



Cairo University

Faculty of Veterinary Medicine

Department of Microbiology



Bacteriological studies on some molluscus

A Thesis presented by:

Suhair Abd-EL Mowgoud Barakat

B.V.SC. (2002), Faculty of Veterinary Medicine, Assuit University

For Master degree

In Veterinary Medical Sciences

(Microbiology)

(Bacteriology, Immunology and Mycology)

Under the Supervision of

Prof. Dr. Nashwa Abd-El salam Ezzeldeen

Professor of Microbiology, Faculty of Veterinary Medicine, Cairo University

Prof. Dr. Hayam Abd-El Aal Mansour

Professor of Meat Hygiene, Faculty of Veterinary Medicine, Cairo University

Prof. Dr. Mohamed Mohamed Mousa

**Professor of Meat Hygiene, Vice Dean of education and students affairs,
Faculty of Veterinary Medicine, Alexandria University**

2015

Supervisors

Prof. Dr. Nashwa Abd-El salam Ezzeldeen

Professor of Microbiology, Faculty of Veterinary Medicine,
Cairo University

Prof. Dr. Hayam Abd-El Aal Mansour

Professor of Meat Hygiene, Faculty of Veterinary Medicine,
Cairo University

Prof. Dr. Mohamed Mohamed Mousa

Professor of Meat Hygiene, Vice Dean of education and students
affairs, Faculty of Veterinary Medicine,
Alexandria University



APPROVAL SHEET

This is to certify that the dissertation submitted by **Suhair Abd-EL Mowgoud Barakat** to Cairo University, for the M.v.s. degree of veterinary medical sciences, Microbiology (Bacteriology, Immunology and Mycology) has been approved by the examining committee.

- **Prof. Dr. Fawzy Riyad Mohamed EL-Seedy** *F. Al-Seedy*

Professor of Microbiology
Faculty of Veterinary Medicine
Beni Suef University

- **Prof. Dr. Heidy Mohamed Shawky** *Heidy Shawky*

Professor of Microbiology
Faculty of Veterinary Medicine
Cairo University

- **Prof. Dr. Nashwa Abd-El Salam Ezzeldeen (Supervisor)**

Professor of Microbiology
Faculty of Veterinary Medicine
Cairo University

- **Prof. Dr. Hayam Abd-El Aal mansour (Supervisor)**

Professor of meat hygiene
Faculty of Veterinary Medicine
Cairo University

- **Prof. Dr. Mohamed Mohamed Mousa (Supervisor)**

Professor of meat hygiene Vice Dean of education and students
affairs, Faculty of Veterinary Medicine
Alexandria University

M. Mousa
14/11/2015

Date: 14/11/2015

Name: Suhair Abd-EL Mowgoud Barakat
Nationality: Egyptian
Date of birth: 6/2/1979
Degree: Master
Department: Microbiology
Thesis Title: Bacteriological studies on some molluscus

Abstract

A total of 100 samples of bivalve molluscus was subjected for enumeration, isolation and identification of *Staphylococcus aureus*, total coliforms, faecal coliforms and *Escherichia coli*. Sixty one strains of *S. aureus* were isolated, 20 strains from each yellow and black Gandoufly and 21 strains from Om El-Kholoul. While 36 strains of *E. coli* were isolated 13 strains from yellow Gandoufly, 12 strains from black Gandoufly and 11 strains from Om El-Kholoul. All *S. aureus* isolates were coagulase positive. The antimicrobial sensitivity test revealed that all the *S. aureus* isolates were 100% sensitive to rifampicin, vancomycin, cephalixin, cephataxime, chloramphenicol, kanamycin, neomycin, amikacine, spiramicin, gentamicin, ciprofloxacin, enrofloxacin, ofloxacin, oxacillin, cloxacillin, amoxy-clavulinic acid and ampicillin. Mean while they were 100% resistant to pefloxacin and flumequine, and 92% to streptomycin. While the *E. coli* isolates were 100% resistance to ampicillin, amoxicillin and streptomycin, 50% to trimethoprim-sulfamathoxazole, lincomycin, neomycin and pefloxacin. Mean while they were 100% sensitive to ofloxacin, enrofloxacin, gentamicin, spiramicin and amikacin, 93.3, 90, 90, 83.3, 80, 80, 76.6, 63.3 and 60% to cephataxime, cephalixin, amoxy-clavulinic, chloramphenicol, tetracycline, kanamycin, flumequine, ciprofloxacin and erythromycin respectively.

Key words: Bivalve • *S. aureus* • *E. coli* • Antimicrobial sensitivity

To the soul of my father

To My mother, my husband and my little daughters

(Mai and Yara)

My dearest friend Abeer

My sisters and brother

Acknowledgement

First of all, I would like to express my greatest thanks to ALLAH as who gave me this opportunity to carry out this thesis and supported me with his blessing and unlimited care.

