

# Dose-Response Relationship between Antimicrobial Drugs and Livestock-Associated MRSA in Pig Farming<sup>1</sup>

Alejandro Dorado-García, Wietske Dohmen, Marian E.H. Bos, Koen M. Verstappen, Manon Houben, Jaap A. Wagenaar, Dick J.J. Heederik

The farming community can be a vehicle for introduction of livestock-associated methicillin-resistant *Staphylococcus aureus* (LA-MRSA) in hospitals. During 2011–2013, an 18-month longitudinal study aimed at reducing the prevalence of LA-MRSA was conducted on 36 pig farms in the Netherlands. Evaluations every 6 months showed a slight decrease in MRSA prevalence in animals and a stable prevalence in farmers and family members. Antimicrobial use, expressed as defined daily dosages per animal per year, decreased 44% during the study period and was associated with declining MRSA prevalence in pigs. MRSA carriage in animals was substantially higher at farms using cephalosporins. Antimicrobial use remained strongly associated with LA-MRSA in humans regardless of the level of animal contact. A risk factor analysis outlined potential future interventions for LA-MRSA control. These results should encourage animal and public health authorities to maintain their efforts in reducing antimicrobial use in livestock and ask for future controlled intervention studies.

In 2005, sequence type (ST) 398 of methicillin-resistant *Staphylococcus aureus* (MRSA) emerged in Europe with proven transmission between pigs and humans (1,2). Since then, pigs, veal calves, and (to a lesser extent) poultry were increasingly found to harbor livestock-associated MRSA (LA-MRSA) (3).

ST398 is widely spread across Europe, and ≈70% of pig farms in the Netherlands test positive (4). After transfer to humans, it can be introduced into hospitals and the community (5–8). In 2011, ST398 accounted for 39% of all new MRSA detected through screening of patients in the Netherlands (9).

To our knowledge, no intervention studies have been undertaken to assess the efficacy of MRSA-reducing measures on farms. Trade of animals is a major risk factor for

introducing MRSA into a negative herd (10–12). Larger herds have been associated with higher antimicrobial use (4). Antimicrobial use could not be identified as a clear determinant for MRSA (4). Transmission dynamics within herds vary by animals' ages and phase of production, potentially leading to endemicity (13).

In 2006, the European Union banned the use of antimicrobial drugs as growth promoters. In the Netherlands the most noticeable change started in 2010, when the government set objectives for a 50% reduction in antimicrobial use by 2013 and 70% by 2015, compared with 2009. This policy was combined with benchmarking of farms, and later veterinarians, to identify persistently high users of antimicrobial drugs (14). As part of this national program, farm treatment and health plans have to be drafted and reviewed annually (15), which has resulted in an almost 60% reduction for the major livestock industry sectors (16,17). Against the background of nationwide reduction of antimicrobial use, during 2011–2013, we evaluated MRSA carriage changes in pigs and humans and study the effect of introduction of an additional range of preventive measures on MRSA carriage in animals, and humans living and/or working on the farms.

## Materials and Methods

### Study Design, Sample Collection, and Laboratory Analysis

Thirty-six pig farms were enrolled in and completed the study; 15 were recruited from farmer cooperatives in the Netherlands, 20 were recruited by veterinarians in the cooperatives, and 1 was recruited by a farm health consultant. Farms were visited at the start of the study during

<sup>1</sup>Preliminary results from this study were presented at the 3rd American Society for Microbiology–European Society of Clinical Microbiology and Infectious Diseases (ASM-ESCMID) Conference on Methicillin-resistant Staphylococci in Animals: Veterinary Public Health Implications, 2013 November 4–7, Copenhagen, Denmark (oral presentation, speaker abstract S7:3); and at the Society for Veterinary Epidemiology and Preventive Medicine annual meeting; 2014 March 26–28, Dublin, Ireland (poster presentation).

Author affiliations: Utrecht University, Utrecht, the Netherlands (A. Dorado-García, W. Dohmen, M.E.H. Bos, K.M. Verstappen, J.A. Wagenaar, D.J.J. Heederik); Wageningen UR, Lelystad, the Netherlands (J.A. Wagenaar); PorQ BV, Son, the Netherlands (M. Houben).

DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.3201/eid2106.140706>

March–September 2011. A questionnaire was completed during a walk-through survey with the farm veterinarian. The questionnaire contained items on farm characteristics, biosecurity, animal management and hygiene practices (online Technical Appendix Table 1, <http://www.wnc.cdc.gov/EID/article/21/6/14-0706-Techapp1.pdf>). Then, tailor-made interventions were developed with the farmer for each farm to be implemented from the beginning of the study. Interventions focused on 1) further reducing antimicrobial use, 2) improving personnel and farm hygiene, and 3) changing animal contact structures.

Each farm was assessed 4 times during the 18-month period (6-month intervals). At each sampling time, the farm questionnaire was filled out again to monitor changes. Human participants completed another questionnaire (online Technical Appendix Table 2) focused on tasks performed, animal contact, and individual health status. Dry cotton nasal swabs (Copan, Brescia, Italy) were used to obtain samples from humans and animals. Persons self-sampled their nostrils, and veterinarians swabbed both anterior nares of 60 pigs per farm. Animal swab samples were analyzed in 10 pools of 6 animals. Each pool comprised pigs of the same age group in the same pen (suckling piglets, weaned piglets, gilts, sows, and finishing pigs). All animal and human samples were sent by courier to the Infectious Diseases and Immunology Department (Faculty of Veterinary Medicine, Utrecht University, Utrecht, the Netherlands). The Medical Ethical Committee of the University Medical Centre Utrecht approved the study protocol, and all participants gave written informed consent.

Swab samples were pre-enriched in Mueller Hinton broth, followed by selective enrichment with ceftizoxime and aztreonam and culture on Brilliance MRSA agar (Oxoid, Badhoevedorp, the Netherlands) (18). Suspected colonies were subcultured on Columbia agar with sheep blood (Oxoid) and confirmed by using real-time PCR targeting *mecA*, *femA*, *nuc*, and *C01* genes (19,20).

### Farm Types

We classified production types as farrowing and farrow-to-finish. Farrowing farms did not produce fatteners and delivered growers (25 kg) to finishing farms (with the exception of 1 farm that delivered gilts for farrowing). Farrow-to-finish farms integrated farrowing and finishing production and delivered fattening pigs to the abattoir. A farm was defined as open when it received external supplies of gilts  $\geq 1$  time per year from at least 1 supplier and as closed when gilts were not supplied externally.

### Data on Antimicrobial Use

In the Netherlands, all antimicrobial drug deliveries to each farm are compiled in national databases. Owners of the study farms gave written consent for retrieval of these

antimicrobial use data over a 2-year period. Antimicrobial use was expressed as defined daily dosages per animal per year (DDDA/Y) per farm for the 4 periods preceding each sampling time. The DDDA/Y is a standard weighted measure indicating the number of days of antimicrobial drug use per year for an average animal on the farm. A more detailed description of the calculation of DDDA/Y has been described (14,16).

### Data Analysis

We conducted all statistical analyses in SAS software version 9.2 (SAS Institute Inc., Cary, NC, USA). We explored changes in MRSA carriage in animals and humans and antimicrobial use over time using simple descriptive statistics. DDDA/Y was  $\log_2$  transformed because of its right-skewed distribution. A total of 134 variables in the farm questionnaire and 59 in the human questionnaire were selected for longitudinal analysis together with antimicrobial use (criteria of  $<10\%$  missing values and  $\leq 10\%$  of farms in each category). Odds ratios (ORs) for MRSA positivity in a pig or a human sample in the presence or absence of a determinant were obtained by using random intercept generalized linear mixed models (PROC GLIMMIX; SAS Institute, Inc.). Only associations from the selected variables with  $p \leq 0.10$  in pigs (adjusting for age group of the pool) and  $p \leq 0.20$  in humans (adjusting for hours worked on the farm) were presented. Goodness-of-fit of the models was described by using  $-2 \log$  residual pseudo-likelihood estimation, and model assumptions were checked with diagnostic plots. Generalized additive mixed modeling (gamm4 package in R 3.0.2; R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria) was used to assess the shape of the relationship between antimicrobial use and MRSA in human and animals.

### Results

The number of farms was unequally distributed by type of farm (Table 1). Characteristics among persons from different farm types did not differ significantly (Table 2). All MRSA isolated from animals and humans was ST398.

### Antimicrobial Use Reduction and Assessment of Particular Interventions

During the 4 periods, tetracyclines were the most used antimicrobial drugs (37.6% of total DDDA/Y), followed by penicillins (30.2%), trimethoprim/sulfonamides (12.3%), macrolides/lincosamides (12.0%), and polymyxins (4.6%). The remaining 3.3% corresponded mainly with cephalosporins, amphenicols, pleuromutilines, and fluoroquinolones. Most antimicrobial classes decreased in parallel during the study; only macrolides slightly increased in DDDA/Y (9.9% to 16.5% from the first to the fourth period), and tetracyclines and trimethoprim/sulfonamides decreased slightly (from 37.0% to 32.7% and from 14.9% to 11.2%,

**Table 1.** Characteristics of farms in a study of the dose–response relationship between antimicrobial drug use and livestock-associated methicillin-resistant *Staphylococcus aureus* in pig farming, the Netherlands, 2011–2013

Type of farm*	No. farms	Median no. (interquartile range)	
		Sows	Fatteners
All	36	350 (270–550)	773 (0–1,950)
Open	22	337 (300–500)	500 (0–1,300)
Farrowing†	9	533 (350–800)	0
Farrow-to finish	13	314 (242–380)	1,100 (600–2,010)
Closed	14	407 (232–698)	1,400 (450–2,725)
Farrowing†	3	439 (239–905)	0
Farrow-to finish	11	367 (200–673)	1,892 (1,025–2,950)

\*Farms were defined as open when they received external supplies of gilts  $\geq 1$  time per year from at least 1 supplier and as closed when they received no external supply of gilts.

