

Review Paper

Intestinal Infections of Campylobacter: A review

ABSTRACT

Campylobacter are Gram negative bacteria, ubiquitous, found in the gastrointestinal tract of warm blooded animals, including poultry and also in their nature. The most dominant species is *Campylobacter jejuni*, followed by *Campylobacter coli*. For a long time, these bacteria have been known as a pathogen of foodborne infections in the worldwide. The most cases of campylobacteriosis, which have been observed in many countries, are sporadic with a seasonal peak during the summer. Usually, the disease is benign and self-limited, manifested by fever, abdominal pain and diarrhea. Often accompanied by blood in the stools, which requires antimicrobial therapy for children, elderly and immunocompromised, but rarely for adults.

This review aims to give an overview of the historical approaches, properties, sources and different ways of transmissions of Campylobacter spp. also clarifying its pathogenesis, its treatment and the prevention against these bacteria.

Keywords: *Campylobacter jejuni*; *Campylobacter coli*; campylobacteriosis; foodborne infections; poultry.

1. INTRODUCTION

Each year, more than 14 pathogens kill humans around the world, where foodborne diseases account for a significant proportion. Campylobacteriosis affects more than 2.4 million people worldwide each year [1]. The genus Campylobacter is in the first class of infectious agents of food poisoning in the European Union (EU) [2] and the third in the United States after Salmonella and *Escherichia coli* O157[3].

Campylobacteriosis is one of the most commonly reported diseases of foodborne illness in the EU, where *C. jejuni* and *C. coli* are the most dominated species. In 2012, the number of confirmed cases was 214,268 with an incidence rate of 64.8 per 100,000 inhabitants [4]. Indeed, the EU loses more than €2.4 billion per year due to Campylobacter genus, which presents an extensive challenge related to food security and economy as well [5].

In Morocco, in the laboratories of agri-food sector and the medical laboratories, the research of Campylobacter in foods hasn't done yet as a systematic process. In addition, several studies show that foreign tourists suffer from campylobacteriosis during their visit in Morocco [6]. In this context, the present work aims to give an overview of the historical approaches of Campylobacter, its properties, its sources and its various modes of transmission, also showing its pathogenicity, its treatment and prevention against these infectious agents.

2. HISTORY OF TAXONOMY

The genus *Campylobacter* has been recognized for hundreds years, its first observation has been made by a pediatrician Theodor Escherich in German children suffering from diarrhea and suspected of having infantile cholera [7].

In 1906, John McFadyean and Stewart Stockman succeeded in isolating bacteria resembling to those isolated by Theodor from the fetal mucus of aborted sheep [8]. Seven years later, the two scientists had cultivated these microorganisms for the first time. Because of their spiral shape, Smith added these microorganisms in 1918 to *Vibrio* group and identified these bacteria as *Vibrio fetus* which is known today as *C. fetus* [9].

In 1957, Elizabeth King's work on the growth and metabolic profile of these bacteria led to differentiate them from the *Vibrio* genus and called "Related *Vibrio*" [10]. As early as, in 1963, the "Related *Vibrio*" was definitively separated from the *Vibrio* genus and took a new genus named *Campylobacter* (curved bacillus), since the composition of Guanine-Cytosine is different from that of *Vibrio* and because that *Campylobacter* do not assimilate sugars [11].

The year 1972, in Belgium, marks the success of the microbiology team who isolated *Campylobacter* from a child's stool using the filtration method. In 1977, Skirrow described a simple technique for the direct isolation of *Campylobacter* on a selective blood agar and incubated at 43 °C in a microaerophilic atmosphere [12].

Following the great success of *Campylobacter* isolation methods, several studies have focused on the development of selective culture media for *Campylobacter* spp. [13]. Since the 1970s, both *C. jejuni* and *C. coli* have been the most frequently observed in millions cases of humans campylobacteriosis [8].

At the beginning of the 20th century, in 2001, the first sequencing of *C. jejuni* strain NCTC 11168 revealed several mysteries of *Campylobacter* [14]. This is why the taxonomy of *Campylobacter* and related organisms has been amended on molecular databases.

Nowadays, the genus *Campylobacter* belongs to the class of Epsilonproteobacteria, order Campylobacterales. This bacterial genus with *Arcobacter* and *Sulfospirillum* forms the Campylobacteriaceae family, with 25 species and 8 subspecies of the genus *Campylobacter* [15, 16].

