

**Epidemiological dynamic potential of transboundary *Salmonella* spp. in meat sold at retail markets in the middle Mekong basin area**

Dethaloun Meunsene<sup>1</sup>, Prapas Patchanee<sup>2</sup>, Phacharaporn Tadee<sup>3</sup>, Pakpoom Tadee<sup>2\*</sup>

<sup>1</sup>*Graduate Program in Veterinary Science, Faculty of Veterinary Medicine, Chiang Mai University, Chiang Mai, 50100, Thailand*

<sup>2</sup>*Integrative Research Center for Veterinary Preventive Medicine, Faculty of Veterinary Medicine, Chiang Mai University, Chiang Mai, 50100, Thailand*

<sup>3</sup>*Faculty of Animal Science and Technology, Maejo University, Chiang Mai, 50290, Thailand*

**\* Corresponding author:** Pakpoom Tadee

Integrative research center for Veterinary Preventive Medicine, Faculty of Veterinary Medicine, Chiang Mai University, Mae Hia, Muang, Chiang Mai, 50100, THAILAND.

Tel: +66 53 948023, Fax: +66 53 948062, E-mail: [td.pakpoom@gmail.com](mailto:td.pakpoom@gmail.com)

26 **Abstract**

27 **Background:** The surrounding areas of the middle Mekong basin, particularly along the border  
28 line between Thailand and Lao People's Democratic Republic (Lao PDR), ~~is~~are considered to  
29 be a high-risk area for many livestock-associated foodborne illnesses, especially salmonellosis.

30 ~~The aim of this study was~~study aimed to determine the prevalence and characteristics of  
31 *Salmonella* spp. contaminated in pork, beef and chicken meats sold at retail markets in the  
32 Thailand-Laos border area surrounding the Thai-Lao Friendship Bridge I from January to May  
33 2019. This study focused on the ~~characteristics of the serotype~~serotype characteristics,  
34 antimicrobial susceptibility testing and the genotype based on multilocus sequence typing  
35 (MLST) of the relevant *Salmonella* strains. The findings will make a significant contribution  
36 to the current understanding of *Salmonella* epidemiology ~~with the aim of enhancing~~to enhance  
37 food security in the region.

**Commented [D1]:** Did you mean genotyping?

**Commented [D2]:** Shift to conclusion part of abstract

38 **Results:** From a total of 370 meat samples collected, 63% were ~~found to be~~ positive for  
39 *Salmonella*, with the prevalence of 73%, 60% and 56% from pork, beef and chicken meat  
40 samples, respectively. Of all the positive samples, 53 serotypes were identified. Of these, *S.*  
41 London accounted for the majority (27%), followed by *S. Corvallis* (14%), and *S. Rissen* (6%).  
42 Resistance against tetracycline was found at the highest frequency (50%), followed by  
43 ampicillin (35%) and sulfamethoxazole-trimethoprim (28%). MLST revealed ~~that no evidence~~  
44 ~~of shared genetical relatedness of *Salmonella* at retail~~no evidence of shared genetic  
45 relatedness of *Salmonella* at retail sites among Thailand-Laos border zone. However, a diverse  
46 range of *Salmonella*~~their~~ genotypes had been spread over the area. Besides, the persistence of  
47 the residential pathogen and sharing of the supply route within-country can be inferred.

**Formatted:** Font: Italic

**Commented [D3]:** Add how it can be inferred i.e. can be inferred from .....

48 **Conclusions:** Regular disinfecting of all working areas ~~along with quality control checking at~~  
49 ~~the pre-retail stage must be applied to reduce the transmission of *Salmonella* as well~~nd quality

50 control checking at the pre-retail stage must be applied to reduce the transmission of  
51 Salmonella and other foodborne pathogens downstream consumers.

Formatted: Font: Italic

53 **Key-words:** *Salmonella*; retail market; MLST; Thailand-Laos border; middle Mekong basin

Commented [D4]: Add keywords of methods, and methodology

## 55 Introduction

56 *Salmonella* spp. is an ~~important~~significant causative agent of certain foodborne illnesses in  
57 humans and can be found ~~all over the world~~worldwide (Sirichote et al., 2010; Van Boxtael et  
58 al., 2012; Basler et al., 2016). Annually, ninety million cases resulting in 150,000 deaths among  
59 salmonellosis patients have been counted (Campioni et al., 2012). Along with the direct effects  
60 of *Salmonella* spp. on the gastrointestinal tract, the evidence of drug resistance is also a ~~major~~  
61 significant public health concern (Foley & Lynne, 2008; Kurtz et al., 2017; Jajere, 2019).  
62 Consequently, a reduction in the first line of empirical treatments and limitations associated  
63 with treatment choices ~~are listed as the main factors that have influenced~~is listed as the main  
64 factors influencing the current situation (Van Boxtael et al., 2012).

65 Livestock products (farm animal-origin food), especially meats, are ~~known to be~~ an important  
66 source of human salmonellosis (Heyndrickx et al., 2002; Mainali et al., 2009; Rostagno &  
67 Callaway, 2012). ~~Considering the food production chain, retail~~ Retail markets have been  
68 identified as the most significant point of contact for salmonellosis exposure and transmission  
69 among humans (Hauser et al., 2011; Gomes-Neves et al., 2012). Furthermore, improper  
70 management at locations ahead of the marketplace, such as farms and/or slaughterhouses, also  
71 contribute to the chances of increased pathogen loads at the retail site. This can occur either  
72 directly or through contaminated equipment due to improper handling practices or unsuitable  
73 storage conditions (Lo Fo Wong et al., 2002).

Commented [D5]: Use major or similar words with statistics showing the proportion of cases due to livestock

Commented [D6]: Consider using either of two conjunctions

Commented [D7]: Incomplete sentence. Also clarify "This" by stating it clearly in start of sentence.

