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**Abstract**

One hundred eight *Listeria monocytogenes* food isolates from four cities in Colombia and previously confirmed by multiplex polymerase chain reaction were characterized for antimicrobial susceptibility. Isolates were evaluated against 17 antimicrobials contained in the MICroSTREP plus® 3 panel (MicroScan system). Susceptibility found for ampicillin, amoxicillin/clavulanic acid, and chloramphenicol was 100%, whereas it was 98% for other antimicrobials such as trimethoprim/sulfamethoxazole, 97% for azithromycin, 92% for vancomycin, 90% for erythromycin, 86% for tetracycline, 84% for penicillin, 70% for ciprofloxacin, 57% for rifampin, 56% for meropenem, and 32% for clindamycin. Natural resistance to cephalosporins was confirmed in all cases, and 16% of isolates were nonsusceptible to penicillin. Using *Staphylococcus* spp. or *Enterococcus* spp. breakpoints, 48% of isolates displayed multidrug resistances, and the major resistance phenotypes were against rifampin, clindamycin, ciprofloxacin, azithromycin, and erythromycin. Colombian food isolates displayed high resistance to clindamycin, meropenem, rifampin, and ciprofloxacin (30%–65%), and the primary drugs of choice against listeriosis remain effective for most of isolates (84%).

**Introduction**

*Listeria monocytogenes* is an emergent food-borne pathogen responsible for major outbreaks and sporadic food-related cases of listeriosis (Posfay-Barbe and Wald, 2009) worldwide (Torres et al., 2004), rendering this food-transmitted disease a public health concern.

*L. monocytogenes* can affect the central nervous system, causing neurological sequels or leading to death. Newborns, pregnant women, old people, and immunologically suppressed people are more susceptible to the illness. The clinical forms of the disease vary according to the infected group and the most common manifestations are meningitis, meningencephalitis, septicemia, abortion, and prenatal infection. Mortality by this disease oscillates between 20% and 30% in risk groups (Korkeala and Siitonen, 2003). The noninvasive form of listeriosis causes gastrointestinal syndrome (Torres et al., 2005).

A large variety of foods have been implicated as vehicles in sporadic outbreaks and epidemics; among them are milk, cheeses, vegetables, poultry, and beef products, particularly ready-to-eat products (Gallegos et al., 2008; Vanegas et al., 2009).

*L. monocytogenes* is naturally resistant to cephalosporins, aztreonam, fosfomycin, pipemidic acid, dalfopristin/quinupristin, and sulfamethoxazole (STX) (Charpentier and Courvalin, 1999; Troxler et al., 2000). The primary drugs of choice against *L. monocytogenes* causing human listeriosis are penicillin and ampicillin alone or combined with an aminoglycoside such as streptomycin or gentamicin; patients allergic to penicillin may be treated with trimethoprim/STX (CLSI, 2008b; Lyon et al., 2008; Chen et al., 2010). Vancomycin, erythromycin, tetracycline, and chloramphenicol have also been used in listeriosis treatment (Charpentier and Courvalin, 1999); however, it is possible to find case reports involving the use of other antibiotics against *L. monocytogenes*, such as linezolid and rifampin (Salamano et al., 2005; Morosi et al., 2006).

Several studies on antimicrobial resistance of *Listeria* spp. clearly show that genetic material involved in short-term evolutionary adaptation may be successfully transferred from *Bacillus subtilis*, *E. coli*, and *Streptococcus* spp. to *Listeria* spp. and also from *Listeria* spp. to other Gram-positive bacteria phylogenetically related, such as *Enterococcus* spp. and *Staphylococcus* spp. (Lyon et al., 2008). Further, the genetic
heterogeneity of Listeria spp. indicates that both vertical and horizontal gene transfers are relatively common in these bacteria (Charpentier and Courvalin, 1999).

Although government recommendations do not support this practice, in Colombia, as in many other countries, it is a common practice to provide large doses of antibiotics to livestock and poultry, assuming a “disease prevention and growth promoters effect” and thus increasing the risk of stimulating a dissemination cycle of antibiotic-resistant microorganisms (Lozano and Arias, 2008).

