Review Article

CANINE MONOCYTIC EHRLICHIOSIS: PATHOGENESIS, DIAGNOSIS, TREATMENT AND CLINICAL OUTCOMES

S.P. Abhijith[1], A. Abdul Kalam[2] and H.J. Apoorva[3]

Consultant Veterinarian,
RMV Multispecialty Veterinary Clinic,
Bengaluru

ABSTRACT

Canine ehrlichiosis is a globally significant, tick-borne disease of dogs, primarily transmitted by Rhipicephalus sanguineus, the brown dog tick. The etiological agents, belonging to the genus Ehrlichia (notably Ehrlichia canis, E. chaffeensis, and E. ewingii), are obligate intracellular Gram-negative bacteria that parasitize monocytes, granulocytes, or platelets, leading to a complex spectrum of clinical manifestations. The disease is classically divided into acute, subclinical, and chronic phases, each associated with varying degrees of hematological abnormalities, including thrombocytopenia, anaemia, and leukocyte dysfunction, accompanied by nonspecific systemic signs such as fever, lethargy, weight loss, lymphadenopathy, and bleeding tendencies. In chronic infections, pancytopenia and bone marrow suppression often carry a poor prognosis. Diagnosis relies on a combination of hematological evaluation, serology, and advanced molecular techniques such as PCR, which remain the gold standard for species-specific identification. Therapeutic approaches commonly involve tetracycline derivatives, especially doxycycline, often combined with supportive management to address secondary complications. Preventive strategies emphasize tick control and emerging vaccine research. Despite significant advances in understanding host-pathogen interactions, immune evasion mechanisms, and diagnostic modalities, challenges persist in early detection, resistance management, and regional epidemiological surveillance. This review consolidates current knowledge on canine ehrlichiosis with emphasis on epidemiology, pathogenesis, clinical features, diagnosis, treatment, prevention, and future perspectives.

Keywords: doxycycline, pcr, thrombocytopenia, rhipicephalus

Received : 22.10.2025 Revised :23.11.2025 Accepted : 05.12.2025

[1]Consultant Veterinarian, RMV Multispecialty Veterinary Clinic, Bengaluru
*Corresponding author: abhijithsp560@gmail.com
[2]Consultant Veterinarian, CUPA, Bengaluru
[3]M.V.Sc. Scholar, Department of Veterinary Medicine, Veterinary College, Bengaluru

Learning Objectives:

1.Understand the causative agent, vector, and epidemiology of CME.
2.Recognize the clinical signs and progression of acute, subclinical, and chronic CME.
3.Interpret hematological, biochemical, serological, and molecular findings for diagnosis.
4.Describe effective treatment, management, and prevention strategies.
5.Appreciate current research trends and future directions in CME control.

INTRODUCTION

Background

Canine monocytic ehrlichiosis (CME) is one of the most important tick-borne diseases of dogs worldwide, caused by the obligate intracellular rickettsial organism Ehrlichia canis (Nyindo *et al.*, 1980). It is transmitted primarily by the brown dog tick, Rhipicephalus sanguineus, which thrives in tropical and subtropical climates, thereby influencing the global distribution of the disease (Groves *et al.*, 1975).

The disease was first recognized in Algeria in 1935 and later described in military dogs during the Vietnam War, highlighting its significance in canine health (Donatien and Lestoquard, 1935; Lewis *et al.*, 1977). Since then, CME has been reported across Asia, Africa, the Americas, and Europe, making it a serious global concern for veterinary practitioners (Neer *et a*l., 2002).

Significance in Veterinary Medicine

CME is associated with substantial morbidity and mortality in dogs, particularly in endemic regions (Harrus and Waner, 2011). The clinical course of the disease varies from mild febrile illness to severe, life-threatening pancytopenia, depending on the stage of infection and the immune status of the host (Neer, 1998).

Due to the broad spectrum of clinical manifestations and overlapping signs with other vector-borne diseases such as babesiosis and anaplasmosis, CME poses diagnostic challenges to veterinarians (Gaunt *et al.*, 1996; Stich *et al.*, 2004). Furthermore, untreated chronic cases often progress to bone marrow suppression and death (Huxsoll *et al*., 1972).

