

AperTO - Archivio Istituzionale Open Access dell'Università di Torino

Detection of pathogenic *Campylobacter*, *E. coli* O157:H7 and *Salmonella* spp. in wastewater by PCR assay

This is the author's manuscript

Original Citation:

Availability:

This version is available <http://hdl.handle.net/2318/1592886> since 2016-09-19T13:12:15Z

Published version:

DOI:10.1007/s11356-016-6682-5

Terms of use:

Open Access

Anyone can freely access the full text of works made available as "Open Access". Works made available under a Creative Commons license can be used according to the terms and conditions of said license. Use of all other works requires consent of the right holder (author or publisher) if not exempted from copyright protection by the applicable law.

(Article begins on next page)

This is the author's final version of the contribution published as:

Bonetta S, Pignata C, Lorenzi E, De Ceglia M, Meucci L, Bonetta S, Gilli G, Carraro E. Detection of pathogenic *Campylobacter*, *E. coli* O157:H7 and *Salmonella* spp. in wastewater by PCR assay. *Environmental Science and Pollution Research*. Vol. 23, issue 15, 2016, Pages 15302-15309, DOI: 10.1007/s11356-016-6682-5

The publisher's version is available at:

[<http://link.springer.com/article/10.1007%2Fs11356-016-6682-5>]

When citing, please refer to the published version.

Link to this full text:

[<https://iris.unito.it/handle/2318/1592886>]

This full text was downloaded from iris-AperTO: <https://iris.unito.it/>

Environmental Science and Pollution Research

Detection of pathogenic *Campylobacter*, *E. coli* O157:H7 and *Salmonella* spp. in wastewater by PCR assay --Manuscript Draft--

Manuscript Number:	ESPR-D-15-05389R2
Full Title:	Detection of pathogenic <i>Campylobacter</i> , <i>E. coli</i> O157:H7 and <i>Salmonella</i> spp. in wastewater by PCR assay
Article Type:	Research Article
Corresponding Author:	Elisabetta Carraro University of Torino Torino, ITALY
Corresponding Author Secondary Information:	
Corresponding Author's Institution:	University of Torino
Corresponding Author's Secondary Institution:	
First Author:	Silvia Bonetta
First Author Secondary Information:	
Order of Authors:	Silvia Bonetta Cristina Pignata Eugenio Lorenzi Margherita De Ceglia Lorenza Meucci Sara Bonetta Giorgio Gilli Elisabetta Carraro
Order of Authors Secondary Information:	
Funding Information:	
Abstract:	The aim of this study was the evaluation of the occurrence of pathogenic <i>Campylobacter</i> , <i>E. coli</i> O157:H7, <i>E. coli</i> virulence genes and <i>Salmonella</i> spp. in different wastewater treatment plants (WWTPs) using a method based on an enrichment step and PCR. This method was sensitive enough to detect low levels (2 CFU/100 ml of raw sewage) of all the investigated pathogens. In the WWTPs samples, <i>E. coli</i> O157:H7 DNA and the <i>eae</i> gene were never found, but 33% of influents and effluents exhibited amplicons corresponding to Shiga-like toxin I. 25% of the influent and 8% of the effluent exhibited the presence of Shiga-like toxin II. <i>Campylobacter jejuni</i> and <i>C. coli</i> DNA were identified in 50% and 25% of the influents and in 8% and 25% of the effluents, respectively. <i>Salmonella</i> spp. DNA was present in all the samples. Considering the results obtained the method tested here offer a reliable and expeditious tool for evaluating the efficiency of the effluents treatment in order to mitigate contamination risk. Influent contamination by <i>Salmonella</i> spp. and <i>Campylobacter</i> spp. provides indirect information about their circulation, moreover their presence in effluents underlines the role of WWTPs in the contamination of the receiving surface waters, which affects public health directly or indirectly.
Response to Reviewers:	Reviewer 2 We agree that the "best practise" procedure in the study design is the use of a positive control as confirmed by the approach utilized in this study, but it was not possible to buy the toxigenic strain (not commercialized in Europe by ATCC). Despite this, we think that the positive results obtained in the wastewater samples don't represent an

	<p>artefact. In fact during the sampling, amplicons with the expected sizes of these genes (Hu et al., 1999, JAM, vol 87) were obtained.</p> <p>Reviewer 3 Major point Binary logistic regression was performed to study the association between the concentration of indicator bacteria and the occurrence of pathogens in wastewater samples. Differences in occurrence of pathogenic bacteria between different wastewater treatment plant (Chieri, Lanzo and Castiglione) and sampling time (Spring; Summer; Autumn; Winter) were studied, but the results obtained did not show a relationship. This information was added in the text.</p> <p>Minor points 1 The volume of spiking sample was added in the text 2. The description of the wastewater treatment methods were clarified. 3. The approach used to evaluate the sensitivity of the protocol was the approach of the “worst case”. The sample used to verify the sensitivity of the protocol was the raw sewage of Castiglione Torinese WWTP, that collects domestic and industrial sewage of the Turin city. Considering the information available at the start of this study, the characteristics of this sample (e.g. turbidity, kind of input) were the worst also respect to the effluent samples. 4. The text was modified as required.</p>
Additional Information:	
Question	Response
§Are you submitting to a Special Issue?	No
§Are you submitting to a Special Issue?	No

[Click here to view linked References](#)

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

TITLE PAGE

**Detection of pathogenic *Campylobacter*, *E. coli* O157:H7 and *Salmonella* spp. in wastewater by PCR
assay**

Si. Bonetta¹, C. Pignata¹, E. Lorenzi², M. De Ceglia², L. Meucci², Sa. Bonetta¹, G. Gilli¹, E. Carraro^{1*}

