

NARMS

National Antimicrobial Resistance Monitoring System: Enteric Bacteria

NARMS

2004

Human Isolates Final Report







DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH & HUMAN SERVICES • USA

CDC

Table of Contents

NARMS Working Group

Centers for Disease Control and Prevention

Foodborne and Diarrheal Diseases Branch
Division of Bacterial and Mycotic Diseases
National Center for Infectious Diseases
Frederick Angulo
Timothy Barrett
Ezra Barzilay
Richard Bishop
Cheryl Bopp
Tom Chiller
Patricia Fields
Kathryn Gay
Lewis Graves
Patricia M. Griffin
Robert Michael Hoekstra
Kevin Joyce
Katie Joyce
Ewelina Lyszkowicz
Amie May ThurdeKoos
Felicita Medalla
Terrell Miller
Michael Omondi
Jacinta Smith
Lauren Stancik Rosenthal
Jennifer Stevenson
Andrew Stuart
Robert V. Tauxe
Jean Whichard

U. S. Food and Drug Administration

Center for Veterinary Medicine
Marcia Headrick
Linda Tollefson
David White

Participating State and Local Health Departments

Alabama Department of Public Health
LaDonna Cranidiotis
J. P. Lofgren
Sharon Massingale
Ethel Oldham
Joanna Roberson

Alaska Department of Health and Social Services
Mary Anctil
Tricia Franklin
Sam Obedi
Shellie Smith
Catherine Xavier

Arizona Department of Health Services
Graham Briggs
Mary Finnerty
Clare Kioski
Ken Komatsu
Stephanie Kreis
William Slanta
Victor Waddell

Arkansas Department of Health
Dennis Berry
Joanie Jones-Harp
Rossina Stefanova

California Department of Health Services
Wendy Cheung
Claudia Crandall
Samar Fontanoz
Paul Kimsey
Will Probert
Sam Shin
Duc Vugia

Colorado Department of Public Health and Environment
James Beebe
Alicia Cronquist
Joyce Knutsen
Michael Rau

Connecticut Department of Public Health
Bob Howard
Sharon Hurd
Charles Welles

Delaware Health and Social Services
Leroy Hatcock
Gaile McLaughlin
Marjorie Postell
Debra Rutledge
Sue Shore

Florida Department of Health
Ronald Baker
Maria Calcaterra
Sonia Etheridge
Dian Sharma

Georgia Division of Public Health
Jim Benson
Elizabeth Franko
Tameka Hayes
Mary Hodel
Susan Lance
Bob Manning
Mahin Park
Lynett Poventud
Suzanne Segler
Stepy Thomas
Melissa Tobin-D'Angelo

Hawaii Department of Health
Rebecca Kanenaka
Norman O'Connor

Houston Health and Human Services Department
Raouf Arafat
Onesia Bishop
Keri Goede
Vern Juchau
Joan Rogers

Idaho Department of Health and Welfare
Susan Dana
Colleen Greenwalt
Vivian Lockary

Illinois Department of Public Health

Nancy Barstead
Bob Cox
Mark Dworkin
Juan Garcia
Rebecca Hambelton
Sue Kubba
Kiran Patel
Bindu Shah

Indiana State Department of Health
Brent Barrett
John Radosevic

Iowa Department of Public Health, University Hygienic Laboratory
Mary DeMartino
Randy Groepper

Kansas Department of Health and Environment
Cheryl Banez-Ocfemia
Robert Flahart
Gail Hansen
Carissa Pursell
June Sexton
Kathleen Waters

Kentucky Department of Public Health
Robin Cotton
Jennifer Everman
Karim George
Matt Nelson
Meloney Russell

Los Angeles County Department of Health Services
Mary Dorado
Mary Beth Duke
Sydney Harvey
Laurene Mascola
Brit Oiulfstad
Roshan Reporter
Joan Sturgeon

Louisiana Department of Health and Hospitals
Gary Balsamo
Wayne Dupree
Catrin Jones-Nazar
Lori Kravet
Steven Martin
Raoult Ratard
Theresa Sokol
Susanne Straif-Bourgeois
Annu Thomas

Maine Department of Human Services
Geoff Beckett
Kathleen Gensheimer
Audrey Littlefield
James Martin
Jeff Randolph
Vicki Rea
Susan Schow
Lori Webber
Donna Wrigley

Maryland Department of Health and Mental Hygiene and University of Maryland School of Medicine, Department of Epidemiology and Preventive Medicine
Marisa Caipo
Karen Cuenco
Julie Kiehlbauch
Melanie Megginson
J. Glenn Morris, Jr.
Jonigene Ruark
Pat Ryan
Mary Warren
T. Watters

Massachusetts Department of Public Health
Catherine Brown
Alfred DeMaria
John Fontana
Robert Goldbaum
Emily Harvey
Patricia Kludt
Joseph Peppe
Tracy Stiles

Michigan Department of Community Health
Carrie Anglewicz
Frances Downes
James Rudrik
William Schneider
Dawn Sievert
Patricia Somsel

Minnesota Department of Health
John Besser
Billie Juni
Fe Leano
Kirk Smith
Charlotte Taylor
Theresa Weber
Stephanie Wedel

Mississippi Department of Health
Jannifer Anderson
Kay Beggerly
Jane Campbell
Sheryl Hand
Cathie Hoover
Mills McNeill
Daphne Ware

Missouri Department of Health
David Byrd
Steve Gladbach
Jason Herstein
Harvey Marx
JoAnn Rudroff

Montana Department of Public Health and Human Services
Jim Murphy
Anne Weber
Susanne Zanto

Nebraska Health and Human Services System and University of Nebraska Medical Center, Department of Pathology and Microbiology
Jude Eberhardt
Paul Fey
Jodi Garrett
Peter Iwen
Tom Safranek

Nevada Department of Health and Human Services
Patricia Armour
Stephanie Ernaga
Jaime Frank
Paul Hug
Bradford Lee
Matt Mikoleit
Lisa Southern
Stephanie Van Hooser

New Hampshire Department of Health and Human Services
Christine Adamski
Christine Bean
Elizabeth Daly
Wendy Lamothe
Nancy Taylor
Daniel Tullo

New Jersey Department of Health
Ruth Besco
John Brook
Sylvia Matiuck
Keith Pilot

New Mexico Department of Health
Bernadette Albanese
Joan Baumbach
Karen Edge
Sonya Flores
Rey Griego

Debra Horensky
David Mills
Lisa Onsichuk
Debbie Sena Johnson
Erica Pierce
C. Mack Sewell
Karla Thornton
William Wiese

New York City Department of Health
Alice Agasan
Mel Backer
Sharon Balter
Tommie Daniels
Heather Hanson
Dennis Kinney
Vasudha Reddy

New York State Department of Health
Nellie Dumas
Yvette Khachadourian
Dale Morse
Tim Root
Shelley Zansky

North Carolina Department of Health and Human Services
Denise Griffin
Brad Jenkins

North Dakota Department of Health
Lisa Elijah
Julie Goplin
Eric Hieb
Nicole Meier
Tracy Miller
Lisa Well

Ohio Department of Health
Rick Bokanyi
Tammy Bannerman
Jane Carmean
Larry King
Mary Kay Parrish
Ellen Salehi

Oklahoma State Department of Health
Rebekah Berry
Mike Lytle
Jeff Mathewson
Mike McDermott

Oregon Department of Human Resources
Debbie Berquist
Cathy Ciaffoni
Paul Cieslak
Emilio DeBess
Eric Espinosa
Julie Hatch
Beletsachew Shiferaw
Larry Stauffer
Ivor Thomas
Janie Tierheimer
Robert Vega
Veronica Williams

Pennsylvania Department of Health
Wayne Chmielecki
Nkuchia Mikanatha
Stanley Reynolds
James Tait
Veronica Urdaneta
Kirsten Waller
Nancy Warren
Gisela Withers

Rhode Island Department of Health
Cheryl Campbell
Tara Cooper
Kerry Patterson
Deanna Simmons
Cindy Vanner

South Carolina Department of Health and Environmental Control
Rosalind G. Funk
Jennifer Meredith
Dixie Roberts
Arthur Wozniak

South Dakota Department of Health
Christopher Carlson
Lon Kightlinger
Mike Smith
Yvette Thomas

Tennessee Department of Health
Paula Bailey
Jeanette Dill
Cynthia Graves
Samir Hanna
Henrietta Hardin
Tim Jones
Chris McKeever
RuthAnn Spence

Texas Department of State Health Services
Tamara Baldwin
Leslie Bullion
Elizabeth Delamater
Linda Gaul
Eldridge Hutcheson
Miriam Johnson
Susan Neill
Pushker Raj
Ana Valle

Utah Department of Health
Dan Andrews
Kim Christensen
Jana Coombs
Cindy Fisher
David Jackson
Barbara Jepson
Susan Mottice
Marilee Poulson
Diane Raccasi

Vermont Department of Health
Valerie Cook
Eunice H. Froeliger
Christine LaBarre
Mary Spayne
Patsy Tassler

Virginia Division of Consolidated Laboratory Services and Virginia Department of Health
Ellen Basinger
Sherry Giese
Sally Henderson
Mary Mismas
Ann Munson
Denise Toney

Washington Department of Health
David Boyle
Craig Colombel
Romesh Gautom
Donna Green
Kathryn MacDonald
Mike McDowell
Jennifer Breezee

West Virginia Department of Health and Human Resources
Maria del Rosario
Danae Bixler
Christi Clark
Loretta Haddy
Andrea Labik
Doug McElfresh
Ron Ramirez
Connie Smith

Wisconsin Department of Health and Family Services
Susan Ahrabi-Fard
John Archer
Jeffrey Davis
Diep Hoang-Johnson
Ronald Laessig
Tim Monson

Dave Warshauer	*Wyoming Department of Health*	Tracy Murphy
Mark Wegner	Richard Harris	Clay Van Houten
	John Harrison	Jim Walford

Suggested Citation: CDC. National Antimicrobial Resistance Monitoring System for Enteric Bacteria (NARMS): Human Isolates Final Report, 2004. Atlanta, Georgia: U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, CDC, 2007.

Disclaimer: Commercial products are mentioned for identification only and do not represent endorsement by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention or the U. S. Department of Health and Human Services.

INFORMATION AVAILABLE ON-LINE

All CDC NARMS Annual Reports and additional information about NARMS are posted on the CDC NARMS website: http://www.cdc.gov/narms.

Additional general information about the NARMS surveillance program is posted on the Food and Drug Administration's Center for Veterinary Medicine website: http://www.fda.gov/cvm/narms_pg.html.

Information about animal isolates in NARMS is available on the U.S. Department of Agriculture–-Agricultural Research Service website: http://www.ars-grin.gov/ars/SoAtlantic/Athens/arru/narms.html.

General information about antimicrobial resistance is posted on the CDC website: http://www.cdc.gov/drugresistance.

Information regarding CDC's Get Smart program is available at http://www.cdc.gov/drugresistance/community.

General information about CDC's Foodborne Diseases Active Surveillance Network (FoodNet) is available at http://www.cdc.gov/foodnet.

General information about the National Molecular Subtyping Network for Foodborne Disease Surveillance (PulseNet) is available at http://www.cdc.gov/pulsenet.

General information about the World Health Organization Global Salm-Surv is available at http://www.who.int/salmsurv/en.

CDC *Salmonella* Annual Summaries are posted on the PHLIS website: http://www.cdc.gov/ncidod/dbmd/phlisdata/salmonella.htm.

CDC *Shigella* Annual Summaries also posted on the PHLIS website: http://www.cdc.gov/ncidod/dbmd/phlisdata/shigella.htm.

General information about the Foodborne and Diarrheal Diseases Branch at CDC is available at http://www.cdc.gov/foodborne/

INTRODUCTION

The National Antimicrobial Resistance Monitoring System (NARMS) for Enteric Bacteria is a collaboration among the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC), Food and Drug Administration (FDA), and U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA). The primary purpose of NARMS at CDC is to monitor antimicrobial resistance among foodborne enteric bacteria isolated from humans. Other components of the interagency NARMS program include surveillance for resistance in human enteric bacterial pathogens isolated from foods, conducted by the FDA Center for Veterinary Medicine (http://www.fda.gov/cvm/narms_pg.html), and resistance in human enteric pathogens isolated from animals, conducted by the USDA Agricultural Research Services (http://www.ars-grin.gov/ars/SoAtlantic/Athens/arru/narms.html).

Many NARMS activities are conducted within the framework of CDC's Emerging Infections Program (EIP), Epidemiology and Laboratory Capacity (ELC) Program, and the Foodborne Diseases Active Surveillance Network (FoodNet). In addition to surveillance of resistance in enteric pathogens, the NARMS program at CDC also includes public health research into the mechanisms of resistance, education efforts to promote prudent use of antimicrobial agents, and studies of resistance in commensal organisms.

Before NARMS was established, CDC monitored antimicrobial resistance in *Salmonella, Shigella*, and *Campylobacter* through periodic surveys of isolates from a panel of sentinel counties. NARMS at CDC began in 1996 with prospective monitoring of antimicrobial resistance among human non-Typhi *Salmonella* and *Escherichia coli* O157 isolates in 14 sites. In 1997, testing of human *Campylobacter* isolates was initiated in the five sites participating in FoodNet. Testing of human *Salmonella* Typhi and *Shigella* isolates was added in 1999. Since 2003, all 50 states have been forwarding a representative sample of non-Typhi *Salmonella, Salmonella* Typhi, *Shigella*, and *E. coli* O157 isolates to NARMS for antimicrobial susceptibility testing, and 10 FoodNet states have been participating in *Campylobacter* surveillance.

This annual report includes CDC's human surveillance data for 2004 for non-Typhi *Salmonella, Salmonella* Typhi, *Shigella*, and *E. coli* O157. Resistance trends and comparisons to previous years are included when appropriate. Antimicrobial subclasses defined by the Clinical and Laboratory Standards Institute (CLSI) are used in data presentation and analysis. CLSI subclasses constitute major classifications of antimicrobial agents, e.g., aminoglycosides and cephalosporins.

This report also includes a section on the Enterococci Resistance Study, which is part of NARMS surveillance on commensal bacteria. Data from the 2004 Enterococci Resistance Study are presented, as are 2001–2003 data when reference to previous years is appropriate. In addition, Appendix A summarizes the *Escherichia coli* Resistance Surveillance Pilot Study conducted in 2004.

Additional NARMS data and more information about NARMS activities are available at http://www.cdc.gov/narms.

SUMMARY OF NARMS 2004 SURVEILLANCE DATA

POPULATION

In 2004, all 50 states participated in NARMS, representing approximately 294 million persons (Table I). Surveillance for antimicrobial resistance included non-Typhi *Salmonella, Salmonella* Typhi, *Shigella*, and *Escherichia coli* O157. *Campylobacter* resistance to antimicrobial agents was monitored in 10 states that also participated in the Foodborne Diseases Active Surveillance Network (FoodNet), representing approximately 45 million persons (15% of the U.S. population).

CLINICALLY IMPORTANT RESISTANCE

In the United States, certain quinolones (e.g., the fluoroquinolone ciprofloxacin) and third-generation cephalosporins (e.g., ceftriaxone) are antimicrobial agents commonly used to treat severe *Campylobacter* and *Salmonella* infections, including *Salmonella* serotype Typhi, the organism that causes Typhoid fever. Nalidixic acid is an elementary quinolone; resistance to nalidixic acid correlates with decreased susceptibility to ciprofloxacin and possible treatment failure. Ceftiofur is a third-generation cephalosporin used in food animals in the United States; resistance to ceftiofur correlates with decreased susceptibility to ceftriaxone. A substantial proportion of isolates tested by NARMS in 2004 demonstrated resistance to these clinically important antimicrobial agents, as follows:

- 19.0% (66/347) of *Campylobacter* isolates were resistant to the fluoroquinolone ciprofloxacin, compared with 12.9% (28/217) in 1997 (OR=1.6, 95% CI [1.0, 2.6]) (Table II).
    - 30.8% (8/26) of *Campylobacter coli* isolates were resistant to ciprofloxacin.
    - 18.1% (58/320) of *Campylobacter jejuni* isolates were resistant to ciprofloxacin.
- 2.6% (47/1793) of non-Typhi *Salmonella* isolates were resistant to the quinolone nalidixic acid, compared with 0.4% (5/1324) in 1996 (OR=9.2, 95% CI [3.6, 23.8]) (Table II).
    - *Salmonella* Enteritidis was the most common serotype among nalidixic acid-resistant non-Typhi *Salmonella* isolates: 38.3% (18/47) of quinolone-resistant isolates were serotype Enteritidis.
    - Nalidixic acid resistance in *Salmonella* Enteritidis was 6.6% (18/271) in 2004, compared with 0.9% (3/351) in 1996 (OR 95% CI [2.3, 49.3]) (Table II).
- 3.4% (61/1793) of non-Typhi *Salmonella* isolates were resistant to the third-generation cephalosporin ceftiofur, compared with 0.2% (2/1324) in 1996 (OR=34.5, 95% CI [8.3, 142.7]) (Table II).
    - *Salmonella* Newport was the most common serotype among ceftiofur-resistant non-Typhi *Salmonella* isolates: 47.5% (29/61) of ceftiofur-resistant isolates were serotype Newport.
- 41.8% (127/304) of *Salmonella* Typhi isolates were resistant to the quinolone nalidixic acid, compared with 18.7% (31/166) in 1999 (OR=3.1, 95% CI [1.9, 4.9]) (Table II).

MULTIDRUG RESISTANCE

- Multidrug resistance is described in NARMS by the number of antimicrobial subclasses or specific coresistant phenotypes. Antimicrobial subclasses are used as defined by the CLSI (Table III). For non-Typhi *Salmonella*, the most common multidrug-resistant phenotypes in 2004 were as follows: resistance to at least ampicillin, chloramphenicol, streptomycin, sulfamethoxazole/sulfisoxazole, and tetracycline (R-Type ACSSuT) and resistance to at least ampicillin, chloramphenicol, streptomycin, sulfamethoxazole/sulfisoxazole, tetracycline, amoxicillin-clavulanic acid, and ceftiofur, and decreased susceptibility to ceftriaxone (minimum inhibitory concentration ≥2 μg/mL) (MDR-AmpC).

- 15.0% (269/1793) of non-Typhi *Salmonella* isolates were resistant to two or more CLSI subclasses, and 8.1% (146/1793) were resistant to five or more CLSI subclasses.
    - 17.4% (33/190) of *Salmonella* Newport isolates were resistant to two or more CLSI subclasses, and 14.7% (28/190) were resistant to five or more CLSI subclasses.
    - 37.2% (142/382) of *Salmonella* Typhimurium isolates were resistant to two or more CLSI subclasses, and 24.3% (93/382) were resistant to five or more CLSI subclasses.
    - 3.0% (8/271) of *Salmonella* Enteritidis isolates were resistant to two or more CLSI subclasses, and 0.7% (2/271) were resistant to five or more CLSI subclasses.

- 7.1% (128/1793) of non-Typhi *Salmonella* isolates had R-Type ACSSuT, compared with 8.8% (116/1324) in 1996 (Table 1.3).
    - 23.3% (89/382) of *Salmonella* Typhimurium isolates were R-Type ACSSuT, compared with 33.7% (103/306) in 1996 (OR=0.6, 95% CI [0.4, 0.8]) (Table II).
    - 14.7% (28/190) of *Salmonella* Newport isolates were R-Type ACSSuT, compared with 5.9% (3/51) in 1996.
- 2.3% (42/1793) of non-Typhi *Salmonella* isolates had the MDR-AmpC phenotype. These isolates consisted of five different serotypes. In 1996, MDR-AmpC resistance was not detected in any serotype.
    - 14.7% (28/189) of *Salmonella* Newport isolates were at least MDR-AmpC resistant, compared with none (0/51) in 1996 (95% CI [3.4, infinity]) (Table II).
    - 2.6% (10/382) of *Salmonella* Typhimurium isolates were at least MDR-AmpC resistant.

Table I: Population size and number of isolates tested, by site, NARMS, 2004

State/Site	Population Size*	Non-Typhi *Salmonella*		*Salmonella* Typhi		*Shigella*		*E. coli* O157		Campylobacter†	
		N	(%)	N	(%)	N	(%)	N	(%)	N	(%)
Alabama	4,530,182	36	(2.0%)	1	(0.3%)	9	(2.8%)	1	(0.6%)	N/A	
Alaska	655,435	2	(0.1%)	0	(0.0%)	1	(0.3%)	1	(0.6%)	N/A	
Arizona	5,743,834	28	(1.6%)	2	(0.7%)	8	(2.5%)	0	(0.0%)	N/A	
Arkansas	2,752,629	22	(1.2%)	0	(0.0%)	4	(1.3%)	3	(1.8%)	N/A	
California‡	32,056,400	109	(6.1%)	65	(21.4%)	1	(0.3%)	7	(4.1%)	27	(7.8%)
Colorado	4,601,403	23	(1.3%)	4	(1.3%)	6	(1.9%)	2	(1.2%)	33	(9.5%)
Connecticut	3,503,604	26	(1.5%)	9	(3.0%)	4	(1.3%)	5	(3.0%)	40	(11.5%)
Delaware	830,364	8	(0.4%)	1	(0.3%)	0	(0.0%)	0	(0.0%)	N/A	
District of Columbia	553,523	0	(0.0%)	0	(0.0%)	0	(0.0%)	0	(0.0%)	N/A	
Florida	17,397,161	54	(3.0%)	10	(3.3%)	0	(0.0%)	0	(0.0%)	N/A	
Georgia	8,829,383	111	(6.2%)	3	(1.0%)	24	(7.6%)	20	(11.8%)	45	(13.0%)
Hawaii	1,262,840	18	(1.0%)	7	(2.3%)	3	(0.9%)	0	(0.0%)	N/A	
Houston, Texas§	2,011,119	33	(1.8%)	0	(0.0%)	0	(0.0%)	0	(0.0%)	N/A	
Idaho	1,393,262	9	(0.5%)	0	(0.0%)	1	(0.3%)	3	(1.8%)	N/A	
Illinois	12,713,634	74	(4.1%)	14	(4.6%)	19	(6.0%)	5	(3.0%)	N/A	
Indiana	6,237,569	35	(2.0%)	1	(0.3%)	2	(0.6%)	2	(1.2%)	N/A	
Iowa	2,954,451	14	(0.8%)	0	(0.0%)	0	(0.0%)	0	(0.0%)	N/A	
Kansas	2,735,502	16	(0.9%)	0	(0.0%)	3	(0.9%)	1	(0.6%)	N/A	
Kentucky	4,145,922	20	(1.1%)	3	(1.0%)	4	(1.3%)	0	(0.0%)	N/A	
Los Angeles¶	3,837,399	60	(3.3%)	22	(7.2%)	7	(2.2%)	0	(0.0%)	N/A	
Louisiana	4,515,770	46	(2.6%)	0	(0.0%)	4	(1.3%)	0	(0.0%)	N/A	
Maine	1,317,253	5	(0.3%)	1	(0.3%)	1	(0.3%)	1	(0.6%)	N/A	
Maryland	5,558,058	44	(2.5%)	16	(5.3%)	8	(2.5%)	3	(1.8%)	22	(6.3%)
Massachusetts	6,416,505	58	(3.2%)	16	(5.3%)	8	(2.5%)	4	(2.4%)	N/A	
Michigan	10,112,620	40	(2.2%)	9	(3.0%)	7	(2.2%)	4	(2.4%)	N/A	
Minnesota	5,100,958	33	(1.8%)	6	(2.0%)	2	(0.6%)	5	(3.0%)	53	(15.3%)
Mississippi	2,902,966	43	(2.4%)	0	(0.0%)	1	(0.3%)	0	(0.0%)	N/A	
Missouri	5,754,618	43	(2.4%)	1	(0.3%)	9	(2.8%)	6	(3.6%)	N/A	
Montana	926,865	5	(0.3%)	0	(0.0%)	1	(0.3%)	1	(0.6%)	N/A	
Nebraska	1,747,214	12	(0.7%)	2	(0.7%)	8	(2.5%)	5	(3.0%)	N/A	
Nevada	2,334,771	12	(0.7%)	2	(0.7%)	4	(1.3%)	2	(1.2%)	N/A	
New Hampshire	1,299,500	8	(0.4%)	0	(0.0%)	0	(0.0%)	1	(0.6%)	N/A	
New Jersey	8,698,879	44	(2.5%)	17	(5.6%)	9	(2.8%)	10	(5.9%)	N/A	
New Mexico	1,903,289	19	(1.1%)	0	(0.0%)	8	(2.5%)	0	(0.0%)	21	(6.1%)
New York4	11,062,382	66	(3.7%)	10	(3.3%)	14	(4.4%)	9	(5.3%)	50	(14.4%)
New York City**	8,164,706	56	(3.1%)	29	(9.5%)	6	(1.9%)	3	(1.8%)	N/A	
North Carolina	8,541,221	86	(4.8%)	4	(1.3%)	7	(2.2%)	8	(4.7%)	N/A	
North Dakota	634,366	3	(0.2%)	0	(0.0%)	1	(0.3%)	1	(0.6%)	N/A	
Ohio	11,459,011	58	(3.2%)	5	(1.6%)	5	(1.6%)	5	(3.0%)	N/A	
Oklahoma	3,523,553	20	(1.1%)	0	(0.0%)	26	(8.2%)	4	(2.4%)	N/A	
Oregon	3,594,586	19	(1.1%)	1	(0.3%)	4	(1.3%)	3	(1.8%)	29	(8.4%)
Pennsylvania	12,406,292	80	(4.5%)	8	(2.6%)	6	(1.9%)	10	(5.9%)	N/A	
Rhode Island	1,080,632	9	(0.5%)	2	(0.7%)	0	(0.0%)	1	(0.6%)	N/A	
South Carolina	4,198,068	3	(0.2%)	0	(0.0%)	3	(0.9%)	0	(0.0%)	N/A	
South Dakota	770,883	10	(0.6%)	0	(0.0%)	6	(1.9%)	9	(5.3%)	N/A	
Tennessee	5,900,962	38	(2.1%)	4	(1.3%)	23	(7.3%)	2	(1.2%)	27	(7.8%)
Texas††	20,478,903	48	(2.7%)	11	(3.6%)	22	(7.0%)	1	(0.6%)	N/A	
Utah	2,389,039	12	(0.7%)	1	(0.3%)	1	(0.3%)	3	(1.8%)	N/A	
Vermont	621,394	2	(0.1%)	1	(0.3%)	1	(0.3%)	0	(0.0%)	N/A	
Virginia	7,459,827	57	(3.2%)	7	(2.3%)	4	(1.3%)	1	(0.6%)	N/A	
Washington	6,203,788	38	(2.1%)	6	(2.0%)	6	(1.9%)	8	(4.7%)	N/A	
West Virginia	1,815,354	30	(1.7%)	0	(0.0%)	1	(0.3%)	1	(0.6%)	N/A	
Wisconsin	5,509,026	43	(2.4%)	3	(1.0%)	13	(4.1%)	5	(3.0%)	N/A	
Wyoming	506,529	5	(0.3%)	0	(0.0%)	1	(0.3%)	3	(1.8%)	N/A	
Total	**293,655,404**	**1793**	**(100.0%)**	**304**	**(100.0%)**	**316**	**(100.0%)**	**169**	**(100.0%)**	**347**	**(100.0%)**

* US Census Bureau, 2004

† *Campylobacter* isolates were submitted only from FoodNet sites; total population size of FoodNet sites was 44,531,182

‡ Excluding Los Angeles County

§ Houston City

¶ Los Angeles County

4 Excluding New York City

** Five burroughs of New York City (Bronx, Brooklyn, Manhattan, Queens, Staten Island)

†† Excluding Houston, Texas

Table II: Summary of trend analysis of the proportion of specific resistance phenotypes among *Campylobacter*, non-Typhi *Salmonella*, and *Salmonella* Typhi isolates, 2004

Resistance Phenotype	Reference Year	Odds Ratio*	95% CI*
Ciprofloxacin resistance in *Campylobacter*	1997	1.6	1.0–2.6
Nalidixic acid resistance in non-Typhi *Salmonella*	1996	9.2	3.6–23.8
Nalidixic acid resistance in *Salmonella* Enteritidis	1996	–[†]	2.3–49.3[†]
Ceftiofur resistance in non-Typhi *Salmonella*	1996	34.5	8.3–142.7
Nalidixic acid resistance in *Salmonella* Typhi	1999	3.1	1.9–4.9
ACSSuT resistance in *Salmonella* Typhimurium[‡]	1996	0.6	0.4–0.8
MDR-AmpC resistance in *Salmonella* Newport[§]	1996	–[†]	3.4–infinity[†]

* For logistic regression models that adjusted for site, odds ratios (ORs) (2004 vs. reference year) and 95% confidence intervals (CIs) were calculated using unconditional maximum likelihood estimation.
[†] Model included only year. In the analysis, the maximum likelihood estimate of the OR did not exist; only the 95% CIs, calculated using unconditional exact methods, are reported.
[‡] Resistance to at least ampicillin, chloramphenicol, streptomycin, sulfamethoxazole/sulfisoxazole, and tetracycline.
[§] Resistance to at least ampicillin, chloramphenicol, streptomycin, sulfamethoxazole/sulfisoxazole, tetracycline, amoxicillin-clavulanic acid, and ceftiofur, and decreased susceptibility to ceftriaxone (minimum inhibitory concentration ≥2 μg/mL).

