



## ***Clostridium difficile* on U.S. Beef Cow-calf Operations**

Disease caused by *Clostridium difficile* is linked most commonly to nosocomial (hospital-acquired) infections in humans, especially after antibiotics are administered that alter normal gastrointestinal flora. Humans develop a spectrum of disease when infected with some strains of *C. difficile*. Symptoms range from mild diarrhea to life-threatening toxic megacolon and pseudo-membranous colitis (Weese, 2010). Even though *C. difficile* is typically seen as a nosocomial infection, there are increasing reports of community acquired infections.

*C. difficile* is a spore-forming organism which can survive in the environment for long periods and can be ingested by animals or humans through contaminated foodstuffs and water (Yaeger et al., 2002). *C. difficile* has also been associated with clinical disease in young pigs and dairy calves (Yaeger et al., 2002; Hammitt et al., 2008). Shedding of *C. difficile* bacteria in animal feces can occur in the absence of clinical signs (Weese, 2010). In addition, some strains of *C. difficile* have been isolated from ground beef, ground pork, and ground veal purchased from retail markets in Canada which could serve as a source of infection in humans (Rodriguez-Palacios et al., 2007; Weese et al., 2009). To date, there has been little information available on the distribution and characteristics of *C. difficile* on various types of livestock operations across the United States.

### **Beef 2007–08 study**

The U.S. Department of Agriculture's National Animal Health Monitoring System (NAHMS) conducted the Beef 2007–08 study, which focused on beef cow-calf health and management practices in 24 States.<sup>1</sup> These States represented 79.6 percent of U.S. operations with beef cows and 87.8 percent of U.S. beef cows. One objective of the Beef 2007–08 study was to determine if *C. difficile* could be found in the feces of beef cows on U.S. cow-calf operations in the United States and, if so, to determine the characteristics of the *C. difficile* isolates.

<sup>1</sup> **States/Regions:**

**West:** California, Colorado, Idaho, Montana, New Mexico, Oregon, Wyoming

**Central:** Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, Nebraska, North Dakota, South Dakota

**Southeast:** Alabama, Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, Oklahoma, Tennessee, Texas, Virginia

### ***C. difficile* prevalence**

During the Beef 2007–08 study, testing for *C. difficile* was performed on 173 cow-calf operations across the 24 participating States.

Overall, 2,965 fecal samples from beef cows presumed to be healthy were cultured for the presence of *C. difficile*.<sup>2</sup> Of the 2,965 fecal samples tested, *C. difficile* was isolated from 188 (6.3 percent) [table 1]. At least 1 positive sample was found on 76 of the 173 operations tested for *C. difficile* (43.9 percent).

**Table 1. Number and percentage of samples and operations tested for *C. difficile*, by test result**

<b>Test Result</b>	<b>Samples Tested</b>		<b>Operations Tested</b>	
	<b>No.</b>	<b>Pct.</b>	<b>No.</b>	<b>Pct.</b>
Positive	188	6.3	76	43.9
Negative	2,777	93.7	97	56.1
Total	2,965	100.0	173	100.0

<sup>2</sup> Culture methods available in Thitaram et al. (2011).

## Sample-level results

### Herd size and region

There was no difference by herd size in the percentage of samples positive for *C. difficile* ( $p=0.23$ ) [table 2].

**Table 2. Number of samples tested and number and percentage of samples positive for *C. difficile*, by herd size**

	Herd Size (number of beef cows)				Total
	1–49	50–99	100–199	200 or More	
Number samples tested	570	475	794	1,126	2,965
Number samples positive	44	32	65	47	188
Percent samples positive	7.7	6.7	8.2	4.2	6.3

There was a difference in the percentage of samples positive for *C. difficile* by region ( $p=0.009$ ), with a higher percentage of positive samples observed from the Southeast region than from the West or Central regions (table 3).

**Table 3. Number of samples tested and number and percentage of samples positive for *C. difficile*, by region**

	Region		
	West	Central	Southeast
Number samples tested	669	990	1,306
Number samples positive	17	43	128
Percent samples positive	2.5	4.3	9.8

## Operation-level results

### Herd size and region

There was no significant difference by herd size ( $p=0.50$ ) in the percentage of operations positive for *C. difficile*-positive [table 4].

