## Antibiogram of aerobic bacterial flora of footrot

S A WANI<sup>1</sup>, S S SHAH<sup>2</sup> and I SAMANTA<sup>3</sup>

S.K. University of Agricultural Sciences and Technology of Kashmir, Shuhama (Alusteng), Srinagar, Jammu and Kashmir 190 006 India

Received: 5 December 2004; Accepted: 1 September 2005

Key words: Aerobic bacterial flora, Antibiogram, Footrot

Footrot is a specific contagious disease of the epidermal structures of the interdigital skin and claws of small ruminants, or more properly an infectious syndrome, caused by the synergistic action of certain bacterial species of which, the Dichelobacter nodosus (D. nodosus) is the main transmitting agent. The disease is characterized by an exudative inflammation with a strong, characteristic odour, followed by necrosis of the epidermal tissue of the hoof. The infection is specific to sheep and goats, although it is also reported in cattle, horse, pigs, deer and moufflon (Beveridge 1967). It is thought that initial invasion of epidermis by D. nodosus paves the way for invasion by other bacteria present in the soil, Other bacteria include strict anaerobes like Fusobacterium necrophorum, Prevotella spp., Porphyromonas spp., Clostridium spp. etc. (Jimenez et al. 2003) and aerobes like Staphylococci spp and Streptococci spp. (Katich 1979). The information regarding aerobic bacterial flora present in footrot lesions in sheep and goats is scanty. In India, there is hardly any report available regarding the footrot. Previously, Darzi et at. (2002) described the gross and microscopic lesions, while investigating an outbreak of footrot in a flock of sheep at highland pasture in Kashmir during July-September 2001. Wani et al. (2004) are first to detect the D. nodosus in clinical cases of ovine footrot in India, and identified it as serogroup B by molecular techniques. Present communication appears the first attempt in India to study the in-vitro antibiogram of aerobic bacterial flora of footrot in sheep and goats.

Exudates of footrot lesions were collected during February 2003 to June 2004, from naturally infected 72 sheep and 20 goats of private owners in Kashmir. Samples were collected on cotton swabs, transported to the laboratory on ice and immediately processed for bacterial examination.

All the samples were initially inoculated into nutrient broth for overnight incubation at 37°C. The broth cultures were streaked on blood agar and MacConkey agar plates and incubated as before. The isolated colonies were picked up from both the plates to nutrient agar slants as pure cultures and subjected to standard morphological and biochemical tests for identification of the organisms (Buchanan and Gibbon 1994). The *in vitro* susceptibility of isolates to antimicrobial agents (Table 1) was determined by single disc diffusion method described by Bauer *et al.* (1966).

Total number of bacterial isolates and their distribution is depicted in Table 1. There seems no report available on isolation of bacteria from footrot lesions from India to compare the results. However, the isolation of Xenorhabdus spp, Citrobacter diversus, Erwinia herbicola (3.38%), Proteus mirabilis, Pseudomonas aeruginosa, Enterobacter asburiae, Tatumella spp., Moellarella spp., Budvicia aquatica, Acinetobacter calcoaceticus, Providencia spp., Leminorella spp. bacteria differed to those isolated from other pyogenic infections of animals in Kashmir (Wani et al. 2003).

The results of in-vitro antibiotic sensitivity tests are also presented in Table 1. Gentamicin and enrofloxacin were most effective antibiotics as all the isolates of the present study were sensitive to them. While as 78,81% of isolates were sensitive to amikacin, 74.57% to oxytetracycline, 72.03% to ciprofloxacin, 65.25% to amoxycillin and 31.35% to penicillin G. However, majority of the isolates were resistant to ampicillin/cloxacillin and streptomycin. There are no reports available to compare the results. Resistance of different bacterial isolates to ampicillin/cloxacillin observed in present study was similar to that observed with bacterial isolates of other pyogenic infection in different animal species in this geographical area (Wani et al. 2003). These findings might be due to indiscriminate and extensive use of these antibiotics in veterinary practice. Emergence of these drug resistant isolates cautions us about indiscriminate use of antibiotics in clinical cases of footrot.

## SUMMARY

Present study describes the isolation, identification and *in*vitro antibiotic sensitivity pattern of aerobic bacterial flora associated with clinical cases of footrot in sheep and goats in

Present address: <sup>1</sup>Senior Scientist-cum-Head, <sup>2</sup>M.V.Sc Student, <sup>3</sup>Ex-Assistant Professor-cum-Junior Scientist, Division of Veterinary Microbiology and Immunology, Paculty of Veterinary Sciences and Animal Husbandry.