SURVEILLANCE AND LABORATORY TESTING METHODS

SURVEILLANCE SITES AND ISOLATE SUBMISSION

In 2004, NARMS conducted nationwide surveillance among the population of approximately 294 million persons (2004 U.S. Census Bureau estimates). Public health laboratories systematically selected every 20th non-Typhi *Salmonella* (i.e., all *Salmonella* serotypes except serotype Typhi)*, Shigella*, and *Escherichia coli* O157 isolate and every *Salmonella* Typhi isolate received at their laboratories and forwarded these isolates to CDC for antimicrobial susceptibility testing.

Public health laboratories of the 10 state health departments that participated in CDC's Foodborne Diseases Active Surveillance Network (FoodNet) during 2004 forwarded *Campylobacter* isolates to CDC for susceptibility testing. The FoodNet sites, representing approximately 45 million persons (2004 U.S. Census Bureau estimates), comprised California, Colorado, Connecticut, Georgia, Maryland, Minnesota, New Mexico, New York, Oregon, and Tennessee. *Campylobacter* isolates submitted to NARMS were selected in one of several ways. In Maryland, Minnesota, New Mexico, New York, and Tennessee, one isolate a week was selected (usually the first isolate received each week was selected, but otherwise isolates were randomly selected) from the collection of isolates sent to the state health department laboratory from almost all clinical laboratories in a geographic area (statewide in Maryland, Minnesota, New Mexico, and Tennessee, and metro Albany and Rochester areas in New York). In Georgia, all *Campylobacter* isolates received at the state laboratory from the Metropolitan Statistical Area (metro Atlanta area) were submitted to CDC. For that state, one isolate a week was selected at CDC (usually the first isolate received each week was selected, but otherwise isolates were randomly selected) from the collection of isolates from almost all clinical laboratories in metro Atlanta. In California, Colorado, Connecticut, and Oregon, one isolate a week was selected (usually the first isolate received each week was selected, but otherwise isolates were randomly selected) from one sentinel clinical laboratory. Sentinel clinical laboratories followed routine isolation practices for *Campylobacter*. No more than 53 *Campylobacter* isolates per state were included in the analyses; if more than one isolate was received in a week from a site, only the first isolate was included.

TESTING OF *SALMONELLA, SHIGELLA*, AND *ESCHERICHIA COLI* O157

Antimicrobial Susceptibility Testing

Salmonella, *Shigella*, and *E. coli* O157 isolates were tested using broth microdilution (Sensititre®, Trek Diagnostics, Westlake, OH) to determine the minimum inhibitory concentration (MIC) for each of 15 antimicrobial agents: amikacin, ampicillin, amoxicillin-clavulanic acid, cefoxitin, ceftiofur, ceftriaxone, chloramphenicol, ciprofloxacin, gentamicin, kanamycin, nalidixic acid, streptomycin, sulfisoxazole, tetracycline, and trimethoprim-sulfamethoxazole (Table III). Before 2004, sulfamethoxazole was used instead of sulfisoxazole to represent the sulfonamides. Interpretive criteria defined by the Clinical and Laboratory Standards Institute (CLSI) were used when available.[1] The resistance breakpoint for amikacin, according to CLSI guidelines, is an MIC of 64 µg/mL. For isolates that grew in all amikacin dilutions on the Sensititre® panel (MIC>4 µg/mL), E-Test (AB BIODISK, Solna, Sweden) was performed to determine amikacin MIC. The amikacin E-Test strip range of dilutions is 0.016–256 µg/mL.

Table III: Antimicrobial agents used for susceptibility testing for *Salmonella*, *Shigella*, *Escherichia coli* O157, and *Campylobacter* isolates, NARMS, 2004

CLSI Subclass	Antimicrobial Agent	Antimicrobial Agent Concentration Range (μg/mL)	MIC Breakpoints (μg/mL)		
			Resistant	Intermediate	Susceptible
Aminoglycosides	Amikacin	0.5–4*	≥64	32	≤16
	Gentamicin	0.25–16 0.016–256†	≥16 ≥8**	8 4**	≤4 ≤2**
	Kanamycin	8–64	≥64	32	≤16
	Streptomycin	32–64	≥64		≤32
Aminopenicillins	Ampicillin	1–32	≥32	16	≤8
β-Lactamase inhibitor combinations	Amoxicillin-Clavulanic acid	1/0.5–32/16	≥32 / ≥16	16/8	≤8 / ≤4
Cephalosporin (1st generation)	Cephalothin‡	2–32	≥32	16	≤8
Cephalosporins (3rd generation)	Ceftiofur§	0.12–8	≥8	4	≤2
	Ceftriaxone	0.25–64	≥64	16–32	≤8
Cephamycins	Cefoxitin	0.5–16	≥32	16	≤8
Folate pathway inhibitors	Trimethoprim-Sulfamethoxazole	0.12/2.4–4/76	≥4 / ≥76		≤2 / ≤38
Lincosamides	Clindamycin	0.016–256†	≥8	4	≤2
Macrolides	Azithromycin	0.016–256†	≥8	4	≤2
	Erythromycin	0.016–256†	≥32	16	≤8
Phenicols	Chloramphenicol	2–32 0.016–256†	≥32	16	≤8
Quinolones	Ciprofloxacin	0.015–4 0.002–32†	≥4	2	≤1
	Nalidixic acid	0.5–32 0.016–256†	≥32 ≥64**	 32**	≤16 ≤16**
Sulfonamides¶	Sulfamethoxazole	16–512	≥512		≤256
	Sulfisoxazole	16–512	≥512		≤256
Tetracyclines	Tetracycline	4–16 0.016–256†	≥16	8	≤4

* The resistance breakpoint for amikacin, according to Clinical and Laboratory Standards Institute (CLSI) guidelines, is 64 μg/mL. For isolates that grew in all amikacin dilutions on the Sensititre® panel (minimum inhibitory concentration [MIC] >4 μg/mL), E-Test (AB BIODISK, Solna, Sweden) was performed to determine amikacin MIC. The amikacin E-Test strip range of dilutions is 0.016–256 μg/mL.
† E-test dilution range used for testing *Campylobacter.*
‡ Cephalothin was not tested in 2004 but was tested in earlier years for *Salmonella*, *Shigella*, and *E. coli* O157.
§ No CLSI breakpoints; resistance breakpoint used in NARMS is 8 μg/mL.
¶ Sulfamethoxazole, which was tested during 1996–2003 to represent sulfonamides, was replaced by sulfisoxazole in 2004.
**Breakpoints for *Campylobacter* only

Additional Testing of Salmonella

Cephalosporin Retesting

Review of *Salmonella* isolates tested in NARMS during 1996–1998 gave conflicting cephalosporin susceptibility results. That is, some isolates previously reported in NARMS as ceftiofur-resistant exhibited a low ceftriaxone MIC and, in some cases, did not exhibit an elevated MIC to other β-lactams. Because these findings indicated that

some previously reported ceftiofur-resistant results were spurious, we retested, using the 2003 NARMS Sensititre® plate, isolates of *Salmonella* tested in NARMS during 1996–1998 that exhibited an MIC ≥2 µg/mL to ceftiofur or ceftriaxone. The retest results first were included in the 2003 NARMS annual report. Totals reported here also reflect the retest results.

Serotype Confirmation/Categorization

To distinguish serotypes Paratyphi B and Paratyphi B var L(+) tartrate-positive (formerly *Salmonella* Java), tartrate testing was performed at CDC on all *Salmonella* Paratyphi B isolates from 1996 to 2004 for which the tartrate result was not reported. Jordan's tartrate test was used to determine tartrate fermentation, and Kauffman's tartrate test subsequently was performed on isolates negative for tartrate fermentation by Jordan's tartrate test. Isolates negative for tartrate fermentation by both assays were categorized as serotype Paratyphi B. Isolates that were positive for tartrate fermentation by either assay were categorized as serotype Paratyphi B var L(+) tartrate-positive and in this report are referred to as serotype Java. Confirmation of other biochemical reactions or somatic and flagellar antigens was not performed at CDC.

Salmonella serotype was accepted as reported with few exceptions. As described above, tartrate testing was performed on all *Salmonella* Paratyphi B isolates for which the tartrate result was not reported. Because of increased submissions of *Salmonella* Typhimurium isolates lacking the second phase flagellar antigen (i.e., *Salmonella* I 4,[5],12:i:-), reports of such isolates tested in NARMS during 1996–2004 were reviewed, and isolates identified as serogroup B that exhibited first-phase flagellar antigen "I" but lacked a second phase are referred to in this report as "monophasic Typhimurium." Serogroup B isolates for which the first-phase flagellar antigen was not reported were not included in this category because they could be one of several other common serogroup B serotypes.

Testing of *Campylobacter*

Identification/Speciation and Antimicrobial Susceptibility Testing

In 2004, putative *Campylobacter* isolates were identified as *Campylobacter jejuni* or *Campylobacter coli* by polymerase chain reaction (PCR) using species-specific BAX® primers according to the manufacturer's instructions (DuPont Qualicon, Wilmington, DE). Isolates not identified as *C. jejuni* or *C. coli* were further characterized in conjunction with the CDC *Campylobacter* Reference Laboratory.

During 1996–2003, isolates were confirmed as *Campylobacter* by dark-field microscopy and oxidase test. Identification of *C. jejuni* was performed using the hippurate hydrolysis test. Hippurate-positive isolates were identified as *C. jejuni*. Hippurate-negative isolates were identified by PCR as *C. jejuni* using a hippuricase gene-based PCR assay,[2] or as *C. coli* using a *C. coli*-specific *ceuE* PCR.[3] Isolates determined to be neither *C. jejuni* nor *C. coli* were referred for identification to the CDC National *Campylobacter* Reference Laboratory. The methodology used during 1996–2003 was described in the 2003 annual report.[4]

In 2004, the E-test methodology (AB Biodisk, Solna, Sweden) was used to determine the MICs for eight antimicrobial agents: azithromycin, chloramphenicol, ciprofloxacin, clindamycin, erythromycin, gentamicin, nalidixic acid, and tetracycline (Table IIII). In this report, new CLSI interpretive criteria for erythromycin and revised NARMS criteria for azithromycin were used for 1997–2004.[5] In previous annual reports, these CLSI interpretive criteria were not available, and NARMS used resistance breakpoints for azithromycin and erythromycin that were lower than the new and revised breakpoints used in this report.[4] In addition, revised NARMS interpretive criteria, adopted from the FDA arm of NARMS, were used for clindamycin, gentamicin, and nalidixic acid.

Retesting

Known mechanisms of quinolone resistance in *Campylobacter* are expected to confer equivalent susceptibilities to nalidixic acid and ciprofloxacin. Similarly, known mechanisms of macrolide resistance are expected to confer equivalent susceptibilities to erythromycin and azithromycin. Confirmatory testing of isolates with conflicting results was performed by E-test (AB Biodisk, Solna, Sweden). Totals reported here reflect the retest results.

Data Analysis

For all pathogens in this report, MICs were categorized as resistant, intermediate susceptibility (if applicable), and susceptible. Analysis was restricted to one isolate (per pathogen) per patient. Where established, CLSI interpretive criteria were used; ceftiofur resistance was defined as MIC ≥8 μg/mL (Table III). The 95% confidence interval (CI) for the percentage of resistant isolates are included in the MIC distribution tables. The 95% CI was calculated using the Clopper-Pearson exact method.[6] Multidrug resistance by CLSI antimicrobial subclass was defined as resistance to two or more subclasses.

When describing results for several years, multidrug resistance for *Salmonella* and *E. coli* O157 isolates was limited to the 13 agents tested in all years from 1996 through 2004 (amoxicillin-clavulanic acid, ampicillin, ceftiofur, ceftriaxone, chloramphenicol, ciprofloxacin, gentamicin, kanamycin, nalidixic acid, streptomycin, sulfamethoxazole, tetracycline, and trimethoprim-sulfamethoxazole). For *Salmonella* Typhi and *Shigella,* results for several years included 14 agents tested in all years from 1999 through 2004 (13 antimicrobial agents mentioned above and amikacin). Similarly, when describing multidrug resistance for several years for *Campylobacter* isolates, multidrug resistance was limited to the six agents tested in all years from 1997 through 2004 (chloramphenicol, ciprofloxacin, clindamycin, erythromycin, nalidixic acid, and tetracycline).

Logistic regression was performed to compare the change in antimicrobial resistance among *Salmonella* and *Campylobacter* isolates tested in NARMS during 2004 with that of previous years for the following:

1. Non-Typhi *Salmonella*: resistance to nalidixic acid, resistance to ceftiofur, resistance to one or more CLSI subclass.
2. *Salmonella* Typhimurium: resistance to at least ampicillin, chloramphenicol, streptomycin, sulfamethoxazole, and tetracycline (R-Type ACSSuT).
3. *Salmonella* Enteritidis: resistance to nalidixic acid.
4. *Salmonella* Newport: resistance to at least ACSSuT, amoxicillin-clavulanic acid, and ceftiofur, with decreased susceptibility to ceftriaxone (MDR-AmpC).
5. *Salmonella* Typhi: resistance to nalidixic acid.
6. *Campylobacter* species: resistance to ciprofloxacin.
7. *Campylobacter jejuni*: resistance to ciprofloxacin.

The final regression models for non-Typhi *Salmonella,* and final models for serotypes Typhimurium and Typhi, adjusted for site using the nine Public Health Service geographic regions described in the Public Health Laboratory Information System (PHLIS [http://www.cdc.gov/ncidod/dbmd/phlisdata/]) based on the patient's state of residence. The PHLIS regions are East North Central, East South Central, Mid-Atlantic, Mountain, New England, Pacific, South Atlantic, West North Central, and West South Central. For all regression models that adjusted for site, odds ratios (ORs) and 95% confidence intervals (CIs) were calculated using unconditional maximum likelihood estimation. In the final regression models for serotypes Enteritidis and Newport, which included only year and used unconditional exact methods, the maximum likelihood estimate of the OR did not exist; only the 95% CIs are reported. For *Campylobacter*, the final regression models adjusted for site using four aggregated regions based on patient's state of residence. All analyses included observations from only those state and local health departments that had submitted isolates for at least 3 years. The adequacy of model fit was assessed in several ways. The significance of the main effect of year was assessed using the likelihood ratio test. The likelihood ratio test was also used to test for significance of interaction between site and year, although the power of the test to detect a single site-specific interaction was low. The Hosmer and Lemeshow goodness-of-fit test also was used.[7] Finally, residual analysis was performed to examine the influence of individual observations. ORs that did not include 1.0 in the 95% CI were reported as significant.

RESULTS FOR 2004

1. NON-TYPHI *SALMONELLA*

In 2004, CDC received 1832 non-Typhi *Salmonella* isolates, of which 1808 (98.7%) were viable and tested for antimicrobial susceptibility. Of these 1808 isolates, 15 isolates were excluded from the analysis because they were submissions from the same patient, leaving 1793 isolates for analysis. (Table I).

Fluoroquinolones (e.g., ciprofloxacin) and third-generation cephalosporins (e.g., ceftriaxone) are commonly used to treat severe *Salmonella* infections. Nalidixic acid is an elementary quinolone; resistance to nalidixic acid correlates with decreased susceptibility to ciprofloxacin and possible treatment failure. Ceftiofur is a third-generation cephalosporin used in food animals in the United States; resistance to ceftiofur correlates with decreased susceptibility to ceftriaxone. In 2004, the prevalence of resistance among *Salmonella* isolates was 2.6% for quinolones (represented by nalidixic acid) and 3.4% for third-generation cephalosporins (represented by ceftiofur) (Table 1.1).

The antimicrobial agents with the highest prevalence of resistance were tetracycline (13.5%), sulfisoxazole (13.2%), ampicillin (12.0%), and streptomycin (11.8%). (Sulfisoxazole replaced sulfamethoxazole to represent the sulfonamides in the 2004 NARMS panel.)

The prevalence of nalidixic acid resistance increased from 0.4% (5/1324) in 1996 to 2.6% (47/1793) in 2004 (Table 1.2); a statistically significant increase (OR=9.2, 95% CI [3.6, 23.8]). The prevalence of ceftiofur resistance increased from 0.2% (2/1324) in 1996 to 3.4% (61/1793) in 2004; a statistically significant increase (OR=34.5, 95% CI [8.3, 142.7]).

The proportion of resistance to most of the agents tested in 2004 was lower than in 2003, including ampicillin, amoxicillin-clavulanic acid, ceftiofur, cefoxitin, chloramphenicol, tetracycline, and streptomycin. However, for ceftiofur, resistance increased since 1996.

Of the 1783 non-Typhi *Salmonella* isolated in 2004, 79.6% (1427) had no detected resistance, a slight increase from the 77.7% in 2003 (Table 1.3). In 2004, 366 (20.4%) were resistant to one or more CLSI subclass; 269 (15.0%), to two or more subclasses; 210 (11.7%), to three or more subclasses; 168 (9.4%), to four or more subclasses; and 146 (8.1%), to five or more subclasses. There was a statistically significant decline in resistance to one or more subclass from 33.8% in 1996 to 20.4% in 2004 (OR=0.6, 95% CI [0.5, 0.7]) (Table 1.3).

In 2004, the most common multidrug-resistant phenotype (7.1%) among non-Typhi *Salmonella* isolates was resistance to at least ampicillin, chloramphenicol, streptomycin, sulfamethoxazole/sulfisoxazole, and tetracycline (R-Type ACSSuT). The proportion of isolates with R-Type ACSSuT was lower in 2004 than in 2003. Overall, however, the prevalence of R-Type ACSSuT did not change among non-Typhi *Salmonell*a isolates from 1996 to 2004. Another common multidrug-resistant phenotype among non-Typhi *Salmonell*a isolates was resistance to at least ACSSuT, amoxicillin-clavulanic acid, and ceftiofur and decreased susceptibility to ceftriaxone (MIC ≥2 µg/mL) (MDR-AmpC) (2.3%). The prevalence of MDR-AmpC increased from 0% (0/1324) in 1996 to 2.3% (42/1793) in 2004. Seven (0.4%) isolates were resistant to a quinolone (nalidixic acid) and third-generation cephalosporin (ceftiofur) (Table 1.3); this pattern was first detected in 1997.

Serotypes were identified for a higher proportion of isolates in NARMS (95.8%) than in the Public Health Laboratory Information System (PHLIS) (90.4%) (Table 1.4). The 20 most common serotypes accounted for 81.1% of isolates in NARMS and for 75.1% in PHLIS. The five most common serotypes accounted for 58.1% of isolates in NARMS and 53.0% in PHLIS.

Table 1.1: Minimum inhibitory concentrations (MICs) and resistance of non-Typhi *Salmonella* isolates to antimicrobial agents, 2004 (N=1793)

Antibiotic		% of isolates			Percent of all isolates with MIC (µg/mL)[§]														
		%I[*]	%R[†]	[95% CI][‡]	0.015	0.03	0.06	0.125	0.25	0.50	1	2	4	8	16	32	64	128	256	512
Aminoglycosides	Amikacin	0.0	0.0	[0.0–0.2]						7.8	69.5	20.0	2.5	0.2						
	Gentamicin	0.4	1.3	[0.9–2.0]					68.4	27.7	2.0	0.2	0.1	0.4	0.6	0.8				
	Kanamycin	0.2	2.8	[2.1–3.7]										96.7	0.3	0.2	0.2	2.6		
	Streptomycin	NA	11.8	[10.4–13.4]												88.2	5.7	6.1		
Aminopenicillins	Ampicillin	0.1	12.0	[10.6–13.6]							60.4	25.8	1.7		0.1	0.1	12.0			
β-lactamase inhibitor	Amoxicillin-clavulanic acid	5.7	3.7	[2.9–4.7]							83.8	3.8	0.4	2.5	5.7	0.8	2.9			
Cephalosporins (3rd generation)	Ceftiofur	0.3	3.4	[2.6–4.3]				0.6	1.5	76.2	17.6	0.4	0.3	0.1	3.3					
	Ceftriaxone	2.6	0.6	[0.3–1.0]					96.4	0.2		0.1		0.2	1.4	1.2	0.5	0.1		
Cephamycins	Cefoxitin	0.3	3.5	[2.7–4.4]						0.2	25.5	56.1	12.7	1.8	0.3	1.3	2.1			
Folate pathway inhibitors	Trimethoprim-sulfamethoxazole	NA	1.8	[1.2–2.5]				76.4	21.0	0.6	0.1	0.2	0.1	1.7						
Phenicols	Chloramphenicol	0.9	7.6	[6.4–8.9]								2.1	45.1	44.3	0.9		7.6			
Quinolones	Ciprofloxacin	0.1	0.2	[0.1–0.6]	95.8	1.4	0.1	1.1	0.9	0.4		0.1		0.2						
	Nalidixic Acid	NA	2.6	[1.9–3.5]						0.1	0.4	26.0	69.2	1.5	0.2	0.2	2.5			
Sulfonamides	Sulfamethoxazole/Sulfisoxazole	NA	13.2	[11.7–14.9]											19.3	55.7	11.5	0.2	0.1	13.2
Tetracyclines	Tetracycline	0.3	13.5	[11.9–15.2]									86.2	0.3	1.4	4.5	7.6			

[*]Percent of isolates with intermediate susceptibility, NA if no MIC range of intermediate susceptibility exists

[†]Percent of isolates that were resistant

[‡]95% confidence intervals (CI) for percent resistant (%R) were calculated using the Clopper-Pearson exact method

[§]The unshaded areas indicate the dilution range of the Sensititre plates used to test isolates. Single vertical bars indicate the breakpoints for susceptibility, while double vertical bars indicate breakpoints for resistance. Numbers in the shaded areas indicate the percentages of isolates with MICs greater than the highest concentrations on the Sensititre plate. Numbers listed for the lowest tested concentrations represent the precentages of isolates with MICs equal to or less than the lowest tested concentration. CLSI breakpoints were used when available.

Table 1.2: Percentage and number of non-Typhi *Salmonella* isolates resistant to antimicrobial agents, 1996–2004

Year		1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004
Total Isolates		1324	1301	1460	1497	1377	1419	2008	1864	1793
Subclass	Antibiotic (Resistance breakpoint)									
Aminoglycosides	Amikacin (MIC ≥ 64)	Not Tested	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.1% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
	Gentamicin (MIC ≥ 16)	4.8% 63	2.9% 38	2.8% 41	2.1% 32	2.7% 37	1.9% 27	1.3% 27	1.4% 26	1.3% 24
	Kanamycin (MIC ≥ 64)	5.0% 66	5.1% 67	5.7% 83	4.3% 65	5.6% 77	4.8% 68	3.8% 76	3.4% 64	2.8% 50
	Streptomycin (MIC ≥ 64)	20.6% 273	21.4% 278	18.6% 272	16.8% 251	16.3% 224	17.0% 241	13.2% 265	15.0% 279	11.8% 212
Aminopenicillins	Ampicillin (MIC ≥ 32)	20.7% 274	18.3% 238	16.5% 241	15.6% 233	15.9% 219	17.4% 247	12.9% 259	13.6% 254	12.0% 216
β-lactamase inhibitor combinations	Amoxicillin-clavulanic acid (MIC ≥ 32)	1.1% 15	1.0% 13	1.7% 25	2.3% 35	3.9% 54	4.7% 66	5.3% 106	4.6% 86	3.7% 67
Cephalosporin (1st generation)	Cephalothin (MIC ≥ 32)	2.9% 39	2.2% 29	2.3% 33	3.6% 54	4.0% 55	4.0% 57	5.0% 101	5.4% 100	Not Tested
Cephalosporins (3rd generation)	Ceftiofur (MIC ≥ 8)	0.2% 2	0.5% 6	0.8% 12	2.0% 30	3.2% 44	4.1% 58	4.3% 87	4.5% 83	3.4% 61
	Ceftriaxone (MIC ≥ 64)	0.0% 0	0.1% 1	0.0% 0	0.3% 5	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.2% 4	0.4% 8	0.6% 10
Cephamycins	Cefoxitin (MIC ≥ 32)	Not Tested	Not Tested	Not Tested	Not Tested	3.2% 44	3.4% 48	4.3% 86	4.2% 79	3.5% 62
Folate pathway inhibitors	Trimethoprim-sulfamethoxazole (MIC ≥ 4)	3.9% 51	1.8% 24	2.3% 34	2.1% 31	2.1% 29	2.0% 28	1.4% 28	1.9% 36	1.8% 32
Phenicols	Chloramphenicol (MIC ≥ 32)	10.6% 140	10.1% 131	9.9% 145	9.2% 138	10.1% 139	11.6% 164	8.6% 172	10.0% 187	7.6% 136
Quinolones	Ciprofloxacin (MIC ≥ 4)	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.1% 1	0.1% 1	0.4% 5	0.2% 3	0.0% 1	0.2% 3	0.2% 4
	Nalidixic Acid (MIC ≥ 32)	0.4% 5	0.9% 12	1.4% 20	1.0% 15	2.5% 34	2.6% 37	1.8% 36	2.3% 42	2.6% 47
Sulfonamides	Sulfamethoxazole/Sulfisoxazole[*] (MIC ≥ 512)	20.3% 269	22.8% 297	19.4% 283	18.0% 270	17.1% 235	17.7% 251	12.8% 258	15.0% 280	13.2% 237
Tetracyclines	Tetracycline (MIC ≥ 16)	24.2% 320	21.7% 282	20.2% 295	19.4% 290	18.6% 256	19.7% 280	14.9% 299	16.3% 303	13.5% 242

[*]Sulfamethoxazole, which was tested during 1996-2003 to represent sulfonamides, was replaced by sulfisoxazole in 2004.

