Table 2: Salmonella in raw materials

raw materials (28 strains *Salmonella*/125 samples)		
raw materials	**Group**	**Salmonella (species)**
SOJA	E	SENFTENBERG
SOJA	C	ARDWICK/RISSEN
SOJA	C	ARDWICK/RISSEN
SOJA	E	SENFTENBERG
SOJA	E	SENFTENBERG
SOJA	C	ARDWICK/RISSEN
SOJA	E	SENFTENBERG
SOJA	E	GRUPPO E (non tipizzata)
SOJA	E	GRUPPO E (non tipizzata)
CRUSCA	E	SENFTENBERG / IDIKAN
SOJA	C/ not categorised	KEDOUGOU/MBANDAKA
SOJA	C/E	S. MONTEVIDEO/RISSEN
SOJA	E	MUENSTER
SOJA	E	HAVANA
SOJA	E	ENTERICA Subsp. ENTERICA
SOJA	B	TYPHIMURIUM
SOJA	E	MUENSTER
SOJA	E	SENFTENBERG
SOJA	not categorised	DERBY
SOJA	C	MONTEVIDEO
SOJA	E	ENTERICA Subsp. ENTERICA
SOJA	not categorised	MBANDAKA

Table.3: Salmonella in non-medicated composite feed

non-medicated composite feed 4positive /179 samples	
group	*Salmonella* (species)
C	KENTUCKY
not categorised	BRAENDERUP
D	ENTERITIDIS
not categorised	ENTERICA Subsp. ENTERICA

9) EVALUATION OF AN ADDITIVE EFFICACY IN BROILER LITTER MICROBIAL LEVEL CONTROL IN FIELD: PRELIMINARY RESULTS

G. Tacconi[1], P. Casagrande Proietti[1], R. Ventura[2], R. Arcaro[2], M. Pennacchi[2]

[1]Dipartimento di Scienze Biopatologiche Veterinarie, Università di Perugia, Italy [2]Laurea in SPA

Corresponding author: Prof. Giuseppina Tacconi. Dipartimento di Scienze Biopatologiche Veterinarie, Sezione di Patologia e Igiene Veterinaria, Università degli Studi di Perugia - Facoltà di Medicina Veterinaria, Via S. Costanzo,4 - 06126, Perugia, Italy. Tel: +39755857736. Fax: +39755857738 - E-mail: gtacconi@unipg.it

ABSTRACT The present study was conducted to evaluate in field the efficacy of an additive (SOP® C Poultry), as an agent for the control of micro-organisms in broiler litter. The Total aerobic Microbial Count, Staphylococcus spp., Coliforms, and Salmonella spp. in broiler litter samples of both the Houses, 2 and 3, were determined, and also at the end of each cycle the mortality rate was recorded. The results showed significant differences of all the microbial counts between treated litter samples and the control. Significant resulted also the difference in mortality rate recorded between H2 and H3.

Key words: litter additive, environment, broiler, TMC, Coliforms, Stapylococcus spp., Salmonella spp., mortality.

Prova di efficacia di un additivo di nuova concezione nel controllo di alcune componenti microbiche della lettiera di polli da carne. Primi risultati.

RIASSUNTO Prove di campo sono state effettuate per valutare l'efficacia di un prodotto igienizzante di nuova concezione (SOP® C Poultry), nel controllo di alcune componenti microbiche della lettiera di polli da carne. Sono stati considerati, come parametri la Carica Microbica Totale aerobia (CMT), Staphilococcus spp., Salmonella spp. e Coliformi ed inoltre alla fine di ogni ciclo è stata valutata la percentuale di mortalità. I risultati hanno mostrato una significativa riduzione dei valori medi per ciascuno dei parametri microbiologici valutati nei campioni di lettiera trattata rispetto al controllo; significativa è risultata anche la riduzione della percentuale di mortalità riscontrata nel capannone trattato rispetto al controllo.

Parole chiave: prodotto igienizzante, lettiera, ambiente, polli da carne, CMT, Coliformi, Staphyloccus spp., Salmonella spp., mortalità.

