

## Bacteremia and Multidrug Resistance in Naturally Parvovirus Infection Dogs

Jutapoln Sunghan<sup>1</sup> Duangporn Pichpol<sup>2</sup> Phongsakorn Chuammitri<sup>2,3</sup> Areerath Akatvipat<sup>4\*</sup>

### Abstract

Antimicrobials are not indicated for treating viral infections; however, secondary bacteremia is an important complication of canine parvovirus infection. The present study aimed to identify the bacteremia and multidrug-resistant bacteria in naturally parvovirus-infected dogs. A total of 50 dogs with canine parvovirus infection were enrolled in the present study. Blood samples were serially collected from the jugular vein with a sterile technique on days 0, 3, 5 and 7 of hospitalization, until the dog died or was discharged, to perform aerobic bacterial hemoculture. The disk diffusion method was used for the antimicrobial susceptibility test. Overall, 13 of 83 blood samples (15.7%) tested positive for bacterial culture [11 of 50 parvovirus-infected dogs (22.0%)]. Bacteremia and multidrug-resistant bacteria were found on each of the days during the period of parvovirus infection and more than one kind of bacteria was present in individual dogs. The isolated bacteria were *Escherichia coli*, *Enterobacter species*, *Pseudomonas aeruginosa*, *Klebsiella pneumoniae*, Coagulase-negative staphylococci, and non-hemolytic streptococci group D (enterococci). In conclusion, bacteremia and multidrug-resistant pathogens were present on each day during canine parvovirus infection. Performing hemoculture in each case of canine parvovirus infection must be encouraged to enhance the therapeutic outcome.

---

**Keywords:** Bacteremia, Dog, Hemoculture, Multidrug resistance (MDR), Parvovirus infection

---

<sup>1</sup>Faculty of Veterinary Science, Prince of Songkla University, Songkhla, Thailand 90110

<sup>2</sup>Department of Veterinary Biosciences and Public Health, Faculty of Veterinary Medicine, Chiang Mai University, Chiang Mai, Thailand 50100

<sup>3</sup>Excellent Center in Veterinary Biosciences (ECVB), Chiang Mai University, Chiang Mai, Thailand 50100

<sup>4</sup>Department of Companion Animals and Wildlife Clinic, Faculty of Veterinary Medicine, Chiang Mai University, Chiang Mai, Thailand 50100

\*Correspondence: areerath.a@cmu.ac.th, areerath22@gmail.com (A. Akatvipat)

## Introduction

Canine parvovirus (CPV) is the main cause of gastrointestinal infection in unvaccinated or incompletely vaccinated dogs (Pollock and Coyne, 1993). Supportive therapy and preventing secondary infections are the recommended treatment (Nandi and Kumar, 2010). The frequently used antimicrobials are amoxicillin-clavulanic acid, ampicillin, cephalosporin, and enrofloxacin (Lobetti *et al.*, 2002; Judge, 2015; Mylonakis *et al.*, 2016). *Escherichia coli*, *Serratia* spp., *Acinobacter anitratus*, *Citrobacter freundii*, *Klebsiella pneumoniae*, *Klebsiella oxytoca*, *Enterobacter* spp., *Staphylococcus intermedius* and *Streptococcus* spp. can be found with CPV infection as the result of bacteria in gastrointestinal tract penetrated into the blood stream or nosocomial infection (Isogai *et al.*, 1989; Lobetti *et al.*, 2002; Prittie, 2004). In veterinary practice, there is an increased abundance of pathogenic multidrug-resistant (MDR) bacteria, the same as in humans (van den Bogaard and Stobberingh, 2000). This causes increased severity and a prolonged hospitalization period (Trott *et al.*, 2004; Iris *et al.*, 2010). The present study aimed to identify the bacteria that cause bacteremia and determine the MDR bacteria among naturally-infecting canine parvoviruses.

## Materials and Methods

**Study dogs:** A total of 50 dogs infected with CPV were enrolled between September 1<sup>st</sup>, 2016 and March 31<sup>st</sup>, 2017. The inclusion criteria were the presence of clinical signs of CPV infection, no history of parvovirus vaccination or the use of antimicrobials in the previous month, and a positive result in the polymerase chain reaction test for CPV. The study protocol was approved by the Animal Care and Use Committee of the Faculty of Veterinary Medicine, Chiang Mai University (Ref. no. S34/2559).

