


## Journal Pre-proof

Multiplex PCR assay based on the citE2 gene and intergenic sequence for the rapid detection of Salmonella Pullorum in chickens

Zhike Liu , Yan Yu , Tetiana Fotina , Roman Petrov ,  
Zhanna Klishchova , Anatoliy Fotin , Jinyou Ma

PII: S0032-5791(22)00272-3  
DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.psj.2022.101981>  
Reference: PSJ 101981



To appear in: *Poultry Science*

Received date: 1 September 2021

Accepted date: 29 May 2022

Please cite this article as: Zhike Liu , Yan Yu , Tetiana Fotina , Roman Petrov , Zhanna Klishchova , Anatoliy Fotin , Jinyou Ma , Multiplex PCR assay based on the citE2 gene and intergenic sequence for the rapid detection of Salmonella Pullorum in chickens, *Poultry Science* (2022), doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.psj.2022.101981>

This is a PDF file of an article that has undergone enhancements after acceptance, such as the addition of a cover page and metadata, and formatting for readability, but it is not yet the definitive version of record. This version will undergo additional copyediting, typesetting and review before it is published in its final form, but we are providing this version to give early visibility of the article. Please note that, during the production process, errors may be discovered which could affect the content, and all legal disclaimers that apply to the journal pertain.

© 2022 Published by Elsevier Inc. on behalf of Poultry Science Association Inc.  
This is an open access article under the CC BY-NC-ND license  
(<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>)

**Running head: MULTIPLEX PCR FOR SALMONELLA**

**Multiplex PCR assay based on the *citE2* gene and intergenic sequence for the rapid detection of *Salmonella Pullorum* in chickens**

Zhike Liu<sup>\*,§</sup>, Yan Yu<sup>\*</sup>, Tetiana Fotina<sup>§,1</sup>, Roman Petrov<sup>§</sup>, Zhanna Klishchova<sup>§</sup>, Anatoliy Fotin<sup>§</sup>, and Jinyou Ma<sup>\*,2</sup>

<sup>\*</sup>*College of Animal Science and Technology, Henan Institute of Science and Technology, Xinxiang, Henan 453003, China*

<sup>§</sup>*Faculty of Veterinary Medicine, Sumy National Agrarian University, Sumy, 40021, Ukraine*

Footnotes-----

<sup>1</sup>Corresponding authors: Tetiana Fotina, Tel: +380-954-952933, E-mail: tif\_ua@meta.ua. Faculty of Veterinary Medicine, Sumy National Agrarian University, Herasima Kondratieva Street 160, Sumy, 40021, Ukraine.

<sup>2</sup>Corresponding authors: Jinyou Ma, Tel: +86-373-3693116, E-mail: marsjy@163.com. College of Animal Science and Technology, Henan Institute of Science and Technology, Hualan Street 90, Xinxiang, Henan 453003, China.

Appropriate scientific section: Microbiology and Food Safety

**ABSTRACT**

*Salmonella* is one of the most common Gram-negative pathogens and seriously threatens chicken farms and food safety. This study aimed to establish a multiplex polymerase chain reaction (PCR) approach for the identification of different *Salmonella enterica* subsp. *enterica*. The *citE2* gene and interval sequence of SPS4\_00301–SPS4\_00311 existed in all *S. enterica* subsp. *enterica* serovars by genomic comparison. By contrast, a 76 bp deletion in *citE2* was found only in *Salmonella* Pullorum. Two pairs of special primers designed from *citE2* and interval sequence were used to establish the multiplex PCR system. The optimized multiplex PCR system could distinguish *Salmonella* Pullorum and non-*Salmonella* Pullorum. The sensitivity of the optimized multiplex PCR system could be as low as 6.25 pg/μL and 10<sup>4</sup> colony-forming units (CFU)/mL for genomic DNA and *Salmonella* Pullorum cells, respectively. The developed multiplex PCR assay distinguished *Salmonella* Pullorum from 33 different *Salmonella enterica* subsp. *enterica* serotypes and 13 non-target species. The detection of egg samples artificially contaminated with *Salmonella* Pullorum, *Salmonella* Enteritidis and naturally contaminated 69 anal swab samples showed that results were consistent with the culture method. These features indicated that the developed multiplex PCR system had high sensitivity and specificity and could be used for the accurate detection of *Salmonella* Pullorum in clinical samples.

**Keywords:** *Salmonella* Pullorum, *Salmonella* Enteritidis, multiplex PCR, *citE2*, interval sequence

## INTRODUCTION

*Salmonella* is an important foodborne pathogen, and more than 2,600 different serovars have been identified so far (Kirk et al., 2015; Geng et al., 2019). *Salmonella* can survive in various environments and hosts, causing up to about 200,000 deaths annually worldwide (Pradhan and Negi, 2019). These pathogenic *Salmonella* often causes infectious diseases that are complex and difficult to control and manage (Park et al., 2014). Among these, *Salmonella enteric* serovar Enteritidis (**S. Enteritidis**), *Salmonella enteric* serovar Gallinarum biovars Pullorum (**S. Pullorum**) and Gallinarum (**S. Gallinarum**) can be found in clean and intact eggs. *S. Pullorum*/*Gallinarum* are host-specific bacteria, and susceptible hosts include poultry, wild birds, turkeys, ducks, quails, and some guinea fowls (Wilson et al., 2019). Thus, *S. Gallinarum* threatens chicken production or water, whereas *S. Pullorum* can vertical transmission through seed eggs to the progeny (Celis-Estupiñan et al., 2017). These two pathogens are closely related, but the main epidemiology and pathogenic mechanism of these biovars are completely distinct, which provides a good model for studies of the disease diagnosis and evolutionary processes (Batista et al., 2016; Celis-Estupiñan et al., 2017). *S. Pullorum*/*Gallinarum* has been basically purified in developed countries but are still widely distributed in chicken farms in most developing countries, such as Asia and Africa, thereby causing serious economic losses with high mortality (Shen et al., 2020; Zhang et al., 2020). Given that the genome is always evolving, the host range of *S. Pullorum*/*Gallinarum* may widen and

is a potential threat to human health. However, there is still a lack of related epidemiologic data of these two pathogens in China, which is the first step of formulating effective control strategies. Therefore, a rapid and accurate method is urgently needed to identify *S. Pullorum* and help us make corresponding prevention and control measures.