†No fattening pigs present.

respectively). Overall, 86% of the DDDA/Y were administered as batch or group treatment (i.e., animals were treated in groups mainly orally for prophylactic or metaphylactic reasons) and 14% as individual treatment (mainly by injection). These percentages did not significantly differ by type of farm. During the study, overall DDDA/Y decreased 44%, comparable with the national trend, across all farm types except open farrowing farms (Figure 1). Open and/or farrowing farms used at least twice as many antimicrobial drugs as closed and farrow-to-finish farms (Figure 1).

Farm management changes over time captured from the questionnaires were modest; just 10% of the intervention variables (median 9.7%, interquartile range [IQR] 6.0%–12.3%) per farm changed during the study. Thus, 27 farms had  $<12$  of the 134 variables that changed. The median number of farms within a single change was 3 (IQR 1–4). Thus, 75% of the changes occurred in  $\leq 4$  farms. Changes over time did not differ by different farm type. Because of these limited and heterogeneous changes, an intervention effect could not be evaluated and we performed only a risk factor analysis.

### MRSA in Pigs

The number of MRSA-positive farms decreased slightly during the study (from 31 to 29 positive farms). Twenty-

eight farms were MRSA-positive at all sampling times. Most were open (21 farms; 13 farrow-to-finish and 8 farrowing farms), and 7 were closed (5 farrow-to-finish and 2 farrowing). Four closed farrow-to-finish farms remained MRSA-negative during the entire study. From the remaining 4 farms, 3 became negative and 1 became positive during the study.

Overall pool-prevalence per sampling time decreased slightly on all farms. Open and farrowing farms remained at higher prevalences than closed and farrow-to-finish farms (Figure 2).

MRSA carriage differed notably between different age groups. The average pool-prevalence was 45.6% for finishing pigs; it was highest for suckling and weaned piglets (52.2% and 66.2%, respectively) and lowest for gilts and sows (30.2% and 30.8%, respectively). These prevalences did not significantly differ by farm type.

### MRSA in Humans


MRSA prevalence in humans did not change significantly over time (Figure 3, panels A, B). Prevalence and carriage dynamics differed by number of hours worked on the farm. Prevalence for persons working  $\geq 20$  hours per week was 5 times higher than for persons working  $<20$  hours (Figure 3, panel B). Persons working  $\geq 20$  hours more frequently

**Table 2.** Characteristics of persons followed during the entire period of a study of the dose–response relationship between antimicrobial drug use and livestock-associated methicillin-resistant *Staphylococcus aureus* in pig farming, the Netherlands, 2011–2013\*


Characteristic	Total study population	Farmers, employees	Partners	Children
Age, y (SD)	33.0 (17.8)	44.0 (13.6)	45.2 (8.9)	14.4 (5.6)
Mean time worked, h (SD)	21.8 (25.2)	46.0 (19.9)	10.1 (14.0)	2.2 (6.6)
Total no.	158	66	32	60
Sex				
M	91	58	0	33
F	67	8	32	27
Open farm	91	34	17	40
Farrowing†	26	11	5	10
Farrow-to finish	65	23	12	30
Closed farm	67	32	15	20
Farrowing†	14	8	3	3
Farrow-to finish	53	24	12	17

\*Farms were defined as open when they received external supplies of gilts  $\geq 1$  time per year from at least 1 supplier and as closed when they received no external supply of gilts.

†No fattening pigs present.



**Figure 1.** Antimicrobial use by type of farm during the 4 periods ( $\approx$ 6 months) before each sampling time in a study of the dose-response relationship between antimicrobial drug use and livestock-associated methicillin-resistant *Staphylococcus aureus* on pig farms, the Netherlands, 2011–2013. GM and 95% CI from  $\log_2$  DDDA/Y. Farms were defined as open when they received external supplies of gilts  $\geq 1$  time per year from at least 1 supplier and as closed when they received no external supply of gilts. Closed triangles indicate closed farrow-to-finish farms; closed squares indicate closed farrowing farms; open triangles indicate open farrow-to-finish farms; open squares indicate open farrowing farms. DDDA/Y, defined daily dosages animal per year; GM, geometric mean. Error bars indicate 95% CIs.



**Figure 2.** Prevalence of LA-MRSA-positive pooled samples from pigs during a study of the dose-response relationship between antimicrobial drug use and LA-MRSA on pig farms, the Netherlands, 2011–2013. Farms were defined as open when they received external supplies of gilts  $\geq 1$  time per year from at least 1 supplier and as closed when they received no external supply of gilts. Closed triangles indicate closed farrow-to-finish farms; closed squares indicate closed farrowing farms; open triangles indicate open farrow-to-finish farms; open squares indicate open farrowing farms. LA-MRSA, livestock-associated methicillin-resistant *Staphylococcus aureus*. Error bars indicate 95% CIs.


tested positive for MRSA at all sampling times (25%) or at least at 1 sampling time (48%), compared with those working  $<20$  hours (2% and 24%, respectively). MRSA carriage dynamics did not significantly differ by level of antimicrobial use (data not shown) or by farm type (see overlap of 95% CIs in Figure 3, panel A).

#### Antimicrobial Use and MRSA Carriage in Pigs and Humans

Farms with higher antimicrobial use were more likely to have MRSA-positive pigs (Figure 4). The odds that a pool would be MRSA positive was 16% higher for a 2-fold increase in DDDA/Y (Table 3). MRSA in pigs from open and from farrowing farms (high users of antimicrobial drugs) showed a positive trend and a significant association, respectively, with antimicrobial use (Table 3). The odds for testing LA-MRSA positive was higher when the proportion of group treatments with antimicrobial drugs was  $>0.5$  (odds ratio [OR] 1.79, 95% CI 1.12–2.88;  $p = 0.02$ ). This association was also found on open and on farrow-to-finish farms but was stronger in farrowing farms (OR 2.9, 95% CI 0.98–8.60;  $p = 0.05$ ). Changes in MRSA carriage in pigs over time were significantly associated with changes in

antimicrobial use; the odds for a 2-fold increase in antimicrobial use per sampling time (antimicrobial use–time interaction) decreased from the second to the last sampling (ORs 0.94, 1.27, 1.26, and 1.14 in the 4 consecutive samplings;  $p = 0.01$ ). The same was found in an analysis restricted to open farms (ORs 0.86, 1.33, 1.18, and 1.06;  $p = 0.01$ ). In farrowing farms (with little reduction in antimicrobial use), the antimicrobial use–time interaction was also significant, but ORs increased over time (ORs 1.04, 1.38, 1.62, 1.62;  $p = 0.03$ ).

We also observed a positive trend between antimicrobial use in animals and human MRSA carriage (Figure 4); the unadjusted OR for a 2-fold increase in DDDA/Y was 1.17 (95% CI 0.98–1.39;  $p = 0.09$ ). The antimicrobial use–MRSA association did not significantly change after adjustment for hours worked ( $OR_{adj}$ ) (Table 3). When stratified by working hours, antimicrobial use remained especially associated with MRSA for persons working  $\geq 20$  hours per week ( $OR_{adj}$  1.25, 95% CI 1.01–1.54;  $p = 0.04$ ), compared with those working  $<20$  hours ( $OR_{adj}$  1.21, 95% CI 0.92–1.59;  $p = 0.18$ ). A similar trend was observed across farrow-to-finish, farrowing, and closed farms (Table 3). The probability of LA-MRSA carriage was higher when the proportion of antimicrobial group treatments was  $\geq 0.5$  ( $OR_{adj}$  1.76, 95% CI 0.79–3.90;  $p = 0.17$ ). Reduction in



**Figure 3.** Prevalence of LA-MRSA in humans ( $n = 158$ ) during a study of the dose-response relationship between antimicrobial drug use and LA-MRSA on pig farms, the Netherlands, 2011–2013. Results are stratified by type of farm (A) and number of hours worked on the farm (B). Farms were defined as open when they received external supplies of gilts  $\geq 1$  time per year from at least 1 supplier and as closed when they received no external supply of gilts. Closed triangles indicate closed farrow-to-finish farms; closed squares indicate closed farrowing farms; open triangles indicate open farrow-to-finish farms; open squares indicate open farrowing farms; open diamonds indicate persons working  $< 20$  hours per week; closed diamonds indicate persons working  $\geq 20$  hours per week. LA-MRSA, livestock-associated methicillin-resistant *Staphylococcus aureus*. Error bars indicate 95% CIs.

antimicrobial use over time was not associated with any change in MRSA carriage in humans.

Specific levels of DDDA/Y for tetracyclines and penicillins were positively associated ( $p$  values from 0.06 to 0.23) with MRSA in pigs and humans (data not shown). The use of cephalosporins (on 7 farms, 6 of them open) during the first sampling time, was strongly associated with MRSA carriage in pigs (OR 2.94, 95% CI 1.45–5.87;  $p = 0.002$ ). This association was not found for humans. Associations with other antimicrobial classes were weaker and often not statistically significant.

#### Other Factors Determining MRSA in Humans and Pigs


Number of hours worked on the farm per week was strongly associated with MRSA in the human study population (univariate OR 1.82/10 hours worked increase, 95% CI 1.58–2.06;  $p < 0.0001$ ). Except for antimicrobial use, tasks related to animal contact and touching pigs from other farms were identified as risk factors for MRSA carriage in humans (Table 4). All variables in Table 4 were moderately or highly correlated (Spearman/Pearson  $r > 0.5$ ), and no multivariable model was built. We found no correlation between farm size, antimicrobial use, and hours worked.

