

Dept. of Food Hygiene
Fac. Vet. Med., Assiut University

SEARCH FOR SOME PATHOGENIC BACTERIA
IN COMMERCIAL HENS AND DUCKS' EGGS
SOLD IN ASSIUT GOVERNORATE
(With 5 Tables)

By

M.S. SABREEN

(Received at 27/3/2001)

البحث عن بعض البكتريا الممرضة في بيض الدجاج والبط بمحافظة أسيوط.

محمد سعد صابرين

جمعت ٢٢٥ بيضة ممثلة لـ ٤٥ مجموعة بطريقة عشوائية من مختلف الأسواق ومحلات البقالة والسوبر ماركت ومزارع الدواجن المعدة للإستهلاك الأدمي وكذلك من منازل الفلاحين في محافظة أسيوط. وقد شملت عينات البيض ثلاثة أنواع وهي: بيض الدجاج التجاري بنوعيه من السلالات البلدية ومزارع الدواجن وكذلك بيض البط. وقد تم فحص العينات لمعرفة مدى تلوثها ببعض البكتريا الممرضة المحتمل وجودها على قشر وفي محتوى البيض الداخلي. وأظهرت النتائج أن ميكروب الليستيريامونوسيتوجينس كان موجوداً بنسبتي ٦,٧% ، ١٣,٣% على قشر بيض مزارع الدواجن والبط على التوالي. أما ميكروب الليستيريا أنكوا فقد تم عزله بنسبتي ١٣,٣% ، ٦,٧% من قشر بيض الدجاج بنوعيه على الترتيب. وكذلك تم عزل ٦,٧% من ميكروب الليستيرياميوراً من على قشر بيض الدجاج البلدي والبط بنفس النسبة (٦,٧%) . وفيما يختص بمحتوى البيض الداخلي فقد كانت عينة واحدة فقط (٦,٧%) من بيض الدجاج البلدي ملوثة بميكروب الليستيريانكوا . أما بالنسبة للميكروب المكور العنقودي الذهبي فقد تم عزله من قشر بيض الدجاج بنوعيه وكذلك قشر بيض البط بالنسب المئوية التالية على التوالي : ٢٦,٧ ، ٢٦,٧ ، ٢٠% . وكذلك تم عزل هذا الميكروب من محتوى البيض الداخلي لبيض الدجاج البلدي بنسبة ١٣,٣% . وفيما يتعلق بالبكتريا المعوية - فقد تم عزلها وتصنيفها من عينات البيض المفحوصة ، فقد بينت النتائج أن ميكروب السالمونيلا تيفي ميوريم كان موجوداً بنسبتي ١٣,٣% ، ٦,٧% على قشر بيض مزارع الدواجن ومحتوي بيض الدجاج البلدي على الترتيب. أما ميكروب الشيغيلا ، فقد تم عزله بنسبة ٦,٧% من قشر بيض الدجاج التجاري بنوعيه. وكذلك أظهرت النتائج أن النسب المئوية الآتية : ٤٦,٧ ، ١٣,٣ ، ٣٣,٣ ، ٦,٧ ، ٦,٧ ، ٢٠% لقشر ومحتويات عينات البيض المفحوصة كانوا ملوثين بميكروب الأيشيريشيا كولاى على التوالي. كما أسفرت النتائج عن عزل الميكروبات التالية : الأنتيروباكترا ، الستروباكترا ، الكليبسيلا ، البروفيدنشيا ، البروتيس ريجرى، البروتيس فولجارز، الأريزونا، الإلكاجينز دسبار، السيراتيا، السيدوموناس صايوجينس من على قشر ومحتويات العينات المفحوصة لبيض الدجاج بنوعيه

وكذلك بيض البط بنسب مئوية مختلفة . هذا وقد اتضح من هذه الدراسة أن قشر البيض أكثر تلوثاً ببعض البكتريا الممرضة عن نظيره من محتوى البيض. وقد نوقشت الطرق الواجب إتباعها لمنع تلوث البيض بهذه البكتريا الممرضة والتي لها أثر خطير على صحة الإنسان.