As there are few works on antimicrobial susceptibility of Colombian Listeria spp. isolated from food (Gallegos et al., 2008), the aim of the present retrospective study was to describe the antimicrobial susceptibility profile of L. monocytogenes food isolates of four cities of Colombia. It is important to remark that because of a low and variable number of isolates from certain food products or cities, it is not possible to establish relation between the resistance pattern and the food origin.

Materials and Methods

Isolates

One hundred eight food isolates of L. monocytogenes previously confirmed by PCR (Poutou et al., 2005) were used. Isolates were distributed as follows: Bogotá (n=44; 41%), Madrid-Colombia (n=8; 7%), Funza (n=42; 39%), Pamplona-Colombia (n=12; 11%), and 2 (2%) of unknown provenience. Isolates were from poultry (n=28; 26%), cheese (n=20; 19%), lettuce (n=8; 7%), spinach (n=34; 31%), raw cow milk (n=17; 16%), and 1 (1%) of unknown food-type origin.

Antimicrobial susceptibility test

Currently, there are no interpretative criteria for antimicrobial susceptibility of Listeria spp., except for ampicillin, penicillin, and trimethoprim/STX. Therefore, breakpoints recommended by CLSI for Enterococcus spp. and Staphylococcus spp. were applied in this study for the other antimicrobials tested (Conter et al., 2009; CLSI, 2010; De Nes et al., 2010).

The antimicrobial susceptibility of the 108 isolates of L. monocytogenes was evaluated with the broth microdilution technique (MicroScan system). This system was approved by the “Instituto Nacional de Vigilancia de Medicamentos y Alimentos” (INVIMA), and the panel MICroSTREP plus3 (Siemens) allowed the fulfillment of the requirement stated in the M45A document by CLSI (2008), related with the use of lysed horse blood for detection of antimicrobial susceptibility of exigent microorganisms (CLSI, 2008a).

A cell suspension equivalent to 0.5 McFarland scale (Mueller-Hinton plus lysed horse blood) was inoculated into the MICroSTREP plus3 (Siemens) and incubated at 37°C as recommended by the manufacturer. The panel includes the following antimicrobials: penicillin, ampicillin, cefotaxime, cephradine, cefepime, chloramphenicol, trimethoprim/STX, cefturoxime, rifampin, meropenem, amoxicillin/clavulanic acid, clindamycin, tetracycline, azithromycin, erythromycin, vancomycin, and ciprofloxacin. We used S. pneumoniae (ATCC 49619) as a control for the antimicrobial susceptibility tests (CLSI, 2008a). Descriptive statistical analysis was carried out with the software Whonet 5.6 (2010) (Miranda et al., 2006b).

Results and Discussion

Colombia, as a tropical country, lacks four seasons and shows slight climatic variations within a region; on the contrary, noticeable climatic differences occur between regions located at different altitudes or “thermal floors.” In a previous study, we detected a certain influence of “thermal floors” and their associated environmental conditions (temperature, relative humidity, oxygen pressure, and ecological factors) on the food recovery of L. monocytogenes (Gallegos et al., 2008). The present retrospective study included L. monocytogenes food isolates from cold-climate cities.

The resistance of L. monocytogenes is emerging and has been previously documented; in this sense, it is known that the standard antibiotic therapy choices for effective treatment of human listeriosis are penicillin, ampicillin, and trimethoprim/STX (CLSI, 2008a); for these antimicrobials, our food isolates of L. monocytogenes displayed 84%–100% susceptibility (Table 1).

The rare occurrence of penicillin resistance among food isolates of L. monocytogenes allows using a category different to susceptible, as it was recommended (CLSI, 2008a). A noteworthy 16% (17/108) of the isolates were nonsusceptible to penicillin, with minimum inhibitory concentrations (MICs) of 4 or 8 μg mL⁻¹ (Table 1); all of these isolates have to be submitted to a reference laboratory for susceptibility confirmation. On the contrary, recent studies have reported penicillin resistance levels of 66.7% (Santos Mantilla et al., 2008), susceptibility levels of 5% (Pesavento et al., 2010), and intermediate levels of about 83% (Chen et al., 2010), which are higher than our results.