More biosecurity items reducing MRSA carriage in pigs were found on closed farms (e.g., different compartments per production phase, boarding platform for sows, washing overalls) (Table 5, <http://wwwnc.cdc.gov/EID/article/21/6/14-0706-T5.htm>). Some variables had a similar effect on open and closed farms, increasing risk for MRSA (e.g., injection of antimicrobial drugs, clipping of

teeth, and vaccination of piglets) or decreasing MRSA carriage (e.g., presence of a medication pipe separated from the water pipe, delivery room for materials, and keeping the sows in stable groups [i.e., not mixing]) (Table 5). However, other effects showed conflicting directions between strata (e.g., farm treatment plan, cleaning and disinfecting the carcass barrels, source of water supply) (Table 5). Low-level correlation existed between some variables (pairwise Spearman  $r < 0.5$ ) and with antimicrobial use or cephalosporin use (Table 5). A full multivariable model (online Technical Appendix Table 3) was fitted by using the significant determinants from Table 5 together with the use of antimicrobials and cephalosporins; results from the backward elimination of non-significant terms are presented in Table 6. The presence of external supply of animals, overall antimicrobial use, and use of cephalosporins were significant risk factors retained through all elimination steps.

#### Discussion

We found a quantitative association between antimicrobial use and MRSA in pigs and humans living and/or working on pig farms. Our findings indicate that a reduction in antimicrobial use is likely to be effective in reducing MRSA carriage in pigs. Risk for MRSA is higher for increased use of tetracyclines and penicillins but more so for use of cephalosporins. Except for the change in antimicrobial use over time, overall changes in farm management were modest and not sufficient to contribute to decreasing MRSA levels. Nevertheless, several factors were identified as possible candidates for future intervention studies.



**Figure 4.** Dose–response relationships between antimicrobial use ( $\log_2$  DDDA/Y) and livestock-associated methicillin-resistant *Staphylococcus aureus* (LA-MRSA) predicted probabilities in pigs (A) and humans (B), the Netherlands, 2011–2013. Splines were obtained from generalized additive mixed models with random intercepts for farms in the analysis for pigs and humans. Models accounted for the repeated measurements design and were adjusted for age group of pigs and for animal contact (i.e., hours worked) for humans. DDDA/Y was determined by dividing the total number of kilograms treatable with a single mass unit of the antimicrobial drug concerned, in accordance with the package insert information, by the average number of animal kilograms on the farm. Farms were defined as open when they received external supplies of gilts  $\geq 1$  time per year from at least 1 supplier and as closed when they received no external supply of gilts. p values and maximum-likelihood (ML) scores for the splines in the models for pigs: all farms ( $p = 0.03$ ; ML 1433.5); open farms ( $p = 0.09$ ; ML 991.3); closed farms ( $p = 0.09$ ; ML 407.9); farrowing farms ( $p = 0.02$ ; ML 438.5); farrow-to-finish farms ( $p = 0.39$ ; ML 936.5). p values and ML scores for the splines in the models for humans: all farms ( $p = 0.01$ ; ML 573.9); open farms ( $p = 0.41$ ; ML 337.8); closed farms ( $p = 0.01$ ; ML 229.9); farrowing farms ( $p = 0.03$ ; ML 170.3); farrow-to-finish farms ( $p = 0.17$ ; ML 398.2). DDDA/Y, defined daily dosages per animal per year; ML, maximum likelihood. Shaded areas indicate 95% CIs.

The extent of representativeness of a convenient sample is difficult to evaluate. Nonetheless, descriptive results show the heterogeneity of farms included; the decreasing trend in use of antimicrobial drugs and the proportions by antimicrobial classes and by group and individual treatments mirror national data (16,17).

Levels of antimicrobial use differed considerably by farm type. Open and/or farrowing farms were high users of antimicrobial drugs and showed a strong positive dose–response relationship between antimicrobial use and MRSA in pigs. In particular, the use of cephalosporins was related to higher carriage rates of MRSA. The literature shows that selective pressure favors transmission and spread of MRSA in pigs (13,21). MRSA ST398 isolates have shown high diversity of resistance genes, and all of them are resistant to penicillin and tetracycline (22); the DDDA/Y of these

antimicrobial classes was related to MRSA in our results. Although the use of cephalosporins represented a small proportion of total antimicrobial use, it was strongly associated with MRSA in pigs. These antimicrobial drugs are known to be important for generation and propagation of resistance in *S. aureus* and other microorganisms (23). The fact that they were administered before the first sampling time might be related to the initial increase in MRSA prevalence in pigs. We refrained from presenting detailed associations by antimicrobial classes because mostly all classes were used on all the farms and were correlated; thus, effects of individual classes of antimicrobial drugs were difficult to disentangle and require cautious interpretation. The higher risk posed by administering group treatments confirms previous findings in the literature (4,12). Interaction between antimicrobial use and time was significant, suggesting a decrease of

**Table 3.** ORs for livestock-associated MRSA in pigs and in humans with increasing use of antimicrobial drugs, the Netherlands, 2011–2013\*

Characteristic	Pooled pig samples				Farmers and family members			
	No.†	OR‡ (95% CI)	p value	-2 log RSPL§	No.¶	OR# (95%CI)	p value	-2 log RSPL§
All farms	1,421	1.16 (1.02–1.33)	<b>0.03**</b>	6,937.5	626	1.22 (1.01–1.48)	<b>0.04</b>	3,196.9
Supply of gilts††								
Open	867	1.11 (0.97–1.27)	0.12**	3,828.9	365	1.08 (0.85–1.38)	0.53	1,806.9
Closed	554	0.86 (0.69–1.33)	0.79	3,132.2	261	1.31 (0.94–1.81)	0.11	1,424.3
Production type								
Farrowing	476	1.38 (1.03–1.86)	<b>0.03**</b>	2,399.2	158	1.28 (0.85–1.94)	0.24	784.3
Farrow-to-finish	954	1.11 (0.95–1.30)	0.18	4,621.4	468	1.19 (0.95–1.50)	0.13	2,439.8

\*Farm antimicrobial use was defined as 1 unit increase in the log<sub>2</sub> DDDA/Y. Results from the random intercept generalized linear mixed models accounting for the repeated measurements design and adjusting for confounders. DDDA/Y indicates the number of days of antimicrobial use per year for an average animal on the farm. It was determined by dividing the total number of kilograms treatable with a single mass unit of the antimicrobial drug concerned, according to the package insert information, by the average number of animal kilograms on the farm. The denominator comprised sows and fatteners. DDDA/Y, defined daily dosages animal per year; MRSA, methicillin-resistant *Staphylococcus aureus*; OR, odd ratio; RSPL, residual pseudo-likelihood. Bold type indicates significance (p<0.05).

†Number of observations at all sampling times together (10 pooled pig samples per farm on 36 farms in 4 sampling times). Values are missing for 19 observations.

‡For analysis in pigs, a farm random intercept was included in the mixed models and adjustment of ORs was made for sampling time and age group of pigs in the pool.

§RSPL from the generalized linear mixed models. Models per stratum of external supply or type of production are not nested and -2 log RSPL cannot be used for comparison.

¶Number of observations in all sampling times together (158 persons, 4 sampling times). Values are missing for 6 observations.

#For analysis in humans, a farm and a person random intercept were included in the mixed models, and number of hours worked on the farm and sampling time were used for adjustment of ORs.

\*\*These models additionally showed significant antimicrobial use–time interaction indicating parallel change in antimicrobial use and livestock-associated MRSA prevalence over the study period (see extended explanation in text).

††Farms were defined as open when they received external supplies of gilts ≥1 time per year from at least 1 supplier and as closed when they received no external supply of gilts.

MRSA prevalence in pigs over time with decreasing antimicrobial use. These associations were not found on closed and farrow-to-finishing farms, indicating that below a certain level, antimicrobial use contributes less to MRSA prevalence. Nevertheless, it is important to consider that other studies have reported high MRSA transmission in the absence of antimicrobial agents (24,25). Thus, antimicrobial use should not be the only target for intervention.

Direct contact with positive animals has been widely reported as the major force driving MRSA carriage in persons living and/or working on farms (26–28). In our study, higher risk for MRSA in the human study population was strongly associated with the number of hours worked on the farm and to the variables related to tasks performed on the farm. However, antimicrobial use also showed a significant positive dose–response relationship to MRSA human carriage during the study, even after adjustment for hours worked. When antimicrobial drugs are administered to animals, substantial quantities of these drugs remain in manure, on surfaces of barns, and in dust as a potential risk source (29). The selective pressure exerted by exposure to dust containing antimicrobial drugs or directly to antimicrobial powder formulations would explain the higher risk for MRSA carriage in persons living or working on pig farms. However, this independent effect of antimicrobial use on susceptible bacteria in humans is difficult to disentangle from direct MRSA transmission from animals to humans.

The role of animal trade in introducing and spreading MRSA has been reported (4,10–13), but information

about carriage status of animals entering the farm was not available in this study. Nevertheless, our results corroborate that external supply of animals is significantly associated with higher MRSA levels. A higher selective pressure for MRSA might also occur on open farms because they had higher overall antimicrobial use and 6 of them used cephalosporins. However, external supply of animals appeared to be a risk factor, even when evaluated together with antimicrobial use and cephalosporin use in the multivariate model.

A previous study in the Netherlands found that the prevalence of MRSA-positive pig farms steeply increased from 40% in 2007 to 70% in 2008 (4). Our results show that this prevalence remains high (>80%) but the slight increase since 2008 indicates that MRSA carriage in pigs might have reached a steady state. Herd size was identified as a risk factor when MRSA was emerging in livestock (12); however, we found no such association.

