ISSN: 2475-5451

Research Article

International Journal of Diabetes & Metabolic Disorders

Antimicrobial Susceptibility Profiles, Multidrug Resistance Patterns, and MAR Index Analysis of Campylobacter jejuni and Campylobacter coli Isolated from Poultry and Chicken Handlers in Maiduguri, Northeast Nigeria

Bashir Usman Malgwi[1,3*], Abdulrahman Mohammed[1], Naphtali Nocholas Atsanda[1], Shuaibu Gidado Adamu[1], Adamu Saleh Saidu[1], Francis Ejeh Oche[1], Iliya Dauda Kwoji[1], Barja John[1] and Moses Luke[2,3]

[1]*Department of Veterinary Public Health and Preventive Medicine, Faculty of Veterinary Medicine, University of Maiduguri, Maiduguri, Borno State, Nigeria*

[2]*School of Public Health, University of Port Harcourt, Nigeria*

[3]*FHI 360, Abuja, Nigeria*

[*]Corresponding Author
Bashir Usman Malgwi, Department of Veterinary Public Health and Preventive Medicine, Faculty of Veterinary Medicine, University of Maiduguri, Maiduguri, Borno State, Nigeria.

Submitted: 2026, Aug 14; **Accepted:** 2026, Sep 17; **Published:** 2026, Sep 25

Citation: Malgwi, B. U., Mohammed, A., Atsanda, N. N., Adamu, S. G., Saidu, A. S., et al. (2026). Antimicrobial Susceptibility Profiles, Multidrug Resistance Patterns, and MAR Index Analysis of Campylobacter jejuni and Campylobacter coli Isolated from Poultry and Chicken Handlers in Maiduguri, Northeast Nigeria. *Int J Diabetes Metab Disord, 11*(2), 01-05.

Abstract

Background: *Antimicrobial resistance (AMR) in Campylobacter jejuni and Campylobacter coli is an escalating global public health concern, driven by misuse of antibiotics in poultry production. In northeastern Nigeria, AMR surveillance data for Campylobacter from live bird markets (LBMs) are essentially absent. This study characterised antimicrobial susceptibility profiles, multidrug resistance (MDR) patterns, multiple antibiotic resistance (MAR) index values, and resistance gene carriage among Campylobacter isolates from chickens and chicken handlers in Maiduguri Metropolis.*

Methods: *Forty-nine phenotypically and molecularly confirmed Campylobacter isolates from 212 samples (broiler cloacal swabs, local chicken cloacal swabs, and hand swabs) were subjected to disc diffusion testing against ten antibiotics per CLSI (2016) guidelines, supplemented by EUCAST where CLSI breakpoints were unavailable [1]. The MAR index was calculated as the ratio of antibiotics resisted to total antibiotics evaluated. Multiplex PCR detected tetracycline tet(A) (888 bp) and erythromycin erm(A) (190 bp) resistance genes. Exact binomial 95% CIs (Clopper–Pearson) were calculated for all resistance rates. MDR was defined as resistance to ≥1 agent in ≥3 antibiotic classes [2].*

Results: *Tetracycline resistance was highest (17/49; 34.7%; 95% CI: 21.3%–49.4%) followed by norfloxacin (11/49; 22.4%; 95% CI: 11.5%–36.4%). All isolates were susceptible to ciprofloxacin and levofloxacin (each 91.8% sensitive; 0% resistant; 95% CI for resistance: 0.0%–7.3%) and no isolate was resistant to erythromycin. MDR was detected in 28/49 (57.1%) isolates across 13 distinct resistance patterns. MAR indices ranged from 0.30 to 0.70 (mean 0.40; median 0.40); 16 isolates (32.7%) had MAR ≥0.40, indicating origin from high antibiotic-use environments. The tet(A) and erm(A) genes were detected by multiplex PCR, corroborating phenotypic resistance findings.*

