ISOLATION, IDENTIFICATION AND ANTIBIOGRAM OF BACTERIA FROM DUNG OF LOCAL CATTLE

BY

Thomas Osondu ALIKE

LSC1906812

DEPARTMENT OF MICROBIOLOGY

FACULTY LIFE SCIENCES

UNIVERSITY OF BENIN

BENIN CITY

MARCH, 2024

ISOLATION, IDENTIFICATION AND ANTIBIOGRAM OF BACTERIA FROM DUNG OF LOCAL CATTLE

BY

Thomas Osondu Alike

LSC1906812

A PROJECT WORK SUBMITTED TO THE DEPARTMENT OF MICROBIOLOGY, FACULTY OF LIFE SCIENCES, UNIVERSITY OF BENIN, BENIN CITY, IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENT FOR THE AWARD OF BACHELOR OF SCIENCE (B.Sc) HONOURS IN MICROBIOLOGY.

MARCH, 2024.

CERTIFICATION

This is to certify that this project was carried out by Thomas Osondu Alike in the Department of Microbiology, Faculty of Life Sciences, University of Benin, under the supervision of Prof.(Mrs.) O.I. Enabulele, submitted to the Department of Microbiology, Faculty of Life Sciences, University of Benin, Benin City, in partial fulfillment for the requirement of the award of Bachelor of Science (B.Sc.) degree in Microbiology.

______________________________ ___________________

Prof. (Mrs) O. I. Enabulele **DATE**

Project Supervisor

APPROVAL

This is to certify that this project work was accepted in partial fulfillment of the requirement for the award of Bachelor of Science B.Sc. (Hons) Degree in Microbiology of the University of Benin, Benin City.

________________________ ________________

PROF. (MRS) F.I. AKINNIBOSUN **DATE**

Head of Department

DEDICATION

I dedicate this project to God Almighty for his guidance, provision, wisdom, understanding, strength and protection during the course of this project and my brother who has taken up the burden of tertiary education.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

First and foremost, my deepest appreciation goes to Almighty God for the grace, wisdom and strength he bestowed upon me during the course of this project. It is by his grace, mercy and provision that this project was successfully completed. I give him all the glory.

I also want to appreciate my supervisor, Prof.(Mrs.) O.I. Enabulele my first encounter with you Ma had a lot of impact in my life. My co-supervisor Dr. A.S Aziegbemhin who not only being a good model to me but showed up for me at the difficult moment of my journey.

My appreciation also goes to my professor friend and mentor Prof. C. E. Oshoma your help is never neglected sir and I really admire you from afar.

A very big thank you to my mother, my brother and his wife, God bless you so much for all the provisions you have made for me right from the beginning I entered the four walls of the university to this moment, you have always been there supporting me financially despite the recent hardship in the economy, your advice has truly been remarkable in my life and has helped guide me during my project work. To my brothers and sisters; Augustus, Ndidi and all my friends who saw me through financially and otherwise thank you all.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TITLE PAGE i

CERTIFICATION ii

APPROVAL iii

DEDICATION iv

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT v

TABLE OF CONTENTS vi

ABSTRACT ix

CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION 1

1.0 BACKGROUND OF THE STUDY 1

1.2 THE OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY ARE TO: 2

CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW 3

2.0 COW DUNG 3

2.1 SOURCE OF ENERGY 4

2.2 AGRICULTURE MANAGEMENT 7

2.3 BIOREMEDIATION OF ENVIRONMENT POLLUTANTS 8

2.4 HUMAN HEALTH MANAGEMENT 9

2.5 SOURCE OF MICROBIAL ENZYMES 9

2.6 PATHOGENS ASSOCIATED WITH COW DUNG 10

2.6.1 ESCHERICHIA COLI 10

2.6.2 SALMONELLA 11

2.6.3 CAMPYLOBACTER 11

2.6.4 LISTERIA MONOCYTOGENES 12

2.6.5 YERSINIA ENTEROCOLITICA 13

2.6.6 ENTEROCOCCUS 13

2.6.7 MUNDTII 14

2.6.8 MYCOBACTERIUM 14

CHAPTER THREE: MATERIALS AND METHODS 17

3.0 STUDY AREA 17

3.1 SAMPLE COLLECTION 17

3.2 SERIAL DILUTION 17

3.4 ISOLATION AND IDENTIFICATION 18

3.5 ANTIBIOTIC SUSCEPTIBILITY TEST 18

CHAPTER FOUR: RESULTS 19

4.1 RESULT PRESENTED SHOWS THE TOTAL BACTERIA COUNT FROM COW DUNG. 19

4.2 RESULTS SHOWS THE DISTRIBUTION OF BACTERIA ISOLATES IN A SAMPLE AND SAMPLE. 21

4.3 RESULTS SHOWS ANTIBACTERIAL RESISTANCE PATTERN 23

CHAPTER FIVE 25

5.1 DISCUSSION 25

5.2 CONCLUSIONS 27

REFERENCES 28

APPENDIX 37

ABSTRACT

Cattle dung contains a lot of potentially pathogenic bacteria. Data on bacteria from local cattle (muturu) unlike its fulani relative is however scarce. This research was carried out to analyze the bacterial microflora of cattle muturu dung. A total of four stool samples received in our Laboratory were analyzed. A ten-fold serial dilution was carried out on all samples. Briefly, one (1) gram each of stool sample was weighed onto test tubes containing 9ml of sterile distilled water to make stock solutions. The tubes were homogenized after which 1ml was inoculated onto petri dish containing solidified agar and rocked for even distribution. Agar plates were incubated at 37℃ for 24hours. Bacterial counts were carried out on each of them. Identification of bacteria isolates were carried out using standard guidelines such as morphological (shape, size, arrangement, staining property, motility and spore formation) colonial (texture, elevation, margin and colour) and biochemical (catalase, oxidase, citrate utilization, urease and indole production) characteristics. Bacterial isolates recovered from cattle dung incude: *Eschericia coli*, *Salmonella* sp.,*Staphylococcus* sp., *Enterococcus* sp., *Shigella* sp., *Bacillus* sp. and *Streptococcus* sp. The antibacterial resistance pattern of bacterial isolates to routinely used antibiotics (azithromycin, levofloxacin, erythromycin, pefloxacin, gentamycin, ampicillin-cloxacillin, cefuroxime, amoxiclin, ceftriaxone and ciprofloxacin) was carried out using the Disc diffusion method. The total heterotrouphic bacterial counts ranged from 1.5×10^{3}cfu/g – 9.8×10^{5} cfu/g. Bacterial isolates showed varying resistance to the antibacterial agents used in this study. Both isolates of *Eschericia coli* were resistant to azithromycin and levofloxacin. *Bacillus* specie was resistant to erythromycin and pefloxacin while *Salmonella* sp. showed resistance to gentamycin. The presence of antibiotic resistance bacteria in local cattle dug could be of grave public health concern.

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

1.0 Background of the Study

Cow dung is excreted by bovine animal species, which are herbivores. It consists of undigested residues of consumed matter which has passed through the cow's gastrointestinal system (Teo and Teoh, 2011).Cow dung contains 14.05-19.00 hemicellulose(%),15.31-29.00 cellulose(%) and 13.97-16.00 lignin(%) (Li *et al,2021*). It contains about 24 different minerals ranging from macro-minerals like: Nitrogen(N2), Potassium (K), Sulphur (S), Magnesium (Mg),and trace elements such as: Copper (CU),Phosphorus (PH) and Zinc (Zn).Cow dung is widely used in formation of manure which is used as bio-fertilizers, source of energy, bioremediation of environmental pollutants, human health management and source of microbial enzyme(Muhammadu *et al*, 2003). Manure of cow dung enhances the minerals of soil and also develops resistance power of plants against pests and plant diseases. Animal pathogens posing risks to animal and possibly human health include a variety of bacteria such as Salmonella spices, *Eschericia coli*, *Shigella spp.*, *Enterococuss* spp., *Staphylococuss* spp., *Streptococuss* spp., *Bacillus* spp., *micrococcuss* spp., and *Psuedomonas* spp., (Davies *et al*., 1997).some of them are endemic in commercial livestock and difficulty to eliminate from animal and production equipment. Because the path mogen in very dominant in animals, there are often present in fresh animal manure and other wastes. Therefore, the pathogens in animals manure and other wastes products pose a very big treat to human and animal health both on and off animal agriculture production equipment if the waste is not absolutely treated and contained (Crane *et al*.,1983; Graczyk *et al*., 2000).

