



SELECTION FOR INCREASED RESISTANCE TO SALMONELLA CARRIER-STATE

C. Beaumont¹, H. Chapuis², N. Sellier¹, F. Calenge¹, P. Zongo¹, P. Velge³, J. Protais⁴

¹Institut National de la Recherche Agronomique, UR083, Unité de Recherche Avicole, 37380 Nouzilly, France

²Syndicat des sélectionneurs avicoles et aquacoles Français, Centre INRA de Tours, 37380 Nouzilly, France

³Institut National de la Recherche Agronomique, UR1282, IASP, 37380 Nouzilly, France,

⁴Agence Française de Sécurité Sanitaire des Aliments, Laboratoire d'Etudes et de Recherches Avicoles, Porcines et Piscicoles, Les Croix, BP53, 22440 Ploufragan, France

Introduction

In France as in other countries, *Salmonella* remains a major cause of human disease related to food consumption and it may result in mild to severe gastroenteritis, which can result in a small proportion of cases in reactive arthritis or, for immuno-depressed individuals, in death (Velge *et al.*, 2005). Poultry products, first of all eggs and egg products (EFSA, 2007c), are responsible for the majority of food-borne disease and the serovars *Salmonella* Enteritidis and *Salmonella* Typhimurium are the most often implicated, as reported to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention in USA, from 1985 to 1999 (Patrick *et al.*, 2004). These *Salmonella* serovars, like many others, may durably colonize the gastro intestinal tracks of chickens without resulting in any visible clinical signs and disease which would help the farmer to identify contamination. This silent carrier-state will in turn lead to horizontal transmission within the flock after faecal shedding or, for *Salmonella* Enteritidis, into vertical transmission through trans-ovarian route (Humphrey *et al.* 1989).

That is the reason why a new regulation was implemented by European Commission to reduce *Salmonella* prevalence in poultry flocks at less than 2% while the latter was recently estimated in EU at 29.7 and 23.7 % of laying and broiler flocks respectively, with large differences between countries (EFSA, 2007a and b), Reduction of prevalence may be achieved by different many prophylactic means: vaccination (Zhang-Barber *et al.*, 1999), competitive exclusion (Rantala and Nurmi, 1973) and acidification of feed, but none of them ensures zero risk of animal contamination and human transmission, at least when used alone. Improving genetic resistance to *Salmonella* carrier-state would be a complementary way to reduce *Salmonella* propagation. The goal is to increase fowls' natural ability to clear their organism from *Salmonella*. It may be evaluated by measuring the persistency of the bacterial infection after inoculation. To this end, many protocols of experimental infection have been developed, with different routes and doses of inoculation, time intervals between inoculation and assessment of bacterial contamination, etc... Most of them consider the acute phase of infection, a few days after inoculation while some others, as those developed by Duchet-Suchaux *et al.* (1995) in chicks and



Protais *et al.* (1996) in adult hens, aims at reproducing the long term and asymptomatic carrier-state.

Using the latter models of infection, heritability of resistance could be estimated at 0.20 in young birds (Berthelot *et al.*, 1998) and higher than 0.35 in laying hens (Beaumont *et al.*, 1999), showing a partial genetic control of duration of *Salmonella* carrier-state. A selection experiment was thus initiated to test the feasibility of a genetic improvement of fowls' ability to eliminate *Salmonella*, thereby reducing the risks of foodborne infections. In parallel, genes controlling variations to *Salmonella* resistance were researched and mathematical modelling of *Salmonella* propagation in laying hens flocks initiated.

The goal of this publication is to give some insights on the most important results of these studies.

I. Genetic improvement

I.1 Classical selection on resistance

First experiments on resistance to disease were undertaken as early as in the 1930's, (see Beaumont *et al.*, 2003a, for a review). The goal was to reduce the frequency of the animal disease and the resulting mortality, at a time when many animals died from acute salmonellosis. No experimental inoculation was needed to observe diseased animals and experiments could be achieved directly on the field. The higher resistance of White Leghorns was then described by Robert and Card, quoted by Hutt and Scholes (1941). But de Volt *et al.* (1944) showed that the former were less resistant than selected Rhode Island Red hens; this result and others contributed to the development of selection for a higher resistance.