SUMMARY

A total of 225 random eggs, representing 45 groups, were collected from different markets, groceries and supermarkets, as well as, from poultry farms and farmers' houses in Assiut Governorate. They included commercial hens' eggs of both native breeds and poultry farms and ducks' eggs. The samples were examined for the presence of some pathogenic bacteria on shells and in the contents. *L. monocytogenes* was isolated from 6.7 and 13.3% of egg shells of poultry farms and ducks, respectively. *L. innocua* was detected on egg shells of commercial hens' eggs of both native breeds and poultry farms with an incidence of 13.3 and 6.7%, respectively. While, *L. murrayi* could be isolated from one sample (6.7%) each of shells of native breeds hens and ducks' eggs. On the other hand, *L. innocua* was isolated from one sample (6.7%) of egg content of native breeds hens. *Staph. aureus* was existed in 26.7, 26.7 and 20% on egg shells of hens of both native breeds and poultry farms and ducks, respectively. However, only two samples (13.3%) of commercial hens' egg contents of the native breeds contained *Staph. aureus*. *Sal. typhimurium* could be isolated, respectively, from 13.3 and 6.7% of examined samples of egg shells of poultry farms and egg contents of native breeds hens. Furthermore, each of shells of native breeds hens and poultry farms' eggs were contaminated by *Shigella* spp. in one sample (6.7%). While, *E.coli* was isolated from 46.7, 13.3 and 33.3% of the examined egg shell samples of both commercial hens and ducks, respectively, and also this bacterium was detected in 6.7, 6.7 and 20% of the examined egg content samples, respectively. Likewise, *Enterobacter* spp., *Citrobacter* spp., *Klebsiella* spp., *Providencia* spp., *Proteus rettgeri*, *Proteus vulgaris*, *Arizona* spp., *Alcaligenes dispar*, *Serratia* spp. and *Pseudomonas cyanogenes* were recovered from the examined samples of shells and contents of hens and ducks' eggs at varying percentages. It is apparent that egg shells were more contaminated with some pathogenic organisms than egg contents. The public health hazards of such pathogenic bacteria and the suggestive measures for improving the quality of eggs were discussed.

Key words: Pathogenic bacteria, Hens, Ducks', Eggs.

INTRODUCTION

Eggs provide a unique, well balanced source of nutrients for all persons of all ages. Eggs and egg products are used in a wide variety of foods, including whole egg custard, mayonnaise, egg salad, egg nog and all types of bakery products. On the other hand, eggs may constitute, if contaminated, a public health hazard and may lead to losses from economic point of view through spoilage. Sources of eggs contamination are numerous such as the egg may become infected before it is laid, when the ovary was infected with bacterial pathogens, also outside eggs are not sterile and the shells soon become contaminated by faecal matter from the bird, by the lining of the nest, by wash water if the eggs are to be washed, by handling and perhaps by the material in which the eggs are packed (Gordon and Tucker, 1965; Dhillon *et al.*, 1974; Matthes, 1984; Foegeding and Leasor, 1989; Board and Fuller, 1994 and Cox *et al.*, 2000). The rate of penetration of these organisms from the intact shell contaminating the egg contents influenced by humidity and storage temperature at which the eggs are produced and stored (Board and Fuller, 1994 and Cox *et al.*, 2000).

Some pathogenic bacteria such as *Listeria* (especially, *L. monocytogenes*), *Staphylococcus aureus*, *Salmonella*, *Shigella*, *Escherichia coli* and other *Enterobacteriaceae* could be isolated from the shells and contents of marketable eggs at variable percentages by different investigators (Garrad, 1946; Board and Board, 1968; Board, 1977; Moats, 1980; Moursy *et al.*, 1982; Ahmed *et al.*, 1985 & 1987; El-Prince, 1988; Foegeding and Leasor, 1989; Saad and El-Prince, 1995; Bastawrows *et al.*, 1997 and Ring and Atanassova, 2001). Furthermore, numerous cases of food-poisoning outbreaks were traced to these pathogenic bacteria (Dack *et al.*, 1930; Mostafa *et al.*, 1948; Taylor, 1969; Tulloch *et al.*, 1973; Anonymous, 1990; Eley, 1992; Wieneke *et al.*, 1993; Henzler *et al.*, 1994; Brooks *et al.*, 1995; Anonymous, 1996 and ICMSF, 1996). It is worth to mention that the presence of such pathogenic bacteria in the eggs caused serious diseases for human-beings during consumption of such contaminated eggs. The main symptoms of these diseases are septicemia, meningitis, abortion in pregnant women, gastroenteritis, epidemic diarrhoea in infants, sporadic summer diarrhoea in children, urinary tract infections or others (MacCkie and MacCartney, 1962; Kornacki and Marth, 1982; Brooks *et al.*, 1995; Miller *et al.*, 1997 and Arizcum *et al.*, 1998).