Epidemiology and Prevalence

The prevalence of CME varies considerably depending on tick density, climate, and geographical region. In tropical and subtropical countries such as India, Brazil, and Thailand, prevalence rates as high as 40–60% have been reported in stray and kennel dogs (Carvalho *et al.*, 2008). In contrast, prevalence is generally lower in temperate regions due to less favorable environmental conditions for R. sanguineus (Mylonakis *et al.*, 2004).

Factors such as poor tick control practices, outdoor housing, and movement of dogs across endemic regions contribute significantly to disease spread (Aguiar *et al.*, 2007). Moreover, CME has gained importance in the context of emerging zoonoses, as related ehrlichial species are known to infect humans (Perez *et al.*, 1996).

ETIOLOGY AND TAXONOMY OF EHRLICHIA CANIS

Historical Perspective

The causative agent of canine monocytic ehrlichiosis (CME), *Ehrlichia canis*, was first identified in 1935 in Algeria by Donatien and Lestoquard, who described rickettsia-like organisms in the monocytes of infected dogs (Donatien and Lestoquard,

1935). Initially, the organism was grouped under the family *Rickettsiaceae* due to its intracellular nature and similarities in morphology (Philip, 1962). With advances in molecular biology and sequencing technologies, *E. canis* was reclassified under the order *Rickettsiales*, family *Anaplasmataceae* (Dumler *et al.*, 2001).

Classification and Taxonomy

Ehrlichia canis belongs to the genus *Ehrlichia,* which comprises several obligate intracellular bacteria transmitted by ticks and primarily infecting leukocytes (Dumler *et al*., 2001). The current taxonomic position of *E. canis* is as follows:

- **Phylum:** Proteobacteria
- **Class:** Alphaproteobacteria
- **Order:** Rickettsiales
- **Family**: Anaplasmataceae
- **Genus:** Ehrlichia
- **Species:** Ehrlichia canis

Phylogenetic studies based on 16S rRNA gene sequences and major outer membrane protein (p28/p30 family) analyses confirm that *E. canis* is genetically distinct but closely related to *E. chaffeensis* and *E. ewingii*, both of which are zoonotic species affecting humans (Dawson *et al.*, 1996; Wen *et al*., 1997).

Morphology and Characteristics

E. canis is a small, Gram-negative, pleomorphic bacterium that replicates within membrane-bound vacuoles of monocytes and macrophages (Lewis *et al.,* 1977). It occurs in clusters known as morulae, which can sometimes be visualized in blood smears or buffy coat preparations (Nyindo *et al*., 1980).

The organism has a biphasic developmental cycle comprising dense-cored (infectious) and reticulate (replicative) forms, similar to other Ehrlichia spp. (Popov *et al.*, 1998). The dense-cored cells are responsible for host cell infection, while the reticulate cells divide by binary fission within the host cell cytoplasm (Rikihisa, 1991).

Antigenic and Genetic Features

Antigenically, *E. canis* exhibits major outer membrane proteins (p28/OMP-1 family) that are involved in host–pathogen interactions and immune evasion (McBride *et al.*, 1999). These proteins demonstrate antigenic variation, which contributes to persistent infection and complicates vaccine development (Harrus *et al*., 2004).

Molecular characterization through sequencing of genes such as 16S rRNA, dsb, groESL, and gltA has provided insights into strain diversity and epidemiology of E. canis worldwide (Unver *et al*., 2001; Inokuma *et al.*, 2006). These studies confirm that while *E. canis* shows global distribution, regional strain variations may influence clinical severity and serological cross-reactivity.