The first selection experiment for resistance to salmonellosis after an experimental inoculation was undertaken in 1932; it proved to be efficient. Indeed, heritability of resistance to death was estimated at 0.15 by Beaumont *et al.* (1999) and at 0.12 by Janss and Bolder (2000), respectively, at one day and two weeks of age, respectively. However, the latter authors also noticed that estimated genetic parameters strongly suggested that more resistant animals would survive longer and could thus contribute to a higher risk for consumers if they were still carriers of the bacteria.

Increased food safety could thus only result from a decreased risk for apparently healthy animals to carry bacteria (i.e. from an increase in genetic resistance to carrier-state). Since heritability estimates showed to be of moderate or even high value (Berthelot *et al.*, 1998; Beaumont *et al.*, 1999), an experiment of divergent selection was initiated by Beaumont *et al.*, (2009). The base population was issued from a layer-type line and two series of divergent lines were selected, for increased or decreased resistance, after inoculation at one week of age or at the peak of lay. They will thereafter be called Saly+ and Saly- for the lines selected at a young age to increase (Saly+) or decrease (Saly-) the level of *Salmonella* contamination while Sala+ and Sala- are the names of lines selected at the adult age. Adult hens were orally contaminated and bacterial contamination of caeca, spleen, liver and ovary assessed four weeks later, as described in Protais *et al.* (1996). The selection criterion was an all-or-none trait called global contamination and coded "1" if at least one organ was found positive and "0" in the other cases. In chicks, resistance was assessed from the logarithm of the number of c.f.u. per gram of caeca (i.e. contamination level) five weeks after oral inoculation, as described in Duchet-Suchaux *et al.* (1995). A total of 3817 animals were



thus measured, among which 1408 at the adult age and 2409 at the younger age (Beaumont et al., 2009).

Most probably because the Saly+ and Saly- lines were only separated from the Sala+ and Sala- lines at the third generation, the difference between the Sala+ and Sala- lines remained small, i.e from 2.19 in the Saly_y- to 2.56 log(cfu) in the Saly+ line. Larger differences were observed between the Sala- and Sala+ lines: at the 5th generation, average contamination levels were equal to 30 and 44% in caeca, 5 and 6% in liver and 15 and 30% in spleen respectively, so that the mean percentages of global contamination (adult_g) were equal to 41 and 60% respectively. Selection may, therefore, be efficient in reducing the level of *Salmonella* carrier-state (Beaumont et al., 2009)

This experiment also allowed estimating on a large data set and thus with a good precision genetic parameters of genetic resistance and its links with production traits. Heritability of resistance was estimated at 0.16 in chicks and at 0.18 for global contamination of hens. In adult fowls, the genetic control appeared to be partly dependant on the organ: heritability estimates varied from 0.14 to 0.23 and genetic correlations between contamination of the different organs ranged from 0.46 to 0.67. This result is in coherence with biological knowledge on the differences between infection of systemic organs (spleen and liver) and intestinal tracts. Indeed, caecal contamination, which occurs earlier and longer than systemic contamination (Duchet-Suchaux et al., 1995) was the most heritable. In the whole, the positive values of estimated correlations are favourable for selection: increasing resistance to global contamination should also decrease ovarian contamination, which is the major feature for the risk of human transmission but whose occurrence is too low for efficient selection. Global contamination of each animal appears to be the most efficient selection criteria. It allows assessing carrier state more precisely, through the results of three tests, thus reducing the risk of false negative results. Moreover, it combines several traits, which are positively correlated between each other. But, these results also underline that assessment of resistance depends on the organ in which *Salmonella* is searched for, which reinforces the importance of a very accurate definition of the resistance trait.