Table 1.3: Resistance patterns of non-Typhi *Salmonella* isolates, 1996–2004

Year	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004
Total Isolates	1324	1301	1460	1497	1377	1419	2008	1864	1793
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
	n	n	n	n	n	n	n	n	n
No resistance detected	66.2%	68.4%	72.9%	74.1%	74.4%	72.3%	79.0%	77.7%	79.6%
	876	890	1064	1109	1024	1026	1586	1449	1427
Resistance ≥1CLSI subclass*	33.8%	31.6%	27.1%	25.9%	25.6%	27.7%	21.0%	22.3%	20.4%
	448	411	396	388	353	393	422	415	366
Resistance ≥2 CLSI subclasses*	27.0%	24.1%	22.6%	20.4%	20.2%	22.1%	15.8%	17.7%	15.0%
	358	314	330	306	278	314	318	330	269
Resistance ≥3 CLSI subclasses*	18.1%	17.7%	16.7%	15.1%	15.6%	16.8%	12.2%	14.3%	11.7%
	240	230	244	226	215	239	244	266	210
Resistance ≥4 CLSI subclasses*	13.7%	13.7%	13.1%	12.3%	12.9%	14.2%	9.9%	11.6%	9.4%
	181	178	191	184	178	202	199	216	168
Resistance ≥5 CLSI subclasses*	10.0%	9.9%	10.1%	8.7%	9.9%	10.5%	8.3%	9.9%	8.1%
	132	129	147	130	137	149	167	185	146
At least ACSSuT†	8.8%	9.5%	8.9%	8.4%	8.9%	10.0%	7.8%	9.3%	7.1%
	116	124	130	126	122	142	156	173	128
At least ACSuTm‡	0.8%	0.4%	0.9%	1.0%	1.0%	0.5%	1.0%	1.2%	0.6%
	10	5	13	15	14	7	21	23	10
At least ACSSuTAuCf§	0.0%	0.3%	0.3%	1.5%	2.6%	2.5%	3.3%	3.2%	2.3%
	0	4	5	23	36	36	67	60	42
At least MDR-AmpC¶	0.0%	0.3%	0.3%	1.5%	2.6%	2.5%	3.3%	3.2%	2.3%
	0	4	5	23	36	36	67	60	42
Resistance to quinolone and cephalosporin (3rd generation)	0.0%	0.2%	0.1%	0.1%	0.3%	0.3%	0.2%	0.2%	0.4%
	0	2	1	1	4	4	5	4	7

*CLSI: Clinical and Laboratory Standards Institute

†ACSSuT: resistance to ampicillin, chloramphenicol, streptomycin, sulfamethoxazole/sulfisoxazole, tetracycline

‡ACSuTm: resistance to ampicillin, chloramphenicol, trimethoprim-sulfamethoxazole

§ACSSuTAuCf: resistance to ACSSuT + amoxicillin-clavulanic acid, ceftiofur

¶MDR-AmpC: resistance to ACSSuTAuCf + decreased susceptibility to ceftriaxone (MIC ≥2 µg/mL)

Table 1.4: Twenty most common non-Typhi *Salmonella* serotypes in NARMS and the Public Health Laboratory Information System, 2004

NARMS			
		Isolates	
Rank	Serotype	N	(%)
1	Typhimurium	382	(21.3%)
2	Enteritidis	271	(15.1%)
3	Newport	190	(10.6%)
4	Javiana	106	(5.9%)
5	Heidelberg	93	(5.2%)
6	Montevideo	50	(2.8%)
7	I 4,[5],12:i:- (monophasic Typhimurium)	36	(2.0%)
8	Braenderup	33	(1.8%)
9	Oranienburg	32	(1.8%)
10	Muenchen	32	(1.8%)
11	Saintpaul	32	(1.8%)
12	Paratyphi B var. L(+) tartrate+	30	(1.7%)
13	Infantis	29	(1.6%)
14	Thompson	26	(1.5%)
15	Mississippi	24	(1.3%)
16	Agona	24	(1.3%)
17	Hartford	18	(1.0%)
18	Anatum	16	(0.9%)
19	Berta	14	(0.8%)
20	Mbandaka	14	(0.8%)
	Subtotal	**1452**	**(81.0%)**
	All Other serotypes	266	(14.8%)
	Unknown serotype	16	(0.9%)
	Partially serotyped	23	(1.3%)
	Rough/Nonmotile isolates	36	(2.0%)
	Subtotal	**341**	**(19.0%)**
	Grand Total	**1793**	**(100.0%)**

PHLIS			
		Isolates	
Rank	Serotype	N	(%)
1	Typhimurium	6855	(19.4%)
2	Enteritidis	5028	(14.2%)
3	Newport	3329	(9.4%)
4	Javiana	1776	(5.0%)
5	Heidelberg	1758	(5.0%)
6	Montevideo	874	(2.5%)
7	I 4,[5],12:i:- (monophasic Typhimurium)	739	(2.1%)
8	Muenchen	739	(2.1%)
9	Saintpaul	695	(2.0%)
10	Braenderup	684	(1.9%)
11	Infantis	588	(1.7%)
12	Mississippi	558	(1.6%)
13	Oranienburg	495	(1.4%)
14	Thompson	494	(1.4%)
15	Berta	409	(1.2%)
16	Agona	407	(1.2%)
17	Paratyphi B var. L(+) tartrate+	354	(1.0%)
18	Hadar	277	(0.8%)
19	Anatum	250	(0.7%)
20	Paratyphi B	239	(0.7%)
	Subtotal	**26548**	**(75.1%)**
	All Other serotypes	5423	(15.3%)
	Unknown serotype	1999	(5.7%)
	Partially serotyped	1324	(3.7%)
	Rough/Nonmotile isolates	61	(0.2%)
	Subtotal	**8807**	**(24.9%)**
	Grand Total	**35355**	**(100.0%)**

A. *Salmonella* Typhimurium

In 2004, Typhimurium was the most common *Salmonella* serotype in NARMS, accounting for 21.3% (382/1793) of non-Typhi *Salmonella* isolates (Table 1.5). Of the 382 *Salmonella* Typhimurium isolates tested, resistance was highest to sulfisoxazole (35.9%), ampicillin (31.9%), streptomycin (31.7%), tetracycline (30.1%), and chloramphenicol (24.1%). The prevalence of resistance among clinically important antimicrobial subclasses was 0.5% for quinolones (represented by nalidixic acid) and 4.5% for third-generation cephalosporins (represented by ceftiofur).

The most dramatic increase over time occurred with ceftiofur resistance—from no resistance in 1996 to 4.5% in 2004 (Table 1.6). Resistance to many of the other antimicrobial agents decreased since 1996 (Table 1.6). Resistance to tetracycline decreased from 49.3% in 1996 to 30.1% in 2004; ampicillin, from 50.0% to 31.9%; streptomycin, from 51.6% to 31.7%; chloramphenicol, from 39.9% to 24.1%; and gentamicin, from 4.2% to 2.1%.

Of the 382 *Salmonella* Typhimurium isolates tested during 2004, 60.7% (232) had no detected resistance, a slight increase from the 55.3% of isolates in 2003 (Table 1.7). In 2004, 37.2% (142/382) were resistant to two or more CLSI subclasses, compared with 40.9% in 2003. Similarly, in 2004, 24.3% (93/382) were resistant to at least five subclasses, compared with 27.5% in 2003.

In 2004, the most common multidrug-resistant phenotype among *Salmonella* Typhimurium was R-Type ACSSuT (23.3% of isolates). For *Salmonella* Typhimurium, R-Type ACSSuT commonly is associated with definitive phage type 104. Since 1996, the prevalence of R-Type ACSSuT among *Salmonella* Typhimurium decreased from 33.7% to 23.3%. In the logistic regression model, this decrease was statistically significant (OR=0.6, 95% CI [0.4, 0.8]).

One (0.3%) serotype Typhimurium isolate was resistant to both quinolones and third-generation cephalosporins in 2004. Since 1996, six *Salmonella* Typhimurium isolates have shown this multidrug resistance pattern.

Table 1.5: Minimum inhibitory concentrations (MICs) and resistance of *Salmonella* Typhimurium isolates to antimicrobial agents, 2004 (N=382)

Antibiotic		% of isolates			Percent of all isolates with MIC (µg/mL)§														
		%I*	%R†	[95% CI]‡	0.015	0.03	0.06	0.125	0.25	0.50	1	2	4	8	16	32	64	128	256	512
Aminoglycosides	Amikacin	0.0	0.0	[0.0–1.0]						1.8	74.3	21.7	2.1							
	Gentamicin	0.0	2.1	[0.9–4.1]					64.1	32.5	1.0	0.3			0.5	1.6				
	Kanamycin	0.0	5.8	[3.6–8.6]										93.7	0.5		0.3	5.5		
	Streptomycin	NA	31.7	[27.0–36.6]												68.3	20.4	11.3		
Aminopenicillins	Ampicillin	0.0	31.9	[27.3–36.9]							43.2	23.3	1.6				31.9			
β-lactamase inhibitor	Amoxicillin-clavulanic acid	21.2	4.7	[2.8–7.3]							66.2	2.1		5.8	21.2	0.3	4.5			
Cephalosporins (3rd generation)	Ceftiofur	0.0	4.5	[2.6–7.0]				0.3	1.0	77.2	16.2	0.8			4.5					
	Ceftriaxone	3.4	0.8	[0.2–2.3]					95.5					0.3	2.9	0.5	0.8			
Cephamycins	Cefoxitin	0.3	4.7	[2.8–7.3]						0.3	19.6	66.2	6.5	2.4	0.3	2.6	2.1			
Folate pathway inhibitors	Trimethoprim-sulfamethoxazole	NA	2.6	[1.3–4.8]				63.4	33.5	0.3	0.3			2.6						
Phenicols	Chloramphenicol	0.3	24.1	[19.9–28.7]								1.8	38.2	35.6	0.3		24.1			
Quinolones	Ciprofloxacin	0.0	0.0	[0.0–1.0]	97.9	1.3		0.5	0.3											
	Nalidixic Acid	NA	0.5	[0.1–1.9]							0.5	24.6	72.8	1.3	0.3		0.5			
Sulfonamides	Sulfamethoxazole/Sulfisoxazole	NA	35.9	[31.0–40.9]											11.8	49.2	2.9	0.3		35.9
Tetracyclines	Tetracycline	0.0	30.1	[25.5–35.0]									69.9		5.2	15.2	9.7			

*Percent of isolates with intermediate susceptibility, NA if no MIC range of intermediate susceptibility exists

†Percent of isolates that were resistant

‡95% confidence intervals (CI) for percent resistant (%R) were calculated using the Clopper-Pearson exact method

§The unshaded areas indicate the dilution range of the Sensititre plates used to test isolates. Single vertical bars indicate the breakpoints for susceptibility, while double vertical bars indicate breakpoints for resistance. Numbers in the shaded areas indicate the percentages of isolates with MICs greater than the highest concentrations on the Sensititre plate. Numbers listed for the lowest tested concentrations represent the precentages of isolates with MICs equal to or less than the lowest tested concentration. CLSI breakpoints were used when available.

Table 1.6: Percentage and number of *Salmonella* Typhimurium isolates resistant to antimicrobial agents, 1996–2004

Year		1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004
Total Isolates		306	328	377	362	303	325	393	403	382
Subclass	Antibiotic (Resistance breakpoint)									
Aminoglycosides	Amikacin (MIC ≥ 64)	Not Tested	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
	Gentamicin (MIC ≥ 16)	4.2% 13	4.6% 15	3.7% 14	2.2% 8	2.6% 8	1.5% 5	2.3% 9	2.0% 8	2.1% 8
	Kanamycin (MIC ≥ 64)	14.4% 44	15.5% 51	15.9% 60	13.0% 47	13.2% 40	8.3% 27	7.6% 30	7.2% 29	5.8% 22
	Streptomycin (MIC ≥ 64)	51.6% 158	55.2% 181	47.2% 178	43.1% 156	39.3% 119	40.0% 130	31.8% 125	35.0% 141	31.7% 121
Aminopenicillins	Ampicillin (MIC ≥ 32)	50.0% 153	50.3% 165	45.1% 170	41.2% 149	41.9% 127	42.5% 138	33.6% 132	35.5% 143	31.9% 122
β-lactamase inhibitor combinations	Amoxicillin-clavulanic acid (MIC ≥ 32)	2.6% 8	3.4% 11	4.5% 17	2.8% 10	6.3% 19	6.2% 20	7.6% 30	5.2% 21	4.7% 18
Cephalosporin (1st generation)	Cephalothin (MIC ≥ 32)	2.0% 6	4.3% 14	4.0% 15	4.4% 16	4.3% 13	3.1% 10	5.6% 22	6.0% 24	Not Tested
Cephalosporins (3rd generation)	Ceftiofur (MIC ≥ 8)	0.0% 0	1.5% 5	1.9% 7	1.9% 7	3.6% 11	3.1% 10	4.3% 17	4.7% 19	4.5% 17
	Ceftriaxone (MIC ≥ 64)	0.0% 0	0.3% 1	0.0% 0	0.3% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.3% 1	0.2% 1	0.8% 3
Cephamycins	Cefoxitin (MIC ≥ 32)	Not Tested	Not Tested	Not Tested	Not Tested	3.6% 11	3.1% 10	4.3% 17	4.2% 17	4.7% 18
Folate pathway inhibitors	Trimethoprim-sulfamethoxazole (MIC ≥ 4)	4.6% 14	3.0% 10	4.5% 17	2.8% 10	3.6% 11	2.5% 8	2.3% 9	3.5% 14	2.6% 10
Phenicols	Chloramphenicol (MIC ≥ 32)	39.9% 122	36.0% 118	33.4% 126	28.7% 104	30.7% 93	31.7% 103	23.2% 91	27.5% 111	24.1% 92
Quinolones	Ciprofloxacin (MIC ≥ 4)	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.3% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
	Nalidixic Acid (MIC ≥ 32)	0.3% 1	0.9% 3	0.5% 2	0.0% 0	1.3% 4	0.6% 2	1.3% 5	1.2% 5	0.5% 2
Sulfonamides	Sulfamethoxazole/Sulfisoxazole* (MIC ≥ 512)	53.3% 163	56.7% 186	49.6% 187	45.6% 165	45.2% 137	43.1% 140	32.1% 126	38.2% 154	35.9% 137
Tetracyclines	Tetracycline (MIC ≥ 16)	49.3% 151	52.4% 172	45.9% 173	41.7% 151	43.2% 131	43.4% 141	31.8% 125	37.7% 152	30.1% 115

*Sulfamethoxazole, which was tested during 1996-2003 to represent sulfonamides, was replaced by sulfisoxazole in 2004.

Table 1.7: Resistance patterns of *Salmonella* Typhimurium isolates, 1996–2004

Year	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004
Total Isolates	306	328	377	362	303	325	393	403	382
	% n	% n	% n	% n	% n	% n	% n	% n	% n
No resistance detected	37.9% 116	39.0% 128	46.9% 177	50.6% 183	49.5% 150	49.2% 160	60.3% 237	55.3% 223	60.7% 232
Resistance ≥1CLSI subclass*	62.1% 190	61.0% 200	53.1% 200	49.4% 179	50.5% 153	50.8% 165	39.7% 156	44.7% 180	39.3% 150
Resistance ≥2 CLSI subclasses*	56.2% 172	56.7% 186	50.9% 192	46.1% 167	46.9% 142	48.0% 156	36.1% 142	40.9% 165	37.2% 142
Resistance ≥3 CLSI subclasses*	51.0% 156	52.4% 172	47.2% 178	43.1% 156	43.2% 131	41.8% 136	32.3% 127	36.5% 147	31.4% 120
Resistance ≥4 CLSI subclasses*	45.4% 139	47.9% 157	42.7% 161	38.4% 139	39.6% 120	38.2% 124	28.5% 112	31.8% 128	28.0% 107
Resistance ≥5 CLSI subclasses*	35.6% 109	36.0% 118	34.0% 128	27.9% 101	30.4% 92	29.8% 97	23.4% 92	27.5% 111	24.3% 93
At least ACSSuT†	33.7% 103	35.1% 115	31.8% 120	27.6% 100	27.7% 84	29.5% 96	21.4% 84	25.8% 104	23.3% 89
At least ACSuTm‡	2.0% 6	0.6% 2	2.7% 10	2.2% 8	1.7% 5	0.9% 3	2.0% 8	3.2% 13	1.6% 6
At least ACSSuTAuCf§	0.0% 0	1.2% 4	1.1% 4	0.6% 2	2.0% 6	1.2% 4	1.8% 7	2.2% 9	2.6% 10
At least MDR-AmpC¶	0.0% 0	1.2% 4	1.1% 4	0.6% 2	2.0% 6	1.2% 4	1.8% 7	2.2% 9	2.6% 10
Resistance to quinolone and cephalosporin (3rd generation)	0.0% 0	0.3% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.3% 1	0.3% 1	0.5% 2	0.0% 0	0.3% 1

*CLSI: Clinical and Laboratory Standards Institute

†ACSSuT: resistance to ampicillin, chloramphenicol, streptomycin, sulfamethoxazole/sulfisoxazole, tetracycline

‡ACSuTm: resistance to ampicillin, chloramphenicol, trimethoprim-sulfamethoxazole

§ACSSuTAuCf: resistance to ACSSuT + amoxicillin-clavulanic acid, ceftiofur

¶MDR-AmpC: resistance to ACSSuTAuCf + decreased susceptibility to ceftriaxone (MIC ≥2 µg/mL)

B. *Salmonella* Enteritidis

In 2004, *Salmonella* Enteritidis was the second most common serotype identified in NARMS, accounting for 15.1% (271/1793) of non-Typhi *Salmonella* isolates (Table 1.8). Among *Salmonella* Enteritidis isolates tested in 2004, resistance was uncommon. The most dramatic increase occurred with nalidixic acid. There was a statistically significant increase in nalidixic acid resistance from 0.9% in 1996 to 6.6% in 2004 (95% CI [2.3, 49.3]) (Table 1.9). *Salmonella* Enteritidis was the most prevalent (38.3%) non-Typhi *Salmonella* serotype that had resistance to nalidixic acid (Table 1.14).

Most (87.1%) of the *Salmonella* Enteritidis isolates tested in 2004 had no detected resistance (Table 1.10). Multidrug resistance was uncommon.

Table 1.8: Minimum inhibitory concentrations (MICs) and resistance of *Salmonella* Enteriditis isolates to antimicrobial agents, 2004 (N=271)

Antibiotic		% of isolates			Percent of all isolates with MIC (µg/mL)[§]														
		%I[*]	%R[†]	[95% CI][‡]	0.015	0.03	0.06	0.125	0.25	0.50	1	2	4	8	16	32	64	128	256	512
Aminoglycosides	Amikacin	0.0	0.0	[0.0–1.4]						23.6	64.9	9.2	2.2							
	Gentamicin	0.0	0.4	[0.0–2.0]					85.2	12.9	1.1		0.4			0.4				
	Kanamycin	0.0	0.7	[0.1–2.6]										99.3				0.7		
	Streptomycin	NA	2.2	[0.8–4.8]												97.8	1.5	0.7		
Aminopenicillins	Ampicillin	0.0	4.1	[2.0–7.1]							57.2	38.4	0.4			0.4	3.7			
β-lactamase inhibitor	Amoxicillin-clavulanic acid	1.5	0.0	[0.0–1.4]							91.9	4.4	0.7	1.5	1.5					
Cephalosporins (3rd generation)	Ceftiofur	0.4	0.0	[0.0–1.4]				1.1	0.7	66.1	31.7		0.4							
	Ceftriaxone	0.0	0.0	[0.0–1.4]					99.6	0.4										
Cephamycins	Cefoxitin	0.0	0.0	[0.0–1.4]						0.4	23.2	69.4	5.9	1.1						
Folate pathway inhibitors	Trimethoprim-sulfamethoxazole	NA	0.0	[0.0–1.4]				81.2	18.1	0.7										
Phenicols	Chloramphenicol	0.4	0.4	[0.0–2.0]								1.8	51.3	46.1	0.4		0.4			
Quinolones	Ciprofloxacin	0.4	0.0	[0.0–1.4]	93.0	0.4		3.3	3.0			0.4								
	Nalidixic Acid	NA	6.6	[4.0–10.3]						0.4	0.4	11.1	80.4	1.1		0.4	6.3			
Sulfonamides	Sulfamethoxazole/Sulfisoxazole	NA	1.8	[0.6–4.3]											15.9	77.1	4.8	0.4		1.8
Tetracyclines	Tetracycline	1.1	3.3	[1.5–6.2]									95.6	1.1	0.4		3.0			

[*]Percent of isolates with intermediate susceptibility, NA if no MIC range of intermediate susceptibility exists

[†]Percent of isolates that were resistant

[‡]95% confidence intervals (CI) for percent resistant (%R) were calculated using the Clopper-Pearson exact method

§The unshaded areas indicate the dilution range of the Sensititre plates used to test isolates. Single vertical bars indicate the breakpoints for susceptibility, while double vertical bars indicate breakpoints for resistance. Numbers in the shaded areas indicate the percentages of isolates with MICs greater than the highest concentrations on the Sensititre plate. Numbers listed for the lowest tested concentrations represent the precentages of isolates with MICs equal to or less than the lowest tested concentration. CLSI breakpoints were used when available.

Table 1.9: Percentage and number of *Salmonella* Enteritidis isolates resistant to antimicrobial agents, 1996–2004

Year		1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004
Total Isolates		351	301	244	269	319	276	337	257	271
Subclass	Antibiotic (Resistance breakpoint)									
Aminoglycosides	Amikacin (MIC ≥ 64)	Not Tested	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
	Gentamicin (MIC ≥ 16)	4.8% 17	0.3% 1	0.4% 1	0.0% 0	0.3% 1	0.0% 0	0.3% 1	0.4% 1	0.4% 1
	Kanamycin (MIC ≥ 64)	0.0% 0	0.7% 2	0.4% 1	0.4% 1	0.3% 1	0.7% 2	0.3% 1	0.0% 0	0.7% 2
	Streptomycin (MIC ≥ 64)	2.0% 7	4.3% 13	1.6% 4	2.2% 6	0.0% 0	1.4% 4	1.8% 6	1.2% 3	2.2% 6
Aminopenicillins	Ampicillin (MIC ≥ 32)	20.5% 72	11.3% 34	6.1% 15	10.8% 29	7.5% 24	8.7% 24	7.1% 24	2.3% 6	4.1% 11
β-lactamase inhibitor combinations	Amoxicillin-clavulanic acid (MIC ≥ 32)	0.6% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.4% 1	0.0% 0	1.4% 4	0.6% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
Cephalosporin (1st generation)	Cephalothin (MIC ≥ 32)	4.0% 14	1.3% 4	0.0% 0	1.9% 5	0.9% 3	1.1% 3	0.6% 2	1.2% 3	Not Tested
Cephalosporins (3rd generation)	Ceftiofur (MIC ≥ 8)	0.0% 0	0.3% 1	0.0% 0	0.4% 1	0.0% 0	2.2% 6	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
	Ceftriaxone (MIC ≥ 64)	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
Cephamycins	Cefoxitin (MIC ≥ 32)	Not Tested	Not Tested	Not Tested	Not Tested	0.0% 0	0.4% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
Folate pathway inhibitors	Trimethoprim-sulfamethoxazole (MIC ≥ 4)	6.6% 23	1.3% 4	0.8% 2	0.7% 2	0.0% 0	0.7% 2	0.6% 2	0.8% 2	0.0% 0
Phenicols	Chloramphenicol (MIC ≥ 32)	0.0% 0	0.7% 2	0.0% 0	0.4% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.6% 2	0.4% 1	0.4% 1
Quinolones	Ciprofloxacin (MIC ≥ 4)	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
	Nalidixic Acid (MIC ≥ 32)	0.9% 3	1.7% 5	2.0% 5	2.2% 6	2.2% 7	4.3% 12	3.9% 13	4.7% 12	6.6% 18
Sulfonamides	Sulfamethoxazole/Sulfisoxazole* (MIC ≥ 512)	8.5% 30	9.0% 27	2.0% 5	3.0% 8	0.9% 3	2.2% 6	1.8% 6	1.2% 3	1.8% 5
Tetracyclines	Tetracycline (MIC ≥ 16)	16.8% 59	9.6% 29	6.6% 16	8.2% 22	1.9% 6	1.8% 5	4.5% 15	1.6% 4	3.3% 9

*Sulfamethoxazole, which was tested during 1996-2003 to represent sulfonamides, was replaced by sulfisoxazole in 2004.

Table 1.10: Resistance patterns of *Salmonella* Enteritidis isolates, 1996–2004

Year	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004
Total Isolates	351	301	244	269	319	276	337	257	271
	% n	% n	% n	% n	% n	% n	% n	% n	% n
No resistance detected	73.5% 258	77.4% 233	87.7% 214	83.6% 225	89.0% 284	86.6% 239	87.2% 294	91.8% 236	87.1% 236
Resistance ≥1CLSI subclass*	26.5% 93	22.6% 68	12.3% 30	16.4% 44	11.0% 35	13.4% 37	12.8% 43	8.2% 21	12.9% 35
Resistance ≥2 CLSI subclasses*	19.1% 67	9.6% 29	6.6% 16	8.6% 23	1.9% 6	4.7% 13	4.2% 14	2.3% 6	3.0% 8
Resistance ≥3 CLSI subclasses*	8.0% 28	3.0% 9	0.8% 2	1.1% 3	0.3% 1	2.9% 8	2.4% 8	0.8% 2	1.1% 3
Resistance ≥4 CLSI subclasses*	4.6% 16	1.3% 4	0.0% 0	0.7% 2	0.0% 0	1.8% 5	1.5% 5	0.4% 1	0.7% 2
Resistance ≥5 CLSI subclasses*	1.7% 6	0.7% 2	0.0% 0	0.4% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.3% 1	0.4% 1	0.7% 2
At least ACSSuT†	0.0% 0	0.3% 1	0.0% 0	0.4% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.3% 1	0.4% 1	0.4% 1
At least ACSuTm‡	0.0% 0	0.3% 1	0.0% 0	0.4% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.4% 1	0.0% 0
At least ACSSuTAuCf§	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.4% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
At least MDR-AmpC¶	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.4% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
Resistance to quinolone and cephalosporin (3rd generation)	0.0% 0	0.3% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.3% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.4% 1	0.0% 0

*CLSI: Clinical and Laboratory Standards Institute

†ACSSuT: resistance to ampicillin, chloramphenicol, streptomycin, sulfamethoxazole/sulfisoxazole, tetracycline

‡ACSuTm: resistance to ampicillin, chloramphenicol, trimethoprim-sulfamethoxazole

§ACSSuTAuCf: resistance to ACSSuT + amoxicillin-clavulanic acid, ceftiofur

¶MDR-AmpC: resistance to ACSSuTAuCf + decreased susceptibility to ceftriaxone (MIC ≥2 µg/mL)

C. *Salmonella* Newport

In 2004, Newport was the third most commonly isolated *Salmonella* serotype in NARMS, accounting for 10.5% (189/1793) of non-Typhi *Salmonella* isolates (Table 1.11). Of the 190 *Salmonella* Newport isolates, resistance was highest to sulfisoxazole (16.8%), tetracycline (16.8%), ampicillin (15.8%), streptomycin (15.8%), amoxicillin-clavulanic acid (15.3%), ceftiofur (15.3%), cefoxitin (15.3%), and chloramphenicol (15.3%). The prevalence of resistance among clinically important antimicrobial subclasses was 0.5% for quinolones (represented by nalidixic acid) and 15.3% for third-generation cephalosporins (represented by ceftiofur).

Ceftiofur resistance was first noted in one isolate (1.3%) in 1998; it increased to 18.2% in 1999, peaked at 27.4% in 2001, and declined to 15.3% in 2004 (Table 1.12). *Salmonella* Newport was the most prevalent (47.5%) non-Typhi *Salmonella* serotype that had resistance to ceftiofur (Table 1.14).

In contrast to other common serotypes, the percentage of *Salmonella* Newport isolates with no detected resistance declined from 86.3% in 1996 and 74.2% in 2003 (Table 1.13). However, the percentage of *Salmonella* Newport isolates with no detected resistance was higher in 2004 (82.1%) than in 2003 (73.9%). In addition, resistance to at least five subclasses of antimicrobial agents increased from 5.9% in 1996 to 14.7% in 2004, but decreased from the peak in 2001, similar to the trend in ceftiofur resistance.

In 2004, the most common multidrug-resistant phenotype among serotype Newport isolates was MDR-AmpC; (14.7% of isolates). This phenotype has increased since 1996, similar to the trend in ceftiofur resistance (Table 1.13). In the logistic regression model, the increase in MDR-AmpC from 1996 to 2004 was statistically significant (95% CI [3.4, infinity]).

Table 1.11: Minimum inhibitory concentrations (MICs) and resistance of *Salmonella* Newport itsolates to antimicrobial agents, 2004 (N=190)

Antibiotic		% of isolates			Percent of all isolates with MIC (µg/mL)§														
		%I*	%R†	[95% CI]‡	0.015	0.03	0.06	0.125	0.25	0.50	1	2	4	8	16	32	64	128	256	512
Aminoglycosides	Amikacin	0.0	0.0	[0.0–1.9]						6.8	72.1	17.9	2.6	0.5						
	Gentamicin	0.0	0.5	[0.0–2.9]					78.4	19.5	1.6					0.5				
	Kanamycin	0.0	2.6	[0.9–6.0]										97.4				2.6		
	Streptomycin	NA	15.8	[10.9–21.8]												84.2		15.8		
Aminopenicillins	Ampicillin	0.0	15.8	[10.9–21.8]							57.4	25.8	1.1				15.8			
β-lactamase inhibitor Cephalosporins (3rd generation)	Amoxicillin-clavulanic acid	0.0	15.3	[10.5–21.2]							81.1	2.1	0.5	1.1		3.7	11.6			
	Ceftiofur	0.0	15.3	[10.5–21.2]				0.5	0.5	73.7	10.0			0.5	14.7					
	Ceftriaxone	12.1	2.6	[0.9–6.0]					84.2	1.1					4.7	7.4	2.1	0.5		
Cephamycins	Cefoxitin	0.0	15.3	[10.5–21.2]							23.7	55.8	3.7	1.6		3.2	12.1			
Folate pathway inhibitors	Trimethoprim-sulfamethoxazole	NA	2.1	[0.6–5.3]				73.2	23.2	0.5	0.5	0.5		2.1						
Phenicols	Chloramphenicol	0.0	15.3	[10.5–21.2]								2.1	54.7	27.9			15.3			
Quinolones	Ciprofloxacin	0.0	0.0	[0.0–1.9]	98.4	1.1		0.5												
	Nalidixic Acid	NA	0.5	[0.0–2.9]							1.1	34.7	62.1	1.6			0.5			
Sulfonamides	Sulfamethoxazole/Sulfisoxazole	NA	16.8	[11.8–22.9]											5.8	42.1	34.7	0.5		16.8
Tetracyclines	Tetracycline	0.0	16.8	[11.8–22.9]									83.2			4.2	12.6			

*Percent of isolates with intermediate susceptibility, NA if no MIC range of intermediate susceptibility exists

†Percent of isolates that were resistant

‡95% confidence intervals (CI) for percent resistant (%R) were calculated using the Clopper-Pearson exact method

§The unshaded areas indicate the dilution range of the Sensititre plates used to test isolates. Single vertical bars indicate the breakpoints for susceptibility, while double vertical bars indicate breakpoints for resistance. Numbers in the shaded areas indicate the percentages of isolates with MICs greater than the highest concentrations on the Sensititre plate. Numbers listed for the lowest tested concentrations represent the precentages of isolates with MICs equal to or less than the lowest tested concentration. CLSI breakpoints were used when available.