3. PROPERTIES OF CAMPYLOBACTER GENUS

Campylobacter spp. in young culture are typically Gram-negative, non-sporulating, comma-shaped, or helical bacilli when clustered in long chain. These bacteria have a diameter of 0.2 to 0.5 µm in width and 0.5 to 5 µm in length with one or more flagella at the ends. Or flagella are two to three times longer than the cell. This morphological character gives them a special motility, described as corkscrew shape except *C. gracilis* [17]. After several days of culture, the bacillus transforms to spherical or coccoid shape of 0.5 micrometer [18].

65 3.1. GENOME

66 Sequencing of the microbial genomes of Campylobacter members shows the existence of a small
67 circular chromosome of 1.641.481 base pairs of which 30.6% is composed of guanine and cytosine
68 [G + C] containing several well-known regulatory systems [19]. Admittedly, *C. jejuni* comprises at
69 least one circular plasmid, which contains genes of resistance to antibiotics and the size of each one
70 differs from species to another. In addition, Campylobacter plasmids share homologous sequences
71 [20].

72 Several studies have shown that the genome of *C. jejuni* exhibits a high degree of plasticity and
73 genetic rearrangements [21]. Indeed, the analysis of the genetic profiles of the homologous
74 sequences of *C. jejuni* isolated from humans and those isolated from animals, showed the
75 conservation of some proteins while others are absent [22]. This instability is explained by the
76 absence of DNA repair.

77 3.2. Origin and Habitat

78 Several studies have shown the presence of Campylobacter spp. in human and animals in multiple
79 organs [8, 16]. The first strains isolated were linked to a disease observed in humans and cattle.
80 Moreover, these bacteria have a particular tropism for the digestive tract of animals, some strain
81 colonize the intestines of homeothermic animals including poultry as a main reservoir [21]. These
82 species are mainly *C. jejuni* and *C. coli* which are related to gastroenteric in humans and isolated from
83 their stool. While, *C. fetus* is also considered pathogenic, responsible for abortions in cattle and
84 isolated from human blood [23].

85 Other reservoirs have been described such as cattle, pigs, small ruminants, but also pets (cats, dogs
86 and hamsters). Because of the asymptomatic aspect of these microorganisms in digestive tract of
87 warm-blooded animals, excreta can contaminate soils and rivers [24]. Because of contaminated
88 surface water by animal feces, Campylobacters can survive in these untreated waters by binding to
89 an intermediate hosts such as protozoa [25].

90 The strain adaption in the environment is preferential, which reveal a unique survival conditions
91 through hypervariable sequences [19]. For example, hypervariable regions PR1 contain important
92 genes used as alternative electron acceptors for respiration and may confer to strains a selective
93 advantage in restricted oxygen environments. However, PR2, 3 and 7 contain abundantly outer
94 membrane proteins and hypothetical proteins of unknown function, some of which may be related to
95 phenotypic variation and adaptation to different ecological niches [21].

96 3.3. Biochemical Characteristics

97 Biochemically, these microorganisms have positive oxidase, catalase and nitrate reductase. In
98 contrast to the Voges-Proskauer reaction, methyl red, urease and indole production which are
99 negative, as well as the absence of production of dihydrogen sulfide on "Triple Sugar Iron ". In
100 addition, Campylobacter are unable to utilize glucose in Hugh and Leifson's medium either by the
101 fermentative or by the oxidative pathway, due to the absence of the phosphofructokinase [26].

Instead, bacteria draw energy through the use of the Embden-Meyerhof-Parnas pathway and by catabolizing amino acids such as L-aspartate, L-glutamate, L-serine and L-proline or by tricarboxylic acids cycle [27].

Campylobacter is microaerophilic by reason of requirement of an atmosphere enriched with CO₂. Generally, the gaseous mixture suitable for cultivation *in vitro* is 5% dioxygen (O₂); 10% carbon dioxide (CO₂) and 85% molecular nitrogen (N₂). Nevertheless, some species may tolerate aerobic conditions although others tend towards anaerobiosis [28].

The blood is added in culture media in order to detoxify potentially harmful compounds due to the presence of catalase and superoxide dismutase [29]. In fact, these microorganisms are extremely sensitive to the free radicals formed during the respiratory chain (nitrite, nitric oxide and sulfite). Thus, the addition of blood, charcoal, ferrous sulphate, sodium metabisulphite and sodium pyruvate to culture media will improve the aerotolerance [16].

