

International Journal of Veterinary Sciences and Animal Husbandry



Molecular identification of bacterial pathogen in suspected cases of respiratory tract infection from chicken

Modi AR and Bhanderi BB

DOI: https://doi.org/10.22271/veterinary.2024.v9.i21.1301

Abstract

The respiratory illness is characterized by weakness, gasping, pump-handled respiration, dyspnea, mucous discharge, mortality, sinus swelling, facial edema, tracheitis, exudative pneumonia, pleuritis, pericarditis, sinusitis, decrease in egg production and poor egg quality (Zorman *et al.*, 2000; Canal *et al.* 2005). Air sacculitis, higher mortality rates, higher medical expenses, and decreased egg production are the most common outcomes of respiratory illnesses in poultry. Total of 52 tissue samples of lungs and tracheae were collected from 52 birds suffering from respiratory tract infections during the period from December 2022 to March 2023. Out of 52 tissue samples, 98.08% tissue samples were found positive for bacterial pathogen isolation, while 1.92% wound swab samples were negative. Molecular detection of bacteria from tissue samples 98.07%, 59.61%, 9.61%, 7.69%, 3.84% and 1.92% isolated *E. coli, Staphylococcus spp., M. gallisepticum, O. rhinotracheale, A. paragallinarum,* and *M. synoviae* respectively. In this study, none of the tissue samples detected *B. avium, P. aeruginosa,* and *P. multocida*.

Keywords: Respiratory infections, chicken, bacteria, polymerase chain reaction

Introduction

Poultry are domesticated birds that are primarily raised for their meat, egg, and feathers. According to the most recent census, there are 23 billion eggs produced worldwide and 4.2 million tonnes of poultry meat are produced annually (Thopireddy, 2023) ^[13]. Compared to illnesses that affect other organs, respiratory tract illnesses constitute a major part of diseases that affect poultry and lead to significant economic losses for the industry globally (Glisson, 1998; Blackall and Soriano-Vargas, 2020)^[5, 2]. The respiratory organs of chicken include the lungs, syrinx, trachea, larynx, air sacs, nasal cavity, and nostrils. The respiratory illness is characterized by weakness, mucous discharge, gasping, dyspnea, mortality, sinus swelling, facial edema, tracheitis, exudative pneumonia, pump handled respiration, pleuritis, pericarditis, sinusitis, poor egg quality, and decrease in egg production (Zorman et al., 2000; Canal et al., 2005) ^[16, 3]. Various bacterial pathogens affecting the respiratory system include Pasteurella multocida (P. multocida), Avibacterium paragallinarum (A.paragallinarum), Escherichia coli (E. coli), Bordetella avium (B. avium), Ornithobacterium rhinotracheale (O.rhinotracheale), Klebsiella pneumoniae (K. pneumoniae), Mycoplasma gallisepticum (M.gallisepticum), and Staphylococcus spp. (Popy et al., 2011)^[9]. Molecular PCR methods that are more sensitive, specific, and effective could be more useful in the diagnosis of respiratory infections (Prabhu et al., 2021)^[10].

Materials and Methods Sample Collection

Samples (lungs and trachea) were collected from 52 birds from commercial farms delivered to the department of Veterinary Pathology for the post-mortem examination. Samples were collected from 40 chicken flocks. The birds were of different ages and came from different regions of the Anand, Gujarat.

ISSN: 2456-2912 VET 2024; 9(2): 877-880 © 2024 VET www.yeterinarypaper.com

Received: 07-01-2024 Accepted: 16-02-2024

Modi AR

Department of Veterinary Microbiology, Kamdhenu University, Anand, Gujarat, India

Bhanderi BB

Department of Veterinary Microbiology, Kamdhenu University, Anand, Gujarat, India

Corresponding Author: Modi AR Department of Veterinary Microbiology, Kamdhenu University, Anand, Gujarat, India

DNA extraction

The DNeasy® blood & tissue kit (50), Cat. No. 69504, Lot No. 172049243 was used to isolate bacterial genomic DNA directly from lung and trachea tissue samples of chickens, according to Kit's instructions. The negative control in the DNA extraction was the Tris buffer used for sample preparation. The quantity and quality of the DNA was determined using the Nanodrop 1000 system (Thermo Fisher

Molecular identification of bacteria by PCR

PCR was carried out in 25 μ l volumes. The reaction mixture consisted of 2X PCR Master Mix (PCR Master Mix) 12.50 μ l, Forward Primer (10pmol/ μ l) 1.0 μ l, Reverse Primer (10pmol/ μ l) 1.0 μ l, Template DNA 3.0 μ l, and Nuclease Free Water 7.50 μ l.

