

Dept. of Animal Hygiene  
 Fac. of Vet. Med. Assiut University  
 Head of Dept. Prof. Dr. Nabila Gazia

## BACTERIOLOGICAL EVALUATION OF POULTRY FEEDS AND FEED INGREDIENTS IN ASSIUT GOVERNORATE

(With 7 Tables)

By

**M.M. AHMED; A.S. SOTOHY; A.A. ISMAIL and M.A. ISMAIL \***

(Received at 14/10/1995)

التقييم البكتريولوجي لبعض علائق الدواجن ومكوناتها  
 في محافظة أسيوط

مصطفى أحمد، سطوحى أحمد، عبد المعز إسماعيل، ماضي إسماعيل

شملت الدراسة التجميع والفحص البكتريولوجى لعدد ٨٢ عينة من علائق الدواجن ومكوناتها ضمت ٢٢ عينة منتج نهائى، ١٨ عينة مركزات أعلاف وكذلك ٤٢ عينة من مكونات الأعلاف النباتية من وحدات إنتاج علائق الدواجن لكل من بنى مر، عرب العوامر، درنكة، ريفا؛ ومنفلوط بمحافظة أسيوط. أسفرت الدراسة عن عزل العديد من عترات الميكروبات المختلفة والتي لها أهميه بالغه لصحة وانتاجية الدواجن. وقد تراوحت متوسطات درجات الأس الهيدروجينى الإجمالى للعينات بين ٥ر٤٥ ± ٥ر٥١ إلى ٦ر٧٢ ± ٥ر٠٢ قبل التعقيم بينما تراوحت من ٥ر٥١ ± ٥ر١٦ إلى ٦ر٦٦ ± ٥ر٠٣ بعد التعقيم كما تراوحت متوسطات العد الطبقي القياسى العام لكل ١ جرام عند ٣٧°م بين (٣ر٠٧ ± ١ر٢١) إلى (١٠ر٠٨ ± ١ر٦) وبعدها أدنى ١ X ١٠ وأقصى ٢ر٨ X ١٠. وقد تبين من الدراسة تلوث العديد من العينات بالميكروبات البرازية تمثلت بمتوسطات عالية لكل من العد الطبقي للميكروبات القولونية والسبحية البرازيه والميكروب اللاهوائى كلستريديوم ولش. وقد تمت مناقشة الأهميه الصحيه لأهم عترات الميكروبات المعزوله بالإضافة الى التوصيات والإشترطات الصحيه الواجب توافرها لمنع أو تقليل حدوث التلوث الميكروبى لعلائق الدواجن ومكوناتها حفاظا على الثروة الداجنه وصحة المستهلك.

### SUMMARY

Eighty two samples of apparently normal poultry feeds and feed ingredients were collected from some poultry processing plants in different localities at Assiut Governorate (Beni-Mor; Arab El-Awamer; Dronka; Rifa and Manfalout). The samples included, poultry rations (22), and concentrate mixtures (18) feed ingredients (42). The pH values were slightly acidic and their over all mean values ranged from 5.54±0.51 to 6.72±0.02 and from 5.51±0.016 to 6.66±0.03 before and after autoclaving, respectively. The aerobic plate count showed a high bacterial load varied from (3.07±1.021) 10<sup>4</sup> to (10.8±1.6) 10<sup>4</sup> with minimum count of 1x10<sup>3</sup> and a maximum of 2.8x10<sup>5</sup> CFU/g. The obtained results revealed that the lowest colony count was in the white corn while the wheat bran showed the highest colony count. The mean values of

\*: Dept. of Botany, Fac. of Science, Assiut.

the total coliform/g ranged from  $(1.22 \pm 0.46) 10^2$  to  $(2.13 \pm 0.62) 10^4$  with a minimum count of  $1.2 \times 10^2$  in soyabean meal and a maximum total coliform count of  $5.7 \times 10^4$  in laying rations. Typical *E. coli* could be recovered from the final rations and most of the feed ingredients. The mean count varied from zero to  $(1.10 \pm 0.54) 10^3$ . The examined samples revealed that both the concentrate mixtures and white corn were free from *E. coli*. Faecal streptococci count/100g ranged from zero to  $(2.50 \pm 0.97) 10^2$  and the maximum count was recorded in the wheat bran samples. However, soyabean meal, yellow corn and white corn are free from *Cl. perfringens* but the count was high in case of the concentrate mixtures. The mean values ranged from zero to  $7.7 \times 10^2$ /g. Wide varieties of pathogenic and potentially pathogenic organisms were isolated with total over all incidence percentages of *Staph. epidermidis* (14.52%), *Strept. faecalis* (9.28%), *Staph. aureus* (8.06%), *Proteus rettgeri* (6.85%), *E. coli* (6.45%), *Cl. perfringens* (6.45%), *Alcaligenes faecalis* (5.64%), *Pseudomonas aeruginosa* (4.44%) beside other enteric organisms with variable total over all percentages. The hygienic significance of the isolates and the protective measures that must be considered were discussed.

