encouraging cooperation a dozen years ago. Those reasons are still valid today and opportunities for mutually beneficial research are even better.

EDWARD MCSWEEGAN
1692 Barrister Court, Crofton, MD 21114, USA. E-mail: edwardmc@qis.net

References and Notes

1. Bilateral Science Agreements Between the United States and Foreign Governments available at http://www.state.gov/www.Glonbal/ocs/science/science_agreements.

Tracking Antibiotics Up the Food Chain

AMONG THE COSTS OF USING ANTIBIOTICS IS the gradual loss of their effectiveness as bacteria evolve resistance to them. S. Falkow and D. Kennedy suggest in their Editorial "Antibiotics, animals, and people—again!" that the best policy to minimize these costs for a class of antibiotics called fluoroquinolines is to ban their use in farm animals (*Science*'s Compass, 19 Jan., p. 397). But evidence does not support their analysis. The suggested policy would deny the public benefits of antibiotic use in animals without materially extending effective use of these drugs in humans.

From our perspective as professional risk analysts, the Editorial presents a flawed diagnosis of the problem. Falkow and Kennedy blame increasing antibiotic resistance on veterinary use because resistance has increased in humans while fluoroquinolines are being used to treat poultry. Our analysis of the Center for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) study and other published results suggests that the evolution of resistance to fluoroquinolines in human commensal bacteria arises independently of use in animals. Strains of *Campylobacter jejuni* resistant to fluoroquinolines existed before this use. The prevalence of resistant strains in people increases at roughly the same rate in countries that do not use fluoroquinolines in farm animals as in countries that do (*1*), whereas resistance in farm animals has no obvious association with use in farm animals (*2*). Indeed, as inoculation theory predicts, the presence of *C. jejuni* strains in chickens protects those who handle (*3*) and eat (*4*) the infected birds against severe diarrhea and campylobacteriosis.

The use of antibiotics in animal husbandry benefits the public in several ways. It can reduce the cost of meat and the numbers of infective microbes in food (*5*). People are healthier as a result. The U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA) should develop an approach to managing antibiotic use that allows us to reap the benefits of these drugs while maximizing their effectiveness. Recent CDC data now being analyzed might allow the FDA to do so. Effective policy-making cannot be based on logic that attributes blame for rising resistance to relatively minor use of antibiotics in animals while neglecting the far more likely cause represented by increasing use in humans.

DANIEL M. BYRD III,[1] L. ANTHONY COX JR.,[2]* JAMES D. WILSON[3]
[1]Consultants in Toxicology, Risk Assessment and Product Safety (CTRAPS), 560 N Street, SW, Washington, DC 20024, USA. [2]Cox Associates, 503 Franklin Street, Denver, CO 80218, USA. [3]Resources for the Future, 1616 P Street, NW, Washington, DC 20036, USA
*To whom correspondence should be addressed. E-mail: tcoxdenver@aol.com

References and Notes

1. C. Gaudreau and H. Gilbert, *Antimicrob. Agents Chemother.* **42**, 2106 (1996); E. Sjogren, G. B. Lindblom, B. Kaijser, *J. Antimicrob. Chemother.* **40**, 257 (1997).
2. L. J. Piddock, V. Ricci, K. Stanley, K. Jones, *J. Antimicrob. Chemother.* **46**, 303 (2000).
3. S. A. Cawthraw, L. Lind, B. Kaijser, D. G. Newell, *Clin. Exp. Immunol.* **122**, 55 (2000).
4. R. Ikram, S. Chambers, P. Mitchell, M. A. Brieseman, O. H. Ikam, *N. Z. Med. J.* **107**, 430 (1994); http://www.cdc.gov/foodnet/pub/iceid/2000/friedman_c.htm
5. G. C. Mead, *Vet. J.* **159**, 111 (2000).

Response

WE POINTED OUT IN OUR EDITORIAL THAT 25 years ago the issue of antibiotics in animal feeds had become an argument in which scientific evidence defaults to risk assessment. The response by Daniel Byrd and coauthors suggests that times haven't changed. They argue that the benefits of continued use of fluoroquinolines in animals outweigh the costs to human and animal health. To support that case, they assert that the use of fluoroquinolines in animals is "minor," while ignoring its human uses.

In fact, 800 tons of fluoroquinolines are used annually in humans, 120 tons in animals; the latter use, hardly minor, threatens the former. Byrd *et al.* point out that resistance to fluoroquinolines in human commensal bacteria arises independently of fluoroquinolone use in animals. That is correct, but irrelevant to our case; the question is whether the animal uses *add* to the resistance load. The weight of epidemiological evidence shows that food of animal origin is the source of most food-borne bacterial infections caused by Campylobacter (as well as nontyphoid Salmonella, Yersinia, *Escherichia coli* 0157, and other pathogens). So the question is whether the use of these drugs in animal feeds contributes to the increase of resistant *C. jejuni* and *E. coli*. Such increases were seen in Europe after the introduction of enrofloxacin in veterinary medicine, and again in the United Kingdom after the approval of quinolines for the same purpose. The increase in the United States reported in our Editorial was the third case, and one can only hope it will be the last [see (*1*) for an authoritative review of these human costs].

To buttress their case for benefits, Byrd *et al.* say that the presence of *C. jejuni* strains in chickens protects handlers and consumers against severe diarrhea and campylobacteriosis. Actually, between 60 and 80% of chickens sold for consumption in U.S. supermarkets have some Campylobacter contamination. Antibiotic use has little effect on that proportion, but what it does do is to make more of the bacteria antibiotic-resistant. The data we cited show that the eventual result is an increase in the proportion of resistant pathogens in people who are buying and eating the chickens. There are about 2.4 million cases of Campylobacter disease in the United States each year (*2*). Clearly, exposure to these bacteria is not a protective event. Why Byrd *et al.* count it as a benefit is not clear.

STANLEY FALKOW,[1] DONALD KENNEDY[2]*
[1]Department of Microbiology and Immunology, Stanford University School of Medicine, Stanford, CA 94305–5124, USA; e-mail: falkow@leland.stanford.edu. [2]Institute for International Studies, Stanford University, Center for Environmental Science and Policy, Stanford, CA 94305–6055, USA; e-mail: kennedyd@leland.stanford.edu
*Editor-in-Chief of *Science*.

References and Notes

1. P. Mead *et al.*, *Emerg. Infect. Dis.* **5**, 607 (1999).
2. J. Engberg *et al.*, *Emerg. Infect. Dis.* **7**, 24 (2001).

Taiwan Seeks to Solve Its Resistance Problems

THE IMPORTANT ROLE OF FOOD ANIMALS IN antibiotic resistance was emphasized in the Editorial by Stanley Falkow and Donald Kennedy. Taiwan has had a serious antibiotic resistance problem for many years. In 1997, the National Health Research Institutes (NHRI), an institute modeled after the U.S. National Institutes of Health, established a program to address it. The program