1.2 The objectives of the study are to:

i. isolate and identify potentially pathogenic bacteria in feacal samples obtained from local cattle.

ii. determine the heterotrophic counts of bacterial isolates in feacal samples of cattles.

iii. determine the antibacterial resistance pattern of bacterial isolates from local cattles.

CHAPTER TWO

LITERATURE REVIEW

2.0 COW DUNG

Cow dung can be defined as the undigested residue of consumed food material being excreted by herbivorous bovine animal species. Being a mixture of faeces and urine in the ratio of 3:1, it mainly consists of lignin, cellulose and hemicelluloses. It also contains 24 different minerals like nitrogen, potassium, along with trace amount of sulphur, iron, magnesium, copper, cobalt and manganese. The indigenous Indian cow also contain higher amount of calcium, phosphorus, zinc and copper than the cross-breed cow (Garg and Mudgal 2007; Randhawa and Kullar 2011). Cow dung harbours a rich microbial diversity, containing different species of bacteria (*Bacillus* spp., *Corynebacterium* spp. and *LactoBacillus* spp.), protozoa and yeast (*Saccharomyces* and *Candida*) (Nene 1999; Randhawa and Kullar 2n011). Sawant *et al*. (2007) have isolated many different bacterial genera such as *Citrobacter konseri*, *Enterobacter aerogenes*, *Escherichia coli*, *Klebsiella oxytoca*, *Klebsiella pneumoniae*, *Kluyvera* spp., *Morgarella morganii*, *Pasteurella* spp., *Providencia alcaligenes*, *Providencia stuartii* and *Pseudomonas* spp. from cow dung.

In India, 69.9 % population resides in rural areas (The Hindu 2011), where cow (Bos indicus) is major cattle and generates 9–15 kg dung/day (Werner *et al*. 1989; Brown 2003). Waste is generally meant for discarding because it may act as a source of pollution (Pongrácz and Pohjola 2004). However, if it is used in some other process such as feedstock it may be considered as co-product (Brown 2003). People in Indian villages use cow dung for cooking purpose by direct burning. It is also used in plastering of walls and floor in rural houses for providing insulation during winter and summer. Application of smoke generated from the burnt cow dung as mosquito repellent and subsequent ash as cleaning agent for kitchen utensils is an age old

practice. Accordingly, different usage of cow dung by village peoples reflect the native knowledge associated with it. It also depict that cow plays an important role in village economy and has high socio-economic value (Dhama *et al*. 2005a).

Cow dung in India is also used as a co-product in agriculture, such as manure, biofertiliser, biopesticides, pestrepellant and as a source of energy (Dhama *et al*. 2005a). As per ayurveda, it can also act as a purifier for all the wastes in the nature (Randhwa and Khullar 2011). Therefore in India, Cow (*B*. *indicus*) is not only just milk-producing animal but also truly considered as Gomata (mother of all) and Kamdhenu (Dhama *et al*. 2005a; Jarald *et al*. 2008). Detailed study of cow dung is gaining interest around the world and few attempts have been made for utilising its potential in the field of energy production, pharmaceutical products. The review intends to highlight the possible applications of cow dung particularly in the area ranging from energy, agriculture and environment to medicine for human welfare.

2.1 SOURCE OF ENERGY

Dependence of mankind on non-renewable source of energy such as coal, oil and gases is increasing worldwide. In India, the main source of energy is coal, which accounts for 44 % of total energy consumption. Our country is now facing the shortage of coal supplies despite being the third largest coal producer in the world. According to energy information administration (EIA), our dependency on imported fossil fuels has risen to 38 % (USEIA 2014). Because of the limited availability of coal, an easily available, economical as well as environment friendly renewable source of energy is required. According to the United Nations Food and Agriculture Organisation (FAO), the animal waste on this planet produces around 55–65 % methane, which upon release in the atmosphere can affect global warming 21 times higher than the rate CO2 does.

Biogas, a mixture of different gases produced by anaerobic fermentation of organic matter from methanogenic bacteria, mainly constitutes methane (50–65 %) and CO_2 (25–45 %) (Sharma 2011). One kilogram of cow manure ncan produce 35–40 l of biogas when mixed with equal amount of water with hydraulic retention time (HRT) of 55–60 days maintained at an ambient temperature of 24–26 °C (Kalia and Singh 2004). Li *et al*. (2009) reported 67 ml/g methane yield from anaerobic digestion of cow manure, whose total and volatile solids were 23.4 and 13.8 g/l, respectively. Green bacteria such as *Pseudomonas* sp., *Azotobacter* sp. and other purple sulphur or purple non-sulphur bacteria are known to produce maximum amount of methane gas in comparison to other photosynthetic bacteria present in cow dung (Rana *et al.* 2014). The optimum production of biogas depends upon mesophilic (32–38 °C) and thermophilic (50–55 °C) temperature range (Kashyap *et al*. 2003). The inability of mesophilic microorganisms to survive in psychrophilic temperature range results in 70 % reduced production of biogas during winters in hilly areas (Kanwar and Guleri 1994). This may be due to the collapse of cell energy, outflow of intracellular substances or cell lysis of mesophiles at lower temperature (Gounot 1986). But many researchers reported a fare amount of biogas production under psychrophilic range of temperature using some modifications (Safley and Westerman 1990; Kanwar and Guleri 1994).

Cow dung is the major source of biogas or gobar gas production in India. The total population of female cows in India is 190.90 million out of which 151 million are indigenous whilst 39 million are crossbreed (Livestock Census 2012). Cow dung generated from 3–5 cattle/day can run a simple 8–10 m^3 biogas plant which is able to produce 1.5–2 m^3 biogas per day which is sufficient for the family 6–8 persons, can cook meal for 2 or 3 times or may light two lamps for 3 h or run a refrigerator for all day and can also operate a 3-KW motor generator for 1 h (Werner *et al*. 1989). A 1-m^3 biogas plant has produced 28.78 l/kg (0.028 m^3) and 32.76 l/kg (0.032 m^3) of

biogas respectively when daily feed with 22 kg of dung/m3 which is mixed with equal amount of water with 9–10 % of total solids. The maximum production of biogas from that plant is 39.00 l/kg (0.039 m3) and 40.04 l/kg (0.04 m3) respectively when operated at the temperature of 23.5 °C (Kalia and Singh 2004). On the other hand, farmer also gains 13.87 metric tons of organic fertiliser per year from the biogas plant. This co-production of biofertiliser also allow farmer to recover the initial investment for setting up of a biogas plant (Sharma 2011).

Though cow dung is solely used as the prime source for biogas production, but research continues to verify the potential of other sources for instance, addition of pig dung was found to have an enhanced effect. Mixture of cow and pig dung (60:40) showed 10 % increase in methane production as investigated by Li *et al*. (2014). Use of potato pulp and cow manure in the ratio of 20:80 also produced fair amount of methane in comparison to pure cow dung (Sanaei-Moghadam *et al*. 2014). Besides this, there are reports on comparative studies for biogas production where various feedstocks such as kitchen waste, corn waste and spent tea waste have been used along with cow dung in a ratio of 1:1 producing less average biogas after 25–30 days; however, cow dung alone produced approximately 50 % more biogas than these mixtures (Munda *et al*. 2012), thereby suggesting that other organic sources may produce biogas but cow dung still remains a potential source. In the light of above-discussed facts, biogas production can also be considered as an effective way of treating organic waste which may produce green house gases if remain untreated.

Supercapacitors are the in-between arrangement in electrochemical batteries which can store a large amount of energy that can be delivered with high power for few milliseconds (Gamby *et al*. 2001). They have high power density (103–104 W/kg), long cycle life (>106 cycles), pulse power supply, low maintenance cost, simplicity and better safety compared to secondary

batteries. The use of porous carbon as electrode material is widespread in supercapacitors. This porous carbon is synthesised by many different methods such as using silica or surfactant, aerogels, organometallic compounds, chemical activation and physical activation. All these processes are costly and consume expensive precursors and time (Lee *al. et* 2006; Fang *et al.* 2009; Kim *et al*. 2012; Yang *et al*. 2012; Bhattacharjya *et al*. 2013; Inamdar *et al*. 2013; Bhattacharjya and Sung 2014; Yang *et al*. 2014). Now focus is shifting towards natural biomass as a potential source for carbon precursors. Several natural biomasses have been explored for production of activated carbon (Demiral and Demiral 2008; Hu *et al*. 2010; Li *et al*. 2010, 2011; Wei *et al*. 2011; Xu *et al*. 2012; Biswal *et al*. 2013; Falco *et al.* 2013; Huang *et al*. 2013; Wang *et al.* 2013; Bhattacharjya and Sung 2014). Activated carbon has recently been synthesised from cow dung by a modified chemical activation method, in which partially carbonised cow dung was treated with potassium hydroxide in the ratio of 2:1. The synthesised activated carbon when tested as supercapacitor electrodes in practical showed specific capacitance of 124 F/g at 0.1 A/g and retained up to 117 F/g at 1.0 A/g current density. It is also durable for long-term operations (Yang *et al.* 2012). The synthesis of activated carbon having high surface area along with optimum micropore and mesopore volume reflects excellent electrochemical application of cow dung for supercapacitors. The literature also suggest that biological waste like cow dung can be converted into a electrode material for other energy storage and conversion systems such as Li-ion batteries and fuel cells.