¹Department of Public Health and Pediatrics, University of Torino, Torino, Italy

²Società Metropolitana Acque Torino S.p.A., Torino, Italy

* Corresponding author: Elisabetta Carraro, Department of Public Health and Pediatrics, University of
Torino, Via Santena 5 bis, 10126, Torino, Italy, Tel: +390116708192; e-mail: elisabetta.carraro@unito.it

1
2
3 **ABSTRACT**

4
5 The aim of this study was the evaluation of the occurrence of pathogenic *Campylobacter*, *E. coli*
6 *O157:H7*, *E. coli* virulence genes and *Salmonella* spp. in different wastewater treatment plants (WWTPs)
7 using a method based on an enrichment step and PCR. This method was sensitive enough to detect low
8 levels (~2 CFU/100 ml of raw sewage) of all the investigated pathogens. In the WWTPs samples, *E. coli*
9 *O157:H7* DNA and the *eae* gene were never found, but 33% of influents and effluents exhibited
10 amplicons corresponding to Shiga-like toxin I. 25% of the influent and 8% of the effluent exhibited the
11 presence of Shiga-like toxin II. *Campylobacter jejuni* and *C. coli* DNA were identified in 50% and 25%
12 of the influents and in 8% and 25% of the effluents, respectively. *Salmonella* spp. DNA was present in all
13 the samples. Considering the results obtained the method tested here offer a reliable and expeditious tool
14 for evaluating the efficiency of the effluents treatment in order to mitigate contamination risk. Influent
15 contamination by *Salmonella* spp. and *Campylobacter* spp. provides indirect information about their
16 circulation, moreover their presence in effluents underlines the role of WWTPs in the contamination of
17 the receiving surface waters, which affects public health directly or indirectly.
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30

31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39 **Keywords:** *Campylobacter* spp., *E. coli* O157:H7, virulence genes, *Salmonella* spp., PCR, wastewater
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

INTRODUCTION

Fecal contamination is a source of environmental bacterial contamination and it is responsible for the presence of pathogens in natural environment (Bertrand and Roig 2007). Surface water can generally be contaminated by human pathogens from enteric origin as a consequence of soil contamination from animal manures or the release of untreated slurry or effluents from wastewater treatment plants. Although wastewater is treated to eliminate pathogenic microorganisms and prevent waterborne transmission, numerous studies indicate that conventional wastewater treatment does not guarantee their complete elimination (Espigares et al. 2006). The microbiological quality of wastewater can also pose a number of potential risks in terms of public health and environment contamination when considering the possible reuse of wastewater effluents (Levantesi et al. 2010). Different pathogenic and opportunistic bacteria have been found in treated effluent, and these bacteria include Shiga toxin (Stx) *Escherichia coli* (STEC or VTEC), *Salmonella* spp., *Campylobacter jejuni*, *Bacillus cereus*, *Clostridium difficile*, and *Listeria monocytogenes* (Varela and Manaia 2013).

Campylobacter spp. and Shiga toxin-producing *E. coli* are important causes of bacterial gastroenteritis in the United States and around the world (Park et al. 2011). In 2013, *Campylobacter* spp. was the most commonly reported gastrointestinal bacterial pathogen in humans in the European Union (EU), and has been since 2005. Moreover, 6,043 confirmed cases of VTEC infections were reported in the EU (EFSA 2015). Nevertheless, the reported cases of *Campylobacter* spp. and VTEC enteritis in Italy are below average relative to reported cases in other European and non-European countries with analogous characteristics (e.g., environmental contamination, routes of transmission). This condition could be ascribed to many factors such as a very low diffusion of these pathogens in the environment and in the Italian human population, or case underestimation (Kaakoush et al. 2015; Pennington 2010).

The water cycle plays an important role in the *Campylobacter* spp. and VTEC enteritis transmission. *C. jejuni*, *C. coli* and VTEC are often present in aquatic environments (e.g. wastewater), which may provide a reservoir, or even a direct source, of their infection (Saxena et al. 2015; Ugarte-Ruiz et al. 2015). *Campylobacter* spp. and VTEC are most frequently associated with waterborne disease outbreaks worldwide (CDC 2013, EFSA 2015; Guzman-Herrador et al. 2015).

The detection of pathogenic microorganisms in wastewater samples is labour-intensive, time-consuming and difficult. Indicator microorganisms (e.g., *E. coli*, faecal enterococci) and *Salmonella* spp. are

1 generally used to assess the microbiological quality of effluents produced by wastewater treatment plants.
2
3 However, the use of traditional indicators is known to have limitations because of their inability to predict
4
5 the presence of all pathogen types in environmental water (Teklehaimanot et al. 2014). The introduction
6
7 of molecular methods, such as the polymerase chain reaction (PCR), has resolved some problems in
8
9 pathogen detection research. PCR has high specificity, speed and sensitivity (Shannon et al. 2007). These
10
11 characteristics are required to evaluate public health risks accurately, quickly identify contaminated
12
13 wastewater and minimize human exposure (Bertrand and Roig 2007).