The ampicillin MIC₉₀ coincided with the susceptibility breakpoint, whereas penicillin MIC₉₀ was 4 μg mL⁻¹, exceeding the susceptibility breakpoint (Table 1). This result suggests an increase in antimicrobial resistance of some L. monocytogenes isolates when compared with clinical isolates.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Antimicrobial</th>
<th>Breakpoints (mg mL⁻¹)</th>
<th>No. of isolates (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEN</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AM</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SXT</td>
<td>≥4/76</td>
<td>1/19–2/38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1. Antimicrobial Susceptibility Test for Penicillin, Ampicillin, and Trimethoprim/Sulfamethoxazole of Listeria monocytogenes Food Isolates

Breakpoints for Listeria monocytogenes were used for interpretation (CLSI, 2008a, 2010).

MIC, minimum inhibitory concentration; R, resistant; I, intermediate; S, susceptible; NS, nonsusceptible; PEN, penicillin; AM, ampicillin; SXT, trimethoprim/sulfamethoxazole.
reported (Martínez-Martínez et al., 2001), which showed MIC$_{90}$ of about 1 µg mL$^{-1}$.

Resistance to trimethoprim/STX of *L. monocytogenes* was previously documented in 1997 (Morvan et al., 2010), with MICs of 1,024 µg mL$^{-1}$. In our present work, 2% of the isolates were intermediate (MIC: 1 µg mL$^{-1}$) against SXT (Table 1). Considering that an intermediate strain will become a resistant one, our results agree with recent studies reporting 1.6% (Conter et al., 2009) and 0.6% (Lyon et al., 2008) of resistance; however, some authors have reported higher resistance levels of up to 66% (Yücel et al., 2005). The MIC$_{90}$ for STX was lower than the susceptibility breakpoint, proving the effectiveness of the antibiotic (Table 1).

Figure 1 (bottom graph) shows that only 1% (1/108) of the isolates were nonsusceptible to penicillin (MIC: 4 µg mL$^{-1}$) and also intermediate for trimethoprim/STX (MIC: 1 µg mL$^{-1}$);

**FIG. 1.** Whonet 5.6 (2010) graphs. Isolates distribution expressed in percentage as a function of *Listeria monocytogenes* MICs. Top: trimethoprim/SXT versus AM. Middle: PEN versus AM. Bottom: PEN versus trimethoprim/SXT. Internal lines remark susceptibility and resistance breakpoints for *L. monocytogenes*, and the space between two vertical or horizontal lines shows the intermediates MIC for SXT. In the case of AM and PEN, only one line appears, remarking the susceptibility breakpoint; in both cases, resistance breakpoint has not been defined (1). MIC, minimum inhibitory concentration; SXT, sulfamethoxazole; AM, ampicillin; PEN, penicillin.
the figure also shows that 15% of penicillin-nonsusceptible isolates were sensitive to trimethoprim/STX. In Figure 1, the middle graph shows that 16% of isolates nonsusceptible to penicillin are susceptible to ampicillin and the top graph shows that 2% of intermediates for trimethoprim/STX isolates were sensitive to ampicillin, which is an encouraging result in terms of possible treatment.

The results of the antimicrobial susceptibility tests for the other antimicrobials are shown in Tables 2 and 3. The other 14 antimicrobial agents were tested, but *L. monocytogenes* showed natural resistance as expected to all the cephalosporins included in the MICrStREP plus3 panel (Troxler et al., 2000), namely cefotaxime, cefepime, cephradine, and cefuroxime axetil; therefore, they were excluded from Tables 2 and 3.

More than 90% of isolates were susceptible to other antimicrobials, such as amoxicillin/clavulanic acid (Augmentin), azithromycin, erythromycin, chloramphenicol, and vancomycin (Tables 2 and 3). On the contrary, there is a remarkable number of isolates with intermediate MICs for rifampin, ciprofloxacin, meropenem, and tetracycline and with a high percentage of resistance to clindamycin and rifampin; all of them showed an MIC90 of about 2 or 4 μg mL⁻¹. This MIC90 ranging between an intermediate and a resistant strain suggests a potentially inefficient antimicrobial action in the future (Table 2).

