporins including cefotaxime, 51 ceftazidime, and ceftriaxone. Transmissible plasmids have acquired genes for AmpC 52 53 enzymes, which consequently can now appear in bacteria lacking or poorly expressing a chromosomal blaAmpC gene, such as Escherichia coli, Klebsiella pneumoniae, and Proteus 54 55 mirabilis. AmpC enzymes encoded by both chromosomal and plasmid genes are also 56 evolving to hydrolyze broad-spectrum cephalosporins more efficiently.

57 Many clinical laboratories currently test *Escherichia coli* for production of extended-58 spectrum β -lactamases (ESBLs) but do not attempt to detect plasmid-mediated AmpC β -59 lactamases probably because the available phenotypic tests are either inconvenient, 50 subjective, or require reagents that are not readily available^{3,4}.

In Nigeria livestock industry, the occurrence of β-lactamase-producing E. coli has been 61 broadly recognized in veterinary medicine, e.g. as causative agents for mastitis in dairy 62 cattle⁵. This problem is becoming very rampart, because they are often encountered in routine 63 diagnoses of disease conditions brought for confirmatory diagnosis in microbiology 64 diagnostic units of some Tertiary Veterinary Teaching Hospitals⁵. There are only few studies 65 in South-South Nigeria that investigated the prevalence of β -lactamase-producing bacteria in 66 livestock. The risk of zoonotic transfer from livestock to people with close contact to these 67 68 animals is still largely unknown, but some studies have implicated a transfer of ESBLproducing *E. coli* or ESBL genes from poultry or pigs to farm workers^{6,7}. Besides this direct 69 zoonotic transfer, other routes as foods of animal origin may be a risk factor for human 70 colonization or infection⁸. It is therefore this potential transfer of extended spectrum β -71 72 lactamases from animal pathogens to strains that could pose a risk for human health that is 73 among the most important challenges arising from the global problem with antimicrobial 74 resistance.

Therefore, the aims and objectives of this study is to detect the presence of AmpC β lactamase enzyme among *E. coli* resistant isolates obtained from Cattle, Goat, Poultry and Swine.

78

79

80 MATERIALS AND METHODS

81 Collection of Samples: A total of 196 fresh faecal samples from different parts of Uyo 82 Metropolis in Akwa Ibom State, Nigeria were randomly and aseptically collected from cattle, 83 chicken, goat and swine into sterile universal containers from January 2017 to March 2017. 84 They were transported to Medical Microbiology and Parasitology laboratory of the 85 University of Uyo Teaching Hospital and stored at 4°C until when required for processing.

Processing of Samples: One gram of the faecal samples was emulsified in 5ml of sterile saline before inoculating by streak plate method on MacConkey agar (Oxoid, UK) and incubated at 37°C for 18–24 hours after which they were examined for growth. From the growth pattern of the organisms observed on the agar plate, distinct smooth, glossy rose-pink lactose fermenting colonies presumed to be *E.coli* were selected and subjected to identification procedures according to standard taxonomic identification schemes of Cowan⁹.

92 Determination of Antimicrobial Susceptibility Profile

93 The susceptibility profile of each of the identified *E.coli* isolates to some selected antibiotics

94 was determined using the agar disk diffusion method as per the recommendation of Clinical

and Laboratory Standards Institute, CLSI¹⁰. The following antibiotics were used;