The traditional serological detection of *Salmonella* identifies O and H antigens by agglutination reaction between the specific antibody and granular antigen, and the serotype of *Salmonella* is determined in accordance with the White–Kauffmann–Le Minor scheme (Issenhuth-Jeanjean et al., 2014). Additionally, *S. Pullorum*/*Gallinarum* has no motility and have the same O antigen in etiology (Guo et al., 2017), and ornithine decarboxylation is only the main difference in biochemical characteristics (Barrow and de Freitas Neto, 2011). Normally, these methods are time-consuming, laborious, and ineffective in distinguishing some serotypes or biotypes of *Salmonella* especially *S. Pullorum*. However, DNA-based molecular techniques developed for *Salmonella*, such as PCR (Kubo et al., 2020), Multiplex Oligonucleotide Ligation–PCR (Gand et al., 2020), solid-phase PCR (Vinayaka et al., 2020), loop-mediated isothermal amplification combined with lateral flow dipstick (Liu et al., 2019, 2020; Priya et al., 2020), and repetitive sequence-based PCR (Gogoi et al., 2018), have already been described. PCR–restriction fragment length polymorphism (Soler-García et al., 2014), PCR–high–resolution melting (Ren et al., 2017), and enterobacterial repeated intergenic consensus–PCR are also used to identify the serotypes of *S. Pullorum*/*Gallinarum* (Xu et al., 2018, 2020). The main bottle necks of

the conventional PCR detection of *S. Pullorum* are due to serotypes of *Salmonella* and production of false-negative results. Given the inherent limitations of these methods, the combination of a variety of diagnostic techniques, repeated operation, and high cost are often needed to obtain results in a timely fashion. Thus, the conventional PCR method is not suitable for the routine clinical diagnosis of *Salmonella*. By contrast, the developed multiplex PCR method constitutes a highly efficient, systematic, economical, and simple tool for diagnostic *Salmonella* species and can be used to classify for the serotyping of the target gene in a single reaction (Zhou et al., 2020; Wilwet et al., 2021).

In the study, we establish a multiplex PCR system for the simultaneous detection of *S. Pullorum* from *S. enterica* subsp. *enterica*. The region of difference (**ROD**) of *citE2*, a 76bp deletion, has been demonstrated to exist in all *S. Pullorum* strains, but not in non-*S. Pullorum* bacteria. Specifically, the intergenic sequence between SPS4\_00301 and SPS4\_00311 has been present in *S. enterica* subsp. *enterica*. Two pairs of primers based on the *citE2* and the intergenic sequence of SPS4\_00301–SPS4\_00311 are exploited to establish the multiplex PCR system identifying *S. enterica* subsp. *enterica* strains. This rapid and sensitive multiplex PCR assay is applied to distinguish the genomic DNA of *Salmonella* from pure cells, artificially spiked egg samples, and clinical samples. Collectively, such results demonstrate that this promising method will be useful for the accurate detection of viable *S. Pullorum* and *S. Enteritidis* in chickens.

## MATERIALS AND METHODS

### *Bacterial Strains*

A collection of 46 bacterial strains, including 6 strains of *S. Pullorum*, 27 strains of other serotypes of non-*S. Pullorum* (belong to *S. enterica* subsp. *enterica*) and 13 strains of non-*Salmonella* strains, were used (Table 1). *S. Pullorum* (CVCC 530) and *S. Enteritidis* (ATCC 4931) were used as standard strains to optimize and establish the multiplex PCR method. All glycerol strains were stored at  $-80\text{ }^{\circ}\text{C}$  in a refrigerator until use.

### *Bacterial Culture and Genomic DNA Extraction*

All *Salmonella* strains were cultivated in Luria–Bertani broth medium at  $37\text{ }^{\circ}\text{C}$  for 12–14 h with shaking at 180 rpm. All non-*Salmonella* strains were routinely cultured overnight under suitable conditions and medium. The bacterial culture medium of overnight cultures (5 mL) were centrifuged at 10,000 rpm for 1 min, and the supernatant was removed as much as possible. Then, the genomic DNA from each bacteria was extracted via the TIANamp Bacteria DNAKit (Tiangen-Biotech, Beijing, China). The DNA of some *Salmonella* samples was extracted as template through the boiling method. The concentration and purity of DNA were quantified using the  $A_{260/280}$  obtained by the Biodrop spectrophotometer (BioDrop, Cambridge, England). The DNA solution was subsequently packed and stored at  $-20\text{ }^{\circ}\text{C}$  prior to use.

### *Bioinformatics Analysis and Designing Primers*

To detect *S. Pullorum* and non-*S. Pullorum* by the multiplex PCR assay, we compared the differences of genome sequences. The *citE2* gene and intergenic





conditions in the assay were performed as follows: initial denaturation at 95 °C for 5 min followed by 30 cycles of 95 °C for 40 s, annealing at 58 °C for 30 s, and extension step at 72 °C for 30 s. The final extension was at 72 °C for 10 min, and repeated three times. The amplified products were separated with 1.5% agarose gel electrophoresis and observed under ultraviolet light.

Genomic DNA was extracted as described above to confirm whether the signal of the multiplex PCR could be detected for cross-reaction among different combinations of primer pairs (*citE2* and SPS4\_00301–SPS4\_00311) and templates of *Salmonella* cells (*S. Pullorum* and *S. Enteritidis*). The PCR system and conditions were conducted in accordance with the PCR protocol. Bacterial tests were performed and repeated in triplicate.

#### ***Sensitivity and Specificity of the Multiplex PCR Assay***

The genomic DNA of *S. Pullorum* was diluted 10 times serially from 62.5 ng/μL to 6.25 fg/μL with sterile DDW. The overnight culture of *S. Pullorum* was washed three times with sterile DDW, and the final concentrations of *S. Pullorum* cells were adjusted from  $4 \times 10^6$  CFU/mL to  $5 \times 10^3$  CFU/mL with sterile DDW. The sensitivity of multiplex PCR was evaluated under the optimized reaction conditions in triplicate. Finally, 1 μL of each dilution was used as template for the multiplex PCR detection.

The specificity of the multiplex PCR assay based on the *citE2* and SPS4\_00301–SPS4\_00311 primers were conducted using genomic DNA from 33 *Salmonella* (belong to *S. enterica* subsp. *enterica*) and 13 non-*Salmonella* strains. Cultures were adjusted to  $10^6$  CFU/mL and confirmed using plate counts for six times.

The DNA template was obtained by direct boiling method and subjected to simple centrifugation for 3 min at 5,000 rpm. The supernatant (1  $\mu$ L) was analyzed for the multiplex PCR assay, and sterile DDW was used as blank control. These experiments were independently repeated in triplicate.