Control of foodborne diseases can be accomplished by reducing the number of pathogens or the amount of their toxins to below that required to cause illness, which can be achieved by thorough heat processing and application of food hygienic practices. Although, critical control measures and legislations for the safety of food with regard to the health of the consumer were introduced, serious health hazards outbreaks due to consumption of the eggs were persisted. Therefore, the aim of this work is to investigate the incidence of some pathogenic bacteria which may be found on the shells and in the contents of commercial hens and ducks' eggs sold in Assiut Governorate.

MATERIAL and METHODS

Collection of samples:

225 eggs were collected, at random, from different markets, groceries, supermarkets, poultry farms and farmers' houses in Assiut Governorate. They included commercial hens' eggs of both native breeds and poultry farms and ducks' eggs (75 eggs each). Every 5 eggs (one group) were placed in a sterile plastic bag and dispatched to the laboratory with a minimum of delay.

Preparation of samples:

(A) **Egg shells:** Egg shells were tested by a surface rinse method as described by Moats (1979).

(B) **Egg contents:** The egg was prepared for evacuation of its content according to Speck (1976).

Experimental techniques:

The rinse solution of egg shells, as well as, the homogenous egg contents were subjected to the following examination:

- 1) Isolation and identification of *Listeria* species were carried out according to Lovett *et al.* (1987) and Hitchins (1995).
- 2) Isolation and identification of *Staph. aureus* were performed according to the recommended methods of Finegold and Martin (1982).
- 3) Isolation and identification of *Salmonella*, *Shigella*, *E.coli* and other *Enterobacteriaceae* organisms were carried out according to the methods recommended by Speck (1976). The serological typing of isolates presumed to be *Salmonella* were carried out at the Department of Bacteriology, Faculty of Medicine, Assiut University.

RESULTS

The obtained results were recorded in Tables 1 - 5.

DISCUSSION

The obtained results recorded in Table 1, show that *L. monocytogenes* was not detected in the examined commercial hens' egg shell samples of the native breeds. While, the bacterium was isolated from 1(6.7%) and 2(13.3%) of the examined samples of commercial hens' egg shells of poultry farms and ducks' egg shells, respectively. On the other hand, *L. innocua* was detected in 2(13.3%) and 1(6.7%) of the examined hens' egg shells of native breeds and poultry farms, respectively. However, *L. murrayi* could be isolated from one sample (6.7%) of each of shells of native breeds hens and ducks' eggs. These results are very low compared with those reported by Saad and El-Prince (1995) who found that hens' egg shells were contaminated by some *Listeria* species. They isolated *L. monocytogenes*, *L. innocua*, *L. seeligeri* and *L. ivanovii* from the examined egg shell samples in percentages of 17.8%, 35.6%, 11.1% and 4.4%, respectively. The difference in incidence of *Listeria* may be attributed to differences in geographic distribution of *Listeria*; variation in bird husbandry practices or variation in methods of isolation (WHO, 1988 and ICMSF, 1996). In recent years, *L. monocytogenes* has become of considerable importance to food industry. Moreover, the presence of *L. monocytogenes* in eggs most likely is due to contamination from the shells during the breaking process or from the processing environment (Foegeding and Leasor, 1989).