VECTOR BIOLOGY AND TRANSMISSION

Role of *Rhipicephalus sanguineus*

The brown dog tick, *Rhipicephalus sanguineus*, is the primary vector responsible for transmitting *Ehrlichia canis* to dogs (Groves *et al.*, 1975). This tick is uniquely adapted to survive in domestic and peridomestic environments, which explains its close association with canine hosts (Dantas-Torres, 2008). Unlike many other tick species that require wildlife hosts, *R. sanguineus* can complete its entire life cycle on dogs, making it an efficient vector of CME (Walker *et al.,* 2000).

The tick is a three-host species, feeding on dogs at all life stages (larva, nymph, adult) and thus maintaining a continuous cycle of infection (Szabó *et al*., 2005). This close dog–tick relationship facilitates sustained transmission in both rural and urban settings.

Transmission Dynamics

Transmission of *E. canis* occurs when infected ticks feed on dogs and introduce the pathogen through their saliva during blood meals (Amyx and Huxsoll, 1973). Experimental studies have demonstrated that the prepatent period for infection ranges between 8 to 20 days post-infection (Woody and Hoskins, 1991).

Ticks acquire the pathogen by feeding on an infected dog during the acute peak bacteraemic phase (Stich *et al.*, 2004). Once infected, *R. sanguineus* maintains the organism transtadially, i.e., across its developmental stages (Groves *et al.,* 1975). However, transovarial transmission (from female tick to eggs) has not been conclusively demonstrated, suggesting that infection relies on repeated dog–tick contact rather than vertical transmission (Beaufils *et al*., 2002).

Environmental and Host Factors

The global distribution of CME is strongly influenced by the ecology of *R. sanguineus*. This tick species prefers warm, dry climates and is especially abundant in tropical and subtropical regions (Dantas-Torres, 2010). In temperate zones, infestations typically peak during summer months, while in tropical regions, ticks can persist year-round (Cicuttin *et al.,* 2015).

Dogs living in kennels, shelters, and rural environments with poor tick control measures are at higher risk of infection (Harrus *et al*., 2010). Furthermore, movement of infected dogs across regions facilitates the introduction of *E. canis* into previously non-endemic areas (Mekuzas *et al.*, 2009). Studies have also indicated that outdoor lifestyle, lack of acaricide use, and cohabitation with multiple dogs increase the risk of tick infestation and subsequent CME transmission (Trapp *et al*., 2006).

Other Possible Vectors

Although *R. sanguineus* is the principal vector, other tick species such as *Haemaphysalis longicornis* and *Dermacentor variabilis* have been implicated experimentally in *E. canis*

transmission (Gupta *et al.*, 2018). However, their role in natural transmission remains uncertain and region-specific. This indicates that while CME is predominantly associated with *R. sanguineus*, vector diversity may influence epidemiology in certain regions.

PATHOGENESIS

Entry and Establishment of Infection

After being transmitted by the bite of an infected *Rhipicephalus sanguineus*, *Ehrlichia canis* enters the bloodstream and targets circulating monocytes and macrophages (Amyx and Huxsoll, 1973). The bacterium attaches to host cell membranes through surface proteins such as OMP-1 and enters by endocytosis (Rikihisa, 1991). Once inside, it resides within membrane-bound vacuoles where it avoids lysosomal degradation and begins replication (Popov *et al*., 1998).

The ability to survive and replicate within host mononuclear cells is critical for dissemination, as these infected cells migrate throughout the body and transport the pathogen to the spleen, lymph nodes, bone marrow, and other reticuloendothelial tissues (Nyindo *et al*., 1980).

Replication and Dissemination

Within infected vacuoles, *E. canis* undergoes a biphasic developmental cycle consisting of reticulate (replicative) and dense-cored (infectious) forms (Popov *et al*., 1998). The reticulate forms multiply by binary fission, leading to clusters known as morulae, which can be detected in stained blood smears (Lewis *et al*., 1977).

Dissemination of the organism throughout the body causes generalized infection. Infected monocytes infiltrate the spleen, lymphoid tissues, lungs, and kidneys, triggering widespread immune activation and tissue injury (Harrus *et al*., 1998).

