

1 **Global and Historical Distribution of *Clostridioides difficile* in the Human Diet (1981-2019):**  
2 **Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis of 21886 Samples Reveal Sources of Heterogeneity,**  
3 **High-Risk Foods, and Unexpected Higher Prevalence Towards the Tropic**

4  
5  
6 Alexander Rodriguez-Palacios DVM PhD<sup>1,2</sup>, Kevin Q Mo BSc<sup>3,4</sup>, Bhavan U. Shah MD MPH<sup>5,6</sup>, Joan Msuya  
7 MSc<sup>7</sup>, Nina Bijedic PhD<sup>8,9</sup>, Abhishek Deshpande MD PhD<sup>6</sup>, Sanja Ilic PhD<sup>3</sup>  
8  
9

10 <sup>1</sup>Division of Gastroenterology and Liver Disease, and <sup>2</sup>Digestive Health Research Institute, Case Western  
11 Reserve University School of Medicine, Cleveland, OH 44106, USA

12 <sup>3</sup>Department of Human Sciences, Human Nutrition, College of Education and Human Ecology, The Ohio  
13 State University, Columbus, OH 43210, USA

14 <sup>4</sup>Northeast Ohio University of Medicine, Rootstown, OH 44272, USA

15 <sup>5</sup>Informatics and Assessment Division, Lorain County General Health District, Elyria, OH 44035, USA

16 <sup>6</sup>Department of Neurology, Weill Cornell Medicine, Cornell University, New York, NY 10065, USA

17 <sup>7</sup>Department of Health and Nutrition, World Vision, Arusha, Tanzania

18 <sup>8</sup>Department of Applied Mathematics and Formal Methods, Information Technologies, University Dzemal  
19 Bijedic, Mostar 88000, Bosnia and Herzegovina.

20 <sup>9</sup>Department of Mathematics, University of North Carolina, Charlotte, NC 28262, USA

21 <sup>10</sup>Medicine Institute Center for Value-Based Care Research, Cleveland Clinic, Cleveland, OH 44106 USA  
22  
23

24 **Correspondence:**

25 [axr503@case.edu](mailto:axr503@case.edu) (AR-P)

26 [ilic2@osu.edu](mailto:ilic2@osu.edu) (SI)

27 **Conflict of interests**

28 The authors declare that there is no conflict of interests regarding the publication of this paper. A.D. has  
29 received research support from Clorox and is on the advisory board of Ferring Pharmaceuticals, unrelated to  
30 the study.

31 **Authors' Contribution**

32 SI and ARP designed the study. SI and AD developed the search algorithm; SI, JM, ARP, and BS developed  
33 and pretested data extraction strategy and tool. JM BS, KM, ARP, and JM performed the literature search.  
34 KM and BS under the supervision of SI and AR extracted the data. AR SI planned and performed all data  
35 analysis with support from NB. SI and ARP wrote the manuscript. All authors read and approved submission  
36 of this manuscript.

37 **Acknowledgments**

38 Study was conducted with internal funds allocated to the corresponding authors. SI is an Assistant professor  
39 of Human Nutrition and Food Microbiology, the official Food Safety State Specialist for the state of Ohio in  
40 the USA, and is a current Expert consultant on food safety for the Food Agricultural Organization of the  
41 United Nations. NB received support from the Fulbright as a senior scholar and visiting professor in  
42 mathematics at the University of North Carolina. ARP receives support from the National Institutes of Health  
43 via grants R21 and R01 subaward mechanism, and is the Director of the Germ Free and Gut Microbiome  
44 Core at the Digestive Diseases Research Institute and is the Technical Director of the Mouse Models Core at  
45 the NIH Silvio O Conte Cleveland Digestive Diseases Research Core Center.

46 **Abstract**

47 *Clostridioides difficile* (CD) is a spore-forming bacterium that causes life-threatening intestinal  
48 infections in humans. Although formerly regarded as exclusively nosocomial, there is increasing genomic  
49 evidence that person-to-person transmission accounts for only <25% of cases, supporting the culture-based  
50 hypothesis that foods may be routine sources of CD-spore ingestion in humans.

51 To synthesize the evidence on the risk of CD exposure via foods, we conducted a systematic review  
52 and meta-analysis of studies reporting the culture prevalence of CD in foods between January 1981 and  
53 November 2019. Meta-analyses, risk-ratio estimates, and meta-regression were used to estimate weighed-  
54 prevalence across studies and food types to identify laboratory and geographical sources of heterogeneity.

55 In total, 21,886 food samples were tested for CD between 1981 and 2019 (232 food-sample-sets; 79  
56 studies; 25 countries). Culture methodology, sample size and type, region, and latitude were significant  
57 sources of heterogeneity ( $p < 0.05$ ). Although non-strictly-anaerobic methods were reported in some studies,  
58 and we confirmed experimentally that improper anaerobiosis of media/sample-handling affects CD recovery  
59 in agar (Fisher,  $p < 0.01$ ), most studies (>72%) employed the same (one-of-six) culture strategy. Because the  
60 prevalence was also meta-analytically similar across six culture strategies reported, all studies were  
61 integrated using three meta-analytical methods. At the study level ( $n=79$ ), the four-decade global cumulative-  
62 prevalence of CD in the human diet was 4.1% (95%CI=-3.71, 11.91). At the food-set level ( $n=232$ ), the  
63 weighted prevalence ranged between 4.5% (95%CI=3-6%; all studies) and 8% (95%CI=7-8%; only CD-  
64 positive-studies). Risk-ratio ranking and meta-regression showed that milk was the least likely source of CD,  
65 while seafood, leafy green vegetables, pork, and poultry carried higher risks ( $p < 0.05$ ). Across regions, the  
66 risk of CD in foods for foodborne exposure reproducibly decreased with Earth latitude ( $p < 0.001$ ).

67 In conclusion, CD in the human diet is a global nonrandom-source of foodborne exposure that  
68 occurs independently of laboratory culture methods, across regions, and at variable level depending on food  
69 type and latitude. The latitudinal trend (high CD-food-prevalence towards tropic) is unexpectedly inverse to  
70 the epidemiological observations of CD-infections in humans (frequent in temperate regions). Findings  
71 suggests the plausible hypothesis that ecologically-richer microbiomes in the tropic might protect against  
72 intestinal CD colonization/infections despite CD ingestion.

## 73 Introduction

74 *Clostridioides (Clostridium) difficile* (CD) is a spore-forming anaerobic bacterium that causes severe  
75 enteritis, colitis, and mortality in susceptible humans, especially if affected with inflammatory bowel diseases,  
76 cancer, immunosuppression, or if taking antibiotics.<sup>110-1213</sup> To date, it is well known that CD infections (CDI)  
77 in humans are more frequent in temperate regions. Latitudinal trends however have not been reported for  
78 CDI at continental scales. Since the first report linking CD to pseudomembranous colitis in 1975, several  
79 reports now indicate that CD could reach humans via foods.<sup>2</sup> If the presence of *C. difficile* in foods was  
80 indeed linearly associated with infections, one would expect that the prevalence of food contamination was  
81 higher in temperate regions as it is the case for the incidence of CDI in humans.

82 CDI have now worsened severity and incidence since the emergence of hypervirulent strains that  
83 caused CDI epidemics in both Canada and the UK in the mid 2000s. After the astounding isolation of such  
84 strains from young cattle and retail beef in Canada in 2005<sup>3,4</sup> numerous food studies support the hypothesis  
85 of potential foodborne exposure<sup>5,6</sup>. With the availability of genomics, elegant studies have shown that only  
86 ~25-30% of CDI in hospitals are nosocomial, redirecting the attention to foods as viable sources of CD.<sup>89</sup>  
87 As further evidence for connectivity between foods and CDI, last year a *de novo* genome sequencing study  
88 showed that the first CD strain derived from foods (PCR ribotype 078) in Canada in 2005 was identical to the  
89 historical strain M120 that contributed to epidemics in the UK in 2007<sup>7</sup>.

90 Unless we understand the distribution pattern of CD across foods, regions, and laboratory variability,  
91 little can be done to minimize the exposure of susceptible persons to CD in their diet. Distinguishing  
92 methodological variability from natural variability is important to assign a proper risk value to the presence of  
93 CD in the food supply<sup>2</sup>. To formally quantify the prevalence of CD in foods and map the distributional trends  
94 over global scales, we conducted a systematic review and meta-regression of studies reporting the presence  
95 of CD in foods. The main quantitative objectives were *i)* to appraise peer-reviewed studies on quality and the  
96 prevalence of CD in foods, *ii)* to determine laboratory factors associated with CD-positivity, and *iii)* to perform  
97 meta-analysis across regions, and food items to examine reporting differences and outline latitudinal trends.

98 Herein, we report that the majority of studies used the same laboratory culture method for the isolation  
99 of CD allowing us to conduct meta-analysis and rank food items based on the weighted risk of contamination  
100 across regions. Although beef and pork were food categories often containing CD, leafy green vegetables  
101 and seafoods had higher rates of contamination. Of remarkable novelty, the contamination of foods followed  
102 a latitudinal trend that is inverse to the Earth's latitude (higher towards the Equator). Although there are no  
103 global reports describing latitudinal trends for CDI, results indicate that the latitudinal trend observed in foods  
104 is inverse to that of what is reported and expected for infections (*i.e.*, high incidence in temperate regions).

## 105 Materials and Methods

106 **Systematic Review, Team and Definitions.** This study follows and complies with principles of  
107 systematic review research methodology for 'food safety' and food item definitions.<sup>14,15</sup> All procedures used  
108 in this study were reported in accordance with Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-  
109 Analyses (PRISMA) guidelines in structuring our literature search analysis.

110 We conducted a systematic search of available literature reporting the prevalence of *C. difficile* in  
111 foods. Electronic databases (MEDLINE/PubMed, Scopus, Web of Science, and Google Scholar) were  
112 searched to identify all studies reporting the prevalence of CD in foods. The detailed search algorithm,  
113 questionnaire, data extraction criteria and verification are available as **Supplementary Materials**. Five  
114 iterative rounds of verification of extraction strategies and tools were validated to ensure reproducibility of  
115 data extraction.

116 In brief, a list of search terms was developed by consensus by the research team to retrieve citations  
117 pertaining to CD prevalence in foods. Search terms (n= 64 terms) relating to population (*e.g.* food, meat,

118 beef, etc.) and outcome (e.g., *Clostridium Clostridioides difficile*) were combined to search numerous food  
119 types (or items), without restrictions. Identified terms were pre-tested in PubMed and used to develop the  
120 final algorithm, using as basis a similar validated strategy we implemented for vegetables.<sup>19</sup> The complete  
121 search terms consisted of the following: "(*C. difficile* OR *Clostridium difficile* OR *difficile*) AND (food\* OR  
122 meal\* OR mollus\* OR fish OR crustaceans OR oysters OR poultry OR chicken OR turkey OR duck OR  
123 goose OR meat\* OR beef OR pork OR venison OR dairy OR milk OR yogurt OR cheese OR egg\* OR  
124 sausage OR seafood OR butter OR lard OR honey OR vegetable\* OR lettuce OR spinach OR cabbage OR  
125 fresh leafy green herb\* OR endive OR arugula OR chard OR watercress OR radicchio OR frieze OR  
126 mustard green OR beans OR cauliflower OR broccoli OR celery OR onion OR cantaloupe OR watermelon  
127 OR melon OR mushroom OR carrot OR potato OR garlic OR radish OR corn OR peas OR cucumber OR  
128 tomato OR pepper\* OR alfalfa OR sprout\*)", and was used to search Web of Science, Scopus Cochrane and  
129 Pub Med. The search was repeated regularly and database updated until the last update in November 2019,  
130 prior to the manuscript submission.