**Keywords:** Bacteriological, evaluation, poultry feeds, feed ingredients, Assiut

### INTRODUCTION

Mixed feeds and their basic raw plant materials are considered unexplored area of poultry science. They represent a main source of disease spread so they must receive the proper bacteriological attention. Although BISCIELLO & SCHRADE (1974) failed to recover *Salmonella* from 30 bone meal samples, but other authors isolated *Salmonellae* from the poultry feeds with percentages ranged from 3-80% (SHOTTS *et al.*, 1961 and HACKING, 1978). However, COX *et al.*, 1983 stated that the most frequently encountered members of family Enterobacteriaceae were *Enterobacter agglomerans*, *E. locae* and *Klebsiella pneumoniae*. He also added that, there is no correlation between the level of Enterobacteriaceae and the presence of *Salmonella* in the poultry feeds. TABIB *et al.*, (1981) recorded

that the microbial activity of broiler, layer and turkey feeds was directly influenced by their pH values so the later is considered as a useful indicator of the feed microbial quality. The present study reports on the microbiological quality of poultry feeds, concentrate mixtures and feed ingredients including the count of colony forming units, Coliform, *E. coli*, *Enterococcus* and *Cl. perfringens* as well as the isolation and identification of pathogenic and potentially pathogenic microorganisms. Moreover, pH values were also determined in the samples of poultry feeds and feed ingredients as a related index for their microbial quality.

### MATERIALS and METHODS

#### Collection of the samples:-

The samples of poultry feeds (22), concentrate mixtures (18) and feed in-

redients (42) were collected from some poultry processing plants in different localities at Assiut Governorate (Beni-Mor, Arab El-Awamer, Dronka, Rifa and Manfalout). The samples were collected in sterile plastic bags and transported to the laboratory for their microbiological and physical examination with a minimum of delay.

pH: was determined on 5% slurries in distilled water before and after autoclaving at 121 °C for 15 min. according to *TABIB et al. (1981)*, using pH meter (Model 3200, Jenway, U.K.).

#### Preparation of the samples for bacteriological examination:-

Fifty grams of each sample were placed in sterile flask with 450 ml of sterile physiological saline and vigorously shaken for 1 min. to make 1:10 basal dil. Ten fold serial dilutions were made till  $10^{-7}$  (Cox et al., 1983).

#### Aerobic plate count:-

The colony forming units (CFU) were carried out according to A.P.H.A. (1985) by using standard plate count agar (Oxoid).

#### Coliform count:-

Enterobacteriaceae were counted in pour plates of violet red bile agar with 1% glucose (*MOSSEL et al., 1962; TABIB et al., 1981 and BAILY & SCOTT, 1994*).

#### *Escherichia coli*:-

Was counted according to *FINEGOLD and BARON (1986) and QUINN et al. (1994)*.

#### Enumeration of Enterococci:-

Enterococcus organisms were counted by MPN technique as described by

*COLLINS et al. (1991) and ELMER et al. (1994)*.

#### Enumeration of *Cl. perfringens*:-

Were carried out according to *BEERENS et al. (1980)*. On the other hand, pour plate technique with tryptose sulfite cycloserine agar was also used (*TOPLY & WILSON, 1990*).

#### Isolation and identification of pathogenic and potentially pathogenic organisms:-

##### *Staphylococci*:-

Staph. medium 110, Manitol salt agar and blood agar media were used for isolation of *Staphylococci* according to *CRUICKSHANK et al. (1980) and DEVRIESE & HAJEK (1980)*.

##### *Salmonella* and other enteric pathogens:-

This was carried out and fulfilled according to *KELLY et al. (1985); FINGOLD & BARON (1986) and QUINN et al. (1994)*.

## RESULTS

The obtained results are tabulated in tables (1-7).

## DISCUSSION

The transfer of pathogenic and potentially pathogenic organisms from feeds to poultry to man is an important pattern of contamination and infection, thus, practical and effective methods must be developed and utilized to eliminate them from the feed supply (*COX et al., 1983*).