74 Nowadays, an ~~increase in demand~~ has led to an intensive transformation of the animal  
75 production industry (Guardabassi et al., 2008). Good Management Practices (GMP) must be  
76 implemented at all ~~levels of production~~production levels to ensure an optimum level of food  
77 safety for consumers. However, these practices cannot be 100% implemented in certain  
78 developing regions such as the middle Mekong basin and the surrounding area, particularly  
79 along the border between Thailand and Lao People's Democratic Republic (Lao PDR). Animal  
80 farming practices are being used extensively in traditional free-range and small-holder  
81 backyard systems, which often employ the minimum in ~~terms of~~ hygienic sanitation systems.  
82 Moreover, inadequate practices in slaughterhouses and retail outlets, such as on-floor  
83 slaughtering and uncontrolled storage conditions in purchasing areas, are considered incautious  
84 ~~methods of practice~~practice methods. Additionally, cultural preferences and an inadequate  
85 level of awareness among local people ~~with regard to~~about raw meat consumption, as well as  
86 an absence of reliable and high-quality resources, such as clean water and cooking supplies,  
87 are also considered important risk factors (Wilson, 2007; Conlan et al., 2014; Okello et al.,  
88 2017). All of the above-mentioned situational conditions are acknowledged as the potential  
89 predisposing factors of several foodborne diseases such as salmonellosis (Mughini-Gras et al.,  
90 2014; Ferrari et al., 2019). In 1994, the Thai-Lao Friendship Bridge I linking Nong Khai  
91 Province, Thailand and the Vientiane Capital of Lao PDR was officially opened. More than  
92 three million people cross the bridge each year (Australian Embassy, Thailand, 2011). These  
93 people cross by way of ~~both private and public vehicles to engage in trade and the exchange~~  
94 ~~of private and public vehicles to engage in trade and exchange~~ various products. Therefore, the  
95 chances of pathogen transmissions between border-line communities are likely to be high.  
96 In a study of *Salmonella* prevalence in the meat being sold surrounding the Thailand-Laos  
97 border region, Sinwat et al., (2016) reported that the prevalence of pork contamination in ~~the~~  
98 ~~border areas of Thailand and Laos PDR~~ was 65%. Moreover, Boonmar et al., (2013) reported

Commented [D8]: Increase in demand of ??

99 that the prevalence of contaminated pork and beef in southern-Laos PDR was 93% and 82%,  
 100 respectively. Both studies reported a widespread variety of serotype distribution including *S.*  
 101 Typhimurium, *S. Derby*, *S. Anatum* or *S. Rissen*. Interestingly, almost all strains of *Salmonella*  
 102 are currently classified as multidrug-resistant strains. However, based on the data that has been  
 103 studied, there is a ~~clear~~ evident lack of reported information on poultry meat, while it is well  
 104 known that poultry meat is commonly consumed in this area. Additionally, ~~in order to gain~~  
 105 ~~access to in-depth epidemiological information, a study of the pathogen characteristics at the~~  
 106 ~~genetic level should be fulfilled in order to~~ gain access to in-depth epidemiological information,  
 107 a study of the pathogen characteristics at the genetic level should be fulfilled to expand upon  
 108 the scope of epidemiological knowledge of these pathogens. Multilocus sequence typing  
 109 (MLST) technique is one of the methods employed in our study. This technique relies on ~~a~~  
 110 ~~comparison of the sequences of allele types in a specific group for each set of house-keeping~~  
 111 ~~genes~~ comparing the sequences of allele types in a specific group for each set of house-keeping  
 112 genes and focuses on the genetics in orders and focuses on the genetics to assemble data of the  
 113 sequence type (ST). The resulting findings can be compared with the information ~~presented in~~  
 114 ~~a number of~~ various databases related to the study of the global bacterial dynamic distribution  
 115 and their genetic evolution (Liu et al., 2011; Patchanee et al., 2017).

116 The purpose of the study was to investigate the prevalence of *Salmonella* in meat sold at retail  
 117 markets in the middle Mekong Basin area along the border of Thailand and Lao PDR,  
 118 surrounding the Thai-Lao Friendship Bridge I. Together with comparing the expressive and  
 119 characteristics (serotypes, ~~antimicrobial~~ antimicrobial-resistant patterns ~~and ST type~~) of  
 120 ~~*Salmonella* to expand upon the epidemiological knowledge of pathogen distribution, and ST~~  
 121 ~~type) of *Salmonella* to expand upon pathogen distribution epidemiological knowledge.~~ The  
 122 findings from this study would be ~~extremely usefu~~ instrumental in ~~the creation of~~ creating

Commented [D9]: Correct sentence formation

123 appropriate preventive measures that would help control the spread of human salmonellosis in  
124 the region.

125

## 126 **Materials and methods**

### 127 **Sample collection**

128 The sample size of this study was determined using the Win Epi online program  
129 (<http://www.winepi.net/uk/index.htm>). ~~For each parameter used, the degree of prevalence~~  
130 ~~identified in the previous study was used as the “expected prevalence”~~The degree of prevalence  
131 ~~identified in the previous study was used as the “expected prevalence” for each parameter used.~~

132 Rates of 65% (Sinwat et al., 2016), 73% (Trongjit et al., 2017) and 82% (Boonmar et al., 2013)  
133 were chosen to calculate the sample sizes for pork, chicken and beef, respectively. Furthermore,  
134 8.5% and 95% were selected as the “accepted error” and “confidence level” values,  
135 respectively, for the required feature inputs. For the infinite population, a minimum of 121, 105  
136 and 79 samples of pork, chicken and beef were designated, respectively. However, in order to  
137 achieve even greater levels of accuracy and reliability, additional samples were carefully  
138 chosen.