2.2 AGRICULTURE MANAGEMENT

Human population is increasing worldwide giving rise to intensive farming system and unsuitable cropland management that ultimately results in reduced soil fertility (Onwudike 2010; Bedada *et al*. 2014). Extensive use of chemical fertilisers is suggested for replenishment of

nutritional deficiencies to increase crop yield. Many disadvantages of widespread use of chemical fertilisers include increase in soil acidity, mineral imbalance and soil degradation (Kang and Juo 1980; Ayoola and Makinde 2008) and even farmers nowadays do not prefer chemical fertilisers (Bedada *et al.* 2014). In composting, microorganisms decompose organic substrate aerobically into carbon dioxide, water, minerals and stabilised organic matter (Bernal *et al*. 2009; Kala *et al.* 2009; Vakili *et al*. 2015). Compost is added into the soil to improve nutrients and water-holding capacity (Arslan *et al*. 2008; Vakili *et al*. 2015).

2.3 BIOREMEDIATION OF ENVIRONMENT POLLUTANTS

Toxic chemicals find their way into the human body, plant tissue and animals through absorption (Adams *et al*. 2014). Active pharmaceutical ingredients (API) serve as a blend of various drugs that are well known to pollute the aquatic environment (Kessler 2010). Agriculture run-off also contributes towards the pollution of water bodies through which water is supplied for human consumption. Presently, in India only 10 % of total waste water is treated and rest is discharged untreated (Singh and Kohli 2012). In industrial treatment plant in Patancheru, near Hyderabad (India), 0.9 mg ciprofloxacin per gram organic matter was found downstream from common contaminated river sediment (Kristiansson *et al*. 2011; Larsson 2014). This condition is not only in India but also in China, U.S. and European countries as discharge of pharmaceuticals is also reported from these regions (Babic *et al*. 2007; Thomas et al. 2007; Fick *et al.* 2009; Kristiansson et al. 2011; Phillips *et al*. 2010; Larsson 2014). These practices are adversely affecting the environment quality which is directly related to the quality of life on earth. Discharge of these toxic compounds imparts negative effect on human health hence rejuvenation of environment is today's utmost need (Dhami *et al*. 2013; Adams *et al*. 2014).

2.4 HUMAN HEALTH MANAGEMENT

Microbial products or their derivatives can kill or inhibit the growth of susceptible pathogenic microbes (Willey *et al*. 2008). However, overuse and misuse of these antimicrobial agents have resulted in the development of resistance amongst pathogens (Aly *et al*. 2012; Sharif *et al*. 2013). At present, bacterial resistance against the antibiotics is of great concern for clinicians, public health officials and researchers as it results in substantial morbidity, mortality and increased cost of treatment (Naiemi *et al.* 2006; Abo-state *et al*. 2012; Aly *et al.* 2012; Jeyasanta *et al*. 2012; Ullah *et al.* 2012; Sharif *et al*. 2013). The pharmaceutical industries and healthcare systems of the world are continuously fighting multidrug-resistant strains of bacteria the last 50 years.

2.5 SOURCE OF MICROBIAL ENZYMES

Microbial enzymes have got immense application because microbes can easily be cultivated and their enzyme can catalyse wide variety of hydrolytic and synthetic reactions (Illavarasi 2014). Many microbial enzymes have been isolated and studied for their industrial and commercial uses. However, still there is a continuous search for the potential microorganisms that are able to synthesise industrially feasible enzymes and microbial diversity of cow dung makes it a potential source for the said purpose (Dowd *et al*. 2008). *Bacillus* spp. from cow dung is capable of producing cellulose, carboxymethyl cellulose and cellulase (Das *et al*. 2010; Sadhu *et al*. 2013; Illavarasi 2014). In case of poor enzyme production, genetically improved strains can be constructed for enhanced enzyme production. For instance, Sadhu *et al*. (2014) described that cow dung *Bacillus* spp. can be mutated with NTG to increase the cellulase production from 9.4 to 16.3 U/mg proteins.

2.6 PATHOGENS ASSOCIATED WITH COW DUNG

2.6.1 ESCHERICHIA COLI

Escherichia coli is a gram-negative, facultative anaerobic, rod-shaped and motile bacterium that exists as a normal flora in the intestinal tract of both healthy animals and humans. It serves as a reliable indicator of fecal contamination and equally indicates a possibility of the occurrence of enteropathogenic and/or toxigenic microbes found in food and water, thereby presenting with public health hazards (Tililawo et al). E. coli O157:H7 found in cattle manure has been reported as the most notorious pathogen which produces a potent toxin that can cause serious infection in humans. This strain can be called verocytotoxic (VTEC) or enterohemorrhagic (EHEC) or Shigatoxin producing (STEC) E. coli. According to Gerba and Smith. owing to the pathogen's low infective dose ascribed to as few as 10 cells and high pathogenicity, it is incriminated as the causative agent of gastrointestinal diseases (gastroenteritis). In addition, Karmali (38) highlighted that the bacterium equally causes attaching and effacing (A/E) lesions by translocating effector proteins into the host cells via a type III protein secretion system. However, cattle harboring this E. coli strain do not develop clinical disease, but serve as the main reservoir for E. coli O157:H7 (Callaway *et al*.2009) Furthermore, humans may be infected with pathogenic E. coli by way of either consuming contaminated food or water or directly by contact with livestock feces and person to person transfer (Mathews *et al* 2013). In adverse/unfavorable environmental conditions (e.g., starvation), the bacterium alters its physiological or metabolic responses in order to persist in the environment without necessarily modifying its structure like most Gram positive bacteria that form resistant spores . In addition, it is acid resistant and can equally form biofilm.

2.6.2 SALMONELLA

Salmonella species belong to the family of *Enterobacteriaceae* and are Gram negative, short, plump shaped rods, non-spore forming, motile, non-capsulated, aerobic and facultative anaerobic organisms (Godfrey and Farrel 2005). These pathogens could be found in a range of animals, including dogs, birds, cats, cattle, pigs and humans and are responsible for the infection called salmonellosis. Salmonellosis occurs via ingestion of food or water contaminated with animal feces or by direct contact with animal feces and is characterized by three major symptoms viz. septicemia, acute enteritis and chronic enteritis. However, the manifestations of salmonellosis vary depending on the species/strain and the host type (Godfrey and Farrel 2005).

Salmonella species viz. *S. Dublin*, *S. Typhimurium* and *S.* Newport constitute a major public health issue since they cause infections in both cattle and humans . More elaborately, Salmonellae have developed increasing resistance to a wide spectrum of antibiotics (i.e., multidrug resistance, MDR) traditionally employed in the treatment of salmonellosis. These MDR strains are vital because of their resistance to available antibiotics, which are critical in the treatment of bacterial infections. However, the resistance could result in high death rates and also present an opportunity for epidemic outbreaks that may be difficult to manage (Nagshetty *et al* 2010)

2.6.3 CAMPYLOBACTER

Campylobacter species are most commonly found in the intestinal tracts of animals such as cattle, pigs, chickens, wild-living mammals and birds (Baserisalehi *et al,* 2007). They are known to cause a wide variety of disorders in cattle, sheep, and pigs. For example, Salihu and coworkers (Balihu *et al,* 2009) mentioned that *Campylobacter jejuni* and *Campylobacter fetus* caused

abortion, stillbirths and birth of weak lambs in sheep at some stage in late pregnancy. Similarly, when transmitted to humans when consuming undercooked agricultural food products and contaminated water (Jaderlund *et al*, 2011), it causes an infection called campylobacteriosis, which is a self-limited and sporadic illness (Adebkule *et al*, 2009,Inglis 2010). In addition, *C. jejuni* and *Campylobacter coli* are the two most important species associated with human bacterial gastroenteritis worldwide (Sheppard 2009, Roskosz *et al*, 2014)