Results given in Table 2 point out that *L. innocua* could be isolated from only one of commercial hens' egg content samples of native breeds with an incidence percentage of 6.7%. Other species of *Listeria* could not be detected in the examined samples of commercial hens and ducks' egg contents. These findings are in good agreement with those recorded by Saad and El-Prince (1995), while Foegeding and Leasor (1989) could isolate *L. monocytogenes* from 2 samples of raw, broken, liquid whole egg with a prevalence percentage of 4.8%. Generally, the contents of newly laid egg from healthy birds are usually sterile, yet the shell soon becomes contaminated with microorganisms which can grow and penetrate through its intact shell contaminating the egg contents. It is worth to mention that the use of *Listeria* species other than *L. monocytogenes* as indicators of presence of such microorganisms has been proposed (Johnson *et al.*, 1990). From the public health point of view, foodborne listeriosis nowadays is represented a serious public

health problem in many countries since the case fatality rate is high (ICMSF, 1996).

The findings reported in Table 3 declare that 26.7, 26.7 and 20% of the examined samples of commercial hens' egg shells of native breeds, commercial hens' egg shells of poultry farms and ducks' egg shells were contaminated with *Staph. aureus*, respectively. On the other hand, from the examined 15 egg content samples of native hens' breeds, only two samples (13.3%) contained *Staph. aureus*, while this organism failed detection in the other types of egg content samples tested. Lower incidence of *Staph. aureus* on egg shells were recorded by Moats (1980) and El-Prince (1988), but higher results were reported by Ahmed *et al.* (1985). However, the results obtained from egg content samples agree to some extent with those recorded by Ahmed *et al.* (1987) and El-Prince (1988). The comparatively low incidence of *Staph. aureus* in the examined samples of egg contents may be due to the presence of lysozyme in the inner shell membrane which acts as an effective agent against Gram-positive organisms, thus the chance of *Staph. aureus* entrance into a shell egg is very remote (Baker, 1974). Although, *Staph. aureus* presence in shell eggs is very rare, yet birds' eggs may be contaminated accidentally from shell, as it has been originated from ova during egg formation (Matthes, 1984), dust, and from the surface of inanimate objects, in addition to, different sources of contamination from skin, nose and throat of poultry workers. Furthermore, considerable number of food-poisoning outbreaks had been attributed to *Staph. aureus* (Dack *et al.*, 1930; Elcy, 1992 and Wieneke *et al.*, 1993).

From the results recorded in Tables 4 & 5, it is evident that egg shells of poultry farms and egg contents of native breeds were found to have *Sal. typhimurium*, with incidence percentages of 13.3 and 6.7%, respectively. While, no other species of *Salmonella* could be detected in the other examined samples of egg shells and contents. The findings of examined samples are nearly similar to those obtained by Ahmed *et al.* (1985 & 1987); El-Prince (1988) and Bastawrows *et al.* (1997). Lower occurrence were reported by El-Agroudy and Awad (1966) and Ring and Atanassova (2001). However, Yang *et al.* (2001) studied the influence of holding temperature on the growth and survival of *Salmonella* spp. and *Staph. aureus* and the production of staphylococcal enterotoxin in egg products, and they revealed that *Salmonella* spp. and *Staph. aureus* in the egg products multiply best at 37°C, followed closely by 22 and 18°C, and neither pathogen showed growth in the egg products held at 5°C. On the other hand, the vertical transmission theory states that *Salmonellae*

come from an infected hen. The horizontal transmission theory states that Salmonellae invade the egg through the shell after the egg is laid. In truth, both routes are probably involved (Cox *et al.*, 2000). Also, contaminated water may act as an effective route of transmission (Dhillon *et al.*, 1974), where Salmonella find their way from alimentary tract via blood to ovaries (Gordon and Toker, 1965). Board and Fuller (1994) reported that when eggs are broken, Salmonella present on egg shells may contaminate the contents and grow rapidly if storage is at ambient temperature. Moreover, much of the evidence of a link between Salmonella and eggs comes from the table egg industry. Numerous Salmonella infections and outbreaks have been recorded, usually involving the consumption of raw or undercooked eggs (Taylor, 1969; Anonymous, 1990; Henzler *et al.*, 1994 and Anonymous, 1996). On the other hand, Shigella spp. were detected in one (6.7%) sample from each of native breeds and poultry farms' egg shells (Table 4), but could not be assured due to lack of antiserum. Nearly similar percentages were reported by Ahmed *et al.* (1985) and El-Prince (1988).