Rifampin is a wide-spectrum antimicrobial because of its action on the RNA polymerase β subunit and is active against mycobacteria and Gram-positive bacteria. Its resistance has been previously documented (Morse et al., 1999) and different levels have been found: 50% (Santos Mantilla et al., 2008), 3% (Conter et al., 2007), and 1.6% (Conter et al., 2009). The levels found in our work, that is, 41% of intermediates plus 2% of resistent (Table 2), should be considered as alarming values because rifampin is the major choice in therapeutic treatment against *Mycobacterium tuberculosis* when no multidrug resistance pattern is detected (Miranda et al., 2006a).

In the case of ciprofloxacin, MIC90 values (2 μg mL⁻¹) similar to that found in our present work (Table 2) have been reported for clinical isolates of *L. monocytogenes* (Martínez-Martínez et al., 2001). The frequency of 30% intermediates in our study is higher when compared with the 2.4% (Li et al., 2006) and 1.6% (Conter et al., 2009) resistance levels previously reported, but all these results are supported by a reduction in susceptibility to ciprofloxacin as was recently reported (De Nes et al., 2010).

Meropenem apparently has not been used in antimicrobial susceptibility testing of *L. monocytogenes* food isolates or in clinical treatment against listeriosis. In this sense, it is not useful to make an interpretation of MIC90 beyond the fact that it coincides with the intermediate MIC (Table 2).

Apparently, the *L. monocytogenes* tetracycline resistance varies widely, being frequently found in food, environmental, human, and animal isolates (Conter et al., 2007). Our results agree with those of Li et al. (2006), who found 18.6% of resistance levels in our study is higher when compared with the 2.4% (Li et al., 2006) and 1.6% (Conter et al., 2009) resistance levels previously reported, but all these results are supported by a reduction in susceptibility to ciprofloxacin as was recently reported (De Nes et al., 2010).

Meropenem apparently has not been used in antimicrobial susceptibility testing of *L. monocytogenes* food isolates or in clinical treatment against listeriosis. In this sense, it is not useful to make an interpretation of MIC90 beyond the fact that it coincides with the intermediate MIC (Table 2).

Table 2. Antimicrobial Susceptibility Test of *Listeria monocytogenes* Food Isolates Against the Other Antimicrobials Assayed, Except Vancomycin

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Antimicrobial</th>
<th>Breakpoints (mg mL⁻¹)</th>
<th>No. of isolates (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amox/Clav</td>
<td>≥32</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meropenem</td>
<td>≥16</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rifampin</td>
<td>≥4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ciprofloxacin</td>
<td>≥4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clindamycin</td>
<td>≥4</td>
<td>1–2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Azithromycin</td>
<td>≥8</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erythromycin</td>
<td>≥8</td>
<td>1–4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chloramphenicol</td>
<td>≥32</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tetracycline</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Common breakpoints for *Staphylococcus* sp. and *Enterococcus* sp. were used for interpretation (CLSI, 2008a, 2010). Un, unknown; Amox/Clav, amoxacillin/clavulanic acid (Augmentin).

Table 3. Antimicrobial Susceptibility Test of *Listeria monocytogenes* Food Isolates Against Vancomycin

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Antimicrobial</th>
<th>Breakpoints (mg mL⁻¹)</th>
<th>No. of isolates (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vancomycin</td>
<td>≥16</td>
<td>4–8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vancomycin</td>
<td>≥32</td>
<td>8–16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