**Sample collection:** BCS Serial blood collection was performed for 50 dogs with CPV on days 0, 3, 5 and 7 of hospitalization. In total, 12 and 5 dogs died during days 1-3 and 4-5 of hospitalization, respectively. In addition, 12, 12 and 11 dogs were discharged during days 1-3, 4-5 and 6-7 of hospitalization, respectively. Overall, 83 blood samples were collected from the jugular vein using a sterile technique.

**Hemoculture:** BCS One milliliter of blood was transferred into a bottle of brain, heart infusion broth (blood to broth ratio 1:9) (Lanna Lab. Co., Thailand). The sample bottle was immediately transferred to the laboratory and incubated at 35°C for 24 h; then, it was withdrawn and inoculated on to a blood agar medium for aerobic culture. Bacterial identification was based on colony type and morphology, gram staining characteristics and standard biochemical tests (Carter, 1990).

**Antimicrobial susceptibility testing and the selected Antimicrobials:** All isolated bacteria were tested for antimicrobial susceptibility using the disk diffusion method on Muller-Hinton agar. The antibiotic disks were not selected on the basis of the identified microbial agents but based on 10 kinds of

antimicrobials that are commonly used in small-animal practice. The intrinsic antimicrobials resistance of each bacterium (Giguere *et al.*, 2013; Mackie, 2017) was indicated (Table 2).

## Results and Discussion

Overall, 13 out of 83 blood samples (15.7%), which were from 11 out of 50 parvovirus-infected dogs (22.0%), tested positive for bacterial isolation. The bacteria isolated from blood samples were found on each of the days during the period of infection and more than one kind of bacteria was present in individual dogs (Table 1). The results regarding antimicrobial resistance and MDR for bacteria isolated from cases of CPV infection are presented in Table 2 (intermediate isolates were included in the resistant isolate group).

The gram-negative bacteria found in the blood samples were *Escherichia coli*, *Pseudomonas aeruginosa*, and *Klebsiella pneumoniae*, which is similar to the findings in previous studies (Prittie, 2004; Sykes, 2012). Most *Escherichia coli*, *Pseudomonas* spp., *Klebsiella* spp., and *Proteus* spp. have been reported to be opportunistic pathogens causing animal infection when host defenses or immune systems are impaired in most animal species (Sykes, 2012). CPV damages the intestinal crypts, which results in small-intestinal epithelial villous collapse and bloody diarrhea, which increases the risk of bacteria entering the body and causing widespread infection (Nandi and Kumar, 2010). Therefore, those gram-negative bacteria need a short period of time before entering the bloodstream (from day 3 onwards in the present study). Coagulase-negative staphylococci (CoNS) were the gram-positive bacteria most commonly isolated here. CoNS and enterococci were reported as the major nosocomial pathogens that have a high impact on the mortality rate and dramatically increase the treatment cost (Moses *et al.*, 2012; Becker, 2014). Therefore, the presence of CoNS and enterococci in the parvovirus-infected dogs was suspected to reflect the contamination of bacteria from the medical personnel/procedure, such as intravenous catheter placement (Lobetti *et al.*, 2002; Moses *et al.*, 2012; Becker, 2014). These were found in the bloodstream from day 0 in the present study. Bacteremia was not the factor that was significantly associated with death in parvovirus infected dogs but hemoculture and a drug sensitivity test had to be performed in every patient which made veterinarians able to choose the right antimicrobial (Sunghan, 2019).

MDR was identified here, the same as in previous studies, especially in *Escherichia coli* (Habib *et al.*, 2016) and enterobacteriaceae (Trott *et al.*, 2004; Gronvold *et al.*, 2010). The possible reasons for the presence of MDR in the parvovirus-infected dogs include the following: firstly, they received previously normal flora from their mother when in the uterus, which is the reservoir for resistance genes (Newman and Seidu, 2002; De Graef *et al.*, 2004); secondly, the transmission of MDR could have occurred from medical personnel/procedures during hospitalization (Lobetti *et al.*, 2002; Becker, 2014). Thirdly, the direct transmission of MDR between the owner and the dog could have occurred through direct contact or from the

environment (Guardabassi *et al.*, 2004). Fourthly, the transmission of MDR from farm animals to humans and pets could have occurred through the food network (Ramos *et al.*, 2013). Therefore, to control MDR needs multiple compliance e.g., awareness of rational drug use, prudent infection control practices, antimicrobial stewardship and the development of new medication.