The species of Campylobacter have a slow growth compared to the enteric flora, their optimum pH is 6.5-7.5. The temperature of growth is a limiting factor that influences the survival of these species whose optimum is 37 °C, but never at 25 °C with the exception of *C. fetus* [30].

3.4. Viable But Non-Cultivable Colony

The concept of a viable but non-culturable colony (VBNC) is described as an adaptive form to degeneration and resistance when conditions of survival become unfavorable [31].

C. jejuni is fragile and sensitive to many environmental factors, including atmospheric oxygen, drying, nutrient deficiency, disinfectants, extreme pH, freezing and heating [32]. During exposure to these stress conditions, the cells become damaged and slow down its metabolic activities until they gradually become coccoid [18]. For now, the process of reviving cell to its infectious form is not clear yet [33].

4. TRANSMISSION

Campylobacter are commensal microorganisms in the intestines of healthy animals, especially poultry that are heavily involved [30]. In reality, healthy birds often excrete Campylobacter species in stools including *C. jejuni*. The origin of the first infection of Campylobacter reservoirs is probably related to the environment, soil and contaminated surface water [24].

Moreover, due to the redundancy of these bacteria in the chicken ceaca (between 10⁶ and 10⁸ colony forming units per gram) and the asymptomatic aspect [34], the contamination of their surroundings occurs very fast, even if the researchers suppose that some organisms of *C. jejuni* cause colonization in 80% of birds [35]. However, birds are infected with *C. jejuni* only from the second or third week of life; this is possibly related to specific maternal antibodies present at first period [36].

Two main modes of transmission of Campylobacter are suggested in humans. First, direct contact with reservoirs which causes a relatively rare infection among farmers, health workers, nurseries and slaughterhouse workers. [37] In fact, contact with livestock, surfaces and handling materials of

animals at risk or with infected patients cannot be negligible [38]. Second, indirect transmission is frequently due to a food vector. Carcass contamination occurs during evisceration when there is ceaca rupture or contact with excreta, resulting cross-contamination through slaughterhouses and food industries [39].

In developed countries, the consumption of raw or half-cooked chickens are the most involved sources in the transmission of these zoonotic microorganisms in humans [8]. In addition to food sources, transmission in developing countries is supplemented by untreated surface water, direct contact with animals of company and environment.

5. PATHOGENICITY

The chemotaxis of epithelial cells, adherence and invasion of mucus are the crucial stages in an intestinal bacterial infection. In fact, the authors agree that the presence of lipopolysaccharides and lipooligosaccharides on bacterial membranes provides a wide variety of structural and functional roles in host-pathogen interactions and surface adhesion to translocation of factors of virulence.

In the stomach, *C. jejuni* and *C. coli* survive due to the presence of the capsule. However, the motility is facilitated by the presence of flagella, matter how these bacteria move to the small intestine to the target organs; colon, ileum and jejunum. After successful colonization of the intestinal mucosa, *C. jejuni* adheres to the enterocytes. Indeed, adhesion is a multifactorial process in which multiple binding factors are necessary to bind to protein receptors during efficient interaction with host cells (BPE1, FLPA, CADF, JlpA and CapA) [39].

The pathogenicity of certain strains is related to the secretion of a thermolabile enterotoxin inducing direct cytotoxicity, in particular by *C. jejuni*, *C. lari*, *C. coli*, *C. fetus* and *C. upsaliensis* [40]. Moreover, the cytolethal distending toxin (CDT) is formed by CdtABC complex, made up of three subunits: CdtA, CdtB and CdtC. In the intestines, Campylobacter strain produces the toxin and causes destruction of the endothelial cells via the heat produced by this endotoxin. The CdtA and CdtC subunits are responsible for binding connection with target cell, while the CdtB subunit and with the interaction of the other two subunits (CdtA and CdtC) induces the activation of enzymatic complex which attacks the target cell, DNA of the intestinal cells and recruits proteins kinases in order to stop the cell cycle [40, 41]. As a result, cells of the intestinal mucosa die through the apoptosis process and the infected patient manifests as watery or often bloody diarrhea.

6. CAMPYLOBACTERIOSIS

The majority of Campylobacter infections are caused by two species of *C. jejuni* and *C. coli*. Between 500-800 colonies forming units of *C. jejuni* can cause disease in children, the elderly or immunocompromised [42].