2.6.4 LISTERIA MONOCYTOGENES

Listeria monocytogenes is a Gram-positive, facultative, intracellular, rod-shaped bacterium incriminated as the causative agent of a severe food borne illness in humans contacted through the fecal-oral route and characterized by localized cutaneous infection. Dairy cows serve as the main reservoir and high levels of the pathogen occurs in animals fed with improperly fermented silage contaminated by growth on manure-fertilized soils. Animal listeriosis is manifested as encephalitis, meningitis, septicemia and abortions. The organism's ability to withstand heat, freezing and refrigeration temperatures have been a call for concern in the food industries since raw foods, unpasteurized milk, raw vegetables, raw and cooked poultry and refrigerated foods could serve as vehicles of transmission (Santomm 2012 and Azizoglu 2009). This characteristic is contradictory since it is a non-spore former. Notwithstanding, it can grow over a wide range of environmental conditions (pH and temperature) thus a longer survival duration in the environment (Uzeh and Adepoju 2013)

2.6.5 YERSINIA ENTEROCOLITICA

Yersinia enterocolitica, a member of the genus *Yersinia* is a Gram-negative coco *Bacillus* spp.belonging to the family of *Enterobacteriaceae*. It is unsporulated, non-capsulated and lives as an intestinal flora in many species of wild and domestic animals, including cattle as well as humans (Johannessen *et al*, 2012). It causes yersiniosis in both animals and humans manifested as lymphadenitis, acute enterocolitis, nosodum erythema, septicemia, poliartritis and even death. According to Tirzui and colleagues the cases of yersiniosis infections throughout the world are under reported and the prevalence/incidence varies from country to country owing to the availability of materials, laboratories and engagement of specialists. The species enterocolitica presents with several serotypes, however, Y. enterocolitica O:9 demonstrate cross reactivity of its smooth liposaccharide with that of Brucella, which masks the diagnosis of brucellosis caused by the latter bacterium (Chenaise *et al*,2012).. Its indirect route of transmission is mainly oral ingestion of contaminated foods of animal and plant origins (e.g., pork, beef, lamb, unpasteurized milk, raw milk, vegetables, ice creams and seafoods) as well as contaminated water (Bonardi *et al*, 2007, Graves *et al*, 2009).

2.6.6 ENTEROCOCCUS

Enterococcus species represent a subgroup of the group D fecal *Streptococcus* spp. and a a coccus, they are spherical in shape and occur either singly, in pairs or as short chains(Graves *et al*, 2009). They are Gram-positive, facultative anaerobic, lactic-acid producing bacteria that live as commensal bacteria in the gastrointestinal tract of humans and animals.Members of this subgroup include *Enterococcus faecalis*, *Enterococcccus faecium*, Enterococcus *gallinarum* or *Enterococcus casseliflavus*, *Enterococcus mundtii* and *Enterococcus avium*, which exhibit

significant differences in the incidence of virulence factors, antibiotic resistance genes and distribution in fresh and dry cattle manure((Graves *et al*, 2009, Eaton and Gasson 2001, Franz *et al*, 2001, Weaver *et al*, 2005).

2.6.7 MUNDTII

Mundtii is the species most commonly reported in cattle manure. Generally, the enterococci are considered avirulent and harmless; however, *E. faecalis* and *E. faecium* are notable opportunistic pathogens causing nosocomial infections in humans. According to the United States Environmental Protection Agency recommendations, enterococci and *E. coli* are the two bacteria regarded as indicator organisms used to determine the sanitary quality of recreational waters across the globe.

2.6.8 MYCOBACTERIUM

Mycobacterium species are acid-fast bacteria reported to be found in cattle manure. They can survive in store manure/environment for long duration since they can withstand fluctuations in temperature and pH, dehydration and exposure to sunlight. This predisposition is ascribed to their acid fast characteristic established by the high lipid and wax content of the mycobacterial cell wall. In addition, the cell wall components confer upon these bacteria the propensity to repel or not to absorb water causing them to demonstrate less susceptibility to some chemical disinfectants (Russel, 1996).

Mycobacterium avium subspecies paratuberculosis or *M. paratuberculosis* is the primary species reported in manure and is the causative agent of Johne's disease (paratuberculosis), a chronic disease of the intestine. It is equally linked to Crohn's disease (a chronic inflammatory bowel disease) in humans. Following infection of the herd, the pathogen can be shed in feces for a long

time prior to the physical manifestations of signs and symptoms associated with the disease; in this way, the condition creates great economic loss (to the producer or dairy industries) noticeable as shortened animal's lifespan, reduced milk production, reduced carcass value and poor reproductive performance. However, *M. bovis* or *M. tuberculosis* could be excreted through feces only by a small fraction of *tuberculous* animals and can be transferred through aerosolized manure emanating from tank agitation and or land application of slurry.

Bacillus and *Clostridium* species are spore forming bacteria that are commonly found in cattle manure. They belong to the classes *Bacilli* and *Clostridia* respectively, but both belong to the phylum Firmicutes (Girija *et al*, 1996). They have the tendency to form spores and persist in that resistant and dormant state when growth conditions are unfavorable but revert to vegetative cells through germination as growth conditions becomes favorable. As spores, they are insensitive to heat, desiccation and disinfectant; consequently, these bacteria were detected in cattle manure though in reduced numbers after pasteurization at 70 °C for hours in a study conducted by Marañón and colleagues (Maranon *et al*, 2006).

Bacillus species identified so far in manure entailed *B. anthracis*, *B. cereus*, *B. subtilis*, and *B. thuringiensis*, which are Gram-positive rods, aerobic spore formers and are mostly harmless and can persist for over years in the soil. The most peculiar of these species is *B. anthracis* that causes anthrax (a life threatening and dreaded disease) especially the pulmonary form through the inhalation of the bacterial spores (Bravata *et al*, 2007). The class *Clostridia* consists of Gram-positive anaerobic spore-forming bacteria that are ubiquitous in the gastrointestinal tract (Girija *et al*, 2013) and can be divided into two groups based on their ability to invade and multiply within living tissues. *Clostridium tetani* and *Clostridium botulinum* belong to the first group with little or no ability to invade and multiply in living tissues; however, their pathogenicity is

manifested by the production of powerful toxins. The second and larger group constitutes *Clostridium chauvoei*, *Clostridium septicum*, *Clostridium haemolyticum*, *Clostridium sordellii*, *Clostridium perfringens*, *Clostridium difficile,* and *Clostridium spiroforme* that are able to invade and multiply in living tissues or the intestines of the host animal. In addition, they produce less potent toxins in comparison to the former group. Based on the individual species, some are responsible for diseases, including mastitis, blackleg, hemoglobinuria, malignant edema and infant botulism in cattle and humans, respectively (Williams, 2014).

In a nutshell, it is remarkable that infections caused by the above-mentioned pathogens could be prevented or controlled through the implementation of stringent sanitation policies and appropriate hygiene measures by food producers and better personal hygienic practices by individuals.

CHAPTER THREE

MATERIALS AND METHODS

3.0 STUDY AREA

This study was carried out at the Laboratory Department of Microbiology, Faculty of Life Science, University of Benin.

3.1 SAMPLE COLLECTION

A total of four (4) cow dung samples were used for this study. They were a kind gift from Dr. A. S. Aziegbemhin.

3.2 SERIAL DILUTION

The total heterotrophic bacterial counts were determined by serial dilution. Briefly, One (1) gram each of cow dung was weighed into 9ml of sterile normal saline and homogenized to form the stock solution. From the stock solution, 1 ml was transferred into test tube labelled 10^{-1} and mixed. Using a new sterile pipette each time, 1ml of 10^{-1} was transferred to another tube labelled 10^{-2}. The same procedure was repeated until 10^{-5}. One (1) ml from tube 10^{-5} was discarded. This was repeated for all sample (Cheesbrough, 2006).

3.3 ENUMERATION OF BACTERIA

One (1) ml each of serially diluted samples from tubes 10-4 and 10-5 were pipetted onto sterile agar plate. Twenty (20) ml each molten Nutrient Agar (HiMedia, India) at 45 ^{o}C were aseptically dispensed onto the agar plate and gently rocked. The plates were allowed to solidify and incubated upside down at 37 ^{o} C overnight. Colonies formed on the plates were counted accordingly (Cheesbrough, 2006).

3.4 ISOLATION AND IDENTIFICATION

Identification was carried out using standard microbiological procedures such as: cultural characteristics(size, shape, arrangement, staining characteristics, mortility and spore formation) colonial characteristics (texture, elevation, margin and colour) biochemical characteristics(catalase, oxidase, citrate utilization, urease and indole production) were interpreted to determine the presumptive nomenclature of the bacteria isolates using Bergey's Manual of Determinative Bacteriology and ABIS online-advanced bacterial identification system (Sorescu and Stoica, 2021). The pure identified bacterial isolates were used for antibiotic susceptibility testing.

