Salmonella in pigs

Skaarup René, Cota Joao, Ljubojevic Dragana, Simon Plinio, Jon-Blaauw Fenja, Ramos Sonia

Why is Salmonella in pigs an important meat borne hazard?

- 2nd most common FBP in the EU
- Salmonella is widespread in pigs but most animals are asymptomatic carriers
- Pig meat and pork products are among the major sources of Salmonella
- Most freq. Serovars among the top 5 serovars infecting humans
 - S. Typhimurium
 - S. Typhimurium monophasic
 - S. Derby

Farm categorization

			m A				Farm B			L	Farm C				L	Farm 0		
	Yes	No	ot know	N/A	Yes	No	ot know	N/A		Yes	No	ot know	N/A		Yes	No	ot know	1 1
arm type											No				Yes			
arrow-to-finishing herd	Yes					No					No						x	
ig farrow-to-finishing herd (more than 200 sows)		No				No				Yes				1		No		Г
nishing herd		No			Yes					Yes						No		t
Ul-In-All-Out	Yes					No												
ivestock housing and facilities																		T
alid flaar		No			Yes					Yes						No	<u> </u>	t
latted floor	Yes	110			10.3	No				10.3	No					No		
ccess to slurry and manure		No			Yes	110				Yes	110				Yes	110		t
ndoor holding with possibility to have access to outdoor		No			 Yes				-	105	no				165	No		t
permanent outdoor holding (free-range farm)		No			165	No	<u> </u>		-		No				Yes	nu		t
traw bedding		No	<u> </u>		 Yes	NO			-	Yes	NO				105	<u> </u>	×	╀
		NO	<u> </u>		 105					105					<u> </u>		×	╀
ivestock feed and water																		╈
reat treatment of feed	Yes						x			Yes					Yes			4
ommercial feed	Yes					No				Yes						No		+
use of municipality water for drinking the animals	Yes					No				Yes						No		4
nicrobiological safe water	Yes						x			Yes							x	4
cification of feed	Yes						х					х				No		4
almonella testing of feed	Yes						х					х					х	4
anitation system for lorries entering the farm	Yes						х				No				Yes			4
est control																		
est control system in place	Yes					No				Yes						No		
ird control	Yes					No				Yes						No		
ontact with other animals than birds (wildlife)		No			Yes						No				Yes			
ccess of other animals to the stable (pets, e.g. cats)		No			Yes				1	Yes					Yes			T
ivestock sourcing																		Г
igh number of pig suppliers		No			Yes						No			1			×	Т
ourchase of Salmonella negative pig (30kg)		No				No				Yes							×	
ourchase of Yersinia negative pig (30kg)		No				No						×					×	Т
ourchase of Toxoplasma negative pig (30kg)		No				No						×					×	t
ositive Salmonella serological status before slaughter (indirect test)			×			No						x					×	t
ositive Yersinia serological status before slaughter (indirect test)			x				x					×			<u> </u>		×	t
positive Toxoplasma serological status before slaughter (indirect test)			x				x					x			<u> </u>		x	t
positive HEV serological status during fattening (indirect test)			x		 		x					×			<u> </u>		x	t
positive FIEV serological status during fattening (lindrect test) positive Salmonella test results during fattening (direct test, e.g. PCR, culture)		No	<u> </u>				x			Yes		<u> </u>			Yes	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	t
positive Samonena test results during fattening (direct test, e.g. PCR, culture)		NO	x				x			105		x			105	<u> </u>	x	t
positive Tersinia test results during fattening(direct test, e.g. PCR, culture) positive Toxoplasma test results during fattening(direct test, e.g. PCR, culture)		<u> </u>							-	<u> </u>					<u> </u>			+
			x				x			———		x			<u> </u>		x	+
positive HEV test results during fattening (direct test, e.g. PCR, culture)			×				×					×					×	+
ulling of Salmonella-positive animals	Yes						x					х			Yes			4
ivestock health																		┢
almonella vaccination	Yes					NO					No						x	4
leworming of sows	Yes						x				No						x	1
feworming of finishers	Yes				Yes						No						×	1
arm is equipped with suitable facilities to isolate sick or injured pigs	Yes				Yes					Yes					Yes			4
Aedicines																		1
ntibiotic group treatments		No					x					x				No		ſ
nedicines for treatmet used only when necessary and prescribed by a Vet			x				x					x					x	Γ
Aanagement, Quality control																		Г
witten procedure for cleaning and disinfection	Yes				Yes					Yes						No		t.
otation of disinfectants	Yes						x		1	yes							x	T
ontrolled access to the stable	Yes					No			1	Yes					Yes			T

Criteria to categorize the farms?

- Difficult to compare
- Focus on Salmonella prior to slaughter
- No serological testing carried out on farms of the exercise
- Evidence of positive animals relies only on fecal testing of finishing pigs

Categorizing abattoirs on FSMS and RBC tools

- High performing (abattoir 1)
 - FSMS tool: 15.5/20 = 77.5%
 - Risk-based categorization tool 2: 2.8%

- Low performing (abattoir 2)
 - FSMS tool: 3.88/20 = 19.4%
 - RBC tool: 80.6%

- Medium performing (abattoir 3)
 - FSMS tool: 8.66/20 = 43.3%
 - RBC tool: 55.6%

Which pigs go to which abattoir?

- High performing
- Medium performing needed)
- Low performing

- \rightarrow all kind of farms (anticipate on hazard)
- \rightarrow low risk, medium risk farms (additional actions
- \rightarrow low risk farms (purchase policy)

Conclusions

- The proposed tools are very useful for categorization of abattoirs.
- Suggestion: a tool for categorization of farms according to different hazards.
- Risk managing for OV and FBO can have different point of views.

Performance of the abattoirs and its impact on Salmonella

- The ability/capacity to adjust the process towards a more hygienic one.
- Target Performance objective in chilled carcasses