14
15 The aim of this study was to evaluate the occurrence of pathogenic *Campylobacter*, *E. coli* O157:H7, *E.*
16
17 *coli* virulence genes and *Salmonella* spp. in influents and effluents of different wastewater treatment
18
19 plants (WWTPs). Data about the presence of these pathogenic bacteria in untreated sewage can reflect
20
21 clinical and subclinical infections that are prevalent in human populations; moreover, the results obtained
22
23 in treated effluents can provide useful information about the role of WWTPs as a possible source of
24
25 environmental contamination. To evaluate the occurrence of *Campylobacter* spp., *E. coli* O157:H7, *E.*
26
27 *coli* virulence genes and *Salmonella* spp. in wastewater samples, a method based on an enrichment step
28
29 and PCR was tested.
30

31 32 33 **MATERIALS AND METHODS**

34 35 **Bacterial strains and culture media**

36
37 *C. jejuni* (ATCC 33291), *E. coli* O157:H7 (NCTC 129, non-toxicogenic strain, encoding eae gene) and *S.*
38
39 *typhimurium* (ATCC 14028) were used as quality control strains throughout this study. *C. jejuni* strain
40
41 was cultivated on blood-free Campylobacter Medium base (Karmali; Biolife, Milan, Italy) or Bolton
42
43 broth (Oxoid, Cambridge, UK) at 42°C under a microaerobic atmosphere (Campygen; Oxoid), and *E. coli*
44
45 O157:H7 and *S. typhimurium* were grown on Tryptic Soy Agar (TSA; Applichem, Darmstadt, Germany)
46
47 or in Tryptic Soy Broth (TSB; Applichem,) at 37°C.
48
49
50
51

52 **Sampling**

53
54 Influent and final effluent samples were collected from three Italian Wastewater Treatment Plants located
55
56 in the Piedmont region (Italy) as follows: Castiglione Torinese (untreated sewage corresponding to a
57
58 population equivalent of 2,500,000), Chieri (untreated sewage corresponding to a population equivalent
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 60,000) and Lanzo Torinese (untreated sewage corresponding to a population equivalent 8,000). The
2
3 WWTPs located in Castiglione Torinese, Chieri and Lanzo employ screening, aerated grit removal,
4
5 biological treatment in a denitrification-nitrification process based on activated sludge, and secondary
6
7 settling. Finally, the effluents are discharged into the receiving water bodies (Po, Tepice-Banna, and Stura
8
9 Rivers, respectively). The plant at Castiglione Torinese uses primary settling before the biological
10
11 treatment, then dephosphatization and a filtration step after the secondary settling.
12
13 Wastewater samples were collected during four sampling periods (spring-May 2014, summer-July 2014,
14
15 autumn October 2014 and winter-February 2015) at the three WWTPs.

16
17 Wastewater composite samples (24 h) were collected in sterile plastic bottles, transported on ice to the
18
19 laboratory and tested within 24 h.
20

21 22 23 **Sample processing**

24
25 Samples of raw sewage (100 ml) and treated effluent (1 l) were used for pathogen detection with the PCR
26
27 protocol. During each sampling, a raw sewage sample spiked with a high concentration of pathogens (10^6
28
29 CFU) was also prepared (positive control). The main steps of the protocol for pathogen detection in
30
31 wastewater samples are summarized in Fig. 1. In brief, wastewater sample was concentrated by filtration
32
33 through 0.45 μm pore size nitrocellulose filters (Merck Millipore, Vimodrone, Italy). The filters were
34
35 then vortexed in peptone water (Oxoid) for *E. coli* O157:H7 and *Salmonella* spp. detection and in Bolton
36
37 broth containing an antibiotic supplement (Oxoid) for *Campylobacter* spp. detection. These broths were
38
39 cultivated (enrichment step) at 37°C for 18 h for *E. coli* O157:H7 and *Salmonella* spp. detection and at
40
41 42°C for 48 h under a microaerobic atmosphere for *Campylobacter* spp. detection. Following incubation,
42
43 2 ml of each broth were centrifuged at 4,500 g for 20 min to recover the bacteria. The DNA was extracted
44
45 and purified with a PowerSoil® DNA Isolation Kit (Mo Bio Laboratories Inc., Carlsbad, USA) according
46
47 to the manufacturer's protocol. The resulting DNA was used for PCR amplification.
48
49
50

51 52 **PCR analysis**

53
54 A triplex PCR amplification assay was performed to target a genus-specific 16S rRNA for
55
56 *Campylobacter* spp. and species-specific mapA and ceuE genes for the detection of *C. jejuni* and *C. coli*
57
58 species. The PCR amplification reactions were performed with previously documented primer pairs and
59
60
61
62

1 PCR protocol (Khan et al. 2009). Each 50 µl reaction mixture contained 15 µl of template DNA, 1X PCR
2 buffer (20 mM Tris-HCl [pH 8.4], 50 mM KCl), 1.5 mM MgCl₂, 0.2 mM of each dNTP, 0.2 µM of each
3 primer and 1 U of Taq Gold Polymerase (Applied Biosystems, Milan, Italy). The amplification reaction
4 was performed with an initial template denaturation step at 95°C for 10 min, followed by 35 cycles of
5 amplification consisting of denaturation at 95°C for 30 s, annealing at 59°C for 1.5 min, and extension at
6 72°C for 1 min, followed by a final extension at 72°C for 5 min.
7

8 Details about the PCR protocol for *E. coli* O157:H7, *E. coli* virulence gene and *Salmonella* spp. were
9 previously reported in Bonetta et al. (2011).
10
11

12 **Detection sensitivity**

13 In order to verify the sensitivity of the protocol, raw sewages (100 ml) were collected and artificially
14 inoculated with different concentrations of *C. jejuni*, *E. coli* O157:H7 and *S. typhimurium* bacterial cells
15 (10-fold dilution series, 2 10⁷-2 CFU). The exponential phase cultures were serially diluted and the
16 number of CFU was determined by plating the dilutions on agar media.
17

18 In all the experiments, the same non-inoculated wastewater sample was analysed to verify the absence of
19 the pathogens (negative control).
20