139 During the period of time from January to May, 2019, 370 samples (121, 133 and 116 samples  
140 of pork, chicken and beef, respectively) were carefully collected from five retail markets in  
141 Vientiane Capital, Lao PDR and six retail markets in Nong Khai Province, Thailand. All  
142 samples were then individually labeled, put into plastic packs and stored in an icebox for  
143 laboratory analysis within 24 hr at the Department of Veterinary Medicine, Faculty of  
144 Agriculture, National University of Laos, Nabong Campus, Lao PDR.

145

### 146 **Salmonella isolation and identification**

**Commented [D10]:** why high accepted error of 8.5% was chosen? Explain.

**Commented [D11]:** Use either period or time. Prefer period

147 Isolation and identification of *Salmonella* spp. from meat samples (pork, chicken, beef) were  
148 performed following ISO6579: 2002 Amendment 1:2007, Annex D technique. Accordingly,  
149 25 g of samples were enriched with 225 ml of Buffered Peptone Water (BPW; Merck,  
150 Germany). The mixing materials were homogenized for 120 sec and incubated at 37°C for 18-  
151 24 hr. An aliquot of 100 µl of the pre-enriched inoculum was transferred to 10 ml of Rappaport-  
152 Vassiliadis broth (RV; Oxoid, England) at 42°C for an incubation period of 24-48 hr. The likely  
153 colonies were streaked on Xylose-Lysine-Desocholate agar (XLD; Oxoid, UK) and Brilliant-  
154 green Phenol Red Lactose sucrose agar (BPLS; Merck, Germany). After an incubation period  
155 of 18-24 hr at 37°C, the plates were then inspected. The presumptive colonies were then placed  
156 on Triple Sugar Iron agar (TSI; Oxoid, England), urease and Motility Indole-Lysine agar (MIL;  
157 Merck, Germany). An analysis of the strains indicated a correct bio-chemical reaction as  
158 positive for *Salmonella*. Finally, all results were then recorded. *Salmonella* prevalence with a  
159 95% confidence level along with evidence of an association between a *Salmonella* positive  
160 proportion and the relevant specifications (location or meat type) were determined by  
161 descriptive statistical analysis and fisher's exact test, respectively. All analyses were completed  
162 using Epi Info™ version 7. Statistically significant levels were determined at p<0.05.

163

#### 164 Serotyping and Antimicrobial susceptibility testing

165 All detected *Salmonella* spp. specimens were serotyped using the serum-agglutination test  
166 according to the White-Kauffmann-Le Minor scheme (Popoff et al., 1993). This was made  
167 possible by a contribution from the Bacteriology Section, Veterinary Research and  
168 Development Center (Upper Northern Region), Lampang, Thailand. All strains were also run  
169 through antimicrobial susceptibility testing with agar disk diffusion using ten panels of  
170 antimicrobial agents. These agents were comprised of amoxicillin-clavulanic acid (AMC)  
171 20/10 µg, ampicillin (AMP) 10 µg, chloramphenicol (C) 30 µg, ciprofloxacin (CIP) 5 µg,

**Commented [D12]:** Time intervals are given in range. Try to give specific time interval provided at each step. If there was a difference in interval of different sample types, state.

**Commented [D13]:** What analysis? State.

**Commented [D14]:** Rephrase or shift to acknowledgement

**Commented [D15]:** rephrase

172 cefotaxime (CTX) 30 µg, nalidixic acid (NA) 30 µg, norfloxacin (NOR) 10 µg, streptomycin  
173 (S) 10 µg, sulfamethoxazole-trimethoprim (SXT) 23.75/1.25 µg and tetracycline (TE) 30 µg.  
174 (CLSI, 2011). Strains that existed with intermediate resistance were grouped as being  
175 susceptible in order to avoid overestimation. Strains that resisted  $\geq 3$  of the antimicrobial agents  
176 were considered ~~multidrug-multidrug~~-resistant.

### 178 Multilocus sequence typing (MLST)

179 Randomly selected 38 specimens of ~~38~~ *Salmonella* obtained from the most frequently found  
180 serotypes were genotyped using the MLST technique. Total numbers of DNA genomics were  
181 extracted according to the protocol described by Liu et al., (2011). Seven housekeeping genes,  
182 including *aroC* (chorismate synthase); *dnaN* (DNA polymerase III beta subunit); *hemD*  
183 (uroporphyrinogenIII cosynthase); *purE* (phosphoribosylaminoimidazole carboxylase); *sucA*  
184 (alpha ketoglutarate dehydrogenase); *hisD* (histidinol dehydrogenase) and *thrA* (aspartokinase  
185 I/homoserine dehydrogenase), were selected for MLST profiling. PCR amplification of all 7  
186 genes was accomplished using the method previously described by Kotetishvil et al., (2002).  
187 Subsequently, the products were sent to be sequenced at the Macrogen Service Center,  
188 Republic of Korea.

189 The sequences obtained in each gene (Supplementary file 1) were transformed into allele  
190 numbers, and were compiled according to the sequence type (ST) data obtained from the  
191 <http://mlst.warwick.ac.uk/mlst/> database. Finally, all data of the *Salmonella* strains acquired  
192 from this study were analysed. A phylogenetic tree was constructed using Bionumerics®  
193 software version 7.6 (Applied Maths, Belgium).

### 195 Results

Commented [D16]: Not clear.

Commented [D17]: Are these sequences submitted to a public data base or repository besides being supplied as supplementary material?  
It is advisable to deposit any sequence data to make it widely available.