According to the clinical picture, the human infections are sporadic and rarely reportable. In adults, abdominal pain, fever and headaches are the clinical signs that precede diarrhea for several hours and occasionally these diarrhea are accompanied by nausea and vomiting [43]. These symptoms occur between 2 and 5 days after infection, but may persist for up to 10 days. The endothelial cells

vacuolate *C. jejuni*. However, this microorganism sometimes resists to lysosomal degradation via the production of catalase. Subsequently, *C. jejuni* is found on the basolateral surface of endothelial cells and undergoes exocytosis. *C. jejuni* causes extra-intestinal infections and therefore leads to long-term complications, including septicemia, meningitis, pancreatitis, abortion of pregnant women, reactive arthritis, Guillain-Barré syndrome, Miller Fisher syndrome [43] etc...

Guilain-Barré syndrome (GBS) and Miller Fisher syndrome (SMF) are acute autoimmune diseases of the most declarable peripheral systems worldwide [44], which result from the secondary localization of *Campylobacter* in the systemic circulation. Because of the structural similarity between the lipo-oligosaccharides of *C. jejuni* and the glycoforms of human brain gangliosides, *C. jejuni* exhibits molecular mimicry with gangliosides since the synthesis of anti-lipo-oligosaccharide and anti-gangliosides antibodies attacks the self-antigen and bacterial cells, so the patient suffers from weakness or paralysis after several weeks of the initial disease [45].

Except *C. fetus* which causes abortions in cattle and humans [9], the most of *Campylobacter* genus are rarely pathogenic to their animal reservoirs [30].

7. TREATMENT

The gastroenteritis induced by *C. jejuni* is self-limiting for one week or less and does not require antimicrobial treatment. In order to treat a patient, it is essential to replace water and electrolytes lost by liquids. In general, oral rehydration is sufficient, but intravenous rehydration may be necessary in cases of severe dehydration, especially in children, elderly patients and pregnant women with severe electrolyte abnormalities or severe anemia and blood during diarrhea.

The use of antibiotics to treat campylobacteriosis is appropriate in cases involving high fever, bloody diarrhea or in immunocompromised patients. Indeed, the use of erythromycin or other molecules of the class of quinolones and fluoroquinolones reduces the duration of the symptoms when they are administered in early stage of the disease [11]. On the other hand, several researchers confirm that *Campylobacter* strains have an antibiotic resistance rate over the past 20 years, particularly quinolones, fluoroquinolones and macrolides over the world [46]. It is important to monitor this resistance to avoid controversies over their use in human medicine as well as in veterinary medicine since this resistance limits the therapeutic possibilities not only in diarrhea where the antibiotics of choice would have the advantage to be active on most other intestinal pathogenic bacteria, but also in systemic infections where an antibiotic with good tissue diffusion is sometimes necessary.

Campylobacteriosis cannot be easily distinguished from other diarrheal diseases, so medication with antidiarrhoeal agents theoretically increases the risk of systemic bacterial invasion when used alone. In addition, travel abroad is a risk factor for infection and spread of resistant *Campylobacter* [67].

Treatment of Guillain-Barré syndrome requires intensive follow-up. Patients with this syndrome are treated with immunomodulators such as intravenous immunoglobulin or plasmapheresis [48].

8. PREVENTION

In recent years, various researches have contributed to the development of effective approaches of control of *Campylobacter* in poultry meat. These approaches are based on two main objectives, the first prevent the risk of colonization of *Campylobacter* in poultry ceaca on the farm, i.e to reduce the probability risk of birds to be colonized by *Campylobacter*. The second aims to minimize the intestinal burden of *Campylobacter* present in the cecal content of poultry colonized before slaughter and after evisceration thereby reducing surface contamination of carcasses by physical or chemical means [49].

In this regard, numerous studies have been carried out to take place of many effectiveness measures such as biosecurity measures and personal hygiene practices, to avoid poultry contamination and transmission between batches. The use of various substances is also recommended to control *Campylobacter* such as essential oils, prebiotics, probiotics, bacteriocins, bacteriophages and immunization measures [50].

9. CONCLUSION

Several countries are now adopting multiple interventions to control these microorganisms. In short, these programs are very beneficial to public health because of their impact throughout the food production chain. However, the preventive approach seems to be the best strategy in itself. It represents a real challenge because of the commensal behavior of this bacterium in the intestines of broiler chickens, at a time when the control of colonization of poultry at farm minimizes the transmission of *Campylobacter* in broiler farms.