#### ***Artificial Contamination of Egg for the Multiplex PCR Assay***

A total of 100 fresh eggs were purchased from a local supermarket (Xinxiang, China) and used to evaluate whether the multiplex PCR detection of *S. Pullorum* (CVCC 530) and *S. Enteritidis* (ATCC 4931) artificially contaminated eggs. All eggs were checked to ensure the *Salmonella*-free according to the standard culture method (GB/T4789.4–2016) depicted in Figure 1 (China National Food Safety Standard, 2016). Briefly, Take three eggs, each egg was placed into a homogeniser and stirred into the homogenate to ensure uncontaminated samples of target bacteria. Then, the homogenate (25 mL) was added into 225 mL buffered peptone water (BPW; Hopebio-Technology, Shangdong, China) to obtain 1:10 as the culture medium of *Salmonella*. After the OD<sub>600</sub> value of *S. Pullorum* culture was adjusted to 1, its serial 10-fold dilutions with sterile DDW were from 10<sup>6</sup> CFU/mL to 10<sup>0</sup> CFU/mL. Simultaneously, each dilution was carried out using xylose–lysine–desoxycholate agar (Hopebio-Technology, Shangdong, China) plates through the plate count method to determine the actual concentration of *S. Pullorum*. Ten fold serial dilutions (1 mL) were thoroughly added into 9 mL culture medium of *Salmonella* and incubated at 37 °C with shaking at 180 rpm for 0, 2, 6, 10, and 12 h, respectively. Thereafter, 1 mL enrichment culture of each dilution was collected by centrifugation at 10,000 rpm for

1 min. DNA was extracted by using the boiling method, and 1  $\mu$ L of each supernatant was used for the multiplex PCR under the same conditions. These results of the multiplex PCR assay of all samples were compared with those of the culture method. Non-inoculated egg with *Salmonella* was tested as the negative template. All experiments were independently repeated in triplicate.

### ***Application of the Multiplex PCR Assay***

To ensure the effect of the multiplex PCR assay, we tested the genomic DNA of 69 clinical samples from the feces of naturally contaminated chicken farms and 3 negative samples of smears from chickens (from which *Salmonella* was not isolated) in Xinjiang Province, China. Chickens were preliminary screened by *S. Pullorum*/Gallinarum Serum Plate Agglutination Test Polyvalent Antigen (Zhonghai Biotech, Beijing, China). Finally, 69 chicken anal swab samples were identified as *S. Pullorum* strains by using the culture method (GB/T4789.4–2016). All clinical samples were tested using the multiplex PCR assay described above after 12 h enrichment at 37 °C in BPW. The results of multiplex PCR for known *S. Pullorum* strains were compared with those of the culture method in this assay.

## **RESULTS**

### ***Sequence Alignment Analysis and Salmonella Detection of the Multiplex PCR***

#### ***Assay***

Bioinformatics analysis showed that *citE2* was conserved, repeatable, and existed in all *S. enterica* subsp. *enterica* strains after searching in the BLASTn program of

Web BLAST (Supplementary S1). The *citE2* sequence comparison showed that the 76 bp fragment of the *citE2* gene in all *S. Pullorum* strains might be absent compared with that in non-*S. Pullorum*. The intergenic sequence between SPS4\_00301 and SPS4\_00311 had 100% homology with all *S. enterica* subsp. *enterica* strains after searching in the BLASTn program of Web BLAST (Supplementary S2). In this study, the specific primer from the *citE2* gene was designed for *S. Pullorum*, and the intergenic sequence primer of SPS4\_00301–SPS4\_00311 was designed as a molecular marker for the identification of all *S. enterica* subsp. *enterica* strains (Figure 2A). The fragment sizes of multiplex PCR were 167 and 257 bp for *S. Pullorum* and 167 and 333 bp for *S. Enteritidis* (Figure 2B).

#### ***Optimization and Effect of the Multiplex PCR Assay***

After the multiplex PCR system was generated, the annealing temperature and the combination ratio of two pairs of primers were optimized. As shown in Supplementary S3A and S3B, no significant difference was observed in the annealing temperature of *citE2* and SPS4\_00301–SPS4\_00311 primers at 52.5°C–61.5°C. Supplementary S3C demonstrates that the different annealing temperatures of multiplex PCR were 55.3 °C, 56.4 °C, 57.6 °C, 58.7 °C, 59.8 °C, and 60.7 °C and that the electrophoretic bands were relatively bright and had no significant difference. Thus, the optimal conditions of multiplex PCR were as follows: annealing temperature of 60 °C and ratio of two pairs of primers (*citE2* primers: SPS4\_00301–SPS4\_00311 primers) of 1:1 (Supplementary S3D). These conditions were applied to amplify the simplex and multiple templates of *Salmonella* (*S.*

Pullorum and *S. Enteritidis*, respectively) to verify whether single and mixed primer pairs, respectively, could be used in a multiplex PCR system. The results of agarose gel electrophoresis showed that the amplified fragments of 167, 257, and 333 bp were obtained from *S. Pullorum* and *S. Enteritidis*. The amplicon lengths of *S. Pullorum* were 167 and 257 bp, and the product sizes of *S. Enteritidis* were 167 and 333 bp (Figure 3). Results showed that the mixed primer pairs could be specifically and effectively applied to the detection system of *S. Pullorum* and non-*S. Pullorum*.

#### ***Specificity of the Multiplex PCR***

A total of 33 strains of *S. enterica* subsp. *enterica* and 13 strains of non-*Salmonella* were tested to determine the specificity of the multiplex PCR assay. The amplicons of 167 and 257 bp size fragments were clearly generated on 1.5% agarose gels for *S. Pullorum*, and two bands with sizes of 167 and 333 bp were observed in 1.5% agarose gels for other *Salmonella* (Figure 4 and Table 1). By contrast, non-*Salmonella* species and blank control did not have the specific band, indicating no cross amplification with other primers. Overall, we speculated that the multiplex PCR showed excellent specificity for the detection of *S. Pullorum* and non-*S. Pullorum*.

#### ***Sensitivity of the Multiplex PCR Assay***

The genomic DNA concentration of *S. Pullorum* was aseptically diluted 10-fold from 62.5 ng/ $\mu$ L to 6.25 fg/ $\mu$ L as a template and tested using the multiplex PCR assay to assess the diagnostic sensitivity of the multiplex PCR system. The detection limit of the PCR method could reach at least 6.25 pg/ $\mu$ L genomic DNA (Figure 5A). Pure *S. Pullorum* cells were diluted from  $4 \times 10^6$  CFU/mL to  $5 \times 10^3$  CFU/mL. Results showed

that the purpose fragment (as low as 10 CFU per reaction) was still detected (Figure 5B).

#### ***Multiplex PCR Assay Evaluation in Artificially Contaminated Egg Samples***

The different concentrations of *S. Pullorum* and *S. Enteritidis* from  $10^6$  CFU/mL to  $10^0$  CFU/mL were used to examine the detection sensitivity of the multiplex PCR assay for artificially contaminated egg samples. As shown in Figure 6, the results of multiplex PCR with different enrichment time points corresponding to different concentrations of *S. Pullorum* and *S. Enteritidis* were detected. At initial inoculation concentrations of  $10^6$  and  $10^5$  CFU/mL per reaction, positive signals could be identified without enrichment. The limits of detection of the multiplex PCR assay in egg were  $10^4$  CFU/mL after 2 h enrichment,  $10^1$  CFU/mL after 6 h enrichment, and  $10^0$  CFU/mL after 10 h and 12 h enrichment, respectively. In addition, the detection limits of *S. Pullorum* and *S. Enteritidis* were similar to that of  $10^4$  CFU/mL viable *S. Pullorum* pure cells in this multiplex PCR assay. Results indicated that the multiplex PCR was experimentally sufficient for the target pathogen in artificially contaminated egg samples.