A important feature was the negative value (-0.50) of the correlation between adult global contamination and chick caecal contamination. This negative value showed that increasing genetic resistance of hens will reduce resistance in chicks. Partly different genetic controls of adult and chicken resistance were suspected but not to such an extent. This result implies that results observed at one age may not be extrapolated to the other without experimental validation.

This study also allowed estimating genetic correlations between resistance and production traits. Most estimated genetic correlations were of moderate value, showing loose biological relations between resistance and production traits, suggesting that selection for an increased resistance should not have much effect on other traits, which is favourable. Since correlation between level of chicken contamination and numbers of eggs laid after 25 weeks of age is positive (0.37), selection for increased laying rate is expected to increase susceptibility to *Salmonella* carrier-state at a younger age. This result is coherent with the higher susceptibility of the commercial egg-type line observed by Duchet-Suchaux et al. (1997). When considering correlations between adult resistance and laying rates at different ages, no clear putative effect of selection for increased laying rate on resistance to adult



contamination could be observed. Negative correlations between egg colour and adult contamination were observed but must be confirmed.

I.2 Identification of marker genes for resistance

Though promising these results may seem, selection for an increased resistance would be very difficult to implement by breeders: they require experimental infections in protected areas, which are very expensive. Nevertheless, it should now be possible to alleviate the need of such measures by using molecular markers related to resistance. Genomic selection based on a large number of anonymous markers should also be very efficient on such traits (Goddard and Hayes, 1997).

Pioneer studies of Bumstead and Barrow (1988; 1993) took profit on inbred lines differing in resistance to mortality after experimental inoculation. Their higher genetic homogeneity increased the statistical power (i.e. the probability of detecting QTL or of evidencing differences of expression) of QTL studies, leading to the identification of QTLs for resistance to disease (Mariani et al., 2009) and to their finer mapping (Fife et al., 2009) as well as allowing testing candidate genes (as in Hu et al., 1995), even if other crosses have been used since (see for example Kramer et al., 2003 or Lamont et al., 2002).

First investigations were on candidate genes, i.e. genes chosen according to an *a priori* knowledge of their effect in *Salmonella* resistance. In particular, many studies focused on *SLC11A1* and *TLR4*, two genes known to be involved in resistance to *Salmonella* in mouse. *SLC11A1* was first called *Nramp1* (natural resistance-associated macrophage protein) and shown to be responsible for the difference between mice strains in resistance to inoculation with *Salmonella* Typhimurium, (Roy and Malo, 2002), *Mycobacterium bovis* and *Leishmania donovani*, because of its role in the control of the intracellular replication of parasites in phagosomes. After its identification, it was recognized as a member of the solute carrier family and renamed *Slc11a1* (Vidal et al. 1993) The chicken homologue of *Nramp1* was mapped on the chicken chromosome 7 (Hu et al. 1995) and subsequently cloned (Hu et al. 1996).

The second candidate gene, *TLR4* (Toll-like receptor 4) was previously named *Lps*, because its mutation results in a lack of response to LPS, lipopolysaccharides specific of the Gram negative bacteria (among which *Salmonella*) and a higher susceptibility to those bacteria. It was shown to belong to a family of innate immune system receptors (Toll-like receptors) and was mapped to the chicken micro chromosome 17 and cloned (Leveque et al. 2003).

Many studies dealt with these two genes. Both are involved in the early response of chicks to an acute infection with *S. Typhimurium* (Hu et al. 1997)). *NRAMP1* was also shown to be involved in early stages of systemic *Salmonella* infection in meat-type chicks (Kramer et al. 2003), in a cross between layer-type strains or breeds (Lamont et al. 2002; Liu et al. 2003) or in pullets (Girard-Santosuosso et al., 2002). While a potential role of *Nramp1* in later stages of infection was also shown in mice inoculated with *S. Enteritidis* (Caron et al. 2002), it is to note that the *NRAMP1* allele coding for a better resistance to an early and acute infection was responsible for a higher excretion rate in later stages. While not yet investigated in fowls, this result implies, at least in mice, that animals selected for

the *NRAMP1* allele coding for resistance to disease could be more susceptible to carrier-state, showing the importance of the choice of the selection criteria and of a relevant protocol of experimental inoculation. In hens, *NRAMP1* was shown to be associated with later spleen contamination of hens (Beaumont *et al.* 2003b), while the role of *TLR4* could not be confirmed in the same study.