Host–Pathogen Interaction

The pathogenesis of CME is closely linked to the host immune response. Infected monocytes secrete pro-inflammatory cytokines such as TNF-α, IL-1, and IL-6, which contribute to fever, anorexia, and systemic illness (Harrus *et al.*, 1997). However, excessive cytokine release also leads to immune-mediated destruction of platelets and erythrocytes, resulting in thrombocytopenia and anemia (Codner and Farris-Smith, 1986).

Furthermore, *E. canis* evades immune clearance through antigenic variation of its outer membrane proteins and by suppressing host immune mechanisms (McBride *et al.*, 1999). Persistent infection is facilitated by the pathogen's ability to downregulate MHC class II expression, leading to impaired antigen presentation (Rikihisa, 1991).

Immunopathology and Chronicity

The severity of CME is often associated with immunopathological mechanisms rather than direct bacterial cytotoxicity. Immune complexes formed between *E. canis* antigens and host antibodies deposit in organs such as kidneys, causing glomerulonephritis (Nyindo *et al.*, 1980).

In chronic infection, bone marrow suppression develops due to prolonged immune activation, leading to pancytopenia and poor prognosis (Huxsoll *et al.,* 1972). German Shepherds are particularly susceptible to severe disease, possibly due to breed-related immunogenetic predispositions (Ristic and Holland, 1993).

Key Determinants of Pathogenesis

The main determinants of pathogenesis in CME include:

- Intracellular survival within monocytes and macrophages.
- Dissemination to lymphoid and reticuloendothelial tissues.
- Immune-mediated cytopenias.
- Antigenic variation and immune evasion.
- Chronic immunopathology resulting in bone marrow suppression.

CLINICAL MANIFESTATIONS

Acute Phase

The acute phase of canine monocytic ehrlichiosis typically occurs 1–3 weeks post-infection and lasts 2–4 weeks (Huxsoll *et al.*, 1972). Clinical signs are often non-specific and may include:

- Fever
- Lethargy and anorexia
- Lymphadenopathy and splenomegaly
- Mild thrombocytopenia and anemia. Some dogs may also develop hemorrhagic tendencies, such as epistaxis or petechial hemorrhages (Ristic, 1991). During this stage, the organism is present in high numbers in circulating monocytes, facilitating diagnosis by blood smear or PCR (Nyindo *et al.*, 1980).

Subclinical Phase

Following the acute stage, many dogs enter a subclinical phase lasting weeks to months, during which clinical signs are minimal or absent (Harrus and Waner, 2011). Despite the lack of overt signs, hematological abnormalities such as mild thrombocytopenia or leukopenia may persist (Neer, 1998). Dogs in this phase serve as reservoirs, sustaining infection and enabling tick-mediated transmission to other animals (Stich *et al.,* 2004).

Chronic Phase

The chronic phase may occur months to years after initial infection, particularly in untreated or immunocompromised dogs (Ristic, 1991). Clinical manifestations during this stage are often severe and may include:

- Pancytopenia (anemia, leukopenia, thrombocytopenia)
- Severe bleeding tendencies (epistaxis, hematomas, melena)
- Weight loss and cachexia
- Ocular lesions (uveitis, retinal hemorrhage)
- Chronic CME is associated with bone marrow suppression and immunopathological damage to organs such as the liver and kidneys (Huxsoll *et al*., 1972).

Breed and Age Susceptibility

Certain breeds, notably German Shepherds, have been reported to develop more severe manifestations of CME, possibly due to genetic predisposition affecting immune response (Nyindo *et al*., 1980; Ristic and Holland, 1993). Puppies and young dogs are also at higher risk of acute and severe disease, whereas older dogs may present with subclinical or chronic infection (Lewis *et al.*, 1977).

Other Clinical Signs

Additional signs of CME may include:

- Gastrointestinal disturbances (vomiting, diarrhea)
- Respiratory signs (dyspnea, pulmonary edema)
- Edema of limbs or ventral abdomen due to hypoalbuminemia
- Recurrent infections due to immunosuppression. The broad spectrum of clinical signs can mimic other vector-borne diseases such as babesiosis, anaplasmosis, and leptospirosis, complicating differential diagnosis (Gaunt *et al.*, 1996).