131 Citations retrieved from electronic databases were imported and de-duplicated in reference  
132 management software EndNote Web™ (Clarivate Analytics). Search verification included manual searching  
133 of references citing the first five manuscripts reporting CD in foods or its potential for foodborne transmission  
134<sup>9, 10, 26, 44, 45</sup> using Google Scholar in consultation with research team members, and the references of all  
135 identified studies. Experts in the field were consulted to identify unpublished data, including theses and  
136 research poster/conference presentations. Google Search Engine limited to the first 600 hits was searched  
137 to identify any "gray literature". Alert in Google Scholar was set up to identify any newly published studies. All  
138 potentially relevant citations discovered through the manual searching method, which were not previously  
139 identified through electronic search, were added into the review process and processed in the same manner  
140 as electronic citations. All peer-reviewed studies, dissertations and reports containing original prevalence  
141 data were eligible. Studies lacking the report of both number of samples tested (*N*) and number of positive  
142 samples (*n*) were excluded.<sup>32</sup> Prevalence contamination data was only extracted for culture assays, and not  
143 for prevalence data based on molecular assays.<sup>27</sup> No restrictions were imposed in terms of the study time  
144 period, design, language, or study origin.

145 Relevant citations after reviewer screen 1 (RS1) were procured as full articles, and screened by two  
146 reviewers (BS and SI) using pre-tested RS2 checklists (**Supplementary Tables 1 and 2**). Conflicts were  
147 resolved by a consensus between respective reviewers and when not possible, by senior authors of this  
148 study. During initial manual screening of selected abstracts, carcass trims or carcass washings/rinsates at  
149 the processing plants were selected for secondary analysis. Data describing environment, wastewater,  
150 animal or human fecal samples were excluded. Non-primary research studies (e.g. narrative reviews) and  
151 studies investigating other aspects (e.g. outbreak reports, test performance studies) were excluded. Case  
152 reports or case series of hospital-associated *C. difficile* infections, and case-control studies that did not  
153 provide prevalence estimates, and duplicate publications were also excluded. Relevant articles were  
154 assessed and categorized by food type (e.g. beef, poultry, vegetables) and descriptive characteristics (e.g.,  
155 food processing level, where in the production chain was the product sampled). Through initial title and  
156 abstract-based relevance screening one (RS1), potentially relevant primary research articles were identified.

157 **Extraction Tool and Risk of Bias.** Prior to reading the manuscripts, two meeting sessions (phone,  
158 and in person) took place (ARP, SI, BS, and AD) to discuss and create a Data Extraction Tool (DET, list of  
159 questions and response categories, see **Supplementary Table 1**) draft to standardize the extraction of data  
160 required for statistical analysis and testing of study objectives. Following five iterative rounds of verification  
161 for accuracy and clarity, the pre-final extraction tool was pretested by ARP and BS at CWRU, and SI and JM  
162 at OSU, using 10 studies (the first five in the 1980s, and 5 in 2015)<sup>9, 10, 26, 44, 45</sup>. Phone conferences occurred  
163 biweekly during this phase to estimate test agreement, to address concerns, to edit/improve, and thus  
164 finalize the DET. The pretesting and definitive data extraction were conducted after the participating  
165 reviewers (KM, BS) were trained on laboratory methodologies available for CD by senior scientists from two  
166 institutions (ARP and SI). Four reviewers extracted data independently. Data extraction was verified by

167 senior two authors for data interpretation, extraction and accuracy. The final DET was used to extract all  
168 relevant research articles, which were assessed for methodological soundness and bias as part of the data  
169 extraction strategy, by at least two reviewers, using the prevalence study-based criteria.

170 All studies were assessed by rating each of the 6 quality assessment items listed in the DET into  
171 dichotomous ratings: low risk (1) and high risk (0). An overall Risk of Bias score was calculated by adding  
172 the numeric value of all six items. High scores indicate low risk of bias and stronger method quality.  
173 Measures of data SD or variability were estimated using the number of food samples tested and the  
174 percentage of positive samples. Because the reliability of available statistical methods on bias have  
175 previously shown to be inaccurate and misleading with effects that are close to the extremes, for instance  
176 close to 0 or to 100%<sup>24</sup>, publication bias was tested using funnel plot and Egger's statistics using study size  
177 at the food set level instead of the standard error of the effect as recommended for proportions with high  
178 data /effects polarity<sup>24</sup>. As we recently mentioned<sup>25</sup> however, it is uncertain how many studies start but do  
179 not get published due to the lack of a prepublication registry of prevalence based studies in foods.

180 **Pooled Ratios, Meta-analysis and Meta-regression.** Extracted data were used to estimate risk  
181 ratios and perform a prevalence meta-analysis. Three main categories of data were extracted: sample  
182 characteristics, methods, and prevalence data. All food items were grouped for analytical purposes into food  
183 item categories (e.g., pork, leafy green vegetables). Pooled risk ratios (RR, 95% CI) for each food group  
184 were calculated to quantify the differences and rank the foods according to the risk of being contaminated  
185 using a random effects model<sup>26,18</sup>. In brief, heterogeneity tests with Higgins'  $I^2$  statistic were performed to  
186 determine the extent of variation between the studies that rely on measure analysis for the deviations for  
187 each within-study variance from a central estimate for the collective between-study variance distribution.<sup>26</sup>  
188 Meta-analysis was used to estimate the overall prevalence of CD in foods globally and per region by pooling  
189 variances of proportions in a random-effects model using DerSimonian and Laird method.<sup>28,29</sup> Analyses  
190 were performed using R software and *Metaphor*<sup>33</sup>, and Stata's *Metaregression and Metacum* functions. To  
191 illustrate the cumulative meta-analytical prevalence of CD globally and regionally at the 'study-level' (n=79),  
192 over the past 4 decades, we analyzed and plotted the data as a forest plot as previously reported<sup>25</sup>.  
193 Because each study tested multiple 'food item categories', we then decomposed the study variance across  
194 each food item, within each study, and constructed the remaining forest plots at the item level presented in  
195 this study. Exact binomial weighted and pooled estimates at 'item level' (n=232) are presented in forest plots  
196 both without adjusting for 'zero-studies' (which excludes 0% prevalence studies), and with adjustments using  
197 either a balanced addition of 1 to n and N, or using the Freeman-Tukey double arcsine transformation, which  
198 include 0% prevalence studies.<sup>33</sup> For meta-regression and latitudinal analysis, coordinate data were  
199 obtained from NASA. To determine if the reported prevalence was influenced by the amount of food tested,  
200 data were extracted as absolute values in grams. Modeling and latitudinal simulations were conducted in R  
201 and STATA<sup>33</sup> (**Supplementary Materials**).

202 **Experiments with *C. difficile* on non-anaerobic media.** The exposure of CD spores to conditions  
203 suitable for grow (high moisture, nutrients, and warmth) trigger spore germination even in room air. However,  
204 the subsequent step, i.e., bacterial growth from germinated spore to cell division does not occur in the  
205 presence of air/oxygen. Because **i)** most studies did not report whether the reagents or the handling of foods  
206 in growth media were fully anaerobically, and because **ii)** the germination of CD spores and the subsequent  
207 viability of vegetative daughter cells are influenced by the lack of strict anaerobiosis, we determined if a  
208 source of low CD recovery and study variability could be partly due to negative selection when non-reduced  
209 reagents are used. To test this hypothesis we plated 1-year old (superdormant) spores aged for 1 year in  
210 PBS as described<sup>36</sup> on TSA agar enriched with 5% defibrinated sheep blood. Two different pre-reduced  
211 agar conditions, which only differed on the length of time the agar had been incubated (pre-reduced)  
212 anaerobically before being used for bacterial inoculation using our Parallel Lanes Plating method.<sup>37</sup>

213 **Role of the Funding Source.** This study was conducted with internal funds allocated to investigators,  
214 with no external funding in the form of grants or industry awards. Study design, data analysis, interpretation,  
215 and writing are thus free of funding-associated bias.

216 **Authorship, Writing and Editorial Assistance.** All authors meet the International Committee of  
217 Medical Journal Editors (ICMJE) criteria for authorship for this article, take responsibility for the integrity of  
218 the work as a whole, and have given their approval for this version to be published. The statistical analysis,  
219 interpretation and writing of the manuscript was conducted by the authors without the aid of fee-for-service  
220 commercial services.

221 **Disclosures and Compliance with Ethics.** The authors declare that there is no conflict of interests  
222 regarding the publication of this paper. A.D. has received research support from Clorox and is on the  
223 advisory board of Ferring Pharmaceuticals, unrelated to the study. This article is based on previously  
224 conducted studies, including publications authored by ARP and SI, but does not contain unpublished studies  
225 performed by any of the authors.

226 **Data Availability and Open Access.** All data, easily inferable from the figures and supplementary  
227 materials and which is also easily extractable from the manuscripts listed in the **Supplementary**  
228 **References**, will be made fully available by the corresponding authors upon reasonable request. This article  
229 is intended for publication as open access under the terms of a Creative Commons Attribution- International  
230 License.

## 231 **Results**

### 232 **Global Distribution of Studies Reporting *C. difficile* in Foods and Publication Bias**

233 The PRISMA-standard [Figure 1](#) summarizes the process of studies selection for this systematic  
234 review. From 1,939 studies identified, 79 fulfilled the inclusion criteria for meta-analysis, involving >231  
235 authors and 25 countries over the past 37 years. The list of studies in chronological order from the Americas  
236 <sup>6,18,19,34,35,38-67</sup>, Europe <sup>23,68-88</sup>, Asia <sup>89-103</sup>, Africa <sup>104-109</sup>, and Oceania (Australia/New Zealand) <sup>20,110,111</sup> is  
237 presented in [Table 1](#). Eleven (13.9%) of all studies reported the absence of CD in the food samples tested  
238 (CD-negative). Only 30% of studies (n=24) were dedicated to testing only one type of food. Most studies  
239 tested between 2 and 4 food types. Funnel plot analysis indicate there has been absent-to-moderate  
240 publication bias, depending on the statistical method used for the funnel analysis to consider data handling  
241 of reports close to 0% prevalence as illustrated in [Figure 2](#).

242

### 243 **Historical Study Referents of *C. difficile* Isolation from Foods.**

244 This meta-analysis illustrates the geographical distributions of the numerous laboratories around the  
245 world that have been examining the potential of foodborne transmissibility of CD spores to humans, via the  
246 food supply. [Figure 3](#) depicts in a map the arithmetic average of the CD prevalence reported for local food  
247 items across countries, and other descriptive features of the studies. Of note, since the first report, there  
248 have been periods of oscillations possibly reflecting trends in research interest or funding availability.

249 Historically, the first study attempting to quantify the prevalence of CD in ready-to-eat foods was  
250 published by Fekety et al., in 1981 <sup>42</sup> in a hospital setting. Using a direct culture approach (effective for  
251 isolation of CD from environmental surfaces) on hospital meals, this study yielded no CD. The following year,  
252 two reports highlighted the potential foodborne and zoonotic potential of CD transmission to humans  
253 (Borriello *et al.*, 1982 and 1983)<sup>21,115</sup> but a period of quiescence lasted until 1996, when Broda *et al.*<sup>116</sup> made  
254 a food science report of incidental isolation of CD from spoiled 'blown-packed' meats in New Zealand.  
255 Google citation statistics of Broda's publication indicate that her findings were only relevant to food spoilage  
256 studies, and not cited on 'public health' or 'food safety' reports due to human health concerns until a report in  
257 2006 discovered the presence of hypervirulent epidemic CD strains in food-producing animals and retail beef  
258 in Canada <sup>5,6</sup>. No citations of Broda *et al.* occurred on the basis of foodborne/health concerns between 1996-  
259 2006 (0 vs. 30 citations on meat spoilage), but steadily increased to 27 foodborne citations after the 2006  
260 reports <sup>5,6</sup> (51 citations on meat spoilage, mainly due to *Clostridium estercholaris*; Fisher's p<0.001). Citation  
261 analyses support the reproducibility and historic context of our systematic review, with minimal publication  
262 interest on the 'foodborne potential of *C. difficile*' before 2006. See [Figure 4](#) for a graphical representation of

263 the historical context and order in which numerous laboratories around the world tested food items intended  
264 for human consumption since 1981.