96 cefotaxime(30µg), cefpodoxime(30µg), ceftrioxone(30µg), ceftazidime(30µg),

- 97 cefepime(30μg), cephoxitin(30μg), Gentamicin(10μg), ciprofloxacin(5μg),
- norfloxacin(10µg), nitrofurantoin(100µg), cotrimoxazole(25µg), and imipenem(10µg). All
- 99 the antibiotic discs were procured from Oxoid. The bacterial inoculum was prepared by
- suspending freshly grown bacteria in 5ml of sterile peptone water. The suspension was
- adjusted to achieve a turbidity equivalent to 0.5 McFarland turbidity standards after which the
- inoculated peptone water was poured onto Mueller Hinton (MH) agar plates and the excess
- drained out. The plates were allowed to dry and appropriate antibiotic disks were aseptically
- placed on the agar plate surface using sterile forceps. The plates were then incubated at 37°C
- for 18-24hours. Diameter of zone of inhibition was determined using the Kirby Bauer test method as described by Willey *et al*¹¹.
- 107 **Chromogenic Agar culture:** Few colonies of the *E. coli* isolates that exhibited resistance to 108 third and fourth generation cephalosporins were homogenized in 1ml of sterile physiological 109 saline (0.85%), and 50 μ l aliquots of the resulting suspension were inoculated onto 110 chromogenic ESBL-Bx agar which was prepared from the dehydrated medium according to 111 the manufacturer's instructions and incubated in ambient air at 37°C for 18 to 24h. After the 112 optimal incubation period, specific coloration enhanced by the chromogenic media indicates 113 the presence of ESBL production.
- 114

115 Screening for Extended Spectrum Beta-Lactamase Production

116 The *E. coli* isolates that exhibited ESBL production and resistance to third and fourth 117 generation cephalosporins were further screened by the modified double disk synergy test to 118 detect ESBL producers.

- Modified Double Disc Synergy Test: This was performed by using amoxicillin-clavulanate 119 (20/10µg) disc along with four cephalosporins; third generation-cefotaxime, ceftriaxone, 120 121 cefpodoxime and fourth generation-cefepime. Briefly, the test isolates were cultured on a Mueller-Hinton agar plate. A disc which contained amoxicillin-clavulanate (20/10µg) was 122 123 placed in the centre of the plate. The discs of cefotaxime, ceftriaxone, and cefpodoxime, were placed 15mm and that of cefepime, 20mm apart, centre to centre to that of the amoxicillin-124 125 clavulanate disc (Paterson and Bonomo, 2005). Any distortion or increase in the inhibition 126 zone towards the disc of amoxicillin-clavulanate was considered positive for ESBL 127 production.
- **AmpC Enzyme Production:** Isolates that exhibited significant synergistic effect with only 128 cefepime in the modified double disc synergy test (MDDST) were further tested for AmpC 129 enzyme production using the modified disc test. The test is based on the use of Tris-EDTA to 130 permeabilize a bacterial cell and release β -lactamases into the external environment. This was 131 done as modified by Kaur et al^{12} . Briefly, sterile plain 6mm disks were punched from 132 Whatmann filter paper and AmpC disks prepared by applying 20ul of a 1:1 mixture of saline 133 134 and Tris-EDTA to the disks. The disks were allowed to dry, and were stored at between 2 to 8°C. Suspension of standard E. coli ATCC 25922 equivalents to 0.5 McFarland turbidity 135 136 standards was prepared and inoculated on a Mueller-Hinton agar plate. A 30ug cephoxitin 137 disc was placed on the inoculated agar surface.
- Prior to use, the prepared AmpC disks were rehydrated with 20µl of saline before being inoculated with several colonies of the test isolates. This was placed beside the cephoxitin disc and the plates incubated at 37°C for 18-24 hours. The plates were examined for either an indentation or a flattening of the zone of inhibition, which indicates the enzyme inactivation of cephoxitin as a positive result, or absence of distortion, indicating no significant inactivation of cephoxitin as negative result.
- 144
- 145

146 **RESULTS**

A total of 196 faecal samples obtained from 4 different livestock were collected and analyzed 147 out of which 23.98% were obtained from cattle, 26.53% from chicken and goat respectively 148 149 while 22.96% were from pig (Table 1). One hundred and twenty three E. coli isolates were 150 harvested out of the total faecal samples analysed. Samples obtained from cattle and chicken each yielded 13.27% and 18.87% respectively, those obtained from goat yielded 16.33% 151 while 14.29% were from samples obtained from Pig making a total of 62.76%. Of the 123 E. 152 153 *coli* isolates obtained, 71.5% exhibited resistance to third and fourth generation 154 cephalosporins. On further testing for ESBL production by the Modified Double Disc Synergy test (MDDST), 55.68% were ESBL producers out of which 12.5% were positive for 155 156 AmpC co-production by the AmpC disc test while the remaining 43.18% were only ESBL producers. The highest percentage of 4.55% was however seen among isolates obtained from 157 158 Pig followed by 3.41% from Chicken while Goat and Cattle each yielded 2.27% respectively 159 (Table 2).