Commented [D18]: Spell out all number < 10

196 A total of 370 meat samples were collected ~~during the period of~~from January to May 2019.  
 197 Subsequently, 135 samples from six retail markets in Nong Khai Province, Thailand and 235  
 198 samples ~~from five in Vientiane Capital~~, Lao PDR were included. With regard to the meat types,  
 199 121, 133 and 116 samples of pork, chicken and beef were obtained, respectively (**Table S1**).  
 200 The overall prevalence of *Salmonella* spp. was found to be 62.70% (232/370; 95% CI: 57.67-  
 201 67.48%). In consideration of the sampling locations, the degree of prevalence of the samples  
 202 collected from Laos PDR (70.21%; 165/235) was statistically higher than the samples collected  
 203 from the Thai sampling sites (49.63%; 67/135) ( $p < 0.05$ ). In terms of measuring each meat type,  
 204 the degree of prevalence of the *Salmonella* spp. positive results found in pork, chicken and beef  
 205 were 72.73% (88/121), 55.64% (74/133) and 60.34% (70/116) in that order. The percentage of  
 206 prevalence from the samples recovered from pork was significantly higher than from the  
 207 chicken samples ( $p < 0.05$ ), but ~~this figure~~ tended to be higher ~~comparing compared~~ with the  
 208 beef samples ( $p = 0.05$ ). **Table 1** demonstrates the distribution details of *Salmonella* spp.  
 209 positives with 95% confidence intervals among the different locations and sample types.  
 210 From the overall *Salmonella* strains, 53 serotypes were identified by serum-agglutination  
 211 according to the White-Kauffmann-Le Minor scheme (**Table 2**). The highest degree of  
 212 frequency was found in *S. London* (26.99%; 61/232), followed by *S. Corvallis* (13.79%;  
 213 32/232), *S. Rissen* (6.47%; 15/232) and *S. Weltevreden* (6.03%; 14/232), respectively. ~~With~~  
 214 ~~regard to the locations of the collected samples, those 4 serotypes were also noted as being in~~  
 215 ~~the majority for all locations with the exception of S. London, only 2 strains were identified in~~  
 216 ~~the Thai samples.~~ Stratifying for each meat type, *S. London* was the most common serotype  
 217 detected from the pork and beef samples. For the chicken samples, the highest degree of  
 218 frequency was found for *S. Corvallis*. Interestingly, there were just three serotypes, *S. London*,  
 219 *S. Rissen*, *S. Corvallis* and *S. Typhimurium*, that were distributed among all meat types.

Commented [D19]: Five what?

Commented [D20]: rephrase

220 All 232 *Salmonella* strains were submitted for antimicrobial susceptibility testing.  
 221 Consequently, 76 of them (32.75%) were classified as multidrug resistant strains. Resistance  
 222 to tetracycline (49.57%; 115/232) was found in the highest frequency, followed by ampicillin  
 223 (35.34%; 82/232), and sulfamethoxazole-trimethoprim (28.45%; 66/232), respectively. On the  
 224 other hand, 94 strains (40.52%) were found to be susceptible to all of the tested antimicrobials.  
 225 Additionally, only 3 strains (1.29%) were found to be resistant to cefotaxime, while 5 (2.16%)  
 226 and 6 strains (2.59%) were found to be resistant to norfloxacin and ciprofloxacin, respectively.  
 227 In terms of the locations from which the samples were obtained, tetracycline (57.78%; 95/165),  
 228 ampicillin (34.55%; 57/165) and sulfamethoxazole-trimethoprim (32.12%; 53/165) were also  
 229 ranked in the top most three antimicrobials demonstrating a high resistant rate in Laos PDR.  
 230 Then again, in Thailand, the resistant rates were ranked as follows; ampicillin (37.31%; 25/67),  
 231 tetracycline (29.85%; 20/67) and streptomycin (20.90%; 14/67), respectively (**Fig. 1**). With  
 232 regard to meat type, resistance rates were divided for each group and are also displayed in **Fig.**  
 233 **1**. Generally, those rates were found to be somewhat different. Interestingly, especially in the  
 234 effective antimicrobials, strains resisted against norfloxacin or ciprofloxacin were almost  
 235 originated from chicken meat. Thus related with the individual data, there were three strain  
 236 resisted at least seven antimicrobials test (AMP / AMC / CIP / NA / NOR / SXT / TE, AMP /  
 237 AMC / C / CIP / NA / NOR / SXT / TE and AMP / AMC / C / CIP / NA / NOR / S / SXT /  
 238 TE), all three were isolated from the chicken meat from Nong Khai, Thailand.  
 239 **Fig. 2** demonstrates the genetic relatedness of *Salmonella* currently being detected at the  
 240 Thailand-Laos border area. From the 38 *Salmonella* strains analysed, 35 genetic characters  
 241 were found. The 28 genotypes could not be identified to any ST, and 11 of them could not be  
 242 grouped in any ST-complex. One to five variation of housekeeping genes of those 28 un-  
 243 identifies from known ST were displayed in **Table 3**. However, for the 7 nameable STs (ST64,  
 244 ST155, ST365, ST469, ST516, ST1541, ST5706), four of those were distinct to a single strain.

**Commented [D21]:** rephrase

**Commented [D22]:** specify strains as coded alpha-numerics as in table 3

**Commented [D23]:** redo exercise of table 3 for relatedness as LPO12 is more related to ST1620 with 126 purE than ST155 with only 6

**Commented [D24]:** which strain?

245 Nonetheless, two strains were grouped in the ST155, ST365 and ST 469. Strains grouped in  
246 ST155 were derived from a Lao-Aussi market, one was chicken meats and the another was  
247 pork. Two strains of ST365 originated from Phonsavang market, one was chicken and the  
248 another was beef were also identified. Additionally, the strains grouped in ST469 were  
249 originated from pork and beef samples collected from different markets located in nearby areas.

Commented [D25]: Which?

Commented [D26]: State strains each time

250

## 251 Discussion

252 The findings obtained from this study represent scientific information on the burden and  
253 intensity of *Salmonella* in livestock meats in a 30 km radius surrounding the Thai-Lao  
254 Friendship Bridge I. It is well known that this bridge is the primary place for the expansion of  
255 trade that has occurred along the Thailand and Laos PDR border since 1994.

