



Inhibition of Antimicrobial-Resistant *Escherichia coli* Using a Broad Host Range Phage Cocktail Targeting Various Bacterial Phylogenetic Groups

Jinshil Kim^{1,2}, Haejoon Park^{1,2}, Sangryeol Ryu^{1,2*} and Byeonghwa Jeon^{3*}

¹ Department of Food and Animal Biotechnology, Department of Agricultural Biotechnology, and Research Institute for Agriculture and Life Sciences, Seoul National University, Seoul, South Korea, ² Center for Food Bioconvergence, Seoul National University, Seoul, South Korea, ³ Divison of Environmental Health Sciences, School of Public Health, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, MN, United States

OPEN ACCESS

Edited by:

Haifeng Zhao, South China University of Technology, China

Reviewed by:

Mohamed Salah Abbassi, Tunis El Manar University, Tunisia Piklu Roy Chowdhury, iThree Institute, Australia

*Correspondence:

Byeonghwa Jeon bjeon@umn.edu Sangryeol Ryu sangryu@snu.ac.kr

Specialty section:

This article was submitted to Food Microbiology, a section of the journal Frontiers in Microbiology

Received: 23 April 2021 Accepted: 02 August 2021 Published: 25 August 2021

Citation:

Kim J, Park H, Ryu S and Jeon B (2021) Inhibition of Antimicrobial-Resistant Escherichia coli Using a Broad Host Range Phage Cocktail Targeting Various Bacterial Phylogenetic Groups. Front. Microbiol. 12:699630. doi: 10.3389/fmicb.2021.699630 Antimicrobial-resistant (AMR) commensal Escherichia coli is a major reservoir that disseminates antimicrobial resistance to humans through the consumption of contaminated foods, such as retail poultry products. This study aimed to control AMR E. coli on retail chicken using a broad host range phage cocktail. Five phages (JEP1, 4, 6, 7, and 8) were isolated and used to construct a phage cocktail after testing infectivity on 67 AMR E. coli strains isolated from retail chicken. Transmission electron microscopic analysis revealed that the five phages belong to the Myoviridae family. The phage genomes had various sizes ranging from 39 to 170 kb and did not possess any genes associated with antimicrobial resistance and virulence. Interestingly, each phage exhibited different levels of infection against AMR E. coli strains depending on the bacterial phylogenetic group. A phage cocktail consisting of the five phages was able to infect AMR E. coli in various phylogenetic groups and inhibited 91.0% (61/67) of AMR E. coli strains used in this study. Furthermore, the phage cocktail was effective in inhibiting E. coli on chicken at refrigeration temperatures. The treatment of artificially contaminated raw chicken skin with the phage cocktail rapidly reduced the viable counts of AMR E. coli by approximately 3 log units within 3 h, and the reduction was maintained throughout the experiment without developing resistance to phage infection. These results suggest that phages can be used as a biocontrol agent to inhibit AMR commensal E. coli on raw chicken.

Keywords: bacteriophage, cocktail, antimicrobial-resistant Escherichia coli, raw chicken, phage cocktail

INTRODUCTION

Escherichia coli is the most common enteric bacteria inhabiting the gastrointestinal tract of a wide range of animals and humans (Kaper et al., 2004). Due to the ubiquitousness in the intestines, commensal *E. coli* is likely to be exposed to orally ingested antibiotics and develops antimicrobial resistance in food-producing animals and may act as a donor and a recipient

1

of antimicrobial resistance genes (Poirel et al., 2018). Antimicrobial-resistant (AMR) commensal *E. coli* is frequently isolated from food-producing animals and their meat products (Szmolka and Nagy, 2013). Although commensal *E. coli* does not cause AMR infection in humans, AMR commensal *E. coli* is considered a major reservoir for disseminating antimicrobial resistance to humans. For instance, extended-spectrum β lactamases (ESBL)-producing *E. coli* is highly prevalent in retail poultry (Saliu et al., 2017). ESBL are β -lactamase enzymes conferring resistance to all β -lactam drugs except carbapenem and mainly located on conjugative plasmids, enhancing their rapid spread in *E. coli* populations and pathogenic bacterial species in the Enterobacterales order (Rupp and Fey, 2003).

AMR bacteria in food-producing animals can be transmitted to foods during processing and subsequently to humans through the consumption of contaminated foods. According to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC), approximately 1 in 5 AMR infections in the United States are associated with food and animals (CDC, 2013). Since meat and poultry are the major food commodity implicated in 35% of foodborne illnesses in the United States (Painter et al., 2013; Dewey-Mattia et al., 2018), antimicrobial resistance originating from food-producing animals poses a serious public health concern. Particularly, AMR bacteria are frequently isolated from retail raw chickens (do Monte et al., 2017; Schrauwen et al., 2017; Wang et al., 2017). Our previous studies also showed that ESBLproducing E. coli is highly prevalent in retail poultry (Park et al., 2019). In addition, we isolated from retail chicken a pan drugresistant E. coli possessing a plasmid harboring mcr-1, which confers resistance to colistin, one of the last resort antibiotics to treat Gram-negative infections (Liu et al., 2016; Kim et al., 2019).

To mitigate the public health risk of antimicrobial resistance, it is important to control the sources that are involved in the spread of antimicrobial resistance. Especially, AMR commensal E. coli in chickens is an important target to control because it is highly prevalent and capable of transferring antimicrobial resistance to pathogenic bacteria, such as pathogenic E. coli and Salmonella (Nhung et al., 2017). Among non-antibiotic-based intervention measures for the control of AMR commensal E. coli, bacteriophages (phages) are considered an ideal antimicrobial alternative because phages specifically infect only target bacteria with completely different antimicrobial mechanisms from those of existing antibiotics (Sulakvelidze et al., 2001; Skurnik and Strauch, 2006; Endersen et al., 2014). Whereas antibiotics affect bacteria other than pathogens, moreover, phages can selectively infect only the target bacteria (Altamirano and Barr, 2019; Nogueira et al., 2019). However, the strict host specificity of phage infection is rather a disadvantage because the host range is generally too narrow to inhibit bacteria with wide genetic diversity (Bert et al., 2010; Talukdar et al., 2013; Park et al., 2019). To overcome the limitations, phages are generally used in a cocktail by mixing phages capable of infecting a range of different hosts (Nilsson, 2014). In this study, we isolated phages that preferentially infect the major phylogenetic groups of E. coli isolates from retail chickens and developed a phage cocktail that effectively inhibited AMR E. coli on chicken carcasses.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Phage Isolation and Stock Preparation

Sixty-seven AMR E. coli strains (E1-E67) were isolated from retail raw chicken in our previous study (Park et al., 2019). The AMR E. coli strains and E. coli MG1655 were routinely cultured at 37°C in Luria-Bertani (LB) media (Difco, United States). Phages were isolated from food (retail chicken and duck carcasses), sewage, and animal (chicken and pig) feces as described previously (Kim and Ryu, 2011). Briefly, the samples were homogenized by vortexing in sodium chloride-magnesium sulfate (SM) buffer (100 mM NaCl, 8 mM MgSO4^{.7}H₂O, and 50 mM Tris HCl, pH 7.5). After centrifugation at 10,000 \times g for 5 min, the supernatant was filtered through a 0.22 μ m pore sized filter (Millipore, United States). Five milliliters of filtered samples were mixed with the equal volume of $2 \times LB$ broth and 100 µl overnight culture of the AMR E. coli strains. After incubation at 37°C overnight, the culture was centrifuged and filter-sterilized. To confirm the presence of phages, supernatants were serially diluted and spotted on 0.4% LB soft top agar containing an overnight culture of AMR E. coli strains. After incubation at 37°C overnight, a single plaque was picked and eluted with 1 ml SM buffer. This step was repeated at least three times for each plaque.