Sr. No.	Name of targeted organism	Primer		Primer sequences (5'-3')		References	
1.	Staphylococcus spp.	TStaG422	F	GGCCGTGTTGAACGTGGTCAAATCA	270	Martineau <i>et al.</i> (2001) ^[8]	
		TStaG765	R	TTACCATTTCAGTACCTTCTGGTAA	570		
2.	Pasteurella multocida	KMT1T7	F	ATCCGCTATTTACCCAGTGG	460	Townsond at $al (1008)$ [14]	
		KMT1SP6	R	GCTGTAAACGAACTCGCCAC	400	Townsend <i>et al.</i> $(1998)^{c}$	
3.	Escherichia coli	Eco 223	F	ATCAACCGAGATTCCCCCAGT	222	Riffon <i>et al.</i> (2001) ^[11]	
		Eco 455	R	TCACTATCGGTCAGTCAGGAG	232		
4.	Avibacterium paragallinarum	HPG-2	F	TGAGGGTAGTCTTGCACGCGAAT	500	Anne et al. (2022) ^[1]	
			R	CAAGGTATCGATCGTCTCTCTACT	500		
5.	Bordetella avium	N-avium	\mathbf{F}	GGCGCCGTCAACACATACTCTTGAT	520	Sevel[rev] at -1 (1002)[[2]	
		C-avium	R	AGGGAGGTCAGATAGCTCTAGAAT	520	Saveikoui <i>ei al.</i> (1993)	
6.	Ornithobacterium rhinotracheale	OR16S	F	GAGAATTAATTTACGGATTAAG	701	Van Emple and Hafez (1999) ^[15]	
			R	TTCGCTTGGTCTCCGAAGAT	/ 04		
7.	Pseudomonas spp.	algD	F	ATGCGAATCAGCATCTTTGGT	1210	Lanotte et al. (2004) ^[6]	
			R	CTACCAGCAGATGCCCTCGGC	1310		
8.	Mycoplasma gallisepticum	mgc2	F	CGCAATTTGGTCCTAATCCCCAACA	300	Garcia at $al (2005)$ ^[4]	
			R	TAAACCCACCTCCAGCTTTATTTCC	300		
0	Mycoplasma synoviae	MS-16SrRNA	F	GAGAAGCAAAATAGTGATATCA	205	Lauerman (1998) ^[7]	
7.			R	CAGTCGTCTCCGAAGTTAAAA	205		

 Table 2: Steps and conditions of thermal cycling for different genus-specific, species-specific, and antimicrobial-resistant genes primer pair used in PCR

Name of targeted organism	Primers (Forward and Reverse)	Cycling conditions								
		Initial Denaturation	Denaturation	Annealing	Extension	Final Extension				
G, 1 1	TStaG422	94 °C	94 °C	52 °C	72 °C	72 °C				
Stapnylococcus spp.	TStaG765	5 minute	30 second	1 minute	1 minute	10 minute				
			Repeated for 40 cycles							
D == (== 11 = == 14 = = 14	$\mathbf{W}\mathbf{M}\mathbf{T}1(\mathbf{E})\mathbf{W}\mathbf{M}\mathbf{T}1(\mathbf{D})$	95 °C	95 °C	58 °C	72 °C	72 °C				
Fasieurena munociaa	\mathbf{K} \mathbf{W} \mathbf{I} \mathbf{I} (\mathbf{F}) \mathbf{K} \mathbf{W} \mathbf{I} \mathbf{I} (\mathbf{K})	5 minute	1 minute	1 minute	1 minute	6 minute				
			es							
E coli	Eco 223	95 °C	94 °C	64 °C	72 °C	72 °C				
E. COll	Eco 455	5 minute	45 second	45 second	90 second	10 minute				
			Repeated for 35 cycles							
Avibacterium	HPG-2 (F)	95 °C	94 °C	65 °C	72 °C	72 °C				
paragallinarum	HPG-2 (R)	5 minute	1 minute	1 minute	2 minute	10 minute				
			Repeated for 25 cycles							
D mium	N-avium (F)	95 °C	95 °C	50 °C	72 °C	72 °C				
B. avium	C-avium (R)	5 minute	30 second	30 second	30 second	5 minute				
			Re							
0 whimotracheale	OR16S (F)	94 °C	94 °C	53 °C	72 °C	72 °C				
O. rninotracheale	OR16S (R)	7 minute	30 second	1 minute	2 minute	7 minute				
			Re	epeated for 30 cycle	es					
D 1	algD (F)	94 °C	94 °C	62 °C	72 °C	72 °C				
Pseudomonas spp.	algD (R)	5 minute	45 second	1 minute	1 minute	7 minute				
			Repeated for 30 cycles							
Mannoniae	16SrRNA (F)	94 °C	94 °C	55 °C	72 °C	72 °C				
M. synoviae	16SrRNA (R)	5 minute	30 second	30 second	1 minute	5 minute				
			Re							
M. adligantioum	<i>mec</i> 2 (F)	93 °C	94 °C	58 °C	72 °C	72 °C				
m. ganisepticum	<i>mec</i> 2 (R)	3 minute	30 second	30 second	1 minute	5 minute				
			Repeated for 30 cycles							
Psaudomonas sm	oprD (F)	93 °C	93 °C	55 °C	72 °C	72 °C				
I seudomondis spp.	oprD (R)	3 minute	1 minute	1 minute	1 minute	7 minute				
			Repeated for 40 cycles							
Stanbylogogaus ann	mecA (F)	94 °C	94 °C	55 °C	72 °C	72 °C				
Siuphylococcus spp.	mecA (R)	5 minute	30 second	30 second	1 minute	5 minute				
			Repeated for 40 cycles							
Stanbylogogaus ann	Coa (F)	94 °C	94 °C	57 °C	70 °C	72 °C				
Siuphylococcus spp.	Coa (R)	45 second	20 second	15 second	15 second	2 minute				
			Re							