The pH values in the examined samples are shown in table,1. Most of

the mean pH values of feeds and feed ingredients were slightly acidic and ranged from  $5.54 \pm 0.51$  to  $6.72 \pm 0.02$  before autoclaving and varied from  $5.51 \pm 0.16$  to  $6.66 \pm 0.03$  after autoclaving. The obtained results more or less agree with that obtained by TABIB *et al.* (1981). pH of the substrate can change as a result of microbiological growth, thus it might be a useful indicator of microbial activity. The CFU/g of the different poultry feeds and feed ingredients are illustrated in tables 2 & 3. The mean values of the CFU/g ranged from  $3.07 \pm 1.21 \times 10^4$  to  $10.8 \pm 1.6 \times 10^4$ . The minimum count was  $1 \times 10^3$ , while the maximum count was  $2.8 \times 10^5$ . The results showed that the lowest colony count was in the white corn while the wheat bran showed the highest colony count. Results given in tables 2 & 3 revealed that all examined samples proved to be highly contaminated with enterobacteriaceae. The mean values of total coliform count/g ranged from  $1.22 \pm 0.46 \times 10^2$  to  $2.13 \pm 0.62 \times 10^4$ . The minimum count/g was  $1.2 \times 10^2$  (soyabean meal) while the maximum count was  $5.7 \times 10^4$  (laying rations). The concentrate mixtures and the white corn had the lowest counts. On the other hand, the laying rations contain the highest coliform count ( $2.13 \pm 0.62 \times 10^4$ ). The obtained results are more or less in agreement with that recorded by COX *et al.* (1983) who found that the final feeds contain high coliform count than bone and meat meal.

It is evident from the results recorded in tables 2 & 3 that, *E.coli* could be

detected in the final rations and most of the feed ingredients. The mean count/g varied from zero to  $1.1 \pm 0.54 \times 10^3$ . The maximum *E.coli* count was  $4 \times 10^3$  (laying rations) while the minimum count was zero for all the examined samples. The results revealed also that both concentrate mixtures and white corn are free from *E.coli*.

*Faecal streptococci* could not be detected in the concentrate mixtures (Tables 2 & 3). On the other hand, the mean values for *Enterococcus* count/100g ranged from zero to  $2.5 \pm 0.97 \times 10^2$ . The maximum *Enterococcus* count was recorded in the wheat bran ( $9.0 \times 10^2/100g$ ).

Absence of *E.coli* and faecal *Streptococci* may be attributed either to the heat treatment during manufacturing or that these products were not subjected to the faecal contamination.

The distribution of *Cl.perfringens* in the examined samples is shown in tables 2 & 3. The mean values of *Cl. perfringens* were ranged from zero to  $7.7 \times 10^2/g$ . However, soyabean meal, yellow corn and white corn are free from *Cl.perfringens*.

In general the animal protein sources and bad stored grains offer great opportunities for contamination with pathogens in the final rations (HALVORSON, 1974).

#### Bacterial isolates:

Data presented in tables 4,5,6 and 7 proved that the feed samples are highly contaminated with many pathogenic and potentially pathogenic organisms.

It is easily noticed that *Staphylococcus aureus* represents one of the most important contaminant and could be isolated from the final rations, concentrate mixtures and feed ingredients with over all frequencies of 27.27; 11.11 and 28.57%, respectively, and with a total over all incidence of 8.06%. It is a causative agent of septicaemic synovitis, arthritis with severe losses of chicks, spondylitis, omphalitis and bacterial endocarditis (DEVRIESE, *et al.*, 1975). Moreover, necrotic foci in the liver and spleen beside granulomatous lesions in the lung with mortality up to 5% in chickens (HORIUCHI, *et al.*, 1969).

However, *Streptococcus faecalis* could not be detected from the concentrate mixtures but were isolated with over all frequency percentages of 36.36 & 35.71 from the final rations and feed ingredients, respectively, and with a total over all incidence of 9.28% (Tables 4, 5, 6 & 7). *Strept faecalis* is being increasingly implicated in a variety of diseases to broilers as acute streptococcal septicaemia and endocarditis of chickens with losses up to 5%, as well as, growth depression (HUHTANEN and PENSACK, 1965).

Although the concentrate mixtures were free from *E.coli* but it represents the highest contaminant in the final rations with an over all frequency 40.91% and a total over all incidence of 6.45% (tables 4, 5, 6 & 7). The organism is responsible for various diseases of major economic losses to poultry industry as Colibacillosis,

Hajris diseases, Coligranuloma, Peritonitis, Salpingitis Synovitis, Omphalitis, air sac diseases and various outbreaks of coli-septicaemia (HOFSTAD *et al.* 1978).

Is also evident from the obtained results that *Pseudomonas aeruginosa* could be isolated with over all frequencies of 27.27; 11.11 and 7.14% from the final rations, concentrates and feed ingredients, respectively (tables 4, 5 & 6). The organism is incriminated in a disease called Pseudomoniasis characterized by profuse diarrhoea, generalized oedema of the head and wattles (MAZZETTI, 1972). On the other hand, *Klebsiella pneumoniae* was only isolated from the final rations with an over all frequency of 9.09%, but not detected in both concentrate mixtures and feed ingredients. *Klebsiella* is a caustive agent of some respiratory and urinary infections (Cowan *et al.*, 1960).