3.5 ANTIBIOTIC SUSCEPTIBILITY TEST

The antibiotic susceptibility testing was performed using the Kirby-Bauer disk diffusion Bacterial suspensions equivalent to 0.5 MacFarland standard were aseptically spread on solidified Mueller-Hinton agar (Himedia, India) using sterile cotton swab sticks. Inoculated plates were allowed to dry. Afterwards, the antibiotic multi-discs at a spatial orientation of 16 mm (distance between discs) were aseptically placed on the inoculum using sterile forceps. The antibiotics used in this study and their concentrations were azithromycin (12 µg), levofloxacin (20 µg), erythromycin (10 µg), gentamicin (10 µg), pefloxacin (10 µg), ampicillin-cloxacillin (30 µg), Cefuroxime (20 µg), amoxicillin (30 µg), ceftriaxone-sodium (25 µg) and ciprofloxacin (10 µg) (Abtek, UK). The results of the diameters of the zones of inhibition were interpreted by comparing them with the Clinical Laboratory Standards Institute standards (CLSI, 2012) and each isolate was recorded as resistant, intermediate or susceptible to the various antibiotics. Multidrug resistance among the isolates was defined as resistance to $\geq$ 3 classes of antibiotics.

CHAPTER FOUR

RESULTS

Table 1 shows the total bacterial count from cow dung.

A total of four (4) samples of cow dung was analyzed. The count range of 1.5×10^{3}cfu/g-9.8×10^{5}cfu/g. The highest count was obtained in sample C while sample B had the lowest count.

Table 1: Total Heterotrophic Bacterial Count of Cattle Dung

Sample	10^{-4}	10^{-5}
A	1.82×10^{5}	3.1×10^{4}
B	1.5×10^{3}	1.4×10^{4}
C	1.5×10^{3}	9.8×10^{5}
D	1.5×10^{3}	1.25×10^{5}

Table 1 shows the distribution of bacteria isolates in cattle dung

Streptococcus sp., *Escherichia coli*, *Salmonella* sp., *Enterococcus* sp., *Shigella* sp., *Bacillus* sp., and *Staphylococcus* sp.

Table 2: Distribution of bacterial isolates in samples

Isolate	A	B	C	D
Strept. Sp.	4(100)	2(50)	0(0)	1(25)
E. coli	0(0)	1(25)	0(0)	0(0)
Enterococcus sp.	0(0)	1(25)	3(75)	1(25)
Salmonella sp.	0(0)	0(0)	1(25)	0(0)
Shigella sp.	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	1(25)
Bacillus sp	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	1(25)
Staph. Sp.	0(0)	1(25)	0(0)	0(0)

4.3 Results shows antibacterial resistance pattern.

100% effective against the pathogens isolated while *Shigella* and *Staphylococcus* are sensitive to all the antibacterial agent.

Table 3: Antibacterial Resistance of Bacterial Isolates from Local Cattle Dung

Isolates	n (%)	Antibacterial Agents									
		AZ	LEV	E	PEF	CN	APX	Z	AM	R	CPX
Streptococcus sp.	6 (60)	0(0)	0(0)	1(16.67)	0(0)	1(16.67)	3(50)	2(33.33)	2(33.33)	1(16.67)	0(0)
E.coli sp.	2(20)	1(100)	1(100)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)
Enterococcus sp.	1(10)	0(0)	0(0)	1(20)	0(0)	0(0)	1(20)	2(40)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)
Salmonella sp.	1(10)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	1(100)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)
Bacillus sp.	1(10)	0(0)	0(0)	1(100)	1(100)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)
Shigella sp.	1(10)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)
Staphylococcus sp.	1(10)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)

KEY: AZ: Azithromycin, LEV: Levofloxacin, E: Erythromycin, PEP: Pefloxacin, GN: Gentamycin, APX: Apicicillin-cloxacillin, Z: Cefuroxime, AM: Amoxicillin, R:Ceftriaxone-sodium, CPX: Ciprofloxacin.

CHAPTER FIVE

5.1 DISCUSSION

Cattle dung serves as a reservoir for most potentially pathogenic microorganisms. These animals are not confined but allowed to roam. There is possibility of pathogens finding their way into the environment. Data on feacal bacteria from local cattle (muturu) unlike its fulani relative is however scarce. The current study isolated and characterized bacteria from local cattle muturu dung with a view to determining their pathogenic attributes and antibacterial resistance pattern. Results from this study showed the mean heterotrophic bacterial counts from local cattle muturu ranged between $1.5x10^{3}$cfu/g-$9.8x10^{5}$cfu/g. This is in agreement with the research of Daniella and Gabriele (2009). This could be attributed to influence of diet, similarity in bacterial composition of the digestive tract as well the time of analysis. However, Rosel *et al* (2013) recorded a higher range variation in the heterotrophic counts. This may be attributed to various environmental factor and time of analysis.

The bacteria isolated from cattle dung in this study include Streptococcus spp., *Escherichia coli*, *enterococcus* sp., *Salmonella* sp., *Shigella* sp., *Bacillus* sp. and *Staphylococcus* sp. However, there are relatively few work on the isolation of bacteria from local cattle dung. *Streptococcus* sp.and *Bacillus* sp. were predominant while *Shigella* sp. being the least. This is in agreement with the work of Funoso and Folakemi who isolated *Escherichia coli* and *Shigella* sp., *Streptococcus* sp. and *Escherichia coli* were predominant apparently due to their ability to survive in the gastrointestinal tract of cattles. Another reason for the predominance could be due to their ability to form biofilm. Biofilm is essential for resistance to adverse environmental condition by bacteria. However the attributes behind the least occurance of *Shigella* sp. could be

because of the acidic nature of the intestine of ruminant animals. The antibacterial resistance pattern showed that *Bacillus* sp. was 100% resistant to erythromycin and perfloxacin. Which is in concordance to the research work of Abu and Wondikom (2018). This may be attributed to the presence of resistance determinants on plasmids with similar selective makers or as a result of independence simultaneous development of resistant to different agents. Similarly, *Eschericia coli* was 100% resistant to azithromycin and levofloxacin . This is concordance to the research work of Abu and wondikom (2018). Reasons behind this could be as the result of resistance developed of time using the antibiotics in treatment of an infection caused by *Eschericia coli* pathogens. The antibacterial resistance conducted shows that *staphylococcus* sp., *Streptococcus* sp. and *Salmonella* sp. showed resistance amoxicillin, ampicillin-cloxacillin and penicillin. They were however not resistant to ciprofloxacin. Ciprofloxacin was proven to be the most effective against Gram positive and Gram negative isolated analzed in the sample of study. This is in agreement with the works of Funoso and Folakemi (2013) and Abu and Wondikom (2018) .Reasons for this resistance could be as a result could be as a result of a result of wide spectrum of the antibiotics. Futhermore, *Salmonella* sp. was 100% resistance to gentamycin. This is also in aggreament to the work of Funoso and Folakemi (2013), which recorded 66.7% resistant of *Salmonella* sp. to gentamycin antibiotics. Reasons behind this could be that *Salmonella* sp. Produced an efflux pumps extruding the antibiotics from bacterial cell wall or that it has developed mutation in its genes that allows it to resist the effect of the antibacterial agents. *Bacillus* sp. and *Eschericia coli* showed the highest resistant rate. This is also in alignment when the work of Fabienne *et al* (2014).This could be as a result of genetic mutation or environmental factor which has greatly contributed to their resistant effect. Resistance of antibiotics has increased to the high rate of infections of local cattle pathogens. Their resistance

could be as a result of enzymatic inactivation, modification of antimicrobial agents alteration of the target sites or expulsion of antibacterial agent effect through efflux pump.

5.2 CONCLUSION

Cow dung host a wide variety of microorganisms. Exploitation of cow dung microflora can contribute significantly in sustainable agriculture and energy requirements. Due to the high bacterial bio burden and drug resistant bacteria in cattle dung, it is suspected that they may find their way into the environment. Local cattle should be confined to avoid transmission of resistant pathogens through their dung.

REFERENCES

Abo-State, M.A, Mahdy HM, Ezzat SM, Abd El Shakour EH, El-Bahnasawy MA (2012) Antimicrobial resistance oprofiles of Enterobacteriaceae isolated from Rosetta Branch of River Nile, Egypt. *World Application Science Journal* **19**:1234–1243

Abu, G.O. and Wondikom, A.C.(2018). Isolation, Characterization and Antibiotic resistance profile studies of bacteria from an evacuated pond in Portharcourt Metropolis, Nigeria. Journal Applied Science and Enviromental Management **22**(8) 1177-1184

Adams, G.O, Tawari-Fufeyin. P.and Ehinomen. I. (2014) Laboratory scale bioremediation of soils from automobile mechanic workshops using cow dung. *Journal Application Environmental Microbiology* **2**:128–134

Adekunle, O.C., Coker, A.O.and Kolawole, D.O. (2009). Antibiotic susceptibility pattern of strains of Campylobacter coli isolated in Osogbo, *Nigeria Biology Medical*;**1**:20–23.