E.coli was detected in 7(46.7%), 2(13.3%) and 5(33.3%) out of 15 samples of both commercial hens (native breeds and poultry farms) and ducks' egg shells, respectively (Table 4). The obtained results agree to a certain extent with those reported by Ahmed *et al.* (1985); El-Prince (1988) and Bastawrows *et al.* (1997). While, E.coli was isolated, respectively, from 6.7, 6.7 and 20% of examined egg content samples of both commercial hens and ducks (Table 5). A higher incidence of E.coli (42.2%) was obtained by Bastawrows *et al.* (1997). E. coli is taken as an index of recent faecal contamination, as it is a normal inhabitant of the intestinal tract of both man and animals, and always present in manure (Garrod, 1946). This organism can grow and penetrate the shell contaminating the egg contents (Mayes and Takeballi, 1983). Likewise, E.coli is considered one of the main contaminants of deteriorated eggs (Moursy *et al.*, 1982). Furthermore, some strains of E.coli are now considered as common causes of traveller's diarrhoea and/or infantile illness, gastroenteritis and sporadic summer diarrhoea in children, as well as many cases of food-poisoning (MacCkic and MacCartney, 1962; Tulloch *et al.*, 1973; Kornacki and Marth, 1982 and Brooks *et al.*, 1995). Therefore, the isolation of E.coli from the examined egg samples in this study constitutes a great threat to the health of humans especially children and also of improperly consumed, some individuals, especially athletics drink freshly beaten eggs.

Enterobacter spp., Citrobacter spp., Klebsiella spp., Providencia spp., Proteus rettgeri, Proteus vulgaris, Arizona spp., Alcaligenes dispar, Serratia spp. and Pseudomonas cyanogenes could be isolated at varying percentages from the examined samples of each of shells and contents of commercial hens' eggs of both native breeds and poultry farms and ducks' eggs (Tables 4 & 5). Some of these organisms were previously isolated from egg samples by several investigators (Garrod, 1946; Board and Board, 1968; Board, 1977; Mackenzie and Skerman, 1982; Moursy et al., 1982; Becirevic, 1983; Ahmed et al., 1985; Ibeh and Izuagbe, 1986; Ahmed et al., 1987; Alaboudi et al., 1988; El-Prince, 1988; El-Essawy et al., 1989 and Bastawrows et al., 1997). Moreover, some of isolated strains were claimed to be incriminated in food-poisoning and urinary tract infections and occasionally other infections and were often resistant to antimicrobial therapy (Wyah, 1992 and Brooks et al., 1995). From the economic point of view, Enterobacter spp., Klebsiella spp., Serratia spp. and others were implicated in different types of objectionable changes, rendering the eggs unfit for human consumption (Board and Board, 1968).

It is well established that the risk of some pathogenic bacteria recovered from the examined egg samples. Therefore, recommendations for prevention of this risk are, proper hygienic measures adopted in the farm, handling and storage of eggs are necessary for obtaining eggs of good quality. Likewise, the practice of cleaning eggs by washing sanitizers is common in egg industry nowadays. As well as, effective inspection of drainage system, public education programmes and thorough heat processing. At the end, pasteurization of egg products has been introduced as a statutory requirement in many countries.

REFERENCES

- Ahmed, A.A-H.; Moustafa, M.K.; Aboul-Khier, F. and El-Bassiony, T.A. (1985): Bacterial contamination of egg shells. *Assiut Vet. Med. J.* 14: 123-127.
- Ahmed, A.A-H.; Saad, Nagah, M. and Moustafa, M.K. (1987): Microbial contamination of market hen eggs. *Assiut Vet. Med. J.* 18: 125-131.
- Alaboudi, A.R.; Hamed, D.A. and Ali, D.S. (1988): Microbial content of market eggs. *Indian J. Animal Sci.* 58: 769-770.
- Anonymous (1990): Update: Salmonella enteritidis infections and shell eggs-United States, 1990. *Morb. Mortal. Wkly. Rep.* 39: 909.