Campylobacter strains have become highly resistant to antibiotics belonging to the class of macrolides, quinolones and fluoroquinolones which are widely used in human and veterinary medicine. Clinical therapy with these antibiotics of cases of gastroenteritis represents limits, hence the need for openness to new routes such as herbal medicine through the use of natural substances.

REFERENCES

1. European Food Safety Association report (EFSA). Analysis of the baseline survey on the prevalence of *Campylobacter* on broiler batches and of *Campylobacter* and *Salmonella* on broiler carcasses in the EU, 2008. Part A: *Campylobacter* and *Salmonella* prevalence estimates. EFSA Journal. 2010;8(03):1503.
2. European Food Safety Association report (EFSA). The European Union summary report on trends and sources of zoonoses, zoonotic agents and food-borne outbreaks in 2013. EFSA Journal. 2015;13(1):3991.
3. Interagency Food Safety Analytics Collaboration Project. Foodborne Illness Source Attribution Estimates for *Salmonella*, *Escherichia coli* O157 (*E. coli* O157), *Listeria monocytogenes* (*Lm*), and *Campylobacter* using Outbreak Surveillance Data, February 2015.
4. European Food Safety Authority (EFSA) and European Centre for Disease Prevention and Control (ECDC). The European Union Summary Report on Trends and Sources of

- 248 Zoonoses, Zoonotic Agents and Food-borne Outbreaks in 2012. EFSA
249 Journal. 2014;12(2):3547.
- 250 5. European Food Safety Association (EFSA). Scientific opinion on *Campylobacter* in broiler
251 meat production: control options and performance objectives and/or targets at different
252 stages of the food chain. EFSA Journal. 2011;9(4):2105.
- 253 6. Ekdahl K, Andersson Y. Regional risks and seasonality in travel-associated
254 campylobacteriosis. BMC Infectious Diseases. 2004;4:54.
- 255 7. Kist M. Who discovered *Campylobacter jejuni/coli*? A review of hitherto disregarded literature.
256 Zentralblatt fur Bakteriologie, Mikrobiologie, und Hygiene. 1986;261(2):177-186.
- 257 8. Butzler JP. *Campylobacter*, from obscurity to celebrity. Clinical Microbiology and Infection.
258 2004;10(10):868-876.
- 259 9. Smith T. The etiological relation of *Spirilla* (*V. foetus*) to bovine abortion. The Journal
260 Experimental Medicine. 1919;30(4):313-323.
- 261 10. King EO. Human infections with *Vibrio fetus* and a closely related vibrio. The Journal of
262 Infectious Diseases. 1957;101(2):119–128.
- 263 11. Moore JE, Corcoran D, Dooley JSG, Fanning S, Lucey B, Matsuda M, et al. *Campylobacter*.
264 Veterinary Research. 2005;36(3):351-382.
- 265 12. Skirrow MB. *Campylobacter* enteritis: a « new » disease. British Medical Journal.
266 1977;2(6078):9-11.
- 267 13. Karmali MA, Simor AE, Roscoe M, Fleming PC, Smith SS, Lane J. Evaluation of a blood-free,
268 charcoal based, selective medium for the isolation of *Campylobacter* organisms from
269 feces. Journal of Clinical Microbiology. 1986;23(3):456–459.
- 270 14. Friis C, Wassenaar TM, Javed MA, Snipen L, Lagesen K, Hallin PF, et al. Genomic
271 characterization of *Campylobacter jejuni* strain M1. PLoS ONE. 2010;5(8):e12253.
- 272 15. Gilbreath JJ, Cody WL, Merrell DS, Hendrixson DR. Change Is Good: Variations in Common
273 Biological Mechanisms in the Epsilonproteobacterial Genera *Campylobacter* and
274 *Helicobacter*. Microbiology and Molecular Biology Reviews. 2011;75(1):84-132.
- 275 16. Man SM. The clinical importance of emerging *Campylobacter species*. Nature Reviews.
276 Gastroenterology and Hepatology. 2011;8(12):669-685.
- 277 17. Allen VM, Bull SA, Corry JE, Domingue G, Jorgensen F, Frost JA, et al. *Campylobacter* spp.
278 contamination of chicken carcasses during processing in relation to flock colonisation.
279 International Journal of Food Microbiology. 2007;113(1):54-61.
- 280 18. Vandamme P, Pot B, Gillis MP, de Vos P, Kersters K, Swings J. Polyphasic taxonomy, a
281 consensus approach to bacterial systematics. Microbiological Reviews. 1996;60(2):407–
282 438.