Conclusions: *The 57.1% MDR rate and the predominance of tetracycline resistance in Campylobacter from Maiduguri's LBMs constitute a public health concern requiring urgent antibiotic stewardship, restriction of over-the-counter antibiotic access in poultry, and routine AMR surveillance. Complete susceptibility to ciprofloxacin, levofloxacin, and erythromycin supports their use as empiric first-line agents pending susceptibility data.*

Keywords: Antimicrobial Resistance, Campylobacter Coli, Campylobacter Jejuni, Live Bird Market, MAR Index, Multidrug Resistance, Tetracycline Resistance, Nigeria

Abbreviations

AMR: Antimicrobial Resistance
MDR: Multidrug Resistance
MAR: Multiple Antibiotic Resistance
LBM: Live Bird Market
CLSI: Clinical and Laboratory Standards Institute
EUCAST: European Committee on Antimicrobial Susceptibility Testing
PCR: Polymerase Chain Reaction
CI: Confidence Interval
IQR: Interquartile Range
NB: Norfloxacin
TET: Tetracycline
CH: Chloramphenicol
APX: Ampidox
AMX: Amoxicillin
RD: Rifampicin
CN: Gentamycin
E: Erythromycin
CPX: Ciprofloxacin
LEV: Levofloxacin

1. Background

Antimicrobial resistance (AMR) was declared a global public health emergency by the World Health Organization in 1997 and identified as a major global risk by the World Economic Forum in 2013 [3,4]. Among foodborne pathogens, thermophilic *Campylobacter* species have emerged as leading AMR contributors, with resistance to fluoroquinolones, tetracyclines, and macrolides documented on every inhabited continent [5]. *Campylobacter jejuni* and *Campylobacter coli* together account for approximately 95% of human campylobacteriosis cases, making resistance in these species a direct clinical threat [6].

In Nigerian poultry production, tetracyclines and other antimicrobials are routinely administered without veterinary prescription as growth promoters and prophylactic agents, creating sustained selection pressure for resistance [7]. The spread of resistant strains from animals to humans through the food chain and occupational contact is a critical pathway for community-level AMR dissemination [4]. The multiple antibiotic resistance (MAR) index provides a validated, quantitative tool for determining whether isolates originate from high-risk antibiotic-use environments; a MAR index >0.2 is considered indicative of such high-risk sourcing [8,9].

Tetracycline resistance in *Campylobacter* is primarily conferred by the *tet*(*O*) and *tet*(*A*) genes, which encode ribosomal protection proteins [10]. Erythromycin resistance involves mutations in 23S rRNA and operates through the CmeABC efflux system [11]. Molecular confirmation of resistance genes provides mechanistic understanding beyond disc diffusion phenotyping and informs surveillance of transmissible resistance determinants [12].

Despite the recognised importance of AMR surveillance at the human–animal interface, comprehensive data on *Campylobacter* resistance profiles from LBMs in northeastern Nigeria where informal poultry trading is widespread and antibiotic governance is minimal are absent. This study addressed that gap.

2. Methods

2.1. Isolate Source and Study Setting

This study used 49 *Campylobacter* isolates obtained from a cross-sectional survey conducted June–August 2020 across six LBMs in Maiduguri Metropolis, Borno State, northeastern Nigeria. Isolates were recovered from 212 samples: 135 broiler cloacal swabs, 60 local chicken cloacal swabs, and 17 hand swabs from chicken handlers. All isolates were confirmed by culture on Campylobacter-selective agar at 42°C under microaerobic conditions, biochemical profiling (oxidase+, catalase+, citrate+, urease−), and PCR (16S rRNA, 566 bp; multiplex *HipO*/*CeuE*). Ethical approval was obtained from the Borno State Ministry of Health.