Table 1.12: Percentage and number of *Salmonella* Newport isolates resistant to antimicrobial agents, 1996–2004

Year		1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004
Total Isolates		51	46	77	99	121	124	239	221	190
Subclass	Antibiotic (Resistance breakpoint)									
Aminoglycosides	Amikacin (MIC ≥ 64)	Not Tested	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
	Gentamicin (MIC ≥ 16)	5.9% 3	4.3% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	2.5% 3	3.2% 4	3.3% 8	3.2% 7	0.5% 1
	Kanamycin (MIC ≥ 64)	2.0% 1	0.0% 0	1.3% 1	1.0% 1	5.0% 6	7.3% 9	9.6% 23	4.5% 10	2.6% 5
	Streptomycin (MIC ≥ 64)	7.8% 4	4.3% 2	2.6% 2	19.2% 19	24.0% 29	31.5% 39	24.7% 59	23.5% 52	15.8% 30
Aminopenicillins	Ampicillin (MIC ≥ 32)	5.9% 3	6.5% 3	2.6% 2	18.2% 18	23.1% 28	29.8% 37	24.3% 58	22.2% 49	15.8% 30
β-lactamase inhibitor combinations	Amoxicillin-clavulanic acid (MIC ≥ 32)	2.0% 1	0.0% 0	2.6% 2	18.2% 18	22.3% 27	26.6% 33	22.2% 53	21.3% 47	15.3% 29
Cephalosporin (1st generation)	Cephalothin (MIC ≥ 32)	3.9% 2	4.3% 2	2.6% 2	18.2% 18	22.3% 27	26.6% 33	22.2% 53	21.7% 48	Not Tested
Cephalosporins (3rd generation)	Ceftiofur (MIC ≥ 8)	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	1.3% 1	18.2% 18	22.3% 27	27.4% 34	22.2% 53	21.7% 48	15.3% 29
	Ceftriaxone (MIC ≥ 64)	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	3.0% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.8% 2	1.8% 4	2.6% 5
Cephamycins	Cefoxitin (MIC ≥ 32)	Not Tested	Not Tested	Not Tested	Not Tested	22.3% 27	25.8% 32	22.2% 53	21.3% 47	15.3% 29
Folate pathway inhibitors	Trimethoprim-sulfamethoxazole (MIC ≥ 4)	3.9% 2	4.3% 2	1.3% 1	2.0% 2	4.1% 5	1.6% 2	4.2% 10	0.9% 2	2.1% 4
Phenicols	Chloramphenicol (MIC ≥ 32)	5.9% 3	4.3% 2	2.6% 2	18.2% 18	23.1% 28	28.2% 35	24.7% 59	21.7% 48	15.3% 29
Quinolones	Ciprofloxacin (MIC ≥ 4)	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
	Nalidixic Acid (MIC ≥ 32)	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.8% 1	0.0% 0	0.8% 2	0.0% 0	0.5% 1
Sulfonamides	Sulfamethoxazole/Sulfisoxazole* (MIC ≥ 512)	11.8% 6	4.3% 2	3.9% 3	22.2% 22	23.1% 28	32.3% 40	25.1% 60	24.0% 53	16.8% 32
Tetracyclines	Tetracycline (MIC ≥ 16)	7.8% 4	4.3% 2	2.6% 2	19.2% 19	23.1% 28	30.6% 38	25.1% 60	23.5% 52	16.8% 32

*Sulfamethoxazole, which was tested during 1996-2003 to represent sulfonamides, was replaced by sulfisoxazole in 2004.

Table 1.13: Resistance patterns of *Salmonella* Newport isolates, 1996–2004

Year	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004
Total Isolates	51	46	77	99	121	124	239	221	190
	% n	% n	% n	% n	% n	% n	% n	% n	% n
No resistance detected	86.3% 44	93.5% 43	94.8% 73	75.8% 75	75.2% 91	65.3% 81	72.8% 174	74.2% 164	82.1% 156
Resistance ≥1CLSI subclass*	13.7% 7	6.5% 3	5.2% 4	24.2% 24	24.8% 30	34.7% 43	27.2% 65	25.8% 57	17.9% 34
Resistance ≥2 CLSI subclasses*	7.8% 4	4.3% 2	2.6% 2	18.2% 18	23.1% 28	32.3% 40	25.1% 60	24.4% 54	17.4% 33
Resistance ≥3 CLSI subclasses*	5.9% 3	4.3% 2	2.6% 2	18.2% 18	23.1% 28	31.5% 39	24.7% 59	22.6% 50	16.8% 32
Resistance ≥4 CLSI subclasses*	5.9% 3	4.3% 2	2.6% 2	18.2% 18	23.1% 28	31.5% 39	24.7% 59	22.2% 49	15.8% 30
Resistance ≥5 CLSI subclasses*	5.9% 3	4.3% 2	2.6% 2	18.2% 18	23.1% 28	27.4% 34	23.0% 55	21.7% 48	14.7% 28
At least ACSSuT†	5.9% 3	4.3% 2	1.3% 1	18.2% 18	23.1% 28	25.8% 32	23.0% 55	21.3% 47	14.7% 28
At least ACSuTm‡	3.9% 2	4.3% 2	1.3% 1	2.0% 2	4.1% 5	0.8% 1	3.8% 9	0.9% 2	1.1% 2
At least ACSSuTAuCf§	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	1.3% 1	18.2% 18	22.3% 27	25.0% 31	22.2% 53	20.8% 46	14.7% 28
At least MDR-AmpC¶	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	1.3% 1	18.2% 18	22.3% 27	25.0% 31	22.2% 53	20.8% 46	14.7% 28
Resistance to quinolone and cephalosporin (3rd generation)	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	1.3% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.4% 1	0.0% 0	0.5% 1

*CLSI: Clinical and Laboratory Standards Institute

†ACSSuT: resistance to ampicillin, chloramphenicol, streptomycin, sulfamethoxazole/sulfisoxazole, tetracycline

‡ACSuTm: resistance to ampicillin, chloramphenicol, trimethoprim-sulfamethoxazole

§ACSSuTAuCf: resistance to ACSSuT + amoxicillin-clavulanic acid, ceftiofur

¶MDR-AmpC: resistance to ACSSuTAuCf + decreased susceptibility to ceftriaxone (MIC ≥2 µg/mL)

D. Specific Phenotypes

The multidrug-resistant phenotypes ACSSuT and MDR-AmpC, and resistance to nalidixic acid and ceftiofur, were detected in several other serotypes in 2004 (Table 1.14).

In 2004, 128 non-Typhi *Salmonella* isolates were resistant to at least ACSSuT. Of these isolates, 69.5% were serotype Typhimurium, 21.9% Newport, and 0.8% each Agona, Anatum, Enteritidis, Heidelberg, and "monophasic Typhimurium."

Forty-two non-Typhi *Salmonella* isolates were at least MDR-AmpC. Of these isolates, 66.7% were serotype Newport, 23.8% Typhimurium, 2.4% Agona, and 2.4% Anatum.

Forty-seven non-Typhi *Salmonella* isolates were nalidixic acid-resistant. Of these isolates, 38.3% were serotype Enteritidis, 4.3% Typhimurium, and 2.1% each Agona, Infantis, Javiana, Montevideo, "monophasic Typhimurium," Newport, and Saintpaul.

Sixty-one non-Typhi *Salmonella* isolates were ceftiofur-resistant. Of these isolates, 47.5% were serotype Newport, 27.9% Typhimurium, 14.8% Heidelberg, and 1.6% each Agona, Anatum, and monophasic Typhimurium."

Table 1.14: Number and percentage of ACSSuT-, MDR-AmpC-, nalidixic acid-, and ceftiofur-resistant isolates among the 20 most common non-Typhi *Salmonella* serotypes isolated in NARMS, 2004

			ACSSuT*		MDRAmpC†		Nalidixic Acid		Ceftiofur	
Rank	**Serotype**	**N**	**n**	**(%)**	**n**	**(%)**	**n**	**(%)**	**n**	**(%)**
1	Typhimurium	382	**89**	**(69.5%)**	**10**	**(23.8%)**	**2**	**(4.3%)**	**17**	**(27.9%)**
2	Enteritidis	271	**1**	**(0.8%)**	0	**(0.0%)**	**18**	**(38.3%)**	0	(0.0%)
3	Newport	190	**28**	**(21.9%)**	**28**	**(66.7%)**	**1**	**(2.1%)**	**29**	**(47.5%)**
4	Javiana	106	0	(0.0%)	0	(0.0%)	**1**	**(2.1%)**	0	(0.0%)
5	Heidelberg	93	**1**	**(0.8%)**	0	(0.0%)	0	(0.0%)	**9**	(14.8%)
6	Montevideo	50	0	(0.0%)	0	(0.0%)	**1**	**(2.1%)**	0	(0.0%)
7	I 4,[5],12:i:- (monophasic Typhimurium)	36	**1**	**(0.8%)**	0	(0.0%)	**1**	**(2.1%)**	**1**	**(1.6%)**
8	Braenderup	33	0	(0.0%)	0	(0.0%)	0	(0.0%)	0	(0.0%)
9	Oranienburg	32	0	(0.0%)	0	(0.0%)	0	(0.0%)	0	(0.0%)
10	Muenchen	32	0	(0.0%)	0	(0.0%)	0	(0.0%)	0	(0.0%)
11	Saintpaul	32	0	(0.0%)	0	(0.0%)	**1**	**(2.1%)**	0	(0.0%)
12	Infantis	30	0	(0.0%)	0	(0.0%)	**1**	**(2.1%)**	0	(0.0%)
13	Paratyphi B var. L(+) tartrate+	29	0	(0.0%)	0	(0.0%)	0	(0.0%)	0	(0.0%)
14	Thompson	26	0	(0.0%)	0	(0.0%)	0	(0.0%)	0	(0.0%)
15	Mississippi	24	0	(0.0%)	0	(0.0%)	0	(0.0%)	0	(0.0%)
16	Agona	24	**1**	**(0.8%)**	**1**	**(2.4%)**	**1**	**(2.1%)**	**1**	**(1.6%)**
17	Hartford	18	0	(0.0%)	0	(0.0%)	0	(0.0%)	0	(0.0%)
18	Anatum	16	**1**	(0.8%)	**1**	**(2.4%)**	0	(0.0%)	**1**	**(1.6%)**
19	Berta	14	0	(0.0%)	0	(0.0%)	0	(0.0%)	0	(0.0%)
20	Mbandaka	14	0	(0.0%)	0	(0.0%)	0	(0.0%)	0	(0.0%)
	Subtotal	**1452**	**122**	**(95.3%)**	**40**	**(95.2%)**	**27**	**(57.4%)**	**58**	**(95.1%)**
	All Other Serotypes	341	6	(4.7%)	2	(4.8%)	20	(42.6%)	3	(4.9%)
	Total	**1793**	**128**	**(100.0%)**	**42**	**(100.0%)**	**47**	**(100.0%)**	**61**	**(100.0%)**

*ACSSuT: resistance to ampicillin, chloramphenicol, streptomycin, sulfamethoxazole/sulfisoxazole, tetracycline
† MDR-AmpC: resistance to ACSSuT + amoxicillin-clavulanic acid, ceftiofur + decreased susceptibility to ceftriaxone (MIC ≥2µg/mL)

Molecular Characterization of β-Lactamase Resistance Genes among NARMS *Salmonella* and *Shigella* Isolates, 2002

Extended-spectrum cephalosporins are important for treating persons with severe *Salmonella* infections [Hohmann EL. Nontyphoidal salmonellosis. Clin Infect Dis 2001;32:263–9]. This drug class is particularly important for pediatric therapy because fluoroquinolones are not approved for use in children. In 2004, 34% (11,976/35,661) of laboratory-confirmed *Salmonella* cases reported to CDC occurred in children <10 years of age [CDC. PHLIS *Salmonella* 2004 Annual Summary. Division of Bacterial and Mycotic Diseases. 2005. Available at http://www.cdc.gov/ncidod/dbmd/phlisdata/salmtab/2004/SalmonellaTable2_2004.pdf]. NARMS conducts surveillance for resistance to two extended-spectrum cephalosporins: ceftriaxone (approved for use in humans) and ceftiofur (approved for use in food animals). The prevalence of resistance to ceftiofur among non-Typhi *Salmonella* isolates tested in NARMS increased from 1996 to 2004 (Figure 1.1).

To facilitate an understanding of this increase in resistance, isolates that exhibited a ceftriaxone minimum inhibitory concentration (MIC) of ≥2 µg/mL or a ceftiofur MIC of ≥2 µg/mL also were tested for extended-spectrum cephalosporin-resistance mechanisms. Of the 2629 non-Typhi *Salmonella* and *Shigella* isolates tested in 2002, 95 (3.6%) isolates, including 94 *Salmonella* and one *Shigella*, met these criteria for additional testing. This included susceptibility testing of additional β-lactams, such as ceftazidime and cefotaxime, and molecular characterization of β-lactamases and β-lactamase genes. Ninety-two percent (87/95) of the isolates exhibited a ceftazidime or cefotaxime MIC that was intermediate or resistant; 76% (72/95) exhibited a ceftazidime or cefotaxime MIC that was resistant.

Isoelectric focusing was performed for β-lactamases and polymerase chain reaction (PCR) for bla_{CMY}, bla_{SHV} and bla_{TEM} genes. Of the 95 isolates, 93 (92 *Salmonella* and one *Shigella*) were positive by isoelectric focusing for one or more β-lactams. Of the 92 *Salmonella* isolates with one or more β-lactams, 53 (58%) were *Salmonella* Newport; 19 (21%) were *Salmonella* Typhimurium; and eight (9%) were *Salmonella* Heidelberg; six (7%) isolates were cultured from blood. Among these 92 isolates, 86 (93%) were positive by PCR for a CMY mechanism, 12 (13%) were positive for a TEM mechanism, and one (1%) was positive for a SHV mechanism. Ten (11%) isolates were positive for both CMY and TEM. The *Shigella* isolate was positive by isoelectric focusing and PCR for a TEM mechanism.

Figure 1.1: Prevalence of resistance to ceftiofur among non-Typhi *Salmonella* isolates



2. *SALMONELLA* TYPHI

In 2004, CDC received 349 *Salmonella* Typhi isolates, of which 341 (97.7%) were viable and tested for antimicrobial susceptibility. Of these 341 isolates, 37 isolates were excluded from the analysis because they were submissions from the same patient, leaving 304 isolates for analysis (Table I). Antimicrobial agents with the highest prevalence of resistance were nalidixic acid (41.8%), trimethoprim-sulfamethoxazole (13.2%), chloramphenicol (13.2%), ampicillin (11.8%), streptomycin (11.8%), and sulfisoxazole (11.8%).

Resistance decreased from 2003 to 2004 to most of the antimicrobial agents tested (Table 2.2). However, nalidixic acid resistance increased from 18.7% in 1999 to 41.8% in 2004; a statistically significant increase (OR=3.1, 95% CI [1.9, 4.9]).

In 1999, 12.0% of *Salmonella* Typhi isolates were resistant to at least ampicillin, chloramphenicol, and trimethoprim-sulfamethoxazole (ACSuTm), which increased to 15.6% in 2003 but declined to 11.8% in 2004 (Table 2.3).

Table 2.1: Minimum inhibitory concentrations (MICs) and resistance of *Salmonella* Typhi isolates to antimicrobial agents, 2004 (N=304)

Antibiotic		% of isolates			Percent of all isolates with MIC (µg/mL)[§]														
		%I[*]	%R[†]	[95% CI][‡]	0.015	0.03	0.06	0.125	0.25	0.50	1	2	4	8	16	32	64	128	256	512
Aminoglycosides	Amikacin	0.0	0.0	[0.0–1.2]						28.0	68.4	3.6								
	Gentamicin	0.0	0.0	[0.0–1.2]					96.1	3.9										
	Kanamycin	0.0	0.0	[0.0–1.2]										100.0						
	Streptomycin	NA	11.8	[8.4–16.0]												88.2	0.3	11.5		
Aminopenicillins	Ampicillin	0.0	11.8	[8.4–16.0]							72.4	15.8					11.8			
β-lactamase inhibitor	Amoxicillin-clavulanic acid	0.3	0.0	[0.0–1.2]							87.5	0.7	3.9	7.6	0.3					
Cephalosporins (3rd generation)	Ceftiofur	0.0	0.0	[0.0–1.2]				2.3	18.8	75.0	3.9									
	Ceftriaxone	0.0	0.0	[0.0–1.2]					100.0											
Cephamycins	Cefoxitin	0.7	0.0	[0.0–1.2]						3.9	45.4	9.9	28.0	12.2	0.7					
Folate pathway inhibitors	Trimethoprim-sulfamethoxazole	NA	13.2	[9.6–17.5]				77.3	9.5					13.2						
Phenicols	Chloramphenicol	0.0	13.2	[9.6–17.5]								3.3	74.3	9.2			13.2			
Quinolones	Ciprofloxacin	0.0	0.0	[0.0–1.2]	53.6	0.3	3.6	15.1	26.0	1.3										
	Nalidixic Acid	NA	41.8	[36.2–47.5]							1.3	50.0	3.6	3.3		1.0	40.8			
Sulfonamides	Sulfamethoxazole/Sulfisoxazole	NA	11.8	[8.4–16.0]											53.6	30.6	3.6	0.3		11.8
Tetracyclines	Tetracycline	0.0	8.9	[5.9–12.7]									91.1				8.9			

[*]Percent of isolates with intermediate susceptibility, NA if no MIC range of intermediate susceptibility exists

[†]Percent of isolates that were resistant

[‡]95% confidence intervals (CI) for percent resistant (%R) were calculated using the Clopper-Pearson exact method

§The unshaded areas indicate the dilution range of the Sensititre plates used to test isolates. Single vertical bars indicate the breakpoints for susceptibility, while double vertical bars indicate breakpoints for resistance. Numbers in the shaded areas indicate the percentages of isolates with MICs greater than the highest concentrations on the Sensititre plate. Numbers listed for the lowest tested concentrations represent the precentages of isolates with MICs equal to or less than the lowest tested concentration. CLSI breakpoints were used when available.

Table 2.2: Percentage and number of *Salmonella* Typhi isolates resistant to antimicrobial agents, 1999–2004

Year Total Isolates		1999 166	2000 177	2001 197	2002 195	2003 334	2004 304
Subclass	Antibiotic (Resistance breakpoint)						
Aminoglycosides	Amikacin (MIC ≥ 64)	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
	Gentamicin (MIC ≥ 16)	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
	Kanamycin (MIC ≥ 64)	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.5% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
	Streptomycin (MIC ≥ 64)	13.3% 22	9.0% 16	20.3% 40	7.2% 14	14.4% 48	11.8% 36
Aminopenicillins	Ampicillin (MIC ≥ 32)	12.7% 21	9.0% 16	20.3% 40	5.6% 11	16.2% 54	11.8% 36
β-lactamase inhibitor combinations	Amoxicillin-clavulanic acid (MIC ≥ 32)	0.6% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.3% 1	0.0% 0
Cephalosporin (1st generation)	Cephalothin (MIC ≥ 32)	2.4% 4	1.1% 2	0.5% 1	1.5% 3	0.6% 2	Not Tested
Cephalosporins (3rd generation)	Ceftiofur (MIC ≥ 8)	0.6% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.6% 2	0.0% 0
	Ceftriaxone (MIC ≥ 64)	0.6% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.3% 1	0.0% 0
Cephamycins	Cefoxitin (MIC ≥ 32)	Not Tested	0.6% 1	0.5% 1	0.0% 0	0.9% 3	0.0% 0
Folate pathway inhibitors	Trimethoprim-sulfamethoxazole (MIC ≥ 4)	12.7% 21	9.0% 16	20.8% 41	6.7% 13	16.8% 56	13.2% 40
Phenicols	Chloramphenicol (MIC ≥ 32)	12.0% 20	10.7% 19	20.8% 41	6.2% 12	16.5% 55	13.2% 40
Quinolones	Ciprofloxacin (MIC ≥ 4)	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.3% 1	0.0% 0
	Nalidixic Acid (MIC ≥ 32)	18.7% 31	22.0% 39	29.9% 59	23.6% 46	37.7% 126	41.8% 127
Sulfonamides	Sulfamethoxazole/Sulfisoxazole* (MIC ≥ 512)	16.3% 27	11.3% 20	20.8% 41	6.2% 12	17.1% 57	11.8% 36
Tetracyclines	Tetracycline (MIC ≥ 16)	9.0% 15	9.6% 17	20.8% 41	6.7% 13	15.6% 52	8.9% 27

*Sulfamethoxazole, which was tested during 1999-2003 to represent sulfonamides, was replaced by sulfisoxazole in 2004.

Table 2.3: Resistance patterns of *Salmonella* Typhi isolates, 1999–2004

Year Total Isolates	1999 166	2000 177	2001 197	2002 195	2003 334	2004 304
	% n	% n	% n	% n	% n	% n
No resistance detected	71.7% 119	72.9% 129	59.4% 117	74.4% 145	56.6% 189	56.6% 172
Resistance ≥1CLSI subclass*	28.3% 47	27.1% 48	40.6% 80	25.6% 50	43.4% 145	43.4% 132
Resistance ≥2 CLSI subclasses*	14.5% 24	10.7% 19	22.8% 45	7.2% 14	18.0% 60	13.2% 40
Resistance ≥3 CLSI subclasses*	12.7% 21	9.6% 17	22.8% 45	6.7% 13	17.7% 59	12.8% 39
Resistance ≥4 CLSI subclasses*	12.7% 21	9.0% 16	21.8% 43	6.7% 13	16.8% 56	12.5% 38
Resistance ≥5 CLSI subclasses*	12.0% 20	9.0% 16	18.8% 37	5.6% 11	15.9% 53	11.8% 36
At least ACSSuT†	9.0% 15	7.9% 14	16.8% 33	5.6% 11	12.6% 42	7.9% 24
At least ACSuTm‡	12.0% 20	9.0% 16	17.8% 35	5.6% 11	15.6% 52	11.8% 36
At least ACSSuTAuCf§	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
At least MDR-AmpC¶	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
Resistance to quinolone and cephalosporin (3rd generation)	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.3% 1	0.0% 0

*CLSI: Clinical and Laboratory Standards Institute

†ACSSuT: resistance to ampicillin, chloramphenicol, streptomycin, sulfamethoxazole/sulfisoxazole, tetracycline

‡ACSuTm: resistance to ampicillin, chloramphenicol, trimethoprim-sulfamethoxazole

§ACSSuTAuCf: resistance to ACSSuT + amoxicillin-clavulanic acid, ceftiofur

¶MDR-AmpC: resistance to ACSSuTAuCf + decreased susceptibility to ceftriaxone (MIC ≥2 µg/mL)

3. *SHIGELLA*

In 2004, CDC received 367 *Shigella* isolates, of which 320 (87.2%) were viable and tested for antimicrobial susceptibility. Of these 320 isolates, three submissions from the same patient and two isolates identified as not *Shigella* were excluded, leaving 315 isolates for analysis. (Table I). Of the 315 isolates tested, 241 (76.5%) were *S. sonnei*; 61 (19.4%), *S. flexneri*; nine (2.9%), *S. boydii*; and two (0.6%), *S. dysenteriae* (Table 3.1). Resistance was highest to ampicillin (77.8%), streptomycin (61.0%), sulfisoxazole (52.4%), trimethoprim-sulfamethoxazole (51.4%), and tetracycline (49.2%) (Table 3.2).

Shigella flexneri isolates showed a higher prevalence of resistance to most antimicrobial agents than did *Shigella sonnei* (Tables 3.3 and 3.4). Important differences between the species include the prevalence of tetracycline resistance (95.1% in *S. flexneri*, compared with 36.1% in *S. sonnei*) and chloramphenicol resistance (60.7% in *S. flexneri*, compared with 2.5% in *S. sonnei*).

The percentage of *S. sonnei* isolates resistant to trimethoprim-sulfamethoxazole increased from 38.5% in 2003 to 53.1% in 2004 (Table 3.6), a rate similar to that during 1999–2000 (53.1–54.9%). Ampicillin resistance among *S. sonnei* isolates remained high (79.3%). Tetracycline resistance also increased from 22.1% in 2003 to 36.1% in 2004. One *S. sonnei* isolate was resistant to ceftriaxone; this is the first ceftriaxone-resistant *Shigella* isolate detected since NARMS began testing *Shigella* in 1999.

Resistance of *S. flexneri* isolates to trimethoprim-sulfamethoxazole also apparently increased from the low of 28.8% in 2002 to 45.9% in 2004 (Table 3.7). However, nalidixic acid resistance was 1.6% in 2004, compared with 5.9% in 2003. Resistance to streptomycin and tetracycline was higher in 2004 (72.1% and 95.1%, respectively) than during 1999–2003. In 2004, chloramphenicol resistance among *S. flexneri* isolates was the lowest of the 6-year period (60.7%).

In all years from 1999 to 2004, more than 90% of *Shigella* isolates tested were resistant to at least one CLSI subclass. A total of 40.5% were resistant to at least five subclasses in 1999, compared with 27.6% in 2004 (Table 3.8).

For both *S. sonnei* and *S. flexneri*, resistance to multiple antimicrobial classes and specific combinations changed from 1999 to 2004 (Tables 3.9 and 3.10). One *Shigella* (*S. sonnei*) isolate was resistant to nalidixic acid and ceftiofur. This is the first *S. sonnei* isolate with this phenotype reported in NARMS. The first reported *Shigella* isolate with this phenotype in NARMS was a *S. flexneri* isolated in 2003. The nalidixic acid- and ceftiofur-resistant *S. sonnei* isolate is also the first ceftriaxone-resistant *Shigella* isolate reported in NARMS. Combined resistance to ampicillin and trimethoprim-sulfamethoxazole (ASuTm) was present in more than 40% of isolates from 1999 through 2001, declined to 30.2% in 2002, but increased to 33.6% in 2003 and 39.4% in 2004. Resistance to both agents is clinically relevant, particularly for children for whom treatment with fluoroquinolones in this age group is not recommended.