#### ***Application of the Multiplex PCR Assay in Fecal Samples***

A total of 69 typical anal swab samples from chicken farms were simultaneously subjected to the multiplex PCR assay to test the diagnostic efficiency of this assay for the detection of *S. Pullorum*. As shown in Figure 7, results demonstrated that 69 bacterial samples amplified two expected bands of 167 and 257 bp for *S. Pullorum*, and no PCR product was observed in 3 negative samples. The multiplex PCR method

was excellent and consistent with the culture method, indicating that the assay could be used for the clinical diagnosis of *S. Pullorum*.

## DISCUSSION

*S. Pullorum* can spread horizontally and vertically. Once these pathogens occur, they can hardly be eliminated (Liu et al., 2019). Therefore, the accurate and rapid diagnosis of pathogens is significant for the control and eradication of *S. Pullorum*. At present, the detection of pathogenic bacteria depends on culture-based techniques and biochemical identification, which are time-consuming, have long detection cycle and low sensitivity, and cannot meet the needs of social development (Blanco and de Tuesta, 2018). Thus, the accurate and simple detection method should be developed for the serotype diagnosis of *S. Pullorum*.

The conventional PCR assay has been successfully established for the diagnosis and identification of *Salmonella*. At the same time, these techniques did still need to develop an improved method for the identification and detection of target bacteria (Park, et al., 2014; Babu, et al., 2021). Many studies reported that multiplex PCR is widely used for identifying microorganisms due to the advantages of high efficiency, system, economy, and simplicity, but can't detected for the poor template (Yang et al., 2013, 2020; Quick et al., 2017; Zhou et al., 2020). Strikingly, the design and quantity of multiplex PCR primers are important for the effective amplification of the target gene sequence. Herein, our assay was applied successfully to improve this problem by designing two sets of primers with different target sequences derived from *S.*

Pullorum. Our PCR method can remarkably improve the detection specificity and eliminate false-positive results. This design may extend the application of PCR for genotyping, evolutionary history of host adaptation, and bacterial biology (Dobrindt and Hacker, 2001; Thomson et al., 2008; Shen et al., 2020).

Our established method could successfully solve the difficulties on the basis of the diagnostic marker of the *citE2* gene and intergenic sequence between SPS4\_00301 and SPS4\_00311 for *S. Pullorum*. A previous study indicated that *citE2* is a subunit of bacterial citrate lyase in bacterial energy metabolism and has been demonstrated as a robust drug target for the physiology and virulence of *Mycobacterium tuberculosis* (Arora et al., 2018). The sequence alignment of the *citE2* gene was present in all *S. enterica* subsp. *enterica* strains, but *S. Pullorum* strains had a 76 bp deletion in *citE2*. The intergenic sequence between SPS4\_00301 and SPS4\_00311 existed in all *S. enterica* subsp. *enteric* stains and was the first to be reported as a diagnostic marker of *Salmonella*. Zhou et al. (2020) developed a PCR-based assay by targeting the *cigR* ROD, and this assay has excellent effectivity and suitability. The conserved ROD represents a potential marker for the specific identification of *S. Pullorum*/Gallinarum (Xiong et al., 2016, 2018). Similarly, the intergenic sequence between two genes in *Salmonella* is conservative in the process of evolution and has important biological functions (Tang et al., 2017). In epidemiologic investigation and transmission of *S. Pullorum*/Gallinarum, increased specific genes are explored to determine *Salmonella* serovars for PCRs (Batista et al., 2018). For example, the *fliC* and *fljB* genes present in *S. Typhimurium* (Khaltabadi et al., 2019) are not highly conservative to



discriminate clinical mutants. The multiplex real-time PCR assay reduces the problems of atypical strains or false-negative results (Naberhaus et al., 2019).

The conservation status of *citE2* ROD and the intergenic sequence of SPS4\_00301–SPS4\_00311 were exploited as target sequences to design *S. Pullorum* primers. In this study, the multiplex PCR assay produced the two expected bands from 6 strains of *S. Pullorum* and 27 strains of non-*S. Pullorum* individually, but 13 strains of non-*Salmonella* did not have a band (Figure 4). Detection limits for the multiplex PCR could be analyzed at 6.25 pg/ $\mu$ L for the genomic DNA of *S. Pullorum* and  $10^4$  CFU/mL for pure *S. Pullorum* cells in a single tube. As shown in Table 2, our method exhibited a sensitivity that was comparable with other earlier reported data for the detection of *S. Pullorum* (Sahu et al., 2019). From the results of the spiked eggs with two of the individual target bacteria, a 10-fold enrichment could be observed to detect  $10^0$  CFU/mL viable *S. Pullorum* and *S. Enteritidis*. Wan et al. (2021) applied a real-time fluorescent quantitative PCR to detect *Salmonella* spp and *S. Enteritidis* in food samples, and 10 CFU in BPW could be detected by applying this quantitative PCR. A total of 69 chicken anal swab samples from chicken farms were detected using the multiplex PCR system, which was also identical with the culture method, to verify the clinical application of this method. Cumulatively, the specificity and sensitivity of two special primer pairs were effectively sufficient to construct a multiplex PCR system for the identification and diagnosis of *S. Pullorum*. Our results indicated that the proposed PCR method provided a useful information to identify *S. Pullorum* from *S. enterica* subsp. *enterica* in laboratory and real samples efficiently.

In summary, a rapid, accurate, and economical multiplex PCR for detecting of *S. Pullorum* was successfully established by the *citE2* gene and the intergenic sequence of SPS4\_00301–SPS4\_00311. Our result revealed that the multiplex PCR was a highly efficient and practical method to distinguish *S. Pullorum* of natural chicken anal swab and egg samples artificially contaminated with *S. Pullorum* and *S. Enteritidis*. Presumably, the present approach might be a valuable strategy for the early diagnosis and epidemiological investigation of *S. enterica* subsp. *enterica* in microbiology laboratories.

#### **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

This research was supported by National Natural Science Foundation of China-Henan Joint Fund (No. U1904117) and Key Science and Technology Program of Henan Province (No. 21210210100). We would like to thank Professor Chuangfu Chen's laboratory of Shihezi University for providing clinical samples for this study. We thank all of the participants who provided clinical samples for this study.

#### **DISCLOSURES**

All authors declare no conflict of interest.