Several determinants could be targeted for specific interventions in the near future. Factors regarding biosecurity considerably reduced the risk for MRSA, especially on closed farms. It is remarkable that mostly variables related to management of piglets were associated with MRSA. Piglets are more susceptible to infection, and they receive larger amounts of antimicrobial drugs. Tooth clipping in piglets increased the probability for MRSA carriage; MRSA transmission from piglet to piglet might be higher when the same plier is used or through the worker. Unexpected risk factors could be the product of reverse

**Table 4.** ORs for determinants of livestock-associated MRSA in humans, adjusted for number of hours worked per week on the farm, the Netherlands, 2011–2013\*

Variable	No.†	OR‡ (95% CI)	p value§	–2 log RSPL¶
Age, per 10 y increase	632	1.14 (0.93–1.41)	0.2	3,204.1
MRSA prevalence in pigs, %, per 10% increase	632	1.08 (0.97–1.21)	0.16	3,190.9
MRSA-negative farm				
Yes	114	0.06 (0.01–0.27)	<b>&lt;0.01</b>	3,288.1
No	518	Ref		
Touching dogs in past 6–12 mo				
Yes	446	0.51 (0.27–0.96)	<b>0.04</b>	3,173.7
No	180	Ref		
Touching pigs from other farms in past 6–12 mo				
Yes	86	2.82 (1.35–5.91)	<b>0.01</b>	3,205.3
No	546	Ref		
Sorting of sows in past 7 d				
Yes	221	1.91 (0.97–3.77)	0.06	3,144.5
No	392	Ref		
Sorting of suckling piglets in past 7 d				
Yes	159	2.21 (1.16–4.22)	<b>0.02</b>	3,169.5
No	455	Ref		
Sorting of weaned piglets in past 7 d				
Yes	174	1.63 (0.83–3.20)	0.16	3,162.9
No	439	Ref		
Feeding sows in past 7 d				
Yes	220	2.03 (0.99–4.17)	0.05	3,126.0
No	390	Ref		
Cleaning and disinfecting weaned piglets section in past 7 d				
Yes	81	1.70 (0.76–3.80)	0.2	3,157.8
No	538	Ref		

\*Results from the random intercept generalized linear mixed models accounting for the repeated measurements design and adjusted for number of hours worked. MRSA, methicillin-associated *Staphylococcus aureus*; OR, odds ratio; Ref, reference category; RSPL, residual pseudo-likelihood. Bold type indicates p values <0.05.

†Number of observations in all sampling times together (158 persons, 4 sampling times). Some variables have missing observations.

‡For analysis in humans, a farm and a person random intercept were included in the mixed models, and number of hours worked on the farm and sampling time were used for adjustment of ORs.

§Only variables with p<0.2 in the mixed models are presented in the human analysis.

¶RSPL from the generalized linear mixed models.

causality such as vaccination of piglets, fatteners, or both and frequent change of needles. These possibilities need to be explored in other, independent studies. Observations for cleaning and disinfection were not consistent. It has been previously reported that disinfection has a short-lasting positive effect for MRSA reduction (30). Keeping the groups of sows stable was an interesting protective factor that might reduce MRSA spread within the farm. Animals that drank water from the public supply instead of from a private source had increased probability for MRSA. Zinc oxide specifically co-selects for MRSA ST398 (31,32), and concentrations can be higher in tap water as a result of leaching from pipes. A higher zinc intake in animals might have led to higher selection for MRSA, but this association needs further research.

Pooling of animal samples leads to less precise prevalence estimates (33,34) but is a low-cost alternative for individual sampling that enabled enlargement of the number of farms tested. Individual testing, however, would not be expected to lead to different outcomes.

This study shows the inherent difficulty in evaluating pragmatic interventions for MRSA control in pig farms under field conditions over a relatively short period. More

farms and controlled interventions, together with longer follow-up periods to capture prevalence changes, are needed to assess intervention effects over time. Despite the limitations, we identified factors that can define attainable future interventions (e.g., avoiding tooth clipping, keeping sows in stable groups). Finally, we demonstrated that antimicrobial use has a strong and positive dose–response relationship with MRSA in pigs and humans living and/or working on pig farms. In particular, use of cephalosporins resulted in increased MRSA carriage rates in pigs. Animal and public health authorities should continue to promote the reduction of antimicrobial use. Different approaches for MRSA control might be needed in light of the differences by type of production and external supply of animals.

#### Acknowledgments

We thank all farmers, family members, and employees for participation and laboratory workers and veterinarians for assistance. We also thank the Southern and Northern Agriculture and Horticulture Organizations (ZLTO and LTO-Noord), and veterinarians for recruitment of farms and the Integrated Chain Management systems for the pig sectors (IKB Varken and IKB Nederland Varkens) for providing the data in antimicrobial use.



**Table 6.** ORs for the most important determinants of livestock-associated MRSA positivity in 1,054 pooled pig samples from 32 farms (multivariable final model), the Netherlands, 2011–2013\*

Characteristic	No.†	OR (95% CI)	p value
Sampling time			
0 mo	262	0.83 (0.48–1.43)	<0.001
6 mo	290	2.05 (1.25–3.37)	
12 mo	259	1.96 (1.20–3.20)	
18 mo	243	Ref	
Age group			
Gilts	212	1.08 (0.65–1.80)	<0.001
Finishers	140	4.09 (2.30–7.25)	
Suckling piglets	212	3.87 (2.34–6.39)	
Weaned piglets	280	9.89 (5.96–16.39)	
Sows	210	Ref	
External supply of gilts‡			
Open	630	5.54 (1.56–19.27)	0.008
Closed	424	Ref	
Delivery room for materials			
Yes	804	0.29 (0.13–0.62)	0.001
No	250	Ref	
Sows housed in stable groups			
Yes	594	0.53 (0.29–0.96)	0.038
No	460	Ref	
Antimicrobial drug use, per 2-fold increase, log <sub>2</sub> DDDA/Y	1,054	1.22 (1.03–1.44)	0.024
Use of cephalosporins			
Yes	84	3.15 (1.47–6.74)	0.003
No	970	Ref	

\*Model fit:  $-2 \log \text{RSPL estimation} = 5331.7$ . Multivariable final model after backward elimination of non-significant variables from a full model (online Technical Appendix Table 3, <http://wwwnc.cdc.gov/EID/article/21/6/14-0706-Techapp1.pdf>) containing the significant associations ( $p < 0.05$ ) presented in Table 5 (<http://wwwnc.cdc.gov/EID/article/21/6/14-0706-T5.htm>) for all farms, together with antimicrobial drug use, use of cephalosporins, sampling time, and age group of the pool. MRSA, methicillin-resistant *Staphylococcus aureus*; OR, odds ratio; DDDA/Y, defined daily dosages animal per year; Ref, reference category; RSPL, residual pseudo-likelihood.

†Multiple variables had missing values in the full model reducing the number of observations in the final model.

‡Farms were defined as open when they received external supplies of gilts  $\geq 1$  time per year from at least 1 supplier and as closed when they received no external supply of gilts.

Finally, we acknowledge the assistance of Lutzen Portengen, Virissa Lenters, and Nahid Mostafavi in the statistical analysis, and the useful discussions with Jan Dahl.

This work was supported by Senter Novem (contract no. FND07003); Product Boards for Livestock and Meat (contract no. 13.31.001); and Netherlands Organization for Research and Development ZonMw (contract no. 50-51700-98-053).

Dr. Dorado-García is a veterinary epidemiologist and PhD candidate at Utrecht University, the Netherlands. His research interests include exploring and assessing different ways to decrease transmission of antimicrobial resistant bacteria from livestock to humans.

## References

- Armand-Lefevre L, Ruimy R, Andremont A. Clonal comparison of *Staphylococcus aureus* isolates from healthy pig farmers, human controls, and pigs. *Emerg Infect Dis.* 2005;11:711–4. <http://dx.doi.org/10.3201/eid1105.040866>
- Voss A, Loeffen F, Bakker J, Klaassen C, Wulf M. Methicillin-resistant *Staphylococcus aureus* in pig farming. *Emerg Infect Dis.* 2005;11:1965–6. <http://dx.doi.org/10.3201/eid1112.050428>
- Graveland H, Duim B, van Duijkeren E, Heederik D, Wagenaar JA. Livestock-associated methicillin-resistant *Staphylococcus aureus* in animals and humans. *Int J Med Microbiol.* 2011;301:630–4. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.ijmm.2011.09.004>
- Broens EM, Graat EA, Van der Wolf PJ, Van de Giessen AW, De Jong MC. Prevalence and risk factor analysis of livestock associated MRSA-positive pig herds in the Netherlands. *Prev Vet Med.* 2011;102:41–9. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.prevetmed.2011.06.005>
- Pantosti A. Methicillin-resistant *Staphylococcus aureus* associated with animals and its relevance to human health. *Front Microbiol.* 2012;3:127. <http://dx.doi.org/10.3389/fmicb.2012.00127>
- Köck R, Schaumburg F, Mellmann A, Köksal M, Jurke A, Becker K, et al. Livestock-associated methicillin-resistant *Staphylococcus aureus* (MRSA) as causes of human infection and colonization in Germany. *PLoS ONE.* 2013;8:e55040. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0055040>
- Fitzgerald JR. Livestock-associated *Staphylococcus aureus*: origin, evolution and public health threat. *Trends Microbiol.* 2012;20:192–8. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.tim.2012.01.006>
- Camoez M, Sierra JM, Pujol M, Hornero A, Martin R, Dominguez MA. Prevalence and molecular characterization of methicillin-resistant *Staphylococcus aureus* ST398 resistant to tetracycline at a Spanish hospital over 12 years. *PLoS ONE.* 2013;8:e72828. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0072828>
- Dutch Working Party on Antibiotic Policy (SWAB), Dutch National Institute for Public Health and the Environment (RIVM). NethMap 2014: consumption of antimicrobial agents and antimicrobial resistance among medically important bacteria in the Netherlands. 2014 June [cited 2014 Apr 23]. [http://www.swab.nl/swab/cms3.nsf/uploads/05ABE3EF93A82F4BC1257D07001DE8BC/\\$FILE/Boek%20Nethmap-MARAN%202014%20TG.pdf](http://www.swab.nl/swab/cms3.nsf/uploads/05ABE3EF93A82F4BC1257D07001DE8BC/$FILE/Boek%20Nethmap-MARAN%202014%20TG.pdf)
- Broens EM, Graat EA, van der Wolf PJ, van de Giessen AW, van Duijkeren E, Wagenaar JA, et al. MRSA CC398 in the pig production chain. *Prev Vet Med.* 2011;98:182–9. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.prevetmed.2010.10.010>