Table 3.1: Frequency of *Shigella* species isolated in NARMS, 2004

Species	2004	
	N	(%)
Shigella sonnei	241	(76.5%)
Shigella flexneri	61	(19.4%)
Shigella boydii	9	(2.9%)
Shigella dysenteriae	2	(0.6%)
Other	2	(0.6%)
Total	**315**	**(100.0%)**

Table 3.2: Minimum inhibitory concentrations (MICs) and resistance of *Shigella* isolates to antimicrobial agents, 2004 (N=316)

Antibiotic		% of isolates			Percent of all isolates with MIC (µg/mL)[§]														
		%I[*]	%R[†]	[95% CI][‡]	0.015	0.03	0.06	0.125	0.25	0.50	1	2	4	8	16	32	64	128	256	512
Aminoglycosides	Amikacin	0.0	0.0	[0.0–1.2]							4.1	54.9	37.8	2.9	0.3					
	Gentamicin	0.0	0.0	[0.0–1.2]					1.9	44.8	51.7	1.6								
	Kanamycin	0.0	0.0	[0.0–1.2]										100.0						
	Streptomycin	NA	61.0	[55.3–66.4]												39.0	20.3	40.6		
Aminopenicillins	Ampicillin	0.3	77.8	[72.8–82.2]							3.8	9.8	6.0	2.2	0.3	0.6	77.1			
β-lactamase inhibitor	Amoxicillin-clavulanic acid	24.8	1.6	[0.5–3.7]							0.6	3.8	16.8	52.4	24.8	1.0	0.6			
Cephalosporins (3rd generation)	Ceftiofur	0.0	0.3	[0.0–1.8]				34.9	59.7	4.8	0.3				0.3					
	Ceftriaxone	0.0	0.3	[0.0–1.8]					99.4	0.3								0.3		
Cephamycins	Cefoxitin	0.3	0.3	[0.0–1.8]						0.3	10.8	67.0	19.7	1.6	0.3	0.3				
Folate pathway inhibitors	Trimethoprim-sulfamethoxazole	NA	51.4	[45.8–57.1]				32.4	10.2	2.2	1.9	1.9	2.5	48.9						
Phenicols	Chloramphenicol	4.4	14.9	[11.2–19.3]								11.1	63.5	6.0	4.4	2.2	12.7			
Quinolones	Ciprofloxacin	0.0	0.0	[0.0–1.2]	98.1	0.3	0.6	1.0												
	Nalidixic Acid	NA	1.6	[0.5–3.7]						0.3	60.6	35.9	1.6			0.6	1.0			
Sulfonamides	Sulfamethoxazole/Sulfisoxazole	NA	52.4	[46.7–58.0]											44.4	3.2				52.4
Tetracyclines	Tetracycline	0.3	49.2	[43.6–54.9]									50.5	0.3		9.5	39.7			

[*]Percent of isolates with intermediate susceptibility, NA if no MIC range of intermediate susceptibility exists

[†]Percent of isolates that were resistant

[‡]95% confidence intervals (CI) for percent resistant (%R) were calculated using the Clopper-Pearson exact method

§The unshaded areas indicate the dilution range of the Sensititre plates used to test isolates. Single vertical bars indicate the breakpoints for susceptibility, while double vertical bars indicate breakpoints for resistance. Numbers in the shaded areas indicate the percentages of isolates with MICs greater than the highest concentrations on the Sensititre plate. Numbers listed for the lowest tested concentrations represent the precentages of isolates with MICs equal to or less than the lowest tested concentration. CLSI breakpoints were used when available.

Table 3.3: Minimum inhibitory concentrations (MICs) and resistance of *Shigella* sonnei isolates to antimicrobial agents, 2004 (N=241)

Antibiotic		% of isolates			Percent of all isolates with MIC (µg/mL)[§]														
		%I[*]	%R[†]	[95% CI][‡]	0.015	0.03	0.06	0.125	0.25	0.50	1	2	4	8	16	32	64	128	256	512
Aminoglycosides	Amikacin	0.0	0.0	[0.0–1.5]							4.6	62.7	30.7	2.1						
	Gentamicin	0.0	0.0	[0.0–1.5]					2.1	47.7	48.5	1.7								
	Kanamycin	0.0	0.0	[0.0–1.5]										100.0						
	Streptomycin	NA	58.1	[51.6–64.4]												41.9	21.2	36.9		
Aminopenicillins	Ampicillin	0.4	79.3	[73.6–84.2]							0.8	10.4	6.2	2.9	0.4	0.8	78.4			
β-lactamase inhibitor	Amoxicillin-clavulanic acid	16.6	1.7	[0.5–4.2]							0.4	1.2	17.0	63.1	16.6	0.8	0.8			
Cephalosporins (3rd generation)	Ceftiofur	0.0	0.4	[0.0–2.3]				27.4	66.4	5.4	0.4				0.4					
	Ceftriaxone	0.0	0.4	[0.0–2.3]					99.2	0.4								0.4		
Cephamycins	Cefoxitin	0.4	0.4	[0.0–2.3]						0.4	12.9	73.0	12.0	0.8	0.4	0.4				
Folate pathway inhibitors	Trimethoprim-sulfamethoxazole	NA	53.1	[46.6–59.5]				33.2	7.9	1.7	2.1	2.1	3.3	49.8						
Phenicols	Chloramphenicol	5.4	2.5	[0.9–5.3]								3.3	81.3	7.5	5.4	0.4	2.1			
Quinolones	Ciprofloxacin	0.0	0.0	[0.0–1.5]	98.3		0.8	0.8												
	Nalidixic Acid	NA	1.7	[0.5–4.2]						0.4	60.6	35.7	1.7			0.8	0.8			
Sulfonamides	Sulfamethoxazole/Sulfisoxazole	NA	49.0	[42.5–55.5]											46.9	4.1				49.0
Tetracyclines	Tetracycline	0.4	36.1	[30.0–42.5]									63.5	0.4		8.3	27.8			

[*]Percent of isolates with intermediate susceptibility, NA if no MIC range of intermediate susceptibility exists

[†]Percent of isolates that were resistant

[‡]95% confidence intervals (CI) for percent resistant (%R) were calculated using the Clopper-Pearson exact method

§The unshaded areas indicate the dilution range of the Sensititre plates used to test isolates. Single vertical bars indicate the breakpoints for susceptibility, while double vertical bars indicate breakpoints for resistance. Numbers in the shaded areas indicate the percentages of isolates with MICs greater than the highest concentrations on the Sensititre plate. Numbers listed for the lowest tested concentrations represent the precentages of isolates with MICs equal to or less than the lowest tested concentration. CLSI breakpoints were used when available.

Table 3.4: Minimum inhibitory concentrations (MICs) and resistance of *Shilgella* flexneri isolates to antimicrobial agents, 2004 (N=61)

Antibiotic		% of isolates			Percent of all isolates with MIC (µg/mL)[§]															
		%I[*]	%R[†]	[95% CI][‡]	0.015	0.03	0.06	0.125	0.25	0.50	1	2	4	8	16	32	64	128	256	512
Aminoglycosides	Amikacin	0.0	0.0	[0.0–5.9]							3.3	27.9	60.7	6.6	1.6					
	Gentamicin	0.0	0.0	[0.0–5.9]					1.6	36.1	60.7	1.6								
	Kanamycin	0.0	0.0	[0.0–5.9]										100.0						
	Streptomycin	NA	72.1	[59.2–82.9]												27.9	19.7	52.5		
Aminopenicillins	Ampicillin	0.0	82.0	[70.0–90.6]							14.8	1.6	1.6				82.0			
β-lactamase inhibitor	Amoxicillin-clavulanic acid	55.7	1.6	[0.0–8.8]							1.6	13.1	6.6	21.3	55.7	1.6				
Cephalosporins (3rd generation)	Ceftiofur	0.0	0.0	[0.0–5.9]				55.7	41.0	3.3										
	Ceftriaxone	0.0	0.0	[0.0–5.9]					100.0											
Cephamycins	Cefoxitin	0.0	0.0	[0.0–5.9]							1.6	45.9	49.2	3.3						
Folate pathway inhibitors	Trimethoprim-sulfamethoxazole	NA	45.9	[33.1–59.2]				31.1	16.4	4.9	1.6			45.9						
Phenicols	Chloramphenicol	1.6	60.7	[47.3–72.9]								34.4	3.3		1.6	8.2	52.5			
Quinolones	Ciprofloxacin	0.0	0.0	[0.0–5.9]	96.7	1.6		1.6												
	Nalidixic Acid	NA	1.6	[0.0–8.8]							60.7	36.1	1.6				1.6			
Sulfonamides	Sulfamethoxazole/Sulfisoxazole	NA	65.6	[52.3–77.3]											34.4					65.6
Tetracyclines	Tetracycline	0.0	95.1	[86.3–99.0]									4.9			13.1	82.0			

[*]Percent of isolates with intermediate susceptibility, NA if no MIC range of intermediate susceptibility exists

[†]Percent of isolates that were resistant

[‡]95% confidence intervals (CI) for percent resistant (%R) were calculated using the Clopper-Pearson exact method

§The unshaded areas indicate the dilution range of the Sensititre plates used to test isolates. Single vertical bars indicate the breakpoints for susceptibility, while double vertical bars indicate breakpoints for resistance. Numbers in the shaded areas indicate the percentages of isolates with MICs greater than the highest concentrations on the Sensititre plate. Numbers listed for the lowest tested concentrations represent the precentages of isolates with MICs equal to or less than the lowest tested concentration. CLSI breakpoints were used when available.

Table 3.5: Percentage and number of *Shigella* isolates resistant to antimicrobial agents, 1999–2004

Year Total Isolates		1999 375	2000 450	2001 344	2002 620	2003 495	2004 315
Subclass	Antibiotic (Resistance breakpoint)						
Aminoglycosides	Amikacin (MIC ≥ 64)	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
	Gentamicin (MIC ≥ 16)	0.3% 1	0.2% 1	0.0% 0	0.2% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
	Kanamycin (MIC ≥ 64)	0.5% 2	1.3% 6	0.6% 2	0.8% 5	0.4% 2	0.0% 0
	Streptomycin (MIC ≥ 64)	55.7% 209	57.1% 257	53.2% 183	54.4% 337	57.0% 282	61.0% 192
Aminopenicillins	Ampicillin (MIC ≥ 32)	77.6% 291	79.1% 356	79.7% 274	76.6% 475	79.4% 393	77.8% 245
β-lactamase inhibitor combinations	Amoxicillin-clavulanic acid (MIC ≥ 32)	1.1% 4	2.2% 10	4.4% 15	2.6% 16	1.4% 7	1.6% 5
Cephalosporin (1st generation)	Cephalothin (MIC ≥ 32)	3.2% 12	8.0% 36	9.0% 31	6.6% 41	9.3% 46	Not Tested
Cephalosporins (3rd generation)	Ceftiofur (MIC ≥ 8)	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.2% 1	0.2% 1	0.3% 1
	Ceftriaxone (MIC ≥ 64)	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.3% 1
Cephamycins	Cefoxitin (MIC ≥ 32)	Not Tested	0.2% 1	1.2% 4	0.3% 2	0.0% 0	0.3% 1
Folate pathway inhibitors	Trimethoprim-sulfamethoxazole (MIC ≥ 4)	51.5% 193	52.9% 238	46.8% 161	37.3% 231	38.6% 191	51.4% 162
Phenicols	Chloramphenicol (MIC ≥ 32)	17.3% 65	14.0% 63	21.5% 74	7.6% 47	8.5% 42	14.9% 47
Quinolones	Ciprofloxacin (MIC ≥ 4)	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.3% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
	Nalidixic Acid (MIC ≥ 32)	1.6% 6	0.9% 4	1.7% 6	1.6% 10	1.0% 5	1.6% 5
Sulfonamides	Sulfamethoxazole/Sulfisoxazole* (MIC ≥ 512)	56.0% 210	55.8% 251	56.4% 194	31.8% 197	33.9% 168	52.4% 165
Tetracyclines	Tetracycline (MIC ≥ 16)	57.3% 215	44.9% 202	59.3% 204	30.6% 190	29.1% 144	49.2% 155

*Sulfamethoxazole, which was tested during 1999-2003 to represent sulfonamides, was replaced by sulfisoxazole in 2004.

Table 3.6: Percentage and number of *Shigella sonnei* isolates resistant to antimicrobial agents, 1999–2004

Year Total Isolates		1999 275	2000 366	2001 239	2002 536	2003 434	2004 241
Subclass	Antibiotic (Resistance breakpoint)						
Aminoglycosides	Amikacin (MIC ≥ 64)	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
	Gentamicin (MIC ≥ 16)	0.4% 1	0.3% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
	Kanamycin (MIC ≥ 64)	0.7% 2	1.6% 6	0.4% 1	0.4% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
	Streptomycin (MIC ≥ 64)	52.0% 143	56.0% 205	54.0% 129	55.4% 297	56.5% 245	58.1% 140
Aminopenicillins	Ampicillin (MIC ≥ 32)	79.6% 219	80.6% 295	82.8% 198	77.6% 416	79.7% 346	79.3% 191
β-lactamase inhibitor combinations	Amoxicillin-clavulanic acid (MIC ≥ 32)	0.4% 1	1.9% 7	4.6% 11	2.2% 12	1.4% 6	1.7% 4
Cephalosporin (1st generation)	Cephalothin (MIC ≥ 32)	2.9% 8	8.7% 32	12.6% 30	7.3% 39	10.1% 44	Not Tested
Cephalosporins (3rd generation)	Ceftiofur (MIC ≥ 8)	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.4% 1
	Ceftriaxone (MIC ≥ 64)	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.4% 1
Cephamycins	Cefoxitin (MIC ≥ 32)	Not Tested	0.3% 1	1.7% 4	0.4% 2	0.0% 0	0.4% 1
Folate pathway inhibitors	Trimethoprim-sulfamethoxazole (MIC ≥ 4)	53.1% 146	54.9% 201	50.6% 121	37.9% 203	38.5% 167	53.1% 128
Phenicols	Chloramphenicol (MIC ≥ 32)	1.8% 5	2.7% 10	1.3% 3	0.2% 1	1.2% 5	2.5% 6
Quinolones	Ciprofloxacin (MIC ≥ 4)	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
	Nalidixic Acid (MIC ≥ 32)	1.5% 4	1.1% 4	0.8% 2	1.5% 8	0.5% 2	1.7% 4
Sulfonamides	Sulfamethoxazole/Sulfisoxazole* (MIC ≥ 512)	54.5% 150	56.0% 205	54.4% 130	29.9% 160	31.3% 136	49.0% 118
Tetracyclines	Tetracycline (MIC ≥ 16)	46.2% 127	34.4% 126	44.8% 107	23.5% 126	22.1% 96	36.1% 87

*Sulfamethoxazole, which was tested during 1999-2003 to represent sulfonamides, was replaced by sulfisoxazole in 2004.

Table 3.7: Percentage and number of *Shigella flexneri* isolates resistant to antimicrobial agents, 1999–2004

Year Total Isolates		1999 87	2000 75	2001 91	2002 73	2003 51	2004 61
Subclass	Antibiotic (Resistance breakpoint)						
Aminoglycosides	Amikacin (MIC ≥ 64)	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
	Gentamicin (MIC ≥ 16)	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	1.4% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
	Kanamycin (MIC ≥ 64)	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	1.1% 1	4.1% 3	3.9% 2	0.0% 0
	Streptomycin (MIC ≥ 64)	63.2% 55	61.3% 46	47.3% 43	43.8% 32	60.8% 31	72.1% 44
Aminopenicillins	Ampicillin (MIC ≥ 32)	77.0% 67	77.3% 58	72.5% 66	75.3% 55	84.3% 43	82.0% 50
β-lactamase inhibitor combinations	Amoxicillin-clavulanic acid (MIC ≥ 32)	3.4% 3	4.0% 3	4.4% 4	5.5% 4	2.0% 1	1.6% 1
Cephalosporin (1st generation)	Cephalothin (MIC ≥ 32)	4.6% 4	2.7% 2	1.1% 1	2.7% 2	3.9% 2	Not Tested
Cephalosporins (3rd generation)	Ceftiofur (MIC ≥ 8)	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	1.4% 1	2.0% 1	0.0% 0
	Ceftriaxone (MIC ≥ 64)	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
Cephamycins	Cefoxitin (MIC ≥ 32)	Not Tested	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
Folate pathway inhibitors	Trimethoprim-sulfamethoxazole (MIC ≥ 4)	48.3% 42	42.7% 32	34.1% 31	28.8% 21	39.2% 20	45.9% 28
Phenicols	Chloramphenicol (MIC ≥ 32)	64.4% 56	69.3% 52	74.7% 68	63.0% 46	68.6% 35	60.7% 37
Quinolones	Ciprofloxacin (MIC ≥ 4)	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	1.1% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
	Nalidixic Acid (MIC ≥ 32)	1.1% 1	0.0% 0	3.3% 3	2.7% 2	5.9% 3	1.6% 1
Sulfonamides	Sulfamethoxazole/Sulfisoxazole* (MIC ≥ 512)	58.6% 51	53.3% 40	57.1% 52	41.1% 30	52.9% 27	65.6% 40
Tetracyclines	Tetracycline (MIC ≥ 16)	92.0% 80	92.0% 69	94.5% 86	78.1% 57	82.4% 42	95.1% 58

*Sulfamethoxazole, which was tested during 1999-2003 to represent sulfonamides, was replaced by sulfisoxazole in 2004.

Table 3.8: Resistance patterns of *Shigella* isolates, 1999–2004

Year Total Isolates	1999 375	2000 450	2001 344	2002 620	2003 495	2004 315
	% n	% n	% n	% n	% n	% n
No resistance detected	9.1% 34	7.3% 33	4.9% 17	8.2% 51	8.5% 42	4.4% 14
Resistance ≥1CLSI subclass*	90.9% 341	92.7% 417	95.1% 327	91.8% 569	91.5% 453	95.6% 301
Resistance ≥2 CLSI subclasses*	63.7% 239	64.7% 291	69.8% 240	55.3% 343	57.8% 286	66.7% 210
Resistance ≥3 CLSI subclasses*	61.1% 229	62.0% 279	61.3% 211	41.8% 259	41.4% 205	62.2% 196
Resistance ≥4 CLSI subclasses*	54.1% 203	56.7% 255	54.1% 186	31.0% 192	32.5% 161	52.1% 164
Resistance ≥5 CLSI subclasses*	40.5% 152	26.2% 118	36.0% 124	20.5% 127	22.4% 111	27.6% 87
At least ACSSuT†	8.5% 32	5.6% 25	6.4% 22	1.8% 11	3.2% 16	6.0% 19
At least ACSuTm‡	9.9% 37	6.9% 31	7.0% 24	2.7% 17	3.6% 18	6.7% 21
At least ASuTm§	44.3% 166	44.4% 200	37.5% 129	29.8% 185	33.7% 167	37.8% 119
At least ANSuTm¶	0.3% 1	0.0% 0	0.6% 2	0.3% 2	0.8% 4	0.6% 2
At least ACSSuTAuCf**	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
At least MDR-AmpC††	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
Resistance to quinolone and cephalosporin (3rd generation)	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.2% 1	0.3% 1

*CLSI: Clinical and Laboratory Standards Institute

†ACSSuT: resistance to ampicillin, chloramphenicol, streptomycin, sulfamethoxazole/sulfisoxazole, tetracycline

‡ACSuTm: resistance to ampicillin, chloramphenicol, trimethoprim-sulfamethoxazole

§ASuTm: resistance to ampicillin, trimethoprim-sulfamethoxazole

¶ANSuTm: resistance to ASuTm + naladixic acid

**ACSSuTAuCf: resistance to ACSSuT + amoxicillin-clavulanic acid, ceftiofur

††MDR-AmpC: resistance to ACSSuTAuCf + decreased susceptibility to ceftriaxone (MIC ≥2 µg/mL)

Table 3.9: Resistance patterns of *Shigella sonnei* isolates, 1999–2004

Year Total Isolates	1999 275	2000 366	2001 239	2002 536	2003 434	2004 241
	% n	% n	% n	% n	% n	% n
No resistance detected	10.5% 29	7.7% 28	5.4% 13	7.1% 38	8.5% 37	5.0% 12
Resistance ≥1CLSI subclass*	89.5% 246	92.3% 338	94.6% 226	92.9% 498	91.5% 397	95.0% 229
Resistance ≥2 CLSI subclasses*	56.0% 154	60.7% 222	60.7% 145	52.1% 279	54.1% 235	59.8% 144
Resistance ≥3 CLSI subclasses*	54.5% 150	57.7% 211	53.1% 127	36.6% 196	36.2% 157	54.4% 131
Resistance ≥4 CLSI subclasses*	50.5% 139	54.1% 198	49.0% 117	26.7% 143	28.6% 124	46.5% 112
Resistance ≥5 CLSI subclasses*	38.5% 106	23.5% 86	36.0% 86	19.4% 104	20.0% 87	24.9% 60
At least ACSSuT†	0.4% 1	0.8% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.2% 1	0.0% 0
At least ACSuTm‡	1.8% 5	1.9% 7	0.8% 2	0.2% 1	0.9% 4	1.7% 4
At least ASuTm§	45.1% 124	46.2% 169	41.0% 98	30.2% 162	33.6% 146	39.4% 95
At least ANSuTm¶	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.2% 1	0.2% 1	0.8% 2
At least ACSSuTAuCf**	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
At least MDR-AmpC††	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
Resistance to quinolone and cephalosporin (3rd generation)	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.4% 1

*CLSI: Clinical and Laboratory Standards Institute

†ACSSuT: resistance to ampicillin, chloramphenicol, streptomycin, sulfamethoxazole/sulfisoxazole, tetracycline

‡ACSuTm: resistance to ampicillin, chloramphenicol, trimethoprim-sulfamethoxazole

§ASuTm: resistance to ampicillin, trimethoprim-sulfamethoxazole

¶ANSuTm: resistance to ASuTm + naladixic acid

**ACSSuTAuCf: resistance to ACSSuT + amoxicillin-clavulanic acid, ceftiofur

††MDR-AmpC: resistance to ACSSuTAuCf + decreased susceptibility to ceftriaxone (MIC ≥2 µg/mL)

Table 3.10: Resistance patterns of *Shigella flexneri* isolates, 1999–2004

Year Total Isolates	1999 87	2000 75	2001 91	2002 73	2003 51	2004 61
	% n	% n	% n	% n	% n	% n
No resistance detected	4.6% 4	4.0% 3	3.3% 3	15.1% 11	7.8% 4	0.0% 0
Resistance ≥1CLSI subclass*	95.4% 83	96.0% 72	96.7% 88	84.9% 62	92.2% 47	100.0% 61
Resistance ≥2 CLSI subclasses*	83.9% 73	82.7% 62	90.1% 82	76.7% 56	86.3% 44	93.4% 57
Resistance ≥3 CLSI subclasses*	80.5% 70	81.3% 61	80.2% 73	75.3% 55	82.4% 42	91.8% 56
Resistance ≥4 CLSI subclasses*	67.8% 59	69.3% 52	65.9% 60	58.9% 43	64.7% 33	75.4% 46
Resistance ≥5 CLSI subclasses*	49.4% 43	40.0% 30	31.9% 29	28.8% 21	45.1% 23	41.0% 25
At least ACSSuT[†]	33.3% 29	29.3% 22	22.0% 20	15.1% 11	29.4% 15	27.9% 17
At least ACSuTm[‡]	34.5% 30	32.0% 24	23.1% 21	21.9% 16	27.5% 14	24.6% 15
At least ASuTm[§]	44.8% 39	38.7% 29	25.3% 23	27.4% 20	37.3% 19	36.1% 22
At least ANSuTm[¶]	1.1% 1	0.0% 0	1.1% 1	1.4% 1	5.9% 3	0.0% 0
At least ACSSuTAuCf**	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
At least MDR-AmpC[††]	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
Resistance to quinolone and cephalosporin (3rd generation)	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	2.0% 1	0.0% 0

*CLSI: Clinical and Laboratory Standards Institute

[†]ACSSuT: resistance to ampicillin, chloramphenicol, streptomycin, sulfamethoxazole/sulfisoxazole, tetracycline

[‡]ACSuTm: resistance to ampicillin, chloramphenicol, trimethoprim-sulfamethoxazole

[§]ASuTm: resistance to ampicillin, trimethoprim-sulfamethoxazole

[¶]ANSuTm: resistance to ASuTm + naladixic acid

**ACSSuTAuCf: resistance to ACSSuT + amoxicillin-clavulanic acid, ceftiofur

[††]MDR-AmpC: resistance to ACSSuTAuCf + decreased susceptibility to ceftriaxone (MIC ≥2 µg/mL)

4. *ESCHERICHIA COLI* O157

In 2004, CDC received a total of 177 *Escherichia coli* O157 isolates, of which 170 (96.0%) were viable and tested for antimicrobial susceptibility. Of these 170 isolates, one isolate was excluded from the analysis because it was a duplicate submission, leaving 169 isolates for analysis (Table I). Antimicrobial agents with the highest prevalence of resistance were nalidixic acid (1.8%), sulfisoxazole (1.8%), streptomycin (1.8%), and tetracycline (1.8%) (Table 4.2). Ampicillin resistance decreased from 3.2% in 2003 to 1.2% in 2004 (Table 4.2). Cefoxitin and chloramphenicol resistance decreased to 0.6% in 2004, down from 1.3% in 2003. No isolates in 2004 were resistant to ceftiofur, whereas two isolates were resistant in 2003 (Table 4.2).

Isolates resistant to at least one CLSI subclass decreased from 9.6% in 2003 to 4.7% in 2004 (Table 4.3). Resistance to at least two CLSI subclasses decreased from 5.1% in 2003 to 1.2% in 2004. No isolates were resistant to at least five subclasses in 2004, but one (0.6%) was resistant in 2003.

Antimicrobial treatment of *E. coli* O157 infections is not recommended, but resistance changes, particularly appearance of third-generation cephalosporin resistance, might prove useful in understanding exchange of mobile resistance elements in bovine production settings.

Table 4.1: Minimum inhibitory concentrations (MICs) and resistance of *Escherichia coli* O157 isolates to antimicrobial agents, 2004 (N=169)

Antibiotic		% of isolates			Percent of all isolates with MIC (µg/mL)§														
		%I*	%R†	[95% CI]‡	0.015	0.03	0.06	0.125	0.25	0.50	1	2	4	8	16	32	64	128	256	512
Aminoglycosides	Amikacin	0.0	0.0	[0.0–2.2]						5.9	68.0	22.5	3.6							
	Gentamicin	0.0	0.6	[0.0–3.3]					57.4	37.3	4.7					0.6				
	Kanamycin	0.0	0.0	[0.0–2.2]										100.0						
	Streptomycin	NA	1.8	[0.4–5.1]												98.2	0.6	1.2		
Aminopenicillins	Ampicillin	0.0	1.2	[0.1–4.2]							5.3	59.2	31.4	3.0			1.2			
β-lactamase inhibitor	Amoxicillin-clavulanic acid	0.6	0.0	[0.0–2.2]							3.6	6.5	88.2	1.2	0.6					
Cephalosporins (3rd generation)	Ceftiofur	0.0	0.0	[0.0–2.2]				2.4	43.2	52.1	2.4									
	Ceftriaxone	0.0	0.0	[0.0–2.2]					100.0											
Cephamycins	Cefoxitin	1.2	0.6	[0.0–3.3]						0.6	3.0	5.9	70.4	18.3	1.2	0.6				
Folate pathway inhibitors	Trimethoprim-sulfamethoxazole	NA	0.0	[0.0–2.2]				94.1	5.9											
Phenicols	Chloramphenicol	0.6	0.6	[0.0–3.3]								1.8	46.2	50.9	0.6		0.6			
Quinolones	Ciprofloxacin	0.0	0.0	[0.0–2.2]	97.6	0.6		0.6	1.2											
	Nalidixic Acid	NA	1.8	[0.4–5.1]							2.4	75.7	19.5	0.6			1.8			
Sulfonamides	Sulfamethoxazole/Sulfisoxazole	NA	1.8	[0.4–5.1]											92.9	5.3				1.8
Tetracyclines	Tetracycline	0.0	1.8	[0.4–5.1]									98.2		0.6		1.2			

*Percent of isolates with intermediate susceptibility, NA if no MIC range of intermediate susceptibility exists

†Percent of isolates that were resistant

‡95% confidence intervals (CI) for percent resistant (%R) were calculated using the Clopper-Pearson exact method

§The unshaded areas indicate the dilution range of the Sensititre plates used to test isolates. Single vertical bars indicate the breakpoints for susceptibility, while double vertical bars indicate breakpoints for resistance. Numbers in the shaded areas indicate the percentages of isolates with MICs greater than the highest concentrations on the Sensititre plate. Numbers listed for the lowest tested concentrations represent the precentages of isolates with MICs equal to or less than the lowest tested concentration. CLSI breakpoints were used when available.