#### **REFERENCES**

- Arora, G., D. Chaudhary, S. Kidwai, D. Sharma, and R. Singh. 2018. CitE enzymes are essential for *Mycobacterium tuberculosis* to establish infection in macrophages and guinea pigs. *Front. Cell. Infect. Microbiol.* 8: 385.
- Babu, U. S., L. M. Harrison, I. R. Patel, M. K. Mammel, E. Bigley III, and K. V.

- Balan. 2021. Development and validation of an improved method for the detection of *Salmonella* in cinnamon bark and oregano leaves using the adsorbent beta zeolite in the pre-enrichment media. *Food Microbiol.* 100: 103852.
- Barrow, P. A., and O. C. F. de Freitas Neto. 2011. Pullorum disease and fowl typhoid—new thoughts on old diseases: a review. *Avian Pathol.* 40: 1–13.
- Batista, D. F. A., O. C. de Freitas Neto, A. M. de Almeida, P. A. Barrow, F. de Oliveira Barbosa, and A. B. Junior. 2016. Molecular identification of *Salmonella enterica* subsp. *Enteric* serovar Gallinarum biovars Gallinarum and Pullorum by a duplex PCR assay. *J. Vet. Diagn. Invest.* 28: 419–422.
- Batista, D. F. A., O. C. de Freitas Neto, A. M. de Almeida, G. Maboni, T. F. de Carvalho, T. P. de Carvalho, P. A. Barrow, and A. B. Junior. 2018. Evaluation of pathogenicity of *Salmonella* Gallinarum strains harbouring deletions in genes whose orthologues are conserved pseudogenes in *S. Pullorum*. *PLoS One* 13: e0200585.
- Blanco, G., and J. A. D. de Tuesta. 2018. Culture-and molecular-based detection of swine-adapted *Salmonella* shed by avian scavengers. *Sci. Total Environ.* 634: 1513–1518.
- China National Food Safety Standard. 2016. *Detection of food microorganisms -Salmonella spp.* ministry of health of the people's Republic of China. China: National food safety standard GB4789.4–2016.
- Celis-Estupiñan, A. L. D. P., D. F. A. Batista, M. V. Cardozo, A. I. S. de Souza, L. B.

- R. Alves, A. M. de Almeida, P. A. Barrow, A. B. Junior, and O. C. de Freitas Neto. 2017. Further investigations on the epidemiology of fowl typhoid in Brazil. *Avian Pathol.* 46: 416–425.
- Dobrindt, U., and J. Hacker. 2001. Whole genome plasticity in pathogenic bacteria. *Curr. Opin. Microbiol.* 4: 550–557.
- Gand, M., W. Mattheus, N. H. C. Roosens, K. Dierick, K. Marchal, S. C. J. de Keersmaecker, and S. Bertrand. 2020. A multiplex oligonucleotide ligation-PCR method for the genosertotyping of common *Salmonella* using a liquid bead suspension assay. *Food Microbiol.* 87: 103394.
- Geng, S., Y. Wang, Y. Xue, H. Wang, Y. Cai, J. Zhang, P. Barrow, Z. Pan, and X. Jiao. 2019. The SseL protein inhibits the intracellular NF- $\kappa$ B pathway to enhance the virulence of *Salmonella Pullorum* in a chicken model. *Microb. Pathog.* 129: 1–6.
- Gogoi, P., P. Borah, I. Hussain, L. Das, G. Hazarika, S. Tamuly, and L. M. Barkalita. 2018. Efficacy of pulsed-field gel electrophoresis and repetitive element sequence-based PCR in typing of *Salmonella* isolates from Assam, India. *J. Clin. Microbiol.* 56: e02043–17.
- Guo, R., Z. Li, Y. Jiao, S. Geng, Z. Pan, X. Chen, Q. Li, and X. Jiao. 2017. O-polysaccharide is important for *Salmonella Pullorum* survival in egg albumen, and virulence and colonization in chicken embryos. *Avian Pathol.* 46: 535–540.
- Issenhuth-Jeanjean, S., P. Roggentin, M. L. Mikoleit, M. Guibourdenche, E. de Pinna, S. Nair, P. I. Fields, and F. X. Weill. 2014. Supplement 2008-2010 (no. 48) to the white-kauffmann-le minor scheme. *Res. Microbiol.* 165: 526–530.

- Khaltabadi, R. F., N. Shahrokhi, M. Ebrahimi-Rad, and P. Ehsani. 2019. *Salmonella* Typhimurium in Iran: Contribution of molecular and IS200 PCR methods in variants detection. PLoS One 14: e0213726.
- Kirk, M. D., S. M. Pires, R. E. Black, M. Caipo, J. A. Crump, B. Devleeschauwer, D. Döpfer, A. Fazil, C. L. Fischer-Walker, T. Hald, A. J. Hall, K. H. Keddy, R. J. Lake, C. F. Lanata, P. R. Torgerson, A. H. Havelaar, and F. J. Angulo. 2015. Worldhealth organization estimates of the global and regional disease burden of 22 foodborne bacterial, protozoal, and viral diseases, 2010: A data synthesis. PLoS Med. 12: e1001921.
- Kubo, I., M. Kajiya, N. Aramaki, and S. Furutani. 2020. Detection of *Salmonella* Enterica in egg yolk by PCR on a microfluidic disc device using immunomagnetic beads. Sensors 20: 1060.
- Liu, R., Z. Wang, X. Liu, A. Chen, and S. Yang. 2020. Rapid on-site detection of *Salmonella* Pullorum based on lateral flow nucleic acid assay combined with recombinase polymerase amplification reaction. Poult. Sci. 99: 7225–7232.
- Liu, Z., Q. Zhang, N. N. Yang, M. G. Xu, J. F. Xu, M. L. Jing, W. X. Wu, Y. D. Lu, F. Shi, and C. F. Chen. 2019. Rapid and sensitive detection of *Salmonella* in chickens using loop-mediated isothermal amplification combined with a lateral flow dipstick. J. Microbiol. Biotechnol. 29: 454–464.
- Naberhaus, S. A., A. C. Krull, L. K. Bradner, K. M. Harmon, P. Arruda, B. L. Arruda, O. Sahin, E. R. Burrough, K. J. Schwartz, and A. J. Kreuder. 2019. Emergence of *Salmonella enteric* serovar 4,[5],12:i:-as the primary serovar identified from