To propagate phages, the incubation time was determined based on the lysis activity of each phage. The purified lysate was added to the culture of exponentially grown propagation host strains (JEP1: E. coli MG1655, JEP4: E. coli E15, JEP6: E. coli E55), and the mixture was incubated at 37°C for 4 h (JEP1, 4, and 6) in LB broth. Also, the purified lysates of JEP7 and JEP8 were incubated with the overnight culture of propagation host strains (JEP7: E. coli E61, JEP8: E. coli E63) overnight in LB broth. Phage propagation was performed with three different culture volumes (4, 40, and 250 ml LB broth), and then the culture was centrifuged and filtered. Phage particles were precipitated by mixing with polyethylene glycol (PEG) 6000 (Junsei Chemical Co. Ltd., Japan) and 1 M NaCl. Finally, CsCl density gradient ultracentrifugation (Himac CP 100b, Hitachi, Japan) with CsCl step densities (1.3, 1.45, 1.5, and 1.7 g/ml) at 78,500 \times g was conducted at 4°C for 2 h. After centrifugation, a blue band of viral particles was collected and dialyzed twice for 1 h in 1 L of SM buffer. The concentrated phage stocks were stored at 4°C until used.

Determination of Phage Host Range

A total of 67 strains of AMR *E. coli* were used to assess the host ranges of eight phage infections. Each strain was incubated at 37° C overnight with shaking (200 rpm), and then 100 µl of each bacterial culture was added to 5 ml of 0.4% LB soft agar and mixed. The mixture was overlaid on a 1.5% LB agar plate and dried at room temperature for 20 min. Subsequently, 10-fold serially diluted by SM buffer of each phage lysates were spotted onto a prepared bacterial lawn and incubated at 37° C for 12 h. After incubation, the formation of single plaques was recorded to determine the phage sensitivity of each strain. The efficiency of phage infection of each strain was compared to that of the host strain.

Transmission Electron Microscopy Analysis

The CsCl-purified phages were morphologically characterized with transmission electron microscopy (TEM) analysis. Briefly, 10 μ l of purified phage (ca. 1 \times 10¹⁰ PFU/ml) was placed on carbon-coated formvar/copper grids (200 mesh) and negatively stained with 2% aqueous uranyl acetate (pH 4.0) for 10 s. The phages were observed with energy-filtering TEM (LIBRA 120, Carl Zeiss, Germany) at 120-kV accelerating voltage at the National Instrumentation Center for Environmental Management (Seoul, South Korea). The phages were identified and classified using the International Committee on Taxonomy of Viruses (ICTV) classification (King et al., 2011).

DNA Purification and Whole-Genome Sequencing of Phages

To extract genomic DNA from phages, bacterial nucleic acids were removed by DNase I and RNase A (1 µg/ml each) at room temperature for 30 min. The virions were then lysed by incubating with a mixture [final concentration of 50 µg/ml proteinase K, 20 mM ethylenediaminetetraacetic acid (EDTA), 0.5% sodium dodecyl sulfate (SDS)] at 56°C for 1 h. After lysis, DNA was purified by phenol-chloroform extraction and precipitated by ethanol. The library was constructed with the Illumina TruSeq DNA library prep kit using purified genomic phage DNA. It was sequenced using the Illumina Miseq platform (300 bp paired ended) and assembled with GS de novo assembler software (Roche, Switzerland) at Sanigen Inc., South Korea. Prediction of open reading frames (ORFs) was performed using the combination of Glimmer3 and GeneMarkS2 software. The complete genome sequences of JEP1, 4, 6, 7, and 8 were deposited in GenBank with the accession numbers of MT740314, MT740315, MT764206, MT764207, and MT764208, respectively. The presence of genes associated with antimicrobial resistance and virulence in the phage genomes was examined with ResFinder 4.1¹ and VirulenceFider 2.0², respectively.

Phylogenetic Analysis of Phages

Phylogenetic analysis of the five phages was performed in comparison with sixty *E. coli* phages in the *Myoviridae* family, which were reported in a previous study (Korf et al., 2019) using VICTOR³ that performs based on genome-BLAST Distance phylogeny (GBDP) method. The phage sequences were obtained through the NCBI nucleotide databases⁴. All pairwise comparisons of the amino acid sequences were conducted using the GBDP method (Meier-Kolthoff et al., 2013) under the settings recommended for prokaryotic viruses (Meier-Kolthoff and Göker, 2017). The resulting intergenomic distances were used to infer a balanced minimum evolution tree with branch support via FASTME including SPR postprocessing for formulas D4 (Lefort et al., 2015). The branch support was inferred from

100 pseudo-bootstrap replicates each. Trees were rooted at the midpoint (Farris, 1972) and visualized with FigTree (Rambaut, 2006). The taxon boundaries at the species, genus, and family levels were estimated with the OPTSIL program (Göker et al., 2009) using the recommended clustering thresholds (Meier-Kolthoff and Göker, 2017) and an F value (fraction of links required for cluster fusion) of 0.5 (Meier-Kolthoff et al., 2014).

Phage Inhibition Assays

The infection efficiency of the phage cocktail was evaluated with mixed cultures of E. coli strains which were randomly selected from the major phylogenetic groups (A, B1, B2, and D), including mixed culture 1 (E20, E41, E55, and E59), mixed culture 2 (E3, E43, E55, and E59), mixed culture 3 (E17, E41, E52, and E59), and mixed culture 4 (E20, E45, E52, and E59). The each strain was incubated at 37°C with shaking (200 rpm) overnight. The mixed culture of the *E. coli* strains was prepared by transferring 1% (v/v) of each strain to fresh LB broth. Then, a single phage or the phage cocktail was added to the bacterial suspension at a multiplicity of infection (MOI) of 1. The optical density at 600 nm (OD₆₀₀) was measured with the SpectraMax i3 multimode microplate reader (Molecular Devices, Sunnyvale, CA, United States) for 12 h. The infection assay was also performed at 4 and 25°C. After cultivation to an OD_{600} of 0.5, the mixed culture of AMR E. coli strains (E20, E41, E55, and E59) was diluted in LB broth and added to 4 ml of LB broth at 10⁵ CFU/ml. The infection was initiated by adding the 10 μ l phage cocktail (approximately 10^8 PFU/ml; MOI 10^3), and the SM buffer was used as a control. The cultures were incubated with shaking (200 rpm) at food storage and handling temperatures (4 and 25°C), and samples were taken at 3, 6, and 24 h postinfection for bacterial counting. Viable counts were determined by 10-fold serial dilution in PBS and plating on LB agar plates.