160 DISCUSSION

161 Extended Spectrum Beta-Lactamases (ESBLs) constitute a serious threat to the β -lactam 162 therapy. Resistance against β -lactam antibiotics is increasingly being reported and is on the 163 rise in *Enterobacteriaceae* from both humans and animals. Due to the difficulty in their 164 detection by the current clinical methods available in most laboratories, many of these strains 165 have been falsely reported to be susceptible to the widely used broad-spectrum β -lactams¹³.

166 The result of this study shows the presence of ESBL producing E. coli in all the group of 167 animals tested. A study conducted in Germany sought the presence of ESBL-producing E. coli in different dairy cattle, beef cattle and mixed farms (both dairy and beef). The results 168 showed a high prevalence of different types of ESBLs¹⁴. The first reports of ESBL-producing 169 bacteria from poultry were performed in Spain. E. coli strains isolated from faecal samples of 170 healthy and sick poultry were found to harbor various types of ESBL genes¹⁵. Similarly, 171 antimicrobial resistance in commensal Enterobacteriaceae from pigs were also confirmed in 172 some Danish farms, where some ESBL producing E. coli strains were recovered from faeces 173 of pigs¹⁶. Generally, animals and birds represent potential sources of spread of multidrug-174 resistant bacteria. This is as a result of the fact that the ESBL-encoding genes are often 175 carried on plasmids, which can easily be transferred between isolates, bearing additional 176 resistance determinants for other classes of antimicrobial agents, mainly fluoroquinolones, 177 178 aminoglycosides and sulfonamides, contributing to the multidrug-resistant phenotype.

This study also indicates that out of the 123 E. coli isolates obtained, 55.68% were ESBL 179 producers while 12.5% possess additional ability for AmpC production. This is in agreement 180 with Kaur et al¹² who got 63.4% ESBL producers out of which 5.4% were AmpC producers. 181 In this study, AmpC production has the highest prevalence of 4.55% among isolates obtained 182 from Pig. This may be related to the use of antibiotics in pig production as previously shown 183 by Jorgensen *et al*¹⁶ who, in their earlier study, confirmed that the use of beta-lactam 184 antibiotics, especially cephalosporins, might be one of the factors for the selection of 185 ESBL/AmpC-producing bacteria in pigs. Also Carattoli et al¹⁷ demonstrated that certain beta-186 lactams, including amoxicillin, used in pig production select for *bla*CTX-M-producing *E. coli* 187 strains in the intestinal flora of pigs. In addition, non-beta-lactam antibiotics might play a role 188 in the selection of beta-lactamase genes. The need for ESBL testing in the AmpC-producing 189 190 species of *Enterobacteriacae* cannot be over-emphasized. In the presence of AmpC, along 191 with ESBL in the gram negative organisms, the DDST may not show positivity, as the AmpC 192 type of β -lactamase inhibits the action of clavulanate. Hence, it obscures the synergistic effect

of clavulanic acid and the third generation cephalosporins which are used. The possible approaches for overcoming the difficulty in the ESBL detection in the presence of AmpC include the use of tazobactam or sulbactam, which are much less likely to induce the AmpC β -lactamases and are therefore the preferable inhibitors of the ESBL detection tests with these organisms or testing cefepime as an ESBL detection agent¹⁸.

198 Unusually high incidence of ESBLs should be a cause of concern to the regulators of the 199 antibiotic policy. Nowadays, over reliance on third generation cephalosporins to treat gram 200 negative infections is one of the prime factors responsible for increased resistance to this 201 class of antibiotics.