- 283 19. Parkhill J, Wren BW, Mungall K, Ketley JM, Churcher C, Basham D, et al. The genome
284 sequence of food-borne pathogen *Campylobacter jejuni* reveals hypervariable sequence.
285 Nature. 2000;403(6770):665-668.
- 286 20. Jesse TW, Pittenger-Alley LG, Englen MD. Sequence analysis of two cryptic plasmids from
287 an agricultural isolate of *Campylobacter coli*. Plasmid. 2006;55(1):64–69.
- 288 21. Ridley AM, Toszeghy MJ, Cawthraw SA, Wassenaar TM, Newell DG. Genetic instability is
289 associated with changes in the colonization potential of *Campylobacter jejuni* in the avian
290 intestine. Journal of Applied Microbiology. 2007;105(1):95-104.
- 291 22. Biswas D, Hannon SJ, Townsend HG, Potter A, Allan BJ. Genes coding for virulence
292 determinants of *Campylobacter jejuni* in human clinical and cattle isolates from Alberta,
293 Canada, and their potential role in colonization of poultry. International Microbiology.
294 2011;14(1):25-32.
- 295 23. Morrell EL, Barbeito CG, Odeon CA, Gimeno EJ, Campero CM. Histopathological,
296 immunohistochemical, lectinohistochemical and molecular findings in spontaneous bovine
297 abortions by *Campylobacter fetus*. Reproduction in Domestic Animals. 2011;46(2):309-
298 315.
- 299 24. Abulreesh HH, Paget TA, Goulder R. Campylobacter in waterfowl and aquatic environments:
300 incidence and methods of detection. Environmental Science and Technology.
301 2006;40(23):7122-7131.
- 302 25. Snelling WJ, McKenna JP, Hack CJ, Moore JE, Dooley JS. An examination of the diversity of
303 a novel Campylobacter reservoir. Archives of Microbiology. 2006;186(1):31-40.
- 304 26. Stahl M, Butcher J, Stintzi A. Nutrient acquisition and metabolism by *Campylobacter jejuni*.
305 Frontiers in Cellular and Infection Microbiology. 2012;2:5.
- 306 27. Guccione E, Leon-Kempis Mdel R, Pearson BM, Hitchin E, Mulholland F, et al. Amino acid-
307 dependent growth of *Campylobacter jejuni*: key roles for aspartase (*AspA*) under
308 microaerobic and oxygen-limited conditions and identification of *AspB* (*Cj0762*), essential
309 for growth on glutamate. Molecular Microbiology. 2008;69(1):77-93.
- 310 28. Carlone GM, Lascelles J. Aerobic and Anaerobic Respiratory Systems in *Campylobacter*
311 *fetus subsp. jejuni* Grown in Atmospheres Containing Hydrogen. Journal of Bacteriology.
312 1982;152(1):306-314.
- 313 29. Day WA Jr, Sajecki JL, Pitts TM, Joens LA. Role of Catalase in *Campylobacter jejuni*
314 Intracellular Survival. Infection and Immunity. 2000;68(11):6337–6345.
- 315 30. Silvia J, Leite D, Fernandes M, Mena C, Gibbs PA, Teixeira P. Campylobacter spp. As a
316 Foodborne Pathogen : A Review. Frontiers in Microbiology. 2011;2:200.