Inhibition of AMR *E. coli* on Raw Chicken Skin by Phage Cocktail

Raw chicken skin samples were purchased from retail stores, and the skin was cut into a 2 cm \times 2 cm square with a sterilized razor. For decontamination, the chicken skin samples were immersed in 70% ethanol overnight and UV-treated on both sides for 30 min in a biosafety cabinet. Mixed culture 1 (E20, E41, E55, and E59), which was used in the phage inhibition assay, was prepared as mentioned above and diluted to 8×10^6 CFU/ml in PBS. Then 50 µl of the mixed culture of the E. coli strains was spotted onto a 2 cm \times 2 cm chicken skin to achieve the final inoculum level of approximately 5 log CFU/cm² on a chicken skin sample. The same volume of PBS was added as a negative control. Samples were dried in a biosafety cabinet for 30 min. Then 100 µl of the phage cocktail (MOI = 10^3) or SM buffer (control) were spotted onto chicken skin samples and incubated at 4 and 25°C. At 3, 6, and 12 h of incubation, each sample was mixed with 10 ml 0.1% buffered peptone water (BPW) and vortexed for 2 min in a 50 ml tube. After removal of the chicken skin, the mixture was centrifuged at 10,000 \times g for 5 min, and pellets were resuspended with 10 ml of BPW. Viable counts were determined by 10-fold serial dilution in PBS and plating on LB agar plates.

¹https://cge.cbs.dtu.dk/services/ResFinder/

²https://cge.cbs.dtu.dk/services/VirulenceFinder/

³https://victor.dsmz.de

⁴http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/nuccore

RESULTS

Determination of the Host Range of Phages Infecting AMR *E. coli* Isolates From Raw Chicken

A total of eight E. coli phages were isolated from meat, sewage, and animal fecal samples (Table 1 and Supplementary Table 1) and used in phage infection assays with 67 AMR E. coli isolates from retail chicken (Figure 1A and Supplementary Tables 2, 3). Among the eight E. coli phages, five phages (JEP1, 4, 6, 7, and 8) were selected for the construction of a cocktail mainly because of their host range (Figure 1A and Table 2). Importantly, the design to construct a phage cocktail was mainly based on the differential infection frequencies depending on the phylogenetic group of E. coli (Figure 1B). For instance, JEP4 phage infected 73.7% (28/38) of AMR E. coli strains in phylogroup A, whereas JEP1 and JEP7 phages effectively infected the strains in phylogroups B1 [69.3% (9/13) and 76.9% (10/13), respectively] (Figure 1 and Table 2). The three phages (JEP1, JEP4, and JEP7) showed similar inhibition frequencies against E. coli strains in phylogenetic group D (Figure 1 and Table 2). A cocktail was constructed to target various phylogenetic groups of E. coli based on the infection pattern dependent on the phylogenetic group. E. coli isolates in phylogenetic groups A, B1, B2, and D could be inhibited by JEP4, JEP1 & 7, JEP6, and JEP1, 4 & 7, respectively (Figure 1B and Table 2). In addition, JEP8 was included in the cocktail to inhibit E. coli isolates in the minor phylogenetic groups (i.e., E and F) (Figure 1B and Table 2). The cocktail consisting of the five phages infected 91.0% (61/67) of AMR *E. coli* strains isolated from retail chicken (Figure 1 and Table 2).

Characterization of the Five *E. coli* Phages

The morphology and genome sequences of JEP1, 4, 6, 7, and 8 phages were analyzed. Based on the TEM analysis, the five phages exhibited the typical morphological features of the *Myoviridae* family, such as a big head and an inflexible/contractile tail (**Figure 2A** and **Table 1**). The phages had various genome sizes ranging from 39 kb (JEP4) to 170 kb (JEP6) (**Table 1**), and genes associated with antimicrobial resistance and virulence were not found in the phage genomes (data not shown). The phylogenetic association of the five phages was analyzed with previously reported *E. coli* phages in the *Myoviridae* family

(Korf et al., 2019). JEP1 & JEP4 and JEP6 & JEP8 belonged to the same genus clusters, and JEP7 belonged to a different genus cluster (**Figure 2B**). At the species level, the five phages were clustered into different groups, indicating that the five phages are phylogenetically distinct from each other.

Inhibition of AMR *E. coli* With the Phage Cocktail

Mixed cultures of AMR E. coli strains were treated with the phage cocktail to evaluate infection efficiency because retail raw chicken is normally contaminated by multiple strains, not a single. E. coli strains were randomly selected from the major phylogenetic groups A, B1, B2, and D, combined in a single culture, and treated with each single phage or the phage cocktail. The treatment of mixed cultures with single phages did not, or only marginally, reduce the growth of mixed cultures of E. coli. However, the phage cocktail substantially inhibited the growth of the mixed cultures (Figure 3). In mixed cultures 2 (Figures 3B) and 4 (Figure 3D), for instance, single phages did not cause any growth reduction compared to the non-treated negative control, whereas the phage cocktail markedly reduced the growth of E. coli strains in mixed cultures. These results indicated the phage cocktail was effective at simultaneously inhibiting multiple strains of E. coli belonging to different phylogenetic groups.

Because raw chicken products are preserved normally at refrigeration temperatures and sometimes exposed to room temperatures during handling, we evaluated the infection frequency at 4 and 25°C. At 25°C, the treatment with the phage cocktail significantly reduced the level of AMR E. coli strains at the beginning of infection (approximately 0.35 log CFU/ml after 6 h; P = 0.0378), but further incubation did not make a difference in the viable counts of E. coli compared to the non-treated control (Figure 4A). However, the level of AMR E. coli was significantly reduced at 4°C within a few hours, and the reduction was maintained during the entire course of the experiment (Figure 4B). We examined the inhibition efficiency of the phage cocktail on raw chicken skin. To mimic the situation of food contamination, raw chicken skin was artificially contaminated with the mixed culture of AMR E. coli strains. Compared to LB media (Figures 4A,B), interestingly, the phage cocktail reduced AMR E. coli more significantly on chicken skin at both 4 and 25°C (Figures 4C,D). When raw chicken

274

71

272

Phage	Isolation source	Morphologica	l features (nm; n = 3)	Genomic features				
		Head	Tail	Size (bp)	GC (%)	ORF ^a	tF	
JEP1	Retail chicken	79.6 ± 1.9	101.0 ± 3.8	143,610	43.54	223		
JEP4	Chicken feces	106.3 ± 5.5	102.9 ± 2.6	39,195	47.05	61		

 110.3 ± 2.3

 95.2 ± 2.4

 95.9 ± 3.5

TABLE 1 | Morphological and genomic features of the five phages used in the cocktail.

 109.1 ± 1.7

 103.9 ± 5.2

 96.1 ± 2.5

^aOpen reading frame.