256 Overall degree of prevalence of *Salmonella* spp. in all meat samples was found to be 63%.

257 With regard to each meat type, pork, chicken and beef were found to be contaminated with  
258 pathogens at rates of 73%, 56% and 60%, respectively. The degree of contamination in pork  
259 had a tendency to be higher in all collected samples in a study conducted by Sinwat et al.,  
260 (2016). The degree of intensity was recorded at 65.06% (95% CI: 59.26-70.47%). However,  
261 for beef samples, the degree of prevalence in this study was lower when compared to the results  
262 of a study conducted by Boonmar et al., (2013), in which the prevalence was recorded at  
263 82.35% (95% CI: 58.97-93.81%). Actually, comprehensive figures related to *Salmonella*  
264 contamination in the chicken meat being sold in the border area of Thailand and Laos have not  
265 yet been reported. A study conducted by Trongjit et al., (2017) reported on the degree of  
266 prevalence of *Salmonella* infection at the Thai-Cambodia border, which was found to be  
267 73.43% (95% CI: 66.65-79.42%). This figure is quite a bit higher when compared with our  
268 results. In general, most studies have not demonstrated much difference when reporting  
269 numbers, which has been proven by an overlap in the 95% confidence intervals. Variations in

270 the results might depend upon the time period of the sampling along with any existing  
271 geographical factors. Nevertheless, high levels of *Salmonella* contamination still persist, even  
272 though some intervention has been implemented in some of these areas. *Salmonella* remains a  
273 problem in the meat being sold in this region, which has been an important public health  
274 concern for the last half decade.

275 The prevalence of *Salmonella* in the Laos PDR-originated samples was statistically and  
276 significantly high. Normally, sanitation practices are different at each location. In fact, there is  
277 no supermarket in Laos DPR. All fresh food, such as meat, can only be bought from fresh  
278 markets and mini-grocery stores. The lack of covering materials, unsuitable storage conditions  
279 and inadequate disinfection practices at the purchasing areas during the meat cutting and  
280 handling processes can substantially increase the risk of bacterial colonization (Gomes-Neves  
281 et al., 2012; Patchanee et al., 2016). In Thailand, supermarkets are the preferred place to  
282 purchase meat. One-sixth of the Thai samples collected in our study were obtained from  
283 supermarkets. It is known for stringently regulating their facilities, as well as for implementing  
284 biosecurity and hygienic policies along with quality control practices at the pre-harvesting and  
285 harvesting stages along the supply chain. However, in general, standard protocols for every  
286 type of retail outlet (supermarkets, mini-grocery stores and fresh markets) tend to be higher in  
287 bigger cities (Trongjit et al., 2017). With a focus on meat type, pork was found to be the most  
288 prevalent when compared with the other types of meat. The reason for this may not be clear. It

289 could be due to the high bacterial loads that emerge during previous production stages, which  
290 can then lead to instances of contamination at retail outlets. According to the information  
291 obtained from previous studies, *Salmonella* prevalence at pig farms and during pig slaughtering  
292 processes was higher than in chicken and beef production (Padungtod & Kaneene, 2006;  
293 Trongjit et al., 2017; Phongaran et al., 2019). Another possible explanation for this is that pork  
294 is the most common type of meat consumed in this region of study (Napasirth & Napasirth,

Commented [D27]: Prevalent for what?

295 2018). The amount of dressing required, along with any other forms of manipulation that are  
296 required before meat is sold, would likely increase the opportunity for contamination or re-  
297 contamination by product exposure at the final.

298 Based on the findings of previous studies, *S. Typhimurium* and *S. Rissen* are the majority  
299 serotypes identified in pork (Patchanee et al., 2016; Sinwat et al., 2016). For chicken meat, *S.*  
300 *Corvallis* and *S. Enteritidis* are known to be the dominant serotypes (Trongjit et al., 2017).  
301 Additionally, *S. Stanley* and *S. Typhimurium* have been reported as the most commonly  
302 recorded serotypes in beef (Boonmar et al., 2013). At the moment, these serotypes have not  
303 been universally matched to each meat type, but low frequencies were recorded in some  
304 instances. However, *S. Corvallis* is still noted as being the dominant serotype in chicken meat.  
305 Consequently, new typical sero-characteristics for this region should be set for pork and beef.

306 As the data indicates, *S. London* is presently the most common serotype. Furthermore, ~~as~~  
307 ~~several serotypes have been detected, some of them~~ several serotypes have been detected, such  
308 as *S. Altona*, *S. Cerro*, *S. Elisabethville*, *S. Itami*, *S. Mikamasima*, *S. Ruzizi*, etc., have been  
309 reported for the very first-time ~~with regard to~~ about the isolation of *Salmonella* in the region.  
310 Time factor and sample picking, ~~as well as~~ and the ~~cross-cross~~-contamination that occurs from  
311 other sources, are notable factors. Furthermore, even though the same serotype might be  
312 present at several meat origins, it cannot be concluded that two or three meat types would ~~be~~  
313 ~~representative of~~ represent a sharing pool for *Salmonella* identified from similar sources  
314 (Sinwat et al., 2016). All of which would need to be proven later.

315 *Salmonella* specimens isolated in this study displayed a relatively high degree of frequency of  
316 resistance against tetracycline and ampicillin, which is consistent with the findings of previous  
317 investigations (Padungtod & Kaneene, 2006; Pulsrikarn et al., 2012; Boonmar et al., 2013).  
318 From the past until now, the antimicrobials have been widely used for treatment and  
319 prophylaxis in livestock. However, excessive or inappropriate use is considered to be a ~~key~~

critical factor that has led to the current situation of resistance (Jajere, 2019). On the contrary, low resistance rates have been recorded for cefotaxime, norfloxacin and ciprofloxacin. Instances of resistance should be of particular concern in resource-limited countries because these are the drugs of choice that are recommended to treat human salmonellosis. Particularly for quinolones (norfloxacin and ciprofloxacin), the antimicrobial class is now often used as the first line of treatment (Kurtz et al., 2017). Of course, all of the quinolone-resistant strains discovered in these study areas originated from chicken meat collected in Thailand, and all were found to be resistant to 7-9 of the tested antimicrobials. Selective pressures such as those associated with antimicrobial use, unsuitable temperatures or pH levels, could be considered sub-lethal stress factors during the short production cycle in broiler farms. Additionally, the chicken's gut ecology should be taken into account when developing resistance to bacterial pathogens (Shang et al., 2018; Yang et al., 2019).