202 Generally, intensive application of antibiotics in livestock husbandry increases the abundance 203 of extended-spectrum β -lactamase-producing Enterobacteriaceae in animals and in consequence in their manure¹⁹. This is confirmed by the presence of ESBL- and AmpC-204 producing E. coli in manure from livestock husbandry that was reported by Hartmann et al^{20} 205 and Snow *et al*²¹. The problem remains that even though the occurrence of ESBL-producing 206 bacteria has been broadly recognized in veterinary medicine, as causative agents for different 207 infections in dairy cattle¹⁵, only a few studies exist which investigates the prevalence of 208 ESBL- and AmpC producing bacteria in Nigerian livestock, showing their existence in sick 209 and healthy cattle, pig and poultry farms. This confirms the fact that the risk of zoonotic 210 211 transfer from livestock to people with close contact to these animals is still largely unknown. However, some studies have implicated a transfer of ESBL producing E. coli or ESBL genes 212 from poultry or pigs to farm workers^{6,7}. One of the greatest challenges in the routine 213 susceptibility test done by clinical laboratories is that it normally fails to detect ESBL 214 215 positive strains hence the phenotypic confirmatory test is highly indispensable in the 216 detection ESBLs.

217 One important fact remains that normal but resistant bacterial microflora in animals and other 218 zoonotic intestinal bacteria could infect humans more frequently through direct contact and 219 also, through animal foodstuffs. These resistant bacteria species could also colonize humans 220 and transfer genes of resistance to other members of the bacterial normal microflora. They 221 could provoke infections and could also be regarded as a main reservoir of resistance genes. 222 Therefore, the rapid dissemination of resistance genes via mobile gene elements increases the 223 risk and creates prerequisites for more complications from a therapeutic point of view, with 224 special emphasis on professionals groups associated with animal care, farmers, veterinarians 225 at farms, slaughterhouse workers and other people engaged in animal foodstuff processing.

226

227 CONCLUSION

228 Improved surveillance of antibiotic use and antibiotic-resistant bacteria in farm animals is a 229 serious issue that requires an urgent attention. Therefore, some important initiatives have to 230 be taken in this regard especially in relation to antibiotic sales data. Countries should 231 routinely monitor levels of antibiotic resistance in farm animals and on retail meat as most of 232 them represents data for monitoring programs for antimicrobial resistance. International 233 governments require cooperation to establish an international antimicrobial resistance 234 surveillance monitoring program and monitor the antimicrobial resistance trends in human 235 and animals for a long time. Both the benefit and risk outcomes of this exercise should be 236 considered into the risk assessment and management. On the other hand, application of 237 biosecurity and hygiene programs in intensive sector of livestock breeding would be a favorable effect on the restriction transfer of antibiotic resistance. Finally, to find a good 238 239 strategy to control antimicrobial resistance, it is necessary to consider the chemotherapeutic 240 medicine, microbiology and agricultural environment and fully understand molecular basis 241 involved in the emergence of antimicrobial resistance.