JEP6

JEP7

JEP8

Pig feces

Retail duck

Retail chicken

170,340

52,936

165,295

35.31

45.94

40.47

tRNA

5

0

7

0

0

Accession No.

MT740314

MT740315

MT764206

MT764207

MT764208

Frontiers in Microbiology | www.frontiersin.org

skin samples were treated with the phage cocktail at an MOI of 10³ at 25°C, the mixed culture of AMR E. coli strains was rapidly reduced by 2.19 log CFU/cm² and 2.58 log CFU/cm² after 3 h and 6 h, respectively (Figure 4C). After that, the mixed culture of AMR E. coli strains continued to grow on chicken skin (Figure 4C). At 4°C, however, the treatment of raw chicken skin with the phage cocktail significantly reduced the level of AMR E. coli strains within 3 h and continued to reduce the viable counts of AMR E. coli by 3.17 CFU/cm² and 3.28 log CFU/cm² after 6 and 24 h, respectively (Figure 4D). The results showed that the phage cocktail is highly effective

in inhibiting AMR E. coli on chicken carcasses especially at refrigeration temperatures.

DISCUSSION

Since bacteria develop phage resistance rapidly (Labrie et al., 2010), phages are normally treated in a cocktail using those that recognize different host receptors (Tanji et al., 2004; Gu et al., 2012; Yen et al., 2017). This is because, if bacteria develop resistance to one phage, another phage in the cocktail, which

FUNCTIONS A B1 B2 D E <	CIP KAN Sesistance CIP CIP KAN CIP CIP KAN CIP KAN CIP KAN CIP KAN CIP KAN CIP KAN CIP KAN CIP KAN CIP CIP CIP CIP CIP CIP CIP CIP CIP CIP						
B JEP1*** JEP4*** JEP6 ^{ns} JEP7** JEP8 ^{ns} JEP1 ^{**} JEP1	Phylogroup		A		B1 B2	2 D E FU	
B JEP1 ^{***} A (n=38) ^{***} B1 (n=13) ^{***} B2 (n=4) ^{***} B2 (n=4) ^{***} B2 (n=4) ^{***} B1 (n=13) ^{***} B2 (n=4) ^{***}							
FIGURE 1 Host range of the five phages. (A) The phage infection of 67 strains of AMR <i>E. coli</i> isolated from retail chicken. The antimicrobial resistance patter he <i>E. coli</i> strains and the infectivity of five phages are indicated. CIP, ciprofloxacin; KAN, kanamycin; GEN, gentamicin; CHL, chloramphenicol; STR, streptom; TET, tetracycline; CTX, cefotaxime; AMP, amplcillin; and phylogroup U, Unknown. (B) Association of the phylogenetic groups of AMR <i>E. coli</i> with the infection	В	_ JEP1***	JEP4***	JEP6 ^{ns}	JEP7**	JEP8 ^{ns}	
FIGURE 1 Host range of the five phages. (A) The phage infection of 67 strains of AMR <i>E. coli</i> isolated from retail chicken. The antimicrobial resistance patter he <i>E. coli</i> strains and the infectivity of five phages are indicated. CIP, ciprofloxacin; KAN, kanamycin; GEN, gentamicin; CHL, chloramphenicol; STR, streptom [ET, tetracycline; CTX, cefotaxime; AMP, ampicillin; and phylogroup U, Unknown. (B) Association of the phylogenetic groups of AMR <i>E. coli</i> with the infection	***A (r	n=38)					
FIGURE 1 Host range of the five phages. (A) The phage infection of 67 strains of AMR <i>E. coli</i> isolated from retail chicken. The antimicrobial resistance patter he <i>E. coli</i> strains and the infectivity of five phages are indicated. CIP, ciprofloxacin; KAN, kanamycin; GEN, gentamicin; CHL, chloramphenicol; STR, streptom [ET, tetracycline; CTX, cefotaxime; AMP, ampicillin; and phylogroup U, Unknown. (B) Association of the phylogenetic groups of AMR <i>E. coli</i> with the infection	** B1 (r	n=13)				•	
Figure 1 Host range of the five phages. (A) The phage infection of 67 strains of AMR <i>E. coli</i> isolated from retail chicken. The antimicrobial resistance patter he <i>E. coli</i> strains and the infectivity of five phages are indicated. CIP, ciprofloxacin; KAN, kanamycin; GEN, gentamicin; CHL, chloramphenicol; STR, streptom; TET, tetracycline; CTX, cefotaxime; AMP, ampicillin; and phylogroup U, Unknown. (B) Association of the phylogenetic groups of AMR <i>E. coli</i> with the infection	dn * B2	(n=4)					
Figure 1 Host range of the five phages. (A) The phage infection of 67 strains of AMR <i>E. coli</i> isolated from retail chicken. The antimicrobial resistance patter he <i>E. coli</i> strains and the infectivity of five phages are indicated. CIP, ciprofloxacin; KAN, kanamycin; GEN, gentamicin; CHL, chloramphenicol; STR, streptom [ET, tetracycline; CTX, cefotaxime; AMP, ampicillin; and phylogroup U, Unknown. (B) Association of the phylogenetic groups of AMR <i>E. coli</i> with the infection	D SD SD	(n=4)					
Figure 1 Host range of the five phages. (A) The phage infection of 67 strains of AMR <i>E. coli</i> isolated from retail chicken. The antimicrobial resistance patter he <i>E. coli</i> strains and the infectivity of five phages are indicated. CIP, ciprofloxacin; KAN, kanamycin; GEN, gentamicin; CHL, chloramphenicol; STR, streptom; TET, tetracycline; CTX, cefotaxime; AMP, ampicillin; and phylogroup U, Unknown. (B) Association of the phylogenetic groups of AMR <i>E. coli</i> with the infection	jz u₂E	(n=6)					
FIGURE 1 Host range of the five phages. (A) The phage infection of 67 strains of AMR <i>E. coli</i> isolated from retail chicken. The antimicrobial resistance patter he <i>E. coli</i> strains and the infectivity of five phages are indicated. CIP, ciprofloxacin; KAN, kanamycin; GEN, gentamicin; CHL, chloramphenicol; STR, streptom; TET, tetracycline; CTX, cefotaxime; AMP, ampicillin; and phylogroup U, Unknown. (B) Association of the phylogenetic groups of AMR <i>E. coli</i> with the infection	۵ ^{ns} F	(n=1)					
 50 100 50 100 50 100 50 100 50 100 50 100 50 100 50 100 50 100 50 100 50 100 50 100 FIGURE 1 Host range of the five phages. (A) The phage infection of 67 strains of AMR <i>E. coli</i> isolated from retail chicken. The antimicrobial resistance patter he <i>E. coli</i> strains and the infectivity of five phages are indicated. CIP, ciprofloxacin; KAN, kanamycin; GEN, gentamicin; CHL, chloramphenicol; STR, streptom [ET, tetracycline; CTX, cefotaxime; AMP, ampicillin; and phylogroup U, Unknown. (B) Association of the phylogenetic groups of AMR <i>E. coli</i> with the infection 	^{ns} U	(n=1)	_				
Infection (%) FIGURE 1 Host range of the five phages. (A) The phage infection of 67 strains of AMR <i>E. coli</i> isolated from retail chicken. The antimicrobial resistance patter he <i>E. coli</i> strains and the infectivity of five phages are indicated. CIP, ciprofloxacin; KAN, kanamycin; GEN, gentamicin; CHL, chloramphenicol; STR, streptom; TET, tetracycline; CTX, cefotaxime; AMP, ampicillin; and phylogroup U, Unknown. (B) Association of the phylogenetic groups of AMR <i>E. coli</i> with the infection		0 50 1	00 0 50 100	0 50 100	0 50 100	0 50 100	
FIGURE 1 Host range of the five phages. (A) The phage infection of 67 strains of AMR <i>E. coli</i> isolated from retail chicken. The antimicrobial resistance patter he <i>E. coli</i> strains and the infectivity of five phages are indicated. CIP, ciprofloxacin; KAN, kanamycin; GEN, gentamicin; CHL, chloramphenicol; STR, streptom retracycline; CTX, cefotaxime; AMP, ampicillin; and phylogroup U, Unknown. (B) Association of the phylogenetic groups of AMR <i>E. coli</i> with the infection				Infection (%)			
TET, tetracycline; CTX, cefotaxime; AMP, ampicillin; and phylogroup U, Unknown. (B) Association of the phylogenetic groups of AMR E. coli with the infection	FIGURE 1 Host range of the five the <i>E. coli</i> strains and the infectivi	e phages. (A) The phag ty of five phages are inc	e infection of 67 strains dicated. CIP, ciprofloxaci	of AMR <i>E. coli</i> isolateo n; KAN, kanamycin; G	d from retail chicken. EN, gentamicin; CH	The antimicrobial resista L, chloramphenicol; STF	ance pattern R, streptomy
	TET, tetracycline; CTX, cefotaxim	e; AMP, ampicillin; and	phylogroup U, Unknown	. (B) Association of th	e phylogenetic group	os of AMR <i>E. coli</i> with th	e infection