An overview of the phylogenetic tree reveals that most of the strains obtained in this study were diverse. Five-sixths of all strains could not be named to any ST. Microevolution or mutation is a possible explanation for the finding (Harbottle et al., 2006; Liu et al., 2011). This may be proven if some unidentified strains differed in only one or two loci from the other known nomenclatures. Moreover, the variation of 3-5 housekeeping genes of known related ST were also denoted. Therefore, of those, many strains cannot be grouped in any clonal complexes. Those that were unidentified may be newly detected STs that have not yet been recorded in the MLST database.

At this moment, shared genetical relatedness of *Salmonella* among Thai-Laos border area was not evidenced. The finding infers that the transboundary food supply chain from locations ahead of the marketplace (farm and/or slaughterhouse) ~~are not involve to contamination~~ ~~occurs is not involved in contamination~~. However, since only 38 strains were analysed, it cannot 100% prove that *Salmonella* contamination from both countries are not related. An analysis

~~together with information of all geographical matching strains previously submitted in MLST database should be recommended fulfilled the gap, further~~ and information of all geographical matching strains previously submitted in MLST database should be recommended to fulfil the gap. Interestingly, various specimens of the *Salmonella* genotypes collected from a single market were remarked. In details, 9 and 6 *Salmonella* genotypes were detected in various meat types collected from Phonsavang and Chengsavang markets, respectively. These findings evidence that more than one infection source can exist at a given location. Contamination can occur by itself in the purchasing area or as a result of inadequate processing when the meat product may have already been contaminated. Unhygienic practices at previous production sites, such as on farms and at slaughterhouses, or at transportation hubs may be causes of transmission in the present situation (Heyndrickx et al., 2002; Campioni et al., 2012). According to the ~~findings of the ST155 and ST365 clonal strain~~ ST155 and ST365 clonal strains' findings, both were detected on different sampling dates from the same marketplaces. Persistence of residential *Salmonella* flora could therefore be inferred. Moreover, two strains of ST469 were recovered from different markets ~~at in~~ nearby areas. Consequently, the sharing of supply routes at the nearby areas could play a significant role in ~~the dissemination of~~ disseminating *Salmonella* spp.

### Conclusions

As has been demonstrated, ~~the presence of *Salmonella*~~ *Salmonella*'s presence in meat sold in the middle Mekong basin area was relatively high in terms of prevalence. Standard hygienic protocols are known to be maintained at a higher level in administrative areas. The findings from the molecular MLST indicate that extensive quality control checking at pre-retail stages should be implemented. Furthermore, regular disinfecting of all equipment, as well as at working areas, must be applied. Future efforts in ~~the strengthening of food safety education~~

~~and awareness programs would help authorities to~~strengthening food safety education and  
awareness programs would help authorities establish strategies that could potentially reduce  
the transmission of *Salmonella* and other foodborne pathogens to downstream consumers.

## Acknowledgements

This study was financially supported by the Faculty of Veterinary Medicine, Chiang Mai University (Project ID: CMU-MIS R000017502). The authors would like to thank the Bacteriology Section, Veterinary Research and Development Center (Upper Northern Region), Lampang, Thailand and the Vientiane Capital Agriculture and Forestry Department, Vientiane, Laos PDR for their valuable contributions. We would like to thank the Department of Veterinary Medicine, Faculty of Agriculture, National University of Laos for allowing us to use their laboratory facilities for the purposes of diagnosis. Finally, we would like to thank the people who operate the <http://mlst.warwick.ac.uk/mlst/> website which made our regional analysis possible.

## Disclosure Statement

No competing financial interests exist.

## Figure Legends

**Figure 1: Percent resistant against antimicrobials of *Salmonella* isolated from various meat types in the Thai-Lao border area.**

Antibiotic abbreviations: amoxicillin-clavulanic acid (AMC) ; ampicillin (AMP) ; chloramphenicol (C); ciprofloxacin (CIP); cefotaxime (CTX); nalidixic acid (NA); norfloxacin (NOR); sulfamethoxazole-Trimethoprim (SXT); streptomycin (S); tetracycline (TE).

**Commented [D28]:** Rewrite figure titles and legends carefully making them descriptive

**Commented [D29]:** Percent of what?

**Figure 2: Dendrogram generated using UPGMA algorithms based on MLST profiles with their phenotypic characterizations and the epidemiological data of *Salmonella* circulating in the Thai-Laos border area.**

## References

- Australian Embassy Thailand. (2011). The First Thai - Laos Friendship Bridge. Available at [http://thailand.embassy.gov.au/bkok/FunRun\\_Bridge\\_History.html](http://thailand.embassy.gov.au/bkok/FunRun_Bridge_History.html) (accessed 31 July 2017).
- Basler C, Nguyen T-A, Anderson TC, Hancock T, Behraves CB. 2016. Outbreaks of Human *Salmonella* Infections Associated with Live Poultry, United States, 1990-2014. *Emerging Infectious Diseases* 22(10):1705-1711. DOI: 10.3201/eid2210.150765.
- Boonmar S, Morita Y, Pulsrikarn C, Chaichana P, Pornruagwong S, Chaunchom S, Sychanh T, Khounsy T, Sisavath D, Yamamoto S, Sato H, Ishioka T, Noda M, Kozawa K, Kimura H. 2013. *Salmonella* prevalence in meat at retail markets in Pakse, Champasak Province, Laos, and antimicrobial susceptibility of isolates. *Journal of Global Antimicrobial Resistance* 1(3):157-161. DOI: 10.1016/j.jgar.2013.05.001.
- Campioni F, Moratto Bergamini AM, Falcao JP. 2012. Genetic diversity, virulence genes and antimicrobial resistance of *Salmonella* Enteritidis isolated from food and humans over a 24-year period in Brazil. *Food Microbiology* 32(2):254-264. DOI: 10.1016/j.fm.2012.06.008.
- Clinical and Laboratory Standards Institute (CLSI). 2011. *Performance standards for antimicrobial disc susceptibility test; Approved standard-Tenth Edition*. Wayne, PA: Clinical and Laboratory Standards Institute.