*Salmonella* species could not be detected from all examined samples. On the other hand, *Cl.perfringens* could be isolated with over all frequencies of 31.82; 33.33 and 7.14% from final rations, concentrates and feed ingredients, respectively (tables 4, 5 and 6) and with a total over all incidence of 6.45% (Table 7). The high frequency percentage of *Cl.perfringens* in the feed concentrates may be due to to insufficient heat treatment and resistance of their spores during processing or due to the post manufacturing contamination. The organism is responsible for sporadic disease of chickens "Necrotic enteritis" beside depression, decreased

appetite, reluctance to move and ruffled feathers in older birds. Birds are often found dead with no previous clinical illness. Furthermore, *Cl. perfringens* is one of the causative agents in outbreak of gangrenous dermatitis disease in chickens and turkey from 17 days to 20 weeks of age (PURCHASE *et al.*, 1989).

Other organisms of minor health significance were also recovered with variable over all frequency percentages as *Staphylococcus epidermidis*, *Alcaligenes faecalis*, *Klebsiella rhinoscleromatis*, *Enterobacter cloecae*, *E. agglomerans*, *Serratia liquificans*, *S. rubidae*, *Proteus morgani*, *P. ettegr*, *P. mirabilis*, *P. vulgaris*, *Providencia*

*species*, *Citrobacter freundii*, *C. versus* and *Hafnia species* (tables 4-6).

The present data suggest that feed associated microbiological problems are more widespread than is commonly believed. Moreover, the products and techniques to correct microbiological problems are underutilized.

In general, the good feed manufacturing practice, heat treatment and correct handling and storage of raw materials and finished feeds which includes keeping moisture level very low are considered the main measures that must be used to minimize risks of poultry feeds and feed ingredients.

#### REFERENCES

- American public health association (1985): Standard methods for the examination of water and wastewater. 16<sup>th</sup> Ed., Washington, D.C., U.S.A.
- Baily, W.R. & Scott, E.G. (1994): Diagnostic microbiology, 9<sup>th</sup> Ed., the C.V. Mosby, Saint Louis.
- Beerens, H.; Romond, C. H.; Lepage, C. and Criquelion, J. (1980): A direct method for the enumeration of *Clostridium perferings* of World Congress Food borne infections and intoxication Berlin ( West ) 29 : 6, 3-7.
- Bisciello, N.B. and Shrade, J.P. (1974): Evaluation of hektaen enteric agar for the detection of *Salmonella* in foods and feeds. J.Assoc. Offic. Anal. Chem., 57: 992-996.
- Collins, C.H.; Paricia M. Lyne and Grange, J.M. (1991): Collins and Lyner's Microbiological methods, 6<sup>th</sup> Ed.
- Cowan, S. T.; Steel, K. J. and Duguid, J. P. (1960): A classification of *Klebsiella* group. J. Gen. Microb., 23 : 601 - 612.
- Cox, N.A.; Bailey, J.S. and Thomson, J.E. (1983): *Salmonella* and other Enterobacteriaceae found in commercial poultry feed. Poultry science, 62: 2169-2175.
- Cruickshank, R.; Duguid, J.P.; Marmion, B.P. and Swain, R.H. (1980): Medical microbiology, 12<sup>th</sup> Ed., Vol.II, reprinted Churichill Livingstone & Rober. Stevenson Edinburgh, EH 1, 3AF.
- Devriese, L. A.; Devos, A. H. and Domme, L. R. (1975): Quantitative aspects of the *Staphylococcus aureus* flora of poultry. Poultry Sci. 54 : 1, 95 - 101.

