Research Article

Identification of Shiga toxin producing *E. Coli* from raw Meat

Abdul Razzaq^{1*}, Sadia Shamsi², Aisha Nawaz³, Aisha Nawaz³, M. Irfan⁴ and K. A. Malik⁴

1. Institute of Molecular Biology and Biotechnology, The University of Lahore-Pakistan

2. Department of Pharmacy, The University of Lahore-Pakistan

3. Lahore College for Women, Lahore-Pakistan

4. Department Biological Sciences, Forman Christian College, Chartered University, Lahore-Pakistan

*Corresponding author's email: biolformanite@gmail.com

Citation

Abdul Razzaq, Sadia Shamsi, Aisha Nawaz, Aisha Nawaz, M. Irfan and K. A. Malik. Identification of Shiga toxin producing *E. Coli* from raw meat. Pure and Applied Biology. Vol. 5, Issue 2, 2016, pp255-262.

<http://dx.doi.org/10.19045/bspab.2016.50033>

Received: 28/12/2015

Revised: 11/02/2016

Accepted: 26/02/2016

Online First: 04/03/2016

Abstract

Emergence of Shiga toxin genes in Shiga toxin producing *E. coli* (STEC), all over the world, has become problematic and causes GIT illnesses in human originating in food of animals mainly from poultry. The aim of this study was to render rapid diagnostics of Shiga toxin producing *E. coli* (STEC) from raw meat. During a 4 month period from May to August a total of 200 samples were collected from beef (100) and chicken (100) and analyzed for Shiga toxin producing *E. coli*. Of the total of 200 samples of raw meat only chicken (2%) and beef (1%) were detected as PCR positive. Over the past decade many improvements have been made both in conventional and modern technique for detection of bacterial pathogens in food that include sample preparation, plating techniques, counting and identification kits but polymerase chain reaction technique is increasingly used which is considered more specific, sensitive, rapid and cost effective. Raw meat could be a source of Shiga toxin producing *E. coli* which indicates that possible risks of infections to people could be transferred by the consumption of raw meat and their rapid diagnostics could be made possible by the use of rapid diagnostic technique polymerase chain reaction.

Key words: STEC; *Stx*; Raw meat *Stx*; Foodborne pathogens

Introduction

In the intestinal micro flora of humans and mammals *Escherichia coli* (*E. coli*) are predominantly found. A German pediatrician 'Theodor Escherich' in 1885 discovered *E. coli* belonging to a family Enterobacteriaceae and this bacterium is one of the inhabitants of intestine. These commensals never cause a problem in their host but some pathogenic *E. coli* are involved in diarrhea and other enteric

illnesses and are called diarrheagenic *E. coli*. It harmlessly colonizes the intestine but several strains of *E. coli* cause various intestinal diseases. *E. coli* are described as Gram negative, facultative anaerobe, non-spore forming; rod shaped and is generally motile [1]. It has been divided into six pathotypes that includes atypical enteropathogenic *E. coli* (ATEC), enteropathogenic *E. coli* (EPEC), enteroaggregative *E. coli* (EAEC),

enterotoxigenic *E. coli* (ETEC), enterohemorrhagic or Shiga toxin producing *E. coli* (EHEC/STEC) and enteroinvasive *E. coli* (EIEC) [2]. These pathotypes indicate the plasticity of *E. coli* genome and the genome of STEC O157:H7 contains 5416 genes in 5.5×10^6 base pairs of DNA [3] which is considered the most prominent and notorious STEC and its incidence varies according to age group and in most of the cases the etiological agent is food stuff [4].

Shiga toxin producing *E. coli* (STEC) is responsible for causing an increasing number of human outbreaks, characterized by bloody diarrhea, non-bloody diarrhea, hemorrhagic colitis and hemolytic uremic syndrome (HUS) and 85% of these cases are implicated with foodborne transmission. *stx* is further subdivided into two families' *stx1* and *stx2* on the basis of sequence analysis. The cardinal virulent factors, of STEC are *stx1* and *stx2* and are referred as cytotoxic [2, 5].

The association of STEC outbreaks has been considered with a variety of dairy products especially raw meat and milk if they are not properly cooked or boiled [6]. A number of reports have been submitted on the sources of transmitting the STEC such as water [7], yogurt [8] and airborne [9] as well. Human outbreaks of STEC are more derived from ground beef than any other source [6]. In particular, ruminants and cattle are considered the primary source of *E. coli* O157:H7 [10, 11]. It was also reported that person to person contact is also a source for the transformation of STEC and it was also manifested that STEC is shed by the infected person through stool even after a month of recovery [12].