- swine clinical samples and development of a multiplex real-time PCR for improved *Salmonella* serovar-level identification. *J. Vet. Diagn. Invest.* 31: 818–827.
- Park, S. H., M. Aydin, A. Khaiwara, M. C. Dolan, D. F. Gilmore, J. L. Bouldin, S. Ahn, and S. C. Ricke. 2014. Current and emerging technologies for rapid detection and characterization of *Salmonella* in poultry and poultry products. *Food Microbiol.* 38: 250–262.
- Pradhan, D., and V. D. Negi. 2019. Stress-induced adaptations in *Salmonella*: a ground for shaping its pathogenesis. *Microbiol. Res.* 229: 126311.
- Priya, G. B., R. K. Agrawal, A. A. P. Milton, M. Mishra, S. K. Mendiratta, A. Luke, S. Inbaraj, B. R. Sungh, D. Kumar, G. R. Kumar, and S. Rajkhowa. 2020. Rapid and visual detection of *Salmonella* in meat using invasion A (*invA*) gene-based loop-mediated isothermal amplification assay. *LWT-Food Sci. Technol.* 126: 109262.
- Quick, J., N. D. Grubaugh, S. T. Pullan, I. M. Claro, A. D. Smith, K. Gangavarapu, G. Oliveira, R. Robles-Sikisaka, T. F. Rogers, N. A. Beutler, D. R. Burton, L. L. Lewis-Ximenez, J. G. De Jesus, M. Giovanetti, S. C. Hill, A. Black, T. Bedford, M. W. Carroll, M. Nunes, L. C. Alcantara Jr, E. C. Sabino, S. A. Baylis, N. R. Faria, M. Loose, J. T. Simpson, O. G. Pybus, K. G. Andersen, and N. J. Loman. 2017. Multiplex PCR method for MinION and Illumina sequencing of zika and other virus genomes directly from clinical samples. *Nat. Protoc.* 12: 1261–1276.
- Ren, X., Y. Fu, C. Xu, Z. Feng, M. Li, L. Zhang, J. Zhang, and M. Liao. 2017. High

- resolution melting (HRM) analysis as a new tool for rapid identification of *Salmonella enteric* serovar Gallinarum biovars Pullorum and Gallinarum. Poul. Sci. 96: 1088–1093.
- Sahu, B., S. D. Singh, B. K. Behera, S. K. Panda, A. Das, and P. K. Parida. 2019. Rapid detection of *Salmonella* contamination in seafoods using multiplex PCR. Braz. J. Microbiol. 50: 807–816.
- Shen, H., J. Wen, X. Liao, Q. Lin, J. Zhang, K. Chen, S. Wang, and J. Zhang. 2020. A sensitive, highly specific novel isothermal amplification method based on single-nucleotide polymorphism for the rapid detection of *Salmonella* Pullorum. Front. Microbiol. 11: 560791.
- Soler-García, Á. A., A. J. De Jesús, K. Taylor, and E. W. Brown. 2014. Differentiation of *Salmonella* strains from the SARA, SARB and SARC reference collections by using three genes PCR-RFLP and the 2100 agilent bioanalyzer. Front. Microbiol. 5: 417.
- Tang, L., S. Zhu, E. Mastriani, X. Fang, Y. J. Zhou, Y. G. Li, R. N. Johnston, Z. Guo, G. R. Liu, and S. L. Liu. 2017. Conserved intergenic sequences revealed by CTAG-profiling in *Salmonella*: Thermodynamic modeling for function prediction. Sci. Rep. 7: 43565.
- Thomson, N. R., D. J. Clayton, D. Windhorst, G. Vernikos, S. Davidson, C. Churcher, M. A. Quail, M. Stevens, M. A. Jones, M. Watson, A. Barron, A. Layton, D. Pickard, R. A. Kingsley, A. Bignell, L. Clark, B. Harris, D. Ormongd, Z. Abdellah, K. Brooks, I. Cherevach, T. Chillingworth, J. Woodward, H.

- Norberczak, A. Lord, C. Arrowsmith, K. Jagels, S. Moule, K. Mungall, M. Sanders, S. Whitehead, J. A. Chabalgoity, D. Maskell, T. Humphrey, M. Roberts, P. A. Barrow, G. Dougan, and J. Parkhill. 2008. Comparative genome analysis of *Salmonella* Enteritidis PT4 and *Salmonella* Gallinarum 287/91 provides insights into evolutionary and host adaptation pathways. *Genome Research* 18: 1624–1637.
- Vinayaka, A. C., T. A. Ngo, T. Nguyen, D. D. Bang, and A. Wolff. 2020. Pathogen concentration combined solid-phase PCR on supercritical angle fluorescence microlens array for multiplexed detection of invasive nontyphoidal *Salmonella* serovars. *Anal. Chem.* 92: 2706–2713.
- Wan, J., L. Zheng, L. Kong, Z. Lu, Y. Tao, Z. Feng, H. Lv, F. Meng, and X. Bie. 2021. Development of a rapid detection method for real-time fluorescent quantitative PCR of *Salmonella* spp. and *Salmonella* Enteritidis in ready-to-eat fruits and vegetables. *LWT-Food Sci. Technol.* 149: 111837.
- Wilson, A., E. M. Fox, N. Fegan, and D. Í. Kurtböke. 2019. Comparative genomics and phenotypic investigations into antibiotic, heavy metal, and disinfectant susceptibilities of *Salmonella enterica* strains isolated in Australia. *Front. Microbiol.* 10: 1620.
- Wilwet, L., R. Jeyashakila, B. Sivaraman, B. B. Nayak, H. S. Kumar, A. K. Jaiswar, V. P. Ratrey, and G. Jeyasekaran. 2021. In-house and on-field validation of the multiplex PCR assay developed for authentication of three commercially important shrimp species. *LWT-Food Sci. Technol.* 148: 111701.



- Xiong, D., L. Song, S. Geng, J. Tao, S. An, Z. Pan, and X. Jiao. 2016. One-step PCR detection of *Salmonella* Pullorum/Gallinarum using a novel target: The flagellar biosynthesis gene flhb. *Front.Microbiol.* 7: 863.
- Xiong, D., L. Song, Z. Pan, and X. Jiao. 2018. Identification and discrimination of *Salmonella enteric* serovar Gallinarum biovars Pullorum and Gallinarum based on a one-step multiplex PCR assay. *Front.Microbiol.* 9: 1718.
- Xu, Y., Y. Hu, Y. Guo, Z. Zhou, D. Xiong, C. Meng, Q. Li, S. Geng, Z. Pan, and X. Jiao. 2018. A new PCR assay based on the new gene-SPUL\_2693 for rapid detection of *Salmonella enterica* subsp. Enteric serovar Gallinarum biovars Gallinarum and Pullorum. *Poult. Sci.* 97: 4000–4007.
- Xu, Z., M. Wang, C. Zhou, G. Gu, J. Liang, X. Hou, M. Wang, and P. Wei. 2020. Prevalence and antimicrobial resistance of retail-meat-borne *Salmonella* in southern China during the years 2009-2016: The diversity of contamination and the resistance evolution of multidrug-resistant isolates. *Int. J. Food Microbiol.* 333: 108790.
- Yang, Y., P. Wang, P. Xia, B. Yang, P. Dai, T. Hong, J. Li, X. Meng, S. El Qaidi, and G. Zhu. 2020. Rapid detection of flagellated and non-flagellated *Salmonella* by targeting the common flagellar hook gene flge. *Appl. Microbiol. Biot.* 104: 9719–9732.
- Yang, Y., F. Xu, H. Xu, Z. P. Aguilar, R. Niu, Y. Yuan, J. Sun, X. You, W. Lai, Y. Xiong, C. Wan, and H. Wei. 2013. Magnetic nano-beads based separation combined with propidiummonoazide treatment and multiplex PCR assay for

simultaneous detection of viable *Salmonella* Typhimurium, *Escherichia coli* O157:H7 and *Listeria monocytogenes* in food products. *Food Microbiol.* 34: 418–424.