2.2. Antimicrobial Susceptibility Testing

Disc diffusion (Kirby-Bauer method) was performed on Mueller-Hinton agar following CLSI (2016) guidelines, with EUCAST breakpoints applied where CLSI interpretive criteria were unavailable for Campylobacter [1,13]. A 0.5 McFarland standard bacterial suspension was inoculated onto Mueller-Hinton agar. Ten antibiotic discs (Oxoid, UK) were applied: ciprofloxacin (CPX, 10 µg), norfloxacin (NB, 30 µg), gentamycin (CN, 10 µg), amoxicillin (AMX, 30 µg), tetracycline (TET, 50 µg), rifampicin (RD, 10 µg), erythromycin (E, 30 µg), chloramphenicol (CH, 20 µg), ampidox (APX, 30 µg), and levofloxacin (LEV, 10 µg). Zones of inhibition were read at 24–48 h using the Sensitre Vizion system 40. Campylobacter jejuni ATCC 33560 was used as quality control.

2.3. MDR Classification and MAR Index

Isolates were classified as MDR if resistant to ≥1 agent in ≥3 different antimicrobial classes per international consensus definitions [2]. The MAR index was computed as MAR = a/b, where a = number of antibiotics resisted and b = total antibiotics assessed (n=10). MAR >0.2 indicates probable origin from a high-risk, high-antibiotic-use environment [8]. Descriptive statistics (mean, median, range, interquartile range) were computed for the MAR index distribution across MDR isolates.

2.4. Molecular Detection of Resistance Genes

Multiplex PCR detected the tetracycline resistance gene *tet*(*A*) (888 bp; Maynard et al., 2004) and the erythromycin resistance gene *erm*(*A*) (190 bp; Strommenger et al., 2003) [14,15]. Reactions (20 µl) used 4 µl Master Mix, 0.8 µl each primer (10 mM), 2 µl DNA, and 13.2 µl RNase-free water. Cycling: 95°C × 3 min; 35 cycles of 95°C × 30 s / 48°C × 30 s / 72°C × 30 s; final extension 72°C × 3 min. Primer sequences are shown in Table 1

Target Gene	Primer Sequence (5'–3')	Amplicon (bp)	Reference
tet(A)	F: AACTTAGGCATTCTGGCTCAC R: GAAGGCAAGCAGGATGTAG	888	Maynard et al. (2004) [14]
erm(A)	F: TATCTTATCGTTGAGAAGGGAT R: CTACACTTGGCTTAGGATGAAA	190	Strommenger et al. (2003) [15]

Table 1: Primers Used for Multiplex PCR Detection of Antimicrobial Resistance Genes

3.Statistical Analysis

Data were analysed using SPSS version 20.0 (IBM Corp., Chicago, IL, USA). Exact binomial 95% CIs were calculated using the Clopper–Pearson method for all resistance proportions. Regression and correlation analyses examined associations between antibiotic resistance and the presence of Campylobacter species. Statistical significance was set at $p<0.05$. Resistance patterns were tabulated in ascending order of MAR index magnitude.

4. Results

4.1. Antimicrobial Susceptibility Profiles with Confidence Intervals

Table 2 presents the complete susceptibility profiles for all 49 isolates with exact 95% CIs for resistance rates. Tetracycline resistance was the highest at 34.7% (95% CI: 21.3%–49.4%), followed by norfloxacin at 22.4% (95% CI: 11.5%–36.4%). Resistance to ampidox, gentamycin, chloramphenicol, rifampicin, and amoxicillin was detected at lower rates, each with broad CIs reflecting the small denominator. No resistance was detected to ciprofloxacin, erythromycin, or levofloxacin (0.0%; exact 95% CI upper bound: 7.3% for each). The high intermediate categories for amoxicillin (85.7%) and rifampicin (81.6%) indicate dose-dependent susceptibility rather than frank resistance.