HEMATOLOGICAL AND BIOCHEMICAL ALTERATIONS

Hematological Changes

Anemia

Anemia is a common finding in dogs infected with *Ehrlichia canis* and may range from mild to severe depending on the stage of infection (Huxsoll *et al.,* 1972). The anemia is usually normocytic and normochromic, although regenerative anemia may be observed during the acute phase (Codner and Farris-Smith, 1986). Immune-mediated hemolysis and bone marrow suppression contribute to the development of anemia in chronic cases (Ristic, 1991).

Thrombocytopenia

Thrombocytopenia is considered a hallmark of CME and is observed in both acute and chronic phases (Harrus and Waner, 2011). Platelet counts may drop below 50,000/µL in severe cases, increasing the risk of spontaneous bleeding (Nyindo *et al*., 1980). The mechanisms include immune-mediated destruction, sequestration in the spleen, and decreased production in the bone marrow (Rikihisa, 1991).

Leukocyte Alterations

Leukopenia, neutropenia, or lymphocytosis may be observed depending on the infection stage (Neer, 1998). Acute infection often triggers leukopenia due to the consumption of immune cells in the inflammatory response, whereas chronic infection may lead to pancytopenia (Lewis *et al*., 1977).Monocytosis is the foremost and most consistent blood picture finding in blood smear evaluation of dogs ailing with *E. canis* infection.

Biochemical Changes

Liver Enzymes

Mild to moderate elevations in liver enzymes such as ALT, AST, and ALP are commonly reported in dogs with CME (Harrus *et al.*, 1998). These changes reflect hepatic inflammation, possibly due to direct pathogen invasion or immune-mediated damage. Hyperbilirubinemia may also occur in severe cases.

Renal Function

Proteinuria and elevated blood urea nitrogen (BUN) and creatinine levels are occasionally observed, indicating renal involvement (Nyindo *et al.*, 1980). Chronic immune-complex glomerulonephritis may develop in prolonged infections, contributing to persistent renal impairment (Codner and Farris-Smith, 1986).

Protein Profile

Hypoalbuminemia and hyperglobulinemia are frequently seen in chronic CME, reflecting persistent inflammation and immune complex formation (Ristic, 1991). The albumin-to-globulin ratio is a useful indicator for monitoring disease progression and response to therapy.

Other Laboratory Findings

- Coagulation abnormalities: Prolonged clotting times in severe thrombocytopenic dogs.
- Bone marrow suppression: Evident in chronic cases with pancytopenia.
- Electrolyte imbalances: Occasionally observed due to renal compromise or gastrointestinal loss.
- Laboratory findings, when combined with clinical signs and serology, significantly improve the accuracy of CME diagnosis and prognosis assessment (Harrus and Waner, 2011).

DIAGNOSIS OF CANINE MONOCYTIC EHRLICHIOSIS (CME)

Clinical Diagnosis

Clinical suspicion of CME is based on a combination of history, tick exposure, and presenting signs (Harrus and Waner, 2011). Dogs with a history of tick infestation in endemic areas presenting with fever, lethargy, lymphadenopathy, and bleeding tendencies should be evaluated for CME (Neer, 1998).

However, due to the non-specific nature of clinical signs, diagnosis based solely on clinical presentation is challenging. Differential diagnoses include babesiosis, anaplasmosis, leptospirosis, and immune-mediated cytopenias (Gaunt *et al*., 1996).

Microscopy and Cytology

Blood Smears

Visualization of *Ehrlichia canis* morulae in monocytes or neutrophils on Giemsa-stained blood smears is considered diagnostic (Lewis *et al.,* 1977). Morulae

are basophilic, intracytoplasmic inclusions, typically observed during the acute phase when bacteraemia is high.

Bone Marrow and Lymph Node Aspirates

In chronic or subclinical cases, morulae may be detected in bone marrow aspirates or lymph node cytology, as peripheral blood smears often appear negative (Amyx and Huxsoll, 1973).