Ali, H., Khan, E. and Sajad, M. (2013) Phytoremediation of heavy metals-concepts and applications. *Chemosphere* **91**:869–881

Aly, M., Essam, T.M. and Amin, M.A. (2012) Antibiotic resistance profile of Escherichia coli strains isolated from clinical specimens and food samples in Egypt. *International Journal Microbiology Research*:176–18.

Arslan, E.I., Öbek, E., Kirbam, S., Pek, U. and Topal, M. (2008) Determination of the effect of compost on soil microorganisms. *International Journal Science Technology* **3**:151–159

Ayoola, O.T. and Makinde, E.A. (2008) Performance of green maize and soil nutrient changes with fortified cow dung. *Africa Journal Plant of Science* **2**:19–22

Azizoglu, R.O., Osborne, J., Wilson, S.and Kathariou, S. Role of growth temperature in freeze-thaw tolerance of Listeria spp. *Application Environmental Microbiology* 2009;**75**:5315–5320.

Babic, S., Mutavdzic, D. Asperger, D., Horvat, A., and Kaštelan-Macan, M. (2007) Determination of veterinary pharmaceuticals in production wastewater by HPTLC-video densitometry. *Chromatographia* **65**:105–110

Baserisalehi, M., Bahador, N. and Kapadous, B.P. Isolation and characterization of Campylobacter spp. from domestic animals and poultry in South of Iran. Pak. *Journal Biology Science* 2007;**10**:1519–1524.

Bedada, W., Karltun, E., Lemenih, M. and Tolera, M. (2014) Long-term addition of compost and NP fertilizer increases crop yield and improves soil quality in experiments on smallholder farms. *Agric Ecosystem Environment* **195**:193–201

Bernal, M.P, Alburqu, J.A. Moral, R. (2009) Composting of animal manures and chemical criteria for compost maturity assessment—*review BioresourceTechnology* **100**:5444–5453

Bhattacharjya, D., Park, H.Y. Kim, M.S., Choi, H.S., Inamdar. S.N. and Yu, J.S. (2013) Nitrogen-doped carbon nanoparticles by flame synthesis as anode material for rechargeable lithium-ion batteries. *Langmuir* **30**:318–324

Biswal, M., Banerjee, A., Deo, M. and Ogale, S. (2013) From dead leaves to high energy density supercapacitors. *Energy Environmental Science* **6**:1249–1259

Bonardi, S., Paris, A., Bacci, C., Incau, M.D., Ferroni, L. and Brindani, F. Detection and characterization of Y. enterocolitica from pigs and cattle. *Veterinary Research Communications* 2007;**31**:347–350.

Bravata, D.M., Holty, J.E., Wang, E., Lewis, R., Wise, P.H., McDonald, K.M. and Owens, D..K. Inhalational, gastrointestinal, and cutaneous anthrax in children: A systemic review of cases: 1900–2500. *Archives of Pediatric Adolescent Medicine* 2007; **161**: 896–905.

Callaway, T.R., Carr, M.A., Edrington, T.S., Anderson, R.C. and Nisbet, D. Diet, Escherichia coli 0157, and cattle: A review after 10 years. *Current Issues Molecular Biology* 2009; **11**:67–80.

Cheesbrough, M.(2006). District Laboratory Practice in Tropical countries (1st Edn). Cambridge University Press, Cambridge. 433pp.

Chenais, E., Bagge, E., Lambertz, S.T. and Artursson, K.(2012). Yersinia enterocolitica serotype O:9 cultured from Swedish sheep showing serologically false-positive reactions for Brucella melitensis. *Infection Ecology Epidemiology*

Daniella, P. and Gabriele, P. (2009). *Journal of Basic Microbiology* 77(5) 919-928.

Demiral, H. and Demiral, I. (2008) Surface properties *Analalysis* of activated carbon prepared from wastes. *Surface and Interface Analysis* **40**:612–615

Dhama, K., Chauhan, R.S. and Singhal, L. (2005a) Anti-cancer activity of cow urine: current status and future directions. *International Journal Cow Science* **1**:1–25

Dhami, J.K., Singh, H. and Gupta, M. (2013) Industrialization at the cost of environment degradation—a case of leather and iron and steel industry from Punjab economy. *Innovation Journal Business and Management* **2**:19–21

Eaton, T.J., Gasson, M.J. Molecular screening of Enterococcus virulence determinants and potential for genetic exchange between food and medical isolates. Applied Environmental Microbiology 2001;**67**:1628–1635.

Fabienne, W., Nikolina, U. Sheila, A. and Jo, H. (2014).Diverse Antibiotics resistance genes in Dairy cow manure. American Society for Microbiology **5**(2) 113-117

Falco, C., Sieben, J.M., Brun, N., Sevilla, M., Mauelen, T., Morallón, E., Cazorla-Amorós, D.and Titirici M.M. (2013). Hydrothermal carbons from hemicellulose-derived aqueous hydrolysis products as electrode materials for supercapacitors. Chem Sus Chem **6**:374–382

Fang, B., Kim, J.H., Kim, M. and Yu, J.S. (2009). Ordered hierarchical nanostructured carbon as a highly efficient cathode catalyst support in proton exchange membrane fuel cell. *Chemistry of materials* **21**:789–796

Fick, J., Söderström, H., Lindberg, R.H., Chad D., Tysklind, M. Larsson, D. (2009). Contamination of surface, ground, and drinking water from pharmaceutical production. *Environmental Toxicology and Chemistry* **28**:2522–2527

Franz, C.M., Muscholl-Silberhorn A.B., Yousif, N.M., Vancanneyt, M., Swings, J. and Holzapfel, W.H. Incidence of virulence factors and antibiotic resistance among enterococci isolated from food. *Applied Environmental Microbiology* 2001;**67**:4385–4386

Frederiksson-Ahomaa, M., Niskanen, T., Laukkanen, R. and Korkeala, H. Characterization of sucrose-negative Y. Enterocolitica 4/O:3 isolates recovered from pig tonsils. *International Journal of Food Microbiology* 2002;**75**:19–25.

Funso, S.O. and Folakemi, P.O.(2013). Antibiotic Resistance Pattern of Bacterial Pathogen Isolated from cow dung used to fertilise Nigerian fish ponds. *Notulae Scientia Biologicae* 5(**1**) 15-19

Gamby, J., Taberna, P.L., Simon, P., Fauvarque, J.F. Chesneau, M. (2001). Studies and characterisations of various activated carbons used for carbon/carbon supercapacitors. *Journal of Power Sources* **101**:109–116

Garg, A.K. and Mudgal. V. (2007) Organic and mineral composition of Gomeya (cow dung) from Desi and crossbred cows—a comparative study. *International Journal of Cow* Science 3:1–

Girija, D., Deepa, K., Xavier, F., Anthony, I. and Shidhi, P.R. Analysis of cow dung microbiota—A metagenomic approach. *Indian Journal of Biotechnology* 2013;**12**:372–378.

Godfree, A. and Farrell, J. Processes for managing pathogens. *Journal of Environmental Quality* 2005; **34**:105–113.

Gounot, A.M. (1986). Psychrophilic and psychrotrophic microorganisms. Experimentia 42:1192–1197

Graves, A. and Weaver, R.W. (2009). Characterization of Enterococci populations in livestock manure using BIOLOG. *Microbiological Research* **164**:260–266.

Huang, C., Sun, T. and Hulicova-Jurcakova, D. (2013). Wide electrochemical window of supercapacitors from coffee bean derived phosphorus rich carbons. *Chem Sus Chem* **6**:2330–2339

Inamdar, S., Choi, H.S., Wang, P. Song, M.Y. and Yu, J.S. (2013). Sulfur-containing carbon by flame synthesis as efficient metal-free electrocatalyst for oxygen reduction reaction. *Electrochemistry Commununications* **30**:9–12

Inglis, G.D., Mcallister, T.A., Larney, F.J. and Topp, E. Prolonged survival of Campylobacter species in bovine manure compost. *Application Environment Microbiology* 2010;**76**:1110–1119.

Jäderlund, L., Sessitsch, A. and Arthurson, V.(2011). Persistence of two Campylobacter jejuni strains in soil and on spinach plants. *Application Environmental Soil Science* 2011;**2011**:1–7.