21 **Microbiological analyses**

22 *E. coli*, enterococci, *Clostridium perfringens* spores, coliforms and *Salmonella* spp. were analysed in all
23 samples. In brief, the membrane filtration method was used to process wastewater samples for *C.*
24 *perfringens* enumeration as reported by the ISO 14189:2013. Wastewater samples were assayed for *E.*
25 *coli*, coliforms and enterococci with a commercial Quanti-Tray™ 2000 (IDEXX Laboratories, Milan,
26 Italy) (method EN ISO 9308-2:2014 and ISS F 003B rev.009). For *Salmonella* spp. detection, 100 ml of
27 influent sample and 1 l of effluent sample were filtered through 0.45 µm-pore (47 mm diameter)
28 nitrocellulose membranes (Merck Millipore) followed by a pre-enrichment step (Peptone Water, Oxoid),
29 a selective enrichment step (Rappaport Vassiliadis Broth, Oxoid) and a selection in XLD Agar (Oxoid)
30 (method ISS F002C rev00). Bacterial colonies with typical *Salmonella* morphology were subcultured
31 onto TSA for 18-24 h and then tested for oxidase, and with API® 20E identification kit (BioMerieux,
32 Marcy L'Etoile, France).
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

Statistical analyses

Statistical analyses were performed with SPSS Package version 22.0 for Windows. Qualitative data for the pathogen variables and a Log 10 conversion of the indicator bacteria variables were used in the statistical analysis. Binary logistic regression was performed to study the association between the concentration of indicator bacteria and the occurrence of pathogens in wastewater samples. Differences in occurrence of pathogenic bacteria between different types of wastewater treatment plant and sampling time were studied with binary logistic regression.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Development of PCR assays for pathogenic *Campylobacter*, *E. coli* O157:H7, *E. coli* virulence genes and *Salmonella* spp.

For successful detection in wastewater samples, we have proposed a method for *Campylobacter* (spp., *jejuni*, *coli*), *E. coli* O157:H7, *E. coli* virulence genes and *Salmonella* spp. based on an enrichment step and PCR.

In evaluating the experiments on wastewater-spiked samples, an initial DNA purification protocol using Chelex and proteinase K was performed on raw wastewater samples that had been inoculated with a high concentration (2×10^7 CFU) of each pathogen (*C. jejuni*, *E. coli* O157:H7 and *S. typhimurium*), but no amplicons were recovered. Considering the difficulties experienced with this protocol, the DNA was extracted and purified with a commercial method that was usually used for DNA extraction from soil (Power Soil® DNA Isolation Kit). Typical PCR amplicons from *Campylobacter* spp. and *C. jejuni* were obtained by analysing inoculated raw wastewater (Fig. 2a). A multiplex PCR analysis of a wastewater sample inoculated with a non-toxicogenic *E. coli* O157:H7 strain revealed three distinct bands of the expected sizes that corresponded to H7, intimin and O157 (Fig. 2b). As expected, no PCR amplicons were observed for Shiga-like toxin I and II genes. Additionally, the PCR primers used for the detection of *Salmonella* spp. generated a specific PCR product (Fig. 2c).

The results obtained for artificially contaminated wastewater samples (Range 2×10^7 -2 CFU) to verify the sensitivity of the protocol are shown in Table 1. The tested method showed a high sensitivity for all microorganisms, with levels as low as ~2 CFU in the spiked wastewater samples (100 ml of raw sewage).

1 For all the pathogens, the presence of PCR products was observed in all duplicate wastewater samples
2 and at the lowest inoculum concentration; no PCR amplicons were observed in the unspiked samples
3 (negative control). The tested method has the following advantages: i) the method involve the use of an
4 enrichment step. Broth enrichment is often used to promote the recovery when the number of pathogens
5 cells is low and can also dilute the inhibitory compounds produced by competing bacteria in the sample as
6 well as aid the recovery of injured, stressed or lag-phase bacterial cells (Pitkanen 2013; Touron et al.
7 2005) ii) the enrichment broth (peptone water) can also be used for *Salmonella* spp. detection in
8 wastewater with the cultural method; iii) the multiplex PCR protocol for VTEC detection uses primer
9 pairs for *E. coli* O157:H7 DNA that can simultaneously reveal serotype O157:H7 and its virulence traits,
10 as previously reported in surface water samples (Bonetta et al. 2011); and iv) the presence of
11 *Campylobacter* spp., *C. jejuni* and *C. coli* DNA can be monitored with a single multiplex PCR.
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

26 **Occurrence of pathogenic *Campylobacter*, *E. coli* O157:H7, *E. coli* virulence genes and *Salmonella*** 27 **spp. in wastewater samples**