Zhang, J. F., B. Wei, S. Y. Cha, K. Shang, H. K. Jang, and M. Kang. 2020. The use of embryonic chicken eggs as an alternative model to evaluate the virulence of *Salmonella enterica* serovar Gallinarum. *PLoS One* 15: e0238630.

Zhou, Y., X. Kang, C. Meng, D. Xiong, Y. Xu, S. Geng, Z. Pan, and X. Jiao. 2020. Multiple PCR assay based on the *cigR* gene for detection of *Salmonella* spp. and *Salmonella* Pullorum/Gallinarum identification. *Poult. Sci.* 99: 5991–5998.

## Table and Figure Legends

Table 1. Bacterial strains used in this study and multiplex PCR system results

Table 2. Nucleic acid-based assays for the determination of *S. Pullorum*/Gallinarum

Figure 1. Comparison of the culture method and multiplex PCR for *Salmonella* spp. detection in a fecal sample. Abbreviations: buffered peptone water (**BPW**), selenite cystine (**SC**) broth, tetrathionatebroth base (**TTB**), Rappaport Vassiliadis (**RV**), Rappaport–Vassiliadis Medium (**MM**), *Salmonella–Shigella* (**SS**) Agar, Xylose Lysine Desoxycholate Medium (**XLD**).

Figure 2. Overview of the multiplex PCR assay for the detection of *S. Pullorum*. (A) Intergenic sequence between SPS4\_00301 and SPS4\_00311 and *citE2* gene existing in all *Salmonella enterica* subsp. *enterica* serovars and highly conserved ROD of the *citE2* of *S. Pullorum* among *S. enterica* subsp. *enterica* serovars. The intergenic sequence and *citE2* were applied to design primers, and black arrows show the size of the amplified fragment. (B) Multiplex PCR results using genomic DNA from *Salmonella* strains. M: Takara DL2000 DNA marker (No: 3427A, Takara, Dalian,

China), Lane 1: *S. Pullorum*, Lane 2: *S. Enteritidis*, Lane 3: negative control (sterile DDW).

Figure 3. Effect of PCR and multiplex PCR assays for detecting *S. Pullorum* and *S. Enteritidis*. Lane M: Takara DL2000 DNA marker, Lane 1: *S. Pullorum* with SPS4\_00301–SPS4\_00311 primers, Lane 2: *S. Pullorum* with *citE2* primers, Lane 3: *S. Enteritidis* with *citE2* primers, Lane 4: Two target bacteria with *citE2* primers, Lane 5: negative control (sterile DDW) with mixed primer pairs, Lane 6: *S. Pullorum* with mixed primer pairs, Lane 7: *S. Enteritidis* with mixed primer pairs, and Lane 8: Two target bacteria with mixed primer pairs.

Figure 4. Specificity of a multiplex PCR assay for the detection of *S. Pullorum*. Lane M: Takara DL2000 DNA marker, NC: negative control (sterile DDW), PC: positive control (*S. Pullorum* CVCC 530). All strain details are shown in Table 1.

Figure 5. Limit of detection of multiplex PCR assays for *S. Pullorum*. Lane M: Takara DL2000 DNA marker, Lane 1: negative control (sterile DDW). (A) PCR for the detection of *Salmonella* DNA samples. Lanes 2–9: 62.5 ng/μL, 6.25 ng/μL, 625 pg/μL, 62.5 pg/μL, 6.25 pg/μL, 625 fg/μL, 62.5 fg/μL, and 6.25 fg/μL, respectively. (B) PCR for the detection of *S. Pullorum* cells. Lanes 2–10:  $4 \times 10^6$ ,  $2 \times 10^6$ ,  $1 \times 10^6$ ,  $1 \times 10^5$ ,  $8 \times 10^4$ ,  $4 \times 10^4$ ,  $2 \times 10^4$ ,  $1 \times 10^4$ , and  $5 \times 10^3$  CFU/mL, respectively.

Figure 6. Evaluation of multiplex PCR assay by using artificially contaminated chicken egg samples. (A) *S. Pullorum* and (B) *S. Enteritidis* from (Lane 1)  $10^6$  CFU/mL to (Lane 7)  $10^0$  CFU/mL. (a) 0, (b) 2, (c) 6, (d) 10, and (e) 12 h enrichment. Lane M: Takara DL2000 DNA marker, PC: positive control (*S. Pullorum* CVCC 530 or *S. Enteritidis* ATCC 4931), NT: negative template (sterile DDW).

Figure 7. Multiplex PCR assay for the detection of *S. Pullorum* from chicken anal swab samples. Lane M: Takara DL2000 DNA marker, Lanes 1–69: 69 wild strains of *S. Pullorum* from chicken farms, NC: negative control (*Salmonella*-free).