265 Although the cumulative prevalence of CD in the foods tested has been 4.1% globally at the study-  
266 level (two-tail 95%CI= -3.71, 11.91, [Table 1](#)), we demonstrate that the cumulative prevalence has distinct  
267 patterns of heterogeneity (variance) depending on the region, being comparably lower at the study-level in  
268 Europe (1.9%; 95%CI= -7.49, 11.29; see [Figure 5](#) for cumulative estimates in other regions).

### 269 270 **Overall Food Contamination: Food-type level analysis.**

271 Because most studies (>75%) tested more than one 'food-item type/category' (e.g., 'beef',  
272 'vegetables';  $2.95 \pm 1.8$  categories/study), and because pooling data from distinct food categories as a single  
273 CD prevalence for each study was deemed biologically inappropriate, and non-informative to generate food-  
274 based risk ranks, we extracted data separately for each food item tested in all studies. Thus, together, this  
275 meta-analysis represents 21,886 samples of retail foods tested across 230 'food item sample sets'. On  
276 average, each food set comprised  $92 \pm 127$  samples; maximum=956. For the pooled analysis, the 232 food  
277 sets were grouped into 20 food categories (e.g., 'pork', 'seafood', 'mixed meats'), being 'beef' the most  
278 studied commodity (see cumulative statistics in [Supplementary Table 3](#)). Reported CD prevalence at the  
279 'food-category level' ranged from 0 to 100%.

280 As a single unweighted statistic, the arithmetic mean for the CD prevalence in foods at the food-type  
281 level was  $10.6 \pm 16.6\%$  ([Supplementary Table 4](#)). Because differences exist across regions and food tested  
282 categories, and because estimations depend on the inclusion of data from zero prevalence studies, we then  
283 computed the overall adjusted weighted meta-analysis cumulative prevalence considering the sample sets  
284 and regions, and three statistical methods to account for the 0% prevalence in CD-negative studies. Notice  
285 that [Figure 6](#) illustrates the heterogeneity ( $I^2$  statistics) across regions and the 230 food sets, at the same  
286 time it illustrates that the overall of *C. difficile* in foods ranges between 4.5% (95%CI=3-6%, for all CD-  
287 positive and CD-negative studies combined) and 8% (95%CI=7-8%, for the CD-positive studies only).

### 288 289 **Heterogeneity and Overall Prevalence of *C. difficile* in Foods is Independent of Culture Method**

290 To date, one of the most cited factors to explain differences in CD across food studies is the  
291 existence of variability across methods and reagents ([Supplementary Table 5](#)). Although we have not seen  
292 recovery differences for antibiotics used as selective reagents in food studies (cycloserine-cefoxitin vs.  
293 cysteine hydrochloride-norfloxacin-moxalactam, CDMN)<sup>11719</sup>, we examined the role that culture methods play  
294 in this meta-analysis.

295 Although studies clearly report the use of anaerobic jars<sup>23</sup>, culture media (e.g., CDMN, BHI), and  
296 homogenization methods for sample disruption (e.g., stomachers, blenders) which mix samples with room  
297 air, unfortunately, most studies did not specify clearly if reagents were pre-reduced (incubated anaerobically  
298 prior to utilization) or if protocols were anaerobic<sup>38,69,104</sup>. Because 73.4% of studies did not use positive  
299 controls (58/79; [Supplementary Table 6](#)), it is impossible to infer if protocols were fully anaerobic. To test if  
300 the incubation of CD spores in non-reduced media (e.g., agar freshly removed from refrigerator) inhibits CD  
301 recovery, we conducted experiments *in vitro*. Using 1-year-aged spores from human PCR-ribotypes 078,  
302 027, 077, strains 630 and ATCC 1869<sup>7,36,65</sup>, we observed that the use of non-reduced agars results in no CD  
303 recovery compared to using agars pre-reduced in an anaerobic chamber 4 hours prior inoculation (0/10 vs.  
304 10/10, Fisher exact  $p < 0.001$ ). Because 26.9% of studies also reported short periods of incubation (e.g.,  
305 overnight), we determined if short incubation influenced CD recovery. Of relevance, aged CD spores grew  
306 slowly requiring ~72 hours to produce the same surface biomass (per colony on agar) as the produced by  
307 vegetative cells in 24 hours. Although results indicate that nonreduced media and short incubations could  
308 yield negative results, we deemed these to be common error factors randomly distributed across methods.

309 Thus, we next examined the role of overall culture strategies, by cataloguing and grouping all  
310 reported methods into six different categories based on sequence of isolation steps and three culture  
311 strategies: *i*) direct plating on agar, *ii*) enrichment of the foods using liquid media prior to culture on agar, and

312 *ii)* the use of ethanol or heat to eliminate non-spore forming microbes in foods prior to culture in liquid media  
313 or agar to favor the growth of CD spores. Frequency analysis showed that almost three-quarters of all food  
314 samples tested (70.8%) used the methodological strategy reported in the first index report of CD in foods in  
315 2006<sup>5,6</sup>. Confirming that the five remaining methods had comparable CD recovery, univariate and weighted  
316 predictive meta-analysis, showed that all the six methods were statistically similar (see [Figure 7](#)).

317 Publication bias, journal impact factor, and the amount of food tested were also ruled out as sources  
318 of variability. However, we discovered that the number of samples tested per food set correlated inversely  
319 with CD prevalence (linear regression  $p=0.007$ ; meta-regression  $p=0.067$  controlling for region/method,  
320 [Supplementary Figures 1-2](#) and [Supplementary Table 7](#)). Although seasonality has yielded heterogeneity  
321 in food animals (*i.e.*, low prevalence in summer; high in winter in temperate regions), seasonal variability  
322 could not be tested since 85.9% of studies did not include referents or surrogates for season. Together,  
323 [Figure 7](#) and the analysis described illustrates that different culture strategies cannot explain the prevalence  
324 heterogeneity reported in the literature, and confirmed that all studies can be integrated in this meta-analysis.  
325

### 326 **Contamination Risk Analysis Ranks Vegetables and Seafoods as High-Risk Food items.**

327 Of relevance to risk statistics, over one-quarter of food sets were CD negative (64/232; 27.8%,  
328 95%CI= 22.2, 32.2). However, from a clinical perspective, doctors and patients could benefit by knowing  
329 which foods are more likely to be contaminated to determine how diets can be adjusted during periods of  
330 increased susceptibility (*e.g.*, cancer, IBD). For instance, by cooking or avoiding high-risk foods.

331 Since different food items could be contaminated with different probability risks, we calculated risk  
332 ratios (RR) to rank each food group with respect to the food yielding the lowest combined prevalence of CD,  
333 and also using meta-analysis weighted estimates ([Figure 8](#)). Using milk as a reference (which had the  
334 lowest prevalence, but clinically important CD strains)<sup>22</sup>, vegetables, seafoods and pork had the highest RR.  
335 Compared to milk, vegetables were 21.9 times more likely to yield CD, while seafoods and pork were 14.3  
336 and 12.9 times more likely, respectively. [Figures 9, 10, 11](#), and [12](#) comparatively illustrate the weighted  
337 prevalences for the following food categories: beef and vegetables, poultry, pork and seafood. Comparing  
338 retail beef, leafy-green vegetables and root vegetables, [Figure 9](#) illustrates that leafy green vegetables are  
339 twice more as likely to carry CD compared to root vegetables. [Supplementary Figures 3-5](#) display detailed  
340 forest plots for both statistical methods for beef and vegetables, and for all the food tests tested including  
341 mixed meals, and others based on the biological origin (animal/plant) of the food.  
342

### 343 **The Probability of Recovery *C. difficile* from Foods Increased Latitudinally Towards the Tropic.**

344 To determine whether the prevalence of CD in foods was influenced by Earth's latitude, we added  
345 the positional coordinates to the dataset. Both unadjusted and arcsine adjusted meta-regression revealed  
346 that latitude determines the magnitude by which CD has been isolated from foods worldwide. While longitude  
347 was nonsignificant, latitude had a negative linear correlation with CD prevalence (in a  $y = \beta_0 + \beta_1\chi_1$  model;  
348 [Figure 13a](#)). Since several studies reporting high prevalence were from mid-range latitudes, collectively the  
349 data displayed a concave pattern (in a  $y = \beta_0 + \beta_1\chi_1 + \beta_2\chi_1^2$  model; [Supplementary Figures 6-7](#)). However,  
350 after dividing the 230 food sets into 22 food-per-continent subsets to control for longitude (*e.g.*, beef in Africa  
351 vs. Asia), regression slope analysis (in  $y = \beta_0 + \beta_1\chi_1$ ) showed that latitude negatively correlation with  
352 prevalence in 94.5% of the 22 data subsets (Sign  $p<0.0001$ ). Such reproducible correlation was not due to  
353 chance, since random allocation of latitude values in 25 simulations showed nonreproducible slopes (Sign  
354  $p=0.35$ ). Findings were also validated using predictive spatial density map simulations on a 2D-plot  
355 representing the Earth's surface ([Figure 13b-e](#), adjusted  $p<0.001$ ). Contour-density plots illustrate that the  
356 patterns of CD have a spatial latitudinal structure that is different from simulations of randomly spaced  
357 studies. For the first time, the prevalence of CD in the human diet is shown to have a latitudinal pattern over  
358 the Earth's latitude. Occurring reproducibly across continental longitudes, with comparatively higher CD  
359 prevalence in regions closer to the tropic, this CD-in-foods trend is opposite to what is expected for CDI in  
360 humans, where most cases seem to occur more often (in temperate regions) away from the tropic.

## 361 Discussion

362 The present meta-analysis, for the first time summarizes the distribution of CD in the human diet,  
363 which we derived from data from 79 studies conducted between 1981 and 2019. Estimated various regional  
364 and global prevalence of CD in foods ranged between 3 and 8% globally, or between 0 and 22% regionally.  
365 We also identified for the first time a latitudinal trend in foods with increased rates of CD recovery in food  
366 towards the tropic. The analysis of almost twenty-two thousand samples across the globe, as a robust  
367 representation of the human diet, indicates that prevalence heterogeneity exists independently of culture  
368 methods. While study variability has been assumed to be consequence of culture method differences, our  
369 analysis (verified using  $I^2$  statistics) demonstrates that there were no significant differences for the CD  
370 prevalence across methods, and that most studies used the same methodology. Prevalence estimates also  
371 varied within studies conducted by the same author, which cannot be explained by variations in culture  
372 methods. Often, the same method was applied to different food items yielded different rates of CD  
373 contamination under the same report. Such differences reflect real variance of CD in the food supply.

374 Although earlier articles speculated that the identification of CD in foods could have been due to  
375 poor techniques and cross-contamination, high-quality studies have shown that contamination is an obsolete  
376 argument to discount the value of identifying toxigenic and even emerging virulent strains of CD in the food  
377 supply, which have been shown to be genetically similar to strains of clinical relevance in distant regions<sup>7</sup>.  
378 Because a number of studies reported 0% of CD, it is possible that there are natural sources of  
379 contamination heterogeneity in foods, similarly to other known foodborne pathogens. There is substantive  
380 evidence to support that the risk changes as a function of climate, and latitude. It has been established that  
381 the tropic has ecologically greater microbial diversity<sup>127</sup>, but how such diversity could determine the  
382 presence of *C. difficile* in the food supply across regions is uncertain. If CD contamination is higher toward  
383 lower latitudes, possible explanations could include that more diverse microbiomes in the gut, environment,  
384<sup>127</sup> and foods towards the tropic could prevent CD colonization and CDI, since CDIs are more often reported  
385 in temperate latitudes.