Centre for disease control (CDC), U.S. department of agriculture and public health officials inspected two outbreaks of STEC O26 infection and used PulseNet system to identify illnesses that were part of the outbreak. Public health officials detected

initial and large outbreak through local foodborne disease surveillance in Washington and Oregon and it was reported that illnesses were caused by and increased by eating at multiple and Chipotle Mexican Grill locations in late October 2015. A total of 55 cases were counted from 11 states that included deaths (0) and hospitalization (21). Second and smaller outbreak was identified of different but rare strains of STEC O26 in three different states. A total of 3 states were counted from 3 states that included deaths (0) and hospitalization (1). The number of ill people reported from each state was: Kansas (1), North Dakota (1) and Oklahoma (3) [13].

Due to number of constraints, the conventional approaches for detection of foodborne pathogens were replaced by polymerase chain reaction in advanced countries. In Pakistan, however, the PCR has not been currently evaluated for its efficacy for the detection of foodborne pathogens from beef, mutton, chicken and milk due to the paucity of information on the PCR based detection of foodborne pathogens. The conventional approaches to detect food related bacteria rely on the selective enrichment and culture characteristics followed by biochemical characterization. These methods are time consuming, labor intensive and often not reliable in contrast to PCR which is a rapid molecular test with high sensitivity and specificity

Material and method

A total of 200 samples including raw chicken (100) and beef (100) were collected in PBS from various regions of Lahore and were carried to the laboratory under refrigerated conditions. After the enrichment of these samples in tryptic soya broth, were streaked on MacConkey agar for the identification of *E. coli* and then on Sorbitol MacConkey agar for the differentiation of pathogenic and non-pathogenic *E. coli* after

overnight incubation at 37°C aerobically. The confirmation of *E. coli* was done by conducting two biochemical tests, the catalase test using a drop of 3% hydrogen peroxide and gently mixed with the colonies of *E. coli* isolated of plates and a triple sugar iron test by preparing a butt to the 3/4th portion of the test tube and then gently pulled back the loop and streaked on the slant area without lifting up the loop. The tubes were plugged properly with cotton plug and incubated at 37°C for overnight aerobically.

Finally, the detection of STEC (*Stx1* and *Stx2*) was confirmed by employing a molecular approach polymerase Chain Reaction which proved to be a rapid and

reliable method for the detection of foodborne bacterial pathogens. For the detection of Shiga toxin1 (*stx1*) and Shiga toxin2 (*stx2*) on all the isolates of *E. coli* from the samples of raw meat, a molecular approach was conducted i.e. polymerase chain reaction (PCR). This molecular approach was designed for the detection of virulence genes of *E. coli* isolates. Primers with unique sequences were used for the detection of the targeted genes and a primer sequence is available in tabular form in (Table#1). All PCR reagents were supplied by Thermo scientific USA and all PCR assays were performed in PCR Master Cyclor (Eppendorfs Germany).

Table 1. PCR primers used in this study

Target gene	Primer name	Sequence 5-3	Amplicon size
<i>Stx1</i>	KS7 (F)	CCCGGATCCATGAAAAAACATTATTAATAGC	282bp
	KS8 (R)	CCCGAATTCAGCTATTCTGAGTCAACG	
<i>Stx2</i>	LP43(F)	ATCCTATTCCTGGGAGTTTACG	584bp
	LP44(R)	GCGTCATCGTATACACAGGAGC	

KS7 and KS8 primers were used for the identification of *stx1* gene. Final mixture of PCR reaction was 25 µl with 2.0 µl bacterial cells as template, 15.3 µl autoclaved water, 2.5 µl of 10X *Taq* buffer, MgCl₂ 1.5 µl, 0.5 µl of dNTPs (5 mM each of dATP, dCTP, dGTP, dTTP), 1.5 µl each of forward and reverse primer (20 pmol) and 0.2 µl of DNA *Taq* polymerase (5.0 U/ µl). Thermal cycler conditions used for *Stx1* were, Initial denaturation was adjusted at 95°C for 10 min. *stx1* gene was amplified for 30 cycles, each cycle with 30 seconds of denaturation at 94°C, 1 min for primer annealing at 52°C and 1min for extension at 72°C followed by final extension at 72°C for 5 min and for *Stx2* using primers LP43 and LP44, After initial denaturation at 95°C for 10 minutes amplification of DNA product for each cycle were for repeated 30 cycles with denaturation at 94°C for 30 seconds, primer

annealing at 57°C for 1 minute, extension at 72°C for 1.5 minutes followed by final extension at 72°C for 5 minutes.