- Anonymous (1996):* Outbreaks of Salmonella serotype enteritidis infection associated with consumption of raw shell eggs-United States, 1994-1995. *Morb. Mortal. Wkly. Rep.* 45: 737.
- Arizcun, C.; Vasseur, C. and Labadie, J.C. (1998):* Effect of several decontamination procedures on *L. monocytogenes* growing in biofilms. *J. Food Prot.* 61: 731-734.
- Baker, R.C. (1974):* Microbiology of eggs- A review. *J. Milk Food Technol.* 37: 265-268.
- Bastawrows, A.F.; Khalil, Nawal, Gh.; Seddek, S.R. and Aly, Seham, M. (1997):* Bacteriological studies on Enterobacteriaceae isolated from table eggs in Assiut. *Assiut Vet. Med. J.* 36: 203-214.
- Becirevic, M. (1983):* Study of the transferable drug resistance of Gram-negative bacteria isolated from eggs. *Veterinaria, Yugoslavia.* 32: 457-472.
- Board, P.A. and Board, R.G. (1968):* A diagnostic key for identifying organisms from rotten egg. *Brit. Poult. Sci.* 9: 111-120.
- Board, R.G. (1977):* Egg science and technology. AVI Publishing Co., Inc., Westport, Connecticut. The microbiology of eggs. P. 49-64. In W.J. Stadelman and O.J. Cotterill (eds).
- Board, R.G. and Fuller, R. (1994):* Microbiology of the avian egg. 1st Ed. Chapman and Hall P. 94- 112-128.
- Brooks, G.F.; Butel, J.S.; Nicholas Ornston, L.; Jawetz, E.; Melnick, J.L. and Adelberg, E.A. (1995):* Medical Microbiology. 20th Ed. Prentice-Hall International Inc., P. 206-217.
- Cox, N.A.; Berrang, M.E. and Cason, J.A. (2000):* Salmonella penetration of egg shells and proliferation in broiler hatching eggs – A review. *Poult. Sci.* 79: 1571-1574.
- Dack, G.M.; Fordon, E.O. and Woolper, O. (1930):* Attempts to immunize human volunteers with Staphylococcus filterates that are toxic to man when swallowed. *J. Preventive Med.* 5: 151-159.
- Dhillon, A.S.; Maurer, A.J.; Deibel, R.H. and Haller, R.W. (1974):* Feeding of different levels of Salmonellae to chickens. *Indian J. Poult. Sci.* 9: 103-107.
- El-Agroudy, M.A. and Awad, F.I. (1966):* Salmonella in hen eggs. *J. Vet. Sci. U.A.R.* 3: 1-4.
- El-Essawy, H.A.; Saudi, A.M. and Sallam, S.S. (1989):* Microbiological studies on market hen eggs. *Alex. J. Vet. Sci.* 5: 219-225.
- Eley, A.R. (1992):* Microbial food poisoning. 1st Ed. Chapman and Hall Publisher, London, New York.