419 Conlan JV, Vongxay K, Khamlome B, Gomez-Morales MA, Pozio E, Blacksell SD, Fenwick  
 420 S, Thompson RCA. 2014. Patterns and Risks of *Trichinella* Infection in Humans and  
 421 Pigs in Northern Laos. *PLOS Neglected Tropical Diseases* 8(7):e3034. DOI:  
 422 10.1371/journal.pntd.0003034.

423 Ferrari RG, Rosario DKA, Cunha-Neto A, Mano SB, Figueiredo EES, Conte-Junior CA. 2019.  
 424 Worldwide Epidemiology of *Salmonella* Serovars in Animal-Based Foods: a Meta-  
 425 analysis. *Applied and Environmental Microbiology* 85(14):e00591-00519. DOI:  
 426 10.1128/AEM.00591-19.

427 Foley SL, Lynne AM. 2008. Food animal-associated *Salmonella* challenges: pathogenicity and  
 428 antimicrobial resistance. *Journal of Animal Science* 86(14):E173-187. DOI:  
 429 10.2527/jas.2007-0447.

430 Gomes-Neves E, Antunes P, Tavares A, Themudo P, Cardoso MF, Gartner F, Costa JM, Peixe  
 431 L. 2012. *Salmonella* cross-contamination in swine abattoirs in Portugal: Carcasses,  
 432 meat and meat handlers. *International Journal of Food Microbiology* 157(1):82-87.  
 433 DOI: 10.1016/j.ijfoodmicro.2012.04.015.

434 Guardabassi L, Jensen LB, Kruse H. 2008. *Guide to Antimicrobial Use in Animals*. Oxford,  
 435 UK: Blackwell Publishing Ltd.

436 Harbottle H, White DG, McDermott PF, Walker RD, Zhao S. 2006. Comparison of multilocus  
 437 sequence typing, pulsed-field gel electrophoresis, and antimicrobial susceptibility  
 438 typing for characterization of *Salmonella enterica* serotype Newport isolates. *Journal*  
 439 *of Clinical Microbiology* 44(7):2449-2457. DOI: 10.1128/jcm.00019-06.

440 Hauser E, Hebner F, Tietze E, Helmuth R, Junker E, Prager R, Schroeter A, Rabsch W, Fruth  
 441 A, Malorny B. 2011. Diversity of *Salmonella enterica* serovar Derby isolated from pig,  
 442 pork and humans in Germany. *International Journal of Food Microbiology* 151(2):141-  
 443 149. DOI: 10.1016/j.ijfoodmicro.2011.08.020.

444 Heyndrickx M, Vandekerchove D, Herman L, Rollier I, Grijspeerdt K, De Zutter L. 2002.  
 445 Routes for *salmonella* contamination of poultry meat: epidemiological study from  
 446 hatchery to slaughterhouse. *Epidemiology and Infection* 129(2):253-265. DOI:  
 447 10.1017/s0950268802007380.

448 Jajere SM. 2019. A review of *Salmonella enterica* with particular focus on the pathogenicity  
 449 and virulence factors, host specificity and antimicrobial resistance including multidrug  
 450 resistance. *Veterinary World* 12(4):504-521. DOI: 10.14202/vetworld.2019.504-521.

451 Kotetishvili M, Stine OC, Kreger A, Morris JG, Sulakvelidze A. 2002. Multilocus Sequence  
 452 Typing for Characterization of Clinical and Environmental *Salmonella* Strains. *Journal*  
 453 *of Clinical Microbiology* 40(5):1626. DOI: 10.1128/JCM.40.5.1626-1635.2002.

454 Kurtz JR, Goggins JA, McLachlan JB. 2017. *Salmonella* infection: Interplay between the  
 455 bacteria and host immune system. *Immunology Letters* 190:42-50. DOI:  
 456 10.1016/j.imlet.2017.07.006.

457 Liu WB, Liu B, Zhu XN, Yu SJ, Shi XM. 2011. Diversity of *Salmonella* isolates using  
 458 serotyping and multilocus sequence typing. *Food Microbiology* 289(6):1182-1189.  
 459 DOI: 10.1016/j.fm.2011.04.001.

460 Lo Fo Wong DMA, Hald T, Van der Wolf P, Swanenburg M. 2002. Epidemiology and control  
 461 measures for *Salmonella* in pigs and pork. *Livestock Production Science* 76:215-222.  
 462 DOI: 10.1016/S0301-6226(02)00121-5.

463 Mainali C, Gensler G, Mcfall M, King R, Irwin R, Senthilselvan A. 2009. Evaluation of  
 464 Associations between Feed Withdrawal and Other Management Factors with  
 465 *Salmonella* Contamination of Broiler Chickens at Slaughter in Alberta. *Journal of Food*  
 466 *Protection* 72(10):2202–2207.

467 Mughini-Gras L, Enserink R, Friesema I, Heck M, van Duynhoven Y, van Pelt W. 2014. Risk  
 468 factors for human salmonellosis originating from pigs, cattle, broiler chickens and egg

469 laying hens: a combined case-control and source attribution analysis. *PLoS One*  
 470 9(2):e87933-e87933. DOI: 10.1371/journal.pone.0087933.