11. Espinosa-Gongora C, Broens EM, Moodley A, Nielsen JP, Guardabassi L. Transmission of MRSA CC398 strains between pig farms related by trade of animals. *Vet Rec.* 2012;170:564. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1136/vr.100704>
12. European Food Safety Authority 2010. Analysis of the baseline survey on the prevalence of methicillin-resistant *Staphylococcus aureus* (MRSA) in holdings with breeding pigs, in the EU, 2008—part B: factors associated with MRSA contamination of holdings. *EFSA Journal.* 2010;8:1597
13. Broens EM, Espinosa-Gongora C, Graat EA, Vendrig N, Van Der Wolf PJ, Guardabassi L, et al. Longitudinal study on transmission of MRSA CC398 within pig herds. *BMC Vet Res.* 2012;8:58. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1186/1746-6148-8-58>
14. Bos ME, Taverne FJ, van Geijlswijk IM, Mouton JW, Mevius DJ, Heederik DJ, et al. Consumption of antimicrobials in pigs, veal calves, and broilers in the Netherlands: quantitative results of nationwide collection of data in 2011. *PLoS ONE.* 2013;8:e77525. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0077525>
15. Speksnijder DC, Mevius DJ, Brusckhe CJ, Wagenaar JA. Reduction of veterinary antimicrobial use in the Netherlands. the Dutch success model. *Zoonoses Public Health.* 2014. Epub ahead of print. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/zph.12167>
16. The Netherlands Veterinary Medicines Authority (SDa). Usage of antibiotics in agricultural livestock in the Netherlands in 2013: trends and benchmarking of livestock farms and veterinarians. 2014 September [cited 2014 Apr 23]. <http://www.autoriteitdiergeneesmiddelen.nl/userfiles/pdf/SDa-rapporten/sda-report-usage-of-antibiotics-in-agricultureal-livestock-in-the-netherlands-in-2013-september-2014.pdf>
17. Central Veterinary institute of Wageningen University. Dutch Food and Consumer Product Safety Authority (NVWA). Monitoring of antimicrobial resistance and antibiotic usage in animals in the Netherlands (MARAN) 2014 [cited 2014 Apr 23]. [http://www.wageningenur.nl/upload\\_mm/1/a/1/0704c512-5b42-4cef-8c1b-60e9e3fb2a62\\_NethMap-MARAN2014.pdf](http://www.wageningenur.nl/upload_mm/1/a/1/0704c512-5b42-4cef-8c1b-60e9e3fb2a62_NethMap-MARAN2014.pdf)
18. Graveland H, van Duijkeren E, van Nes A, Schoormans A, Broekhuizen-Stins M, Oosting-van Schothorst I, et al. Evaluation of isolation procedures and chromogenic agar media for the detection of MRSA in nasal swabs from pigs and veal calves. *Vet Microbiol.* 2009;139:121–5. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.vetmic.2009.05.019>
19. van Meurs ML, Schellekens JJ, de Neeling AJ, Duim B, Schneeberger PM, Hermans MH. Real-time PCR to distinguish livestock-associated (ST398) from non-livestock-associated (methicillin-resistant) *Staphylococcus aureus*. *Infection.* 2013;41:339–46. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s15010-012-0319-5>
20. Francois P, Pittet D, Bento M, Pepey B, Vaudaux P, Lew D, et al. Rapid detection of methicillin-resistant *Staphylococcus aureus* directly from sterile or non-sterile clinical samples by a new molecular assay. *J Clin Microbiol.* 2003;41:254–60. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1128/JCM.41.1.254-260.2003>
21. Moodley A, Nielsen SS, Guardabassi L. Effects of tetracycline and zinc on selection of methicillin-resistant *Staphylococcus aureus* (MRSA) sequence type 398 in pigs. *Vet Microbiol.* 2011;152:420–3. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.vetmic.2011.05.025>
22. Jamrozny DM, Fielder MD, Butaye P, Coldham NG. Comparative genotypic and phenotypic characterization of methicillin-resistant *Staphylococcus aureus* ST398 isolated from animals and humans. *PLoS ONE.* 2012;7:e40458. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0040458>
23. Dancer SJ. The problem with cephalosporins. *J Antimicrob Chemother.* 2001;48:463–78. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/jac/48.4.463>
24. Weese JS, Zwambag A, Rosendal T, Reid-Smith R, Friendship R. Longitudinal investigation of methicillin-resistant *Staphylococcus aureus* in piglets. *Zoonoses Public Health.* 2011;58:238–43. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1863-2378.2010.01340.x>
25. Crombé F, Vanderhaeghen W, Dewulf J, Hermans K, Haesebrouck F, Butaye P. Colonization and transmission of methicillin-resistant *Staphylococcus aureus* ST398 in nursery piglets. *Appl Environ Microbiol.* 2012;78:1631–4. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1128/AEM.07356-11>
26. Van Den Broek IV, van Cleef BA, Haenen A, Broens EM, van der Wolf PJ, van den Broek MJ, et al. Methicillin-resistant *Staphylococcus aureus* in people living and working in pig farms. *Epidemiol Infect.* 2009;137:700–8. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/S0950268808001507>
27. Dorado-García A, Bos ME, Graveland H, Van Cleef BA, Verstappen KM, Kluytmans JA, et al. Risk factors for persistence of livestock-associated MRSA and environmental exposure in veal calf farmers and their family members: an observational longitudinal study. *BMJ Open.* 2013;3:e003272. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1136/bmjopen-2013-003272>
28. van Cleef BA, Graveland H, Haenen AP, van de Giessen AW, Heederik D, Wagenaar JA, et al. Persistence of livestock-associated methicillin-resistant *Staphylococcus aureus* in field workers after short-term occupational exposure to pigs and veal calves. *J Clin Microbiol.* 2011;49:1030–3. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1128/JCM.00493-10>
29. Hamscher G, Pawelzick HT, Sczesny S, Nau H, Hartung J. Antibiotics in dust originating from a pig-fattening farm: a new source of health hazard for farmers? *Environ Health Perspect.* 2003;111:1590–4. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1289/ehp.6288>
30. Pletinckx LJ, Dewulf J, De Bleecker Y, Rasschaert G, Goddeeris BM, De Man I. Effect of a disinfection strategy on the methicillin-resistant *Staphylococcus aureus* CC398 prevalence of sows, their piglets and the barn environment. *J Appl Microbiol.* 2013;114:1634–41. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/jam.12201>
31. Moodley A, Nielsen SS, Guardabassi L. Effects of tetracycline and zinc on selection of methicillin-resistant *Staphylococcus aureus* (MRSA) sequence type 398 in pigs. *Vet Microbiol.* 2011;152:420–3. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.vetmic.2011.05.025>
32. Cavaco LM, Hasman H, Stegger M, Andersen PS, Skov R, Fluit AC, et al. Cloning and occurrence of *czrC*, a gene conferring cadmium and zinc resistance in methicillin-resistant *Staphylococcus aureus* CC398 isolates. *Antimicrob Agents Chemother.* 2010;54:3605–8. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1128/AAC.00058-10>
33. Muñoz-Zanzi C, Thurmond M, Hietala S, Johnson W. Factors affecting sensitivity and specificity of pooled-sample testing for diagnosis of low prevalence infections. *Prev Vet Med.* 2006;74:309–22. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.prevetmed.2005.12.006>
34. Jordan D. Simulating the sensitivity of pooled-sample herd tests for fecal *Salmonella* in cattle. *Prev Vet Med.* 2005;70:59–73. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.prevetmed.2005.02.013>

Address for correspondence: Alejandro Dorado-García, Institute for Risk Assessment Sciences, Universiteit Utrecht, PO Box 80178, 3508 TD Utrecht, the Netherlands; email: a.doradogarcia@uu.nl

# Dose-Response Relationship between Antimicrobial Drugs and Livestock-Associated MRSA in Pig Farming

## Technical Appendix

**Technical Appendix Table 1.** Farm questionnaire used in each of the four sampling times in a risk factor analysis for livestock-associated methicillin-resistant *Staphylococcus aureus* in pig farming, the Netherlands, 2011-2013.