Antibiotic (Disc Concentration)	Sensitive n (%)	Intermediate n (%)	Resistant n (%)	95% CI for Resistance
Ciprofloxacin (CPX, 10 µg)	45 (91.8)	4 (8.2)	0 (0.0)	0.0% – 7.3%
Norfloxacin (NB, 30 µg)	1 (2.0)	37 (75.5)	11 (22.4)	11.5% – 36.4%
Gentamycin (CN, 10 µg)	17 (34.7)	29 (59.2)	3 (6.1)	1.3% – 16.6%
Amoxicillin (AMX, 30 µg)	6 (12.2)	42 (85.7)	1 (2.0)	0.1% – 9.7%
Tetracycline (TET, 50 µg)	5 (10.2)	27 (55.1)	17 (34.7)	21.3% – 49.4%
Rifampicin (RD, 10 µg)	8 (16.3)	40 (81.6)	1 (2.0)	0.1% – 9.7%
Erythromycin (E, 30 µg)	33 (67.3)	16 (32.7)	0 (0.0)	0.0% – 7.3%
Chloramphenicol (CH, 20 µg)	26 (53.1)	21 (42.9)	2 (4.1)	0.5% – 13.8%
Ampidox (APX, 30 µg)	9 (18.4)	32 (65.3)	8 (16.3)	7.2% – 29.8%
Levofloxacin (LEV, 10 µg)	45 (91.8)	4 (8.2)	0 (0.0)	0.0% – 7.3%

Table 2: Antimicrobial Susceptibility of Campylobacter Isolates (n=49) with Exact 95% Clopper–Pearson CIs for Eesistance Rates

4.2. MAR Index Distribution Analysis

MDR was detected in 28/49 (57.1%) isolates. Thirteen distinct resistance patterns were identified (Table 3) spanning MAR indices of 0.30–0.70. Descriptive statistics for the MAR index distribution among MDR isolates are mean = 0.40, median = 0.40, range = 0.30–0.70, interquartile range (IQR) = 0.30–0.40. The modal MAR index was 0.30, occurring in 12 isolates (42.9% of MDR isolates). Sixteen isolates (32.7% of all 49 isolates; 57.1% of MDR isolates) had MAR ≥0.40, indicating high-risk contamination sources with heavy antibiotic use [8]. The most extreme pattern (CN–AMX–RD–CH–APX–TET–NB; MAR=0.70) was present in one isolate and conferred resistance across seven agents spanning five antibiotic classes.

No. of Agents Resisted	Resistance Pattern	Isolates n (%)	MAR Index	Antibiotic Classes Involved
3	CH – NB – TET	2 (4.1)	0.30	3
3	NB – AMX – TET	7 (14.3)	0.30	3
3	TET – RD – APX	1 (2.0)	0.30	3
3	APX – TET – NB	2 (4.1)	0.30	3
4	AMX – NB – TET – APX	4 (8.2)	0.40	4

4	TET – CH – APX – NB	2 (4.1)	0.40	4
4	RD – APX – CH – NB	1 (2.0)	0.40	4
4	AMX – RD – APX – CN	1 (2.0)	0.40	4
5	TET – CH – APX – NB – E	2 (4.1)	0.50	5
5	CN – TET – APX – AMX – NB	2 (4.1)	0.50	4
6	RD – APX – CH – CN – TET – NB	2 (4.1)	0.60	5
6	CN – AMX – NB – RD – TET – APX	1 (2.0)	0.60	5
7	CN – AMX – RD – CH – APX – TET – NB	1 (2.0)	0.70	5
NB = norfloxacin; TET = tetracycline; CH = chloramphenicol; APX = ampidox; AMX = amoxicillin; RD = rifampicin; CN = gentamycin; E = erythromycin. MDR = multidrug resistant. MAR = multiple antibiotic resistance.				

Table 3: Antimicrobial Resistance Patterns of Campylobacter Isolates in Ascending MAR Index Order (n=28 MDR isolates of 49 total)

4.3. Molecular Detection of Resistance Genes

Multiplex PCR detected the *tet*(*A*) gene (888 bp) and the *erm*(*A*) gene (190 bp) in isolates consistent with the phenotypic resistance results. The presence of *tet*(*A*) corroborated the high tetracycline resistance rates observed by disc diffusion. Detection of *erm*(*A*) in the absence of frank phenotypic erythromycin resistance is consistent with sub-clinical or low-level resistance determinants, a phenomenon previously documented when CmeABC efflux pump activity and 23S rRNA mutations interact at sub-threshold levels [11].