In addition to these two genes, several QTL detection programs were carried out in crosses between inbred lines differing for resistance to disease for a large range of *Salmonella* serotypes (Bumstead *et al.* 1988, 1993) or to *Salmonella* carrier-state (Tilquin *et al.* 2005). Several QTLs were identified (Mariani *et al.* 2001, Tilquin *et al.* 2005) in these genotypes. However, the latter study used selective genotypings (i.e only those of the most extreme animals) which could have resulted in biases. Calenge *et al.* (2009) therefore genotyped all animals in the formerly identified QTL regions, thus confirming two out of the 4 QTLs. The same authors tested the effect of the genome regions identified by Tilquin *et al.*, (2005) in animals close to commercial ones. They used data and samples issued from the selection experiment and could thus confirm the role of the QTL on chromosome 1 and of *SLC11A1* in both chicken and laying hens. Development of a large scale arrays thanks to the identification of a large number of SNPs should soon result in the identification of new genome regions and in a shorter term, SNP-assisted or even genomic selection.

In parallel, differences in gene expression after a *S. Enteritidis* infection were identified between poultry lines, either for candidate immune genes (Sadeyen *et al.* 2004, 2006; Kaiser *et al.* 2006), or using large scale arrays as in Van Hemert *et al.* (2006, 2007). These results will also contribute to the identification of the genes involved in resistance, provided that the mutations responsible for resistance result in differences in their expression levels.

In conclusion, many genomes regions have already been identified for their effect on resistance to *Salmonella* but most of them were only studied with one protocol of experimental inoculation (i.e. one serovar, one route of inoculation, one single animal age and genotype...). These results cannot thus be extrapolated to other conditions without confirmation. A particular care must be taken of the negative genetic correlation between resistance of chicks and laying hens, which might lead to different strategies for layer- and meat-type lines.

II Modelling

All the former results show the complexity of the genetic control of resistance to carrier state. It first depends on the animal's age but also on the organ, so that several selection criteria should be used to increase bacterial clearance. Their choice is an important issue. The same holds for the global strategy of genetic improvement: for instance, should the resistance of all animals be improved or would it be more efficient to increase it in smaller proportion of animals but to a larger extent? Answering such a question will clearly benefit from the comparison of the impact of these different options on the rate and levels of contamination of laying hens flocks. Modelling of *Salmonella* propagation within a flock allows such comparisons. Prevost *et al* [2006, 2008] derived mathematical models: in addition to naïve (also called susceptible) birds, they distinguished three steps in the contamination:

- digestive contamination when only the digestive tract harbours *Salmonella*,

- systemic infection (when systemic organs such as liver or spleen are contaminated after translocation of bacteria through the digestive barrier, which may also result in egg contamination) and
- bacterial clearance leading to recovery.

The development of the models and in particular the fitting of the key parameters used the results from the selection experiment (I.1). This allowed identifying the most important factors for the risk of egg contamination and thus to human contamination risks:

- the recovery rate is dependant on the ability of hens to eliminate *Salmonella*. It influences both the maximal prevalence and the duration of the epizooty.
- the rate of return to the susceptible state depends on the loss of protective immunity.