I wish to express my sincere gratitude to prof. Dr. Nashwa Abd-El salam Ezzeldeen professor of microbiology, Faculty of veterinary Medicine, Cairo University, for her supervision, kind true guidance, stimulating suggestion and valuable help given to make this work accurate and successful and given me so much of her valuable time, experience and scientific knowledge. I am proud of work under her supervision.

I greatly thank prof. Dr. Hayam Abd El-All Mansour, professor of Meat hygiene, Faculty of veterinary Medicine, Cairo University, for her supervision, continuous help, encouragement and great effort that she has given during investigation.

I greatly thank prof. Dr. Mohamed Mohamed Mousa, professor of Meat hygiene, Faculty of veterinary Medicine, Alexandria University, for his supervision, continuous help, supporting and encouragement.

Also I want to express my great thank to Dr. Mahmoud El-Hariry for his helping in my work,

List of CONTENTS

	Page
<u>Introduction</u>	1
<u>Review of literature</u>	5
2.1. Food poisoning bacteria and bivalve molluscus.....	5
2.2. Antibiotic sensitivity of <i>Staphylococcus aureus</i>	21
2.3. Antibiotic sensitivity of <i>Escherichia coli</i>	30
<u>Materials and Methods</u>	38
<u>3.1. Materials</u>	38
3.1.1. Samples.....	38
3.1.2. Ringer solution.....	38
<u>3.1.3. Media used for isolation and identification of some bacterial isolates</u>	38
3.1.3.1. Media used for isolation of <i>staphylococcus aureus</i>	38
3.1.3.2. Media used for isolation of <i>Salmonella</i> spp.....	39
3.1.3.3. Media used for isolation of coliforms and <i>E. coli</i>	39
3.1.3.4. Media used for preservation of bacterial isolates.....	40
3.1.3.5. Media used for study of the colonial characteristics.....	40
<u>3.1.4. Media used for biochemical identification</u>	40
3.1.4.1. Media used for identification of Gram positive isolates.....	40
3.1.4.2. Media used for identification of Gram negative isolates.....	41
<u>3.1.5. Media used for antibiogram assay</u>	42
<u>3.1.6. Reagents and chemicals</u>	42
3.1.6.1. Reagents and chemicals were used for identification of Gram positive Isolates.....	42

3.1.6.2. Reagents used for identification of Gram negative isolates.....	43
3.1.7. Stain.....	43
<u>3.1.8. Mcfarland tube 0.5.....</u>	44
<u>3.1.9. Reference strain.....</u>	44
<u>3.1.10. Antimicrobial susceptibility discs (Oxoid).....</u>	45
<u>3.1.11. Disposable plastic, glass ware and laboratory supplies.....</u>	45
<u>3.1.12. Equipments.....</u>	47
<u>3.2. Methods.....</u>	48
<u>3.2.1. Collection of samples.....</u>	48
<u>3.2.2. Preparation of sample for examination.....</u>	48
<u>3.2.3. Isolation of <i>Staphylococcus aureus</i>.....</u>	49
<u>3.2.4. <i>Staphylococcus aureus</i> count</u>	49
<u>3.2.5. Purification.....</u>	49
<u>3.2.6. Microscopical examination</u>	50
<u>3.2.7 Biochemical identification of <i>S. aureus</i> isolates</u>	50
<u>3.2.8. Coliforms count.....</u>	51
<u>3.2.9. Enumeration of fecal coliforms bacteria.....</u>	52
<u>3.2.10. Isolation of <i>Escherichia coli</i></u>	53
<u>3.2.11. Isolation of <i>Salmonella</i> microorganisms.....</u>	53
<u>3.2.12. Identification of Gram negative isolates.....</u>	54
3.2.12.1. Microscopical examination.....	54
3.2.12.2. Detection of motility.....	55
3.2.12.3. Biochemical identification	55
<u>3.2.13. Antimicrobial sensitivity test.....</u>	58
<u>Results.....</u>	61
<u>4.1.Results of <i>S. aureus</i> isolated from bivalve mollusc.....</u>	61
<u>4.2. Results of cultural identification of <i>S.aureus</i>.....</u>	61

<u>4.3. Microscopic examination of <i>Staphylococcus aureus</i></u>	63
<u>4.4. Biochemical identification of <i>S. aureus</i></u>	63
<u>4.5. Prevalence of <i>S. aureus</i> isolated from bivalve mollusc</u>	64
<u>4.6. <i>Staphylococcus aureus</i> count</u>	64
<u>4.7. Isolation of <i>E. coli</i>, the count of coliforms and fecal coliforms</u>	66
<u>4.8. Results of cultural identification of <i>E. coli</i></u>	67
<u>4.9. Microscopic examination of <i>E. coli</i></u>	68
<u>4.10. Biochemical identification of <i>E. coli</i></u>	68
<u>4.11. Results of antimicrobial sensitivity test</u>	72
4.11.1. Results of the antimicrobial sensitivity test of <i>S. aureus</i>	72
4.11.2. Results of the antimicrobial sensitivity test of <i>Escherichia coli</i>	74
<u>Discussion</u>	75
<u>Conclusion</u>	90
<u>Summary</u>	91
<u>References</u>	93