Question	Possible answers
<b>General farm characteristics:</b>	
1. <b>Farm size: mean number of sows present per year</b> ¶¶	No.
2. <b>Type of production</b> ¶	Farrowing / Farrow-to-finish
3. Mean number of fattener pigs present per year	No.
4. Frequency of gilts supply per year	No.
5. Number of farms from which pigs are supplied per year	No.
6. <b>External supply of gilts ≥1 time a year from at least one supplier (aggregated from questions 4 and 5)</b> ¶	Open / Closed
7. Complete all in-all out system is applied for closed farm¶	Yes / No
8. Frequency of removal of piglets	No.
9. Frequency of removal of fattener pigs	No.
10. Frequency of removal of rearing gilts	No.
11. Frequency of removal of sows	No.
12. Percentage of loss of weaned piglets per year	No.
13. Average lactation period (days)	No.
14. Mean number of weaned piglets per sow per year	No.
15. Mean number of weaned piglets per litter	No.
16. Percentage of loss of fattener pigs per year	No.
17. Percentage of loss of sows per year	No.
18. Mean growth per piglet per day	No.
19. Mean growth per fattener pig per year	No.
20. After delivering the leftover piglets are placed together	Yes / No
21. After delivering there is a leftover piglets department	Yes / No
<b>Biosecurity and hygiene status</b>	
22. Hygiene status of the farm	A/ B/ C/ D/ E/ F
23. The farm owns an Specific pathogen free (SPF) status¶	Yes / No
24. SPF status for	App/ Aujeszky/ M.Hyo/ PRRSv/ None
25. Housing of the gestating sows ¶	Cubicle / Groups
26. Group size of the gestating sows¶	Yes / No
27. There are other animals present on the farm¶	Yes / No
28. There are also sheep present on the farm¶	Yes / No
29. There are also goats present on the farm¶	Yes / No
30. There are also cattle present on the farm¶	Yes / No
31. There are also horses present on the farm¶	Yes / No
32. There are also poultry present on the farm¶	Yes / No
33. No other farming animals are present on the farm	Yes / No
34. Cats are able to enter the shed	Yes / No
35. Dogs are able to enter the shed¶	Yes / No
36. Number of people working on the farm (including assisting family members)	Yes / No
37. Biosecurity score (aggregated sum from questions 38, 42, 45,49, 90, 136 where yes=1 and no=0 )¶	0 to 6
38. There is only one entrance to the farm, which is the hygiene lock, other doors are locked¶	Yes / No
39. A doorbell or phone number of the owner is clearly visible at the entrance of the farm. In this way it is possible to contact the people of the farm¶	Yes / No
40. The farm's terrain is paved and cleaned up ¶	Yes / No
41. Silos are filled from the side of the dirty road¶	Yes / No
42. Pigs and personnel go outside during working activities¶	Yes / No
43. The hygiene lock consists of a clean and dirty part, separated by a corridor shower¶	Yes / No
44. The lock does not contain a shower, but it does consist of a clearly separated clean and dirty part	Yes / No
45. Showering is mandatory¶	Yes / No
46. If showering is not mandatory, everyone washes his or her hands before entering the farm	Yes / No

Question	Possible answers
47. Showering is not mandatory, however wearing farm-issued clothing is (pants and shirt	Yes / No
48. Farmer and his co-workers use the hygiene lock in the same way visitors do¶	Yes / No
49. The farmer and his co-workers wash their hands before entering the farm¶	Yes / No
50. There is warm water available¶	Yes / No
51. There is soap available	Yes / No
52. There is a clean towel present	Yes / No
53. There are clean boots and overalls available¶	Yes / No
<b>54. Workers' overalls are washed daily¶</b>	Yes / No
55. Overalls are washed	Daily/Weekly / Monthly/ Less than monthly
56. On average, for how many months does the manure stay in the pits during the summer?¶	<6 / ≥6
57. On average, for how many months does the manure stay in the pits during the summer?¶	<3 / 3-6 / 6-9 / >9
<b>58. On average, for how many months does the manure stay in the pits during the winter?¶</b>	<6 / ≥6
59. On average, for how many months does the manure stay in the pits during the winter?¶	<3 / 3-6 / 6-9 / >9
60. Delivered animals are placed in quarantine for a certain period of time. This part has its own entrance and is not a part of the rest of the farm	Yes / No
61. The quarantine has its own lock and clothing	Yes / No
62. The quarantine is visited at the end of the day	Yes / No
63. After delivery, the gilts arrive at an empty and cleaned section. This is not a quarantine	Yes / No
64. When gilts are delivered, these animals do not arrive at an empty section or quarantine	Yes / No
65. Piglets are delivered on the same day as fatteners	Yes / No
66. Sperm is delivered on the dirty road, the cooling box is not brought on the farm terrain¶	Yes / No
<b>67. There is a delivery room for materials and bagged goods. Materials are not delivered directly to the farm¶</b>	Yes / No
68. Pest control is handed over to a professional organization¶	Yes / No
69. Birds are able to enter the sheds¶	Yes / No
70. Is there presence of rats and/or mice?¶	Yes / No
71. Animals have access to an outdoor run (e.g. after weaning)	Yes / No
<b>72. When pigs are moved, they have to go outside¶</b>	Yes / No
<b>73. There is a boarding platform for the sows, preventing the truck from parking directly against the shed¶</b>	Yes / No
74. There is a boarding platform for the piglets, preventing the truck from parking directly against the shed¶	Yes / No
75. There is a boarding platform for the fatteners, preventing the truck from parking directly against the shed ¶	Yes / No
76. There is boarding platform for piglets and/or fatteners¶	Yes / No
77. The boarding location is not situated directly next to or beneath an air inlet¶	Yes / No
<b>78. The border for the delivery of animals is a 100% clear and is also implemented this way¶</b>	Yes / No
79. After delivery of the animals, the delivery platform is cleaned and disinfected immediately¶	Yes / No
80. The driver does not enter the clean road¶	Yes / No
81. Transport trucks are clean, empty and disinfected when they arrive on the farm to load the sows¶	Yes / No
82. The carcass storage is cooled and locked¶	Yes / No
83. The carcass cooler is situated on the dirty road¶	Yes / No
84. Small destruction materials can be thrown into the cooler from the clean road¶	Yes / No
85. There is a double number of barrels on the farm. So there is a surplus of barrels¶	Yes / No
<b>86. After the destructor emptied the barrels, the barrels are cleaned and disinfected before retrieved¶</b>	Yes / No
87. Rinsing water of cleaning barrels is discharged into the sewer	Yes / No
88. When handling carcasses, gloves are always worn¶	Yes / No
89. When treating sick animals, gloves are always worn¶	Yes / No
90. When treating piglets, gloves are always worn¶	Yes / No
91. After someone entered a pen of the weaned piglets or the fatteners, hygienic measures are taken	Yes / No
<u>Animal health management</u>	
92. During gestation, vaccinations are implemented	Yes / No
93. During lactation, vaccinations are implemented	Yes / No
<b>94. The piglets and/or fatteners are vaccinated¶</b>	Yes / No
95. PRRSv vaccination is implemented	Yes / No
96. <i>Mycoplasma hyponeumoniae</i> vaccination is implemented	Yes / No
97. PCV2 vaccination is implemented	Yes / No
98. APP vaccination is implemented	Yes / No
99. Glässer vaccination is implemented	Yes / No
100. The piglets are vaccinated without the use of a needle	Yes / No
<b>101. The teeth of the new-born piglets are clipped¶</b>	Yes / No
102. The tails of the piglets are docked¶	Yes / No
103. The boar piglets are castrated	Yes / No
<b>104. All piglets are given an injection of antibiotics in their first week of life¶</b>	Yes / No

Question	Possible answers
105. When treating the piglets, gloves are worn	Yes / No
106. The gloves are renewed:	After each litter/ After each section /Each day Yes / No
107. When treating the piglets, other hygiene measures are taken in order to prevent the transfer of infection from one to the other litter¶	
108. Needles for vaccination of sows are renewed:¶	Once a day / Once a week / When necessary Yes / No
109. Needles for vaccination of piglets and/or fatteners are renewed per pen¶	Yes / No
<b>110. Needles for vaccination of piglets and/or fatteners are renewed per section¶</b>	Yes / No
111. At the end of the day, the syringes are cleaned:	Daily, rinsing with cold water / Taken apart and with water and soap / Dishwasher / Not cleaned
112. There is a sick-bay present¶	Yes / No
113. The sick-bay is used as a sick-bay	Yes / No
114. In the sick-bay, different ages are present	Yes / No
115. Animals enter and exit a sick-bay (back to the farm)	Yes / No
116. The sick-bay is visited at the end of the day	Yes / No
117. There is a care option for sick and cripple animals at their own group/section¶	Yes / No
<u>Animal contact structure</u>	
<b>118. The sows are housed in stable groups¶</b>	Yes / No
119. Piglets are placed per litter¶	Yes / No
<b>120. Some piglets are reared motherless¶</b>	Yes / No
121. After the third day, piglets can still be switched¶	Yes / No
122. Foster sows are used¶	Yes / No
123. When creating foster sows, different litters of piglets are moved up to a different sow	Yes / No
124. Separation between piglet cages is open¶	Yes / No
125. Separation between piglet cages is taken up by the feeder and/or trough, which is shared between the animals¶	Yes / No
126. Supervision of the animals from the central hall way	Yes / No
127. Separation between cages fatteners is open¶	Yes / No
128. Separation between cages fatteners is taken up by the feeder and/or trough, which is shared between the animals¶	Yes / No
129. Separation between cages for sows is open¶	Yes / No
130. Separation between cages for sows is taken up by the feeder and/or trough, which is shared between the animals¶	Yes / No
131. Carcasses are placed on the ground in the section¶	Yes / No
132. Carcasses are placed on the ground in the central hall way¶	Yes / No
133. Cadaver bags are used¶	Yes / No
134. Considering hygienic measures, direction of work is from young to old ¶	Yes / No
<b>135. Sows, piglets and fatteners are different components within the farm. Each component makes use of different clothing and materials¶</b>	Yes / No
<u>Cleaning and disinfection</u>	
136. All farm sections are cleaned and disinfected ¶	Yes / No
137. All farm sections are disinfected ¶	Yes / No
138. All farm sections are cleaned with soaking agents¶	Yes / No
139. Farrow section hygiene (aggregated variable from questions 143 and 144)¶	Disinfection and or soaking / None
140. Farrow corridor hygiene (aggregated variable from questions 148 and 149)¶	Yes / No
141. Farrowing section is cleaned with cold water	Yes / No
142. Farrowing section is cleaned with warm water	Yes / No
143. Farrowing section is cleaned with soaking agent	Yes / No
144. Farrowing section is cleaned with disinfection agent	Yes / No
145. After cleaning farrowing section, there is a dry period of at least 24 hours	Yes / No
146. Farrowing section is cleaned by sweeping	Yes / No
147. Farrowing corridor is cleaned with soaking agent	Yes / No
148. Farrowing corridor is cleaned with disinfection agent	Yes / No
<b>149. Piglets section hygiene (aggregated variable from questions 153 and 154)¶</b>	Disinfection and soaking / Just soaking / Just disinfection / None
150. Piglets corridor hygiene (aggregated variable from questions 157 and 158)¶	Disinfection and soaking / Just soaking / None
151. Piglets section is cleaned with cold water	Yes / No
152. Piglets section is cleaned with warm water	Yes / No
153. Piglets section is cleaned with soaking agent	Yes / No
154. Piglets section is cleaned with disinfection agent	Yes / No
155. After cleaning piglets section, there is a dry period of at least 24 hours	Yes / No
156. Piglets section is cleaned by sweeping	Yes / No
157. Piglets corridor is cleaned with soaking agent	Yes / No
158. Piglets corridor is cleaned with disinfection agent	Yes / No
159. Fatteners section hygiene (aggregated variable from questions 163 and 164)	Disinfection and soaking / Just soaking / Just disinfection / None
160. Fattener corridor hygiene (aggregated variable from questions 167 and 168)	Disinfection and or soaking /