This modelling also showed that the effect of selection of both parameters were not the same when selecting for a higher level of bacterial load than for a lower one: The recovery rate was more modified when selecting for reduced carrier-state while the rate of return to the susceptible line was mainly responsible for the higher susceptibility of Sala+ lines. This result is coherent with results on immune response of lines differing (among other resistance traits) in resistance to carrier state, whether inbred (Sadeyen *et al.* 2006), or outbred (Proux *et al.* 2002; Protais *et al.*, 2003). Moreover, in the latter study, vaccine efficiency was found to be better in the more resistant lines. This difference in immune response also suggests the vaccines will be less efficient in lines more susceptible to carrier-state. This difference was found in our simulations when comparing response to selection in populations mimicking our selected lines (Prevost *et al.*, 2008). It is important to notice that the combination of vaccination and genetic selection results in a very low percentage of contamination, very similar to the level the European community is asking for.

This study also compared the kinetics of infection between a homogenous population corresponding to the base population from which selection was undertaken or a mixture of the Sala+ and Sala- lines with the same geometrical mean, which is the same duration of the different steps of infection. Introducing Sala+ animals reduces the peak of infection (*i.e.* the maximal percentage of infected animals), since accelerated bacterial clearance of Sala- animals reduces the risk of cross contamination. But it also delays the extinction of the epizooty, because Sala- animals require more time to recover. Inversely, results of genotype comparisons will not be the same when animals with different degree of bacterial clearance are reared together or not. This point should be further studied in practice.

These models may be further improved toward a finer modelling of the animal innate immune response which may allow the animal to get rid of a digestive contamination. Individual variations should also be more thoroughly investigated through Individual Based Models. This will allow considering the individual level and not as before the whole population, summarizing it through the proportions of the different categories of animals (naïve, infective at the digestive level, systematically infected or recovered). Such investigations are currently achieved



Conclusion

Selection for a reduced propensity to carrier state is possible and synergize with other means of prevention. It will no doubt benefit very soon from Marker Assisted or Genomic Selection. But, whatever the sophistication of the method of selection, its efficiency will first be dependant on the choice of selection criteria. Large genotype x environment interaction influence resistance traits and special care must be taken of the animal's age. Reversely, literature results must be compared using a detailed definition, as underlined in general by Hughes et al (2008) concerning animal trait ontology.

In parallel, lines differing in resistance will also be useful as resources for research towards a deeper understanding of the genetic control of resistance and of the interaction between host resistance and pathogen.

Acknowledgements

The grants Aliment Demain SF20 from French Ministries of Research and of Agriculture, RESISAL from French National Agency for Research, as well the help of the Region Centre and of the EADGENE Network of Excellence are greatly acknowledged.

References

- BEAUMONT, C., PROTAIS, J., GUILLOT, J. F., COLIN, P., PROUX, K., MILLET, N. and PARDON, P.** (1999) Genetic resistance to mortality of day-old chicks and carrier-state of hens after inoculation with *Salmonella enteritidis*. *Avian Pathology* 28:131-135.
- BEAUMONT, C., DAMBRINE, G., CHAUSSE, A.M. and FLOCK, D.** (2003a) Selection for disease resistance: conventional breeding for resistance to bacteria and viruses. In MUIR W.M., AGGREY S.E. (Eds.), "Poultry Genetics, Breeding and Biotechnology", 357-384, CAB International, Oxon, UK.
- BEAUMONT, C., PROTAIS, J., PITEL, F., LEVEQUE, G., MALO, D., LANTIER, F., PLISSON-PETIT, F., COLIN, P., PROTAIS, M., LE ROY, P., ELSEN, J. M., MILAN, D., LANTIER, I., NEAU, A., SALVAT, G. and VIGNAL, A.** (2003b) Effect of two candidate genes on the *Salmonella* carrier state in fowl. *Poultry Science* 82: 721-726.
- BEAUMONT, C., CHAPUIS, H., PROTAIS, J., SELLIER, N., MENANTEAU, P., FRAVALO, P., VELGE, P.,** 2009 Resistance to *Salmonella* carrier-state: selection may be efficient but response depends on animal's age. Accepted for publication in *Genetics Research*.
- BERTHELOT, F., BEAUMONT, C., MOMPART, F., GIRARD-SANTOSUOSSO, O., PARDON, P., and M. DUCHET-SUCHAUX.** (1998) Estimated heritability of the resistance to cecal carrier state of *Salmonella enteritidis* in chickens. *Poultry Science* 77:797-801.
- BUMSTEAD, N. and BARROW, P.** (1988) Genetics of resistance to *Salmonella typhimurium* in newly hatched chicks. *British Poultry Science* 29: 521-9.