In conclusion, MDR pathogens were present in the bloodstream on each day during CPV infection. The

gram-positive organisms isolated from the bloodstream were CoNS and enterococci and the gram-negative organisms were *Escherichia coli*, *Enterobacter spp.*, *Pseudomonas aeruginosa*, and *Klebsiella pneumoniae*. Awareness of bacteremia and MDR through performing blood culture in each case of CPV infection must be promoted to enhance therapeutic outcomes.

**Table 1** Thirteen cases of bacterial identification from 83 blood samples in 50 canine parvovirus-infected dogs

Bacterial species	Day of Hospitalization			
	Day 0	Day 3	Day 5	Day 7
<i>Escherichia coli</i>	0	1 (dog no.2)	0	1 (dog no.7)
<i>Enterobacter</i> species	0	1 (dog no.3)	0	0
<i>Klebsiella pneumoniae</i>	0	0	2 (dog no.3,32)	0
<i>Pseudomonas aeruginosa</i>	0	1 (dog no.28)	0	1 (dog no.4)
Coagulase-negative staphylococci	3 (dog no.33,41,46)	1 (dog no.31)	1 (dog no.31)	0
Non-hemolytic streptococci group D (enterococci)	1 (dog no.50)	0	0	0

**Table 2** Antimicrobial resistance patterns isolated from blood in all groups (n = 13). Red means resistant to that kind of antimicrobial. Orange means intrinsic resistant. (AMC-Amoxicillin-clavulanate, AMK-Amikacin, CFS-Cefoperazone-Sulbactam, CEF-Ceftriaxone, CIP-Ciprofloxacin, CLI-Clindamycin, GEN-Gentamicin, IMI-Imipenem, SXT-Trimethoprim-sulfamethoxazole, TET-Tetracycline)

Isolated bacteria	AMC	AMK	CFS	CEF	CIP	CLI	GEN	IMI	SXT	TET
E. coli1	Red	Red			Red	Orange			Red	Red
E. coli2				Red	Red	Orange	Red		Red	Red
Enterobacter	Orange			Red	Red				Red	Red
P. aeruginosa1			Red	Orange	Red		Red		Orange	Orange
P. aeruginosa2	Orange					Orange			Orange	Orange
K. pneumoniae1	Red		Red		Red	Red	Red		Red	Red
K. pneumoniae2					Red	Red	Red		Red	Red
CoNS1		Red		Red	Red	Red	Red		Red	Red
CoNS2	Red		Red	Red	Red	Red			Red	Red
CoNS3						Red			Red	Red
CoNS4						Red			Red	Red
CoNS5									Red	Red
Enterococci		Red	Orange	Red		Orange	Red		Orange	

E. coli = *Escherichia coli*, P. aeruginosa = *Pseudomonas aeruginosa*, K. pneumoniae = *Klebsiella pneumoniae*, CoNS = Coagulase-negative staphylococci

## References

- Becker K, Heilmann C and Peters G 2014. Coagulase-negative staphylococci. Clin Microbiol Rev., 27(4): 870-926.
- Carter GR and Cole JR Jr 1990. Diagnostic Procedures in Veterinary bacteriology and Mycology. 5<sup>th</sup> ed. Academic Press London/Sandieg. 620pp.
- De Graef EM, Decostere A, Devriese LA and Haesebrouck F 2004. Antibiotic resistance among fecal indicator bacteria from healthy individually owned and kennel dogs. Microb Drug Resist. 10(1): 65-69.
- Giguere S, Prescott JF, Dowling PM. 2013. Antimicrobial Therapy in Veterinary Medicine 4<sup>th</sup>

