

CHAIRE EN RECHERCHE AVICOLE Faculté de médecine vétérinaire

Research results and strategies on AMU reduction in Canadian poultry and their impact

Martine Boulianne, DMV, PhD, Dip ACPV Chair in Poultry Research, Faculty of Veterinary Medicine, University of Montreal



Outline of the presentation

- A quick Canadian portrait
 - Political structure and legislation
 - Structure of the Canadian broiler chicken industry
 - Some statistics
- -Brief description of the Chair in Poultry Research
- A short history on AMR and AMU surveillance programs
 - CIPARS surveillance program
 - = 2003 annual report on Salmonella Heidelberg data and Quebec voluntary ban
 - -Chicken Farmers of Canada
 - CIPARS results and Media influence on public perception
 - Publication by Dutil et al.,
 - CFC internal study on AMU and producers' perception
 - Meetings with the poultry industry stakeholders
 - Chair in Poultry Research
 - -Various research projects to support the poultry producers in adopting changes

Where is Canada located?



Canada: provinces and territories





Antimicrobial use

- Federal: drug licensing
- Provincial: Drug use regulations
 - Differences between provinces in terms of
 - Veterinary prescription
 - Access to medications

Structure of the poultry industry

- No vertical integration
- At the basis: the producer
- Different segments:
 - ChickenTurkey
 - Commercial eggs
 - Incubation eggs

Structure of the poultry industry

- Poultry production in Canada is managed by a supply management system which was created in the 70s
- Producers must acquire quotas to produce
- Price paid to the producer is based on production costs
- Production is predicted according to consumption

Structure of the Canadian chicken industry

Université 就



Some Canadian statistics...

- Per capita consumption: 35,8 kg of chicken (2021)
- 2877 chicken producers
- Sustains 101,900 jobs
- 1,3 Billions kg (eviscerated weight) in 2021
- 185 processors and further processors
- Contributes \$8 billion to Canada's GDP

https://www.chickenfarmers.ca/good-for-canada/

https://agriculture.canada.ca/en/international-trade/market-intelligence/reports/customized-report-service-canadian-poultry-meat-trends



Canadian broiler chicken production

	PARA ALLAND						
	Starter phase	Gro	wth phase		Fin	isher phase	
0 d	ay 10 d	lays		28 c	days	35 days	
	Antibiotics Anticoccidials		tibiotics coccidials			ibiotics occidials	
		Conventional prevention programs					

★Previous use of ATM at the hatchery



Chair in Poultry Research

- Established in May 1999
- First industry Chair at the Faculté de médecine vétérinaire

Founding members

Quebec Poultry Producers Quebec Egg Board Quebec Hatchery association Quebec Poultry Abattoir Association Quebec Incubation Egg Producers

































Antibiotics categorization in Canada

Categories	Preferred option for treatment of serious human infections	No or limited alternatives available
I- Very high importance	Yes	Yes
II- High importance	Yes	No Importa
III- Medium importance	No	No/yes medicin
IV- Low importance	Not applicable	Not applicable

D

*Serious infections are considered those which if left untreated would lead to significant morbidity requiring emergency care including hospitalization and/or mortality.



Antibiotics used in poultry, based on their categorization

Categories	Antibiotic class
I- Very high importance	Cephalosporins 3 rd generation (Ceftiofur) Fluoroquinolones (Enrofloxacin)
II- High importance	Aminoglycosides (<u>Spectinomycin</u> ¹ , gentamycin, neomycin, streptomycin) Lincosamides (<u>Lincomycin</u> ¹) Macrolides (<u>Tylosin</u> ¹ , erythromycin) Penicillin (Penicillin G, amoxicillin) Streptogramins (<u>Virginiamycin</u> ¹) Trimethoprim – sulfamethoxazole (combination)
III- Medium importance	<mark>Bacitracin</mark> ^I Sulphonamides (Sulfamethazine, sulfaquinoxaline) Tetracyclines
IV- Low importance	<mark>Ionophors</mark> ^I Flavophospholipol (Bambermycine)

Not categorized: Chemical coccidiostats¹ and Orthomycin (<u>Avilamycin</u>¹)

¹ Frequently used in prevention programs



In 2003 and 2004

- CIPARS reports the emergence of ceftiofur-resistant
 Salmonella Heidelberg in both retail chicken and humans
- Observed mostly in the province of Quebec
- Quebec hatcheries decide on a voluntary withdrawal in February 2005

Ceftiofur resistance in Salmonella Heidelberg in 2003





In 2003 and 2004

- CIPARS reports the emergence of ceftiofur-resistant
 Salmonella Heidelberg in both retail chicken and humans
- Observed mostly in the province of Quebec
- Quebec hatcheries decide on a voluntary withdrawal in February 2005
- ... with partial reinstitution of ceftiofur use in 2007 (in rotation)



In 2003 and 2004

Dutil et al., 2010.



Figure 2. Prevalence of ceftiofur resistance (moving average of the current quarter and the previous 2 quarters) among retail chicken *Escherichia coli*, and retail chicken and human clinical *Salmonella enterica* serovar Heidelberg isolates during 2003–2008 in Québec, Canada.