aBreakpoint for *Staphylococcus* sp.
bBreakpoint for *Enterococcus* sp. used for interpretation (CLSI, 2008a, 2010).
cThese results should not be considered alarming data, if we consider that the breakpoints for *Staphylococcus* spp., and *Enterococcus* spp. are very different. On the other hand, it is not convenient to generate alarm over the presence of phenotypes *L. monocytogenes* VA1 without prior exhaustive confirmation.
Sixty-five percent of isolates displayed a strong resistance against clindamycin. This antimicrobial interferes with the protein synthesis in a similar way as erythromycin and chloramphenicol. All of them bind with the bacterial 50S ribosomal subunit. Because of this reason, a cross-resistance among clindamycin, erythromycin, and chloramphenicol can sometimes be detected (Depardieu et al., 2007). In our present work, only 5 of 52 multidrug-resistant isolates (10%) displayed resistance to both clindamycin and erythromycin, suggesting a possible modification of the 23S rRNA (Davis and Jackson, 2009). No resistance to chloramphenicol was detected. In contrast, the high resistance found against clindamycin (Table 2) may suggest that a mechanism of resistance such as a clindamycin-inactivating enzyme that modifies the antimicrobial structure could occur, as has been previously reported (Brisson-Noel et al., 1988; Davis and Jackson, 2009; Chen et al., 2010).

On the basis of the CLSI breakpoints for Staphylococcus spp. and Enterococcus spp., 48% of the isolates were classified as multidrug resistant (Table 4). In this study, intermediate MICs were considered as resistant at the moment of performing the multidrug resistance patterns. These distributions show that resistances to rifampin, clindamycin, erythromycin, meropenem, tetracycline, and ciprofloxacin were the most frequent multidrug resistance phenotypes and were present in all the food types (Table 4).

The geographical distribution of multidrug resistance patterns was as follows: 50% (4/8) in Madrid (Colombia), 42% (5/12) in Pamplona (Colombia), 59% (26/44) in Bogotá, 36% (15/42) in Funza, and 100% (2/2) of unknown origin. In this sense, it is important to remark that, in the present study, it was not possible to test the hypothesis that the resistance pattern depends on the origin because of a low and variable number of isolates from certain food products or cities.

These results are supported by the fact that both poultry and cattle are treated with antibiotics as prophylactic agents and growth promoters and vegetables are irrigated with poultry manure (called “gallinaza” in Colombia).

All these antimicrobial susceptibility results are also supported by the fact that in Colombia it is authorized to use more than 16 antimicrobial molecules with the intention of fattening or for therapeutic purposes (Lozano and Arias, 2008), which leads to resistance gene transfer and the presence of antibiotic residues in food products (Teuber, 1999; Phillips et al., 2004; Lozano and Arias, 2008). Although since 2005 the