- Devriese, L.A. and Hajek, V. (1980): Identification of pathogenic *Staphylococci* isolated from animal and foods derived from animals. *J.appl. Bact.*, 49: 1-6.
- Elmer, W.K.; Stephen, D.; Allen, M.D.; William, M. Janda; Schreckenberger, P.C. and Washington, C.W. (1994): Introduction to diagnostic microbiology. J.B. Lippincott company Philadelphia.
- Finegold, S.M. and Baron, E.J. (1986): Enterobacteriaceae. In Baily & Scott's Diagnostic microbiology, 7<sup>th</sup> Ed. St. Louis, Missouri, Mosby.
- Hacking, W.C.; Mitchell, W.R. and Carlson, H.C. (1978): *Salmonella* investigation in an Ontario feed mill. *Can. J. Comp. Med.*, 42: 400-406.
- Halvorson, D. (1974): The many aspects of sanitation in poultry diseases control. *Poultry digest*, 190-195.
- Hofstad, M. S. ; Calnek, B. W. ; Helmboldt, C. F. ; Reid, M. W. and Yoder, J. H. W. (1978) : Diseases of poultry . 7<sup>th</sup> Ed . , Iowa State University Press .
- Horiuchi, T.; Nonomura, L.; Shoya, S. and Soto, S. (1969) : Visceral lesions in chickens infected with *Staphylococcus aureus* . *Nan Inst. Anim. Health Qt.* , Tokyo , 9 : 174 - 180
- Huhtanen, C. H. and Pensack, J. M. (1965) : The role of *Streptococcus faecalis* in the antibiotic growth effect in chickens . *Poultry Sci.* , 44 : 3 , 830 - 834 .
- Kelly, M. T. ; Brenner, D. J. And Farmer, J.J. (1985) : III-Enterobacteriaceae. In Lennette, E.H. ( Ed - in - chief ) : Manual of clinical Microbiology 4<sup>th</sup>Ed. Washington, D. C. , American Society For Microbiology , 1985 .
- Mazzetti, R. ( 1972 ) : *Pseudomoniasis* of fowls observations and practical consideration . *Zoo Profilassi* , 27 , 191 .
- Mossel, D.A.A.; Mengerink, W.H.J. and Schots, H.H. (1962): Use of a modified MacConkey agar for the selective growth and enumeration of Enterobacteriaceae. *J. Bacteriology*, 84: 381-386.
- Purchase, H. G.; Arp, L. H.; Domermuth, C. H. and Pearson, J. E. (1989) : A laboratory Manual for the isolation and identification of Avian pathogens Third Ed. , P. 47 - 51 .
- Quinn, P.J. ; Carter, M. E. ; Markey, B. K. and Carter, G. R. (1994) : " Clinical Veterinary Microbiology " . Virginia Tech . , Blacksburg , U. S.A.
- Shotts, E.B.; Martin, W.T. and Galton, M.M. (1961): Further studies on *Salmonella* in human and animal foods in the environment of processing plants. P. 309-318 in *proc. 65<sup>th</sup> Annu. Mtg. Us Livestock Assoc.*
- Tabib, Z.; Jones, F.T. and Hamilton, P.B. (1981): Microbiological quality of poultry feed and ingredients. *Poultry Science*, 60: 1392-1397.
- Topley, W. W. C. and Wilson, G. S. (1990) : Principles of bacteriology, Virology and Immunity . 8<sup>th</sup> Edition Systematic Bacteriology.

Table (1): Statistical pH values of poultry feeds and feed ingredients.

P. feeds & ingredients	No. of samples	Before autoclaving			After autoclaving		
		Min	Max	Mean	Min	Max	Mean
<i>Laying rations</i>	9	5.97	6.34	6.16±0.05	6.08	6.51	6.34±0.06
<i>Starters (Broilers)</i>	13	6.04	6.25	6.17±0.02	6.02	6.37	6.17±0.29
<i>Conc., Layers</i>	7	6.13	6.12	6.17±0.01	6.11	6.49	6.22±0.05
<i>Conc., broilers</i>	11	5.82	6.11	5.97±0.03	5.79	6.15	5.96±0.03
<i>Soyabean meal</i>	13	6.58	6.81	6.72±0.02	6.42	6.79	6.66±0.03
<i>Yellow corn (Maiz)</i>	14	4.19	6.08	5.54±0.51	4.06	6.13	5.51±0.16
<i>White corn</i>	3	5.92	5.98	5.94±0.02	5.91	6.07	5.98±0.06
<i>Wheat bran</i>	12	6.27	6.73	6.48±0.05	6.23	6.71	6.43±0.06



Table (2): Statistical analysis of microbiological counts of poultry feeds and feed ingredients

P. feeds & ingredients	Samples No.	Total colony count/g			Total Coliform count/g			Total E. coli count/g		
		Min	Max	Mean	Min	Max	Mean	Min	Max	Mean
Laying ration	9	$1 \times 10^5$	$1.3 \times 10^5$	$5.42 \times 10^4 \pm 1.54$	$1.3 \times 10^4$	$5.7 \times 10^4$	$2.13 \times 10^4 \pm 0.62$	0	$4 \times 10^5$	$1.1 \times 10^5 \pm 0.54$
Conc. (layers)	7	$3 \times 10^4$	$1.2 \times 10^5$	$4.9 \times 10^4 \pm 1.32$	$1.9 \times 10^4$	$1.2 \times 10^4$	$1.22 \times 10^4 \pm 0.46$	0	0	0
Starters	13	$5 \times 10^3$	$1.4 \times 10^5$	$4.6 \times 10^4 \pm 1.46$	$8.2 \times 10^3$	$3.8 \times 10^4$	$10.7 \times 10^3 \pm 0.88$	0	$2 \times 10^5$	$2.6 \times 10^5 \pm 1.71$
Conc. (broiler)	11	$1.6 \times 10^3$	$1.7 \times 10^5$	$3.3 \times 10^4 \pm 1.46$	$2.1 \times 10^4$	$4.2 \times 10^4$	$1.8 \times 10^4 \pm 0.48$	0	0	0
Soyabean meal	15	$5.8 \times 10^3$	$2.8 \times 10^5$	$7.47 \times 10^4 \pm 2.44$	$1.2 \times 10^4$	$1.0 \times 10^4$	$4.1 \times 10^3 \pm 0.94$	0	$6.6 \times 10^4$	$2.4 \times 10^4 \pm 8.13$
Yellow corn	14	$3.7 \times 10^3$	$1.2 \times 10^5$	$5.65 \times 10^4 \pm 1.04$	$4.8 \times 10^3$	$2.4 \times 10^4$	$6.8 \times 10^3 \pm 1.87$	0	$2 \times 10^4$	$0.3 \times 10^4 \pm 3.61$
White corn	3	$1.1 \times 10^4$	$4.2 \times 10^4$	$3.07 \times 10^4 \pm 1.21$	$2.0 \times 10^4$	$8.0 \times 10^4$	$5.7 \times 10^4 \pm 2.3$	0	0	0
Wheat bran	12	$8.9 \times 10^3$	$1.9 \times 10^5$	$1.08 \times 10^5 \pm 0.16$	$4.0 \times 10^4$	$3.6 \times 10^4$	$1.4 \times 10^4 \pm 4.22$	0	$1.1 \times 10^4$	$0.8 \times 10^4 \pm 1.23$