386 Our study only examined the reported prevalence of CD in food items, regardless of the toxinogenic  
387 potential of the identified isolates, assessed on culture cells or in susceptible hosts. Virtually, every study  
388 recovering CD have determined that the isolates have had at least one of the three toxins or genes needed  
389 to fulfill the criteria for CD toxigenicity (*tcdA*, *tcdB*, *cdtA/B*). Similarly, numerous studies have used molecular  
390 methods to determine the epidemiological distribution of the isolates in human hospitals. However, because  
391 the performance, acceptability, and generalizability of molecular typing methods vary across regions, and  
392 because there is no a single unified system for CD strain typing or nomenclature worldwide to make  
393 meaningful comparisons at global scales, we refer the readers to the original publications to examine the  
394 strength of the genomic evidence reported in each epidemiological study. As historically highlighted, we  
395 emphasize that there is molecular evidence that the presence of CD in the human diet is genuine and not  
396 due to laboratory cross contamination with CD from human specimens. Major examples include the  
397 complete genome sequence of the first food derived PCR-ribotype 078 isolates from foods in Canada that  
398 matched contemporary strains affecting humans in the UK, in the mid 2000s, when there was no physical  
399 connection between the laboratories that reported both studies<sup>7</sup>. Supporting the remarkable risk for CD  
400 exposure via seafoods, we also highlight the latest report of CD in foods conducted in the Adriatic Sea where  
401 mussels and clams contaminated at a mean prevalence of 16.9% (CI: 14.1%–19.8%) carried a large  
402 proportion of CD representing diverse genotypes commonly isolated in European hospitals (113 CD isolates  
403 represented 53 genotypes, with 40.7% of them belonging to CD seen in CDI in hospitals).<sup>133</sup>

404 Although the present meta-analysis showed significant latitudinal heterogeneity, one of the  
405 limitations of the reported studies, and therefore the coordinate data used for the analysis, is that the  
406 latitudinal positioning of the samples collected and processed by each of the study authors is inferred for  
407 each research center, and it is not the actual coordinates of origin of each sample which was not reported in  
408 any study. However, since the analysis is conducted at the global scale and it is considered to be a proxy for

409 the exposure risk, for all studies, which is relevant for the local communities in the districts sampled by the  
410 researchers, the analysis and findings are deemed pertinent and good indicators of the effect of latitudinal  
411 positioning and the CD prevalence trend observed at the global scale. Lastly, most studies have been  
412 conducted in Northern regions, however, to increase the study power we normalized all latitudes by squaring  
413 the latitudinal coordinates as the distance from the equator toward both hemispheres which is  
414 mathematically and geo-positionally standard method to gain statistical symmetry around latitude 0  
415 (equator).

416 In summary, this study does not intend to make inferences/comparisons between north and south  
417 hemispheres. It only addresses the effect of absolute coordinates, which by the virtue of being positive (by  
418 squaring negative coordinates), they may be more representative or inflate the ecology in the north latitudes.  
419 Because local climates vary in opposing terms as latitude increases toward the poles (winter in north,  
420 summer in south, and vice versa, not controlled in this study because precise temporal referents were not  
421 reported in the reviewed studies) it is advisable that future studies provide databases containing the  
422 coordinates, day/month of the year and air temperature for each sample, and the CD test results to validate  
423 and further test the latitudinal trend and hypothesis herein generated in this systematic review.

424 In conclusion, it is reasonable to infer from our analysis that there is no a single number that  
425 summarizes the complexity of CD in the human diet worldwide. Until the dynamics of CD over space and  
426 time are better defined, doctors could advice patients and communities at risk to cook their meals better and  
427 give other simple suggestions, such as avoiding high-risk foods that are commonly consumed raw (*e.g.*,  
428 fresh produce), until the patient's susceptibility to CDI decreases. From a clinical and prevention perspective,  
429 patients could benefit by knowing which foods are more likely to be contaminated with CD to determine how  
430 to adjust their diets during periods of increased susceptibility. Considering that ~10% of the samples in this  
431 study (~20 grams per sample, over 1 overfilled tablespoon) were contaminated with CD, which represents  
432 only a fraction of an average meal size per person, it is possible that consumers are exposed to CD very  
433 frequently. If a person consumes 500 g of food per day, estimates could suggest than in average one table  
434 spoon full of meal in every 13 (260 grams of meal) could be contaminated with CD, if not cooked properly.  
435 Basic recommendations emphasizing food safety practices updated to CD (using >85°C for 10 minutes, or  
436 even better, boiling temperatures)<sup>65,66,118,119,120</sup>, could prevent inadvertent exposure especially if patients are  
437 affected with debilitating conditions that increase the risk for CD intestinal colonization and infection. Future  
438 publications should include in their design and reporting descriptors for climate, ambient temperature,  
439 season and latitude.



440

441 **Figure 1. PRISMA selection of studies reporting ‘*C. difficile* prevalence in foods’ included in this**  
 442 **meta-analysis.** The final dataset includes data from 232 food item sample sets reported in 79 studies (Table  
 443 1 and Figures 1 and 2 illustrate the distribution of studies conducted in America,<sup>1-5, 7-30, 79-84</sup>, Europe,<sup>31-35, 37-</sup>  
 444 <sup>53</sup> Asia,<sup>54-67, 70</sup> Africa,<sup>71-76</sup> and Oceania,<sup>77, 78, 85</sup>. References for all included studies are available in  
 445 **Supplementary Materials.** [Click to RETURN TO RESULTS SECTION](#)

446

447

**Table 1. List of studies included in this meta-analysis and their collective cumulative prevalence.**

Year	Study	Food Types	Total	Positive	Percent	pub_country	Latitude	ES (95% CI)
1981	Fekerty et al.	1	38	0	0	USA	42.2808	0.00 (-74.48, 74.48)
1988	Quaglio et al.	1	167	3	1.8	Italy	44.6471	0.15 (-72.40, 72.71)
1993	Sartory et al.	1	192	0	0	UK	42.2959	0.15 (-71.10, 71.39)
1996	Al Saif et al.	3	336	9	2.68	UK	51.4816	0.26 (-70.55, 71.06)
1996	Broda et al.	1	21	1	4.76	New Zealand	-37.787	0.83 (-33.47, 35.12)
2003	Al-Hindi et al.	1	48	1	2.08	Saudi Arabia	21.2854	0.85 (-31.29, 32.99)
2007	Rodriguez-Palacios et al.	2	53	11	20.75	Canada	43.5448	2.19 (-27.75, 32.13)
2008	Simango et al.	1	100	29	29	Zimbabwe	-17.8252	3.38 (-25.89, 32.64)
2009	Bakri et al.	3	72	3	4.17	UK	55.8642	3.36 (-25.25, 31.97)
2009	Indra et al.	3	84	0	0	Austria	48.2082	3.26 (-24.92, 31.44)
2009	Rodriguez-Palacios et al.	2	214	13	6.07	Canada	45.5017	3.31 (-24.80, 31.42)
2009	Satish et al.	4	140	0	0	India	11.0168	3.28 (-24.69, 31.24)
2009	Songer et al.	7	88	37	42.05	USA	32.2217	5.72 (-21.21, 32.66)
2009	Von Abercorn et al.	1	32	2	6.25	Sweden	59.8586	5.08 (-19.41, 29.56)
2009	Weese et al.	2	230	28	12.17	USA	49.2827	5.17 (-19.27, 29.60)
2010	Bouttier et al.	2	164	2	1.22	France	48.8566	5.15 (-19.22, 29.51)
2010	Hofer et al.	2	92	0	0	Switzerland	47.5596	5.05 (-19.09, 29.20)
2010	Jobstl et al.	1	100	3	3	Austria	47.0707	5.02 (-18.93, 28.98)
2010	Koo et al.	4	35	7	20	USA	30.628	5.34 (-16.62, 27.29)
2010	Metcalfe et al.	4	393	7	1.78	Canada	49.2827	5.34 (-16.61, 27.29)
2010	Metcalfe et al.	3	333	5	1.5	Canada	43.5448	5.34 (-16.59, 27.27)
2010	Weese et al.	3	203	26	12.81	Canada	43.5448	5.42 (-16.47, 27.31)
2011	Boer et al.	5	500	8	1.6	Netherlands	52.1601	5.42 (-16.46, 27.31)
2011	Harvey et al.	1	62	8	12.9	USA	30.628	5.53 (-15.90, 26.96)
2011	Harvey et al.	3	96	7	7.29	USA	30.628	5.55 (-15.72, 26.82)
2011	Kouassi et al.	3	395	81	20.51	Cotedivoire	5.3453	5.64 (-15.62, 26.90)
2011	Metcalfe et al.	3	119	5	4.2	Canada	44.6488	5.63 (-15.53, 26.80)
2011	Pasquale et al.	3	6	1	16.67	Italy	40.8518	1.82 (-7.07, 10.71)
2012	Curry et al.	1	102	2	1.96	USA	40.4406	1.82 (-7.06, 10.70)
2012	Houser et al.	3	1000	83	8.3	USA	40.8148	1.82 (-7.06, 10.70)
2012	Laino et al.	8	93	26	27.96	USA	29.7604	1.93 (-6.93, 10.79)
2012	Limbago et al.	4	1755	0	0	USA	-----	1.93 (-6.93, 10.79)
2012	Pasquale et al.	3	53	26	49.06	Italy	40.4644	2.59 (-6.15, 11.33)
2012	Visser et al.	3	48	3	6.25	Canada	49.8951	2.59 (-6.11, 11.29)
2013	Eckert et al.	2	208	6	2.88	France	48.8566	2.59 (-6.10, 11.29)
2013	Hasanzadeh et al.	2	240	25	10.42	Iran	32.6546	2.60 (-6.09, 11.30)
2013	Hasanzadeh et al.	1	120	19	15.83	Iran	32.6546	2.63 (-6.05, 11.32)
2013	Kalchayanand et al.	1	956	0	0	USA	40.8069	2.63 (-6.05, 11.32)
2013	Quesada-Gomez et al.	3	200	4	2	Costa Rica	9.92807	2.64 (-6.05, 11.32)
2013	Rodriguez et al.	3	201	11	5.47	Belgium	50.6326	2.64 (-6.04, 11.32)
2013	Saad et al.	3	100	16	16	Egypt	27.1783	2.68 (-5.99, 11.35)
2013	Sepulveda-Diaz et al.	6	342	0	0	USA	44.9777	2.68 (-5.99, 11.35)
2014	Adegboyege et al.	1	100	0	0	Nigeria	9.07648	2.67 (-5.99, 11.33)
2014	Esfandiari et al.	6	155	7	4.52	Iran	32.6546	2.67 (-5.98, 11.33)
2014	Esfandiari et al.	4	200	8	4	Iran	35.6892	2.68 (-5.98, 11.33)
2014	Kouassi et al.	4	395	49	12.41	Cotedivoire	5.35995	2.69 (-5.97, 11.34)
2014	Norman et al.	1	134	6	4.48	USA	30.628	2.69 (-5.96, 11.34)
2014	Rahimi et al.	5	430	2	0.47	Iran	32.6546	2.69 (-5.96, 11.34)
2014	Rahimi et al.	6	660	13	1.97	Iran	32.6546	2.69 (-5.96, 11.34)
2014	Rodriguez-Palacios et al.	4	125	3	2.4	USA	40.8051	2.69 (-5.95, 11.33)
2014	Rodriguez et al.	2	240	8	3.33	Belgium	50.6326	2.69 (-5.95, 11.33)
2014	Varshney et al.	4	303	31	10.23	USA	40.8148	2.70 (-5.94, 11.34)
2015	Guran et al.	5	310	25	8.06	Germany	37.9714	2.70 (-5.93, 11.34)
2015	Montazeri et al.	1	19	9	47.37	USA	29.9511	2.73 (-4.18, 11.63)
2015	Mooyottu et al.	3	300	3	1	USA	41.8084	2.73 (-4.18, 11.63)
2015	Rahimi et al.	5	368	5	1.36	Iran	32.3282	2.73 (-4.17, 11.63)
2015	Rahimi et al.	5	550	6	1.09	Iran	32.3282	2.73 (-4.17, 11.63)
2015	Rodriguez et al.	1	188	1	0.53	Belgium	50.6326	2.73 (-4.17, 11.63)
2015	Troiano et al.	2	925	36	3.89	Italy	40.8518	2.73 (-4.17, 11.63)
2015	Yamoudy et al.	1	106	6	5.66	Iran	32.6546	2.73 (-4.16, 11.63)
2016	Bakri et al.	3	600	9	1.5	Saudi Arabia	16.8894	2.73 (-4.16, 11.63)
2016	Han et al.	3	297	15	5.05	USA	36.6777	2.86 (-4.03, 11.75)
2016	Kwon et al.	8	1871	3	0.16	USA	38.627	2.86 (-4.03, 11.75)
2016	Rodriguez-Palacios et al.	1	2	2	100	USA	40.8051	2.86 (-4.03, 11.75)
2017	Atasoy et al.	2	100	3	3	Turkey	41.2797	2.86 (-4.03, 11.75)
2017	Kheradmand et al.	1	100	30	30	Iran	34.3277	2.94 (-3.93, 11.82)
2017	Razmyar et al.	1	72	11	15.28	Iran	36.2605	2.97 (-3.88, 11.83)
2017	Rodriguez-Palacios et al.	1	188	2	1.06	USA	40.8051	2.97 (-3.88, 11.83)
2017	Wu et al.	6	248	43	17.34	Taiwan	24.1477	2.99 (-3.86, 11.83)
2018	Abdel-Ghll et al.	1	150	0	0	Egypt	30.5539	2.99 (-3.86, 11.83)
2018	Ersoz et al.	6	101	2	1.98	Turkey	40.7833	2.98 (-3.86, 11.82)
2018	Han et al.	3	297	41	13.8	USA	36.6777	2.99 (-3.85, 11.83)
2018	Lee et al.	3	415	45	10.84	South Korea	37.2636	4.00 (-3.85, 11.84)
2018	Lim et al.	3	100	30	30	Australia	-31.982	4.08 (-3.75, 11.91)
2018	Nayebpour et al.	4	820	26	3.17	Iran	28.9833	4.08 (-3.75, 11.91)
2018	Pires et al.	1	80	0	0	Brazil	30.0346	4.07 (-3.75, 11.89)
2018	Frimavilla et al.	4	350	2	0.57	Italy	43.1122	4.07 (-3.75, 11.89)
2019	Tkalec et al.	2	154	28	18.18	Slovenia	46.5547	4.09 (-3.72, 11.91)
2019	Agnolli et al.	2	702	118	16.81	Italy	44.3197	4.10 (-3.71, 11.91)