**Table 4. Number of operations tested and number and percentage of operations with at least one sample positive for *C. difficile*, by herd size**

	Herd Size (number of beef cows)				Total
	1–49	50–99	100–199	200 or More	
Number operations tested	49	26	42	56	173
Number operations positive	26	11	17	22	76
Percent operations positive	53.1	42.3	40.5	39.3	43.9

While the highest percentage of operations positive for *C. difficile* was in the Southeast region, the differences between regions were not statistically significant ( $p=0.15$ ) [table 5].

**Table 5. Number of operations tested and number and percentage of operations with at least one sample positive for *C. difficile*, by region**

	Region		
	West	Central	Southeast
Number operations tested	39	54	80
Number operations positive	11	21	44
Percent operations positive	28.2	38.9	55.0

## Summary

Overall, the prevalence of *C. difficile* was relatively low (6.3 percent of samples positive) but the organism was widely distributed (43.9 percent of operations had at least one positive sample).

The recovery of *C. difficile* from feces on livestock operations warrants further investigation. Not all strains of *C. difficile* appear to have the same propensity to cause disease. Therefore, isolates from this study will be further characterized to determine how related these isolates are to those causing human disease. Further characterization of *C. difficile* isolates, including molecular typing and additional epidemiological studies, is needed to ascertain if a relationship exists between food animal isolates and those from humans in order to determine the potential for foodborne disease.

## References

- Hammitt MC, Bueschel DM, Keel MK, Glock RD, Cuneo P, DeYoung DW, Reggiardo C, Trinh HT, Songer JG. 2008. A possible role for *Clostridium difficile* in the etiology of calf enteritis. *Vet Microbiol*.127(3–4):343–352.
- Rodriguez-Palacios A, Staempfli HR, Duffield T, Weese JS. 2007. *Clostridium difficile* in retail ground meat, Canada. *Emerg Infect Dis*.13(3):485–487.
- Thitaram SN, Frank JF, Lyon SA, Siragusa GR, Bailey JS, Lombard JE, Haley CA, Wagner BA, Dargatz DA, Fedorka-Cray PJ. 2011. *Clostridium difficile* from healthy food animals: optimized isolation and prevalence. *J Food Prot* 74(1):130–133.
- Weese JS. 2010. *Clostridium difficile* in food—innocent bystander or serious treat? *Clin Microbiol Infect* 16: 3–10.
- Weese JS, Avery BP, Rousseau J, Reid-Smith RJ. 2009. Detection and enumeration of *Clostridium difficile* spores in retail beef and pork. *Appl Environ Microbiol* 75(15):5009–5011.
- Yaeger M, Funk N, Hoffman L. 2002. A survey of agents associated with neonatal diarrhea in Iowa swine including *Clostridium difficile* and porcine reproductive and respiratory syndrome virus. *J Vet Diagn Invest* 14(4):281–287.

AHPIS acknowledges the contributions of the USDA-ARS Bacterial Epidemiology and Antimicrobial Resistance Research Unit for their participation in the Beef 2007-08 study.

---

For more information, contact:

USDA–APHIS–VS–CEAH  
NRRRC Building B, M.S. 2E7  
2150 Centre Avenue  
Fort Collins, CO 80526-8117  
970.494.7000  
Email: NAHMS@aphis.usda.gov  
<http://nahms.aphis.usda.gov>

#598.0511

---

The U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) prohibits discrimination in all its programs and activities on the basis of race, color, national origin, age, disability, and where applicable, sex, marital status, familial status, parental status, religion, sexual orientation, genetic information, political beliefs, reprisal, or because all or part of an individual's income is derived from any public assistance program. (Not all prohibited bases apply to all programs.) Persons with disabilities who require alternative means for communication of program information (Braille, large print, audiotape, etc.) should contact USDA's TARGET Center at (202) 720–2600 (voice and TDD). To file a complaint of discrimination, write to USDA, Director, Office of Civil Rights, 1400 Independence Avenue, S.W., Washington, D.C. 20250–9410, or call (800) 795–3272 (voice) or (202) 720–6382 (TDD). USDA is an equal opportunity provider and employer.

Mention of companies or commercial products does not imply recommendation or endorsement by the USDA over others not mentioned. USDA neither guarantees nor warrants the standard of any product mentioned. Product names are mentioned solely to report factually on available data and to provide specific information.