(*P < 0.05; **P < 0.01; ***P < 0.001; ns, not significant).TABLE 2 | Infection frequencies of the five phages used in the cocktail.

	A (n = 38)	B1 (<i>n</i> = 13)	B2 (n = 4)	D (n = 4)	E (<i>n</i> = 6)	F (<i>n</i> = 1)	U ^a (<i>n</i> = 1)	
JEP1	3 (7.9%)	9 (69.3%)	0 (0.0%)	3 (75.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	15 (22.4%)
JEP4	28 (73.7%)	1(7.7%)	0 (0.0%)	3 (75.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	32 (47.8%)
JEP6	11 (28.9%)	3 (23.1%)	3 (75.0%)	2 (50.0%)	3 (50.0%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (100.0%)	23 (34.3%)
JEP7	8 (21.1%)	10 (76.9%)	0 (0.0%)	3 (75.0%)	2 (33.3%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	23 (34.3%)
JEP8	7 (18.4%)	2 (15.4%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	3 (50.0%)	1 (100.0%)	0 (0.0%)	13 (19.4%)
Total	34 (89.5%)	12 (92.3%)	3 (75.0%)	4 (100.0%)	6 (100.0%)	1 (100.0%)	1 (100.0%)	61 (91.0%)
o .								

Phylogenetic group of ESBL-producing E. coli

^aunknown.

Phage

AI

Strain no. JEP 7 IEP JEF

JEP 1

Total (n = 67)



FIGURE 2 | The morphological and genomic features of phages. (A) Transmission electron microscopy (TEM) images of the five phages. (B) Phylogenetic analysis showing the relationship between the five phages and 60 *Myoviridae* family phages that were reported in a previous study (Korf et al., 2019).



recognizes a different receptor, still can infect the bacteria. However, the identification of the host receptor of a phage requires a series of experiments involving mutagenesis, which is often labor-intensive and time-consuming. Without identifying the host receptors of E. coli phages, in this study, we constructed a phage cocktail that can effectively infect E. coli isolates from retail chicken using phages that preferentially infect the major phylogenetic groups of E. coli. The Clermont phylotyping classifies E. coli into four major (A, B1, B2, and D) and two minor groups (E and F) (Clermont et al., 2013). The phylogenetic group of E. coli is related to certain pathotypes and the host origin. For instance, phylogroups A and B2 normally predominate in human strains, while E. coli isolates from chicken mostly belong to phylogroups A and B1 (Unno et al., 2009; Kluytmans et al., 2012; Xu et al., 2014; Coura et al., 2015). Consistently, in our previous study, AMR E. coli strains isolated from retail chicken dominantly belonged to phylogroups A and B1 (Park et al., 2019). In the cocktail, we included three phages (JEP1, JEP4, and JEP7) that infected the major phylogenetic groups of E. coli isolates from chicken (i.e., A and B1) (Figure 1B and Table 2), and the phage cocktail infected 91.0% of the tested AMR E. coli strains (Figure 1A and Table 2). The same approach can be used to construct phage cocktails to target other pathogenic bacteria demonstrating unique phylogenetic features. For example, extraintestinal pathogenic E. coli (ExPEC) predominates phylogroups B2 and D (Picard et al., 1999; Cortés et al., 2010). Based on this, cocktails can

be constructed using *E. coli* phages that preferentially infect phylogroups B2 and D.

The association of phage infectivity with the phylogenetic group of E. coli may be related to the prevalence of phage receptors. Phages initiate infection by binding to host receptors on the bacterial surface. Phage receptors in E. coli, which have been reported thus far, include the ferrichrome outer membrane transporter FhuA (Raya et al., 2011), the major outer membrane protein OmpC (Morita et al., 2002), surface glycoconjugates (Kudva et al., 1999), and the O antigen of lipopolysaccharide (LPS) (Perry et al., 2009). Bacteria often develop phage resistance by hindering this critical step of infection using various mechanisms, such as the alteration of phage receptors through spontaneous mutations (Uhl and Miller, 1996), the removal of receptor genes by an insertion sequence (Kim and Ryu, 2011), and the interruption of phage access to host receptors (Kim and Ryu, 2012). The prevalence of host receptors can be related to the phylogenetic group of E. coli because the distribution of genes encoding outer membrane proteins, fimbriae, or capsular proteins is different depending on the phylogenetic group (Johnson et al., 2002). Also, the phylogenetic group of E. coli is related to the type of the core oligosaccharide of LPS, a common host receptor for phage infection (Amor et al., 2000; Dissanayake et al., 2008). At this stage, further studies are required to examine this possibility.