28 The results of analyses performed on wastewater samples with the developed protocol are reported in
29 Table 2. *Salmonella* spp. DNA was present in all raw sewage analysed by molecular methods. Moreover
30 all the samples were positive for *Salmonella* spp. detection by cultural method. These data are consistent
31 with the results obtained by Cataldo et al. (2001) that verify the occurrence of *Salmonella* spp. in raw
32 sewage from a wastewater treatment plant located near Rome (Italy). A high *Salmonella* spp.
33 concentration was detected in municipal Finnish wastewaters (Koivunen et al. 2003), and in municipal
34 wastewater treatment plants located in France (Wery et al. 2008) and South Africa (Teklehaimanot et al.
35 2015). Minor contamination (33% of influent samples) was revealed in a similar study conducted in
36 different wastewaters from the province of Venice (Ostoich et al. 2007). The results obtained in our work
37 suggest that the presence of *Salmonella* spp. in the influents could be a consequence of the local
38 epidemiological situation as proposed in other studies (Berge et al. 2006; Ostoich et al. 2007). In our
39 study, the *Salmonella* spp. contamination was also monitored in all of the effluents of WWTPs,
40 highlighting that this bacteria survived the treatment processes and was discharged to the natural
41 receiving waters. This behaviour indicated that conventional municipal wastewater treatment without
42 efficient tertiary treatment may constitute a risk to public health (Koivunen et al. 2003).
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 The results obtained by PCR highlighted that 83% (20/24) of the wastewater samples were positive for
2 H7 DNA, but *E. coli* O157:H7 DNA was never found. The prevalence of Shiga toxin-producing *E. coli* in
3 sewage has previously been evaluated in different studies, showing a wide range of positive samples for
4 the isolated bacteria depending on the volume of analysed samples and the given method (Muniesa et al.
5 2006). The molecular analysis conducted in our study on the major virulence factor genes of pathogenic
6 Shiga toxin-producing *E. coli* strains highlighted the presence of amplicons that correspond to *stx1* and
7 *stx2* according to the results obtained in other studies (Dumke et al. 2006; Martinez-Castillo et al. 2012).
8 A total of 4 influent (4/12 or 33%) and 4 effluent (4/12 or 33%) samples revealed the presence of
9 amplicons corresponding to Shiga-like toxin I. These amplicons were found during the spring and
10 summer seasons. The *stx₂* gene (Shiga like toxin II) was detected only in 3 wastewater influent samples
11 (3/12 or 25%) during the summer and winter and in a single effluent sample during the summer (1/12 or
12 8%). These results highlighted the possible presence of other pathogenic bacteria. In fact, the *stx1/stx2*
13 genes are widely distributed among *E. coli* (Shiga-toxin-producing *E. coli* or verotoxin-producing *E. coli*)
14 and *Shigella* strains, as well as other waterborne bacteria, because of their dissemination via
15 bacteriophages (James et al. 2001; Strauch et al. 2008). It is important to highlight that although *Stx* is the
16 primary factor that defines the virulence of Shiga toxin-producing *E. coli*, its presence is essential but not
17 sufficient to cause infection. Other major virulence factors such as the *eae* gene, which encodes the
18 intimin protein, could play an important role (Loukiadis et al. 2006; Martinez-Castillo et al. 2012; Yang et
19 al. 2014). In our study, the *eae* gene related to intimin expression was never observed.

20 During sampling, the presence of the *Campylobacter* genus DNA was observed in 83% (10/12) of
21 wastewater influent samples. This result highlights widespread contamination by thermotolerant
22 *Campylobacter* species in the inlet of monitored wastewater samples. Different studies showed that
23 *Campylobacter* spp. are ubiquitous in sewage (Rechenburg and Kistemann 2009; Whiley et al. 2013). In
24 almost all the samples (67%, 8/12), the presence of this genus was related to *C. jejuni* and/or *C. coli*
25 contamination. 50% (6/12) and 25% (3/12) of the influent samples were positive for *C. jejuni* and *C. coli*
26 DNA, respectively. These data allowed us to suggest the real circulation of these microorganisms in the
27 population, underlining the need to investigate this issue further. A lower frequency of *C. jejuni*
28 contamination was revealed in raw sewage samples (36.4%) in British Columbia (Canada) (Jokinen et al.
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 2010), and a higher frequency (98%) was observed in untreated urban effluents in Spain (Ugarte-Ruiz et
2 al. 2015).

3
4
5 Considering the results obtained in our study, 42% (5/12) of wastewater effluents were contaminated by
6
7 *Campylobacter* spp. DNA; in particular the frequency of positive wastewater samples was 8% (1/12) and
8
9 25% (3/12) for *C. jejuni* and *C. coli* DNA, respectively. These results indicated that the treatment of raw
10
11 sewage may be insufficient to eliminate these pathogenic microorganisms. Previous studies have reported
12
13 that the majority of *Campylobacter* are already eliminated during primary sedimentation, even if the
14
15 effectiveness of a sewage treatment plant in reducing *Campylobacter* contamination also depends on the
16
17 complexity of the plant as well as on the characteristics of the raw sewage (Whiley et al. 2013).
18
19 Moreover, even if a lower frequency of these bacteria was observed with respect to influent samples, it is
20
21 important to highlight that the samples were collected simultaneously, and thus a real relation between the
22
23 influent and effluent is not possible.

24
25 Seasonal frequency variation was not observed in all the monitored pathogens ($p>0.05$), and their
26
27 detection in wastewater did not seem to be affected by the capacity of the wastewater treatment plant
28
29 ($p>0.05$).

30
31 To verify the correlation with emerging pathogens, some classic faecal indicators such as *E. coli*,
32
33 coliforms, enterococci and *C. perfringens* spores were also analysed. *Salmonella* spp. was monitored with
34
35 the culture method because it is generally used as a pathogen indicator in wastewater samples; moreover,
36
37 this parameter is used to evaluate the possible reuse of wastewater effluent as fertilizer. The results for the
38
39 faecal indicators and the mean abatement of the three WWTPs are reported in Figure 3. The coliform, *E.*
40
41 *coli* and enterococci loads had values ranging between 7.3-5.5, 6.8-4.4 and 5.8-3.7 log MPN 100 ml⁻¹,
42
43 respectively. The concentration of *C. perfringens* spores ranged from 5.6-3.6 log CFU 100 ml⁻¹.
44
45 Generally, the lowest values for all the parameters were observed in the influent of the Lanzo wastewater
46
47 treatment plant. As observed for the molecular method, *Salmonella* spp. was present in all the analysed
48
49 samples. The greatest reduction in faecal indicators occurred in the WWTP of Castiglione (range 2.0-2.5
50
51 log) followed by Chieri, with a lower overall average (range 1.3-2.0 log), and Lanzo (range 0.7- 0.8 log).
52
53 No significant association between the occurrence of bands corresponding to H7, O157, intimin (*eae*
54
55 gene), Shiga-like toxin I (*stx₁* gene), Shiga-like toxin II (*stx₂* gene) and microbiological indicators (*E. coli*,
56
57 enterococci, *C. perfringens* spores, and coliforms) were obtained by binary logistic regression ($p>0.05$).
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 Moreover the results of the binary logistic regression did not show a relationship between the bacterial
2 indicator load and the occurrence of *Campylobacter* spp., *C. jejuni* and *C. coli* DNA in wastewater
3 samples ($p>0.05$), except the coliform count for *Campylobacter* spp. and *C. coli* DNA. No relation was
4 observed between *Salmonella* spp. contamination and faecal indicators or other pathogens ($p>0.05$).
5 These results suggest that the indicator bacteria were not good indicators of different pathogenic bacteria
6 in municipal wastewater samples, according to different studies that showed that the presence of indicator
7 bacteria does not clearly correlate with the presence of pathogenic bacteria including *Salmonella* spp. and
8 *Campylobacter* spp. (Li et al. 2013; Wery et al. 2008).

