

Assessing microbial contamination and particulate matter exposure in Portuguese poultry facilities

Bianca Gomes^{1,2,*}, Marta Dias^{2,3}, Renata Cervantes^{2,3}, Pedro Pena^{2,3}, Carla Viegas^{2,3}

E-mail address: bianca.gomes@estesl.ipl.pt

- Center for Ecology, Evolution and Environmental Change, Faculdade de Ciências, Universidade de Lisboa, 1749-016 Lisbon, Portugal
- H&TRC - Health & Technology Research Center, ESTeSL- Escola Superior de Tecnologia da Saúde, Instituto Politécnico de Lisboa
- NOVA National School of Public Health, Public Health Research Centre, Comprehensive Health Research Center, CHRC, REAL, CCAL, NOVA University Lisbon, Lisbon, Portugal

Introduction

In poultry farms, the combination of feathers, feces, and bedding material appears to be critical to the development of pathogens, enhancing the risks associated with zoonosis and its dissemination throughout the food chain [1]

Currently, the prevalent airborne microorganisms in animal production facilities are poorly described in terms of quantity, composition, and risk category. Identification and quantification on the other hand, would be useful for determining the causative agents and performing risk assessments [2].



Objective: This study intends to characterize microbial contamination in poultry pavilions through a multi-approach protocol for sampling and analyses.

Methods

1. Sampling

Methods

Particulate matter

Active sampling



LIGHTHOUSE

Microbial Characterization

Active sampling

Passive sampling


EDC

BEDDING MATERIAL



MAS-100

Strategy



Poultry pavilions (n=14)

3 Visits:
1st week
2nd week
3rd week

2 Seasons:
Summer
Winter



2. Analysis

Particle assessment

Microbial characterization

Culture-based methods:

- Microbial quantification
- (Fungi and bacteria)
- Fungal identification
- Fungal resistant profile




Molecular tools qPCR (Toxigenic fungi)

Mycotoxins detection (n= 38)

Cytotoxicity assessment (lung cells, kidney cells)

Expected results



Conclusion

- The framework will contribute for the awareness and foster workplace solutions that will encourage safer working conditions and advance the health of animals, people, and the environment.
- SDGs will be supported.



Funding: H&TRC authors gratefully acknowledge FCT/MCTES national support through the IPL/2022/InChildHealth/BI/12M/2022-01266-00, UI/BD/151431/2021, also supported by national funds through FCT/MCTES/FSE/UE, UI/BD/153746/2022 and CEC unit UIDB/00329/2020 (<https://doi.org/10.54459/UIDB/00329/2020>), and the ESTeSL- Escola Superior de Tecnologia e Saúde de Lisboa, Instituto Politécnico de Lisboa, national support through IPL/IDI/CA2023/FoodAIIEU_ESTeSL; IPL/IDI/CA2023/ASPRak_ESTeSL; IPL/IDI/CA2023/ARAFSaawmills_ESTeSL; Partly funded by the European Union's Horizon 2021 research and innovation program under grant agreement no. 101050883 and received co-funding from the author's organizations and/or Ministers. This work has received funding from the Swiss State Secretariat for Education, Research and Innovation (SERI) grant number 21.00324, from the United Kingdom Research and Innovation (UKRI) grant number 10040524, and the Australian National Health & Medical Research Council (NMHRC) grant numbers APP2017786 and APP2008813. Views and opinions expressed are however those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or the Swiss State Secretariat for Education, Research and Innovation (SERI), or the United Kingdom Research and Innovation (UKRI), or the Australian National Health & Medical Research Council (NMHRC). Neither the European Union nor the granting authorities can be held responsible for them.

References: [1]Gomes, B.; Pena, P.; Cervantes, R.; Dias, M.; Viegas, C. Microbial Contamination of Bedding Material: One Health in Poultry Production. *Int. J. Environ. Res. Public Health* **2022**, *19*, 16508. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph192416508> [2]Martin, E.; Dziurawitz, N.; Jäckel, U.; Schäfer, J. (2015). Detection of Airborne Bacteria in a Duck Production Facility with Two Different Personal Air Sampling Devices for an Exposure Assessment. *Journal of Occupational and Environmental Hygiene*, *12*(2), 77–86. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15459624.2014.946514>