REFERENCES

243 244 245 246	1.	Pitout, J. D. D, Laupland K. B. Extended-spectrum beta-lactamase-producing Enterobacteriaceae: an emerging public-health concern. <i>Lancet Infectious Diseases</i> . 2008; 8(3):159–66.
247 248 249	2.	Paterson, D. L., Bonomo, R. A. Extended spectrum β -lactamases: a clinical update. Clin Microbiol Rev. 2005; 18(4)657-86
250 251 252 253	3.	Nasim, K., Elsayed, S., Pitout, J. D., Conly, J., Church, D. L., and Gregson, D. B.(2004). New method for laboratory detection of AmpC β-lactamases in <i>Escherichia coli</i> and <i>Klebsiella pneumoniae</i> . J. Clin. Microbiol. 42: 4799–4802
255 254 255 256 257	4.	Black, J. A., K. S. Thomson, and J. D. Pitout. (2004). Use of β-lactamase inhibitors in disk tests to detect plasmid-mediated AmpC β-lactamases. <i>J. Clin. Microbiol.</i> 42:2203–2206.
258 259 260 261 262	5.	Ogunleye, A. O., Oyekunle, M. A. and Sonibare, A. O. Multidrug resistant <i>Escherichia coli</i> isolates of poultry origin in Abeokuta, South Western Nigeria, <i>Veterinarski Arhiv</i> , vol. 78, no. 6, pp. 501–509, 2008.
263 264 265 266 267	6.	Dierikx, C., van der Goot, J., Fabri, T., van Essen-Zandbergen, A., Smith, H., Mevius, D. (2013). Extended-spectrum beta-lactamase- and AmpC-beta-lactamase-producing <i>Escherichia coli</i> in Dutch broilers and broiler farmers. <i>J Antimicrob Chemother</i> ; 68(1):60–7.
268 269 270 271 272 273	7.	Huijbers, P. M., Graat, E. A., Haenen, A. P., van Santen, M. G., van Essen-Zandbergen, A., Mevius, D. J, <i>et al</i> (2014). Extended-spectrum and AmpC beta-lactamase-producing <i>Escherichia coli</i> in broilers and people living and/or working on broiler farms: prevalence, risk factors and molecular characteristics. <i>J Antimicrob Chemother</i> ; 69(10):2669–75.
274 275 276 277 278	8.	Leistner, R., Meyer, E., Gastmeier, P., Pfeifer, Y., Eller, C., Dem, P., <i>et al.</i> Risk factors associated with the community-acquired colonization of extended-spectrum beta-lactamase (ESBL) positive Escherichia Coli. An exploratory case-control study. <i>PLoS One.</i> 2013; 8(9):e74323.
279 280 281	9.	Cowan, S.T., Steel, K.J., 1985. <i>Manual for the Identification of Medical Bacteria (4th Edition)</i> . Cambridge University Press. London. 217p.
282 283 284 285	10.	Clinical and Laboratory Standards Institute. 2010. Performance standards for antimicrobial susceptibility testing; 20th informational supplement. M100–S20. Clinical and Laboratory Standards Institute, Wayne, PA.
286 287 288	11.	Willey. M, Sherwood. M, Woolverton. J. (2011). Mechanisms of multidrug resistance in bacteria. <i>Prescott, Harley and Klein's microbiology</i> . 8 th edn 849-853.

289 290 291	 Kaur, M., Aggarwal, A. Occurrence of the CTX-M, SHV and the TEM Genes among the Extended Spectrum beta-Lactamase Producing Isolates of Enterobacteriaceae in a Tertiary Care Hospital of North India. <i>J Clin Diagn Res.</i> 2013; 7(4): 642–645.
292 293 294 205	 MacKenzie, F. M, Miller, F. M. C. A, Gould, I. M. Comparison of screening methods for TEM and SHV derived ESBL detection. <i>Clin Microbiol Infect.</i> 2002; 8:715-24.
295 296 297 298 299 300	 Schmid, A., Hormansdorfer, S., Messelhausser, U., Kasbohrer, A., Sauter-Louis, C., Mansfeld, R. Prevalence of extended-spectrum beta-lactamase-producing <i>Escherichia</i> <i>coli</i> on bavarian dairy and beef cattle farms. <i>Appl Environ Microbiol</i>. 2013; 79(9):3027–32.
301 302 303 304 305	 Brinas, L., Moreno, M. A., Zarazaga, M., Porrero, C., Saenz, Y., Garcia, M., <i>et al.</i> (2003). Detection of CMY-2, CTX-M-14, and SHV-12 beta-lactamases in <i>Escherichia coli</i> fecal-sample isolates from healthy chickens. <i>Antimicrob Agents Chemother</i>; 47(6): 2056–8.
306 307 308 309	 Jorgensen, C.J., Cavac, o L.M., Hasman, H., Emborg, H.D., Guardabassi, L.: Occurrence of CTX-M-1 producing <i>E. coli</i> in pigs treated with ceftiofur. <i>J.</i> <i>Antimicrobial Chemotherapy</i> 2007, 59, 1040-1042.
310 311 312	17. Carattoli A. Animal reservoirs for extended spectrum beta-lactamase producers. <i>Clin</i> <i>Microbiol Infect.</i> 2008;14:117–23.
313 314 315	 Manchanda, V., Singh, N. P. Occurrence and detection of AmpC β-lactamases among gram negative clinical isolates using a modified three-dimensional test at Guru Tegh Bhadur Hospital, Delhi, India. <i>J Antimicrob Chemother</i>. 2003; 51:415-18.
316 317 318 319 320 221	 Friese, A., Schulz, J., Laube, H., von Salviati, C., Hartung, J., Roesler, U (2013). Faecal occurrence and emissions of livestock-associated methicillin-resistant <i>Staphylococcus aureus</i> (laMRSA) and ESBL/AmpC-producing from animal farms in Germany. <i>Berl Munch Tierarztl Wochenschr</i>; 126(3–4): 175–180.
322 323 324	 Hartmann, A., Locatelli, A., Amoureux, L., Depret, G., Jolivet, C., Gueneau, E, <i>et al.</i>, (2012). Occurrence of CTX-M producing <i>Escherichia coli</i> in soils, cattle, and farm environment in France (Burgundy Region). <i>Front Microbiol</i>; 3: 83.
325 326 327 328 329	21. Snow, L. C., Warner, R. G., Cheney, T., Wearing, H., Stokes, M., Harris, K, et al. (2012). Risk factors associated with extended spectrum beta-lactamase <i>Escherichia</i> <i>coli</i> (CTX-M) on dairy farms in North West England and North Wales. <i>Prev Vet Med</i> ; 106(3–4): 225–234.
330 331	
332 333 334	
335 336 227	
33/	

