Prevalence and Epidemiology of Salmonella enterica subsp. enterica in Small Pig Slaughtering Units in Hanoi, Vietnam

Cédric Le Bas¹, Tran T. Hanh², Nguyen T. Thanh², Dang D. Thuong², Ngo C. Thuy²

¹CIRAD, International Research Institute in Agronomy for Tropical Countries, PRISE consortium, Hanoi, Vietnam. cedric.le_bas@cirad.fr; http://pigtrop.cirad.fr; ² NIVR, National Institute of Veterinary Research, Hanoi, Vietnam

Introduction

This study aimed to make a preliminary assessment of Salmonella spp. prevalence and epidemiology in the pig production chain in Vietnam. Food safety of animal products is indeed an emerging research topic of preliminary importance in Vietnam [1,2]: in the frame of WTO membership, increase of demand for quality and safety [3] and need of public health improvement, risk analysis researches are urgently needed. Slaughtering is an essential step for food hygiene and gives information on upstream and downstream hygienic status for live animals or carcasses. Small abattoirs (10 to 30 pigs/day) are still the most common structure for slaughtering pigs in North Vietnam [4]. Salmonella spp. remains one of the most frequent zoonotic food pathogen reported in the world and pigs are known to be asymptomatic carrier. The Salmonella spp. shedding pigs are most likely to contaminate carcasses and slaughtering environment [5].

Material and Methods



Analysis

- Caecal content 15g (1/10) Cotton cloth swabs (150 ml)
- Selective enrichment (RV)
- Biochemical confirmation
- (Kligler and additional tests)
- serotyping (in progress)

Results

Table 1: Number of samples positive for Salmonella spp. and precision levels.

| | Number of positive samples for Salmonella spp. (in %=P) | Absolute precision (A) in % (p=0,05) ^(a) | Relative precision (R) in % (p=0,05) ^(b) |
|-----------------------|--|---|---|
| 1. Caeca n=116 | 57 (49,14%) | 9,10% | 18,51% |
| 2. Swabs n=46 | 44 (95,65%) | 5,89% | 6,16% |
| 3. Tank water n=26 | 21 (80,77%) | 15,15% | 18,76% |

Figure 1: Caracteristical colony of Salmonella spp. on XLT4 agar Lactose -H₂S +, glucose ? Gaz + Figure 2: Result on Kligler agar typical for Salmonella spp.

Discussion

- Nearly 50% of the pigs are Salmonella carriers -presence of Salmonella in caecal content- at the time of slaughtering, which represents a high contamination pressure for the slaughtering environment and the carcasses.
- Over 80% of the water tank samples are positive for Salmonella spp. This contamination of rinsing water is probably due to slaughtering practices (rinsing of material in the tank, for instance) and is responsible for the high contamination rate of pig carcasses.
- Contamination rate of tank water samples explain high contamination rate of swabs (>95%), since the carcasses are rinsed with tank water after evisceration
- European literature report generally a prevalence of Salmonella spp. at slaughterhouse as following: 6,2 to 23% for caecal content [6,7], 1,4 to % for carcass swabs [6,8,9], with a mean around 5% after evisceration [9]. Whereas evisceration has been described in Europe as the major cause carcass contamination [5], the present study shows epidemiological picture of carcass contamination.
- Indeed, our results show a lack of good hygiene slaughtering practices and the central role played by rinsing water in the contamination process. Thus, little improvement of the practices through staff education could considerably reduce the carcass contamination rate.
- If this hygienic context is not necessarily a cause of concern when consumers and food vendors are used to cook meat product enough, it can represent a bigger threat for public health at following conditions : - Crosscontamination during handling of meat with other products, - Changing of consumer habits, like eating of little cooked meat, - extension of the pig production chain with a time increase between production and consumption, Increase of processing of pig products (consumption and production).
- This study shows the need to perform risk analysis for specific issues on the entire production chain with a farm to fork approach. This should be led with a multidisciplinary approach involving socio-economical researches on production and consumption levels.

Acknoledgement

NIVR staff, esp. vet. Hyg. and parasitology teams Veterinary services and slaughterhouse staff AFSSA, HQPAP CIRAD PRISE



References

[1] (2002a). Capacity Building for the prevention of foodborne diseases - Final Report. Hanoi, World Health Organization:

22 P. (2002). Food Safety Activities in Vietnam. FAO/WHO Global Forum of Food Safety Regulators, Marrakech Morocco.

Marrakech, Morocco.

[3] Ginhoux, V. (2001). Etude de la sensibilité des consommateurs urbains de viande porcine.: 79 p.

[4] Wegener, H. C. (1999). The Hygiene Inspection System of the Veterinary Services in Vietnam. Consultancy Mission, 6-10 june 1999. Strengthening of Veterinary Services in Vietnam (SVSV). Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development in Vietnam, European Commission.: 73 p.

[5] Berends, B. R., Van Knapen, F., Snijders, J. M. A. et Mossel, D. A. A. (1997). Identification and quantification of risk factors regarding Salmonella spp. on pork carcasses. International Journal of Food Microbiology 36 (2-3): 199-206.

[6] Wray, C. (2001). Review of research into Salmonella infections in pigs., Meat and Livestock Commission: 63 p.

[7] Davies, R. H., Dalziel, R., Wilesmith, J. W., Ryan, J. M. B., Evans, S. J., Paiba, G. A., Byrne, C. et Pascoe, S. J. S. (2001). National Survey for Salmonella in Pigs at Slaughter in Great Britain. Proceedings of the 4th International Symposium on the Epidemiology and Control of Salmonella and other food pathogens in Pork., 2-5 september 2001, Leipzig, Germany.

Symposium on the Epidemiology and Leipzig, Germany.

[8] Korsak, N., Jacob, B., Groven, B., Etienne, G., China, B., Ghafir, Y. et Daube, G. (2003). Salmonella contamination of pigs and ports in an integrated pig production system. Journal of Food Protection 66 (7): 1126-1133.

[9] Alban, L. et Stark, K. D. C. (2005). Where should the effort be put to reduce the salmonella prevalence in the slaughtered swine carcass effectively? Preventive Veterinary Medecine 68: 63-79.