Serology

Indirect Fluorescent Antibody (IFA)

IFA remains the gold standard serological test for CME. It detects IgG antibodies against E. canis antigens, with titers ≥1:80 considered positive in most laboratories (Harrus *et al.*, 1998). However, seroconversion may take 7–28 days post-infection, limiting early diagnosis.

Enzyme-Linked Immunosorbent Assay (ELISA)

Commercial ELISA kits targeting *E. canis* p30/p28 proteins are widely used for rapid screening (McBride *et al.*, 1999). These tests are convenient and allow high-throughput screening but may cross-react with other ehrlichial species, necessitating confirmatory testing.

Molecular Methods

Polymerase Chain Reaction (PCR)

PCR provides a sensitive and specific method for detecting *E. canis* DNA in blood, bone marrow, or spleen samples (Stich *et al.*, 2004). Various primers targeting the 16S rRNA, dsb, or groESL genes are used for amplification and detection (Unver *et al.,* 2001).

Real-Time PCR and Sequencing

Real-time quantitative PCR (qPCR) allows rapid detection and quantification of *E. canis* load in clinical samples, aiding in monitoring treatment efficacy (Inokuma *et al*., 2006). Sequencing of PCR products can further identify strain variations and support epidemiological studies.

Diagnostic Challenges

- Early-stage infection may be missed due to low antibody titers or absent morulae in blood smears.
- Chronic infections often have low bacterial loads, making PCR necessary for confirmation.
- Cross-reactivity in serological tests can complicate interpretation, especially in regions with multiple ehrlichial species.

A combination of clinical signs, hematology, serology, and molecular assays provides the most reliable approach for accurate CME diagnosis (Harrus and Waner, 2011).

TREATMENT AND MANAGEMENT

Chemotherapeutic Agents

Doxycycline

Doxycycline is the drug of choice for CME due to its high efficacy against *Ehrlichia canis* and good tissue

penetration (Harrus and Waner, 2011). The recommended dose is 10 mg/kg orally once daily for 28 days. Doxycycline eliminates the organism from blood and tissues in most acute and subclinical cases and reduces the risk of progression to chronic disease (Neer, 1998).

Imidocarb Dipropionate

Imidocarb dipropionate has been used as an alternative treatment, particularly in cases resistant to doxycycline (Lewis *et al*., 1977). The drug is administered intramuscularly or subcutaneously at a dose of 5–6 mg/kg, repeated after 14 days. Although effective, it is less commonly used due to potential side effects such as cholinergic signs and injection-site reactions.

Other Antibiotics

Other antibiotics, including minocycline and rifampicin, have shown some efficacy in experimental infections but are not widely recommended due to limited clinical data (Gaunt *et al*., 1996).

Supportive Therapy

Supportive care is essential in dogs with severe or chronic CME and may include:

- Blood transfusions for severe anemia or thrombocytopenia (Huxsoll *et al.*, 1972).
- Fluid therapy and electrolyte correction for dehydration or renal involvement.
- Corticosteroids or immunosuppressive therapy in cases with severe immune-mediated cytopenias (Codner and Farris-Smith, 1986).

Prognosis

The prognosis of CME depends on the stage of infection and promptness of therapy. Dogs treated during the acute or subclinical phase typically recover fully, with restoration of normal hematological parameters (Harrus *et al.*, 1998).

Chronic infections with pancytopenia, bone marrow suppression, or severe organ involvement carry a guarded to poor prognosis, and some dogs may require prolonged monitoring and repeated therapy (Ristic, 1991). Early diagnosis and effective treatment are therefore critical to prevent irreversible damage.

Treatment Challenges

- Delayed diagnosis due to subclinical infection or non-specific signs.
- Persistence of the organism in tissues despite therapy, necessitating long-term monitoring.
- Drug resistance is uncommon but may develop in regions with widespread doxycycline use.
- Concurrent infections with other vector-borne pathogens complicate management and response to therapy (Stich *et al.*, 2004).