5. Discussion

The highest resistance rate in this study was to tetracycline (34.7%; 95% CI: 21.3%–49.4%), consistent with the globally documented pattern of high tetracycline resistance in *Campylobacter* and comparable to rates reported in Sokoto, Nigeria and in sub-Saharan African regional studies [16]. Samad et al. (2018) reported 75% tetracycline resistance among *Campylobacter* isolates in poultry, while Lopes et al. (2018) reported 16.7% demonstrating considerable geographic variation [17,18]. The mechanistic basis for tetracycline resistance rests primarily on the *tet*(*O*) gene, which encodes a ribosomal protection protein on self-transmissible plasmids (45–58 kb) capable of horizontal gene transfer between *Campylobacter* strains and across species [10]. Detection of *tet*(*A*) in the present study confirms that genotypic resistance mechanisms are active in Maiduguri isolates, posing a risk of mobile genetic element-mediated dissemination [19].

Norfloxacin resistance at 22.4% (95% CI: 11.5%–36.4%) is noteworthy given the therapeutic importance of fluoroquinolones for campylobacteriosis. By contrast, the complete absence of ciprofloxacin and levofloxacin resistance (0.0%; exact upper CI: 7.3%) may reflect lower utilisation of these specific agents in Maiduguri's poultry sector relative to norfloxacin, a finding consistent with Salihu et al. (2012) in Sokoto [16]. This contrasts with global trends: Engberg et al. (2001) linked increasing fluoroquinolone resistance in *Campylobacter* directly to veterinary authorisation of enrofloxacin use in poultry production [20]. The current susceptibility of Maiduguri isolates to ciprofloxacin and levofloxacin supports their continued use as first-line agents, but mandates ongoing surveillance given the trajectory of fluoroquinolone resistance globally.

Complete susceptibility to erythromycin (0% resistant; 67.3% sensitive) is a critical clinical finding, as macrolides specifically azithromycin are the first-line recommended treatment for severe human campylobacteriosis. The detection of *erm*(*A*) by multiplex PCR in the absence of disc diffusion resistance is consistent with the documented role of the CmeABC efflux pump and sub-threshold 23S rRNA mutations in conferring latent macrolide resistance; this distinction is important because phenotypic susceptibility does not guarantee that the resistance genetic machinery is absent [11].

The 57.1% MDR rate and the MAR index distribution (mean 0.40; IQR 0.30–0.40; maximum 0.70) unambiguously confirm that most *Campylobacter* isolates from Maiduguri's LBMs originate from high antibiotic-use environments. All MAR indices exceeded the 0.2 threshold established by Davis and Brown (2016) as indicative of such risk environments [8]. The most frequently occurring resistance pattern NB–AMX–TET (14.3% of isolates; MAR=0.30) spans three antibiotic classes and recapitulates the antibiotics most used without prescription in Nigerian poultry. The dominance of patterns containing tetracycline (present in 11 of 13 identified patterns) reflects the ubiquity of tetracycline use and confirms this agent as the primary resistance driver in this setting, as noted in the broader Nigerian literature [3].

For intermediate categories amoxicillin (85.7% intermediate) and rifampicin (81.6% intermediate) the data suggest that adjusted dosing might achieve clinical efficacy, but these agents should not be used empirically for campylobacteriosis without susceptibility confirmation [21]. The 57.1% MDR rate is higher than rates

reported in several comparable Sub-Saharan African LBM studies and underscores the urgent need for antibiotic stewardship programming, restriction of over-the-counter antimicrobial access in Nigerian poultry markets, and integration of routine *Campylobacter* AMR surveillance into existing National Action Plans on Antimicrobial Resistance.