List of tables

No	Title	page
1	Antimicrobial susceptibility discs	45
2	Biochemical characteristics of <i>S. aureus</i>	51
3	Interpretation and results of TSI test	56
4	Interpretion and zone diameter of inhibition among the antimicrobial agent used for <i>S. aureus</i>	59
5	Interpretion and zone diameter of inhibition among the antimicrobial agent used for <i>E. coli</i>	60
6	Biochemical and some enzyme production characteristics of <i>S. aureus</i> isolates	63
7	Prevalence of <i>S. aureus</i> isolated from bivalve molluscus (live and chilled samples).	64
8	<i>S. aureus</i> count (cfu/g) in chilled yellow gandoufly.	64
9	<i>S. aureus</i> count (cfu/g) in chilled black gandoufly	65
10	<i>S. aureus</i> count (cfu/g) in chilled OM-Elkholoul	65
11	Prevalence of <i>E. coli</i> isolated from molluscus (live and chilled samples 100)	66
12	Biochemical tests of <i>E. coli</i> convential standard separate tests	70
13	Mean total coliforms and fecal coliforms count (cfu/g) among different chilled bivalve molluscus	70
14	The results of sensitivity of <i>S. aureus</i> isolates (n=25) to some antimicrobial agent.	73
15	The results of sensitivity of <i>E. coli</i> isolates (n=30) to some antimicrobial agent.	74

List of figures

No	Title	Page
1	Incidence of haemolysis of <i>S. aureus</i> on sheep blood agar	63
2	Mean count of <i>S. aureus</i> in chilled bivalve molluscus	66
3	Prevalence of <i>E. coli</i> isolated from chilled bivalve molluscus	67
4	Total coliforms count (MPN/g) in bivalve molluscus	71
5	Total fecal coliforms count (MPN/g) in bivalve molluscus	71

List of Photographs

No	Title	Page
1	Colonies of <i>S. aureus</i> on Baird Parker agar medium.	61
2	Colonies of <i>S. aureus</i> on mannitol salt agar medium	62
3	Colonies of <i>E. coli</i> on Eosin methylin blue and MacConkey's agar plates	68
4	Triple sugar Iron (TSI) test.	69
5	Positive Indole test	69
6	Antimicrobial sensitivity test for <i>S. aureus</i> .	72

List of abbreviations

APHA	American public health association
AOAC	Association of official analytical chemists
BGLB	Brilliant green lactose bile
CFU	Colony forming unit
CLSI	Clinical and Laboratory Standards Institute
<i>E. coli</i>	<i>Escherichia coli</i>
FAO	Food and Agriculture Organization
ICMSF	International Commission on Microbiological Specifications for Food
MPN	most probable number
<i>S. aureus</i>	<i>Staphylococcus aureus</i>

1. Introduction

The biological class of Bivalvia contains more than 20,000 species of marine and fresh water molluscus, including mussels, oyster and clams. These molluscus are commonly called bivalves. One of the distinguishing characteristics of this class is the presence of lamellibranch gills, which allow filter feeding (**Villee *et al.*, 1978**). During filter feeding, large volumes of water pass across the gills to allow the shellfish to obtain oxygen and food. Particulate matter from the water, including microorganisms is trapped in the mucus on the gills and transported to the mouth by ciliary action (**SITO, 2005**).

Numerous studies have shown that shellfish rapidly accumulate microorganisms if they are present in polluted water (**Eyles, 1980; Rose and Sobsey, 1993 and Lees, 2000**). It is fairly well established that bacteria can be removed from shellfish by placing them in clean water under specified environmental conditions in a process known as depuration (**Richards, 1988**). Eventually scientists began to understand the combined effects of bivalve filter feeding and environmental pollution on shellfish food safety, and today raw molluscan shellfish receive the second highest hazard rating of all foods (**ICMSF, 1978**). Temperature abuse during raw seafood harvesting and storage may help in microbial pathogens multiplication, thus posing a potential health threat to susceptible consumers (**Liston, 1990**).

Bivalves are regarded as potentially hazardous foods because of their inherent tendency to bioaccumulate pathogenic bacteria through filter feeding (**Hatha *et al.*, 2005**). Seafood borne diseases associated with consumption of shellfish are the major challenge to the food hygienists in the 21st century, especially in the coastal cities-Egypt. Good hygienic conditions prevent the cross-contamination from raw food to other food, clean disposable gloves were used during shellfish handling and thorough cooking of shellfish must be adopted to control the hazard of seafood-borne pathogens (**Ali and Hamza, 2004**).