

Scotland's Rural College

## Measurement of antimicrobial usage & resistance

Humphry, RW

*Published in:*  
SEFARI

Print publication: 01/09/2018

*Document Version*  
Other version

[Link to publication](#)

*Citation for pulished version (APA):*

Humphry, RW. (2018). Measurement of antimicrobial usage & resistance. In *SEFARI*

### General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the public portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the public portal ?

### Take down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

SEFARI



# Measurement of Antimicrobial Usage & Resistance

Roger Humphry,

Epidemiology Research Unit, Inverness

SEFARI Conference, Edinburgh, 25<sup>th</sup> September 2018

*Leading the way in Agriculture and Rural Research, Education and Consulting*

# Epidemiology of AMR in faecal *E. coli*




- Higher (sample level) prevalence in diarrhoeic calves than non-diarrhoeic calves
- Higher (sample level) prevalence in calves, compared to adult cows. Lowest in sheep

Table: prevalence of samples from healthy calves, adult cows and sheep testing resistant to three antimicrobials

	<b>Ampicillin</b>	<b>Apramycin</b>	<b>Nalidixic Acid</b>
<b>Calves</b>	<b>87.8%</b>	<b>15.2%</b>	<b>7.38%</b>
<b>Adult cows</b>	<b>47.0%</b>	<b>3.36%</b>	<b>1.94%</b>
<b>Sheep</b>	<b>20.6%</b>	<b>4.55%</b>	<b>0.785%</b>


# AMU: difficult to measure



# Importance of measurement



AMR Systems Map – Influences on the development of AMR  
Animals and the Environment







# What measures of AMR are available?



	Phenotypic	Genotypic
Isolate level test	Minimum Inhibitory Concentration (MIC) determination, Disk diffusion	PCR, Whole genome sequencing
Whole sample level test	Streak plating, Spiral plating, Spread plating, Disk diffusion,	PCR, Whole genome sequencing

# 40 ruminant faecal samples – isolate level V sample level



		Sample level (Streak plating method)	
Ampicillin			
Isolate level		Sensitive	Resistant
Based on	<b>Sensitive</b>	 <p>26</p>	 <p>8</p>
Minimum Inhibitory Concentration (MIC) of 8 isolates	<b>Resistant</b>		 <p>0</p>



# RESAS (WP2.2.6) 2016-2021 comparison of methods



- Samples (n=189) from >1 study, in which *E. coli* was detected
- Sample level V isolate level (disk diffusion)
- Prevalence estimates (ampicillin): 60% V 2%

Sample level – Ampicillin streak plate score	Isolate level	
	Sensitive	Resistant
Sensitive	74	1
Resistant	111	3



# Prevalence

---



- Comparisons of prevalence between studies only meaningful if the same measure was used.
- In the literature the most common measure of resistance is based on a single isolate per sample – this gives lower estimates of prevalence than whole sample techniques.

# Future studies

---



- Exploring a method of serial dilution to enumerate the density of all *E. coli* and density of resistant *E. coli*
- If this method is successful then we aim to replicate measurement of AMR at more than one level (isolate, sample, animal) – where does variation lie?

# Measurement of AMR: Should we be worried?

---



- We should be aware of the massive differences the different measures of AMR make.
- We should be concerned that we don't know what the best measures of AMR are for progressing the knowledge base.
- We should be aware that most published studies don't consider the choice of measurement.