Results

Of the total 200 samples of raw chicken and beef, cultured on MacConkey agar, showed 78 and 65 lactose fermenting pink colonies of *E. coli* respectively. These colonies were then incorporated for further confirmation of *E. coli* using biochemical tests.

Triple sugar iron test (TSI) was performed on these pink colonies of *E. coli* for the confirmation of *E. coli* in which yellow color of the medium in all test tubes was observed which indicated the fermentation of all three sugars such as sucrose, lactose and glucose that led to the determination of *E. coli*. In addition to TSI, another biochemical test, catalase test was conducted on the same number of pink colonies for the confirmation of *E. coli* and a moderate

reaction was observed with precipitation or bubbling which indicated the presence of *E. coli*.

After these biochemical confirmations these rose pink colonies of *E. coli* were further preceded for the determination of STEC using molecular methods. All plates with pink colonies of chicken (78%) and beef (65%) were streaked on SMAC. SMAC displayed Sorbitol fermenting (SF) rose pink

colonies 53 and 33 respectively and non-Sorbitol fermenting (NSF) colorless colonies 25 and 32 respectively (Table 2). These NSF colonies of chicken and beef were detected as PCR positive with 2% of chicken and 1% of beef harboring STEC genes either *stx1* or *stx2* while none of the SF colonies were detected as PCR positive (Figure 1, 2, 3 & 4).

Table 2. Isolation frequency of *E. coli* (STEC) from various sources

Sampling source	sample collected	+ve for <i>E. coli</i> on MAC	+ve for <i>E. coli</i> on TSI	+ve for <i>E. coli</i> Catalase	+ve for <i>E. coli</i> SMAC	PCR +ve	percentage
Chicken	100	78	78	78	53SF/25NSF	0/2	2%
Beef	100	65	65	65	33SF/32NSF	0/1	1%
Total	200	143	143	143	86/57	0/3	3%

Figure 1. PCR (Chicken). Lane M: Molecular weight marker of 1kb. (Thermo scientific-Gene Ruler, 0.1 µg / µl, 50 µg), Lane 1: Amplification product of 282 bp for *Stx1* gene in positive control strain EDL933, Lane 2: No amplification in negative (Master Mix-Template) control strain, Lane 6 & 7: Showing amplification product of 282 bp of *Stx1* gene, Lane 3, 4 & 5: Showing empty wells

Figure 2. PCR (Beef). Lane M: Molecular weight marker of 1kb. (Thermo scientific-Gene Ruler, 0.1 µg / µl, 50 µg), Lane 1: Amplification product of 282 bp for *Stx1* gene in positive control strain EDL933, Lane 2: No amplification in negative (Master Mix-Template) control strain, Lane 3: Showing empty well, Lane 4: Showing amplification product of 282 bp of *Stx1* gene.

Figure 3. PCR (Chicken) Lane M: Molecular weight marker of 1kb. (Thermo scientific-Gene Ruler, 0.1 µg / µl, 50 µg), Lane 1: Amplification product of 584 bp for *Stx2* gene in positive control strain EDL933, Lane 2: No amplification in negative control strain (Master Mix-Template), Lane 7 & 10: Showing amplification product of 584 bp of *Stx2* gene, Lane 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 9, 11, 12 & 13: Showing negative samples

Discussion

Foodborne infections are caused by the consumption of contaminated food with bacteria, parasites and viruses [14]. Shiga toxin is a deadly bacterial strain usually causes foodborne illnesses and often associated with beef contamination, giving weekend state to the young, weak or elders. *E. coli* appears in various forms like O157, producing Shiga toxin along with the emergence of HUS [15].

The pathogenicity of *E. coli* O157:H7 is ascribed with some virulence factors such as Shiga toxins *Stx 1* and *Stx 2* [16] which are encoded with *Stx* family and cytotoxic effects are manifested by this pathotype on endothelial cells of kidney, heart and brain [2].

From 200 samples of raw meat and milk *E. coli* was identified using plate methods incorporating MacConkey agar, Sorbitol

Figure 4. PCR (Beef). Lane M: Molecular weight marker of 1kb. (Thermo scientific-Gene Ruler, 0.1 µg / µl, 50 µg), Lane 1: Amplification product of 584 bp for *Stx2* gene in positive control strain EDL933, Lane 2: No amplification in negative control strain (Master Mix-Template), Lane 5: Showing amplification product of 584 bp of *Stx2* gene, Lane 3, 4, 6, 7, 8 & 9 & 10: Showing negative samples

MacConkey agar, triple sugar iron test and catalase test. Sorbitol MacConkey agar differentiated NSF and SF. These NSF colonies were further tested for PCR as these colonies were regarded as pathogenic. It is revealed from a study that from 220 samples of diarrheagenic patient only 59% was having *E. coli* using MacConkey agar as initial identification. Sorbitol fermenting and non-sorbitol fermenting phenotype was identified on SMAC [17].