International Journal of Veterinary Sciences and Animal Husbandry

PCR products were detected by running a 5 μ l sample in 2% agarose gel containing ethidium bromide for 45 min at 80 V and visualization under UV light.

Results and Discussion

The present study was undertaken to study the presence of bacteria in respiratory tract infections from chickens. To find out the bacterial organisms from the respiratory tract of chickens using direct culture and molecular methods. In the present investigation samples were collected from the dead birds presented for post-mortem disease diagnosis at the Department of Veterinary Pathology, Veterinary College, Anand from December 2022 to March 2023. In the present study, 52 bird tissue samples (lung and trachea) were collected from chickens suffering from respiratory tract infections. Out of 52 tissue samples, 51 (98.07%) tissue samples were found positive for bacterial pathogen by PCR, while 01 (1.92%) tissue sample was negative for the presence of any pathogen. PCR-based detection of tissue samples revealed positivity for Escherichia coli 98.08% (51/52) followed by Staphylococcus spp. 59.61% (31/52),Mycoplasma gallisepticum 9.61% (05/52), Ornithobacterium rhinotracheale 7.69% (04/52), Avibacterium paragallinarum 3.85% (02/52), and Mycoplasma synoviae 1.92% (01/52). None of the samples found to be positive for Bordetella avium, Pasteurella multocida, and Pseudomonas aeruginosa through PCR.



Fig 1: Agarose gel showing amplified product for *Eco* gene PCR product of *E. coli* of 232bp. L- 100-1000bp N- Negative, 1-5 bacterial isolates



Fig 2: Agarose gel showing amplified product for *TStaG* gene PCR product of *Staphylococcus* spp. of 370bp. L- 100-1000bp 8-Negative, 1-7 bacterial isolates



Fig 3: Agarose gel showing amplified product for *OR16S* gene PCR product of *O. rhinotracheale* of 784bp. L- 100-1000bp N- Negative, 1-4 bacterial isolates



Fig 4: Agarose gel showing amplified product for *HPG-2* gene PCR product of *A. paragallinarum* of 500bp. L- 100-1000bp N- Negative, 1-2 bacterial isolates



Fig 5: Agarose gel showing amplified product for *mec* gene PCR product of *M. gallisepticum* 300bp. L- 100-1000bp N- Negative, 1-5 bacterial isolates



Fig 6: Agarose gel showing amplified product for 16S-rRNA gene PCR product of *M. synoviae* of 205bp. L- 100-1000bp N- Negative, 1 bacterial isolates

Conclusion

Our study highlights the prevalence of bacterial pathogens in chickens suffering from respiratory tract infections. Utilizing molecular methods, notably PCR, we detected a high incidence of Escherichia coli and Staphylococcus spp. in lung and trachea tissue samples. This underscores the significance of these bacteria in poultry respiratory diseases. Importantly, the absence of *Bordetella avium*, Pasteurella multocida, and Pseudomonas aeruginosa suggests their limited involvement in the sampled cases. Our findings emphasize the necessity of thorough surveillance and targeted control measures against prevalent bacterial pathogens to mitigate the impact of respiratory infections in poultry populations. Future research could explore the molecular characteristics and virulence factors of the identified pathogens to enhance understanding and develop more effective control strategies.