Phages have been used for the control of foodborne pathogenic bacteria on chicken carcasses. A previous study demonstrated



< 0.05; **P < 0.01; ***P < 0.001).

that the treatment with a phage cocktail significantly reduced the number of Listeria monocytogenes on chicken carcasses (Cufaoglu and Ayaz, 2019). Atterbury et al. reported that Campylobacter jejuni phages effectively infected C. jejuni on chicken skin at 4°C (Atterbury et al., 2003). The results in this study showed that phages effectively inhibited E. coli on chicken skin particularly at 4°C (Figures 4C, and D). For the control of bacterial contamination of food, temperatures are an important factor affecting the efficacy of phage infection (Seeley and Primrose, 1980; Tokman et al., 2016). The increased efficacy of phage infection at refrigeration temperatures is probably because low temperatures may reduce the emergence of phageresistant bacteria due to the reduced growth rate of E. coli at 4°C compared to 25°C and the limited function of the restrictionmodification systems involved in the degradation of phage DNA injected into the host (Dodds et al., 1987; Kim et al., 2012). Additionally, the temperature is a critical environmental factor that determines the viability of phages. Since phages stored at 4° C are more stable than those stored at $\geq 10^{\circ}$ C (Olson et al., 2004), differential phage sensitivity at different temperatures may also affect phage infectivity at 4°C even though the phages were tested at refrigeration temperatures relatively for a short time (24 h) in this study. Regardless of the underlying molecular mechanisms, the increased lytic activity of the phage cocktail on foods (i.e., chicken) at low temperatures may enable the phages to inhibit AMR *E. coli* on raw chicken effectively because raw chicken products are distributed in the cold chain. Given this, the broad host range phage cocktail in this study can be used to control AMR commensal *E. coli* on retail chicken products. To achieve practical application of phages to food, additionally, further studies are needed to develop methods to make phages maintain their infectivity long enough in the food supply chain.

DATA AVAILABILITY STATEMENT

The datasets presented in this study can be found in online repositories. The names of the repository/repositories and accession number(s) can be found below: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/genbank/, MT740314; https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/genbank/, MT764206; https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/genbank/, MT 764207; and https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/genbank/, MT764208.

AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS

JK, SR, and BJ designed the study, analyzed the data, and reviewed the manuscript. JK and HP performed the experiments.

JK and BJ wrote the manuscript. All authors contributed to the article and approved the submitted version.

FUNDING

JK and HP were supported by the BK21 Plus Program of the Department of Agricultural Biotechnology, Seoul National University, Seoul, South Korea. BJ was supported

REFERENCES

- Altamirano, F. L. G., and Barr, J. J. (2019). Phage therapy in the postantibiotic era. *Clin. Microbiol. Rev.* 32:e00066–18. doi: 10.1128/cmr.00066-18
- Amor, K., Heinrichs, D. E., Frirdich, E., Ziebell, K., Johnson, R. P., and Whitfield, C.
 (2000). Distribution of core oligosaccharide types in lipopolysaccharides from *Escherichia coli. Infect. Immun.* 68, 1116–1124. doi: 10.1128/iai.68.3.1116-1124.
 2000
- Atterbury, R. J., Connerton, P. L., Dodd, C. E., Rees, C. E., and Connerton, I. F. (2003). Application of host-specific bacteriophages to the surface of chicken skin leads to a reduction in recovery of *Campylobacter jejuni*. *Appl. Environ. Microbiol.* 69, 6302–6306. doi: 10.1128/aem.69.10.6302-6306.2003
- Bert, F., Johnson, J. R., Ouattara, B., Leflon-Guibout, V., Johnston, B., Marcon, E., et al. (2010). Genetic diversity and virulence profiles of *Escherichia coli* isolates causing spontaneous bacterial peritonitis and bacteremia in patients with cirrhosis. J. Clin. Microbiol. 48, 2709–2714. doi: 10.1128/jcm.00 516-10

CDC (2013). Antibiotic Resistance Threats In The United States. Atlanta, GA: CDC.

- Clermont, O., Christenson, J. K., Denamur, E., and Gordon, D. M. (2013). The Clermont *Escherichia coli* phylo-typing method revisited: improvement of specificity and detection of new phylo-groups. *Environ. Microbiol. Rep.* 5, 58–65. doi: 10.1111/1758-2229.12019
- Cortés, P., Blanc, V., Mora, A., Dahbi, G., Blanco, J. E., Blanco, M., et al. (2010). Isolation and characterization of potentially pathogenic antimicrobial-resistant *Escherichia coli* strains from chicken and pig farms in Spain. *Appl. Environ. Microbiol.* 76, 2799–2805. doi: 10.1128/aem.02421-09
- Coura, F. M., Diniz, S. D. A., Silva, M. X., Mussi, J. M. S., Barbosa, S. M., Lage, A. P., et al. (2015). Phylogenetic group determination of *Escherichia coli* isolated from animals samples. *Sci. World J.* 2015, 258424–258424. doi: 10.1155/2015/258424
- Cufaoglu, G., and Ayaz, N. D. (2019). Listeria monocytogenes risk associated with chicken at slaughter and biocontrol with three new bacteriophages. J. Food Saf. 39:e12621. doi: 10.1111/jfs.12621
- Dewey-Mattia, D., Manikonda, K., Hall, A. J., Wise, M. E., and Crowe, S. J. (2018). Surveillance for foodborne disease outbreaks—United States, 2009– 2015. MMWR CDC Surveill. Summ. 67:1. doi: 10.15585/mmwr.ss6710a1
- Dissanayake, D., Wijewardana, T., Gunawardena, G., and Poxton, I. (2008). Distribution of lipopolysaccharide core types among avian pathogenic *Escherichia coli* in relation to the major phylogenetic groups. *Vet. Microbiol.* 132, 355–363. doi: 10.1016/j.vetmic.2008.05.024
- do Monte, D. F., Fernandes, M. R., Cerdeira, L., Esposito, F., Galvão, J. A., Franco, B. D., et al. (2017). Chicken meat as reservoir of colistin-resistant *Escherichia coli* carrying *mcr-1* genes in South America. *Antimicrob. Agents Chemother.* 61:e02718–16. doi: 10.1128/aac.02718-16
- Dodds, K. L., Perry, M. B., and Mcdonald, I. J. (1987). Alterations in lipopolysaccharide produced by chemostat-grown *Escherichia coli* O157: H7 as a function of growth rate and growth-limiting nutrient. *Can. J. Microbiol.* 33, 452–458. doi: 10.1139/m87-075
- Endersen, L., O'mahony, J., Hill, C., Ross, R. P., Mcauliffe, O., and Coffey, A. (2014). Phage therapy in the food industry. *Annu. Rev. Food Sci. Technol.* 5, 327–349. doi: 10.1146/annurev-food-030713-092415
- Farris, J. S. (1972). Estimating phylogenetic trees from distance matrices. *Am. Nat.* 106, 645–668. doi: 10.1086/282802
- Göker, M., García-Blázquez, G., Voglmayr, H., Tellería, M. T., and Martín, M. P. (2009). Molecular taxonomy of phytopathogenic fungi: a case study in Peronospora. *PLoS One* 4:e6319. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0006319

by MnDRIVE (Minnesota's Discovery, Research, and InnoVation Economy).