Global Cumulative Prevalence of C. difficile in foods over 4 decades

448

449


ES, weighted cumulative prevalence and 95% CIs across studies over time. [Click to RETURN TO RESULTS SECTION](#)

450



451


452 **Figure 2. Funnel plot analysis of *C. difficile* prevalence reports and distribution of studies by the**  
453 **number of food items tested per study. a) Funnel plots for bias. Panel on the left is the standard plot of**  
454 **weighted estimated prevalence vs. standard error of estimated prevalence, however, such strategy is**  
455 **misleading towards suggesting there is publication bias when used on proportion based meta-analyses if the**  
456 **reported effects are close to zero<sup>86</sup>. The alternative panel to the right is weighted estimated prevalence vs**  
457 **sample size<sup>86</sup>. b) Histogram. Study distributions categorized based on total number of food/nonfood item**  
458 **categories tested in each study. [Click to RETURN TO RESULTS SECTION](#)**




459  
460

461 **Figure 3. Global distribution and temporal oscillations of the reported prevalence of *C. difficile* in the**  
 462 **human diet.** Includes publications between 1981 and 2018. **a)** Distribution of studies included in the meta-  
 463 analysis (n=79) with mean prevalence per country. **b)** Scatterplot (correlation) of number of food samples  
 464 processed (sample size) for each food set sample and the percentage of samples with *C. difficile*. Insets,  
 465 Example of prevalence variability among food items tested per country, distribution of studies over time, and  
 466 number of food item categories (eg., beef, vegetables, poultry) tested per study. **b)** Chronological order of  
 467 reported proportions for various food samples tested as sets irrespective of food category (food sample sets,  
 468 n=230). Note that some studies collected samples from >1 food item category for culture of *C. difficile*. [Click to](#)  
 469 [RETURN TO RESULTS SECTION](#)

470



471 **Figure 4. Graphical and chronological overview of food item categories (types) for human**  
472 **consumption tested for *C. difficile*: (1981-2019).** Contextualization of food items tested in America,  
473 6,18,19,34,35,38-67, Europe, 23,68-88 Asia, 89-103 Africa, 104-109 and Oceania, 20,110,111. For a historic narrative see  
474 Results section. \*First studies relevant to risk of ingestion *C. difficile* and food microbial safety epidemiology.  
475 <sup>a</sup>First study in human hospital menus; negative results. Others <sup>55,56,64</sup> yielded positive results <sup>132</sup>. <sup>b</sup>First  
476 isolation from food produced by invertebrate insects – honey. <sup>c</sup>First study in drinking water. <sup>d</sup>First isolation of  
477 *C. difficile* from retail raw root vegetables. <sup>e</sup>First isolation of *C. difficile* from animal-derived meat product,  
478 incidental finding while studying clostridia in spoiled and blown vacuumed packed sausages. No recognition  
479 of relevance to human health. <sup>f</sup>First study on retail food derived from farm animals destined for mass scale  
480 production of food for humans with genotyping evidence of *C. difficile* hyper-virulent strains present in retail  
481 foods. Isolates obtained from retail ground beef purchased in Guelph, Ontario, Canada, 2004-2005. PCR  
482 ribotypes had assigned international nomenclature by Dr. Jon Brazier, U. of Wales, UK. <sup>g</sup>First national  
483 systematic sampling study reporting seasonality of *C. difficile* in foods, Canada, 2006. [Click to RETURN TO](#)  
484 [RESULTS SECTION](#)



485


486

487

488

489

**Figure 5. Forest plot of cumulative prevalence of *C. difficile* in foods for studies published since 1981, in chronological order per region ('study-level', n=79). Notice heterogeneity across regions. The detailed decomposed heterogeneity at the 'food-item-category' level (food types), for 232 food sets is presented below. [Click to RETURN TO RESULTS SECTION](#)**




490

491 **Figure 6. Forest plot of weighed prevalence of *C. difficile* at 'Food-category' level.** ('food item sets',  
492  $n=232$ ). A version in PDF that can be magnified to high resolution is available in [FigShare](#). Each plot  
493 represents different analytical strategies that differed on the method used for data transformation to deal with  
494 'zero' prevalence reports. Data ranked by author and year. See estimates (ES) and weights (W) for each  
495 region in green and shaded ovals. Note that the confidence intervals (CI) overlap irrespective of analytical  
496 adjustments. **a)** Meta-analysis conducted with untransformed proportions. This mathematically excludes food  
497 sets with 0% prevalence (red font, approx. 25%). **b)** Meta-analysis conducted after adding 1 to the  
498 denominator and numerator ( $n/N$ ), and after using the Arcsine Transformation of the raw data which forces  
499 the inclusion of adjusted data derived from 'zero' prevalence. Note the ranking of studies excluded in plot  
500 panel a (red font), are re-ranked in adjusted analyses. The smaller size of circles with the arcsine  
501 transformation illustrates better adjustment of heterogeneity. Confidence intervals are exact binomial  
502 (Clopper-Pearson).  $P < 0.05$  indicates pooled prevalence is different from zero.  $I^2$ , heterogeneity test,  $p < 0.05$   
503 indicates the 'true effect' across studies is not the same. Random-effects, DerSimonian/Laird statistics. [Click](#)  
504 [to RETURN TO RESULTS SECTION](#)


**Culture Method Strategies for Clostridium difficile in Foods Tested in this Meta-Analysis:**

- 0. Not clearly reported or not described.
- 1. Sample → direct plating
- 2. Sample → heat/ethanol selection → direct plating
- 3. Sample → heat/ethanol selection → pre-enrichment in broth → plating
- 4. Sample → heat/ethanol selection → pre-enrichment in broth → heat/ethanol selection → plating
- 5. Sample → pre-enrichment in broth → plating
- 6. Sample → pre-enrichment in broth → heat/ethanol selection → plating



505


506 **Figure 7. The isolation of *C. difficile* from foods is independent of the culture methods.** a) Overview of  
 507 culture sequence/strategies. b) Distribution of culture methods (pie charts) across the spectrum of study size  
 508 or reported prevalences in this systematic review (scatter plot and best univariate linear fit models). Most  
 509 studies used the enrichment method described by Rodriguez-Palacios *et al.*, since fist studies reporting *C.*  
 510 *difficile* in food-producing young animals, and retail beef<sup>5,6</sup> (dark blue in pie charts, #6). na/nr, not reported.  
 511 b) Boxplots of reported prevalences across regions. Controlling for study name, geographical region, and  
 512 culture method, there are no differences across regions in the log norm prevalence data in multivariable  
 513 analysis (italic superscript 'a', adjusted p>0.1; generalized linear model: outcome, a99a\_percentplus1log;  
 514 categorical variables, a46a\_overall\_cult\_apprch a9\_pub\_region a5\_stdy\_id). c) Cumulative standard  
 515 boxplot and density scatter boxplot of reported prevalences across culture method. Inset, Density scatter  
 516 boxplot for beef samples illustrates reproducibility of cumulative data. See statistical details in  
 517 **Supplementary Table 5.** [Click to RETURN TO RESULTS SECTION](#)



518

519 **Figure 8. Global risk ranking of foods based on probability of carrying *C. difficile* illustrates higher**  
 520 **heterogeneity for pork, poultry, seafood and vegetables.** A version in PDF that can be magnified  
 521 to limitless resolution is available in [FigShare](#). **a)** Hierarchical unsupervised analysis of reported prevalence of  
 522 *C. difficile* (CD) in various food items (y-axis labels) across regions and studies (x-axis). Note that several  
 523 studies processed various types of foods. na, not tested. **b)** Ranking of foods based on the expected risk of  
 524 carrying CD (Relative Risk Ratios [RRR] and 95% CI). Note that the RRR ranks beef, poultry, pork, and  
 525 vegetables at different levels although they cluster together in panel a, which clusters these products  
 526 together because those were more commonly tested across regions. Horizontal bars connect products with  
 527 statistically similar RRR. Distinct superscripts denote statistical differences, Chi-square  $p < 0.05$ . **c)** Meta-  
 528 analytic display of weighed prevalence estimates at the 'food set' level. Top panel displays data from all  
 529 studies, including 'zero' prevalence reports (Arcsine transformation, homogeneous adjustment for variability,  
 530 see comparably-sized small circles), while the top panel displays data of only positive studies (larger  
 531 variably-sized circles, see area within rectangular polygon). Vertical ovals in top panel highlight  
 532 representative clusters of reports describing high prevalence of *C. difficile* in certain foods, supports raking  
 533 statistics in Panel b. Leafy green vegetables are ranked high since estimates are from studies with larger  
 534 sample sizes/more weighed influence (small circles, narrower CI in bottom panel; larger circles in arcsine-  
 535 adjusted top panel). [Click to RETURN TO RESULTS SECTION](#)

Global *C. difficile* prevalances for BEFF and VEGETABLE products by Region - Pooled Meta-analysis



536

537

538

539

540

541

542

543

544


545

546

547

**Figure 9. Comparative global and regional prevalence of *C. difficile* in beef and vegetables.** Forest plots using the Arcsine Transformation of the raw data force the inclusion of adjusted data derived from 'zero' prevalence studies. Confidence intervals (CI) are exact binomial. Rectangular ovals denote overall estimates. Shaded ovals, region estimates. Back ovals denote overall estimates from unadjusted meta-analysis (detailed plots with higher prevalence estimates from unadjusted data to include only CD positive studies are in **Supplementary Figures 3 and 4**). Note larger variability among studies conducted with vegetables (wide overall CIs) when compared to variability for beef products (narrow overall CI). Leafy green vegetables are twice more commonly found to contain CD compared to root vegetables. Analysis of these three food type categories, based on weighed mean prevalences, ranks leafy green vegetables as more likely to carry CD, and beef products the least likely. [Click to RETURN TO RESULTS SECTION](#)