### Table 4. Distribution of Multidrug Resistance Patterns by Food Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phenotype</th>
<th>Cheeses</th>
<th>Cow milk</th>
<th>Poultry</th>
<th>Lettuce</th>
<th>Spinach</th>
<th>Unknown</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MER&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt; RIF&lt;sup&gt;R&lt;/sup&gt; CD&lt;sup&gt;R&lt;/sup&gt; CP&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>2/12 (16.6)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MER&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt; RIF&lt;sup&gt;R&lt;/sup&gt; CD&lt;sup&gt;R&lt;/sup&gt; CP&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt; TE&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>1/4 (7.2)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MER&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt; RIF&lt;sup&gt;R&lt;/sup&gt; CD&lt;sup&gt;R&lt;/sup&gt; CP&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt; TE&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt; AZI&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>1/8 (12.5)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MER&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt; RIF&lt;sup&gt;R&lt;/sup&gt; CD&lt;sup&gt;R&lt;/sup&gt; CP&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt; TE&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt; E&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>1/8 (12.5)</td>
<td>1/4 (7.2)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MER&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt; RIF&lt;sup&gt;R&lt;/sup&gt; CD&lt;sup&gt;R&lt;/sup&gt; CP&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt; TE&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt; E&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>1/8 (12.5)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MER&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt; RIF&lt;sup&gt;R&lt;/sup&gt; CD&lt;sup&gt;R&lt;/sup&gt; CP&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt; AZI&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt; E&lt;sup&gt;R&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>1/3 (33.33)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MER&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt; RIF&lt;sup&gt;R&lt;/sup&gt; CP&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt; TE&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt; E&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>1/12 (8.3)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MER&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt; RIF&lt;sup&gt;R&lt;/sup&gt; CP&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt; TE&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>1/12 (8.3)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MER&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt; RIF&lt;sup&gt;R&lt;/sup&gt; CP&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt; AZI&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt; E&lt;sup&gt;R&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>1/3 (33.33)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MER&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt; RIF&lt;sup&gt;R&lt;/sup&gt; CP&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt; TE&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>1/12 (8.3)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MER&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt; RIF&lt;sup&gt;R&lt;/sup&gt; CP&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt; E&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>1/12 (8.3)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MER&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt; RIF&lt;sup&gt;R&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>8/14 (57.2)</td>
<td>2/8 (25)</td>
<td>3/14 (21.3)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>2/12 (16.6)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MER&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt; RIF&lt;sup&gt;R&lt;/sup&gt; TE&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>1/12 (8.3)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MER&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt; RIF&lt;sup&gt;R&lt;/sup&gt; TE&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt; E&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>1/12 (8.3)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MER&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt; RIF&lt;sup&gt;R&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>3/14 (21.2)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>4/14 (28.6)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MER&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt; RIF&lt;sup&gt;R&lt;/sup&gt; TE&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>1/4 (25)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MER&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt; RIF&lt;sup&gt;R&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>1/4 (25)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MER&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt; RIF&lt;sup&gt;R&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>1/4 (25)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RIF&lt;sup&gt;R&lt;/sup&gt; CD&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>1/8 (12.5)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RIF&lt;sup&gt;R&lt;/sup&gt; CD&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>1/8 (12.5)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RIF&lt;sup&gt;R&lt;/sup&gt; CD&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>1/4 (25)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RIF&lt;sup&gt;R&lt;/sup&gt; CD&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>1/8 (12.5)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RIF&lt;sup&gt;R&lt;/sup&gt; CD&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>1/8 (12.5)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RIF&lt;sup&gt;R&lt;/sup&gt; CD&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>1/8 (12.5)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No. of multidrug-resistant/no. of food-specific isolates (%) 14/20 (70) 8/17 (47) 14/28 (50) 3/8 (38) 12/34 (62) 1/2 (50)

No. of multidrug-resistant/total multidrug-resistant isolates (%) 14/52 (27) 8/52 (15) 14/52 (27) 3/52 (6) 12/52 (23) 1/2 (2)

No. of multidrug-resistant/total isolates (%) 14/108 (13) 8/108 (7) 14/108 (13) 3/108 (3) 12/108 (11) 1/108 (1)

Intermediates were considered inside the multidrug resistance pattern. Vancomycin intermediates were not included because breakpoints differ between Staphylococcus spp. and Enterococcus spp.

MER, meropenem; RIF, rifampin; CD, clindamycin; CP, ciprofloxacin; TE, Tetracycline; AZI, azithromycin; E, erythromycin.
Instituto Colombiano de Agricultura has taken action against the indiscriminate use of antibiotics and the national legislation has adopted several standards for animals, prohibiting the use of nitrofurans, chloramphenicol, gentian violet, and dimetridazole, and the application of therapeutic antimicrobials as growth promoters (Conpes, 2005, 2007a, 2007b), there remain shortcomings in monitoring and controlling the marketing of these products.

Conclusions

Despite having a nonhomogeneous isolate distribution, the results of this work show several important findings: first, the antibiotics of choice in the treatment of listeriosis (penicillin, ampicillin, and trimethoprim/STX) remain effective, despite the occurrence of nonsusceptible strains to penicillin; second, our results support the fact that the indiscriminate supply of antibiotics as prophylactics or metaphylactics has favored the acquisition of antimicrobial resistance genes, which has been documented by other authors (Phillips et al., 2004; Lozano and Arias, 2008); third, it seems that rifampin resistance was high, which is alarming if we consider that rifampin is a very important choice in the treatment against M. tuberculosis; and forth, MIC90 value for vancomycin was low, which is a positive and significant fact taking into account the gene transfer between L. monocytogenes and Staphylococcus aureus (Lyon et al., 2008), a vancomycin intermediate or resistant (VISA or VRSA) phenotype that has not yet been officially reported in Colombia (Contreras et al., 2005).
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