Table 4.2: Percentage and number of *Escherichia coli* O157 isolates resistant to antimicrobial agents, 1996–2004

Year Total Isolates		1996 201	1997 161	1998 318	1999 292	2000 407	2001 277	2002 399	2003 157	2004 169
Subclass	Antibiotic (Resistance breakpoint)									
Aminoglycosides	Amikacin (MIC ≥ 64)	Not Tested	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
	Gentamicin (MIC ≥ 16)	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.3% 1	0.5% 2	0.4% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.6% 1
	Kanamycin (MIC ≥ 64)	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.3% 1	0.7% 2	1.0% 4	0.0% 0	0.5% 2	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
	Streptomycin (MIC ≥ 64)	2.0% 4	2.5% 4	1.9% 6	2.7% 8	5.2% 21	1.8% 5	2.3% 9	1.9% 3	1.8% 3
Aminopenicillins	Ampicillin (MIC ≥ 32)	1.5% 3	0.0% 0	2.5% 8	1.4% 4	2.7% 11	2.2% 6	1.5% 6	3.2% 5	1.2% 2
Beta-lactamase inhibitor combinations	Amoxicillin-clavulanic acid (MIC ≥ 32)	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.3% 1	1.0% 4	0.7% 2	0.0% 0	1.3% 2	0.0% 0
Cephalosporin (1st Gen.)	Cephalothin (MIC ≥ 32)	1.5% 3	2.5% 4	0.0% 0	0.7% 2	1.2% 5	1.4% 4	1.5% 6	2.5% 4	Not Tested
Cephalosporins (3rd Gen.)	Ceftiofur (MIC ≥ 8)	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	1.0% 4	1.1% 3	0.0% 0	1.3% 2	0.0% 0
	Ceftriaxone (MIC ≥ 64)	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
Cephamycins	Cefoxitin (MIC ≥ 32)	Not Tested	Not Tested	Not Tested	Not Tested	1.0% 4	0.7% 2	0.0% 0	1.3% 2	0.6% 1
Folate pathway inhibitors	Trimethoprim-sulfamethoxazole (MIC ≥ 4)	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.6% 2	1.4% 4	0.7% 3	0.7% 2	0.5% 2	0.6% 1	0.0% 0
Phenicols	Chloramphenicol (MIC ≥ 32)	0.5% 1	0.0% 0	0.3% 1	0.0% 0	3.7% 15	1.4% 4	1.3% 5	1.3% 2	0.6% 1
Quinolones	Ciprofloxacin (MIC ≥ 4)	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
	Nalidixic acid (MIC ≥ 32)	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.7% 2	0.5% 2	1.1% 3	1.0% 4	0.6% 1	1.8% 3
Sulfonamides	Sulfamethoxazole/Sulfisoxazole* (MIC ≥ 512)	11.9% 24	9.9% 16	5.7% 18	8.2% 24	5.9% 24	5.1% 14	3.5% 14	3.8% 6	1.8% 3
Tetracyclines	Tetracycline (MIC ≥ 16)	5.0% 10	3.1% 5	4.4% 14	3.4% 10	7.1% 29	5.4% 15	3.0% 12	5.7% 9	1.8% 3

*Sulfamethoxazole, which was tested during 1996-2003 to represent sulfonamides, was replaced by sulfisoxazole in 2004.

Table 4.3: Resistance patterns of *Escherichia coli* O157 isolates, 1996–2004

Year Total Isolates	1996 201	1997 161	1998 318	1999 292	2000 407	2001 277	2002 399	2003 157	2004 169
	% n	% n	% n	% n	% n	% n	% n	% n	% n
No resistance detected	86.6% 174	88.8% 143	92.8% 295	89.7% 262	90.4% 368	91.3% 253	94.0% 375	90.4% 142	95.3% 161
Resistance ≥1CLSI subclass*	13.4% 27	11.2% 18	7.2% 23	10.3% 30	9.6% 39	8.7% 24	6.0% 24	9.6% 15	4.7% 8
Resistance ≥2 CLSI subclasses*	5.0% 10	3.7% 6	5.3% 17	3.4% 10	6.6% 27	5.4% 15	3.8% 15	5.1% 8	1.2% 2
Resistance ≥3 CLSI subclasses*	1.5% 3	0.6% 1	1.9% 6	3.1% 9	4.7% 19	2.2% 6	2.0% 8	3.2% 5	0.6% 1
Resistance ≥4 CLSI subclasses*	0.5% 1	0.0% 0	0.9% 3	1.0% 3	3.7% 15	1.8% 5	1.0% 4	1.3% 2	0.6% 1
Resistance ≥5 CLSI subclasses*	0.5% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.7% 2	1.5% 6	0.7% 2	0.3% 1	0.6% 1	0.0% 0
At least ACSSuT†	0.5% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	1.2% 5	0.4% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
At least ACSuTm‡	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.2% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
At least ACSSuTAuCf§	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	1.0% 4	0.4% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
At least MDR-AmpC¶	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	1.0% 4	0.4% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
Resistance to quinolone and cephalosporin (3rd generation)	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0

*CLSI: Clinical and Laboratory Standards Institute

†ACSSuT: resistance to ampicillin, chloramphenicol, streptomycin, sulfamethoxazole/sulfisoxazole, tetracycline

‡ACSuTm: resistance to ampicillin, chloramphenicol, trimethoprim-sulfamethoxazole

§ACSSuTAuCf: resistance to ACSSuT + amoxicillin-clavulanic acid, ceftiofur

¶MDR-AmpC: resistance to ACSSuTAuCf + decreased susceptibility to ceftriaxone (MIC ≥2 µg/mL)

5. *CAMPYLOBACTER*

In 2004, CDC received 449 *Campylobacter* isolates, of which 431 isolates (95.9%) were viable and tested for antimicrobial susceptibility. Of these 431 isolates, 70 isolates that were not part of the sampling scheme, eight isolates that were not *Campylobacter*, and six submissions from patients residing outside the catchment area were excluded, leaving 347 isolates for analysis (Table I). A total of 320 (92.2%) were *C. jejuni* and 26 (7.5%) were *C. coli* (Table 5.1).

For the *Campylobacter* isolates tested in 2004, resistance was highest to tetracycline (46.1%), nalidixic acid (19.6%), and ciprofloxacin (19.0%) (Table 5.3). Of these isolates tested, 1.4% were resistant to chloramphenicol.

The percentage of *Campylobacter* isolates resistant to ciprofloxacin increased from 12.9% in 1997 and peaked at 20.1% in 2002 (Table 5.3). (This significant increase was reported in previous annual reports.) The percentage of *Campylobacter* isolates resistant to ciprofloxacin was 19.0% in 2004, which is not a statistically significant increase from 1997 (OR=1.6, 95% CI [1.0, 2.6]). Resistance to erythromycin remained low at 0.3% in 2004.

In 2004, 53.9% of *Campylobacter* isolates were resistant to one or more CLSI subclass, compared with 48.8% in 2003 (Table 5.4). In 2004, 14.1% of *Campylobacter* isolates were resistant to two or more subclasses, compared with 8.5% in 2003.

The antimicrobial agent with the highest prevalence of resistance among the 320 *C. jejuni* isolates was tetracycline (46.9%), followed by nalidixic acid (18.4%) and ciprofloxacin (18.1%) (Table 5.6). Of note, 0.3% and 1.6% of *C. jejuni* isolates were resistant to gentamicin and chloramphenicol, respectively.

The percentage of *C. jejuni* isolates resistant to ciprofloxacin increased from 12.4% in 1997 to 18.1% in 2004 (Table 5.6), but the increase was not statistically significant (OR=1.6, 95% CI [0.9, 2.6]). Resistance to erythromycin remained low at 0.3% in 2004.

The highest levels of resistance among the 26 *C. coli* isolates were to tetracycline (38.5%), nalidixic acid (34.6%), and ciprofloxacin (30.8%) (Table 5.8). The percentage of *C. coli* isolates resistant to ciprofloxacin was 33.3% in 1997 and 30.8% in 2004 (Table 5.8). Resistance to erythromycin, which was 12.5% in 1998 and 4.0%–10.0% during 1999–2003, was not detected in 2004.

Table 5.1: Frequency of *Campylobacter* species isolated in NARMS, 2004

Species	2004	
	N	(%)
Campylobacter jejuni	320	(92.2%)
Campylobacter coli	26	(7.5%)
Other	1	(0.3%)
Total	**347**	**(100.0%)**

Table 5.2: Minimum inhibitory concentrations (MICs) and resistance of *Campylobacter* isolates to antimicrobial agents, 2004 (N=347)

Antibiotic		% of isolates			Percent of all isolates with MIC (µg/mL)[§]															
		%I[*]	%R[†]	[95% CI][‡]	0.015	0.03	0.06	0.125	0.25	0.50	1	2	4	8	16	32	64	128	256	512
Aminoglycosides	Gentamicin	2.0	0.3	[0.0–1.6]			0.3		9.2	44.4	29.7	14.1	2.0							0.3
Lincosamides	Clindamycin	0.3	2.0	[0.8–4.1]		0.6	2.0	23.3	48.7	18.2	3.2	1.7	0.3	0.3	1.2		0.6			
Macrolides	Azithromycin	1.4	0.6	[0.1–2.1]			5.5	39.8	44.7	6.1	1.4	0.6	1.4				0.3			0.3
	Erythromycin	0.6	0.3	[0.0–1.6]			0.6	0.9	10.4	48.4	27.7	9.2	1.7	0.3	0.6					0.3
Phenicols	Chloramphenicol	2.9	1.4	[0.5–3.3]					0.6	2.3	42.9	35.7	10.7	3.5	2.9	1.4				
Quinolones	Ciprofloxacin	0.0	19.0	[15.0–23.6]	0.6	36.3	36.0	6.6	1.2	0.3				0.3	1.4		17.3			
	Nalidixic Acid	0.6	19.6	[15.6–24.2]						0.6	11.0	38.0	21.3	6.9	2.0	0.6	0.3			19.3
Tetracyclines	Tetracycline	0.3	46.1	[40.8–51.5]		2.0	20.7	22.8	6.1	1.2	0.6		0.3	0.3	1.4	4.6	5.8	5.8	1.2	27.4

[*]Percent of isolates with intermediate susceptibility

[†]Percent of isolates that were resistant

[‡]95% confidence intervals (CI) for percent resistant (%R) were calculated using the Clopper-Pearson exact method

[§]The unshaded areas indicate the range of dilutions tested for each antimicrobial agent. Single vertical bars indicate the breakpoints for susceptibility, while double vertical bars indicate breakpoints for resistance. Numbers in the shaded areas indicate the percentages of isolates with MICs greater than the highest tested concentrations. Numbers listed for the lowest tested concentrations represent the precentages of isolates with MICs equal to or less than the lowest tested concentration. CLSI breakpoints were used when available.

Table 5.3: Percentage and number of Campylobacter isolates resistant to antimicrobial agents, 1997–2004

Year Total Isolates		1997 217	1998 310	1999 317	2000 324	2001 384	2002 354	2003 328	2004 347
Subclass	Antibiotic (Resistance breakpoint)								
Aminoglycosides	Gentamicin (MIC ≥ 8)	Not Tested	0.3% 1	0.0% 0	0.3% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.3% 1	0.3% 1
Lincosamides	Clindamycin (MIC ≥ 8)	1.8% 4	1.3% 4	1.3% 4	0.9% 3	2.1% 8	2.0% 7	0.6% 2	2.0% 7
Macrolides	Azithromycin (MIC ≥ 8)	Not Tested	0.6% 2	2.2% 7	1.9% 6	2.1% 8	2.0% 7	0.9% 3	0.6% 2
	Erythromycin (MIC ≥ 32)	1.8% 4	1.0% 3	1.9% 6	1.2% 4	2.1% 8	1.4% 5	0.9% 3	0.3% 1
Phenicols	Chloramphenicol (MIC ≥ 32)	5.1% 11	2.9% 9	0.6% 2	0.0% 0	0.3% 1	0.3% 1	0.0% 0	1.4% 5
Quinolones	Ciprofloxacin (MIC ≥ 4)	12.9% 28	13.9% 43	18.3% 58	14.8% 48	19.5% 75	20.1% 71	17.7% 58	19.0% 66
	Nalidixic acid (MIC ≥ 64)	14.3% 31	16.8% 52	21.1% 67	16.7% 54	20.3% 78	20.6% 73	18.9% 62	19.6% 68
Tetracyclines	Tetracycline (MIC ≥ 16)	47.9% 104	45.5% 141	43.8% 139	38.3% 124	40.9% 157	41.2% 146	38.4% 126	46.1% 160

Table 5.4: Resistance patterns of *Campylobacter* isolates, 1997–2004

Year Total Isolates	1997 217	1998 310	1999 317	2000 324	2001 384	2002 354	2003 328	2004 347
	% n	% n	% n	% n	% n	% n	% n	% n
No resistance detected	47.0% 102	45.2% 140	47.3% 150	52.2% 169	49.2% 189	48.3% 171	50.9% 167	46.1% 160
Resistance ≥1CLSI subclass*	53.0% 115	54.8% 170	52.7% 167	47.8% 155	50.8% 195	51.7% 183	49.1% 161	53.9% 187
Resistance ≥2 CLSI subclasses*	15.7% 34	9.7% 30	13.6% 43	8.0% 26	13.3% 51	12.7% 45	8.5% 28	14.1% 49
Resistance ≥3 CLSI subclasses*	1.8% 4	2.6% 8	1.6% 5	0.9% 3	1.6% 6	1.1% 4	0.9% 3	1.2% 4
Resistance ≥4 CLSI subclasses*	0.5% 1	0.3% 1	0.9% 3	0.3% 1	0.3% 1	0.0% 0	0.3% 1	0.3% 1
Resistance ≥5 CLSI subclasses*	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0

*CLSI: Clinical and Laboratory Standards Institute

Table 5.5: Minimum inhibitory concentrations (MICs) and resistance of *Campylobacter jejuni* isolates to antimicrobial agents, 2004 (N=320)

Antibiotic		% of isolates			Percent of all isolates with MIC (µg/mL)[§]														
		%I[*]	%R[†]	[95% CI][‡]	0.015	0.03	0.06	0.125	0.25	0.50	1	2	4	8	16	32	64	128	256	512
Aminoglycosides	Gentamicin	1.9	0.3	[0.0–1.7]			0.3		9.4	45.3	28.8	14.1	1.9							0.3
Lincosamides	Clindamycin	0.3	2.2	[0.9–4.5]		0.6	2.2	25.3	48.1	18.1	2.2	0.9	0.3	0.3	1.3		0.6			
Macrolides	Azithromycin	1.6	0.6	[0.1–2.2]			5.9	40.3	44.4	5.3	1.6	0.3	1.6				0.3			0.3
	Erythromycin	0.3	0.3	[0.0–1.7]			0.6	0.9	10.0	49.7	28.4	7.8	1.6	0.3	0.3					0.3
Phenicols	Chloramphenicol	3.1	1.6	[0.5–3.6]					0.6	2.5	45.9	35.3	8.4	2.5	3.1	1.6				
Quinolones	Ciprofloxacin	0.0	18.1	[14.1–22.8]	0.6	36.9	37.8	5.6	0.9						1.6		16.6			
	Nalidixic Acid	0.6	18.4	[14.3–23.1]						0.6	11.9	39.4	20.6	6.9	1.6	0.6	0.3			18.1
Tetracyclines	Tetracycline	0.3	46.9	[41.3–52.5]		2.2	22.2	21.3	5.3	1.3	0.3		0.3	0.3	1.6	4.7	5.6	5.6	1.3	28.1

[*]Percent of isolates with intermediate susceptibility

[†]Percent of isolates that were resistant

[‡]95% confidence intervals (CI) for percent resistant (%R) were calculated using the Clopper-Pearson exact method

[§]The unshaded areas indicate the range of dilutions tested for each antimicrobial agent. Single vertical bars indicate the breakpoints for susceptibility, while double vertical bars indicate breakpoints for resistance. Numbers in the shaded areas indicate the percentages of isolates with MICs greater than the highest tested concentrations. Numbers listed for the lowest tested concentrations represent the precentages of isolates with MICs equal to or less than the lowest tested concentration. CLSI breakpoints were used when available.

Table 5.6: Percentage and number of Campylobacter jejuni isolates resistant to antimicrobial agents, 1997–2004

Year Total Isolates		1997 209	1998 297	1999 293	2000 306	2001 365	2002 329	2003 303	2004 320
Subclass	Antibiotic (Resistance breakpoint)								
Aminoglycosides	Gentamicin (MIC ≥ 8)	Not Tested	0.3% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.3% 1
Lincosamides	Clindamycin (MIC ≥ 8)	1.0% 2	1.0% 3	0.7% 2	0.7% 2	1.9% 7	1.8% 6	0.0% 0	2.2% 7
Macrolides	Azithromycin (MIC ≥ 8)	Not Tested	0.3% 1	1.7% 5	1.6% 5	1.9% 7	1.8% 6	0.3% 1	0.6% 2
	Erythromycin (MIC ≥ 32)	1.4% 3	0.7% 2	1.4% 4	1.0% 3	1.9% 7	1.2% 4	0.3% 1	0.3% 1
Phenicols	Chloramphenicol (MIC ≥ 32)	3.8% 8	1.0% 3	0.7% 2	0.0% 0	0.3% 1	0.3% 1	0.0% 0	1.6% 5
Quinolones	Ciprofloxacin (MIC ≥ 4)	12.4% 26	13.8% 41	17.7% 52	14.7% 45	18.4% 67	20.7% 68	17.2% 52	18.1% 58
	Nalidixic acid (MIC ≥ 64)	13.4% 28	15.5% 46	20.1% 59	16.0% 49	18.9% 69	21.3% 70	17.8% 54	18.4% 59
Tetracyclines	Tetracycline (MIC ≥ 16)	47.8% 100	46.1% 137	45.4% 133	39.2% 120	40.3% 147	41.3% 136	38.3% 116	46.9% 150

Table 5.7: Minimum inhibitory concentrations (MICs) and resistance of *Campylobacter coli* isolates to antimicrobial agents, 2004 (N=26)

Antibiotic		% of isolates			Percent of all isolates with MIC (µg/mL)[§]														
		%I[*]	%R[†]	[95% CI][‡]	0.015	0.03	0.06	0.125	0.25	0.50	1	2	4	8	16	32	64	128	256	512
Aminoglycosides	Gentamicin	3.8	0.0	[0.0–13.2]					7.7	30.8	42.3	15.4	3.8							
Lincosamides	Clindamycin	0.0	0.0	[0.0–13.2]					53.8	19.2	15.4	11.5								
Macrolides	Azithromycin	0.0	0.0	[0.0–13.2]				34.6	46.2	15.4		3.8								
	Erythromycin	3.8	0.0	[0.0–13.2]					15.4	34.6	15.4	26.9	3.8		3.8					
Phenicols	Chloramphenicol	0.0	0.0	[0.0–13.2]							7.7	38.5	38.5	15.4						
Quinolones	Ciprofloxacin	0.0	30.8	[14.3–51.8]		26.9	15.4	19.2	3.8	3.8				3.8			26.9			
	Nalidixic Acid	0.0	34.6	[17.2–55.7]								19.2	30.8	7.7	7.7					34.6
Tetracyclines	Tetracycline	0.0	38.5	[20.2–59.4]				42.3	15.4		3.8					3.8	7.7	7.7		19.2

[*]Percent of isolates with intermediate susceptibility

[†]Percent of isolates that were resistant

[‡]95% confidence intervals (CI) for percent resistant (%R) were calculated using the Clopper-Pearson exact method

§The unshaded areas indicate the range of dilutions tested for each antimicrobial agent. Single vertical bars indicate the breakpoints for susceptibility, while double vertical bars indicate breakpoints for resistance. Numbers in the shaded areas indicate the percentages of isolates with MICs greater than the highest tested concentrations. Numbers listed for the lowest tested concentrations represent the precentages of isolates with MICs equal to or less than the lowest tested concentration. CLSI breakpoints were used when available.

Table 5.8: Percentage and number of *Campylobacter coli* isolates resistant to antimicrobial agents, 1997–2004

Year Total Isolates		1997 6	1998 8	1999 20	2000 12	2001 17	2002 25	2003 22	2004 26
Subclass	Antibiotic (Resistance breakpoint)								
Aminoglycosides	Gentamicin (MIC ≥ 8)	Not Tested	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	8.3% 1	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	4.5% 1	0.0% 0
Lincosamides	Clindamycin (MIC ≥ 8)	16.7% 1	12.5% 1	10.0% 2	8.3% 1	5.9% 1	4.0% 1	9.1% 2	0.0% 0
Macrolides	Azithromycin (MIC ≥ 8)	Not Tested	12.5% 1	10.0% 2	8.3% 1	5.9% 1	4.0% 1	9.1% 2	0.0% 0
	Erythromycin (MIC ≥ 32)	0.0% 0	12.5% 1	10.0% 2	8.3% 1	5.9% 1	4.0% 1	9.1% 2	0.0% 0
Phenicols	Chloramphenicol (MIC ≥ 32)	50.0% 3	37.5% 3	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0.0% 0
Quinolones	Ciprofloxacin (MIC ≥ 4)	33.3% 2	0.0% 0	30.0% 6	25.0% 3	47.1% 8	12.0% 3	22.7% 5	30.8% 8
	Nalidixic acid (MIC ≥ 64)	50.0% 3	50.0% 4	30.0% 6	25.0% 3	47.1% 8	12.0% 3	22.7% 5	34.6% 9
Tetracyclines	Tetracycline (MIC ≥ 16)	66.7% 4	50.0% 4	30.0% 6	25.0% 3	58.8% 10	40.0% 10	45.5% 10	38.5% 10

Limitations to NARMS Campylobacter *Surveillance*

Three limitations are evident in NARMS *Campylobacter* surveillance; the use of sentinel clinical laboratories in some states, the sampling scheme, and the limited geographic area under surveillance. In four states that participated in NARMS *Campylobacter* surveillance during 2004 (California, Colorado, Connecticut, and Oregon), *Campylobacter* isolates were submitted to NARMS from one sentinel clinical laboratory. In Georgia, Maryland, Minnesota, New Mexico, New York, and Tennessee, the *Campylobacter* isolates submitted were selected from all *Campylobacter* isolates from most clinical laboratories within a specific geographic area (metro Atlanta area in Georgia; statewide in Maryland, Minnesota, New Mexico, and Tennessee; and the metro Albany and Rochester areas in New York). In California, Colorado, Connecticut, and Oregon, the sentinel clinical laboratory selected the first *Campylobacter* isolate isolated each week for submission to NARMS; if no isolate was isolated in a week, then no isolate was submitted from that laboratory. Because none of the sentinel clinical laboratories used an isolation procedure that was more or less likely than the procedure of other clinical laboratories in their respective states to yield antimicrobial-resistant *Campylobacter* isolates, use of a sentinel clinical laboratory is unlikely to be associated with a change of antimicrobial resistance among *Campylobacter* isolates submitted to NARMS.

In 2004, the NARMS participating public health laboratories in Georgia, Maryland, Minnesota, New Mexico, New York, and Tennessee, and sentinel clinical laboratories in all other FoodNet sites, selected one *Campylobacter* isolate each week and forwarded the isolate to CDC. When the isolates were selected, the antimicrobial resistance pattern of the isolates was not known. Therefore, the antimicrobial resistance pattern of an isolate is unlikely to influence submission of the isolate to NARMS. However, the one-a-week sampling scheme could result in oversampling or undersampling of antimicrobial-resistant isolates if the prevalence of such resistance is not uniform throughout the year. The impact of oversampling or undersampling can vary among states.

Campylobacter isolates were forwarded to CDC by 10 states participating in FoodNet during 2004, representing approximately 45 million persons (15% of the U.S. population). Because NARMS 2004 *Campylobacter* surveillance was not nationwide, generalization of findings to the U.S. population should be done with caution because of possible regional differences in the prevalence of antimicrobial resistance among *Campylobacter*.

6. SUMMARY OF LONG-TERM CHANGES

Non-Typhi *Salmonella*, 1979–2004

For non-Typhi *Salmonella*, sentinel counties were surveyed during 1979–80, 1984–85, 1989–90, and 1994–95.[8-11] CDC tested isolates by disk diffusion. NARMS began testing *Salmonella* in 1996 with 14 participating sites, and by 2003 had expanded nationwide. From 1996 to 2002, participating sites forwarded every 10th non-Typhi *Salmonella* received at their public health laboratories to CDC. Since 2003, sites have forwarded every 20th isolate. In 2004, isolates were tested by broth microdilution to determine minimal inhibitory concentrations (MICs) to 15 antimicrobial agents.

During the last quarter-century, resistance among non-Typhi *Salmonella* has increased to a number of clinically important antimicrobial agents (Figures 6.1 and 6.2). Resistance to ampicillin and trimethoprim-sulfamethoxazole increased first, reaching 20.7% and 3.9%, respectively, in 1996. Resistance to third-generation cephalosporins (e.g., ceftriaxone) and quinolones (e.g., nalidixic acid) and ACSSuT increased more recently.

A public health concern raised by this resistance is loss of efficacious agents to treat serious *Salmonella* infections, especially in children. The clinical implications of current resistance levels are potential treatment failure, increased duration of illness, and increased length of hospitalization.[10,12,13] For more information about treatment of *Salmonella* see *Diagnosis and Management of Foodborne Illness: A Primer for Physicians*.[14]

Figure 6.1: Sentinel county studies: 1979–1980, 1984–1985, 1989–1990, and 1994–1995



Figure 6.2: NARMS: 1996–2004



Ampicillin; Trimethoprim/Sulfamethoxazole; Third-generation cephalosporins; Nalidixic Acid; ACSSuT*

*ACSSuT = resistance to ampicillin, chloramphenicol, streptomycin, sulfamethoxazole, and tetracycline

Campylobacter jejuni, 1989–2004

For *Campylobacter jejuni*, sentinel counties were surveyed during 1989–90.[15] Isolates were received and tested at CDC. NARMS began testing *Campylobacter* in 1997 with five participating sites in 1997, seven in 1998, eight in 1999, nine in 2000–2002, and 10 in 2003–2004. In 2004, one *Campylobacter* isolate per week was forwarded to CDC and tested by E-test to determine MICs to eight antimicrobial agents.

During the last 16 years, *C. jejuni* resistance to a number of clinically important antimicrobial agents has changed (Figures 6.3 and 6.4). Resistance to tetracycline was already 42% in 1989–90 and has declined in more recent years. Resistance to ciprofloxacin has increased. No isolates resistant to ciprofloxacin were identified in 1989–90; 12.4% were resistant in 1997, 20.7% in 2002, 17.2% in 2003, and 18.1% in 2004. Using the new CLSI interpretive criteria for macrolides, resistance to erythromycin remained low, at less than 2% from 1997 to 2004. Because poultry is the primary reservoir for *C. jejuni*, this increasing ciprofloxacin resistance is likely to be related to use of fluoroquinolones, which in 1995 were approved for use in poultry farming. This resistance raised public health concern because of the threat it posed to the efficacy of fluoroquinolones for treating campylobacteriosis. The clinical implications of resistance to fluoroquinolones include increased duration of illness and potential treatment failure.[16] For more information about treatment of *Campylobacter*, see *Diagnosis and Management of Foodborne Illness: A Primer for Physicians*.[14]

Figure 6.3: Sentinel county study: 1989–90



Figure 6.4: NARMS: 1997–2004



***Shigella*, 1985–2004**

For *Shigella*, sentinel counties were surveyed during 1985–86 and 1995–96.[17,18] Isolates were received and tested at CDC. Since NARMS began testing *Shigella* in 1999, every 10th *Shigella* isolate received at participating state public health laboratories was forwarded to CDC during 1999–2002 and every 20th isolate during 2003–2004. In 2004, isolates were tested by broth microdilution to determine MICs to 15 antimicrobial agents.

During the last 19 years, resistance among *Shigella* isolates has increased to a number of clinically important antimicrobial agents (Figures 6.5 and 6.6). Resistance to ampicillin, already 32% in 1985–86, increased to 67% by 1995. Resistance to nalidixic acid emerged more recently. One *Shigella* isolate resistant to nalidixic acid was identified during 1985–86. The percentage of *Shigella* isolates resistant to nalidixic acid increased to nearly 2% in 1999 but has remained at 2% or less. One isolate was resistant to ciprofloxacin in 2001. One ceftriaxone-resistant isolate was noted in 2004.