- BUMSTEAD, N. and BARROW, P.** (1993) Resistance to *Salmonella gallinarum*, *S. pullorum* and *S. enteritidis* in inbred lines of chickens. *Avian Diseases* 37: 189-93.
- CALENGE, F., LECERF, F., DEMARS, J., FEVE, K., VIGNOLES, F., PITEL, F., VIGNAL, A., VELGE, P., SELLIER, N., BEAUMONT, C.** (2009) Interest of a selective genotyping analysis in inbred lines to improve *Salmonella* carrier state resistance in chicken commercial lines. *Animals Genetics* (in press).
- CARON, J., LOREDO-OSTI, J., LAROCHE, L., SKAMENE, E., MORGAN, K. and MALO, D.** (2002) Identification of genetic loci controlling bacterial clearance in experimental *Salmonella enteritidis* infection : an unexpected role of *Nramp1* (*Slc11a1*) in the persistence of infection in mice. *Genes and Immunology*, 3:196-204
- DE VOLT, H.M., QUIGLEY, G.D. and BYERLY, T.G.,** (1941). Studies of resistance to pullorum disease in chicks. *Poultry science*, 20: 339-341.
- DUCHET-SUCHAUX, M., LECHOPIER, P., MARLY, J., BERNARDET, P., DELAUNAY, R. and PARDON P.** (1995). Quantification of experimental *Salmonella enteritidis* carrier state in B13 leghorn chicks. *Avian Disease* 39:796-803.
- EFSA** (2007a) Report of the Task Force on Zoonoses Data Collection on the Analysis of the baseline survey on the prevalence of *Salmonella* in broiler flocks of *Gallus gallus*, in the EU, 2005-2006. *The EFSA Journal* 98:1-85.
- EFSA** (2007b) Report on the Analysis of the baseline study on the prevalence of *Salmonella* in holdings of laying hen flocks of *Gallus gallus*. *The EFSA Journal* 97,
- EFSA** (2007c) The Community Summary Report on Trends and Sources of Zoonoses, Zoonotic Agents, Antimicrobial resistance and Foodborne outbreaks in the European Union in 2005. 20ISBN 978-92-9199-046-7, http://www.efsa.europa.eu/EFSA/efsa_locale-1178620753812_1178620767319.htm
- FIFE, M. S., SALMON, N., HOCKING, P. M. and KAISER, P.** (2009) Fine mapping of the chicken salmonellosis resistance locus (*SALI*). *Animal Genetics*, accepted for publication.
- GIRARD-SANTOSUOSSO, O., LANTIER, F., LANTIER, I., BUMSTEAD, N., ELSÉN, J. M. and BEAUMONT, C.** (2002) Heritability of susceptibility to *Salmonella enteritidis* infection in fowls and test of the role of the chromosome carrying the *NRAMP1* gene. *Genetics Selection Evolution* 34: 211-219.
- GODDARD, M.E., B.J. HAYES.** (2007) Genomic selection. *Journal of Animal Breeding and Genetics., Special issue: Genomic selection*, 124, 323-330.
- HU, J., BUMSTEAD, N., BURKE, D., FA, P.D.L., SKAMENE, E., GROS, P. and MALO, D.** (1995) Genetic and physical mapping of the natural resistance-associated macrophage protein 1 (*NRAMP1*) in chicken. *Mammalian Genome* 6: 809-15.
- HU, J., BUMSTEAD, N., SKAMENE, E., GROS, P. and MALO D.** (1996) Structural organization, sequence, and expression of the chicken *NRAMP1* gene encoding the natural resistance-associated macrophage protein 1. *DNA Cell Biology* 15: 113-23.
- HUGHES, L.M., BAO, J., HU, Z.L., HONAVAR, V., and REECY, J. M.** (2008) Animal trait ontology: The importance and usefulness of a unified trait vocabulary for animal species. *Journal of Animal Science* 86(6): 1485–1491