- 317 31. Rollins DM, Colwell RR. Viable but nonculturable stage of *Campylobacter jejuni* and its role in
318 survival in the natural aquatic environment. *Applied and Environmental Microbiology*.
319 1986;52(3):531–538.
- 320 32. Mederma GJ, Schets FM, van de Giessen AW, Havelaar AH. Lack of colonization of 1-day-
321 old chicks by viable, non-culturable *Campylobacter jejuni*. *Journal of Applied Bacteriology*.
322 1992;72(6):512–516.
- 323 33. Li L, Mendis N, Trigui H, Oliver JD, Faucher SP. The importance of the viable but non-
324 culturable state in human bacterial pathogens. *Frontiers in Microbiology*. 2014;5:258.
- 325 34. Teh KH, Flint S, French N. Biofilm formation by *Campylobacter jejuni* in controlled mixed-
326 microbial populations. *International Journal of Food Microbiology*. 2010;143(3):118-124.
- 327 35. Hald B, Skov NM, Nielsen EM, Rahbek C, Madsen JJ, Waino M, et al. *Campylobacter jejuni*
328 and *Campylobacter coli* in wild birds on Danish livestock farms. *Acta Veterinaria*
329 Scandinavia. 2016;58:11.
- 330 36. Evans S, Sayers AR. A longitudinal study of *Campylobacter* infection of broiler flocks in Great
331 Britain. *Preventive Veterinary Medicine*. 2000;46(3):209–223.
- 332 37. Ellstrom P, Hansson I, Soderstrom C, Engvall EO, Rautelin H. A Prospective Follow-Up
333 Study on Transmission of *Campylobacter* from Poultry to Abattoir Workers. *Foodborne*
334 *Pathogens and Disease*. 2014;11(9):684-688.
- 335 38. Cools I, Uyttendaele M, Carpenter J, D'Haese E, Nelis HJ, Debevere J. Persistence of
336 *Campylobacter jejuni* on surfaces in a processing environment and on cutting boards.
337 *Letters in Applied Microbiology*. 2005;40(6):418-423.
- 338 39. Flanagan RC, Neal-McKinney JM, Dhillon AS, Miller WG, Konkel ME. Examination of
339 *Campylobacter jejuni* Putative Adhesins Leads to the Identification of a New Protein,
340 Designated FlpA, Required for Chicken Colonization. *Infection and Immunity*.
341 2009;77(6):2399-407.
- 342 40. Johnson WM, Lior H. A new heat-labile cytolethal distending toxin (CLDT) produced by
343 *Campylobacter* spp. *Microbial Pathogenesis*. 1988;4(2):115–126.
- 344 41. Lara-Tejero M, Galan JE. A bacterial toxin that controls cell cycle progression as a
345 deoxyribonuclease-like protein. *Science*. 2000;290(5490):354–357.
- 346 42. Black RE, Levine MM, Clements ML, Hughes TP, Blaser MJ. Experimental *Campylobacter*
347 *jejuni* infection in humans. *The Journal of Infectious Diseases*. 1988;157(3):472–479.
- 348 43. Hannu T, Mattila L, Rautelin H, Siitonen A, Leirisalo-Repo M. Three cases of cardiac
349 complications associated with *Campylobacter jejuni* infection and review of the literature.
350 *European Journal of Clinical Microbiology and Infectious Diseases*. 2005;24(9):619–622.

- 351 44. Willison HJ, Jacobs BC, Van Doorn PA. Guillain-Barré syndrome. The Lancet.
352 2016;388(10045):717–27.
- 353 45. Perera VN, Nachamkin I, Ung H, Patterson JH, McConville MJ, Coloe PJ, et al. Molecular
354 mimicry in *Campylobacter jejuni*: role of the lipo-oligosaccharide core oligosaccharide in
355 inducing anti-ganglioside antibodies. FEMS Immunology and Medical Microbiology.
356 2007;50(1):27–36.
- 357 46. Sierra–Arguello YM, Perdoncini G, Morgan RB, Salle CT, Moraes HL, Gomes MG, et al.
358 Fluoroquinolone and Macrolide Resistance in *Campylobacter Jejuni* Isolated from Broiler
359 Slaughterhouses in Southern Brazil. Avian Pathology. 2016;45(1):66-72.
- 360 47. Engberg J, Neimann J, Nielsen EM, Aarestrup FM, Fussing V. Quinolone-resistant
361 *Campylobacter* Infections in Denmark: Risk Factors and Clinical Consequences.
362 Emerging Infectious Diseases. 2004;10(6):1056–1063.
- 363 48. Saad K, Mohamad IL, Abd El-Hamed MA, Tawfeek MS, Ahmed AE, Abdel Baseer KA, et al.
364 A comparison between plasmapheresis and intravenous immunoglobulin in children with
365 Guillain–Barré syndrome in Upper Egypt. Therapeutic Advances in Neurological
366 Disorders. 2016;9(1):3–8.
- 367 49. Rosenquist H, Sommer HM, Nielsen NL, Christensen BB. The effect of slaughter operations
368 on the contamination of chicken carcasses with thermotolerant *Campylobacter*.
369 International Journal of Food Microbiology. 2006;108(2):226-232.
- 370 50. Gibbens JC, Pascoe SJ, Evans SJ, Davies RH, Sayers AR. A trial of biosecurity as a means
371 to control *Campylobacter* infection of broiler chickens. Preventive Veterinary Medicine.
372 2001; 48(2):85-99.