Because *Shigella* has no environmental or animal reservoir except humans, this resistance probably is related to the use of antimicrobials in human medicine. A public health concern raised by these resistances is the loss of efficacious agents to treat *Shigella* infections. The clinical implication of current resistance levels is potential treatment failure. This may be particularly important for infections related to international travel.[17,19] For more information about treatment of *Shigella*, see *Diagnosis and Management of Foodborne Illness: A Primer for Physicians*.[14]

Figure 6.5: Sentinel county studies: 1985–86 and 1995–96



Figure 6.6: NARMS: 1999–2004





7. SUMMARY OF ENTEROCOCCI RESISTANCE SURVEILLANCE, 2004

Enterococci Working Group

Centers for Disease Control and Prevention

Frederick Angulo, Tim Barrett, Tom Chiller, Alison Drake, Kathryn Gay, Patricia M. Griffin, Nikki Holmes, Katie Lewis, Kevin Joyce, Amie ThurdeKoos, Terrell Miller, Felicita Medalla, Robert V. Tauxe
Foodborne and Diarrheal Diseases Branch, Division of Bacterial and Mycotic Diseases
National Center for Infectious Diseases

Participating State and Local Health Departments

Georgia Division of Public Health
Jim Benson, Edie Carden, Tameka Hayes, Susan Lance, Mahin Park, Lynette Poventud, Stepy Thomas, Melissa Tobin-D'Angelo

Maryland Department of Health and Mental Hygiene and University of Maryland
Karen Cuenco, Jonigene Ruark, David Torpey, Mary Warren

Michigan Department of Community Health and William Beaumont Hospital
Sue Donabedian, Mary Beth Perry, Mary Thill, Mark Zervos

Minnesota Department of Health
John Besser, Anita Glennen, Billie Juni, Brian Lee, Kirk Smith, Maureen Sullivan,

Oregon Department of Human Resources
Emilio DeBess, Julie Hatch, Larry Stauffer, Robert Vega, Veronica Williams

INTRODUCTION

Enterococci are gram-positive cocci whose major habitat is the gastrointestinal tract of humans and other animals. Intestinal carriage of resistant enterococci in humans is associated with hospitalization and antimicrobial use. However, carriage of enterococci resistant to certain antimicrobial agents has been documented among persons who have not been hospitalized or recently taken antimicrobial agents, suggesting a community source. Antimicrobial agents commonly are used for growth promotion, disease prevention, and therapy in food animals, such as chickens and pigs. Such use results in the selection of resistant enterococci in the intestinal tracts of animals, suggesting that use of antimicrobial agents in food animals creates selective pressure on enterococci among food animals and ultimately might contribute to the pool of resistant enterococci among humans. Therefore, monitoring resistance in commensals is important to determine the role of these bacteria as reservoirs of resistance determinants for human pathogens. The Enterococci Resistance Surveillance project was designed to determine the prevalence of clinically important antimicrobial-resistant enterococci in stool samples among persons in the community.

SUMMARY OF 2004 SURVEILLANCE DATA

Background

Enterococci resistance study began in 2001 to prospectively monitor the prevalence of antimicrobial resistance of human enterococci isolates from stool samples. The study includes five sites: Georgia, Maryland, Michigan, Minnesota, and Oregon.

Multidrug-resistant enterococci

- Multidrug resistance is described in NARMS by the number of antimicrobial subclasses or specific co-resistance phenotypes. Antimicrobial subclasses are used as defined by CLSI.
- 99.3% of *Enterococcus faecium* and 98.1% of *Enterococcus faecalis* isolates tested were resistant to two or more CLSI subclasses.
- 17.8% of *E. faecium* and 30.2% of *E. faecalis* isolates tested were resistant to five or more CLSI subclasses.

Clinically Important Resistance

The number of antimicrobial agents available to treat serious enterococcal infections in humans is limited, in part because of the intrinsic resistance of enterococci to many antimicrobials and the ease with which the bacteria acquire resistance. Concern exists that currently available antimicrobial agents also progressively are losing effectiveness because of resistance, complicating treatment or presenting with serious enterococci infection. In particular, resistance has developed to gentamicin, penicillin, quinupristin-dalfopristin (Synercid®), and vancomycin.

- 1.5% of *E. faecium* isolates and 6.2% of *E. faecalis* isolates were resistant to gentamicin.
- 5.9% of *E. faecium* isolates and 1.2% of *E. faecalis* isolates were resistant to penicillin.
- 3.7% of *E. faecium* isolates were resistant to quinupristin-dalfopristin. *E. faecalis* was not reported because of intrinsic resistance.
- 0.7% of *E. faecium* isolates were resistant to vancomycin. No *E. faecalis* isolates were resistant to vancomycin.

SURVEILLANCE AND LABORATORY TESTING METHODS

Stool samples from outpatients with diarrhea and healthy volunteers were collected by laboratories in Georgia, Maryland, Michigan, Minnesota, and Oregon. All presumptive enterococci were submitted to the NARMS lab for species identification and antimicrobial susceptibility testing. Ten stool samples per month were requested.

Predominant Enterococci

Predominant enterococci were selected by mixing 0.5 grams of each stool in 5 mL of bile-esculin azide broth and incubating at 35–37°C for 48 hours. After incubation, 10 μL from a black culture was streaked onto Columbia CNA[20] with 5% sheep blood and incubated at 35–37°C for 24 hours. A predominant colony with typical enterococci morphology were Gram stained and L-pyrrolidonyl-β-naphthylamide (PYR) spot-tested.

Enrichment for Vancomycin-Resistant Enterococci

Vancomycin-resistant enterococci (VRE) were selected as above with the addition of 10 μg/mL vancomycin and 10 μg/mL aztreonam to the bile-esculin azide broth. After incubation, 10 μl from a black culture was streaked onto Modified Ford agar[21] supplemented with 10 g/mL raffinose and incubated at 35–37 C for 24 hours. A red colony characteristic of *E. faecium* and *E. faecalis* (raffinose nonfermenters) were Gram stained and PYR spot-tested.

Enterococcus Species Identification and Antimicrobial Susceptibility Testing

On arrival at CDC, isolates were subcultured on trypticase soy agar at least two times to obtain isolated single colonies. All incubations were performed at 35° ± 1°C. A pure culture was selected for definitive identification, antimicrobial susceptibility testing, and freezing at –70°C for archival purposes. Enterococci were identified to the species level according to standard biochemical methods.[22] Antimicrobial susceptibility was tested by microbroth dilution using a custom Sensititre® panel, according to the manufacturer's instructions (Trek Diagnostics, Cleveland, OH). MICs of antimicrobials were read manually using the Sensititre® Sensitouch™ system in 2001. In 2002 and 2003, susceptibility results were read and interpreted using an automated system, ARIS™ by Trek Diagnostics. *Staphylococcus aureus* ATCC 29213, *Escherichia coli* ATCC 25922, *E. faecalis* ATCC 29212, and *E. faecalis* ATCC 51299 were used as quality controls for *Enterococcus* susceptibility testing according to CLSI guidelines.[1] MICs were determined for 17 antimicrobial agents: bacitracin, chloramphenicol, ciprofloxacin, daptomycin, erythromycin, flavomycin, gentamicin, kanamycin, lincomycin, linezolid, nitrofurantoin, penicillin, streptomycin, quinupristin/dalfopristin, tetracycline, tylosin, and vancomycin (Table 7.1).

Where established, CLSI interpretive criteria were used (Table 7.1). The 95% CIs for the percentage of resistant isolates calculated using the Clopper-Pearson exact method are included in the MIC distribution tables.[6] Similarly, multidrug resistance by CLSI antimicrobial subclass was defined as resistance two or more subclasses.

RESULTS

Predominant Enterococci

In 2004, CDC received 479 enterococci isolates, of which 474 (98.9%) were viable and tested for antimicrobial susceptibility (Table 7.2). Of the enterococci isolates tested, 54.4% (258/474) were *E. faecalis,* and 28.5% (135/474) were *E. faecium* (Table 7.3).

MICs for *E. faecium, E. faecalis*, and other enterococci species were determined for each of the 17 antimicrobial agents from 2004 (Table 7.4). Resistance to specific antimicrobial agents also was determined (Table 7.5).

E. faecium

Of the *E. faecium* isolates, 1.5% were resistant to gentamicin in 2004. Resistance to penicillin was 5.9% (Table 7.5), and resistance to quinupristin/dalfopristin was 3.7%. Vancomycin resistance among *E. faecium* isolates was 0.7% (Table 7.5).

E. faecalis

Of the *E. faecalis* isolates, 6.2% were resistant to gentamicin. Resistance to penicillin was 1.2% and 58.1% to tetracycline (Table 7.5).

In 2004, 99.3% of *E. faecium* isolates were resistant to two or more CLSI subclasses, and 17.8% were resistant to five or more CLSI subclasses (Table 7.6). *E. faecalis* isolates resistant to two or more CLSI subclasses was 98.1%, and resistance to five or more CLSI subclasses was 30.2% (Table 7.6).

Enrichment for Vancomycin-Resistant Enterococci (VRE)

In 2004, specimens from 13 patients yielded enterococci growth on VRE media. CDC received these isolates and tested them for antimicrobial susceptibility. Two isolates were confirmed *E. faecalis*, and neither were confirmed resistant to vancomycin. Five isolates were confirmed *E. faecium*, of which four were confirmed resistant to vancomycin.

Table 7.1: Antimicrobial agents used for susceptibility testing of Enterococci, NARMS, 2004

CLSI Subclass	Antimicrobial Agent	Antimicrobial Agent Concentration Range (µg/mL)	Breakpoints			Source of MIC
			Resistant	Intermediate	Susceptible	
Aminoglycoside	Gentamicin	128 - 1024	≥500		≤256	CLSI
	Kanamycin	128 - 1024	≥2048		≤1024	DanMap
	Streptomycin	512 - 2048	≥1000		≤512	CLSI
Glycopeptide	Vancomycin	0.5 - 32	32	8-16	≤4	CLSI
Lincosamides	Lincomycin	1 - 32	≥8		≤4	CASFM
Lipopeptides	Daptomycin	0.5 - 16	≥8		≤4	CLSI
Macrolide	Erythromycin	0.5 - 8	≥8	1-4	≤0.5	CLSI
	Tylosin	0.25 - 32	≥8		≤4	DanMap
Nitrofuran	Nitrofurantoin	2 - 64	≥128	64	≤32	CLSI
Oxazolidinones	Linezolid	0.5 - 8	≥8	4	≤2	CLSI
Penicillin	Penicillin	0.5 - 16	≥16		≤8	CLSI
Phenicol	Chloramphenicol	2 - 32	≥32	16	≤8	CLSI
Phosphoglycolipid	Flavomycin	1 - 32	≥16		≤8	DanMap
Polypeptide	Bacitracin	8 - 128	≥64		≤32	NORM-VET
Quinolone	Ciprofloxacin	0.12 - 4	≥4	2	≤1	CLSI
Streptogramin	Synercid QD	1 - 32	≥4	2	≤1	CLSI
Tetracycline	Tetracycline	4 - 32	≥16	8	≤4	CLSI

Table 7.2: Frequency of Enterococci isolated by site, NARMS, 2004

Site	2004 N	(%)
Georgia	78	(16.5%)
Maryland	99	(20.9%)
Michigan	111	(23.4%)
Minnesota	107	(22.6%)
Oregon	79	(16.7%)
Total	**474**	**(100.0%)**

Table 7.3: Enterococci speciation for isolates received in NARMS, 2004

Species	2004 N	(%)
Enterococcus faecalis	258	(54.4%)
Enterococcus faecium	135	(28.5%)
Enterococcus avium	31	(6.5%)
Enterococcus durans	14	(3.0%)
Enterococcus casseliflavus	9	(1.9%)
Enterococcus hirae	8	(1.7%)
Enterococcus raffinosus	6	(1.3%)
Enterococcus gallinarum	5	(1.1%)
Enterococcus spp.	4	(0.8%)
Enterococcus pseudoavium	3	(0.6%)
Enterococcus sanguinicola	1	(0.2%)
Total	**474**	**(100.0%)**

Table 7.4: Minimum inhibitory concentrations (MICs) and resistance of Enterococcus isolates to antimicrobial agents, 2004 (N=474)

Antibiotic		Species*	% of isolates			Percent of all isolates with MIC (µg/mL)¶														
			%I†	%R‡	[95% CI]§	0.12	0.25	0.5	1	2	4	8	16	32	64	128	256	512	1024	2048	4096
Aminoglycosides		ENTFM	NA	1.5	[0.2–5.3]											96.3	2.2	0.7		0.7	
	Gentamicin	ENTFS	NA	6.2	[3.6–9.9]											92.2	1.6	1.6	0.4	4.3	
		OTHER	NA	1.2	[0.0–6.8]											98.8			1.2		
		ENTFM	NA	2.2	[0.5–6.4]											73.3	22.2	2.2		2.2	
	Kanamycin	ENTFS	NA	17.8	[13.4–23.1]											79.8	2.3			17.8	
		OTHER	NA	2.5	[0.3–8.7]											96.3	1.2			2.5	
		ENTFM	NA	0.7	[0.0–4.1]													99.3		0.7	
	Streptomycin	ENTFS	NA	11.7	[8.0–16.2]													88.3	3.1	4.3	4.3
		OTHER	NA	11.1	[5.3–20.3]													88.9	1.2	8.6	1.2
		ENTFM	0.0	0.7	[0.0–4.1]			80.0	14.8	4.4					0.7						
Glycopeptides	Vancomycin	ENTFS	0.0	0.0	[0.0–1.4]			0.4	54.7	39.5	5.4										
		OTHER	3.7	0.0	[0.0–4.5]			65.4	17.3		13.6	2.5	1.2								
		ENTFM	NA	73.3	[64.8–80.4]				18.5	2.2	5.9	20.0	38.5	8.1	6.7						
Lincosamides	Lincomycin	ENTFS	NA	98.1	[95.5–99.4]						1.9	4.3	44.2	26.4	23.3						
		OTHER	NA	82.7	[72.4–90.1]				7.4		9.9	48.1	28.4		6.2						
		ENTFM	0.0	8.9	[4.7–15.1]			5.9	5.2	21.5	58.5	8.9									
Lipopeptides	Daptomycin	ENTFS	0.0	0.0	[0.0–1.4]			24.8	67.8	7.4											
		OTHER	0.0	1.2	[0.0–6.8]			40.7	34.6	11.1	12.3	1.2									
Macrolides		ENTFM	66.7	12.6	[7.6–19.5]			20.7	18.5	22.2	25.9	8.9	3.7								
	Erythromycin	ENTFS	41.1	25.2	[20.0–31.0]			33.7	34.5	5.0	1.6	2.7	22.5								
		OTHER	25.9	18.5	[9.9–27.6]			55.6	17.3	2.5	6.2	3.7	14.8								
		ENTFM	NA	37.8	[29.1–46.1]			0.7	9.6	19.3	32.6	27.4	7.4	0.7	2.2						
	Tylosin	ENTFS	NA	25.6	[20.4–31.4]				19.8	50.8	3.9	0.4	0.8		24.4						
		OTHER	NA	9.9	[4.4–18.8]		1.2	3.7	23.5	40.7	21.0	1.2			8.6						
		ENTFM	76.3	3.0	[0.5–6.4]							0.7	4.4	15.6	76.3	3.0					
Nitrofurans	Nitrofurantoin	ENTFS	0.0	0.0	[0.0–1.4]						1.9	59.7	35.7	2.7							
		OTHER	40.7	14.8	[8.0–24.7]						4.9	9.9	8.6	21.0	40.7	14.8					
		ENTFM	3.0	0.7	[0.0–2.7]			2.2	49.6	44.4	3.0	0.7									
Oxazolidinones	Linezolid	ENTFS	2.3	0.4	[0.0–2.1]			1.9	77.1	18.2	2.3	0.4									
		OTHER	2.5	1.2	[0.0–6.8]			18.5	27.2	50.6	2.5	1.2									
		ENTFM	NA	5.9	[2.1–10.5]			9.6	10.4	28.1	33.3	12.6	0.7	5.2							
Penicillins	Penicillin	ENTFS	NA	1.2	[0.2–3.4]			0.4		24.8	54.3	19.4	1.2								
		OTHER	NA	3.7	[0.8–10.6]			27.2	17.3	40.7	11.1		1.2	2.5							
		ENTFM	1.5	1.5	[0.2–5.3]					1.5	71.9	23.7	1.5	1.5							
Phenicols	Chloramphenicol	ENTFS	0.8	6.6	[3.9–10.3]					0.8	52.3	39.5	0.8	3.9	2.7						
		OTHER	2.5	7.4	[2.8–15.6]					14.8	38.3	37.0	2.5		7.4						
		ENTFM	NA	94.1	[88.6–97.4]					1.5	1.5	3.0	3.0	4.4	86.7						
Phosphoglycolipid	Flavomycin	ENTFS	NA	6.2	[3.6–9.9]				5.0	86.8	1.2	0.8	1.6	0.4	4.3						
		OTHER	NA	49.4	[38.6–61.4]				2.5	19.8	22.2	6.2	4.9	2.5	42.0						
		ENTFM	NA	91.1	[84.9–95.3]							3.0	0.7	5.2	25.9	52.6	12.6				
Polypeptide	Bacitracin	ENTFS	NA	92.2	[88.3–95.2]								1.2	6.6	27.5	54.7	10.1				
		OTHER	NA	84.0	[73.8–91.1]							4.9	6.2	4.9	29.6	46.9	7.4				
		ENTFM	18.5	20.0	[13.7–27.9]			14.1	47.4	18.5	13.3	6.7									
Quinolones	Ciprofloxacin	ENTFS	16.3	5.0	[2.7–8.5]			11.6	67.1	16.3		5.0									
		OTHER	33.3	9.9	[4.4–18.8]	1.2	4.9	19.8	30.9	33.3	1.2	8.6									
		ENTFM	53.3	3.7	[1.2–8.5]				43.0	53.3	0.7	0.7		1.5	0.7						
Streptogramins	Synercid QD	ENTFS**	NA	NA	NA																
		OTHER	21.0	3.7	[0.8–10.6]				75.3	21.0	1.2	1.2		1.2							
		ENTFM	3.0	24.4	[17.6–32.8]						72.6	3.0	5.2		19.3						
Tetracyclines	Tetracycline	ENTFS	1.6	58.1	[51.9–64.2]						40.3	1.6	6.6	36.8	14.7						
		OTHER	3.7	46.9	[35.0–57.8]						49.4	3.7	6.2	23.5	17.3						

*ENTFM: *Enterococcus faecium* (n=135), ENTFS: *Enterococcus faecalis* (n=258), OTHER: all other *Enterococcus* spp. (n=81)

†Percent of isolates with intermediate susceptibility, NA if no MIC range of intermediate susceptibility exists

‡Percent of isolates that were resistant

§95% confidence intervals (CI) for percent resistant (%R) were calculated using the Clopper-Pearson exact method

¶The unshaded areas indicate the dilution range of the Sensititre plates used to test isolates. Single vertical bars indicate the breakpoints for susceptibility, while double vertical bars indicate breakpoints for resistance. Numbers in the shaded areas indicate the percentages of isolates with MICs greater than the highest concentrations on the Sensititre plate. Numbers listed for the lowest tested concentrations represent the precentages of isolates with MICs equal to or less than the lowest tested concentration. CLSI breakpoints were used when available.

**Intrinsic resistance to Quinipristin-Dalfopristin

Table 7.5: Minimum inhibitory concentrations (MICs) and resistance of enterococci, by species, to antimicrobial agents, 2001–2004

Species		ENTFM*				ENTFS†				OTHER‡			
Year		2001	2002	2003	2004	2001	2002	2003	2004	2001	2002	2003	2004
Total Isolates		234	172	165	135	315	219	247	258	61	57	58	81
Subclass	Antibiotic (Resistance breakpoint)												
Aminoglycosides	Gentamicin	1.7%	0.6%	0.0%	1.5%	5.7%	6.4%	2.0%	6.2%	1.6%	0.0%	0.0%	1.2%
	(MIC >500)	4	1	0	2	18	14	5	16	1	0	0	1
	Kanamycin	8.5%	9.3%	2.4%	2.2%	14.9%	14.2%	8.9%	17.8%	4.9%	8.8%	3.4%	2.5%
	(MIC ≥2048)	20	16	4	3	47	31	22	46	3	5	2	2
	Streptomycin	4.3%	7.0%	2.4%	0.7%	14.6%	10.0%	7.7%	11.6%	11.5%	8.8%	3.4%	11.1%
	(MIC >1000)	10	12	4	1	46	22	19	30	7	5	2	9
Glycopeptides	Vancomycin	1.7%	2.3%	0.0%	0.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	(MIC ≥32)	4	4	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Ionophore coccidiostat	Salinomycin	0.0%	0.6%	0.0%	Not	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	Not	0.0%	1.8%	0.0%	Not
	(MIC ≥16)	0	1	0	Tested	0	0	0	Tested	0	1	0	Tested
Lincosamides	Lincomycin	75.6%	69.8%	73.9%	73.3%	95.6%	98.6%	98.4%	98.1%	78.7%	86.0%	74.1%	82.7%
	(MIC ≥8)	177	120	122	99	301	216	243	253	48	49	43	67
Lipopeptides	Daptomycin	Not	Not	Not	8.9%	Not	Not	Not	0.0%	Not	Not	Not	1.2%
	(MIC ≥8)	Tested	Tested	Tested	12	Tested	tested	tested	0	Tested	Tested	Tested	1
Macrolides	Erythromycin	7.3%	15.1%	10.3%	12.6%	24.4%	19.2%	22.7%	25.2%	21.3%	21.1%	10.3%	18.5%
	(MIC ≥8)	17	26	17	17	77	42	56	65	13	12	6	15
	Tylosin	23.5%	20.3%	6.7%	37.8%	23.8%	20.1%	22.7%	25.6%	13.1%	10.5%	6.9%	9.9%
	(MIC ≥8)	55	35	11	51	75	44	56	66	8	6	4	8
Nitrofurans	Nitrofurantoin	14.1%	2.9%	0.0%	3.0%	0.3%	0.5%	0.0%	0.0%	13.1%	0.0%	0.0%	14.8%
	(MIC ≥128)	33	5	0	4	1	1	0	0	8	0	0	12
Oxazolidinones	Linezolid	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.2%
	(MIC ≥8)	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
Penicillins	Penicillin	4.3%	7.6%	10.3%	5.9%	0.0%	2.3%	0.4%	1.2%	4.9%	8.8%	8.6%	3.7%
	(MIC ≥16)	10	13	17	8	0	5	1	3	3	5	5	3
Phenicols	Chloramphenicol	1.7%	0.0%	0.0%	1.5%	6.0%	7.3%	2.0%	6.6%	1.6%	0.0%	0.0%	7.4%
	(MIC ≥32)	4	0	0	2	19	16	5	17	1	0	0	6
Phosphoglycolipid	Flavomycin	79.9%	90.1%	90.3%	94.1%	2.5%	0.5%	0.0%	6.2%	42.6%	35.1%	50.0%	49.4%
	(MIC ≥16)	187	155	149	127	8	1	0	16	26	20	29	40
Polypeptide	Bacitracin	92.3%	93.6%	92.7%	91.1%	84.4%	90.4%	96.0%	92.2%	83.6%	87.7%	89.7%	84.0%
	(MIC ≥64)	216	161	153	123	266	198	237	238	51	50	52	68
Quinolones	Ciprofloxacin	15.0%	12.2%	18.2%	20.0%	4.4%	4.6%	3.2%	5.0%	1.6%	0.0%	1.7%	9.9%
	(MIC ≥4)	35	21	30	27	14	10	8	13	1	0	1	8
Streptogramins	Quinupristin-Dalfopristin	20.9%	2.3%	3.6%	3.7%	Not	Not	Not	Not	8.2%	3.5%	3.4%	3.7%
	(MIC ≥4)	49	4	6	5	Reported§	Reported§	Reported§	Reported§	5	2	2	3
	Virginiamycin	0.9%	Not	Not	Not	11.1%	Not	Not	Not	0.0%	Not	Not	Not
	(MIC ≥8)	2	Tested	Tested	Tested	35	Tested	Tested	Tested	0	Tested	Tested	Tested
Tetracyclines	Tetracycline	21.4%	18.0%	15.2%	24.4%	56.8%	57.5%	55.1%	58.1%	42.6%	47.4%	22.4%	46.9%
	(MIC ≥16)	50	31	25	33	179	126	136	150	26	27	13	38

*ENTFM = *Enterococcus faecium*

†ENTFS = *Enterococcus faecalis*

‡OTHER = *Enterococcus* spp.

§Intrinsic resistance to quinupristin-dalfopristin

Table 7.6: Resistance of enterococci, by species, to antimicrobial agents, 2001–2004

Species	ENTFM*				ENTFS†				OTHER‡			
Year	2001	2002	2003	2004	2001	2002	2003	2004	2001	2002	2003	2004
Total Isolates	234	172	165	135	315	219	247	258	61	57	58	81
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
	n	n	n	n	n	n	n	n	n	n	n	n
No resistance detected	0.9%	1.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.3%	0.5%	0.0%	0.0%	1.6%	0.0%	1.7%	1.2%
	2	3	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	0	1	1
Resistance ≥1CLSI subclass§	99.1%	98.3%	100.0%	100.0%	99.7%	99.5%	100.0%	100.0%	98.4%	100.0%	98.3%	98.8%
	232	169	165	135	314	218	247	258	60	57	57	80
Resistance ≥2 CLSI subclasses§	97.4%	96.5%	97.0%	99.3%	95.6%	96.8%	97.6%	98.1%	96.7%	98.2%	89.7%	92.6%
	228	166	160	134	301	212	241	253	59	56	52	75
Resistance ≥3 CLSI subclasses§	86.3%	80.2%	73.9%	83.7%	84.8%	84.5%	90.3%	90.7%	70.5%	61.4%	56.9%	74.1%
	202	138	122	113	267	185	223	234	43	35	33	60
Resistance ≥4 CLSI subclasses§	47.4%	38.4%	30.9%	48.1%	56.8%	50.2%	54.7%	58.5%	32.8%	28.1%	13.8%	38.3%
	111	66	51	65	179	110	135	151	20	16	8	31
Resistance ≥5 CLSI subclasses§	19.7%	11.6%	9.1%	17.8%	30.5%	21.5%	23.1%	30.2%	14.8%	12.3%	6.9%	16.0%
	46	20	15	24	96	47	57	78	9	7	4	13

*ENTFM = *Enterococcus faecium*

†ENTFS = *Enterococcus faecalis*

‡OTHER = *Enterococcus* spp.

§CLSI: Clinical and Laboratory Standards Institute

Molecular Characterization of Vancomycin-resistant enterococci isolated from persons in the community in the United States, 2001-2004

Vancomycin-resistant enterococci (VRE), a major cause of nosocomial infection, were isolated first in Europe in 1986 and in the United States in 1987 [Sahm DF, Kissinger J, Gilmore MS, et al. *In vitro* susceptibility studies of vancomycin-resistant *Enterococcus faecalis*. Antimicrob Agents Chemother 1989;33:1588–91]. Avoparcin, a glycopeptide related to vancomycin, was used for growth promotion of food animals in Europe during 1975–1997 [Casewell M, Friis C, Marco E, et al. The European ban on growth-promoting antibiotics and emerging consequences for human and animal health. Antimicrob Agents Chemother 2003;52:159–61]. The use of avoparcin in food animals resulted in a reservoir of VRE in food animals, and after transmission of VRE through the food supply, a reservoir of VRE in persons in the European community. In the United States, avoparcin was never approved for use in food animals, and confirmed reports of VRE in persons outside of a health-care setting are lacking. An aim of the NARMS Enterococci Resistance Surveillance is to investigate community-associated VRE in the United States.

As part of ongoing surveillance, stool samples from outpatients with diarrhea and healthy volunteers were collected by laboratories in Georgia, Maryland, Michigan, Minnesota, and Oregon. Beginning in 2001, stool samples were tested for enterococci. If present, one enterococci isolated from each sample was susceptibility tested for vancomycin.

VRE (MIC ≥32 mg/L) was screened by polymerase chain reaction (PCR) for *van*A, *van*B, *van*C, and *van*D [Clark NC, Cooksey RC, Hill BC, Swenson JM, Tenover FC. Characterization of glycopeptide-resistant enterococci from U.S. hospitals. Antimicrob Agents Chemother 1993;37:2311–7]. VRE also was tested by PCR for a macrolide-resistance determinant *ermB* [Tait-Kamradt A, Clancy J, Cronan M, et al. mefE is necessary for the erythromycin-resistant M phenotype in *Streptococcus pneumoniae*. Antimicrob Agents Chemother 1997;41:2251–5] and tetracycline resistance determinant *tetM* [Aarestrup FM, Agerso Y, Gerner-Smidt P, Madsen M, Jensen LB. Comparison of antimicrobial resistance phenotypes and resistance genes in *Enterococcus faecalis* and *Enterococcus faecium* from humans in the community, broilers, and pigs in Denmark. Diagn Microbiol Infect Dis 2000;37:127–37].

Of 2483 stool specimens tested during 2001–2004, 2002 (80.6%) yielded enterococci. Of 2002 enterococci isolates tested for susceptibility, 26 (1.3%) of the isolates were VRE, of which 24 (92.3%) were resistant to penicillin; 18 (69.2%), to erythromycin; 15 (57.7%), to tetracycline; and 11 (42.3%), to high-level gentamicin. Of the 23 VRE that were available for further characterization, 22 were *E. faecium* with vancomycin MICs ≥256 mg/L harboring *van*A, and one was *E. faecalis* with a vancomycin MIC of 64 mg/L with *van*B. All erythromycin- and tetracycline-resistant isolates contained *ermB* and *tetM*,, respectively.