Table (2): Continue

P. feeds & feed ingredients	Sample No.	Total Enterococcus, MPN/100g			Total Cl. perfringens/g		
		Min	Max	Mean	Min	Max	Mean
Laying ration	9	0	45	$24.4 \pm 6.64$	0	$1 \times 10^3$	$1.1 \times 10^2$
Conc. (layers)	7	0	0	0	0	$1 \times 10^3$	$5.7 \times 10^2$
Starters	13	7	95	$18.38 \pm 6.73$	0	$1 \times 10^4$	$7.7 \times 10^2$
Conc. (broiler)	11	0	0	0	0	$1 \times 10^2$	$3.3 \times 10^1$
Soyabean meal	15	17	35	$25.15 \pm 1.69$	0	0	0
Yellow corn	14	50	115	$83.57 \pm 5.79$	0	0	0
White corn	3	17	20	$18.0 \pm 1.22$	0	0	0
Wheat bran	12	80	$9 \times 10^2$	$2.5 \times 10^2 \pm 0.97$	0	$1 \times 10^4$	1.7

Table (3): Statistical microbiological mean values of different poultry feeds and feed ingredients.

feeds & Ingredient	No.	(CFU/g) $\times 10^4$	T. coliform /g	E. coli /g	F. Strep. MPN/100	Cl. perfringens /g
Laying ration	9	5.42 $\pm$ 1.54	2.13 $\times 10^3 \pm 0.62$	1.1 $\times 10^3 \pm 0.54$	24.4 $\pm$ 6.64	1.1 $\times 10^2$
Starter	13	4.6 $\pm$ 1.46	10.7 $\times 10^3 \pm 2.88$	2.6 $\times 10^3 \pm 1.71$	18.38 $\pm$ 6.63	7.7 $\times 10^2$
Concentrates (Layer)	7	4.9 $\pm$ 1.32	1.22 $\times 10^3 \pm 0.46$	0	0	5.7 $\times 10^2$
Concentrates (Broiler)	11	3.3 $\pm$ 1.16	1.8 $\times 10^3 \pm 0.48$	0	0	3.3 $\times 10^2$
Soyabean meal	13	7.47 $\pm$ 2.44	4.1 $\times 10^3 \pm 0.94$	2.4 $\times 10^3 \pm 3.13$	25.15 $\pm$ 1.69	0
Yellow corn	14	5.65 $\pm$ 1.04	6.8 $\times 10^3 \pm 1.87$	0.3 $\times 10^3 \pm 3.61$	83.57 $\pm$ 5.79	0
White corn	3	3.07 $\pm$ 1.21	5.7 $\times 10^3 \pm 2.3$	0	18.00 $\pm$ 1.22	0
Wheat bran	12	10.8 $\pm$ 1.60	1.4 $\times 10^3 \pm 4.22$	0.8 $\times 10^3 \pm 1.32$	2.5 $\times 10^2 \pm 0.97$	1.7 $\pm$ 1.2

Table (4): Frequency distribution and incidence percentages of pathogenic and potentially pathogenic isolates from poultry rations.