Question	Possible answers
	None
161. Fattener section is cleaned with cold water	Yes / No
162. Fatteners section is cleaned with warm water	Yes / No
163. Fatteners section is cleaned with soaking agent	Yes / No
164. Fatteners section is cleaned with disinfection agent	Yes / No
165. After cleaning fatteners section, there is a dry period of at least 24 hours	Yes / No
166. Fatteners section is cleaned by sweeping	Yes / No
167. Fatteners corridor is cleaned with soaking agent	Yes / No
168. Fatteners corridor is cleaned with disinfection agent	Yes / No
<b>169. Gilts section hygiene (aggregated variable from questions 173 and 174)¶</b>	Disinfection and or soaking / Just soaking / None
170. Gilts corridor hygiene (aggregated variable from questions 177 and 178)¶	Disinfection and or soaking / None
171. Gilts section is cleaned with cold water	Yes / No
172. Gilts section is cleaned with warm water	Yes / No
173. Gilts section is cleaned with soaking agent	Yes / No
174. Gilts section is cleaned with disinfection agent	Yes / No
175. After cleaning gilts section, there is a dry period of at least 24 hours	Yes / No
176. Gilts section is cleaned by sweeping	Yes / No
177. Gilts corridor is cleaned with soaking agent	Yes / No
178. Gilts corridor is cleaned with disinfection agent	Yes / No
<b>179. Mating section hygiene (aggregated variable from questions 183 and 184) ¶</b>	Disinfection and or soaking / None
180. Mating corridor hygiene (aggregated variable from questions 187 and 188)¶	Disinfection and or soaking / None
181. Mating section is cleaned with cold water	Yes / No
182. Mating section is cleaned with warm water	Yes / No
183. Mating section is cleaned with soaking agent	Yes / No
184. Mating section is cleaned with disinfection agent	Yes / No
185. After cleaning mating section, there is a dry period of at least 24 hours	Yes / No
186. Mating section is cleaned by sweeping	Yes / No
187. Mating corridor is cleaned with soaking agent	Yes / No
188. Mating corridor is cleaned with disinfection agent	Yes / No
189. Gestation shed section hygiene (aggregated variable from questions 193 and 194)¶	Disinfection and or soaking / None
190. Gestation shed corridor hygiene (aggregated variable from questions 197 and 198)¶	Disinfection and or soaking / None
191. Gestation shed section is cleaned with cold water	Yes / No
192. Gestation shed section is cleaned with warm water	Yes / No
193. Gestation shed section is cleaned with soaking agent	Yes / No
194. Gestation shed section is cleaned with disinfection agent	Yes / No
195. After cleaning gestation shed section, there is a dry period of at least 24 hours	Yes / No
196. Gestation shed section is cleaned by sweeping	Yes / No
197. Gestation corridor is cleaned with soaking agent	Yes / No
198. Gestation corridor is cleaned with disinfection agent	Yes / No
<u>Workflow, feed and water supply</u>	
199. Work is visibly done with a week planner¶	Yes / No
200. Work is visibly done with a day planner¶	Yes / No
201. There are protocols present in the shed (work flows) ¶	Yes / No
202. The date of placement is present on the section doors ¶	Yes / No
<b>203. Farm treatment plan recorded and stored¶</b>	Yes / No
204. A medical prescription with dosage is present on the farm¶	Yes / No
205. Farrowing sows are fed with broth¶	Yes / No
206. Farrowing sows are fed with dry feed¶	Yes / No
207. Farrowing sows are fed with milk	Yes / No
208. Farrowing sows are fed with mush/pulp	Yes / No
209. Dry and gestating sows are fed with broth¶	Yes / No
210. Dry and gestating sows are fed with dry feed¶	Yes / No
211. Dry and gestating sows are fed with milk	Yes / No
212. Dry and gestating sows are fed with mush/pulp	Yes / No
213. Gilts are fed with broth¶	Yes / No
214. Gilts are fed with dry feed¶	Yes / No
215. Gilts are fed with milk	Yes / No
216. Gilts are fed with mush/pulp	Yes / No
217. Piglets with sow are fed with broth¶	Yes / No
218. Piglets with sow are fed with dry feed¶	Yes / No
219. Piglets with sow are fed with milk¶	Yes / No
220. Piglets with sow are fed with mush/pulp¶	Yes / No
221. Weaned piglets are fed with broth¶	Yes / No
222. Weaned piglets are fed with dry feed¶	Yes / No
223. Weaned piglets are fed with milk	Yes / No
224. Weaned piglets are fed with mush/pulp¶	Yes / No
225. Fatteners are fed with broth¶	Yes / No
226. Fatteners are fed with dry feed	Yes / No

Question	Possible answers
227. Fatteners are fed with milk	Yes / No
228. Fatteners are fed with mush/pulp	Yes / No
<b>229. Animals get water mainly from¶</b>	Public source, tap/ Private source
230. Water medication is possible via a dosator¶	Yes / No
231. Water medication is possible per section¶	Yes / No
<b>232. A separate medication pipe is present on the farm¶</b>	Yes / No
233. The water pipe is cleaned¶	Yes / No
234. In the farrowing section drinking water is just supplied via a nipple¶	Yes / No
235. In the farrowing section drinking water is mainly supplied via a nipple¶	Yes / No
236. In the farrowing section drinking water is mainly supplied via a water bowl¶	Yes / No
237. In the piglet section drinking water is just supplied via a nipple¶	Yes / No
238. In the piglet section drinking water is mainly supplied via a nipple¶	Yes / No
239. In the piglet section drinking water is just supplied via water bowl¶	Yes / No
240. In the piglet section drinking water is mainly supplied via a water bowl¶	Yes / No
241. In the fattener section drinking water is mainly supplied via a nipple¶	Yes / No
242. In the fattener section drinking water is just supplied via water bowl¶	Yes / No
243. In the fattener section drinking water is mainly supplied via a water bowl¶	Yes / No
244. In the (rearing) gilt section drinking water is mainly supplied via a nipple¶	Yes / No
245. In the (rearing) gilt section drinking water is mainly supplied via a water bowl¶	Yes / No
246. In the mating section drinking water is mainly supplied via a nipple¶	Yes / No
247. In the mating section drinking water is mainly supplied via a water bowl¶	Yes / No
248. In the gestation shed drinking water is mainly supplied via a water bowl¶	Yes / No

Bold type indicates variables presented in table 5 with  $p \leq 0.1$  in the overall analysis or in at least one stratum (open or closed).

¶Variables with less than 10% missing values, at least 10% of farms in each category. Random intercept generalized linear mixed models were fitted for each variable by using a macro statement in SAS.

†Farm size had a  $p > 0.10$  but was evaluated and presented irrespective of significance.

**Technical Appendix Table 2.** Human questionnaire used in each of the four sampling times in a risk factor analysis for livestock-associated methicillin-resistant *Staphylococcus aureus* in pig farming, the Netherlands, 2011-2013.