CIPARS Design and Methods







Field trial on ABF chicken flocks Results (one year prospective study in 8 farms)

- Even with similar management and feed, necrotic enteritis affected 25% of the flocks
 - Clostridium perfringens can persist in consecutive flocks





Field trial on ABF chicken flocks



Results (one year prospective study in 8 paired barns)

- Even with similar management and feed, necrotic enteritis affected 25% of the flocks (Clostridium perfringens a resident of the barn microflora?)
- Importance of coccidia prevention
- Importance of optimal brooding







https://www.cra-fmv.org/poussin-podium



In 2011 chickens became a problem to the public



Chicken Farmers of Canada launched a voluntary strategy in 2012





AMU legislative changes

*The strategy involved preventive uses only

** To be determined, ongoing review of the impact

***Enhanced veterinary oversight/veterinary prescription only use, removal of growth promotion claims in some antibiotics, and mandatory reporting of sales and distribution data.







AMU at the hatchery

Vertical transmission of ceftiofur resistance genes, virulence genes of ExPECs and antimicrobial resistance profiles in breeders and their progeny after ceftiofur ban in broiler hatcheries

Verify if the removal of ceftiofur from the hatchery decreased resistance to this antibiotic in *E. coli* strains, 12 months after withdrawal



Vertical transmission of ceftiofur resistance genes, virulence genes of ExPECs and antimicrobial resistance profiles in breeders and their progeny after ceftiofur ban in broiler hatcheries





Withdrawal of *in ovo* ceftiofur administration ^U can lead to reduced prevalence of resistant genes in meconium

for		Somplingvoor	No of samples	% samples with one or more isolates positive for:		
Sdfl	nple	Sampling year	(isolates)		bla _{CMY-2}	bla _{стх-м}
Declard for	oc Duocdou	2014	22 (110)	68	0	0
Pooled fec	es Breeder	2015	1 (4)	0	100	0
	Ceftiofur	2014	20 (100)	45	90ª	20ª
Meconium	LS	2015	16 (80)	56	50 ^b	0 ^b
	Without AM	2015	14 (70)	71	36 ^b	0 ^b
	Ceftiofur	2014	20 (100)	50	60ª	5
Pooled feces	LS	2015	16 (80)	69	44 ^b	6
Broiler	Without antimicrobial	2015	14 (70)	43	50	0

Replacing ceftiofur with another molecule is not the answer...



Antimicrobial use (AMU) reduction of preventive antibiotics in broiler chickens



- Commercial field trial in collaboration with the industry
 - One-yr prospective study in paired barns on 7 farms
 - Strategies to reduce ATB use in broiler chickens
 - □ Impact on performances and intestinal health
 - □ Impact of antibiotic on caecal microbiota composition

Antimicrobial use (AMU) reduction of preventive antibiotics in broiler chickens



CHAIRE EN RECHERCHE AVICOLE Faculté de médecine vétérinaire







Immunology, Health and Disease

Impacts of antibiotic reduction strategies on zootechnical performances, health control, and *Eimeria* spp. excretion compared with conventional antibiotic programs in commercial broiler chicken flocks

Eric Parent *, [†], Marie Archambault [†], Robert J. Moore [‡], Martine Boulianne *, [†] A 🖾

7ootechnical parameter	Ionophores (n = 21)		Ionophores and butyric acids (n = 21)		Conventional (n = 42)		P -value	
	Mean	SE	Mean	SE	Mean	SE	\frown	
Slaughter weight (kg)	2.44	0.07	2.41	0.04	2.43	0.03	0.40	
Feed conversion ratio	1.62	0.04	1.64	0.02	1.64	0.02	0.23	
Average daily gain (g/D)	66.7	1.1	65.7	1.1	66.1	0.9	0.34	
Age at slaughter (days)	36.7	1.0	36.7	0.3	36.6	0.3	0.66	
Mortality (%)	2.92	0.58	3.03	0.38	3.18	0.33	0.43	
Total condemnations (%)	1.74	1.17	1.62	1.17	1.70	1.15	0.64	

Factors explaining the microbiota variation

Effect size and significance of farm-level factors with the microbiota composition evaluated by the ANOSIM (n = 1002).

	ANOSIM (analysis of similarities)		
Factor	R-value	p-value	
Paired flocks	0.37	0.001	
Farm	0.24	0.001	
Feed mill	0.12	0.001	
ATB program	0.04	0.002	
Hatchery	0.04	0.017	









Consequence of the bans?

- Increased early mortality (variable)
- Emergence of Enterococcal spondylitis and osteomyelitis
 - Mostly Enterococcus cecorum
 - Multi-resistant bacteria
- Increased use of Category II antibiotics in some provinces

CIPARS captured human and animal data before and after the voluntary intervention by the industry – public health impact

Figure 47. Temporal variation in frequency of ceftriaxone resistance (%) among all Salmonella serovars as well as ceftiofur use (% of flocks) by host species (chicken and human) and CIPARS surveillance component, 2003-2019



Source: **CARSS Report, 2022**. https://www.canada.ca/en/public-health/services/publications/drugs-health-products/canadian-antimicrobial-resistance-surveillance-system-report-2022.html#a4.5.1



44



CIPARS AMU and AMR surveillance in broiler chickens

- AMU has decreased since 2016, as well as resistance to ≥ 3 antimicrobial classes in Salmonella, E. coli, and Campylobacter
- The diversity of antimicrobial classes reported to be used has **decreased**, consistent with the timing of the elimination of preventive uses of Category II antimicrobials.



CIPARS Farm - Integrated AMU and AMR



Acknowledgements

- To the first Canadian veterinary epidemiologists who developed CIPARS
 - To Drs Rebecca Irwin and Lucie Dutil for their leadership
 - To Dr. Agnes Agunos for her contagious smile and generous support
- To Canadian poultry producers for accepting such a challenge
- Staff and students from the Chair in Poultry Research