Isolates	Laying rations				Broiler rations			Over all frequency %	Over all Incidence %
	Isolate No.	Incidence %	Frequency %	Isolates No.	Incid. %	Freq. %			
<i>Staph. aureus</i>	3	6.98	33.33	3	5.77	23.08	27.27	6.31	
<i>Staph. epidermidis</i>	6	13.95	66.67	7	13.46	53.85	59.09	13.68	
<i>Strept. faecalis</i>	4	9.30	44.44	4	7.69	30.77	36.36	8.42	
<i>Cl. perfringens</i>	2	4.65	22.22	5	9.61	38.46	31.82	7.37	
<i>Ps. aeruginosa</i>	3	6.98	33.33	3	5.77	23.08	27.27	6.31	
<i>Alcaligenes faecalis</i>	2	4.65	22.22	2	3.85	15.38	18.18	4.21	
<i>Escherichia coli</i>	5	11.63	55.55	4	7.69	30.77	40.91	9.47	
<i>Klebsiella pneumoniae</i>	1	2.32	11.11	1	1.92	7.69	9.09	2.10	
<i>K. rhinoscleromatis</i>	1	2.32	11.11	1	1.92	7.69	9.09	2.10	
<i>Enterobacter cloacae</i>	1	2.32	11.11	3	5.77	23.08	18.18	4.21	
<i>E. agglomerans</i>	1	2.32	11.11	2	3.85	15.38	13.64	3.16	
<i>Serratia liquificans</i>	1	2.32	11.11	1	1.92	7.69	9.09	2.10	
<i>S. rubidae</i>	1	2.32	11.11	2	3.85	15.38	13.64	3.16	
<i>Protelus morganti</i>	0	0	0	2	3.85	15.38	9.09	2.10	
<i>P. rettgeri</i>	2	4.65	22.22	3	5.77	23.08	22.73	5.26	
<i>P. mirabilis</i>	2	4.65	22.22	1	1.92	7.69	13.64	3.16	
<i>P. vulgaris</i>	0	0	0	1	1.92	7.69	4.54	1.05	
<i>Providencia spp.</i>	1	2.32	11.11	3	5.77	23.08	18.18	4.21	
<i>P. gondii</i>	2	4.65	22.22	2	3.85	15.38	18.18	4.21	
<i>Citrobacter freundii</i>	1	2.32	11.11	0	0	0	4.54	1.05	
<i>C. diversus</i>	2	4.65	22.22	1	1.92	7.69	13.64	3.16	
<i>Hafnia spp.</i>	2	4.65	22.22	1	1.92	7.69	13.64	3.16	
<i>Salmonella spp.</i>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Table (5): Frequency distribution and incidence percentages of pathogenic and potentially pathogenic isolates from poultry concentrates.

Isolates	Layer concentrates			Broiler concentrates			Over all frequency%	Over all incidence%
	Isolates No.	Incidence %	Frequency	Isolate No	Incidence %	Frequency %		
		%						
<i>Staph. aureus</i>	2	15.38	28.57	0	0	0	11.11	6.25
<i>Staph. epidermidis</i>	3	23.08	42.86	1	5.26	9.09	16.67	12.50
<i>Strept. faecalis</i>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<i>Cl. perfringens</i>	3	23.08	42.86	3	15.79	27.27	33.33	18.75
<i>Ps. aeruginosa</i>	0	0	0	2	10.53	18.18	11.11	6.25
<i>Alcaligenes faecalis</i>	2	15.38	28.57	3	15.79	27.27	27.78	15.62
<i>Escherichia coli</i>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<i>Klebsiella pneumoniae</i>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<i>K. rhinoscleromatis</i>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<i>Enterobacter cloacae</i>	1	7.69	14.28	0	0	0	5.55	3.12
<i>E. agglomerans</i>	1	7.69	14.28	2	10.53	18.18	16.67	9.37
<i>Serratia liquifcans</i>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<i>S. rubidae</i>	1	7.69	14.28	1	5.26	9.09	11.11	6.25
<i>Protocus morgantii</i>	0	0	0	1	5.26	9.09	5.55	3.12
<i>P. rettgeri</i>	0	0	0	1	5.26	9.09	5.55	3.12
<i>P. mirabilis</i>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<i>P. vulgaris</i>	0	0	0	2	10.53	18.18	11.11	6.25
<i>Providencia spp.</i>	0	0	0	1	5.26	9.09	5.55	3.12
<i>P. gondii</i>	0	0	0	1	5.26	9.09	5.55	3.12
<i>Citrobacter freundii</i>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<i>C. diversus</i>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<i>Hafnia spp.</i>	0	0	0	1	5.26	9.09	5.55	3.12
<i>Salmonella spp.</i>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Table (6): Frequency distribution and incidence percentages of pathogenic and potentially pathogenic isolates from poultry feeds and feed ingredients.