**Table 1** List of the bacteria strains used in this study and the results of the multiplex

No.	Analyte	Source	Serogroup	the multiplex PCR results (333 bp/257 bp/167 bp) <sup>d</sup>		
				<i>citE2</i>	<i>citE2</i> ROD	SPS4_00301- SPS4_00311
<i>Salmonella</i>						
1	<i>S. Pullorum</i>	CVCC 530 <sup>a</sup>	D	-	+	+
2	<i>S. Pullorum</i>	CVCC 1791	D	-	+	+
3	<i>S. Pullorum</i>	CVCC 1799	D	-	+	+
4	<i>S. Pullorum</i>	CVCC 535	D	-	+	+
5	<i>S. Pullorum</i>	ATCC 9120 <sup>b</sup>	D	-	+	+
6	<i>S. Pullorum</i>	ATCC 9120	D	-	+	+
7	<i>S. Enteritidis</i>	ATCC 4931	D1	+	-	+
8	<i>S. Typhimurium</i>	ATCC 13311	B	+	-	+
9	<i>S. Typhimurium</i>	CMCC50115 <sup>c</sup>	B	+	-	+
10	<i>S. Typhimurium</i>	CVCC541	B	+	-	+
11	<i>S. Paratyphi</i>	Laboratory stock	B	+	-	+
12	<i>S. Kentucky</i>	Laboratory stock	/	+	-	+
13	<i>S. Paratyphoid</i>	Laboratory stock	B	+	-	+
14	<i>S. Heidelberg</i>	Laboratory stock	/	+	-	+
15	<i>S. Enteritidis</i>	ATCC 13076	D	+	-	+
16	<i>S. Choleraesuis</i>	ATCC 10708	D	+	-	+
17	<i>S. Enteritidis</i>	ATCC 4931	D	+	-	+
18	<i>S. Enteritidis</i>	Laboratory stock	D	+	-	+
19	<i>S. Choleraesuis</i>	ATCC 10708	C1	+	-	+
20	<i>S. Dublin</i>	Laboratory stock	D1	+	-	+
21	<i>S. Indiana</i>	ATCC 51959	/	+	-	+
22	<i>S. Oranienburg</i>	ATCC 9239	B	+	-	+
23	<i>S. Hadar</i>	ATCC 51956	E	+	-	+
24	<i>S. Newport</i>	ATCC 6962	C2	+	-	+
25	<i>S. Paratyphi A</i>	ATCC 9150	/	+	-	+
26	<i>S. Madelia</i>	Laboratory stock	/	+	-	+
27	<i>S. Kaapstad</i>	Laboratory stock	/	+	-	+
28	<i>S. Kentucky</i>	Laboratory stock	/	+	-	+
29	<i>S. Dublin</i>	Laboratory stock	/	+	-	+
30	<i>S. Enteritidis</i>	Laboratory stock	/	+	-	+
31	<i>S. Westhampton</i>	ATCC 9712	/	+	-	+
32	<i>S. Saintpaul</i>	ATCC 19430	/	+	-	+
33	<i>S. Typhi</i>	Laboratory stock	D	+	-	+
<i>Non-Salmonella</i>						
1	<i>Escherichia coli</i> O157:H7	Laboratory stock	/	-	-	-
2	<i>Escherichia coli</i> O157:H7	CMCC 44828	/	-	-	-
3	<i>Listeria monocytogenes</i>	ATCC 19111	/	-	-	-

4	<i>Shigella flexneri</i>	ATCC 13932	/	-	-	-
5	<i>Staphylococcus aureus</i>	ATCC 25931	/	-	-	-
6	<i>Aeromonas hydrophila</i>	CMCC 26001	/	-	-	-
7	<i>Bacillus subtilis</i>	ATCC 9372	/	-	-	-
8	<i>Campylobacter jejuni</i>	ATCC 63501	/	-	-	-
9	<i>Pseudomonas aeruginosa</i>	ATCC 27853	/	-	-	-
10	<i>Escherichia coli</i>	CICC 10783	/	-	-	-
11	<i>Staphylococcus aureus</i>	ATCC 6538	/	-	-	-
12	<i>Enterococcus faecalis</i>	ATCC 29212	/	-	-	-
13	<i>Yersinia pseudotuberculosis</i>	ATCC 908	/	-	-	-

<sup>a</sup>CVCC,China Veterinary Culture Collection Center, China;

<sup>b</sup> ATCC,American Type Culture Collection, USA;

<sup>c</sup>CMCC, National Center for Medical Culture Collections, China;

<sup>d</sup> +, positive; -, negative.

**Table 2** List of nucleic acid-based assays for the determination of *S.*

## Pullorum/Gallinarum

Methods	Target	Comment	Linear range	Sensitivity	References
Multiple PCR	<i>S. Pullorum/Gallinarum</i>	<i>cigR</i>	$4 \times 10^5 - 2 \times 10^7$ CFU/mL	$2 \times 10^4$ CFU/mL	Zhou et al. 2020
One-step PCR	<i>S. Pullorum/Gallinarum</i>	<i>flhB</i>	$2 \times 10^6 - 2 \times 10^3$ CFU/mL	$2 \times 10^3$ CFU/mL	Xiong et al. 2016
<i>flgE</i> -PCR	<i>S. Pullorum/Gallinarum</i>	<i>flgE</i>	$10^9 - 10^5$ CFU/mL	$10^5$ CFU/mL	Yang et al. 2020
LFNAA	<i>S. Pullorum</i>	<i>SEEP</i>	$10 - 5 \times 10^{-3}$ ng/uL	$5 \times 10^{-3}$ ng/ uL	Liu et al. 2020
LP-LAMP	<i>S. Pullorum</i>	<i>rfbS</i>	49.2ng/ $\mu$ L-4.92 pg/ $\mu$ L	4.92 pg/ $\mu$ L	Shen et al. 2020
EA-probe	<i>S. Pullorum</i>	<i>rfbS</i>	4.53pg/mL-45.3 ng/ $\mu$ L	4.53 pg/ $\mu$ L	Wen et al. 2021
Multiplex qPCR	<i>S. Pullorum/Gallinarum</i>	<i>pSGP/pSG/pSP</i>	$10^8 - 10^1$ CFU/mL	$10^1$ CFU/mL	Rubio et al. 2017
Multiplex PCR	<i>S. Pullorum/Gallinarum</i>	<i>tcpS</i>	$2 \times 10^7 - 2 \times 10^4$ CFU/mL	$2 \times 10^4$ CFU/mL	Xiong et al. 2017
PCR	<i>S. Pullorum/Gallinarum</i>	<i>ipaJ</i>	$10^{10} - 10^5$ CFU/mL	$10^5$ CFU/mL	Xu et al. 2018a
CACA	<i>S. Pullorum</i>	<i>rfbS</i>	$3.98 \times 10^3 - 3.98$ pg/ $\mu$ L	3.98 pg/ $\mu$ L	Wen et al. 2021
PCR	<i>S. Pullorum</i>	<i>SPUL 2693</i>	$6.24 \times 10^8 - 6 \times 10^3$ CFU/mL	$6 \times 10^3$ CFU/mL	Xu, et al. 2018b
LAMP	<i>S. Gallinarum</i>	<i>sefA</i>	$2 \times 10^8 - 2 \times 10^5$ CFU/mL	$2 \times 10^5$ CFU/mL	Gong et al. 2016
Multiplex PCR	<i>S. Pullorum</i>	<i>citE2</i>	$4 \times 10^6 - 10^4$ CFU/mL	$10^4$ CFU/mL	in this study



Multiplex PCR assay based on the *citE2* gene and intergenic sequence for the rapid detection of *Salmonella* Pullorum in chickens

### **Conflict of Interest Form**

We declare that we have no financial and personal relationships with other people or organizations that can inappropriately influence our work, there is no professional or other personal interest of any nature or kind in any product, service and/or company that could be construed as influencing the position presented in, or the review of the manuscript entitled “Multiplex PCR assay based on the *citE2* gene and intergenic sequence for the rapid detection of *Salmonella* Pullorum in chickens”.

Figure 1




Figure 2




Figure 3




Figure 5




Figure 6




Figure 7