Source of	Sample No. of Samp collected	oles No.(%) of <i>E. coli</i> isolated	
Cattle	35	18(13.27)	
Chicken	40	29(18.87) 25(16.33)	
Goat	40		
Pig	33	21(14.29)	
TOTAL	196	123(62.76)	
Table 2: E	CSBL and <i>AmpC</i> produ	ncing <i>E. coli</i> Isolates (n=88)	
Table 2: E Source of ESBL	ESBL and <i>AmpC</i> produ No.(%) of potential ESBL	icing <i>E. coli</i> Isolates (n=88) No.(%) of ESBL & AmpC No.(%) of only Sample producing isolates	
Table 2: E Source of ESBL producing i	ESBL and <i>AmpC</i> produ No.(%) of potential ESBL solates produci	ncing <i>E. coli</i> Isolates (n=88) No.(%) of ESBL & AmpC No.(%) of only Sample producing isolates ing isolates	
Table 2: F Source of ESBL producing i Cattle	ESBL and <i>AmpC</i> production No.(%) of potential ESBL solates production 10(11.36)	Icing E. coli Isolates (n=88)No.(%) of ESBL & AmpCNo.(%) of ESBL & AmpCSampleproducing isolatesing isolates2(2.27)8(9.09)	
Table 2: ESource ofESBLproducing iCattleChicken	ESBL and <i>AmpC</i> production No.(%) of potential ESBL solates production 10(11.36) 13(14.78)	acing E. coli Isolates (n=88)No.(%) of ESBL & AmpCNo.(%) of onlySampleproducing isolatesing isolates2(2.27)3(3.41)10(11.36)	
Table 2: ESource ofESBLproducing iCattleChickenGoat	ESBL and AmpC product No.(%) of potential ESBL solates product 10(11.36) 13(14.78) 10(11.36)	Icing E. coli Isolates (n=88) No.(%) of ESBL & AmpC No.(%) of only producing isolates Ing isolates 2(2.27) 3(3.41) 10(11.36) 2(2.27) 6(6.82)	
Table 2: E Source of ESBL producing i Cattle Chicken Goat Pig	CSBL and AmpC production No.(%) of potential ESBL solates production solates production 10(11.36) 13(14.78) 10(11.36) 10(11.36) 16(18.18) </td <td>acing E. coli Isolates (n=88) No.(%) of ESBL & AmpC No.(%) of only producing isolates Sample producing isolates 2(2.27) 8(9.09) 3(3.41) 10(11.36) 2(2.27) 6(6.82) 4(4.55) 14(15.91)</td>	acing E. coli Isolates (n=88) No.(%) of ESBL & AmpC No.(%) of only producing isolates Sample producing isolates 2(2.27) 8(9.09) 3(3.41) 10(11.36) 2(2.27) 6(6.82) 4(4.55) 14(15.91)	

338 Table 1: Sources of *Escherichia coli* Isolates