SUPPLEMENTARY MATERIAL

The Supplementary Material for this article can be found online at: https://www.frontiersin.org/articles/10.3389/fmicb. 2021.699630/full#supplementary-material

- Gu, J., Liu, X., Li, Y., Han, W., Lei, L., Yang, Y., et al. (2012). A method for generation phage cocktail with great therapeutic potential. *PLoS One* 7:e31698. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0031698
- Johnson, J. R., Oswald, E., O'bryan, T. T., Kuskowski, M. A., and Spanjaard, L. (2002). Phylogenetic distribution of virulence-associated genes among *Escherichia coli* isolates associated with neonatal bacterial meningitis in the Netherlands. J. Infect. Dis. 185, 774–784. doi: 10.1086/339343
- Kaper, J. B., Nataro, J. P., and Mobley, H. L. (2004). Pathogenic Escherichia coli. Nat. Rev. Microbiol. 2, 123–140. doi: 10.1038/nrmicro818
- Kim, J., Hwang, B. K., Choi, H., Wang, Y., Choi, S. H., Ryu, S., et al. (2019). Characterization of *mcr-1*-harboring plasmids from pan drug-resistant *Escherichia coli* strains isolated from retail raw chicken in South Korea. *Microorganisms* 7:344. doi: 10.3390/microorganisms7090344
- Kim, J.-W., Dutta, V., Elhanafi, D., Lee, S., Osborne, J. A., and Kathariou, S. (2012). A novel restriction-modification system is responsible for temperaturedependent phage resistance in *Listeria monocytogenes* ECII. *Appl. Environ. Microbiol.* 78, 1995–2004. doi: 10.1128/aem.07086-11
- Kim, M., and Ryu, S. (2011). Characterization of a T5-like coliphage, SPC35, and differential development of resistance to SPC35 in *Salmonella enterica* serovar Typhimurium and *Escherichia coli. Appl. Environ. Microbiol.* 77, 2042–2050. doi: 10.1128/aem.02504-10
- Kim, M., and Ryu, S. (2012). Spontaneous and transient defence against bacteriophage by phase-variable glucosylation of O-antigen in Salmonella enterica serovar Typhimurium. Mol. Microbiol. 86, 411–425. doi: 10.1111/j. 1365-2958.2012.08202.x
- King, A. M., Lefkowitz, E., Adams, M. J., and Carstens, E. B. (2011). Virus taxonomy: ninth report of the International Committee on Taxonomy of Viruses. Amsterdam: Elsevier.
- Kluytmans, J. A., Overdevest, I. T., Willemsen, I., Kluytmans-Van Den Bergh, M. F., Van Der Zwaluw, K., Heck, M., et al. (2012). Extended-spectrum β-lactamase– producing *Escherichia coli* from retail chicken meat and humans: comparison of strains, plasmids, resistance genes, and virulence factors. *Clin. Infect. Dis.* 56, 478–487. doi: 10.1093/cid/cis929
- Korf, I. H., Meier-Kolthoff, J. P., Adriaenssens, E. M., Kropinski, A. M., Nimtz, M., Rohde, M., et al. (2019). Still something to discover: novel insights into *Escherichia coli* phage diversity and taxonomy. *Viruses* 11:454. doi: 10.3390/ v11050454
- Kudva, I. T., Jelacic, S., Tarr, P. I., Youderian, P., and Hovde, C. J. (1999). Biocontrol of *Escherichia coli* O157 with O157-specific bacteriophages. *Appl. Environ. Microbiol.* 65, 3767–3773. doi: 10.1128/aem.65.9.3767-3773.1999
- Labrie, S. J., Samson, J. E., and Moineau, S. (2010). Bacteriophage resistance mechanisms. *Nat. Rev. Microbiol.* 8, 317–327. doi: 10.1038/nrmicro2315
- Lefort, V., Desper, R., and Gascuel, O. (2015). FastME 2.0: a comprehensive, accurate, and fast distance-based phylogeny inference program. *Mol. Biol. Evol.* 32, 2798–2800. doi: 10.1093/molbev/msv150
- Liu, Y.-Y., Wang, Y., Walsh, T. R., Yi, L.-X., Zhang, R., Spencer, J., et al. (2016). Emergence of plasmid-mediated colistin resistance mechanism MCR-1 in animals and human beings in China: a microbiological and molecular biological study. *Lancet. Infect. Dis.* 16, 161–168. doi: 10.1016/s1473-3099(15)00424-7
- Meier-Kolthoff, J. P., Auch, A. F., Klenk, H.-P., and Göker, M. (2013). Genome sequence-based species delimitation with confidence intervals and improved distance functions. *BMC bioinformatics* 14:60. doi: 10.1186/1471-2105-14-60
- Meier-Kolthoff, J. P., and Göker, M. (2017). VICTOR: genome-based phylogeny and classification of prokaryotic viruses. *Bioinformatics* 33, 3396–3404. doi: 10.1093/bioinformatics/btx440

