Persistence of erythromycin resistance gene *erm*(B) in cattle feedlot pens over time

Amy R. Mantz¹, Daniel N. Miller¹, Mindy J. Spiehs², Bryan L. Woodbury², and Lisa M. Durso¹

¹USDA, ARS, 137 Keim Hall, UNL-East Campus, Lincoln, NE 68583, USA, ²USDA, ARS, Meat Animal Research Center, State Spur 18D, Clay Center, NE 68933, USA

OBJECTIVE:

Determine whether the distribution of erythromycin resistance gene erm(B) is associated with beef cattle fecal excretions and ascertain whether the gene is enriched in areas of feedlot pens with high manure deposition over time.



Background

- Erythromycin, a macrolide antibiotic that is commonly used to treat infections in humans, is on the World Health Organization's list of antimicrobial agents that are critical to human health.
- In cattle, related macrolides like Tylosin are used to treat respiratory disease, pneumonia, metritis, mastitis, and foot rot.
- Bacteria can develop resistance to macrolide antibiotics by encoding for a suite of more than 30 erm genes.
- Genes that code for antibiotic resistance enter the environment via

feces and have the potential to be transferred through agroecosystems and the food chain.

Methods

- Grab samples taken at 12 locations based of EMI values, over a year long period (June 2009-August 2010) from 10 pens.
- Samples (n=240) from initial and final collections analyzed for the erm(B) gene
- DNA was extracted from the soil, purified, then screened with PCR
- Statistical data was analyzed with ANOVA and Logistic procedures available in SAS Analysis program version 9.2.
 - Differences were considered significant at P ≤ 0.05 and were considered tendencies when the P-value ranged from P = 0.05 to P < 0.10.



Mapping of feedlot pens at two time points. High EMI readings (dark blue) have been previously correlated with areas of high manure deposition. Red dots indicate sites of *erm*(B) positive samples.

Statistical Differences between erm(B) positive and erm(B) negative sites*

	June 2009 76% <i>erm</i> (B) positive		August 2010 81% <i>erm</i> (B) positive	
	Edge	Mound	Edge	Mound
loisture, %	none	none	none	none
olatile Solids, %	none	none	none	P<0.05
otal S, g/kg DM	none	none	none	0.05 <p<0.1< td=""></p<0.1<>
otal N, g/kg DM	none	none	0.05 <p<0.1< td=""><td>P<0.05</td></p<0.1<>	P<0.05
otal P, g/kg DM	none	none	none	0.05 <p<0.1< td=""></p<0.1<>
otal K, g/kg DM	none	none	none	none
oil temperature, °C	none	none	none	none
urface temperature, °C	none	none	none	none
oil pH	P<0.05	none	none	none
hallow ECa, mS/m	none	none	P<0.05	none
eep ECa, mS/m	none	none	none	none

*Statistically significant differences were observed between mound and edge in 2009, but this trend was not supported once additional data was collected



ASA 2013 Annual Meeting POSTER # 1104

Thanks to Jennifer McGhee for providing technical assistance and guidance. Thanks to Alan Kruger, Todd Boman, John Holman, Dale Janssen, and Sue Wise for data collection and processing.

Presented at the
ASA, CSSA & SSSA
International
Annual Meeting,2013, Tampa,
Florida

14 months of manure accumulation did not result in a larger number of *erm*(B) positive soils

Distribution of *erm*(B) genes was not correlated with location of high manure deposition in feedlot

pens