Introduction

The environment in the poultry house is a combination of physical and biological factors which interact as a complex dynamic system of social interactions, husbandry system, light, temperature and the aerial environment (Sainsbury,1992; Kristensen and Wathes, 2000). The high stocking density in the modern poultry house may lead to reduce air quality with high concentrations of aerial pollutants (Curtis and Drummond, 1982; Maghirang et al., 1991; Feddes and Licsko, 1993; Kristensen and Wathes, 2000). Their concentrations in poultry houses approach, and sometimes exceed, recommended occupational limits for humans (Kristensen and Wathes, 2000). Litter is considered one of the major sources of pollutants in poultry houses, then the need to ménage it using additives has been considered since the last past years (Vanchev et al., 1989; Nestof and Petkov, 1994; Ivanov, 2001) but has not yet been resolved conclusively. The present study investigated the use of an additive as an agent for the control of micro-organisms in broiler litter, and also the possible effect on the mortality.

Material and methods

Planning. This study was carried out from February 2002 to March 2004 in two large commercial broiler houses, House2 and House3 (H2 and H3) of one Umbrian Company farm, in which broilers were reared to 7-8 weeks of age. The buildings were of conventional layout. The litter was cut wheat straw. In H2 and H3 the ventilation system comprised 2 propeller fans of 40,000 m^3/hour and 26,000 m^3/hour capacity each, mounted on the windward side of the poultry house to increase the velocity of the air as it blows through the building.

Treatment. Litter in H2 was treated as follow: 2 g. of additive plus 25 g. of calcium carbonate per m^2 were added to the litter the day before the arrival of the chicks, and the treatment repeated every two weeks until the end of each cycle. After the first month the additive dose was reduced to 1 g. per m^2.

Additive. The field trials were performed with Calcium sulphate (gypsum) and essential oils (lemon grass and lavender) used as carriers. By the SIRIO OPERATING PROCESS® method such components are activated by an energetic modulation process and enriched with oxygen and specific information about litter components.

Samples. Litter was sampled one day during the first and the seventh week of each cycle. Composite samples of about 500 g. were obtained from ten different sites within each house and placed immediately into sterile plastic bags, sealed and refrigerated until microbiological evaluation was made.

Microbiological analysis. Twenty-five grams of each sample was transferred into a sterile plastic bag and 225 ml of sterile 1% buffered peptone water was added. After treatment with Stomacker Circulator 400 (PBI, Milan) the samples were allowed to sit for 30-45 min at room temperature with frequent shaking. One ml of this samples (1:10 dilution) was diluted serially via 10-fold dilutions (from 10^{-1} to 10^{-8}).Total aerobic bacteria, *Staphylococcus* spp. (*Staph*. spp.), *Salmonella* spp. and Coliforms in 1 g^{-1} of litter were determined by plating, in duplicated, 0.1-ml of appropriate dilution on SPGCA (Standard Plate Count Agar), BP (Baird Parker agar) and VRBA (Violet Red Bile Agar). The cultures were incubated at 37°C for 24-48 hr and the number of grown colonies was determined. The *Salmonella* spp. isolation procedure used in this study included Selenite-Cystine broth and Rappaport-Vassiliadis broth (Oxoid, Milan), as enrichment media and two plating media. The Selenite-Cystine Broth was incubated aerobically at 37° C for 24 hours and the Rappaport-Vassiliadis broth was incubated aerobically at 43° C for 24 hours. The subcultures from the enrichment media were made onto Hectoen enteric agar (Oxoid) and then incubated aerobically at 37° C for 24 hours. The composition of each selective medium is detailed in the OXOID Manual.

Mortality rate was recorded at the end of each eight cycles.

Statistical Analysis. The mean values of all parameters evaluated were compared by t-test.

Results and discussion

The results from eight cycles on treatment of litter are summarised in Table 1 and 2. Significant differences between experimental and control samples, with regard both the microbial cell counts (Table 1), and the mortality (Table 2) were observed. Also the bacterial counts of the treated litter were reduced to about 70 % of the control values. Sex strains of *Escherichia coli* were isolated throughout the sampling period: 3 strains (1 from H2 and 2 from H3) during 2002-2003, and 3 strains (1 from H2 and 2 from H3) in 2004. Standard procedures were used to identify *E. coli,* which do not differentiate between pathogenic and non pathogenic. The number of *E. coli* in the litter, like total aerobic bacteria, *Staphylococcus* spp., and Coliforms resulted in treated litter lower than the control house litter.

The treatment of the litter proved to be effective in control of some microbial litter components. Of interest is the reduced mortality rate of broilers because in field conditions the health problems are known to be associated with litter.

Although all litter sampled was examined for *Salmonella* spp. none was found.