Bacterial species	No of isolates (%)	No of isolates sensitive to								
		G	0	C <sub>p</sub>	Ax	Ex	P	Am	S	Ak
Escherichia coli	73 (61.86)	73	53	62	24	73	16	57	7	64
Staphylococcus aureus	15 (12.7)	15	15	0	14	15	12	2	15	11
Erwinia herbicola	04 (3.38)	4	3	2	3	3	1	3	2	1
Enterobacter aburiae	01 (0.84)	1	1	0	1	1	0	1	1	0
Tatumella spp.	01 (0.84)	1	1	1	I	1	1	0	1	1
Moellarella spp.	01 (0.84)	1	1	0	1	I	1	0	1	1
Xenorhabdus spp.	08 (6.77)	8	4	6	2	8	2	1	2	3
Proteus mirabilis	03 (2.54)	3	3	3	0	3	1	3	0	3
Citrobacter diversus	05 (4.23)	5	4	5	0	5	1	5	0	3
Budvicja aquatica	01 (0.84)	I	1	0	1	1	I	0	1	1
Acinetobacter calcoaceticus	01 (0,84)	1	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	1
Pseudomonas aeruginosa	03 (2.54)	3	1	3	0	3	1	2	0	2
Providencia spp	01 (0.84)	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0
Leminorella spp	01 (0.84)	1	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	0
Total	118	118	88	85	47	118	37	77	30	91

Table 1. In-vitro antibiotic sensitivity patterns of aerobic bacterial isolates from footrot samples

G, Gentamicin; O, oxyteracycline; Cp, ciprofloxacin; Ax, ampicillin/cloxacillin; Ex, enrofloxacin; P, penicillin G; Am, amoxycillin; S, streptomycin; Ak, amikacin.

Kashmir valley. aerobic bacterial strains 118 belonging to 14 bacterial species were isolated from footrot lesions of 72 sheep and 20 goats. The bacterial species most frequently isolated was *Escherichia coli* followed by *Staphylococcus aureus*, *Xenorhabdus* spp, *Citrobacter diversus*, *Erwinia herbicola*, *Proteus mirabilis*, *Pseudomonas aeruginosa*. Gentamicin and enrofloxacin were found most effective antibiotics as all the isolates were sensitive to them. This was followed by amikacin, oxytetracycline, ciprofloxacin, amoxycillin and penicillin G. While as majority of the isolates were resistant to ampicillin/ eloxacillin and streptomycin.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The constant support and encouragement provided by Professor Anwar Alam, Vice Chancellor, SKUAST-K, for conducting this research work is thankfully acknowledged.

## REFERENCES

Bauer A W, Kirby W M M, Shemis J C and Turck M. 1966. Antibiotic susceptibility testing by a standard simple disc method. American Journal of Clinical Pathology 45: 493-96.

- Beveridge WIB. 1967. Disease caused by non-sporing anaerobes: ovine footrot necrobacillosis. Bulletin of International Epizootiology 67: 1597-1601.
- Buchanan R E and Gibbon N E. 1994. Bergey's Manual of Determinative Bacteriology. 9th edn. Williams and Wilkins. Baltimore, pp. 787.
- Darzi M M, Willayat M, Hussain S A, Munshi Z H, Mir M S and Khan H M. 2002. Study on ovine footrot under semi migratory system of management. *Indian Journal of Small Rumminant Research* 8: 156-58.
- Jimenez R, Piriz S, Martin-Palomino P, Mateos E and Vadillo S. 2003. Aetiology of ovine footrot in the Portugese region of Alto Alentejo. Journal of Veterinary Medicine B 50: 118-20.
- Katich R V. 1979. Les proble'mes de l'immunoprophylaxiae dans le pie'tin' du mouton. Compendium of Immunology and Microbiology of Infectious Disease 2: 55-59.
- Wani S A, Bhat M A and Buchh A S. 2003. Antibiogram and bacterial flora of pyogenic infections of domestic animals in Kashmir valley. *Indian Journal of Animal Sciences* 73: 384-86.
- Wani S A, Samanta I, Buchh A S and Bhat M A. 2004. Molecular detection and characterization of *Dichelobacter nodosus* in ovine footrot in India. *Molecular and Cellular Probes* 18: 289-91.