471 Napasirth P, Napasirth V. 2018. Current situation and future prospects for beef production in  
 472 Lao People's Democratic Republic - A review. *Asian-Australasian Journal of Animal*  
 473 *Sciences* 31(7):961-967. DOI: 10.5713/ajas.18.0206.

474 Okello AL, Tiemann TT, Inthavong P, Khamlome B, Phengvilaysouk A, Keonouchanh S,  
 475 Keokhamphet C, Somoulay V, Blaszak K, Blacksell SD, Okello WO, Allen J. 2017.  
 476 Integrating market chain assessments with zoonoses risk analysis in two cross-border  
 477 pig value chains in Lao PDR. *Asian-Australasian Journal of Animal Sciences*  
 478 30(11):1651-1659. DOI: 10.5713/ajas.16.0887

479 Padungtod P, Kaneene JB. 2006. *Salmonella* in food animals and humans in northern Thailand.  
 480 *International Journal of Food Microbiology* 108(3):346-354. DOI:  
 481 10.1016/j.ijfoodmicro.2005.11.020.

482 Patchanee P, Eiamsam-Ang T, Vanaseang J, Boonkhot P, Tadee P. 2017. Determination of  
 483 regional relationships among *Salmonella* spp. isolated from retail pork circulating in  
 484 the Chiang Mai municipality area using a WGS data approach. *International Journal*  
 485 *of Food Microbiology* 254:18-24. DOI: 10.1016/j.ijfoodmicro.2017.05.006.

486 Patchanee P, Tansirichaoenkul K, Buawiratert T, Wiratsudakul A, Angchokchatchawal K,  
 487 Yamsakul P, Yano T, Boonkhot P, Rojanasatien S, Tadee P. 2016. *Salmonella* in pork  
 488 retail outlets and dissemination of its pulsotypes through pig production chain in Chiang  
 489 Mai and surrounding areas, Thailand. *Preventive Veterinary Medicine* 130:99-105.  
 490 DOI: 10.1016/j.prevetmed.2016.06.013.

491 Phongaran D, Khang-Air S, Angkititrakul S. 2019. Molecular epidemiology and antimicrobial  
 492 resistance of *Salmonella* isolates from broilers and pigs in Thailand. *Veterinary World*  
 493 12(8):1311-1318. DOI: 10.14202/vetworld.2019.1311-1318.

494 Popoff MY, Bockemühl J, McWhorter-Murlin A. 1993. Supplement 1992 (no. 36) to the  
 495 Kauffmann-White scheme. *Research in Microbiology* 144(6):495-498. DOI:  
 496 doi.org/10.1016/0923-2508(93)90058-A.

497 Pulsrikarn C, Chaichana P, Pornruangwong S, Morita Y, Yamamoto S, Boonmar S. 2012.  
 498 Serotype, Antimicrobial Susceptibility, and Genotype of *Salmonella* Isolates from  
 499 Swine and Pork in Sa Kaew Province, Thailand. *The Thai Journal of Veterinary*  
 500 *Medicine* 42(1):21-28.

501 Rostagno MH, Callaway TR. 2012. Pre-harvest risk factors for *Salmonella enterica* in pork  
 502 production. *Food Research International* 45(2):634-640. DOI:  
 503 10.1016/j.foodres.2011.04.041.

504 Shang K, Wei B, Kang M. 2018. Distribution and dissemination of antimicrobial-resistant  
 505 *Salmonella* in broiler farms with or without enrofloxacin use. *BMC Veterinary*  
 506 *Research* 14(1):257. DOI: 10.1186/s12917-018-1590-1.

507 Sinwat N, Angkittitrakul S, Coulson KF, Pilapil FM, Meunsene D, Chuanchuen R. 2016. High  
 508 prevalence and molecular characteristics of multidrug-resistant *Salmonella* in pigs,  
 509 pork and humans in Thailand and Laos provinces. *Journal of Medical Microbiology*  
 510 65(10):1182-1193. DOI: 10.1099/jmm.0.000339.

511 Sirichote P, Bangtrakulnonth A, Tianmanee K, Unahalekhaka A, Oulai A, Chittaphithakchai  
 512 P, Kheowrod W, Hendriksen RS. 2010. Serotypes and Antimicrobial Resistance of  
 513 *Salmonella enterica* ssp in Central Thailand, 2001-2006. *The Southeast Asian journal*  
 514 *of tropical medicine and public health* 41(6):1405-1415.

515 Trongjit S, Angkititrakul S, Tuttle R, Pongseeree J, Padungtod P, Chuanchuen R. 2017.  
 516 Prevalence and antimicrobial resistance in *Salmonella enterica* isolated from broiler  
 517 chickens, pigs and meat products in the Thailand-Cambodia border provinces: AMR in

518 *Salmonella enterica*. *Microbiology and Immunology* 61. DOI: 10.1111/1348-  
519 0421.12462.

520 Van Boxtael S, Dierick K, Van Huffel X, Uyttendaele M, Berkvens D, Herman L, Bertrand  
521 S, Wildemauwe C, Catry B, Butaye P, Imberechts H. 2012. Comparison of  
522 antimicrobial resistance patterns and phage types of *Salmonella* Typhimurium isolated  
523 from pigs, pork and humans in Belgium between 2001 and 2006. *Food Research*  
524 *International* 45(2):913-918. DOI: 10.1016/j.foodres.2011.05.025.

525 Wilson RT. 2007. Status and prospects for livestock production in the Lao People's Democratic  
526 Republic. *Tropical Animal Health and Production* 39(6):443-452. DOI:  
527 10.1007/s11250-007-9048-7.

528 Yang Y, Ashworth AJ, Willett C, Cook K, Upadhyay A, Owens PR, Ricke SC, DeBruyn JM,  
529 Moore Jr. PA. 2019. Review of Antibiotic Resistance, Ecology, Dissemination, and  
530 Mitigation in U.S. Broiler Poultry Systems. *Frontiers in Microbiology* 10:e2639. DOI:  
531 10.3389/fmicb.2019.02639