### Global distribution of *C. difficile* prevalence for POULTRY products by Region - Pooled Meta-analysis




548

549

550

**Figure 10. Global Prevalence of *C. difficile* in Poultry.** Untransformed data (left panel) and Freeman-Tukey Double Arcsine Transformation (right panel). [Click to RETURN TO RESULTS SECTION](#)

### Global distribution of *C. difficile* prevalence for PORK products by Region - Pooled Meta-analysis




551


552 **Figure 11. Global Prevalence of *C. difficile* in Pork.** Untransformed data (left panel) and Freeman-Tukey  
 553 Double Arcsine Transformation (right panel). [Click to RETURN TO RESULTS SECTION](#)

### Global distribution of *C. difficile* prevalence for SEAFOOD products by Region - Pooled Meta-analysis

Unadjusted raw data (excludes 0 and 100% food sets)



FT Transformed (includes all reports)




554

555

556

**Figure 12. Global Prevalence of *C. difficile* in Seafood.** Untransformed data (left panel) and Freeman-Tukey Double Arcsine Transformation (right panel). [Click to RETURN TO RESULTS SECTION](#)



557

558

559

560

561

562

563

564

565

566

567

568

569

570

571

572

573

574

575

576

**Figure 13. The probability of recovering *C. difficile* from foods increases towards the tropic.** Linear correlation estimates, various meta-regression analyses controlling for confounders, contour plot simulation and Monte Carlo permutation test (n=224, 1000 perm, joint P=0.01) statistics revealed that latitude has been one of the most influential variables determining the magnitude and frequency by which *C. difficile* has been found in the human diet. **a)** Moment-based estimate of between-food-set study variance and display of weighed correlation between prevalence and the absolute latitude. Without Knapp & Hartung modification to standard errors. P-values unadjusted and adjusted for multiple testing. Note that longitude is not significant variable. **b)** Plot of linear trends derived from fitting linear models to actual data segregated by type of food and continents/regions aligned over distinct longitude ranges. Notice that except one slope, published reports have documented an inversed latitudinal trend. **c)** Contour line plot simulation of the weighed CD prevalence for all food items over absolute latitude and real longitude plane (semi-transparent circles of different sizes, the larger the circle, the greater the influence on overall simulation). **d)** Contour density and line plot simulation to help visualize the low prevalence estimates (near zero=blue) and latitudinal trends. Circles represent the location of the research centers where the studies were conducted or the centroid for the region that was sampled. **e)** Contour density simulation to illustrate that latitudinal trends (arrows) can cover different latitudinal ranges, depending on the region (e.g., short high arrow corresponds to Europe). In iterative simulations, it is to note that such density latitudinal trends tend to cluster between two extreme arrangement patterns but that the significance is independent of the region (**Supplementary Figures 6-7** for further details and statistics). [Click to RETURN TO RESULTS SECTION](#)

577

## 578 References

- 579 1. Lawson PA, Citron DM, Tyrrell KL, Finegold SM. Reclassification of *Clostridium difficile* as  
580 *Clostridioides difficile* (Hall and O'Toole 1935) Prévot 1938. *Anaerobe* 2016; **40**: 95-9.
- 581 2. Rodriguez-Palacios A, Borgmann S, Kline TR, LeJeune JT. *Clostridium difficile* in foods and animals:  
582 history and measures to reduce exposure. *Anim Health Res Rev* 2013; **14**(1): 11-29.
- 583 3. Loo VG, Poirier L, Miller MA, et al. A predominantly clonal multi-institutional outbreak of *Clostridium*  
584 *difficile*-associated diarrhea with high morbidity and mortality. *N Engl J Med* 2005; **353**(23): 2442-9.
- 585 4. Warny M, Pepin J, Fang A, et al. Toxin production by an emerging strain of *Clostridium difficile*  
586 associated with outbreaks of severe disease in North America and Europe. *Lancet* 2005; **366**(9491): 1079-  
587 84.
- 588 5. Rodriguez-Palacios A, Stämpfli HR, Duffield T, et al. *Clostridium difficile* PCR ribotypes in calves,  
589 Canada. *Emerging Infectious Diseases* 2006; **12**(11): 1730-6.
- 590 6. Rodriguez-Palacios A, Staempfli HR, Duffield T, Weese JS. *Clostridium difficile* in retail ground  
591 meat, Canada. *Emerg Infect Dis* 2007; **13**(3): 485-7.
- 592 7. Kumar A, Davenport KW, Vuyisich G, et al. Complete Genome Sequences of Historic *Clostridioides*  
593 *difficile* Food-Dwelling Ribotype 078 Strains in Canada Identical to That of the Historic Human Clinical Strain  
594 M120 in the United Kingdom. *Microbiology Resource Announcements* 2018; **7**(12).
- 595 8. Martin JS, Monaghan TM, Wilcox MH. *Clostridium difficile* infection: epidemiology, diagnosis and  
596 understanding transmission. *Nat Rev Gastroenterol Hepatol* 2016; **13**(4): 206-16.
- 597 9. Piatti G, Bruzzone M, Fontana V, Mannini A, Ceppi M. Epidemiology of *Clostridium Difficile* Infection  
598 in a Large Hospital in Northern Italy: Questioning the Ward-Based Transmission. *Open Microbiol J* 2017; **11**:  
599 360-71.
- 600 10. Eyre DW, Golubchik T, Gordon NC, et al. A pilot study of rapid benchtop sequencing of  
601 *Staphylococcus aureus* and *Clostridium difficile* for outbreak detection and surveillance. *BMJ Open* 2012;  
602 **2**(3).
- 603 11. Walker AS, Eyre DW, Wyllie DH, et al. Characterisation of *Clostridium difficile* Hospital Ward-Based  
604 Transmission Using Extensive Epidemiological Data and Molecular Typing. *PLoS Med* 2012; **9**(2):  
605 e1001172.
- 606 12. Grundmann H, Bärwolff S, Tami A, et al. How many infections are caused by patient-to-patient  
607 transmission in intensive care units? *Crit Care Med* 2005; **33**(5): 946-51.
- 608 13. Sartelli M, Malangoni MA, Abu-Zidan FM, et al. WSES guidelines for management of *Clostridium*  
609 *difficile* infection in surgical patients. *World J Emerg Surg* 2015; **10**: 38.
- 610 14. Sargeant JM, Rajic A, Read S, Ohlsson A. The process of systematic review and its application in  
611 agri-food public-health. *Preventive Veterinary Medicine* 2006; **75**(3-4): 141-51.
- 612 15. Sargeant J, Amezcua M, Rajić A, Waddell L. A Guide to Conducting Systematic Reviews in Agri-  
613 Food Public Health. 2005. <http://publications.gc.ca/collections/Collection/HP5-9-2005E.pdf>.
- 614 16. Moher D, Liberati A, Tetzlaff J, Altman DG, Group P. Preferred reporting items for systematic  
615 reviews and meta-analyses: the PRISMA statement. *PLoS Med* 2009; **6**(7): e1000097.
- 616 17. Panic N, Leoncini E, de Belvis G, Ricciardi W, Boccia S. Evaluation of the endorsement of the  
617 preferred reporting items for systematic reviews and meta-analysis (PRISMA) statement on the quality of  
618 published systematic review and meta-analyses. *PLoS One* 2013; **8**(12): e83138.
- 619 18. Rodriguez-Palacios A, Ilic S, LeJeune JT. *Clostridium difficile* with Moxifloxacin/Clindamycin  
620 Resistance in Vegetables in Ohio, USA, and Prevalence Meta-Analysis. *J Pathog* 2014; **2014**: 158601.
- 621 19. Rodriguez-Palacios A, Reid-Smith RJ, Staempfli HR, et al. Possible seasonality of *Clostridium*  
622 *difficile* in retail meat, Canada. *Emerg Infect Dis* 2009; **15**(5): 802-5.
- 623 20. Broda DM, DeLacy KM, Bell RG, Braggins TJ, Cook RL. Psychrotrophic *Clostridium* spp. associated  
624 with 'blown pack' spoilage of chilled vacuum-packed red meats and dog rolls in gas-impermeable plastic  
625 casings. *Int J Food Microbiol* 1996; **29**(2-3): 335-52.
- 626 21. Borriello SP, Honour P, Barclay F. Foodborne transmission of *Clostridium difficile*. *Gastroenterology*  
627 1983; **84**(1): 201.
- 628 22. Romano V, Pasquale V, Lemee L, et al. *Clostridioides difficile* in the environment, food, animals and  
629 humans in southern Italy: Occurrence and genetic relatedness. *Comp Immunol Microbiol Infect Dis* 2018; **59**:  
630 41-6.
- 631 23. Primavilla S, Farneti S, Petruzzelli A, Drigo I, Scuota S. Contamination of hospital food with  
632 *Clostridium difficile* in Central Italy. *Anaerobe* 2018; **55**: 8-10.

- 633 24. Hunter JP, Saratzis A, Sutton AJ, Boucher RH, Sayers RD, Bown MJ. In meta-analyses of  
634 proportion studies, funnel plots were found to be an inaccurate method of assessing publication bias. *J Clin*  
635 *Epidemiol* 2014; **67**(8): 897-903.
- 636 25. Thornton A, Lee P. Publication bias in meta-analysis: its causes and consequences. *J Clin*  
637 *Epidemiol* 2000; **53**(2): 207-16.
- 638 26. Sterne JAC. Meta-analysis in Stata: metan, metacum, and metap. Metan Dealing with zero cells. In:  
639 Sterne JAC, ed. *Meta-Analysis in Stata: An Updated Collection from the Stata Journal*: Stata Press; 2009.
- 640 27. Higgins JP, Thompson SG, Deeks JJ, Altman DG. Measuring inconsistency in meta-analyses. *BMJ*  
641 2003; **327**(7414): 557-60.
- 642 28. DerSimonian R, Laird N. Meta-analysis in clinical trials. *Controlled Clinical Trials* 1986; (3): 177-88.
- 643 29. DerSimonian R, Laird N. Meta-analysis in clinical trials revisited. *Contemp Clin Trials* 2015; **45**(Pt A):  
644 139-45.
- 645 30. Freeman MF, Tukey JW. Transformations Related to the Angular and the Square Root. *The Annals*  
646 *of Mathematical Statistics* 1950; **21**(4): 607-11.
- 647 31. Miller JJ. The Inverse of the Freeman –Tukey Double Arcsine Transformation. *American Statistician*  
648 1978; **32**(4): 138.
- 649 32. Warton DI, Hui FK. The arcsine is asinine: the analysis of proportions in ecology. *Ecology* 2011;  
650 **92**(1): 3-10.
- 651 33. Viechtbauer W. Conducting Meta-Analyses in R with the metafor Package. *Journal of Statistical*  
652 *Software* 2010; **36**(3).
- 653 34. Kalchayanand N, Arthur TM, Bosilevac JM, et al. Isolation and characterization of *Clostridium difficile*  
654 associated with beef cattle and commercially produced ground beef. *J Food Prot* 2013; **76**(2): 256-64.
- 655 35. Limbago B, Thompson AD, Greene SA, et al. Development of a consensus method for culture of  
656 *Clostridium difficile* from meat and its use in a survey of U.S. retail meats. *Food Microbiol* 2012; **32**(2): 448-  
657 51.
- 658 36. Rodriguez-Palacios A, Lejeune JT. Moist-heat resistance, spore aging, and superdormancy in  
659 *Clostridium difficile*. *Appl Environ Microbiol* 2011; **77**(9): 3085-91.
- 660 37. Rodriguez-Palacios A, Harding A, Menghini P, et al. The artificial sweetener Splenda promotes gut  
661 Proteobacteria, dysbiosis and myeloperoxidase reactivity in Crohn's disease-like ileitis. *Inflammatory Bowel*  
662 *Diseases, Accepted, In press* 2018.
- 663 38. Pires RN, Caurio CFB, Saldanha GZ, Martins AF, Pasqualotto AC. *Clostridium difficile* contamination  
664 in retail meat products in Brazil. *Braz J Infect Dis* 2018; **22**(4): 345-6.
- 665 39. Han Y. Detection of Antibiotic Resistance *Clostridium difficile* in Lettuce. MSc Thesis. Louisiana  
666 State University. [https://digitalcommons.lsu.edu/gradschool\\_theses/1516](https://digitalcommons.lsu.edu/gradschool_theses/1516); 2016.
- 667 40. Han Y, King J, Janes ME. Detection of antibiotic resistance toxigenic *Clostridium difficile* in  
668 processed retail lettuce. *Food Quality and Safety* 2018; **00**: 1.
- 669 41. Shaughnessy MK, Snider T, Sepulveda R, et al. Prevalence and Molecular Characteristics of  
670 *Clostridium difficile* in Retail Meats, Food-Producing and Companion Animals, and Humans in Minnesota. *J*  
671 *Food Prot* 2018; **81**(10): 1635-42.
- 672 42. Fekety R, Kim KH, Brown D, Batts DH, Cudmore M, Silva J. Epidemiology of antibiotic-associated  
673 colitis; isolation of *Clostridium difficile* from the hospital environment. *Am J Med* 1981; **70**(4): 906-8.
- 674 43. Songer JG, Trinh HT, Killgore GE, Thompson AD, McDonald LC, Limbago BM. *Clostridium difficile* in  
675 retail meat products, USA, 2007. *Emerg Infect Dis* 2009; **15**(5): 819-21.
- 676 44. Weese JS, Avery BP, Rousseau J, Reid-Smith RJ. Detection and enumeration of *Clostridium difficile*  
677 spores in retail beef and pork. *Appl Environ Microbiol* 2009; **75**(15): 5009-11.
- 678 45. Norman KN, Andrews K, Brawley AD, Hume ME, Harvey RB, Scott HM. Varied prevalence of  
679 *Clostridium difficile* in an integrated swine operation [electronic resource]. *Anaerobe* 2009; **15**(6): 256-60.
- 680 46. Metcalf D, Reid-Smith RJ, Avery BP, Weese JS. Prevalence of *Clostridium difficile* in retail pork. *Can*  
681 *Vet J* 2010; **51**(8): 873-6.
- 682 47. Weese JS, Reid-Smith RJ, Avery BP, Rousseau J. Detection and characterization of *Clostridium*  
683 *difficile* in retail chicken. *Lett Appl Microbiol* 2010; **50**(4): 362-5.
- 684 48. Rodriguez-Palacios A, LeJeune JT, Loerch S, Pickworth C. Transient Fecal Shedding and Limited  
685 Animal-to-Animal Transmission of *Clostridium difficile* by Naturally Infected Finishing Feedlot Cattle. *Applied*  
686 *and environmental microbiology AEM* 2011; **77**(10): 3391-7.
- 687 49. Harvey RB, Norman KN, Andrews K, et al. *Clostridium difficile* in retail meat and processing plants in  
688 Texas. *J Vet Diagn Invest* 2011; **23**(4): 807-11.