9 In conclusion, the method tested here offer a reliable and expeditious tool for evaluating the efficiency of
10 the effluents treatment in order to mitigate contamination risk and could be used as a routine analysis for
11 the evaluation of microbiological quality in wastewater samples. Moreover, the data obtained from the
12 samples showed the presence of pathogenic bacteria, especially *Salmonella* spp. and thermotolerant
13 *Campylobacter* spp., in the untreated sewage of wastewater treatment plants by providing useful
14 information about those circulating in the population. The presence of these microorganisms in the treated
15 effluents, even at a lower frequency with respect to the wastewater influent, underlines the possible role
16 of wastewater treatment plants in environmental contamination. This is true when the contaminated
17 effluents are discharged into the receiving surface waters and consequently affect public health directly or
18 indirectly to a severe degree.

41 REFERENCES

- 42 Berge ACB, Dueger EL, Sischo WM (2006). Comparison of *Salmonella enterica* serovar distribution and
43 antibiotic resistance patterns in wastewater at municipal water treatment plants in two California
44 cities. J Appl Microbiol 101:1309-1316. doi:10.1111/j.1365-2672.2006.03031.x.
45
46 Bertrand R, Roig B (2007). Evaluation of enrichment-free PCR-based detection on the rfbE gene of
47 *Escherichia coli* O157 – Application to municipal wastewater. Water Res 41:1280-1286.
48 doi:10.1016/j.watres.2006.11.027.
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

- 1 Bonetta Si, Borelli E, Bonetta Sa, Conio O, Palumbo F, Carraro E (2011). Development of a PCR
2 protocol for the detection of *Escherichia coli* O157:H7 and *Salmonella* spp. in surface water.
3
4 Environ Monit Assess 177:493-503. doi:10.1007/s10661-010-1650-x.
5
6
- 7 Cataldo C, Briancesco R, Bonadonna L (2001). Water reuse: hygienic and technical aspects related to the
8 occurrence of enteric pathogens. Rapporti ISTISAN 34:1-38.
9
- 10
11 Center for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) (2013). Surveillance for waterborne disease
12 outbreaks associated with drinking water and other non recreational water - United States, 2009-
13 2010. MMWR 62:714-20.
14
15
- 16
17 Dumke R, Schroter-Bobsin U, Jacobs E, Roske I (2006). Detection of phages carrying the Shiga toxin 1
18 and 2 genes in waste water and river water samples. Lett Appl Microbiol 42:48-53.
19
20 doi:10.1111/j.1472-765X.2005.01809.x.
21
22
- 23 Espigares E, Bueno A, Espigares M, Galvez R (2006). Isolation of *Salmonella* serotypes in wastewater
24 and effluent: effect of treatment and potential risk. Int J Hyg Environ Health 209: 103-107.
25
26 doi:10.1016/j.ijheh.2005.08.006
27
28
- 29 European Food Safety Authority (EFSA) (2015). The European Union Summary Report on Trends and
30 Sources of Zoonoses, Zoonotic Agents and Food-borne Outbreaks in 2013. EFSA J 13: 3991.
31
32
- 33 Guzman-Herrador B, Carlander A, Ethelberg S, Freiesleben de Blasio B, Kuusi M, Lund V, MacDonald
34 E, Nichols G, Shonning C, Sudre B, Tronnberg L, Vold L, Semenza JC, Nygard K (2015).
35
36 Waterborne outbreaks in the Nordic countries, 1998 to 2012. Euro Surveill 20:1-10.
37
38
- 39 James CE, Stanley KN, Allison HE, Flint HJ, Stewart CS, Sharp RJ, et al. (2001). Lytic and lysogenic
40 infection of diverse *Escherichia coli* and *Shigella* strains with a verocytotoxigenic bacteriophage.
41
42 Appl Environ Microbiol 67: 4335-4337.
43
44
- 45 Jokinen CC, Schreier H, Mauro W, Taboada E, Isaac-Renton JL, Topp E, Edge T, Thomas JE, Gannon
46 VPJ (2010). The occurrence and sources of *Campylobacter* spp., *Salmonella enterica* and
47
48 *Escherichia coli* O157:H7 in the Salmon River, British Columbia, Canada. J Water Health 08.2:374-
49
50 386. doi: 10.2166/wh.2009.076.
51
52
- 53 Kaakoush NO, Castano-Rodriguez N, Mitchell H, Man SM (2015). Global epidemiology of
54
55 *Campylobacter* infection. Clin Microbiol Rev 28:687-720. doi:10.1128/CMR.00006-15.
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