In present study the collection of samples was done between the months June to August and it was noted the positive testing was prevalent during these months. The elevation in ambient temperature is more favorable and plausible for incidence of STEC, thereby resulting in the constant source of infections. According to this information on elevation of temperature, the prevalence of STEC could be expected

more, as observed, in summer season from June to August and this pathogen STEC was found in this duration to the detectable level in raw meat.

In a survey of United Kingdom, it was reported that the positive testing of *E. coli* O157:H7 was only in the months between May and September. The positive testing of *E. coli* O157:H7 was more prevalent between June-September in United State [18].

In present study for the identification of STEC a PCR approach was employed using gene specific primers targeting virulent genes *Stx1* and *Stx2* and monitored with a reference strain EDL933. The specificity of PCR was validated using a reference strain and was further evaluated on 200 isolates of raw meat of different geographical regions. The PCR approach was conducted for rapid and reliable identification of STEC on enrichment of samples instead of using DNA isolation procedures and plate labor intensive methods to replace the traditional tedious techniques. Out of 200 samples of chicken and beef and only 3 number of samples were detected as positive harboring STEC genes either *stx1* or *stx2*. Of the 3, hundred samples of each chicken and beef carried STEC 2% and 1% respectively.

Detection methods based on nucleic acid have been developed for nearly all bacterial pathogens, based on hybridization assays PCRs targeting the gene region or specific sequence of a gene. Several problems may be encountered for the direct detection of pathogens from the food samples: contamination in sensitive PCR assay, PCR inhibition by food components and detection of living as well as dead cells [19]. As described above two virulent genes were selected from the bacterium Shiga toxin producing *E. coli*: *Stx1* and *Stx2*. By incorporating the PCR primers and other components, became able to develop a PCR for the detection of these genes. An

important factor to evaluate DNA based test is the specificity of DNA sequence chosen for gene of interest which is going to be targeted [20]. The ability of PCR is to detect or amplify a gene or a segment of a gene directly from the sample containing various bacterial strains. One major problem in detecting the gene directly from the sample which often encountered with PCR is the reduction in sensitivity [21].

To overcome the PCR inhibition problems and to increase its sensitivity, enrichment method was employed. Enrichment method increased the number of required viable count while dead organisms reduces the probability of detection and even 2µl of the enrichment was able to produce the PCR results which indicate the PCR sensitivity and specificity.

Conclusion

In conclusion, I developed a rapid, simple and convenient PCR-based method for the specific detection of one of the major food borne pathogens. This method rendered final results in hours rather than lengthy and equally expensive biochemical methods. Application of this method in food industries and municipal water supply departments is an additional benefit attributed to this technique.

Authors' contributions

Conceived and designed the experiments: MM Gillani & KA Malik, Performed the experiments: A Razzaq, Analyzed the data: A Razzaq, Contributed reagents/ materials/ analysis tools: S Shamsi, Wrote the paper: A Razzaq.

References

1. Xia X, Meng J, McDermott PF, Ayers S, Blickenstaff K, Tran TT, Abbott J, Zheng J & Zhao S (2010). Presence and characterization of shiga toxin-producing *Escherichia coli* and other potentially diarrheagenic *E. coli* strains in retail meats. *Appl Environ Microbiol* 76(6): 1709-1717.