Figure 7.1: Prevalence of co-resistant phenotypes among VRE and VSE: erythromycin, gentamicin, penicillin, and tetracycline



REFERENCES

1. Clinical and Laboratory Standards Institute (CLSI). Performance Standards for Antimicrobial Susceptibility Testing; Sixteenth Informational Supplement. CLSI Document M100-S16. Clinical and Laboratory Standards Institute, Wayne, Pennsylvania, 2006.
2. Linton D, Lawson AJ, Owen RJ, Stanley J. PCR detection, identification to species level, and fingerprinting of *Campylobacter jejuni* and *Campylobacter coli* direct from diarrheic samples. J Clin Microbiol 1997;35:2568–72.
3. Gonzalez I, Grant KA, Richardson PT, Park SF, Collins MD. Specific identification of the enteropathogens *Campylobacter jejuni* and *Campylobacter coli* by using a PCR test based on the *ceuE* gene encoding a putative virulence determinant. J Clin Microbiol 1997;35:759–63.
4. CDC. National Antimicrobial Resistance Monitoring System for Enteric Bacteria (NARMS): 2003 Human Isolates Final Report. Atlanta, Georgia: U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, CDC, 2006.
5. Clinical and Laboratory Standards Institute. Methods for Antimicrobial Dilution and Disk Susceptibility Testing of Infrequently Isolated or Fastidious Bacteria: Approved Guideline. CLSI Document M45-A. Clinical and Laboratory Standards Institute, Wayne, Pennsylvania, 2006.
6. Newcombe RG. Two-sided confidence intervals for the single proportion: comparison of seven methods. Stat Med 1998;17:857-872.
7. Fleiss JL, Levin B, Paik MC. Statistical Methods in for Rates and Proportions. In: Shewart WA, Wilks SS, eds. Wiley Series in Probability and Statistics. Published Online; 2004.
8. Riley LW, Cohen ML, Seals JE, et al. Importance of host factors in human salmonellosis caused by multiresistant strains of *Salmonella*. J Infect Dis 1984;149:878–83.
9. MacDonald KI, Cohen ML, Hargrett-Bean NT, et al. Changes in antimicrobial resistance of *Salmonella* isolated from humans in the United States. JAMA 1987;258:1496–9.
10. Lee LA, Puhr ND, Maloney EK, Bean NT, Tauxe RV. Increase in antimicrobial-resistance *Salmonella* infectious in the United States, 1989-1990. J Infect Dis 1994;170:128–34.
11. Herikstad H, Hayes PS, Hogan J, Floyd P, Snyder L, Angulo FJ. Ceftriaxone-resistant *Salmonella* in the United States. Pediatr Infect Dis *J* 1997;16:904–5.
12. Molbak K, Baggesen DL, Aarestrup FM, et al. An outbreak of multidrug-resistant, quinolone-resistant *Salmonella enterica* serotype Typhimurium DT104. N Engl J Med 1999;341:1420–5.
13. Holmberg SD, Solomon SL, Blake PA. Health and economic impacts of antimicrobial resistance. Rev Infect Dis 1987;9:1065–78.
14. CDC. Diagnosis and management of foodborne illnesses: a primer for physicians and other health care professionals. MMWR 2004;53(RR-4):1–33.
15. Gupta A, Nelson JM, Barrett TJ, et al. Antimicrobial resistance among *Campylobacter* strains, United States, 1997–2001. Emerg Infect Dis 2004;10:1102–9.
16. Nelson JM, Smith KE, Vugia DJ, et al. Prolonged diarrhea due to ciprofloxacin-resistant *Campylobacter* infections. J Infect Dis 2004;190:1150–7.
17. Sivapalasingam S, Nelson JM, Joyce K, Hoekstra M, Angulo FJ, Mintz ED. High prevalence of antimicrobial resistance among Shigella isolates in the United States tested by the National Antimicrobial Resistance Monitoring System from 1999 to 2002. Antimicrob Agents Chemother 2006;50:49–54.
18. Cook K, Boyce T, Puhr N, Tauxe R, Mintz E. Increasing antimicrobial-resistant *Shigella* infections in the United States. In Abstracts of the 36th Interscience Conference on Antimicrobial Agents and Chemotherapy, New Orleans, LA, September 1996.
19. Tauxe RV, Puhr ND, Wells JG, Hargrett-Bean N, Blake PA. Antimicrobial resistance of Shigella isolates in the USA: the importance of international travelers. J Infect Dis 1990;162:1107–11.
20. McDonald LC, Rossiter S, Mackinson C, et al. Quinupristin-dalfopristin-resistant *Enterococcus faecium* on chicken and in human stool specimens. N Engl J Med 2001;345:1155–60.
21. Ford M, Perry JD, Gould FK. Use of cephalexin-aztreonam-arabinose agar for selective isolation of *Enterococcus faecium*. J Clin Microbiol 1994;32:2999–3001.
22. Facklam RR, Sahm DF, Teixeira LM. *Enterococcus*. In: Murray PR, Barron EJ, Pfaller MJ, Tenover FC, Yolken RH, eds. Manual of Clinical Microbiology. Washington, DC: ASM Press; 1999: 297–305.

NARMS PUBLICATIONS IN 2004

Angulo FJ, Nargund VN, Chiller TC. Evidence of an association between use of anti-microbial agents in food animals and anti-microbial resistance among bacteria isolated from humans and the human health consequences of such resistance. J Vet Med B Infect Dis Vet Public Health 2004;51:374–9.

Angulo FJ, Nunnery JA, Bair HD. Antimicrobial resistance in zoonotic enteric pathogens. Rev Sci Tech 2004;23:485–96.

Angulo FJ, Baker NL, Olsen SJ, Anderson A, Barrett TJ. Antimicrobial use in agriculture: controlling the transfer of antimicrobial resistance to humans. Semin Pediatr Infect Dis 2004;15:78–85.

Chiller TM, Barrett T, Angulo FJ. CDC studies incorrectly summarized in "critical review." J Antimicrob Chemother 2004;54:275–6.

Doublet B, Carattoli A, Whichard JM, White DG, Baucheron S, Chaslus-Dancla E, Cloeckaert A. Plasmid-mediated florfenicol and ceftriaxone resistance encoded by the *flo*R and *bla*(CMY-2) genes in *Salmonella enterica* serovars Typhimurium and Newport isolated in the United States. FEMS Microbiol Lett 2004;233:301–5.

Giles WP, Benson AK, Olson ME, Hutkins RW, Whichard JM, Winokur PL, Fey PD. DNA sequence analysis of regions surrounding blaCMY-2 from multiple *Salmonella* plasmid backbones. Antimicrob Agents Chemother 2004;48:2845–52.

Glynn MK, Reddy V, Hutwagner L, Rabatsky-Ehr T, Shiferaw B, Vugia DJ, Segler S, Bender J, Barrett TJ, Angulo FJ, for the Emerging Infections Program FoodNet Working Group. Prior antimicrobial agent use increases the risk of sporadic infections with multidrug-resistant *Salmonella enterica* Serotype Typhimurium: a FoodNet case-control study, 1996–1997. Clin Infect Dis 2004;38(Suppl 3):S227–36.

Gupta A, Nelson JM, Barrett TJ, Tauxe RV, Rossiter SP, Friedman CR, Joyce KW, Smith KE, Jones TF, Hawkins MA, Shiferaw B, Beebe JL, Vugia DJ, Rabatsky-Ehr T, Benson JA, Root TP, Angulo FJ. Antimicrobial resistance among *Campylobacter* strains, United States, 1997–2001. Emerg Infect Dis 2004;10:1102–9.

Kassenborg HD, Smith KE, Hoekstra RM, Carter MA, Tauxe RV, Angulo FJ. Reply to Cox. Clin Infect Dis 2004;39:1400–1.

Kassenborg HD, Smith, KE, Vugia DJ, Rabatsky-Ehr T, Bates MR, Carter MA, Dumas NB, Cassidy MP, Marano N, Tauxe RV, Angulo FJ, for the Emerging Infections Program FoodNet Working Group. Fluoroquinolone-resistant *Campylobacter* infections: eating poultry outside of the home and foreign travel are risk factors. Clin Infect Dis 2004;38(Suppl 3):S279–84.

Nargund VN. Human health safety of animal feeds workshop [conference summary]. Emerg Infect Dis 2004;10:2268.

Nelson JM, Smith KE, Vugia DJ, Rabatsky-Ehr T, Segler SD, Kassenborg HD, Zansky SM, Joyce K, Marano N, Hoekstra RM, Angulo FJ. Prolonged diarrhea due to ciprofloxacin-resistant *Campylobacter* infection. J Infect Dis 2004;190:1150–7.

Olsen SJ, Ying M, Davis MF, Deasy M, Holland B, Iampietro L, Baysinger CM, Sassano F, Polk LD, Gormley B, Hung MJ, Pilot K, Osini M, Van Duyne S, Rankin S, Genese C, Bresnitz EA, Smucker J, Moll M, Sobel J. Multidrug-resistant *Salmonella* Typhimurium infection from milk contaminated after pasteurization. Emerg Infect Dis 2004;10:932–5.

Rabatsky-Ehr T, Whichard J, Rossiter S, Holland B, Stamey K, Headrick ML, Barrett TJ, Angulo FJ, NARMS Working Group. Multidrug-resistant strains of *Salmonella enterica* Typhimurium, United States, 1997–1998. Emerg Infect Dis 2004;10:795–801.

NARMS ABSTRACTS & INVITED LECTURES IN 2004

Baker L, Joyce K, Mintz E, Chiller T, the NARMS Working Group. Antimicrobial resistance among *Salmonella* serotype Paratyphi in the United States, NARMS data 1996–2001. 4th International Conference on Emerging Infectious Diseases, Atlanta, GA, February 2004.

Chiller T. Foodborne disease associated with produce. USDA AMS meeting on foodborne pathogens and produce sampling, May 2004 [invited lecture].

Chiller T. Transmission of antimicrobial resistant bacteria from animals to man: public health and the food supply. Eastern Pennsylvania Branch, ASM, Philadelphia, PA, November 2004 [invited lecture].

Chiller T, Stevenson J, Barrett T, Angulo F, the NARMS Working Group. National Antimicrobial Resistance Monitoring System (NARMS), 1996–2001: emerging multi-drug and clinically important resistance in enteric bacteria. 4th International Conference on Emerging Infectious Diseases, Atlanta, GA, February 2004.

Lyszkowicz E, Nargund V, Holland B, Ahmed R, Whichard J, Barrett T. Phage types among *Salmonella enterica* serotype Enteritidis: results and comparison of 1996, 1997 and 2001 NARMS human monitoring. 104th General Meeting of the American Society for Microbiology, New Orleans, LA, October 2004.

Medalla F, Drake A, Theriot C, Barrett T, Chiller T, the NARMS Working Group. Ciprofloxacin and macrolide resistance in *Campylobacter*, NARMS, 1997–2002. 2004 National Foundation of Infectious Diseases Annual Conference on Antimicrobial Resistance, Bethesda, MD, June 2004.

Stevenson J, Threlfall E, Barrett T, Chiller T. Antimicrobial resistance among human non-Typhoidal *Salmonella*: a comparison between Enter-net in Europe and NARMS in the United States. 4th International Conference on Emerging Infectious Diseases, Atlanta, GA, February 2004.

Theriot CM, Whichard JM, Baker NL, Varma JK, Barrett TJ. *bla*$_{CMY}$-mediated third generation cephalosporin resistance among *Salmonella enterica* serotype Newport strains: preliminary results of FoodNet case-control study. 104th General Meeting of the American Society for Microbiology, New Orleans, LA, October 2004.

Whichard JM. Extended-spectrum β-lactam resistance among human clinical *Enterobacteriaceae* in the United States: results and characterization of NARMS surveillance, 1996-2002. Health Protection Agency, London, England, December 2004 [invited lecture].

Whichard JM. Multidrug resistance among *Salmonella* and *E. coli* O157:H7; results of NARMS monitoring of bacterial isolates from humans, 1996–2002. 141st American Veterinary Medical Association Annual Convention, Philadelphia, PA, July 2004.

Whichard JM. *Salmonella enterica* ser. Heidelberg: the next *bla*$_{CMY}$-positive player? National Antimicrobial Resistance Monitoring Systems, 2004 Annual Scientific Meeting, Hilton Head, SC, March 2004.

Whichard JM, Gay K, Stevenson JE, Wheeler D, Omondi M, Barrett TJ. Concurrent quinolone and extended-spectrum cephalosporin resistance among human *Salmonella* isolates: Results of 2002 NARMS monitoring. 104th General Meeting of the American Society for Microbiology, New Orleans, LA, October 2004.

APPENDIX A
SUMMARY OF *ESCHERICHIA COLI* RESISTANCE SURVEILLANCE PILOT STUDY, 2004

***E. COLI* WORKING GROUP**

Centers for Disease Control and Prevention

Frederick Angulo, Tim Barrett, Tom Chiller, Alison Drake, Kathryn Gay, Patricia Griffin, Nikki Holmes, Katie Joyce, Kevin Joyce, Amie ThurdeKoos, Terrell Miller, Felicita Medalla, Robert Tauxe
Foodborne and Diarrheal Diseases Branch, Division of Bacterial and Mycotic Diseases
National Center for Infectious Diseases

Participating State and Local Health Departments

Maryland Department of Health and Mental Hygiene and University of Maryland
Karen Cuenco, Jonigene Ruark, David Torpey, Mary Warren

Michigan Department of Community Health and William Beaumont Hospital
Sue Donabedian, Mary Beth Perry, Mary Thill, Mark Zervos

INTRODUCTION

Escherichia coli is a gram-negative rod that is part of the intestinal flora of humans and other animals. Because antimicrobial resistance genes commonly reside in mobile genetic elements that can be transferred horizontally to other bacteria, antimicrobial-resistant bacteria of the intestinal flora, including *E. coli*, constitute an important reservoir of resistance genes for pathogenic bacteria of humans and other animals. Furthermore, when introduced into a normally sterile site, *E. coli* is an important cause of infections, including septicemia, urinary tract infections, and wound infections. The human intestinal tract is the predominant source of *E. coli* causing these infections. Antimicrobial resistance among *E. coli* causing such infections complicates treatment options.

The use of antimicrobial agents creates a selective pressure for the emergence and dissemination of resistant bacteria. Use of antimicrobial agents in food animals selects resistant bacteria, including resistant *E. coli* in the intestinal tract of food animals. These resistant bacteria can be transmitted to humans through the food supply.[1,2,3] Therefore, monitoring resistance in *E. coli* isolated from the intestinal flora of humans and animals is important to determining the role of these bacteria as human pathogens and as reservoirs of resistance determinants for human pathogens.[4] The *E. coli* Resistance Surveillance Pilot is designed to determine the prevalence of resistance to clinically important antimicrobial agents among *E. coli* isolated from persons in the community.

SUMMARY OF 2004 SURVEILLANCE DATA

Background

Beginning in 2004, NARMS began to prospectively monitor the prevalence of antimicrobial resistance of *E. coli* isolated from human stool samples in two sites: Maryland and Michigan.

Multidrug-Resistant *E. coli*

- 24.8% of 218 *E. coli* isolates tested were resistant to two or more subclasses of antimicrobial agents.
- 6.9% of 218 *E. coli* isolates tested were resistant to five or more subclasses of antimicrobial agents.

Clinically Important Resistance

Antimicrobial agents commonly used to treat serious *E. coli* infections in humans include third-generation cephalosporins and fluoroquinolones.

- 0.9% of 218 *E. coli* isolates were resistant to ceftiofur (Table A.3).
- 9.3% of 218 *E. coli* isolates were resistant to ciprofloxacin (Table A.3).

SURVEILLANCE AND LABORATORY TESTING METHODS

Participating laboratories in Maryland and Michigan cultured 10 human stool samples each month for *E. coli* using Eosin Methylene Blue agar one *E. coli* isolate, if present, from each stool sample was sent to CDC for susceptibility testing to antimicrobial agents using broth microdilution (Sensititre®) to determine the minimum inhibitory concentration (MIC) for each of 15 antimicrobial agents: amikacin, ampicillin, amoxicillin-clavulanic acid, cefoxitin, ceftiofur, ceftriaxone, chloramphenicol, ciprofloxacin, gentamicin, kanamycin, nalidixic acid, streptomycin, sulfamethoxazole, tetracycline, and trimethoprim-sulfamethoxazole (Table A.1). The resistance breakpoint for amikacin, according to CLSI[5] guidelines, is an MIC of 64 µg/mL.

Interpretive criteria from the Clinical Laboratory and Standards Institute (CLSI) were used (Table A.1). The 95% CIs for the percentage of resistant isolates calculated using the Clopper-Pearson exact method, are included in the MIC distribution tables. Similarly, multiclass resistance by CLSI antimicrobial subclass was defined as resistance to two or more subclasses.

RESULTS

In 2004, CDC received and tested 218 viable *E. coli* isolates (Table A.2). MICs were determined for *E. coli* isolates for 15 antimicrobial agents (Table A.3).

Resistance also was determined to specific antimicrobial agents during 2004 (Table A.4). Of the *E. coli* isolates, 30.1% were resistant to ampicillin; 23.1%, to sulfamethoxazole; 19.0%, to nalidixic acid; and 17.1% to tetracycline (Table A-4).

In 2004, 24.8% of *E. coli* isolates were resistant to two or more CLSI subclasses, and 6.9% were resistant to five or more CLSI subclasses (Table A.5).

There is an apparent difference in the level of resistance among *E. coli* isolates in this study compared with *E. coli* O157 isolates submitted to NARMS in 2004. Because of the different sampling methods employed in this study and NARMS, this observation requires further investigation.

Table A.1: Antimicrobial agents used for susceptibility testing of *Escherichia coli* , NARMS, 2004

CLSI Subclass	Antimicrobial Agent	Antimicrobial Agent Concentration Range (µg/mL)	Breakpoints		
			Resistant	Intermediate	Susceptible
Aminoglycosides	Amikacin*	0.5 – 4*	>64	32	<16
	Gentamicin	0.25 – 16	>16	8	<4
	Kanamycin	8 – 64	>64	32	<16
	Streptomycin	32 – 64	>64		<32
Aminopenicillins	Ampicillin	1 – 32	>32	16	<8
β-lactamase inhibitor combinations	Amoxicillin–Clavulanic acid	1/0.5 – 32/16	>32/16	46/8	<8/4
Cephalosporins (3rd Gen.)	Ceftiofur	0.12– 8	>8	4	<2
	Ceftriaxone	0.25 – 64	>64	16-32	<8
Cephamycins	Cefoxitin	0.5 – 16	>32	16	≤8
Folate pathway inhibitors	Trimethoprim–Sulfamethoxazole	0.12/2.4 – 4/76	>4/76		<2/38
Phenicols	Chloramphenicol	2 – 32	>32	16	<8
Quinolones	Ciprofloxacin	0.015 – 4	>4	2	<1
	Nalidixic acid	0.5 – 32	>32		<16
Sulfonamides	Sulfisoxazole	16 – 512	>512		<256
Tetracyclines	Tetracycline	4 – 16	>16	8	<4

* The resistance breakpoint for amikacin, according to Clinical and Laboratory Standards Institute (CLSI) guidelines, is 64µg/mL. For isolates that grew in all amikacin dilutions on the Sensititre panel (minimum inhibitory concentration [MIC] >4 µg/mL), E-Test (AB BIODISK, Solna, Sweden) was performed in order to determine amikacin MIC. The amikacin E-Test strip range of dilutions is 0.016-256 µg/mL.

Table A.2: Frequency of *Escherichia coli* isolated by site, NARMS, 2004

Site	2004 N	(%)
Maryland	133	(61.0%)
Michigan	85	(39.0%)
Total	**218**	**(100.0%)**

Table A.3: Minimum inhibitory concentrations (MICs) and resistance of *Escherichia coli* isolates to antimicrobial agents, 2004 (N=216)

Antibiotic		% of isolates			Percent of all isolates with MIC (µg/mL)[§]														
		%I[*]	%R[†]	[95% CI][‡]	0.015	0.03	0.06	0.125	0.25	0.50	1	2	4	8	16	32	64	128	256	512
Aminoglycosides	Amikacin	0.0	0.5	[0.0–2.6]						0.9	37.5	54.6	5.6	0.9				0.5		
	Gentamicin	0.0	5.1	[2.2–8.3]					22.2	61.1	11.1	0.5				5.1				
	Kanamycin	0.0	2.8	[0.8–5.3]										94.4	2.8		0.5	2.3		
	Streptomycin	NA	14.4	[9.6–19.2]												85.6	3.7	10.6		
Aminopenicillins	Ampicillin	0.0	30.1	[24.1–36.7]							6.5	38.9	20.4	4.2		1.4	28.7			
β-lactamase inhibitor	Amoxicillin-clavulanic acid	2.3	3.7	[1.6–7.2]							3.7	17.6	45.8	26.9	2.3	3.2	0.5			
Cephalosporins (3rd generation)	Ceftiofur	0.0	0.9	[0.0–2.6]				10.2	69.0	17.6	2.3				0.9					
	Ceftriaxone	0.5	0.5	[0.0–2.6]					97.2	1.9						0.5		0.5		
Cephamycins	Cefoxitin	1.9	3.2	[1.3–6.6]							4.2	31.5	50.9	8.3	1.9	2.8	0.5			
Folate pathway inhibitors	Trimethoprim-sulfamethoxazole	NA	15.7	[11.2–21.3]				73.6	9.3	1.4				15.7						
Phenicols	Chloramphenicol	2.8	1.9	[0.5–4.7]								6.5	62.0	26.9	2.8		1.9			
Quinolones	Ciprofloxacin	0.0	9.3	[5.7–13.9]	79.2	1.9	1.4	4.2	3.7	0.5				9.3						
	Nalidixic Acid	NA	19.0	[14.0–24.9]							15.3	56.5	8.8	0.5		2.3	16.7			
Sulfonamides	Sulfamethoxazole/Sulfisoxazole	NA	23.1	[17.7–29.4]											66.2	10.2	0.5			23.1
Tetracyclines	Tetracycline	0.0	17.1	[12.4–22.8]									82.9			3.2	13.9			

[*]Percent of isolates with intermediate susceptibility, NA if no MIC range of intermediate susceptibility exists

[†]Percent of isolates that were resistant

[‡]95% confidence intervals (CI) for percent resistant (%R) were calculated using the Clopper-Pearson exact method

[§]The unshaded areas indicate the dilution range of the Sensititre plates used to test isolates. Single vertical bars indicate the breakpoints for susceptibility, while double vertical bars indicate breakpoints for resistance. Numbers in the shaded areas indicate the percentages of isolates with MICs greater than the highest concentrations on the Sensititre plate. Numbers listed for the lowest tested concentrations represent the precentages of isolates with MICs equal to or less than the lowest tested concentration. CLSI breakpoints were used when available.

Table A.4: *Escherichia coli* isolates with antimicrobial resistance, 2004

Year		**2004**
Total Isolates		**216**
Subclass	Antibiotic (Resistance breakpoint)	
Aminoglycosides	Amikacin (MIC ≥ 64)	0.5% 1
	Gentamicin (MIC ≥ 16)	4.6% 10
	Kanamycin (MIC ≥ 64)	2.3% 5
	Streptomycin (MIC ≥ 64)	13.9% 30
Aminopenicillins	Ampicillin (MIC ≥ 32)	30.1% 65
β-lactamase inhibitor combinations	Amoxicillin-clavulanic acid (MIC ≥ 32)	3.7% 8
Cephalosporin (1st generation)	Cephalothin (MIC ≥ 32)	Not Tested
Cephalosporins (3rd generation)	Ceftiofur (MIC ≥ 8)	0.5% 1
	Ceftriaxone (MIC ≥ 64)	0.5% 1
Cephamycins	Cefoxitin (MIC ≥ 32)	3.2% 7
Folate pathway inhibitors	Trimethoprim-sulfamethoxazole (MIC ≥ 4)	15.7% 34
Phenicols	Chloramphenicol (MIC ≥ 32)	1.9% 4
Quinolones	Ciprofloxacin (MIC ≥ 4)	9.3% 20
	Nalidixic Acid (MIC ≥ 32)	19.0% 41
Sulfonamides	Sulfamethoxazole/Sulfisoxazole (MIC ≥ 512)	23.1% 50
Tetracyclines	Tetracycline (MIC ≥ 16)	17.1% 37

Table A.5: Antimicrobial agents resistant to *Escherichia coli* , 2004

Year Total Isolates	2004 216
	% n
No resistance detected	55.6% 120
Resistance ≥1CLSI subclass*	45.4% 98
Resistance ≥2 CLSI subclasses*	25.0% 54
Resistance ≥3 CLSI subclasses*	16.2% 35
Resistance ≥4 CLSI subclasses*	9.7% 21
Resistance ≥5 CLSI subclasses*	6.9% 15
At least ACSSuT[†]	1.4% 3
At least ACSuTm[‡]	1.9% 4
At least ACSSuTAuCf[§]	0.0% 0
At least AAuC[¶]	0.0% 0
At least A3C**	0.0% 0
At least MDR-AmpC[††]	0.0% 0
Resistance to quinolone and cephalosporin (3rd generation)	0.5% 1

*CLSI: Clinical and Laboratory Standards Institute

[†]ACSSuT: resistance to ampicillin, chloramphenicol, streptomycin, sulfamethoxazole/sulfisoxazole, tetracycline

[‡]ACSuTm: resistance to ampicillin, chloramphenicol, trimethoprim-sulfamethoxazole

[§]ACSSuTAuCf: resistance to ACSSuT + amoxicillin-clavulanic acid, ceftiofur

[¶]AAuC: resistance to ampicillin, amoxicillin-clavulanic acid, ceftiofur

**A3C: resistance to amikacin, ampicillin, amoxicillin-clavulanic acid

[††]MDR-AmpC: resistance to ACSSuTAuCf + decreased susceptibility to ceftriaxone (MIC ≥2 µg/mL)

REFERENCES

1. Levy SB, Fitzgerald GB, Macone AB. Changes in intestinal flora of farm personnel after introduction of a tetracycline-supplemented feed on a farm. N Engl J Med 1976;295:583–8.
2. Schaberg DR, Culver DH, Gaynes RP. Major trends in the microbial etiology of nosocomial infection. Am J Med 1991;91(Suppl 3B):3B-72S–5S.
3. Van den Bogaard AE, Stobberingh EE. Epidemiology of resistance to antibiotics: links between animals and humans. Int J Antimicrob Agents 2000;14:327–35.
4. Corpet DE. Antibiotic resistance from food. N Engl J Med 1988;318:1206–7.
5. Clinical and Laboratory Standards Institute (CLSI). Performance Standards for Antimicrobial Susceptibility Testing; Sixteenth Informational Supplement. CLSI Document M100-S16. Clinical and Laboratory Standards Institute, Wayne, Pennsylvania, 2006.

APPENDIX B:
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

ACSSuT	Resistance to at least ampicillin, chloramphenicol, streptomycin, sulfamethoxazole/sulfisoxazole, and tetracycline
ACSSuTAuC	Resistance to at least ACSSuT , amoxicillin-clavulanic acid, and ceftiofur
ACSuTm	Resistance to at least ampicillin, chloramphenicol, and trimethoprim-sulfamethoxazole
CDC	Centers for Disease Control and Prevention
CI	Confidence interval
CLSI	Clinical and Laboratory Standards Institute
EIP	Emerging Infections Program
ELC	Epidemiology and Laboratory Capacity
EMB	Eosin methylene blue
ENTFM	*Enterococcus faecium*
ENTFS	*Enterococcus faecalis*
ERS	Enterococci Resistance Surveillance
FDA	Food and Drug Administration
FoodNet	Foodborne Diseases Active Surveillance Network
MDR-AmpC	Resistance to at least ACSSuT, amoxicillin-clavulanic acid, and ceftiofur, and decreased susceptibility to ceftriaxone (MIC ≥ 2 µg/mL)
MIC	Minimum inhibitory concentration
NARMS	National Antimicrobial Resistance Monitoring System for Enteric Bacteria
OR	Odds ratio
PCR	Polymerase chain reaction
PHLIS	Public Health Laboratory Information System
VRE	Vancomycin-resistant enterococci