- 1 Khan IUH, Gannon V, Loughborough A, Jokinen C, Kent R, Koning W, Lapen DR, Medeiros D, Miller
2 J, Neumann N, Phillips R, Robertson W, Schereirer H, Topp E, van Bochove E, Edge TA (2009). A
3 methods comparison for the isolation and detection of thermophilic *Campylobacter* in agricultural
4 watersheds. *J Microbiol Methods* 79:307-313. doi:10.1016/j.mimet.2009.09.024.
5
6
7
8
9 Koivunen J, Siitonen A, Heinonen-Tanski H (2003). Elimination of enteric bacteria in biological-
10 chemical wastewater treatment and tertiary filtration units. *Water Res* 37:690-698. doi:10.1016/S0043-
11 1354(02)00305-6.
12
13
14
15 Levantesi C, La Mantia R, Masciopinto C, Bockelmann U, Ayuso-Gabella MN, Salgot M, Tandoi V, Van
16 Houtte E, Wintgens T., Grohmann E. (2010). Quantification of pathogenic microorganisms and
17 microbial indicators in three wastewater reclamation and managed aquifer recharge facilities in
18 Europe. *Sci Total Environ* 408:4923-4930. doi:10.1016/j.scitotenv.2010.07.042
19
20
21
22
23 Li D, Zeng S, Gu AZ, He M, Shi H (2013). Inactivation, reactivation and regrowth of indigenous bacteria
24 in reclaimed water after chlorine disinfection of a municipal wastewater treatment plant. *J Environ Sci*
25 25: 1319-1325. doi: 10.1016/S1001-0742(12)60176-4.
26
27
28
29 Loukiadis E, Kerouredan M, Beutin L, Oswald E, Brugere H (2006). Characterization of Shiga toxin gene
30 (*stx*)-positive and intimin gene (*eae*)-positive *Escherichia coli* isolates from wastewater of
31 slaughterhouses in France. *Appl Environ Microbiol* 72:3245-3251. doi:10.1128/AEM.72.5.3245-
32 3251.2006
33
34
35
36
37 Martinez-Castillo A, Allue-Guardia A, Dahbi G, Blanco J, Kreuzburg K, Schmidt H, Muniesa M (2012).
38 Type III effector genes and other virulence factors of Shiga toxin-encoding *Escherichia coli* isolated
39 from wastewater. *Environ Microbiol Rep* 4:147-155. doi:10.1111/j.1758-2229.2011.00317.x.
40
41
42
43 Muniesa M, Jofre J, Garcia-Aliaro C, Blanch AR (2006). Occurrence of *Escherichia coli* O157:H7 and
44 other enterohemorrhagic *Escherichia coli* in the environment. *Environ Sci Technol* 40:7141-7149.
45 doi:10.1021/es060927k.
46
47
48
49 Ostoich M, Aimo E, Frate R, Vazzoler M, Stradella S, Osti P (2007). Integrated approach for
50 microbiological impact assessment of public wastewater treatment plants. *Chem Ecol* 23:43-62. doi:
51 10.1080/02757540601083963.
52
53
54
55 Park SH, Hanning I, Jarquin R, Moore P, Donoghue DJ, Donoghue AM, Ricke SC (2011). Multiplex
56 PCR assay for the detection and quantification of *Campylobacter* spp., *Escherichia coli* O157:H7,
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

- 1 and *Salmonella* serotypes in water samples. FEMS Microbiol Lett 316:7-15. doi: 10.1111/j.1574-
2 6968.2010.02188.x.
- 3
4
- 5 Pitkanen T (2013). Review of *Campylobacter* spp. in drinking and environmental waters. J Microbiol
6
7 Methods 95:39-47. doi: 10.1016/j.mimet.2013.06.008.
- 8
- 9 Rechenburg A, Kistemann T (2009). Sewage effluent as a source of *Campylobacter* spp. in a surface
10
11 water catchment. Int J Environ Health Res 19:239-249. doi:10.1080/09603120802460376.
- 12
- 13 Saxena T, Kaushik P, Mohan MK (2015). Prevalence of *E. coli* O157:H7 in water sources: an overview
14
15 on associated diseases, outbreaks and detection methods. Diagn Microbiol Infect Dis 82:249-264.
16
17 10.1016/j.diagmicrobio.2015.03.015.
- 18
- 19 Shannon KE, Lee DY, Trevors JT, Beaudette LA (2007). Application of real-time quantitative PCR for
20
21 the detection of selected bacterial pathogens during municipal wastewater treatment. Sci Total
22
23 Environ 382:121-129. doi:10.1016/j.scitotenv.2007.02.039.
- 24
- 25 Strauch E, Hammerl JA, Konietzny A, Schneiker-Bekel S, Arnold W, Goesmann A, et al. (2008).
26
27 Bacteriophage 2851 is a prototype phage for dissemination of the Shiga toxin variant gene 2c in
28
29 *Escherichia coli* O157:H7. Infect Immun 76:5466–5477.
- 30
- 31 Teklehaimanot GZ, Coetzee MAA, Momba MNB (2014). Faecal pollution loads in the wastewater
32
33 effluents and receiving water bodies: a potential threat to the health of Sediberg and Soshanguve
34
35 communities, South Africa. Environ Sci Pollut Res 21:9589-9603. doi:10.1007/s11356-014-2980-y.
- 36
- 37 Teklehaimanot GZ, Genthe B, Kamika I, Momba MNB (2015). Prevalence of enteropathogenic bacteria
38
39 in treated effluents and receiving water bodies and their potential health risks. Sci Total Environ
40
41 518-519:441-449. doi:10.1016/j.scitotenv.2015.03.019.
- 42
- 43 Tournon A, Berthe T, Pawlak B, Petit F (2005). Detection of *Salmonella* in environmental water and
44
45 sediment by a nested-multiplex polymerase chain reaction assay. Res Microbiol 156:541-553. doi:
46
47 10.1016/j.resmic.2005.01.001.
- 48
- 49 Ugarte-Ruiz M, Florez-Cuadrado D, Wassenaar TM, Porrero MC, Dominguez L (2015). Method
50
51 comparison for enhanced recovery, isolation and qualitative detection of *C. jejuni* and *C. coli* from
52
53 wastewater effluents samples. Int J Environ Res Public Health 12:2749-2764.
54
55 doi:10.3390/ijerph120302749
- 56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