Question	Possible answers
<u>General characteristics:</u>	
1. Sex: ¶	M / F
2. Age¶	Years
3. Relation to pig farmer¶	Farmer / Worker / Partner/ Children
4. I live on the pig farm ¶	Yes / No
5. Number of household members: ¶	No.
<u>Animal contact</u>	
6. Average number of hours worked on the pig farm: ¶	No.
<b>7. Did you touch someone else's pigs in the last 6/12 months? ¶</b>	Yes / No
8. Did you touch dairy cattle in the last 6/12 months? ¶	Yes / No
9. Did you touch any calves in the last 6/12 months? ¶	Yes / No
10. Did you touch any horses in the last 6/12 months? ¶	Yes / No
11. Did you touch any sheep in the last 6/12 months? ¶	Yes / No
12. Did you touch any goats in the last 6/12 months? ¶	Yes / No
<b>13. Did you touch any dogs in the last 6/12 months? ¶</b>	Yes / No
14. Did you touch any cats in the last 6/12 months? ¶	Yes / No
15. Did you touch any poultry in the last 6/12 months? ¶	Yes / No
16. Do you have pets? ¶	Yes / No
a. How many dogs? ¶	No.
b. How many cats? ¶	No.
c. How many rabbits?	No.
d. How many rodents?	No.
e. How many fishes?	No.
17. Are your pets allowed in the living room? ¶	Yes / No
<u>Tasks performed in the farm:</u>	
<b>18. Sorting the sows in the past 7 days ¶</b>	Yes / No
<b>19. Sorting the suckling piglets in the past 7 days ¶</b>	Yes / No
<b>20. Sorting the weaned piglets in the past 7 days ¶</b>	Yes / No
21. Sorting the fattener pigs in the past 7 days ¶	Yes / No
<b>22. Feeding sows in the past 7 days ¶</b>	Yes / No
23. Feeding suckling piglets in the past 7 days ¶	Yes / No
24. Feeding weaned piglets in the past 7 days ¶	Yes / No
25. Feeding fattener pigs in the past 7 days ¶	Yes / No
26. Washing sows in the past 7 days ¶	Yes / No
27. Washing suckling piglets in the past 7 days ¶	Yes / No
28. Washing weaned piglets in the past 7 days ¶	Yes / No
29. Washing fattener pigs in the past 7 days ¶	Yes / No
30. Healthcare tasks in sows in the past 7 days ¶	Yes / No
31. Healthcare tasks in suckling piglets in the past 7 days ¶	Yes / No
32. Healthcare tasks in weaned piglets in the past 7 days ¶	Yes / No
33. Healthcare tasks in fattener pigs in the past 7 days ¶	Yes / No
34. Birth assistance of sows in the past 7 days ¶	Yes / No

Question	Possible answers
35. Birth assistance of suckling piglets in the past 7 days ¶	Yes / No
36. Birth assistance of weaned piglets in the past 7 days ¶	Yes / No
37. Birth assistance of fatterer pigs in the past 7 days ¶	Yes / No
38. Removing the manure of sows in the past 7 days ¶	Yes / No
39. Removing the manure of suckling piglets in the past 7 days ¶	Yes / No
40. Removing the manure of weaned piglets in the past 7 days ¶	Yes / No
41. Removing the manure of fatterer pigs in the past 7 days ¶	Yes / No
42. Cleaning and disinfecting sows in the past 7 days ¶	Yes / No
43. Cleaning and disinfecting suckling piglets in the past 7 days ¶	Yes / No
<b>44. Cleaning and disinfecting weaned piglets in the past 7 days ¶</b>	Yes / No
45. Cleaning and disinfecting fatterer pigs in the past 7 days ¶	Yes / No
46. Did you yourself administer antibiotics to the pigs in the last month? ¶	Yes / No
<u>Personal hygiene:</u>	
47. Do you use a mouth mask while working in the sheds? ¶	Yes / No
48. Do you wash your hands directly before entering the sheds? ¶	Yes / No
49. Do you wash your hands directly after leaving the sheds? ¶	Yes / No
<u>Individual health condition:</u>	
50. Were you hospitalized in or did you visit a hospital in the Netherlands in the last 6/12 months? ¶	Yes / No
51. Were you hospitalized in another Dutch health institution or did you visit one in the last 6/12 months?	Yes / No
52. Were you hospitalized in a foreign hospital or did you visit one in the last 6/12 months?	Yes / No
53. Have you received homecare in the last 6/12 months?	Yes / No
54. Did you visit your general practitioner in the last 6/12 months? ¶	Yes / No
55. Did you visit a specialist on the outpatient clinic in the last 6/12 months?	Yes / No
56. Have you had allergies in the last 6/12 months? ¶	Yes / No
57. Have you had eczema in the last 6/12 months? ¶	Yes / No
58. Have you had psoriasis in the last 6/12 months? ¶	Yes / No
59. Have you had impetigo in the last 6/12 months?	Yes / No
60. Have you had open wounds in the last 6/12 months? ¶	Yes / No
61. Have you had an abscess in the last 6/12 months?	Yes / No
62. Have you had a furuncle in the last 6/12 months?	Yes / No
63. Have you had a cold in the last 6/12 months?	Yes / No
64. Have you had laryngitis in the last 6/12 months?	Yes / No
65. Have you had inflammation of the ear in the last 6/12 months?	Yes / No
66. Have you had sinusitis in the last 6/12 months?	Yes / No
67. Have you had pneumonia in the last 6/12 months?	Yes / No
68. Have you had COPD in the last 6/12 months?	Yes / No
69. Have you had blood poisoning in the last 6/12 months?	Yes / No
70. Have you had arthritis in the last 6/12 months?	Yes / No
71. Have you had diabetes in the last 6/12 months?	Yes / No
72. Have you had surgery in the last 6/12 months?	Yes / No
73. Have you been fitted with a joint prosthesis in the last 6/12 months?	Yes / No
74. Have you had an external fixator in the last 6/12 months?	Yes / No
75. Have you had an IV in the last 6/12 months?	Yes / No
76. Have you had an stomach tube in the last 6/12 months?	Yes / No
77. Have you had an intestinal tube in the last 6/12 months?	Yes / No
78. Have you had an trachea fistula in the last 6/12 months?	Yes / No
79. Have you had artificial respiration in the last 6/12 months?	Yes / No
80. Have you had a bladder catheter in the last 6/12 months?	Yes / No
81. Have you had dialysis in the last 6/12 months?	Yes / No
82. Have you had acupuncture in the last 6/12 months?	Yes / No
83. Have you had medication with a needle in the last 6/12 months?	Yes / No
84. Are you currently treated with medication?	Yes / No
a. Name medication.	text
b. Indication	text
c. Since date	date
85. Have you ever smoked or do you currently smoke? ¶	Yes / No
<u>Contact with other people</u>	
86. Did persons living in a foreign country stay at your place in the last 6/12 months? ¶	Yes / No
87. In which country do these persons live?	Country
88. Did you go to another country for holidays?	Yes / No
89. If more than 6/12 months ago, when was the last time?	Date
90. If less than 6/12 months ago, when was the last time?	Date
<u>Contact with meat</u>	
91. How many times per week do you eat meat? ¶	No.
92. How many times per week do you have contact with unheated/unprocessed meat (for examples during cooking or packaging)? ¶	No.

Bold type indicates variables presented in table 4 with  $p \leq 0.2$  in the longitudinal analysis with mixed models.

¶ Variables with less than 10% missing values, at least 10% of farms in each category. Random intercept generalized linear mixed models were fitted for each variable by using a macro statement in SAS.



**Technical Appendix Table 3.** ORs for determinants of livestock-associated MRSA positivity in pooled pig samples (n = 1,054) from 32 farms (full multivariable generalized linear mixed model), the Netherlands, 2011-2013\*

Variable	N†	OR (95%CI)	P-value
Sampling moment			
0 months	262	0.89 (0.47-1.71)	<b>&lt;0.001</b>
6 months	290	2.30 (1.27-4.15)	
12 months	259	1.99 (1.15-3.42)	
18 months	243	Ref.	
Age group			
Gilts	212	1.11 (0.66-1.85)	<b>&lt;0.001</b>
Finishers	140	4.25 (2.37-7.59)	
Suckling piglets	212	3.99 (2.40-6.63)	
Weaned piglets	280	10.40 (6.22-17.38)	
Sows	210	Ref.	
External supply of gilts†			
Open	630	4.87 (1.24-19.16)	<b>0.023</b>
Closed	424	Ref.	
Water supply for animals			
Tap water	424	2.42 (0.81-7.25)	0.112
Private source	630	Ref.	
Separate medication pipe			
Yes	750	0.76 (0.31-1.90)	0.559
No	304	Ref.	
Carcass barrels cleaned and disinfected after emptied			
Yes	398	0.62 (0.30-1.31)	0.214
No	656	Ref.	
There is a delivery room for materials			
Yes	804	0.37 (0.15-0.90)	<b>0.028</b>
No	250	Ref.	
Injection of antimicrobials in piglets during the first week			
Yes	601	1.45 (0.77-2.73)	0.249
No	453	Ref.	
Tooth clipping in piglets			
Yes	416	1.83 (0.61-5.46)	0.280
No	638	Ref.	
Piglets and/or fatteners are vaccinated			
Yes	870	1.37 (0.59-3.16)	0.460
No	184	Ref.	
Needles renewed per compartment			
Yes	738	1.38 (0.68-2.78)	0.370
No	316	Ref.	
Sows in stable groups			
Yes	594	0.61 (0.31-1.18)	0.141
No	460	Ref.	
Hygiene in piglet compartment			
Disinfection	149	0.81 (0.24-2.69)	0.773
Soaking	270	1.54 (0.53-4.51)	
Soaking and disinfection	431	1.28 (0.52-4.51)	
None	204	Ref.	
Hygiene in the mating section			
Soaking and disinfection	169	0.50 (0.18-1.36)	0.173
None	885	Ref.	
Antimicrobial use per 2-fold increase (log <sub>2</sub> DDDA/Y)	1054	1.21 (1.00-1.45)	<b>0.049</b>
Use of cephalosporins			
Yes	84	2.76 (1.24-6.14)	<b>0.013</b>
No	970	Ref.	

Model fit: -2 Log RSPL= 5397.87

\*Full multivariable model with random intercept for farm, sampling time and animal age group as terms of adjustment. All variables from the longitudinal risk factor analysis in pigs with  $p \leq 0.05$  (table 5) are fitted in the model together with overall antimicrobial use (log<sub>2</sub> DDDA/Y) and use of cephalosporins. MRSA, methicillin-resistant *Staphylococcus aureus*; OR, odds ratio; DDDA/Y, defined daily dosages animal per year; Ref, reference category; RSPL, residual pseudo-likelihood.

†Multiple variables had missing values in the full model reducing the number of observations in the final model (table 6).

‡Farms were defined as open when they received external supplies of gilts  $\geq 1$  time per year from at least 1 supplier and as closed when they received no external supply of gilts.