- HUMPHREY, T.J., BASKERVILLE, A., MAWER, S., ROWE, B. and HOPPER, S.** (1989) Salmonella enteritidis phage Type 4 from the contents of intact eggs: a study involving naturally infected hens. *Epidemiology and Infection* 103: 415-423
- HUTT, F. and SCHOLE, J.** (1941) XIII. Breed differences in susceptibility to *Salmonella pullorum*. *Poultry Science* 20: 342-352.
- JANSS, L. L. and BOLDER, N. M.** (2000). Heritabilities of and genetic relationships between salmonella resistance traits in broilers. *Journal of Animal Science*, 78: 2287-2291,
- KAISER, M., CHEESEMAN, J., KAISER, P. and LAMONT, S.** (2006) Cytokine expression in chicken peripheral blood mononuclear cells after in vitro exposure to *Salmonella enterica* serovar enteritidis. *Poultry Science* 85: 1907-11.
- KRAMER, J., MALEK, M. and LAMONT, S.** (2003) Association of twelve candidate gene polymorphisms and response to challenge with *Salmonella enteritidis* in poultry. *Animal Genetics* 34: 339-48.
- LAMONT, S. J., KAISER, M. G. and LIU, W.** (2002) Candidate genes for resistance to *Salmonella enteritidis* colonization in chickens as detected in a novel genetic cross. *Veterinary Immunology and Immunopathology* 87: 423-428.
- LEVEQUE, G., FORGETTA, V., MORROLL, S., SMITH, A., BUMSTEAD, N., BARROW, P., LOREDO-OSTI, J., MORGAN, K. and MALO, D.** (2003) Allelic variation in *TLR4* is linked to susceptibility to *Salmonella enterica* serovar typhimurium infection in chickens. *Infection and Immunity* 71: 1116-24.
- LIU, W., KAISER, M. and LAMONT, S.** (2003) Natural resistance-associated macrophage protein 1 gene polymorphisms and response to vaccine against or challenge with *Salmonella enteritidis* in young chicks. *Poultry Science* 82: 259-66.
- MARIANI, P., BARROW, P. A., CHENG, H. H., GROENEN, M. A. M., NEGRINI, R. and BUMSTEAD, N.** (2001) Localization to chicken Chromosome 5 of a novel locus determining salmonellosis resistance. *Immunogenetics* 53: 786-791.
- PATRICK, M.E., ADCOCK, P.M., GOMEZ, T.M., ALTEKRUSE, S.F., HOLAND, B.H., TAUXE, R.V. and SWERDLOW D. L.** (2004) *Salmonella enteritidis* infections, United States, 1985-1999. *Emerging Infectious Disease* 10: 1-7.
- PRÉVOST, K., MAGAL, P. and BEAUMONT C.** (2006) A model of *Salmonella* infection within industrial house hens. *Journal of Theoretical Biology* 242: 755-63.
- PREVOST, K., MAGAL, P., PROTAIS, J. and BEAUMONT, C.** (2008) Effect of genetic resistance of the hen to *Salmonella* carrier-state on incidence of bacterial contamination: synergy with vaccination. *Veterinary Research* 39: 20-31,
- PROTAIS, J., COLIN, P., BEAUMONT, C., GUILLOT, J. F., LANTIER, F., PARDON, P. and BENNEJEAN, G.** (1996) Line differences in resistance to *Salmonella enteritidis* PT4 infection. *British Poultry Science*, 37: 329-339.
- PROTAIS, J., NAGARD, B., BOSCHER, E., QUEGUINER, S., BEAUMONT, C. and SALVAT, G.** (2003) Changes in *Salmonella enteritidis* contamination in two layer lines vaccinated during the rearing period. *British Poultry Science* 44: 827-828.