- ed. Wiley-Blackwell, Ames, Iowa, USA, Oxford. 704pp.
- Gronvold AM, L'Abée-Lund TM, Sorum H, Skancke E, Yannarell AC and Mackie RI 2010. Changes in fecal microbiota of healthy dogs administered with amoxicillin. *FEMS Microbiol Ecol.* 71(2): 313-326.
- Guardabassi L, Schwarz S and Lloyd DH 2004. Pet animals as reservoirs of antimicrobial-resistant bacteria. *J Antimicrob Chemother.* 54(2): 321-332.
- Habib I, Anjum AA, Rabbani M, Ahmad MUD, Ali MA, Nawaz M, Kamran M and Khan HM 2016. Occurrence of Antimicrobial Resistant Bacteria in Dogs Suffering from Enteritis. *J Anim Plant Sci.* 26(1): 13-16.
- Iris K, Leontides LS, Mylonakis ME, Adamama-Moraitou K, Rallis T and Koutinas AF 2010. Factors affecting the occurrence, duration of hospitalization and final outcome in canine parvovirus infection. *Res Vet Sci.* 89(2): 174-178.
- Isogai E, Isogai H, Onuma M, Mizukoshi N, Hayashi M and Namioka S 1989. *Escherichia coli* associated endotoxemia in dogs with parvovirus infection. *Nihon Juigaku Zasshi.* 51(3): 597-606.
- Judge PR 2015. Management of the patient with canine parvovirus enteritis. Proceedings of the New Zealand veterinary nursing association annual conference. [Online]. Available: <https://www.nzvna.org.nz/site/nzvna/files/Quizzes/Parvo.pdf> Accessed Jan, 2015.
- Lobetti RG, Joubert KE, Picard J, Carstens J and Pretorius E 2002. Bacterial colonization of intravenous catheters in young dogs suspected to have parvoviral enteritis. *J Am Vet Med Assoc.* 220(9): 1321-1324.
- Mackie J 2017 Intrinsic antibiotic resistance. [Online]. Available: [http://www.vetqml.com.au/Portals/0/PDF/Publications/1465\\_VQ\\_IntrinAntibioResist\\_Sep17.pdf](http://www.vetqml.com.au/Portals/0/PDF/Publications/1465_VQ_IntrinAntibioResist_Sep17.pdf). Accessed September 2017.
- Moses V, Jerobin J, Nair A, Sathyendara S, Balaji V, George IA, Peter JV 2012 Enterococcal Bacteremia is Associated with Prolonged Stay in the Medical Intensive Care Unit. *J Glob Infect Dis.* 4(1):26-30.
- Mylonakis ME, Kalli I, Rallis TS 2016 Canine parvoviral enteritis: an update on the clinical diagnosis, treatment, and prevention. *Veterinary Medicine: Research and Reports.* 2106(7): 91 – 100.
- Nandi S and Kumar M 2010. Canine parvovirus: current perspective. *Indian J Virol.* 21(1): 31-44.
- Newman MJ and Seidu A 2002. Carriage of antimicrobial resistant *Escherichia coli* in adult intestinal flora. *West Afr J Med.* 21(1): 48-50.
- Pollock RV and Coyne MJ 1993. Canine parvovirus. *Vet Clin North Am Small Anim Pract.* 23(3): 555-568.
- Prittie J 2004. Canine parvoviral enteritis: a review of diagnosis, management, and prevention. *J Vet Emerg Crit Car.* 14(3): 167-176.
- Ramos S, Silva N, Canica M, Capelo-Martinez JL, Brito F, Igrejas G and Poeta P 2013. High prevalence of antimicrobial-resistant *Escherichia coli* from animals at slaughter: a food safety risk. *J Sci Food Agric.* 93(3): 517-526.
- Sunghan J, Akatvipat A, Granick JL, Chuammitri P and Boonyayatra S. 2019. Clinical factors associated with death during hospitalization in parvovirus infection dogs. *Vet Integ Sci.* "in press"
- Sykes J, Greene CE 2012. Gram-negative bacterial infections. In: *Infectious disease of the dog and cat: 4<sup>th</sup> ed* ELSEVIER SAUDERS, St. Louis, Missouri: 349-359.
- Trott DJ, Filippich LJ, Bensink JC, Downs MT, McKenzie SE, Townsend KM, Moss SM and Chin JJ 2004. Canine model for investigating the impact of oral enrofloxacin on commensal coliforms and colonization with multidrug-resistant *Escherichia coli*. *J Med Microbiol.* 53(Pt 5): 439-443.
- van den Bogaard AE and Stobberingh EE 2000. Epidemiology of resistance to antibiotics. Links between animals and humans. *Int J Antimicrob Agents.* 14(4): 327-335.