- El-Prince, Enas, M. (1988):* Microbiological quality of hen's eggs. M.V.Sci. Thesis, Fac. Vet. Med., Assiut Univ., Egypt.
- Finegold, S.M. and Martin, W.J. (1982):* Bailey and Scott Diagnostic Microbiology. 6th Ed. C.V. Mosby Co. St. Louis, Toronto, London.
- Foegeding, P.M. and Leason, S.B. (1989):* Heat resistance and growth of *L. monocytogenes* in liquid whole egg. *J. Food Prot.* 52: 85-89.
- Garrad, E.H. (1946):* Coliform contamination of eggs. *Cand. J. Res.* 24: 121-125.
- Gordon, R.F. and Toker (1965):* The epizootology of Salmonella menston infection of fowls and the effect of feeding poultry food artificially infected with Salmonella. *Brit. Poult. Sci.* 6: 251-264.
- Henzler, D.J.; Ebel, E.; Sanders, J.; Kradel, D. and Mason, J. (1994):* Salmonella enteritidis in eggs from commercial chicken layer flocks implicated in human outbreaks. *Avian Dis.* 38: 37-43.
- Hitchins, A.D. (1995):* Listeria monocytogenes. In: 8th Ed. Food and Drug Administration Bacteriological Analytical Manual. AOAC International Pub. Co., Gaithersburg, MD, USA.
- Ibeh, I.N. and Izuagbe, Y.S. (1986):* An analysis of the microflora of broken eggs used in confectionery products in Nigeria and the occurrence of enterotoxigenic Gram-negative bacteria. *Int. J. Food Microbiol.* 3: 71-77.
- ICMSF (1996):* Microorganisms in foods, Microbiological specifications of food pathogens. Co-published by James & James Ltd, London.
- Johnson, J.L.; Doyle, M.P. and Cassens, R.G. (1990):* Listeria monocytogenes and other Listeria spp. in meat and meat products- A review. *J. Food Prot.* 53: 81-91.
- Kornacki, J.L. and Marth, E.H. (1982):* Food borne illness caused by E.coli- A review. *J. Food Prot.* 45: 1051.
- Lovett, J.; Francis, D.W. and Hunt, J.M. (1987):* L. monocytogenes in raw milk: Detection, incidence and pathogenicity. *J. Food Prot.* 50: 188-192.
- MacKie, K.J. and MacCartney, J.E. (1962):* Hand book of practical bacteriology. 10th Ed. F & S. Livingstone Ltd., London.
- Mackenzie, K.A. and Skerman, V.B. (1982):* Microbial spoilage in unpasteurized liquid whole egg. *Food Tech. in Australia.* 34: 524-528.

- Matthes, S. (1984):* Diminution of egg quality caused by avian diseases and microbial contamination. *J. World's Poul. Sci.* 40: 81.
- Mayes, F.J. and Takeballi, M.A. (1983):* Microbial contamination of the hen's egg - A review. *J. Food Prot.* 46: 1092-1098.
- Miller, A.J.; Whiting, R.C. and Smith, J.L. (1997):* Use of risk assessment to reduce listeriosis incidence. *Food Technol.* 51: 100-103.
- Moats, W.A. (1979):* The effect of washing eggs under commercial conditions on bacterial loads on egg shells. *Poult. Sci.* 58: 1228-1233.
- Moats, W.A. (1980):* Classification of bacteria from commercial egg washers and washed and unwashed eggs. *Appl. Environ. Microbiol.* 40: 710-714.
- Mostafa, M.N.; Elyan, A. and Gohar, M.A. (1948):* *J. Egypt Med. Assoc.* 31: 556 cited after Reimann, H. (1969): Food-borne infection and intoxications. Academic press, New York and London.
- Moursy, A.W.; Al-Ashmawy, A.M. and Moursy, E.A. (1982):* Microbiological studies on deteriorated hen eggs. *Assiut Vet. Med. J.* 9: 91-96.
- Ring, Ch. and Atanassova, V. (2001):* Surveillance of poultry flocks kept in three different housing systems for the prevalence of *Campylobacter* and *Salmonella* spp. 1st Cong. of Food Hygiene & Human Health, Fac. Vet. Med., Assiut, Egypt: 91-97.
- Sead, Nagah, M. and El-Prince, Enas, M. (1995):* Prevalence of *Listeria* species in hen's eggs sold in Assiut City. *Assiut Vet. Med. J.* 33: 127-131.
- Speck, M.L. (ed) (1976):* Compendium of methods for microbiological examination of food. American Public Health Association, Washington, DC.
- Taylor, J. (1969):* *Salmonellae* and *Salmonellosis*. P. 25 in: Bacterial food poisoning. London. The Royal Society of Health.
- Tulloch, F.F.; Ryan, K.J.; Formal, S.S. and Franlin, F.A. (1973):* Invasive enteropathogenic *E. coli* dysentery. An outbreak in 28 adults. *Ann. Interna. Med.* 79, 1, 13, *J. Hyg.* 48. II.
- WHO (1988):* Report of the WHO Informal Working Group on Foodborne Listeriosis, Geneva 15-19 February 1988 (WHO/EHE/FOS/88.5) World Health Organisation.
- Wieneke, A.A.; Roberts, D. and Gilbert, R.J. (1993):* Staphylococcal food poisoning in the United Kingdom, 1969-1990. *Epidemiol. Infect.* 110, 519.