Several workers suggested that bird health is harmed by chronic exposure to modest burdens, especially in the presence of simultaneous challenge by respiratory pathogens (Anderson et al., 1964; Oyetunde et al., 1978; Carpenter et al., 1986), but the concentration of most pollutants often rises in poultry houses. The rise is consequence of an increased generation rates from the major sources, that is the birds themselves and particularly the litter, which acts as a nutritious reservoir for micro-organisms (Conceição et al., 1989). Our data pointed out the high litter bacteria concentrations, considered common in broiler houses (Ivanov, 2001), and make its control essential for better health and performance of birds.

The data of the present study seem to indicate a significant reduction of the bacteria evaluated in the treated litter. Based on the results of these field trials, it was concluded that the additive studied during this investigation has an inhibitory effect on the survivals of micro-organisms in broiler house litter.

Table 1. Results of some microbial parameters in litter samples from H2 (treated with SOP® C POULTRY) and H3 (control) (mean values from eight cycles are expressed in CFU/g^{-1}).

Parameters	*TMC*	*TMC*	*Staph*. spp.	*Staph*. spp.	*Coliforms*	*Coliforms*
Dilution	10^{-8}	10^{-8}	10^{-8}	10^{-8}	10^{-6}	10^{-6}
Houses	treated	control	treated	control	treated	control
μ	153,69	416,42	31,14	185,48	58,05	328,34
t test	0,0078		0,0021		0,0541	
%	-63,1		-83,21		-82,32	

Table 2. Mortality rate (%) recorded at the end of eight cycles in H2 and H3 (treated with SOP® C POULTRY and control).

Cycles	1st	2nd	3rd	4th	5th	6th	7th	8th
treated	5	4,3	3,1	8,4	3,4	3,1	3,3	3,9
control	9	4,7	4,3	10,8	5,7	3,4	5,1	4,5

P= 0,00106

Acknowledgements

The writers wish to express their gratitude to the SOP S.r.l. for furnishing the additive used in this study and for providing financial support for the project.

Il lavoro è stato supervisionato dal traduttore di madre lingua della Facoltà di Medicina Veterinaria di Perugia.

REFERENCES

1. Anderson, D.P., Beard, C.W. & Hanson, R.P. 1964. The adverse effects of ammonia on chickens including resistance to infection with Newcastle disease virus. Avian Diseases. 8: 369-379
2. Carpenter, G.A., Smith, W.K., Maclaren, A.P.C. & Spackman, D. 1986. Effects of internal air filtration on the performance of broilers and the aerial concentrations of dust and bacteria. British Poultry Sci., 27:471-480.
3. Conceição, M. A. P., Johnson, H. E. & Wathes, C. M. 1989. Air hygiene in a pullet house: Spatial homogeneity and aerial pollutants. British Poultry Science. 7: 189-198.
4. Curtis, S. E., & Drummond, J. G. 1982. Air environment and animal performance. In : Handbook of Agricultural Productivity, volume 2, Animal Productivity (Rechcigl, M. Jr, Ed.) CRC Press Inc, Florida, USA.
5. Feddes, J. J. R. & Licsko, Z. J. 1993. Air quality in commercial turkey housing. Canadian Agricultural Engineering. 35: 147-150.
6. Kristensen H. H. & Wathes, C. M. 2000 Ammonia and poultry welfare: a review. World's Poultry Science Journal. 56: 235-245.

7. Ivanov, I. E. 2001. Treatment of boiler bitter with organic acids. Research in Veterinary Science, 70, 169-173.
8. Netsov, N., & Petkov, G. 1944. Zoohygiene, Sofia, 17-19:284-285.
9. Maghirang R. G., Manbeck, H. B., Roush, W. B. & Muir, F. V. 1991. Air contaminant distributions in a commercial laying house. Transactions of the American society of Agricultural Eingeneering. 34: 2171-2180.
10. Oyetunde, O.O. F., Thomson, R. G. & Carlson, H. C. 1978. Aerosol exposure of ammonia, dust and *Escherichia coli* in broiler chickens. Canadian Veterinary Journal. 19: 187-193.
11. Sainsbury, D. 1992. Poultry Health and Management- Chickens, Turkeys, Ducks, Geese, Quail, 3rd ed, Blackwell scientific Ltd, Oxford, UK.
12. Vanchev, T., Donchev, R., & Kaitazov, G. 1989. Poultry breeding, Sofia, 147-149.