6. Conclusion

This study provides the first comprehensive AMR characterisation of *Campylobacter* isolates from live bird markets in Maiduguri Metropolis, northeastern Nigeria. Tetracycline resistance (34.7%; 95% CI: 21.3%–49.4%), MDR prevalence (57.1%), elevated MAR indices (mean 0.40; range 0.30–0.70), and molecular detection of *tet*(*A*) and *erm*(*A*) resistance genes together constitute a public health concern of high magnitude. The full susceptibility of all isolates to ciprofloxacin, levofloxacin, and erythromycin supports their continued use as empirical first-line therapy in this region. Immediate implementation of antibiotic stewardship policies, enforcement of veterinary prescription requirements, routine LBM surveillance, and farmer education on responsible antibiotic use are essential to contain MDR *Campylobacter* in northeastern Nigeria.

Declarations

Ethics Approval and Consent to Participate

Ethical approval was obtained from the Borno State Ministry of Health. Informed consent was obtained from all human participants. All animal procedures complied with veterinary ethics guidelines.

Availability of Data and Materials

All datasets generated during this study are available from the corresponding author on reasonable request.

Authors' Contributions

BUM, AM, and NNA designed the study, collected the data, and wrote the first draft of the manuscript. AM, NNA, ASS, and SGA oversaw the entire research process and critically reviewed the manuscript. BUM, FEO, IDK, and BJ contributed to data collation, data cleaning, and conducted the data analyses for the study. Finally, ML conducted the literature search and contributed to the writing of the final manuscript. All authors read and approved the final version of the manuscript.

Acknowledgements

The authors acknowledge the Veterinary Microbiology Department and the North-East Zonal Centre of Excellence for Biotechnology, University of Maiduguri, for laboratory support.

References

1. Clinical and Laboratory Standards Institute. (2016). Performance standards for antimicrobial susceptibility testing (26th ed.). CLSI Supplement M100.
2. Magiorakos, A. P., Srinivasan, A., Carey, R. B., Carmeli, Y., Falagas, M. E., Giske, C. G., ... & Monnet, D. L. (2012). Multidrug-resistant, extensively drug-resistant and pandrug-resistant bacteria: an international expert proposal for interim standard definitions for acquired resistance. *Clinical microbiology and infection, 18*(3), 268-281.
3. Abd El-Hack, M. E., El-Saadony, M. T., Salem, H. M., El-Tahan, A. M., Soliman, M. M., Youssef, G. B., ... & Swelum, A. A. (2022). Alternatives to antibiotics for organic poultry production: types, modes of action and impacts on bird's health and production. *Poultry science, 101*(4), 101696.
4. Schrijver, R., Stijntjes, M., Rodríguez-Baño, J., Tacconelli, E., Rajendran, N. B., & Voss, A. (2018). Review of antimicrobial resistance surveillance programmes in livestock and meat in EU with focus on humans. *Clinical microbiology and infection, 24*(6), 577-590.
5. Ge, B., Wang, F., Sjölund-Karlsson, M., & McDermott, P. F. (2013). Antimicrobial resistance in Campylobacter: susceptibility testing methods and resistance trends. *Journal of microbiological methods, 95*(1), 57-67.
6. Coker, A. O., Isokpehi, R. D., Thomas, B. N., Amisu, K. O., & Obi, C. L. (2002). Human campylobacteriosis in developing countries1. *Emerging infectious diseases, 8*(3), 237.
7. Shaikh, S., Fatima, J., Shakil, S., Rizvi, S. M. D., & Kamal, M. A. (2015). Antibiotic resistance and extended spectrum beta-lactamases: Types, epidemiology and treatment. *Saudi journal of biological sciences, 22*(1), 90-101.
8. Davis, R., & Brown, P. D. (2016). Multiple antibiotic resistance index, fitness and virulence potential in respiratory Pseudomonas aeruginosa from Jamaica. *Journal of medical microbiology, 65*(4), 261-271.
9. Osundiya, O. O., Oladele, R. O., & Oduyebo, O. O. (2013). Multiple antibiotic resistance (MAR) indices of Pseudomonas and Klebsiella species isolates in Lagos University Teaching Hospital. *African Journal of Clinical and Experimental Microbiology, 14*(3), 164-168.
10. Gibreel, A., Tracz, D. M., Nonaka, L., Ngo, T. M., Connell, S. R., & Taylor, D. E. (2004). Incidence of antibiotic resistance in Campylobacter jejuni isolated in Alberta, Canada, from 1999 to 2002, with special reference to tet (O)-mediated tetracycline resistance. *Antimicrobial Agents and Chemotherapy, 48*(9), 3442-3450.
11. Acheson, D., & Allos, B. M. (2001). Campylobacter jejuni infections: update on emerging issues and trends. *Clinical infectious diseases, 32*(8), 1201-1206.
12. Abdi-Hachesoo, B., Khoshbakht, R., Sharifiyazdi, H., Tabatabaei, M., Hosseinzadeh, S., & Asasi, K. (2014). Tetracycline resistance genes in Campylobacter jejuni and C. coli isolated from poultry carcasses. *Jundishapur journal of microbiology, 7*(9), e12129.
13. Narvaez-Bravo, C., Taboada, E. N., Mutschall, S. K., & Aslam, M. (2017). Epidemiology of antimicrobial resistant Campylobacter spp. isolated from retail meats in Canada. *International Journal of Food Microbiology, 253*, 43-47.
14. Maynard, C., Bekal, S., Sanschagrin, F., Levesque, R. C., Brousseau, R., Masson, L., ... & Harel, J. (2004). Heterogeneity among virulence and antimicrobial resistance gene profiles of extraintestinal Escherichia coli isolates of animal and human origin. *Journal of clinical microbiology, 42*(12), 5444-5452.
15. Strommenger, B., Kettlitz, C., Werner, G., & Witte, W.