Wyah, G.M. (1992): Immunoassays for food poisoning bacteria and bacterial toxins. 1st Ed. Chapman and Hall.

Yang, S.E.; Yu, R.C. and Chou, C.C. (2001): Influence of holding temperature on the growth and survival of *Salmonella* spp. and *Staphylococcus aureus* and the production of staphylococcal enterotoxin in egg products. Int. J. Food Microbiol. 63: 99-107.

Table 1: Incidence of *Listeria* species recovered from the examined commercial hens and ducks' egg shells.

<i>Listeria species</i>	Commercial hens' eggs				Ducks' eggs	
	Native breeds		Poultry farms			
	Positive samples				Positive samples	
	No./15	%	No./15	%	No./15	%
<i>L. monocytogenes</i>	0	0	1	6.7	2	13.3
<i>L. innocua</i>	2	13.3	1	6.7	0	0
<i>L. murrayi</i>	1	6.7	0	0	1	6.7
Total	3	20.0	2	13.3	3	20.0

Table 2: Incidence of *Listeria* species recovered from the examined commercial hens and ducks' egg contents.

<i>Listeria species</i>	Commercial hens' eggs				Ducks' eggs	
	Native breeds		Poultry farms			
	Positive samples				Positive samples	
	No./15	%	No./15	%	No./15	%
<i>L. monocytogenes</i>	0	0	0	0	0	0
<i>L. innocua</i>	1	6.7	0	0	0	0
<i>L. murrayi</i>	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	1	6.7	0	0	0	0

Table 3: Incidence of *Staph. aureus* recovered from the examined Commercial hens and ducks' eggs.

Category	Commercial hens' eggs				Ducks' eggs	
	Native breeds		Poultry farms			
	Positive samples				Positive samples	
	No./15	%	No./15	%	No./15	%
Egg shells	4	26.7	4	26.7	3	20.0
Egg contents	2	13.3	0	0	0	0

Table 4: Incidence of Salmonella, Shigella, E.coli and other Enterobacteriaceae organisms recovered from the examined commercial hens and ducks' egg shells.

Organisms	Commercial hens' eggs				Ducks' eggs	
	Native breeds		Poultry farms			
	Positive samples		Positive samples		Positive samples	
	No./15	%	No./15	%	No./15	%
<i>Sal. Typhimurium</i>	0	0	2	13.3	0	0
<i>Shigella spp.</i>	1	6.7	1	6.7	0	0
<i>E.coli</i>	7	46.7	2	13.3	5	33.3
<i>Enterobacter spp.</i>	1	6.7	2	13.3	3	20.0
<i>Citrobacter spp.</i>	2	13.3	1	6.7	0	0
<i>Klebsiella spp.</i>	0	0	0	0	1	6.7
<i>Providencia spp.</i>	3	20.0	0	0	1	6.7
<i>Proteus rettgeri</i>	1	6.7	2	13.3	1	6.7
<i>Arizona spp.</i>	0	0	1	6.7	0	0
<i>Alcaligenes dispar</i>	1	6.7	1	6.7	0	0

Table 5: Incidence of Salmonella, Shigella, E.coli and other Enterobacteriaceae organisms recovered from the examined commercial hens and ducks' egg contents.

Organisms	Commercial hens' eggs				Ducks' eggs	
	Native breeds		Poultry farms			
	Positive samples		Positive samples		Positive samples	
	No./15	%	No./15	%	No./15	%
<i>Sal. typhimurium</i>	1	6.7	0	0	0	0
<i>E.coli</i>	1	6.7	1	6.7	3	20.0
<i>Enterobacter spp.</i>	1	6.7	0	0	0	0
<i>Citrobacter spp.</i>	0	0	0	0	3	20.0
<i>Providencia spp.</i>	1	6.7	0	0	1	6.7
<i>Proteus rettgeri</i>	1	6.7	0	0	0	0
<i>Proteus vulgaris</i>	0	0	0	0	1	6.7
<i>Arizona spp.</i>	1	6.7	0	0	0	0
<i>Serratia spp.</i>	2	13.3	0	0	0	0
<i>Pseudomonas cyanogenes</i>	0	0	0	0	1	6.7