Jarald, E., Edwin, S., Tiwari, V., Garg, R. and Toppo, E. (2008). Antioxidant and antimicrobial activities of cow urine. *Global Journal of Pharmacology* **2**:20–22

Jeyasanta, K.I., Aiyamperumal, V. and Patterson, J. (2012) Prevalence of antibiotic resistant Escherichia coli in sea foods of Tuticorin coast, southeastern India. *Advanced Biological Research* **6**:70–77

Johannessen, G.S., Kapperud, G. and Kruse, H.(2000). Occurrence of pathogenic Y. enterocolitica in Norvegian International pork products determined by a PCR method and traditional culturing method. *Journal Food Microbiology* 2000;**54**:75–80.

Kala, D.R., Rosenani, A.B., Fauziah, C.I. and Thohirah, L.A. (2009). Composting oil palm wastes and sewage sludge for use in potting media of ornamental plants. Malays *Journal of Soil Science* **13**:77–91

Kalia, A. and Singh, S. (2004) Development of a biogas plant. *Energy Sources* **26**:707–714

Kang, B.T. and Juo, A.S. (1980). Management of low-activity clay soils in Tropical Africa for food crop production. In: Terry ER, Oduro KA, Caveness F (eds) Tropical root crops: research strategies for the 1980s. IDRC, Ottawa, p 129–13.

Kanwar, S.S. and Guleri, R.L. (1994) Performance evaluation of a family size rubber balloon biogas plant under hilly conditions. Biores Technol 50:119–121

Karmali, M.A. (2004). Infection by Shiga-toxin producing Escherichia coli: An overview. *Molecular Biotechnology* **26**:117–122.

Kashyap, D.R., Dadhich, K.S. and Sharma S.K. (2003) Biomethanation under psychrophilic conditions: a review. *Bioresource Technology* **87**:147–153

Kessler, R. (2010). Pharmaceutical factories as a source of drugs in water. Environ Health Perspect 118:383

Kim, J.H., Fang, B., Song, M.Y. and Yu, J.S. (2012) Topological transformation of thioether-bridged organosilicas into nanostructured functional materials. *Chemistry of Materials* **24**:2256–2264

Larsson, D.J. (2014). Antibiotics in the environment. Upsala *Journal of Medical Science* **119**:108–112

Lee, J., Kim, J. and Hyeon, T. (2006). Recent progress in the synthesis of porous carbon materials. *Advanced Materials* **18**:2073–2094

Li, J., Jha, A.K. and Bajracharya, T.R. (2014). Dry anaerobic co-digestion of cow dung with pig manure for methane production. *Applied Biochemistry Biotechnology* **173**:1537–1552

Li, R., Chen, S. and Li, X. (2009). Anaerobic co-digestion of kitchen waste and cattle manure for methane production. *Energy Source Part A Recovery Utililization Environmental Efficiency* **31**:1848–1856

Li, X., Han, C., Chen, X. Shi, C. (2010). Preparation and performance of straw based activated carbon for supercapacitor in non-aqueous electrolytes. *Microporous Mesoporous Material* **131**:303–309

Li, X., Xing, W., Zhuo, S., Zhou, J., Li, F., Qiao, S.Z. and Lu, G.Q. (2011). Preparation of capacitor's electrode from sunflower seed shell. *Bioresources Technology* **102**:1118–1123

Marañón, E., Castrillón, L., Fernández, J.J., Fernández, Y., Peľez, A.I. and Sánchez, J. (2006).Anaerobic mesophilic treatment of cattle manure in an upflow anaerobic sludge blanket reactor with prior pasteurization. *Journal Air Waste Management Association*. 56:137–143.

Matthews, L., Reeve, R., Gally, D.L., Low, J.C., Woolhouse, E.J., Mcateer, S.P., Locking, M.E., Chase-Topping, M.E., Haydon, D.T. and Allison L.J.(2013) . Predicting the public health benefit of vaccinating cattle against Escherichia coli 0157. Proceeding *National Academy Science* USA.

Mondal, T., Khan, M.R., Alam, M., Purakayashtha, M., Das, M. Siddique M.P.(2008). Isolation, identification and characterization of Salmonella from duck. Bangladesh *Journal Veternary Medicine **6***:7–12.

Morrison, D. and Woodford, N. Cookson B. Enterococci as emerging pathogens of humans. In: Andrew P.W., Mitchell T.J., editors. The Biology of Streptococci and Enterococci. Blackwell Science; Oxford, UK: 1997. pp. 89–99

Munda, U.S., Pholane, L., Kar, D.D. and Meikap, B.C. (2012). Production of bioenergy from composite waste materials made of corn waste, spent tea waste, and kitchen waste co-mixed with cow dung. *International Journal Green Energy* 9:361–375

Nagshetty, K., Channappa, S.T. and Gaddad S.M.(2010) Antimicrobial susceptibility of Salmonella typhi in India. *Journal Infectous Development countries.* 4:70–73.

Naiemi, N.A., Heddema, E.R., Bart, A., De Jonge, E., Vandenbroucke-Grauls, C.M., Savelkoul, P.H. and Duim, B. (2006). Emergence of multidrug-resistant Gram-negative bacteria during selective decontamination of the digestive tract on an intensive care unit. *Journal Antimicrobial Chemotherapy* **58**:853–856

Nene, Y.L. (1999). Utilizing traditional knowledge in agriculture. Traditional knowledge system of India and Sri Lanka, pp 32–38

Onwudike, S .U. (2010). Effectiveness of cow dung and mineral fertilizer on soil properties, nutrient uptake and yield of sweet potato (Ipomoea batatas) in Southeastern Nigeria. Asian *Jounal Agric Resource* **4**:148–154

Ott, S.L., Wells, S.J. and Wagner, B.A. Herd-level economic losses associated with Johne's disease on U.S. dairy operations. *Preventive Veterinary Medicine* 1999;40:179–192.

Pongrácz, E. and Pohjola, V.J. (2004). Re-defining waste, the concept of ownership and the role of waste management. *Resources Conservation Recyclycle* **40**:141–153

Puttamreddy, S. and Cornick N.A.(2010). Minion F.C. Genome wide transposon mutagenesis reveals a role for pO157 genes in biofilm development in Escherichia coli O157:H7 EDL933. *Infections and Immunity* **78**:2377–2384.

Rana, G., Mandal, T. Mandal, N.K. (2014). Generation of high calorific fuel gas by photosynthetic bacteria isolated from cow dung. *International Journal Research* 1:115–128

Rokosz. N., Rastawicki, W. and Wotkowicz, T. Micrbiological diagnosis of infections caused by Campylobacter jejuni and Campylobacter coli in humans. Postep. Hig. Med.

Rosel, R.A., Liliana, D., Natalia, M., Desouza, A. and Fabio, S(2013). Journal of Food Protection.

Russell, A.D. Activity of biocides against mycobacteria. Aly MEA, Essam T,M and Amin, M.A. (2012) Antibiotic resistance profile of Escherichia coli strains isolated from clinical specimens and food samples in Egypt. *International Journal Microbiology Research* **3**:176–1821996;81:87S–101S.

Safley, L.M. and Westerman, P.W. (1990) Psychrophilic anaerobic digestion of animal manure: proposed design methodology. *Biological Wastes* **34**:133–148

Salihu, M.D., Junaidu, A.U., Oboegbulem, S.I. and Egwu G.O. Prevalence and biotypes of Campylobacter species isolated from sheep in Sokoto State, Nigeria. *International Journal Animal Veterinary Advance* 2009;**1** :6–9.

Santorum, P., Garcia, R., Lopez, V. and Martinez-Suarez, J.V. (2012). Review: Dairy farm management and production practices associated with the presence of Listeria monocytogenes in raw milk and beef. Span. *Journal Agric Research*;**10**:360–371.

Sawant, A.A., Hegde, N.V. Straley, B,A., Donaldson, S.C. Love, B.C., Knabel, S.J. Jayarao, B.M. (2007). Antimicrobial-resistant enteric bacteria from dairy cattle. *Applied Environmental Microbiology* **73**:156–163

Sharif, M.R., Alizargar, J. and Sharif, A. (2013). Antimicrobial resistance among Gram-negative bacteria isolated from different samples of patients admitted to a University hospital in Kashan, Iran. *Advance Biology Research* 7:199–202

Sharma, B. and Singh, M.(2015). Isolation and characterization of bacteria from cow dung of desi cow breed on different morpho-biochemical parameters in Dehradun. *International Journal of Advances in pharmacy*, *Biology and Chemistry* 4(2).