- 1 Varela AR, Manaia CM (2013). Human health implications of clinically relevant bacteria in wastewater
2 habitats. *Environ Sci Pollut Res* 20:3550-3569. doi: 10.1007/s11356-013-1594-0
3
4
5 Wery N, Lhoutellier C, Ducray F, Delgenes J, Godon J (2008). Behaviour of pathogenic and indicator
6 bacteria during urban wastewater treatment and sludge composting, as revealed by quantitative PCR.
7
8
9 *Water Res* 42:53-62. doi:10.1016/j.watres.2007.06.048.
10
11 Whiley H, van den Akker B, Giglio S, Bentham R (2013). The role of environmental reservoirs in human
12 campylobacteriosis. *Int J Environ Res Public Health* 10:5886-5907. doi:10.3390/ijerph10115886.
13
14
15 Yang, K., Pagaling, E. and Yan, T. (2014). Estimating the prevalence of potential enteropathogenic
16 *Escherichia coli* and intimin gene diversity in a human community by monitoring sanitary sewage.
17
18
19 *Appl Environ Microbiol* 80:119-127. doi:10.1128/AEM.02747-13.
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 **Fig 1.** Primary steps of the protocol for detecting *Campylobacter* (spp., *coli* and *jejuni*), *Salmonella* spp.,
2
3 *E. coli* O157:H7 and *E. coli* virulence genes in wastewater samples.
4
5
6

7 **Fig 2.** (a) Agarose gel electrophoresis of PCR products amplified from raw wastewater inoculated with *C.*
8 *jejuni* (2×10^7 CFU). Lane L: 100 bp DNA ladder (size marker); Lane 1: negative control (no template);
9 Lane 2-3: *C. jejuni* with the expected amplicon sizes of this genus (857 bp) and *jejuni* species (589 bp).
10
11 (b) Agarose gel electrophoresis of PCR products amplified from raw wastewater inoculated with non-
12 toxigenic *E. coli* O157:H7 (2×10^7 CFU). Lane L: 100 bp DNA ladder (size marker); Lane 1: negative
13 control (no template); Lane 2: *E. coli* strain using H7 (625 bp), intimin (368 bp) and O157 PCR (292 bp)
14 primers. (b) Agarose gel electrophoresis of PCR products amplified from raw wastewater inoculated with
15 *S. typhimurium* (2×10^7 CFU). Lane L: 100 bp DNA ladder (size marker); Lane 1: negative control (no
16 template); and Lane 2: *S. typhimurium* strain (284 bp).
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26

27 **Fig 3.** Faecal indicator contamination and abatement in the three WWTPs (mean and SD). I: Influent; E:
28 Effluent; ABAT: abatement; 1: Castiglione plant; 2: Chieri plant; 3: Lanzo plant.
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

Table 1. Sensitivity of the PCR assay for detecting *Campylobacter* (spp., *jejuni*), *E. coli* O157:H7 and *S. typhimurium* in spiked wastewater samples (100 ml of raw sewage) (each experiment was performed in duplicate).

Pathogens	Number of cells ^a detected by PCR									
	2 10 ⁷	2 10 ⁶	2 10 ⁵	2 10 ⁴	2 10 ³	2 10 ²	2 10	2	C-	
<i>Campylobacter</i> spp.	+/+	+/+	+/+	+/+	+/+	+/+	+/+	+/+	+/+	-/-
<i>C. jejuni</i>	+/+	+/+	+/+	+/+	+/+	+/+	+/+	+/+	+/+	-/-
<i>S. typhimurium</i>	+/+	+/+	+/+	+/+	+/+	+/+	+/+	+/+	+/+	-/-
<i>E. coli</i> O157:H7eae+	+/+	+/+	+/+	+/+	+/+	+/+	+/+	+/+	+/+	-/-

^a The number of bacterial cells was determined by plating in triplicate on TSA (Oxoid) and on Karmali Agar (Biolife).

C-: not spiked wastewater

+: positive PCR

-: negative PCR

16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

Table 2. Detection of *Campylobacter* (spp., *coli*, and *jejuni*), *E. coli* O157:H7, *E. coli* virulence genes and *Salmonella* spp. by PCR method in wastewater samples

Sample	Season	<i>Salmonella</i>	<i>E. coli</i> O157:H7					<i>Campylobacter</i>		
		invA	O157	H7	Intimin	SLT-I	SLT-II	Genus	<i>C. jejuni</i>	<i>C. coli</i>
I1	S	+	-	+	-	+	-	+	+	-
E1	S	+	-	+	-	+	-	+	-	-
I2	S	+	-	+	-	+	-	+	+	+
E2	S	+	-	+	-	+	-	+	+	-
I3	S	+	-	+	-	+	-	+	-	-
E3	S	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
I1	Su	+	-	+	-	-	-	+	+	-
E1	Su	+	-	+	-	+	-	-	-	-
I2	Su	+	-	+	-	+	+	+	+	-
E2	Su	+	-	+	-	+	+	-	-	-
I3	Su	+	-	+	-	-	-	+	+	-
E3	Su	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
I1	A	+	-	+	-	-	-	+	+	-
E1	A	+	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	-
I2	A	+	-	+	-	-	-	+	-	-
E2	A	+	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	-
I3	A	+	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	-
E3	A	+	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	-
I1	W	+	-	+	-	-	+	+	-	+
E1	W	+	-	+	-	-	-	+	-	+
I2	W	+	-	-	-	-	+	+	-	+
E2	W	+	-	+	-	-	-	+	-	+
I3	W	+	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	-
E3	W	+	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	+

I: Influent; E: Effluent; S: Spring; Su: Summer; A: Autumn; W: Winter; 1: Castiglione plant; 2: Chieri plant; 3: Lanzo plant.

+: positive PCR

-: negative PCR

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

Figure 1




Figure2





Figure3





Click here to access/download
Supplementary Material
Certificate.pdf