References

1. Anne NS, Malmarugan S, Prabhu M, Rajeswar JJ. Isolation and molecular serotyping of *A. paragallinarum* from desi birds. Indian Journal of Animal Health. 2022;61(1):78-83.

DOI: https://doi.org/10.36062/ijah.2022.12021

 Blackall PJ, Soriano-Vargas E. Infectious coryza and related bacterial infections. Diseases of Poultry. 2020:890-906.

DOI: https://doi.org/10.1002/9781119371199.ch20

- Canal CW, Leao JA, Rocha SLS, Macagnan M, Lima-Rosa CAV, Oliveira SD, Back A. Isolation and characterization of *O. rhinotracheale* from chickens in Brazil. Research in veterinary science. 2005;78(3):225-230. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rvsc.2004.10.003
- García M, Ikuta N, Levisohn S, Kleven SH. Evaluation and comparison of various PCR methods for detection of *M. gallisepticum* infection in chickens. Avian diseases. 2005;49(1):125-132. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1637/7261-0812204R1
- Glisson JR. Bacterial respiratory disease of poultry. Poultry Science. 1998;77(8):1139-1142. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1093/ps/77.8.1139

 Lanotte P, Watt S, Mereghetti L, Dartiguelongue N, Rastegar-Lari A, Goudeau A, *et al.* Genetic features of Pseudomonas aeruginosa isolates from cystic fibrosis patients compared with those of isolates from other origins. Journal of medical microbiology. 2004;53(1):73-81.

DOI: https://doi.org/10.1099/jmm.0.05324-0

 Lauerman LH, Hoerr FJ, Sharpton AR, Shah SM, Van Santen VL. Development and application of a polymerase chain reaction assay for *M. synoviae*. Avian Diseases. 1993:829-834. Doi: https://doi.org/10.2307/1592037

8. Martineau F, Picard FJ, Ke D, Paradis S, Roy PH,

Ouellette M, Bergeron MG. Development of a PCR assay for identification of staphylococci at genus and species levels. Journal of clinical microbiology. 2001;39(7):2541-2547.

Doi: https://doi.org/10.1128/jcm.39.7.2541-2547.2001

 Popy N, Asaduzzaman M, Miah MS, Siddika A, Sufian MA. Pathological study on the upper respiratory tract infection of chickens and isolation, identification of causal bacteria. The Bangladesh Veterinarian. 2011;28:60-69.

DOI: https://doi.org/10.3329/bvet.v28i2.10677

 Prabhu M, Malmarugan S, Sweetline Anne N, Parthiban S, Balakrishnan G, Johnson Rajeswar J. Detection of *M. gallisepticum* infection in turkey and chicken farms of Tamil Nadu, India. International Journal of Current Microbiology and Applied Sciences. 2021;10(01):3151-3158.

DOI: https://doi.org/10.20546/ijcmas.2021.1001.367

- Riffon R, Sayasith K, Khalil H, Dubreuil P, Drolet M, Lagacé J. Development of a rapid and sensitive test for identification of major pathogens in bovine mastitis by PCR. Journal of clinical microbiology. 2001;39(7):2584-2589. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1128/jcm.39.7.2584-2589.2001
- Savelkoul PH, de Groot LE, Boersma C, Livey I, Duggleby CJ, Van der Zeijist BA, *et al.* Identification of *Bordetella avium* using the polymerase chain reaction. Microbial Pathogenesis. 1993;15(3):207-215. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1006/mpat.1993.1071
- Thopireddy NR. Isolation and Molecular Detection of E. coli from Common Respiratory Infections of Poultry in AP. 2023. DOI: 10.36349/easjvms.2023.v05i01.001
- Townsend KM, Frost AJ, Lee CW, Papadimitriou JM, Dawkins HJ. Development of PCR assays for speciesand type-specific identification of *Pasteurella multocida* isolates. Journal of Clinical Microbiology. 1998;36(4):1096-1100.

Doi: https://doi.org/10.1128/jcm.36.4.1096-1100.1998

15. Van Empel PCM, Hafez HM. Ornithobacterium rhinotracheale: a review. Avian pathology. 1999;28(3):217-227.

DOI: https://doi.org/10.1080/03079459994704.

 Zorman-Rojs O, Zdovc I, Bencina D, Mrzel I. Infection of turkeys with *O. rhinotracheale* and *M. synoviae*. Avian Disease. 2000;44:1017-1022. DOI: https://doi.org/10.2307/1593082.