- Meier-Kolthoff, J. P., Hahnke, R. L., Petersen, J., Scheuner, C., Michael, V., Fiebig, A., et al. (2014). Complete genome sequence of DSM 30083 T, the type strain (U5/41 T) of *Escherichia coli*, and a proposal for delineating subspecies in microbial taxonomy. *Stand. Genomic Sci.* 9:2. doi: 10.1186/1944-3277-9-2
- Morita, M., Tanji, Y., Mizoguchi, K., Akitsu, T., Kijima, N., and Unno, H. (2002). Characterization of a virulent bacteriophage specific for *Escherichia coli* O157:H7 and analysis of its cellular receptor and two tail fiber genes. *FEMS Microbiol. Lett.* 211, 77–83. doi: 10.1111/j.1574-6968.2002.tb11206.x
- Nhung, N. T., Chansiripornchai, N., and Carrique-Mas, J. J. (2017). Antimicrobial resistance in bacterial poultry pathogens: a review. *Front. Vet. Sci.* 4:126. doi: 10.3389/fvets.2017.00126
- Nilsson, A. S. (2014). Phage therapy—constraints and possibilities. UPS J. Med. Sci. 119, 192–198. doi: 10.3109/03009734.2014.902878
- Nogueira, T., David, P. H., and Pothier, J. (2019). Antibiotics as both friends and foes of the human gut microbiome: the microbial community approach. *Drug Dev. Res.* 80, 86–97. doi: 10.1002/ddr.21466
- Olson, M. R., Axler, R. P., and Hicks, R. E. (2004). Effects of freezing and storage temperature on MS2 viability. J. Virol. Methods 122, 147–152. doi: 10.1016/j. jviromet.2004.08.010
- Painter, J. A., Hoekstra, R. M., Ayers, T., Tauxe, R. V., Braden, C. R., Angulo, F. J., et al. (2013). Attribution of foodborne illnesses, hospitalizations, and deaths to food commodities by using outbreak data, United States, 1998-2008. *Emerg. Infect. Dis.* 19, 407–415. doi: 10.3201/eid1903.111866
- Park, H., Kim, J., Ryu, S., and Jeon, B. (2019). Predominance of *bla*_{CTX-M-65} and *bla*_{CTX-M-55} in extended-spectrum β-lactamase-producing *Escherichia coli* from raw retail chicken in South Korea. *J. Glob. Antimicrob. Resist.* 17, 216–220. doi: 10.1016/j.jgar.2019.01.005
- Perry, L. L., Sanmiguel, P., Minocha, U., Terekhov, A. I., Shroyer, M. L., Farris, L. A., et al. (2009). Sequence analysis of *Escherichia coli* O157:H7 bacteriophage PhiV10 and identification of a phage-encoded immunity protein that modifies the O157 antigen. *FEMS Microbiol. Lett.* 292, 182–186. doi: 10.1111/j.1574-6968.2009.01511.x
- Picard, B., Garcia, J. S., Gouriou, S., Duriez, P., Brahimi, N., Bingen, E., et al. (1999). The link between phylogeny and virulence in *Escherichia coli* extraintestinal infection. *Infect. Immun.* 67, 546–553. doi: 10.1128/iai.67.2.546-553.1999
- Poirel, L., Madec, J.-Y., Lupo, A., Schink, A.-K., Kieffer, N., Nordmann, P., et al. (2018). Antimicrobial resistance in *Escherichia coli. Microbiol. Spectr.* 6:4. doi: 10.1128/microbiolspec.ARBA-0026-2017
- Rambaut, A. (2006). FigTree 1.4.3 A Graphical Viewer of Phylogenetic Trees and a Program for Producing Publication-Ready Figures. Available at: https://mac. softpedia.com/get/Graphics/FigTree.shtml,https://www.ed.ac.uk/edinburghinfectious-diseases/research/themes/disease-dynamics/andrew-rambaut
- Raya, R. R., Oot, R. A., Moore-Maley, B., Wieland, S., Callaway, T. R., Kutter, E. M., et al. (2011). Naturally resident and exogenously applied T4-like and T5like bacteriophages can reduce *Escherichia coli* O157:H7 levels in sheep guts. *Bacteriophage* 1, 15–24. doi: 10.4161/bact.1.1.14175
- Rupp, M. E., and Fey, P. D. (2003). Extended spectrum β -lactamase (ESBL)-producing *Enterobacteriaceae*. Drugs 63, 353–365. doi: 10.2165/00003495-200363040-00002
- Saliu, E.-M., Vahjen, W., and Zentek, J. (2017). Types and prevalence of extendedspectrum beta-lactamase producing *Enterobacteriaceae* in poultry. *Anim. Health. Res. Rev.* 18, 46–57. doi: 10.1017/s1466252317000020
- Schrauwen, E. J., Huizinga, P., Van Spreuwel, N., Verhulst, C., Kluytmans-Van Den Bergh, M. F., and Kluytmans, J. A. (2017). High prevalence of the mcr-1 gene in retail chicken meat in the Netherlands in 2015. Antimicrob. Resist. Infect. Control 6, 83. doi: 10.1186/s13756-017-0242-8

- Seeley, N., and Primrose, S. (1980). The effect of temperature on the ecology of aquatic bacteriophages. J. Gen. Virol. 46, 87–95. doi: 10.1099/0022-1317-46-1-87
- Skurnik, M., and Strauch, E. (2006). Phage therapy: facts and fiction. *Int. J. Med. Microbiol.* 296, 5–14. doi: 10.1016/j.ijmm.2005.09.002
- Sulakvelidze, A., Alavidze, Z., and Morris, J. G. (2001). Bacteriophage therapy. Antimicrob. Agents Chemother. 45, 649–659. doi: 10.1128/aac.45.3.649-659. 2001
- Szmolka, A., and Nagy, B. (2013). Multidrug resistant commensal *Escherichia coli* in animals and its impact for public health. *Front. Microbiol.* 4:258. doi: 10.3389/fmicb.2013.00258
- Talukdar, P. K., Rahman, M., Rahman, M., Nabi, A., Islam, Z., Hoque, M. M., et al. (2013). Antimicrobial resistance, virulence factors and genetic diversity of *Escherichia coli* isolates from household water supply in Dhaka Bangladesh. *PLoS One* 8:e61090. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0061090
- Tanji, Y., Shimada, T., Yoichi, M., Miyanaga, K., Hori, K., and Unno, H. (2004). Toward rational control of *Escherichia coli* O157:H7 by a phage cocktail. *Appl. Microbiol. Biotechnol.* 64, 270–274. doi: 10.1007/s00253-003-1438-9
- Tokman, J. I., Kent, D. J., Wiedmann, M., and Denes, T. (2016). Temperature significantly affects the plaquing and adsorption efficiencies of Listeria phages. *Front. Microbiol.* 7:631. doi: 10.3389/fmicb.2016.00631
- Uhl, M. A., and Miller, J. F. (1996). Integration of multiple domains in a twocomponent sensor protein: the *Bordetella pertussis* BvgAS phosphorelay. *EMBO J.* 15, 1028–1036. doi: 10.1002/j.1460-2075.1996.tb00440.x
- Unno, T., Han, D., Jang, J., Lee, S.-N., Ko, G., Choi, H. Y., et al. (2009). Absence of *Escherichia coli* phylogenetic group B2 strains in humans and domesticated animals from Jeonnam Province, Republic of Korea. *Appl. Environ. Microbiol.* 75, 5659–5666. doi: 10.1128/aem.00443-09
- Wang, Y., Zhang, R., Li, J., Wu, Z., Yin, W., Schwarz, S., et al. (2017). Comprehensive resistome analysis reveals the prevalence of NDM and MCR-1 in Chinese poultry production. *Nat. Microbiol.* 2:16260. doi: 10.21037/jlpm. 2017.06.02
- Xu, X., Cui, S., Zhang, F., Luo, Y., Gu, Y., Yang, B., et al. (2014). Prevalence and characterization of cefotaxime and ciprofloxacin co-resistant *Escherichia coli* isolates in retail chicken carcasses and ground pork. *China. Microb. Drug Resist.* 20, 73–81. doi: 10.1089/mdr.2012.0224
- Yen, M., Cairns, L. S., and Camilli, A. (2017). A cocktail of three virulent bacteriophages prevents *Vibrio cholerae* infection in animal models. *Nat. Commun.* 8, 1–7. doi: 10.1038/ncomms14187

Conflict of Interest: The authors declare that the research was conducted in the absence of any commercial or financial relationships that could be construed as a potential conflict of interest.

Publisher's Note: All claims expressed in this article are solely those of the authors and do not necessarily represent those of their affiliated organizations, or those of the publisher, the editors and the reviewers. Any product that may be evaluated in this article, or claim that may be made by its manufacturer, is not guaranteed or endorsed by the publisher.

Copyright © 2021 Kim, Park, Ryu and Jeon. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (CC BY). The use, distribution or reproduction in other forums is permitted, provided the original author(s) and the copyright owner(s) are credited and that the original publication in this journal is cited, in accordance with accepted academic practice. No use, distribution or reproduction is permitted which does not comply with these terms.