- PROUX, K., JOUY, E., HOUDAYER, C., PROTAIS, J., DIBB-FULLER, M., BOSCHER, E., GILLARD, A., GRACIEUX, P., GILBERT, F., BEAUMONT, C., and DUCHET-SUCHAUX, M.** (2002) Reliable Elisav showing differences between resistant and susceptible lines in hens orally inoculated with *Salmonella enteritidis*. *Veterinary Research* 33: 23-33.
- RANTALA, M. and NURMI, E.** (1973) Prevention of the growth of *Salmonella infantis* in chicks by the flora of the alimentary tract of chicken, *British Poultry Science* 14: 627-630.
- ROY, M.F. and MALO, D.** (2002) Genetic regulation of host responses to *salmonella* infection in mice. *Genes and Immunity* 3: 381-93.
- SADEYEN, J.R., TROTTEREAU, J., VELGE, P., MARLY, J., BEAUMONT, C., BARROW, P., BUMSTEAD, N. and LALMANACH, A.C.** (2004) *Salmonella* carrier state in chicken: comparison of expression of immune response genes between susceptible and resistant animals. *Microbes and Infection* 6: 1278-86.
- SADEYEN, J.R., TROTTEREAU, J., PROTAIS, J., BEAUMONT, C., SELLIER, N., SALVAT, G., VELGE, P. and LALMANACH, A.-C.** (2006) *Salmonella* carrier-state in hens: study of host resistance by a gene expression approach. *Microbes and Infection* 8: 1308-14.
- SELLIER, N., VIDAL, M.L., BARON F., MICHEL, J., GAUTRON J. PROTAIS, M., BEAUMONT C., GAUTIER, M. and NYS, Y.** (2007) Estimations of repeatability and heritability of different measures of egg's natural defenses. *British Poultry Science*, 48 : 559-566.
- TILQUIN, P., BARROW, P.A., MARLY, J., PITEL, F., PLISSON-PETIT, F., VELGE, P., VIGNAL, A., BARET P.V., BUMSTEAD, N. and BEAUMONT C.** (2005) A Genome Scan For Quantitative Trait Loci Affecting *Salmonella* Carrier-state In Chicken. *Genetics Selection Evolution* 37: 539-561.
- VAN HEMERT, S., HOEKMAN, A., SMITS, M. and REBEL, J.** (2006) Gene expression responses to a *Salmonella* infection in the chicken intestine differ between lines. *Veterinary Immunology and Immunopathology* 114: 247-58.
- VAN HEMERT, S., HOEKMAN, A., SMITS, M. and REBEL, J.** (2007) Immunological and gene expression responses to a *Salmonella* infection in the chicken intestine. *Veterinary Research* 38: 51-63.
- VELGE, P., CLOECKAERT, A. and BARROW, P.** (2005) Emergence of *Salmonella* epidemics: the problems related to *Salmonella enterica* serotype Enteritidis and multiple antibiotic resistance in other major serotypes. *Veterinary Research* 36: 267-88.
- VIDAL, S., TREMBLAY, M., GOVONI, G., GAUTHIER, S., SEBASTIANI, G., MALO, D., SKAMENE, E., OLIVIER, M., JOTHY, S. and GROS P.** (1993) The *Ity/Lsh/Bcg* locus: natural resistance to infection with intracellular parasites is abrogated by disruption of the *Nramp1* gene. *Journal of Experimental Medicine* 182: 655-66.
- ZHANG-BARBER, L., TURNER, A.K. and BARROW, P.A.** (1999) Vaccination for control of *Salmonella* in Poultry. *Vaccine* 17: 2538-2545.