Sheppard, S.K., Dallas, J.F., Strachan, N.J., MacRae, M., Mc Carthy, N.D., Wilson, D.J., Gormley, F.J., Falush, D., Oqden, I.D., Maiden, M.C. Campylobacter genotyping to determine the source of human infection. *Clinical Infectous Disease* 2009;**48**:1072–1074

Silva, N., Igrejas, G., Gonçalves, A. and Poeta, P.(2011). Commensal gut bacteria: Distribution of Enterococcus species and prevalence of Escherichia coli phylogenetic groups in animals and humans in Portugal. *Annals Microbiology* 2011

Singh, A. and Kohli, J.S. (2012). Effect of pollution on common man in India: a legal perspective. *Advance Life ScienceTechnology* **4**:35–41

Sorescu, I. and Stoica, c. Online Advanced Bacterial Identification Software, an Original Tool for Phenotypic Bacterial Identification. Roman Biotechnological Letters 26(**6**) 3047-3053

Soupir, M.L., Mostaghimi, S., Yagow, E.R., Hagedorn, C. and Vaughan, D.H.(2006). Transport of fecal bacteria from poultry litter and cattle manures applied to pasture land. Water Air Soil Pollution **169**:125–136.

Teo, K.C. and Teoh, S.M.(2011).Preliminary biological screening of microbes isolated from cow dung in Kampar. *African Journal of Biotechnology*, **10**(9) 1640-1645

Thomas, K.V., Dye, C., Schlabach, M. and Langford, K.H. (2007) Source to sink tracking of selected human pharmaceuticals from two Oslo city hospitals and a wastewater treatment works. *Journal of Environmental Monitoring* 9:1410–1418

Titilawo, Y., Obi, L. and Okoh, A.(2015). Occurrence of virulrnce gene signatures associated with diarrhoeagenic and non-diarrhoeagenic pathovars of Escherichia coli isolates from some selected rivers in South Western Nigeria. *BMC Microbiology*

Tsolis, R.M., Adams, L.G., Ficht, T.A. and Bäumler A.J. (1999). Contribution of Salmonella typhimurium virulence factors to diarrheal disease in calves. *Infectious and Immunity* **67**:4879–4885.

Ullah, A., Durrani, R., Ullah, I. and Rafiq, M. (2012) Antibiotic resistance profile of clinical gram negative bacteria. *Journal of Biology Food Science Research* **1**:23–25

United States Environmental Protection Agency . Method 1600: Enterococci in Water by Membrane Filtration Using Membrane-Enterococcus Indoxyl-B-D-Glucoside Agar (Mei) United States Environmental Protection Agency; Washington, DC, USA:

Uzeh, R.E. and Adepoju, A. (2013). Incidence and survival of Escherichia coli O157:H7 and Listeria monocytogenes on salad vegetables. *International Food Research Journal* **20**:1921–1925.

Vakili, M., Zwain, H.M., Rafatullah, M., Gholami, Z. Mohammadpour, R. (2015). Potentiality of palm oil biomass with cow dung for compost production. KSCE *Journal Civil Engneering* **19**:1994–1999

Van Elsas, J.D., Semenov, A.V., Costa, R. and Trevors, J.T.(2011). Survival of Escherichia coli in the environment: Fundamental and public health aspects. *International Society Microbial Ecology* **5**:173–183.

Wang, L., Mu, G., Tian, C., Sun, L., Zhou, W., Yu, P., Yin, J. and Fu, H. (2013). Porous graphitic carbon nanosheets derived from cornstalk biomass for advanced supercapacitors. *Chem Sus Chem* **6**:880–889

Weaver, R.W., Entry, J.A. and Graves, A. Numbers of fecal streptococci and Escherichia coli in fresh and dry cattle, horse and sheep manure. *Journal Canadian Microbiology* 2005;**51**:847–851.

Wei, L., Sevilla, M., Fuertes, A.B., Mokaya, R. and Yushin, G. (2011). Hydrothermal carbonization of abundant renewable natural organic chemicals for high-performance supercapacitor electrodes. *Advance Energy Material* **1**:356–361

Willey, M.J., Sherwood, M.L. and Woolverton, J.C. (2008). Prescott, Harley, and Klein's Microbiology. The McGraw-Hill Higher Education, New York

Williams, S. Health Risks from Pathogens in Livestock Manure. Waste Contaminants: Life Cycle and Entry into Food Chain. Sustainable Organic Waste Management for Environmental Protection and Food Safety. ((accessed on 28 May 2014)).

Xu, B., Hou, S., Cao, G., Wu, F. and Yang, Y. (2012). Sustainable nitrogen-doped porous carbon with high surface areas prepared from gelatin for supercapacitors. *Journal Material Chemistry* **22**:19088–19093

Yang, D.S., Bhattacharjya, D., Inamdar, S., Park, J. and Yu, J.S. (2012) Phosphorus-doped ordered mesoporous carbons with different lengths as efficient metal-free electrocatalysts for oxygen reduction reaction in alkaline media. *America Chemical Society* **134**:16127–16130

Yang, D.S., Bhattacharjya, D., Song, M.Y. and Yu, J.S. (2014) Highly efficient metal-free phosphorus-doped platelet ordered mesoporous carbon for electrocatalytic oxygen reduction. *Carbon* **67**:736–743

APPENDIX

APPENDIX I

Table1: Cultural characteristics, Morphological characteristics and Biochemical characteristics of bacterial isolates from cow dung.

APPENDIX II

MORPHOLOGICAL IDENTIFICATION

Gram Staining

A thin smear was prepared on a clean microscope slide. The smear was stained with crystal violent for 60 seconds and rapidly washed off with distilled water for 5 seconds and cover the smear with Lugol's iodine for 60 seconds and washed off with distilled water. Decolorized using 90% ethanol and washed off immediately with distilled water. Smear was counter stained with safranin reagent for 60 seconds and then washed off with distilled water. The slide was blot dry using paper towel.

The stained cell were examined under microscope with oil immersion using only 100x objective lens. Gram positive cells stain purple or blue while Gram negative cells stain pink or red.

BIOCHEMICAL TEST

Oxidase Test

Procedure: place a piece of filter paper in a clean petri dish and add 2 or 3 drops of freshly prepared oxidase reagent. Using a piece of stick or glass rod, remove a colony of the test organism and Smear it on the filter paper. Positive colonies turn bluish - purple.

Catalase Test

Procedure: 1ml of hydrogen peroxide solution was poured in a test tube. A sterile glass rod was used to collect or remove several colonies of the test organism and immersed. In the hydrogen peroxide solution, the test tube was observed for immediate bubbling of glass which indicate a positive reaction. Equation of reaction: $2H202 \longrightarrow H20+O2$

Indole Test

Procedure: place a piece of filter paper in a clean petri dish add 2or 3 drops of freshly prepared indole reagent. Using a sterile swab stick, pick a colony of the test organism and Smear it on a filter paper. Positive colonies turns greenish.

Citrate Utilization

Procedure: prepare slants of Simmon Citrate Agar in a test tubes as recommend by the manufacturer (store at 2-8°c), using a sterile inoculating loop, the colony is inoculation on the slant and incubated at 35°c for 24 hours. A blue color indicate positive reaction.

Sugar fermentation and production of gases using Triple sugar iron Agar (TSI)

TSI was prepared following manufacturer's instruction and prepared media was placed in a test tube and kept in a slant positive for it to solidify. The slant and butt of the media was inoculated with the test bacterium using a sterile swab stick and it was incubated for 18-24 hours. The results were read on the basis of acid or alkaline production in the slant or butt region of the tube and gas production was confirmed by the presence of crack or air bubbles in the slant or butt region. Moreso, production of hydrogen sulphide was confirmed by the blackening of the medium. A prepared laboratory chat was used for result interpretation in line with microbiological standards as well as other biochemical test carried out on the isolates to confirm or ascertain their identity.

MEDIA PREPARATION

Nutrient Agar 28g of powdered nutrient Agar were dissolved in 1000ml of distilled water and allowed to soak for 10mins and then sterilized with an autoclave for 15 minutes at 121°c and cooled at water bath at the temperature of 45-55°c and pour into petri dishes.

Eosin Methylene Blue

37.5g of powdered EMB Agar was dissolved in 1000ml of distilled water. Shake to homogenized, sterilize using 121°c for 151mintues. Allow to cool at 45-55°c before dispensing into different petri dishes.

Simmons Citrate Agar

24g of powdered SCA was dissolved in 100ml of distilled water, shake for 2 minutes. Dispense into a test tube by adding 5ml and sterilize by autoclaving at 121^0C for 15 minutes. The media was incubated at 37^oc for 48hours.