- 689 50. Harvey RB, Norman KN, Andrews K, et al. Clostridium difficile in poultry and poultry meat.  
690 *Foodborne Pathog Dis* 2011; **8**(12): 1321-3.
- 691 51. Metcalf D, Avery BP, Janecko N, Matic N, Reid-Smith R, Weese JS. Clostridium difficile in seafood  
692 and fish. *Anaerobe* 2011; **17**(2): 85-6.
- 693 52. Visser M, Sephri S, Sepehrim S, et al. Detection of Clostridium difficile in retail ground meat products  
694 in Manitoba. *Can J Infect Dis Med Microbiol* 2012; **23**(1): 28-30.
- 695 53. Curry SR, Marsh JW, Schlackman JL, Harrison LH. Prevalence of Clostridium difficile in uncooked  
696 ground meat products from Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania. *Appl Environ Microbiol* 2012; **78**(12): 4183-6.
- 697 54. Houser BA, Soehnlen MK, Wolfgang DR, Lysczek HR, Burns CM, Jayarao BM. Prevalence of  
698 Clostridium difficile toxin genes in the feces of veal calves and incidence of ground veal contamination.  
699 *Foodborne Pathog Dis* 2012; **9**(1): 32-6.
- 700 55. Koo H, Darkoh C, Koo DC, et al. Potential Foodborne Transmission of *Clostridium Difficile* Infection  
701 In a Hospital Setting. 2010. <https://idsa.confex.com/idsa/2010/webprogram/Paper5071.html3-2-2013>).
- 702 56. Laino C, Martin LJ. Hospital food contaminated with C diff. 2012. <http://www.webmd.com/healthy-aging/news/20121019/hospital-food-contaminated-c-diff3-2-2013>).
- 703 57. Hawken P, Weese JS, Friendship R, Warriner K. Longitudinal study of Clostridium difficile and  
704 Methicillin-resistant Staphylococcus aureus associated with pigs from weaning through to the end of  
705 processing. *J Food Prot* 2013; **76**(4): 624-30.
- 706 58. Hawken P, Scott Weese J, Friendship R, Warriner K. Carriage and dissemination of Clostridium  
707 difficile and methicillin resistant Staphylococcus aureus in pork processing. *Food Control* 2013; **31**(2): 433-7.
- 708 59. Sepulveda Diaz RV. Prevalence of Clostridium difficile in retail meats from Minnesota and  
709 comparison of growth and survival of human and animal isolates. Retrieved from the University of  
710 Minnesota Digital Conservancy, <http://hdl.handle.net/11299/160297>.; 2013.
- 711 60. Norman KN, Harvey RB, Andrews K, et al. Survey of Clostridium difficile in retail seafood in College  
712 Station, Texas. *Food Addit Contam Part A Chem Anal Control Expo Risk Assess* 2014; **31**(6): 1127-9.
- 713 61. Varshney JB, Very KJ, Williams JL, et al. Characterization of Clostridium difficile isolates from  
714 human fecal samples and retail meat from Pennsylvania. *Foodborne Pathog Dis* 2014; **11**(10): 822-9.
- 715 62. Montazeri N, Liu D, Janes ME. Occurrence of Toxigenic *Clostridium difficile* in Louisiana Oysters  
716 (*Crassostrea virginica*) and Environmental Waters. *Food and Nutrition Sciences* 2015; **6**: 1065-70.
- 717 63. Mooyottu S, Flock G, Kollanoor-Johny A, Upadhyaya I, Jayarao B, Venkitanarayanan K.  
718 Characterization of a multidrug resistant C. difficile meat isolate. *Int J Food Microbiol* 2015; **192**: 111-6.
- 719 64. Kwon JH, Lanzas C, Reske KA, et al. An Evaluation of Food as a Potential Source for Clostridium  
720 difficile Acquisition in Hospitalized Patients. *Infect Control Hosp Epidemiol* 2016: 1-7.
- 721 65. Rodriguez-Palacios A, Ilic S, LeJeune JT. Subboiling Moist Heat Favors the Selection of Enteric  
722 Pathogen Clostridium difficile PCR Ribotype 078 Spores in Food. *Can J Infect Dis Med Microbiol* 2016;  
723 **2016**: 1462405.
- 724 66. Rodriguez-Palacios A, Ilic S, LeJeune JT. Food Indwelling Clostridium difficile in Naturally  
725 Contaminated Household Meals: Data for Expanded Risk Mathematical Predictions. *Infect Control Hosp*  
726 *Epidemiol* 2017; **38**(4): 509-10.
- 727 67. Quesada-Gómez C, Mulvey MR, Vargas P, Gamboa-Coronado MeM, Rodríguez C, Rodríguez-  
728 Cavillini E. Isolation of a toxigenic and clinical genotype of clostridium difficile in retail meats in Costa Rica. *J*  
729 *Food Prot* 2013; **76**(2): 348-51.
- 730 68. Tkalec V, Janezic S, Skok B, et al. High Clostridium difficile contamination rates of domestic and  
731 imported potatoes compared to some other vegetables in Slovenia. *Food Microbiol* 2019; **78**: 194-200.
- 732 69. Ersöz Ş, Coşansu S. Prevalence of *Clostridium difficile* Isolated from Beef and Chicken Meat  
733 Products in Turkey. *Korean J Food Sci Anim Resour* 2018; **38**(4): 759-67.
- 734 70. Quaglio P, Messi P, Fabio A. Bacterial isolates of the genus Clostridium in honey samples. *Igiene*  
735 *Moderna* 1988; **90**(3): 486-96.
- 736 71. Sartory DP, Pritchard AM, Holmes P. ENUMERATION OF SULFITE-REDUCING CLOSTRIDIA  
737 FROM POTABLE WATER-SUPPLIES. *Water Science and Technology* 1993; **27**(3-4): 279-82.
- 738 72. al Saif N, Brazier JS. The distribution of Clostridium difficile in the environment of South Wales. *J*  
739 *Med Microbiol* 1996; **45**(2): 133-7.
- 740 73. Indra A, Lassnig H, Baliko N, et al. Clostridium difficile: a new zoonotic agent? *Wien Klin*  
741 *Wochenschr* 2009; **121**(3-4): 91-5.
- 742 74. Abercron SMMV, Wierup M, Krovacek K, Karlsson F, Wigh GT. Low Occurrence of Clostridium  
743 difficile in Retail Ground Meat in Sweden. *Journal of food protection* 2009; **72**(8): 1732-4.
- 744