(2003). Multiplex PCR assay for simultaneous detection of nine clinically relevant antibiotic resistance genes in Staphylococcus aureus. *Journal of clinical microbiology, 41*(9), 4089-4094.

16. Salihu, M. D., Junaidu, A. U., Magaji, A. A., & Yakubu, Y. (2012). Prevalence and antimicrobial resistance of thermophilic Campylobacter isolates from commercial broiler flocks in Sokoto, *Nigeria. Res. J. Vet. Sci, 5*(2), 51-58.
17. Samad, A., Aziz, T., Rahman, A., Khan, A., & Ali, A. (2018). Antimicrobial susceptibility and serotyping of Campylobacter jejuni. Pakistan Veterinary Journal, 38(1), 72–76.
18. Lopes, G. V., Landgraf, M., & Destro, M. T. (2018). Occurrence of Campylobacter in raw chicken and beef from retail outlets in São Paulo, Brazil. *Journal of Food Safety, 38*(3), e12442.
19. Carattoli, A., Villa, L., Feudi, C., Curcio, L., Orsini, S., Luppi, A., ... & Magistrali, C. F. (2017). Novel plasmid-mediated colistin resistance mcr-4 gene in Salmonella and Escherichia coli, Italy 2013, Spain and Belgium, 2015 to 2016. *Eurosurveillance, 22*(31), 30589.
20. Engberg, J., Aarestrup, F. M., Taylor, D. E., Gerner-Smidt, P., & Nachamkin, I. (2001). Quinolone and macrolide resistance in Campylobacter jejuni and C. coli: resistance mechanisms and trends in human isolates. *Emerging infectious diseases, 7*(1), 24.
21. Sandhu, R., Dahiya, S., & Sayal, P. (2016). Evaluation of multiple antibiotic resistance (MAR) index and Doxycycline susceptibility of Acinetobacter species among inpatients. *Indian J Microbiol Res, 3*(3), 299.