Isolates	Soyabean meal			Yellow corn			White corn			Wheat bran			Over all frequency%	Over all incidence %
	No. of isolates	Incid. %	I req. %	No. of isolates	Incid. %	I req. %	No. of isolates	Incid. %	I req. %	No. of isolates	Inc. %	Freq. %		
<i>Staph. aureus</i>	5	13.16	38.46	3	12.50	21.43	1	8.33	33.33	3	6.38	25	28.57	9.92
<i>Staph. epidermidis</i>	6	15.79	46.15	5	20.83	15.71	2	16.67	66.67	6	12.76	50	45.24	15.70
<i>Strept. faecalis</i>	5	13.16	38.46	5	20.83	15.71	1	8.33	33.33	4	8.51	33.33	35.71	12.40
<i>C. perfringens</i>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	6.38	25	7.14	2.48
<i>Ps. aeruginosa</i>	1	2.63	7.69	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	4.25	16.67	7.14	2.48
<i>Alcaligenes faecalis</i>	2	5.26	15.38	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	6.38	25	11.90	4.13
<i>Escherichia coli</i>	3	7.89	23.08	2	8.33	14.28	0	0	0	2	4.25	16.67	16.67	5.78
<i>Klebsiella pneumoniae</i>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<i>K. rhinoscleromatis</i>	1	2.63	7.69	0	0	0	1	8.33	33.33	1	2.13	8.33	7.14	2.48
<i>Enterobacter cloacae</i>	2	5.26	15.38	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	4.25	16.67	9.52	3.30
<i>E. agglomerans</i>	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	8.33	33.33	3	6.38	25	9.52	3.30
<i>Serratia liquefaciens</i>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2.13	8.33	2.38	0.83
<i>S. rubidae</i>	2	5.26	15.38	1	4.17	7.14	1	8.33	33.33	2	4.25	16.67	17.28	4.96
<i>Proteus morgani</i>	1	2.63	7.69	1	4.17	7.14	1	8.33	33.33	2	4.25	16.67	11.90	4.13
<i>P. rettgeri</i>	3	7.89	23.08	2	8.33	14.28	2	16.67	66.67	4	8.51	33.33	26.19	9.09
<i>P. mirabilis</i>	1	2.63	7.69	1	4.17	7.14	0	0	0	2	4.25	16.67	9.52	3.30
<i>P. vulgaris</i>	1	2.63	7.69	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2.13	8.33	4.76	1.65
<i>Providencia spp.</i>	1	2.63	7.69	1	4.17	7.14	1	8.33	33.33	2	4.25	16.67	11.90	4.13
<i>P. gonadii</i>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<i>Citrobacter freundii</i>	2	5.26	15.38	1	4.17	7.14	0	0	0	2	4.25	16.67	11.90	4.13
<i>C. diversus</i>	1	2.63	7.69	2	8.33	14.28	1	8.33	33.33	1	2.13	8.33	11.90	4.13
<i>Hafnia spp.</i>	1	2.63	7.69	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2.13	8.33	4.76	1.65
<i>Salmonella spp.</i>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Table (7): Frequency distribution and incidence percentages of pathogenic and potentially pathogenic isolates from poultry feeds and feed ingredients.

Isolates	No. of isolates										T. over all incidence %	T. over all frequency %
	Laying ration	Broiler ration	Conc. layer	Conc. broiler	Soyabean meal	Yellow corn	White corn	Wheat bran	T. isolates			
<i>Staph. aureus</i>	3	3	2	0	5	3	1	3	20	8.06	24.39	
<i>Staph. epidermidis</i>	6	7	3	1	6	5	2	6	36	14.52	43.90	
<i>Strept. faecalis</i>	4	4	0	0	5	5	1	4	23	9.28	28.05	
<i>C. perfringens</i>	2	5	3	3	0	0	0	3	16	6.45	19.51	
<i>P. aeruginosa</i>	3	3	0	2	1	0	0	2	11	4.44	13.41	
<i>Alcaligenes faecalis</i>	2	2	2	3	0	0	0	3	14	5.64	17.07	
<i>Escherichia coli</i>	5	4	0	0	3	2	0	2	16	6.45	19.51	
<i>Klebsiella pneumoniae</i>	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0.81	2.44	
<i>K. rhinoscleromatis</i>	1	1	0	0	1	0	1	1	5	2.02	6.09	
<i>Enterobacter cloecae</i>	1	3	1	0	2	0	2	2	9	3.63	10.97	
<i>E. agglomerans</i>	1	2	1	2	0	0	1	3	10	4.03	12.19	
<i>Serratia liquefacans</i>	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	1.21	3.66	
<i>S. rubidae</i>	1	2	1	1	2	1	1	2	11	4.44	13.41	
<i>Proteus morganii</i>	0	2	0	1	1	1	1	2	8	3.22	9.76	
<i>P. rettgeri</i>	2	3	0	1	3	2	2	4	17	6.85	20.73	
<i>P. mirabilis</i>	2	1	0	0	1	1	0	2	7	2.82	8.54	
<i>P. vulgaris</i>	0	1	0	2	1	0	0	1	5	2.02	6.09	
<i>Providencia spp.</i>	1	3	0	1	1	1	1	2	10	4.03	12.19	
<i>P. gondii</i>	2	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	5	2.02	6.09	
<i>Citrobacter freundii</i>	1	0	0	0	2	1	0	2	6	2.42	7.38	
<i>C. diversus</i>	2	1	0	0	1	2	1	1	8	3.22	9.76	
<i>Itafina spp.</i>	2	1	0	1	1	0	0	1	6	2.42	7.38	
<i>Salmonella spp.</i>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Total	43	52	13	19	38	24	12	47	248	100	302.52	