2. Muller D, Greune L, Heusipp G, Karch H, Fruth A, Tschape H & Schmidt MA (2007). Identification of Unconventional Intestinal Pathogenic *Escherichia coli* Expressing Intermediate Virulence Factor Profiles with a Novel Single Step Multiplex PCR. *Appl Environ Microbiol*
3. Perna NT, Plunkett G, Burland V, Mau B, Glancer JD, Rose DJ, Mayhew GF, Evan PS, Gregor J, Kirkpatrick HA, Posfai G, Hackett J, Klink S, Boutin A, Shao Y, Miller L, Grotbeck EJ, Davis NW, Lim A, Dimalanta ET, Potamousis KD, Apodaca J, Anantharaman TS, Lin J, Yn G, Schwartz DC, Welch RA & Blattner FR (2001). Genome sequence of enterohemorrhagic *E. coli* O157: H7. *Nat* 409: 529-533
4. World Health Organization (2007). First formal meeting of foodborne diseases. Burden epidemiology reference group (FERG), Geneva, WHO
5. Schmidt H, Scheef J, Huppertz HI, Frosch M & Karch H (1999). *Escherichia coli* O157:H7 and O157:H2 strains that do not produce Shiga toxin: phenotypic and genetic characterization of isolates associated with diarrhea and hemolytic-uremic syndrome. *J Clin Microbiol* 37: 3491-3496.
6. Josefa MR, Phyllis H, Sparling CC, Patricia MG & David LS (2005). Emerging Infectious Diseases. www.cdc.gov/eid.11 (4).
7. Halabi M, Orth D, Grif K, Wiesholzer-pittl M, Kainz M, Schoberl J, Dierich MP, Allerberger F & Wurznner R (2008). Prevalence of Shiga toxin-intimin and haemolysin genes in *E. coli* isolates from drinking water supplies in a rural area of Austria. *Intl J Hyg Environ Health* 211: 454-457.
8. Morgan D, Gunneberg C, Gunnell D, Healing TD, Lamerton S, Soltanpoor N, Lewis DA & White DG (1994). An outbreak of *Campylobacter* infection associated with the consumption of unpasteurized milk at a large festival in England. *Europ J Epidemiol* 10: 581-585.
9. Bender JB, Hedberg CW, Boxrud DJ, Besser JM, Wicklund JH, Smith KE & Osterholm MT (2001). Use of molecular subtyping in surveillance for *Salmonella enterica* serotype typhimurium. *N Engl J Med* 344: 189-195.
10. Tom S, Edrington TR, Sam EI, Mike JE, Mike LL, Robin CA & David JN (2006). Seasonal Shedding of *Escherichia coli* O157:H7 in Ruminants: A New Hypothesis. *Foodborne Pathog and Dis* 3(4): 413-421.
11. Griffin PM and Tauxe RV (1991). The epidemiology of infections caused by *Escherichia coli* O157:H7, other enterohemorrhagic *E. coli*, and the associated hemolytic uremic syndrome. *Epidemiol Rev* 13: 60-98.
12. Ludwig K, Ruder H, Bitzan M, Zimmermann S & Karch H (1997). Outbreak of *E. coli* infection in large family. *Eur J clin Microbiol infect Dis* 16: 238-241.
13. CDC (2016). Multistate Outbreaks of Shiga toxin-producing *Escherichia coli* O26 Infections Linked to Chipotle Mexican Grill Restaurants (Final Update)
14. Thompson D.E. (1994). The role of mycobacteria in Crohn's disease. *J. Med. Microbiol.* 41: 74-94.
15. Cebula TA, Payne WL & Feng P (1995). Simultaneous identification of strain of *E. coli* serotype O157:H7 and their shiga like toxin type by mismatch amplification mutation assay-multiplex PCR. *J Clin Microbiol* 33: 248-250.
16. Chen S, Xu R, Yee A, Wu KY, Wang CN, Read S & De Grandis SA (1998). An automated fluorescent PCR method for detection of Shiga toxin-producing

- Escherichia coli* in foods. *Appl Environ Microbiol* 64: 4206-4210.
17. Mohsin M, Ali A, Sarwar A, Bashir Y, Tariq S, Afzal A, Ifthikhar A & Saeed MA (2010). Effect of ampicillin, gentamicin, and cefotaxime on the release of Shiga toxins from Shiga toxin producing *Escherichia coli* isolated during a diarrhea episode in Faisalabad, Pakistan. *Foodborne Pathog Dis* 7: 85-90.
 18. Chapman PA, Malo ATC & Ellin M (2001). *Escherichia coli* O157 in cattle and sheep at slaughter, on beef and lamb carcasses and in raw beef and lamb products in South Yorkshire, UK. *Int J Food Microbiol* 64: 139-150.
 19. Heyndrickx MN, Rijpens & Herman L (2001). Molecular detection and typing of foodborne bacterial pathogens. *Appl Microbiol* 11: 193-238.
 20. Winters DK, O'Leary AE & Slavik MF (1998). Polymerase chain reaction for rapid detection of *Campylobacter jejuni* in artificially contaminated foods. *Lett Appl Microbiol* 7: 163-167.
 21. Mousavi SL, Rasooli I, Nazarian S & Jafar A (2009). Simultaneous detection of *Escherichia coli* O157:H7, toxigenic *Vibrio cholerae*, and *Salmonella typhimurium* by multiplex PCR. *Iran J of Clin Infect Dis* 4(2): 97-103.