- 745 75. Bakri MM, Brown DJ, Butcher JP, Sutherland AD. Clostridium difficile in ready-to-eat salads,  
746 Scotland. *Emerg Infect Dis* 2009; **15**(5): 817-8.
- 747 76. Bouttier S, Barc MC, Felix B, Lambert S, Collignon A, Barbut F. Clostridium difficile in ground meat,  
748 France. *Emerg Infect Dis* 2010; **16**(4): 733-5.
- 749 77. Jobstl M, Heuberger S, Indra A, Nepf R, Kofer J, Wagner M. Clostridium difficile in raw products of  
750 animal origin. *Int J Food Microbiol* 2010.
- 751 78. Hoffer E, Haechler H, Frei R, Stephan R. Low occurrence of Clostridium difficile in fecal samples of  
752 healthy calves and pigs at slaughter and in minced meat in Switzerland. *J Food Prot* 2010; **73**(5): 973-5.
- 753 79. de Boer E, Zwartkruis-Nahuis A, Heuvelink AE, Harmanus C, Kuijper EJ. Prevalence of Clostridium  
754 difficile in retailed meat in the Netherlands. *Int J Food Microbiol* 2011; **144**(3): 561-4.
- 755 80. Pasquale V, Romano VJ, Rupnik M, et al. Isolation and characterization of Clostridium difficile from  
756 shellfish and marine environments. *Folia Microbiol (Praha)* 2011; **56**(5): 431-7.
- 757 81. Pasquale V, Romano V, Rupnik M, et al. Occurrence of toxigenic Clostridium difficile in edible  
758 bivalve molluscs. *Food Microbiol* 2012; **31**(2): 309-12.
- 759 82. Eckert C, Burghoffer B, Barbut F. Contamination of ready-to-eat raw vegetables with Clostridium  
760 difficile in France. *J Med Microbiol* 2013; **62**(Pt 9): 1435-8.
- 761 83. Rodriguez C, Avesani V, Van Broeck J, Taminiau B, Delmée M, Daube G. Presence of Clostridium  
762 difficile in pigs and cattle intestinal contents and carcass contamination at the slaughterhouse in Belgium. *Int*  
763 *J Food Microbiol* 2013; **166**(2): 256-62.
- 764 84. Rodriguez C, Taminiau B, Avesani V, Van Broeck J, Delmée M, Daube G. Multilocus sequence  
765 typing analysis and antibiotic resistance of Clostridium difficile strains isolated from retail meat and humans  
766 in Belgium. *Food Microbiol* 2014; **42**: 166-71.
- 767 85. Rodriguez C, Korsak N, Taminiau B, et al. Clostridium difficile from food and surface samples in a  
768 Belgian nursing home: An unlikely source of contamination. *Anaerobe* 2015; **32**: 87-9.
- 769 86. Troiano T, Harmanus C, Sanders IM, et al. Toxigenic Clostridium difficile PCR ribotypes in edible  
770 marine bivalve molluscs in Italy. *Int J Food Microbiol* 2015; **208**: 30-4.
- 771 87. Guran HS, Ilhak OI. Clostridium difficile in retail chicken meat parts and liver in the Eastern Region  
772 of Turkey. *Journal für Verbraucherschutz und Lebensmittelsicherheit* 2015; **10**: 359-64.
- 773 88. Atasoy F, Gucukoglu A. Detection of Clostridium difficile and toxin genes in samples of modified  
774 atmosphere packaged (MAP) minced and cubed beef meat. *Ankara Üniv Vet Fak Derg* 2017; **64**: 165-70.
- 775 89. Nayeypour F, Rahimi E. Prevalence, antibiotic resistance, and toxigenic gene profile of the  
776 Clostridium difficile isolated from molluscan shellfish. *Journal of Food Safety* 2018;  
777 **e12586**, <https://doi.org/10.1111/jfs.12586>.
- 778 90. Al-Hindi RR. Microbiological qualities of imported and locally produced honey in Saudi Arabia. *Arab*  
779 *Gulf Journal of Scientific Research* 2003; **21**(4): 204-9.
- 780 91. Sathish S, Swaminathan K. Genetic diversity among toxigenic clostridia isolated from soil, water,  
781 meat and associated polluted sites in South India. *Indian Journal of Medical Microbiology* 2009; **27**(4): 311-  
782 20.
- 783 92. Rahimi E, Jalali M, Weese JS. Prevalence of Clostridium difficile in raw beef, cow, sheep, goat,  
784 camel and buffalo meat in Iran. *BMC Public Health* 2014; **14**: 119.
- 785 93. Rahimi E, Momtaz H, Hemmati M. Occurrence of Clostridium difficile in Raw Bovine, Ovine, Caprine,  
786 Camel and Buffalo Milk in Iran. *Kafkas Universitesi Veteriner Fakultesi Dergisi* 2014; **20**(3): 371-4.
- 787 94. Esfandiari Z, Weese S, Ezzatpanah H, Jalali M, Chamani M. Occurrence of Clostridium difficile in  
788 seasoned hamburgers and seven processing plants in Iran. *BMC Microbiol* 2014; **14**(1): 283.
- 789 95. Esfandiari Z, Jalali M, Ezzatpanah H, Weese JS, Chamani M. Prevalence and Characterization of  
790 Clostridium difficile in Beef and Mutton Meats of Isfahan Region, Iran. *Jundishapur J Microbiol* 2014; **7**(8):  
791 e16771.
- 792 96. Hasanzadeh A, Rahimi E. Isolation of Clostridium difficile from chicken meat sold in meat stores of  
793 Isfahan City. *Advances in Environmental Biology* 2013; **7**(9): 2372-4.
- 794 97. Hasanzade A, Rahimi E. Isolation of Clostridium difficile from turkey and ostrich meat sold in meat  
795 stores of Isfahan City. *International Journal of Advanced Biological and Biomedical Research* 2013; **1**(9):  
796 963-7.
- 797 98. Yamoudy M, Mirlohi M, Isfahani BN, Jalali M, Esfandiari Z, Hosseini NS. Isolation of toxigenic  
798 Clostridium difficile from ready-to-eat salads by multiplex polymerase chain reaction in Isfahan, Iran. *Adv*  
799 *Biomed Res* 2015; **4**: 87.

- 800 99. Rahimi E, Khaksar F. Detection of toxigenic *Clostridium difficile* strains isolated from meat and meat  
801 products in Iran. *Bulgarian Journal of Veterinary Medicine* 2015; **18**(3): 277-81.
- 802 100. Rahimi E, Afzali ZS, Baghbadorani ZT. *Clostridium difficile* in ready-to-eat foods in Isfahan and  
803 Shahrekord, Iran. *Asian Pacific Journal of Tropical Biomedicine* 2015; **5**(2): 128-31.
- 804 101. Bakri M. Prevalence of *Clostridium difficile* in raw cow, sheep, and goat meat in Jazan, Saudi Arabia.  
805 *Saudi Journal of Biological Sciences* 2016.
- 806 102. Wu YC, Chen CM, Kuo CJ, et al. Prevalence and molecular characterization of *Clostridium difficile*  
807 isolates from a pig slaughterhouse, pork, and humans in Taiwan. *Int J Food Microbiol* 2017; **242**: 37-44.
- 808 103. Kheradmand M, Jalilian S, Alvandi A, Abiri R. Prevalence of *Clostridium difficile* and its toxigenic  
809 genotype in beef samples in west of Iran. *Iran J Microbiol* 2017; **9**(3): 169-73.
- 810 104. Abdel-Guil MY, Thomas P, Schmoock G, et al. Presence of *Clostridium difficile* in poultry and poultry  
811 meat in Egypt. *Anaerobe* 2018; **51**: 21-5.
- 812 105. Simango C, Mwakurudza S. *Clostridium difficile* in broiler chickens sold at market places in  
813 Zimbabwe and their antimicrobial susceptibility. *Int J Food Microbiol* 2008; **124**(3): 268-70.
- 814 106. Saad NM, Amin WF, Shaker EM. Detection of toxigenic *Clostridium difficile* in powdered infant and  
815 follow-up formulae in Egypt. *Veterinary World* 2013; **6**(11): 862-4.
- 816 107. Kouassi KA, Dadie AT, N'Guessan KF, Dje KM, Loukou YG. *Clostridium perfringens* and *Clostridium*  
817 *difficile* in cooked beef sold in Côte d'Ivoire and their antimicrobial susceptibility. *Anaerobe* 2014; **28**: 90-4.
- 818 108. Adegboyega T. Environmental Sources *Clostridium difficile* in Lagos State, Nigeria. *Journal of*  
819 *Health, Medicine and Nursing* 2014; **3**.
- 820 109. Kouassi KA, Dadie AT, Nanga ZY, Dje KM, Loukou YG. Prevalence of sulfite reducing *Clostridium*  
821 species in barbecued meat in Abidjan, Côte d'Ivoire. *Journal of Applied Biosciences* 2011; **38**: 2518-22.
- 822 110. Knight DR, Putsathit P, Elliott B, Riley TV. Contamination of Australian newborn calf carcasses at  
823 slaughter with *Clostridium difficile*. *Clin Microbiol Infect* 2016; **22**(3): 266.e1-7.
- 824 111. Lim SC, Foster NF, Elliott B, Riley TV. High prevalence of *Clostridium difficile* on retail root  
825 vegetables, Western Australia. *J Appl Microbiol* 2017.
- 826 112. Hampikyan H, Bingol EB, Muratoglu K, Akkaya E, Cetin O, Colak H. The prevalence of *Clostridium*  
827 *difficile* in cattle and sheep carcasses and the antibiotic susceptibility of isolates. *Meat Sci* 2018; **139**: 120-4.
- 828 113. Freeman LM, Janecko N, Weese JS. Nutritional and microbial analysis of bully sticks and survey of  
829 opinions about pet treats. *Can Vet J* 2013; **54**(1): 50-4.
- 830 114. Weese JS, Rousseau J, Arroyo L. Bacteriological evaluation of commercial canine and feline raw  
831 diets. *Can Vet J* 2005; **46**(6): 513-6.
- 832 115. Borriello SP, Honour P, Turner T, Barclay F. Household pets as a potential reservoir for *Clostridium*  
833 *difficile* infection. *J Clin Pathol* 1983; **36**(1): 84-7.
- 834 116. Broda DM, DeLacy KM, Bell RG, Braggins TJ, Cook RL. Psychrotrophic *Clostridium* spp associated  
835 with 'blown pack' spoilage of chilled vacuum-packed red meats and dog rolls in gas-impermeable plastic  
836 casings. *International Journal of Food Microbiology* 1996; **29**(2-3): 335-52.
- 837 117. Aspinall ST, Dealler SF. New rapid identification test for *Clostridium difficile*. *Journal of Clinical*  
838 *Pathology* 1992; **45**(11): 956-8.
- 839 118. Rodriguez-Palacios A, LeJeune JT. Moist-Heat Resistance, Spore Aging, and Superdormancy in  
840 *Clostridium difficile*. *Applied and environmental microbiology AEM* 2011; **77**(9): 3085-91.
- 841 119. Rodriguez-Palacios A, Reid-Smith RJ, Staempfli HR, Weese JS. *Clostridium difficile* survives  
842 minimal temperature recommended for cooking ground meats. *Anaerobe* 2010; **16**(5): 540-2.
- 843 120. Pickering DS, Wilcox MH, Chilton CH. Biofilm-derived spores of *Clostridioides* (*Clostridium*) *difficile*  
844 exhibit increased thermotolerance compared to planktonic spores. *Anaerobe* 2018; **54**: 169-71.
- 845 121. Rodriguez-Palacios A, Barman T, LeJeune JT. Three-week summer period prevalence of  
846 *Clostridium difficile* in farm animals in a temperate region of the United States (Ohio). *Can Vet J* 2014; **55**(8):  
847 786-9.
- 848 122. Polgreen PM, Chen YY, Cavanaugh JE, et al. An outbreak of severe *Clostridium difficile*-associated  
849 disease possibly related to inappropriate antimicrobial therapy for community-acquired pneumonia. *Infection*  
850 *Control and Hospital Epidemiology* 2007; **28**(2): 212-4.
- 851 123. Furuya-Kanamori L, McKenzie SJ, Yakob L, et al. *Clostridium difficile* infection seasonality: patterns  
852 across hemispheres and continents - a systematic review. *PLoS One* 2015; **10**(3): e0120730.
- 853 124. Reil M, Hensgens MP, Kuijper EJ, et al. Seasonality of *Clostridium difficile* infections in Southern  
854 Germany. *Epidemiol Infect* 2012; **140**(10): 1787-93.

- 855 125. Rodriguez-Palacios A, Stampfli HR, Stalker M, Duffield T, Weese JS. Natural and experimental  
856 infection of neonatal calves with *Clostridium difficile*. *Vet Microbiol* 2007; **124**(1-2): 166-72.
- 857 126. Hanberger H, Skoog G, Ternhag A, Giske CG. Antibiotic consumption and antibiotic stewardship in  
858 Swedish hospitals. *Ups J Med Sci* 2014; **119**(2): 154-61.
- 859 127. Guernier V, Hochberg ME, Guégan JF. Ecology drives the worldwide distribution of human diseases.  
860 *PLoS Biol* 2004; **2**(6): e141.
- 861 128. Metcalf DS, Costa MC, Dew WM, Weese JS. *Clostridium difficile* in vegetables, Canada. *Lett Appl*  
862 *Microbiol* 2010; **51**(5): 600-2.
- 863 129. Karlsson F. Finns Clostridium difficile i köttprodukter i Sverige? ; 2009.
- 864 130. Razmyar J, Jamshidi A, Khanzadi S, Kalidari G. Toxigenic Clostridium difficile in retail packed  
865 chicken meat and broiler flocks in northeastern Iran. *Iran J Vet Res* 2017; **18**(4): 271-4.
- 866 131. Lee JY, Lee DY, Cho YS. Prevalence of Clostridium difficile isolated from various raw meats in  
867 Korea. *Food Science and Biotechnology* 2018: 1-7.
- 868 132. Hoover DG, Rodriguez-Palacios A. Transmission of Clostridium difficile in foods. *Infect Dis Clin*  
869 *North Am* 2013; **27**(3): 675-85.
- 870 133. Agnoletti F, Arcangeli G, Barbanti F, Barco L, Brunetta R, Cocchi M, Conedera G, D'Este L, Drigo I,  
871 Spigaglia P, Mazzolini E. Survey, characterization and antimicrobial susceptibility of *Clostridium difficile* from  
872 marine bivalve shellfish of North Adriatic Sea. *Int J Food Microbiol*. 2019; **298**:74-80