Integrated Management

Comprehensive CME management includes:

- Early chemotherapeutic intervention.
- Regular monitoring of hematological and biochemical parameters.
- Tick control to prevent reinfection.
- Client education regarding disease signs and prevention strategies.

PREVENTION AND CONTROL STRATEGIES

Tick Control

Environmental Management

Since *Rhipicephalus sanguineus* thrives in kennels and domestic environments, maintaining clean living conditions is essential. Regular removal of leaf litter, debris, and thorough cleaning of dog bedding reduces tick habitat (Dantas-Torres, 2008).

Acaricidal Treatments

Topical acaricides such as fipronil, permethrin, or selamectin effectively prevent tick infestations (Fourie *et al.*, 2013). Monthly application or longer-acting spot-on formulations are recommended, particularly in endemic areas.

Tick Collars and Systemic Treatments

Tick collars impregnated with amitraz or flumethrin provide long-term protection. Oral systemic treatments with isoxazoline compounds (e.g., fluralaner, afoxolaner) have shown excellent efficacy against *R. sanguineus* (Beugnet and Larsen, 2015).

Dog Management

Regular Grooming and Inspection

Routine inspection and grooming help identify and remove ticks before they transmit *E. canis.* Emphasis should be placed on areas like ears, neck, and interdigital spaces where ticks commonly attach (Dantas-Torres, 2010).

Isolation of Infected Dogs

Dogs diagnosed with CME should be kept isolated until ticks are eradicated to prevent spread to other dogs (Harrus and Waner, 2011).

Owner Education

Educating pet owners about tick biology, CME signs, and preventive measures significantly reduces infection rates (Trapp *et al.*, 2006). Awareness campaigns in endemic areas are particularly effective.

Vaccination Prospects

Currently, no commercially available vaccine exists for CME. Research on recombinant outer membrane protein vaccines (p28/p30) is ongoing, showing partial protection in experimental studies (McBride *et al*., 1999). Vaccine development is challenged by antigenic variability and the intracellular lifestyle of *E. canis.*

Integrated Control Strategy

Effective CME prevention requires an integrated approach combining:

- Environmental management
- Routine tick control with acaricides
- Monitoring and treatment of infected dogs
- Owner education and community awareness programs
- Research toward vaccine development and epidemiological surveillance

Zoonotic and Public Health Considerations

Although *Ehrlichia canis* primarily affects dogs, related ehrlichial species (*E. chaffeensis*, *E. ewingii*) are zoonotic, highlighting the need for tick control to prevent human infections (Dumler *et al.*, 2001). Proper tick management in domestic settings reduces the risk of human exposure.

FUTURE DIRECTIONS AND RESEARCH

Vaccine Development

Despite decades of research, no commercially available vaccine exists for canine monocytic ehrlichiosis. Current studies focus on recombinant outer membrane proteins (p28, p30) and other immunogenic antigens that can stimulate protective immunity (McBride *et al.*, 1999). Future research should aim at developing vaccines that induce both humoral and cellular immunity, considering the antigenic variability of *Ehrlichia canis* strains.

Novel Therapeutic Approaches

While doxycycline remains the drug of choice, there is a need for alternative therapies, particularly for chronic or resistant infections. Research on new antibiotics, combination therapies, and host-directed treatments is ongoing (Gaunt *et al.*, 1996). Additionally, immunomodulatory therapy targeting cytokine-mediated pathology may help reduce complications associated with chronic CME.

Molecular Epidemiology and Strain Diversity

Global distribution of *E. canis* suggests significant genetic variability among strains (Unver *et al*., 2001). Advanced genomic studies using next-generation sequencing can provide insights into strain differences, virulence factors, and regional epidemiology. These studies are critical for vaccine design and understanding disease severity in different dog populations.

Vector Ecology and Control

Understanding the ecology of *Rhipicephalus sanguineus* and other potential vectors is vital for improving tick control strategies. Climate change, urbanization, and dog movement patterns influence tick populations and CME prevalence (Dantas-Torres, 2010). Future research should focus on sustainable vector control methods, integrated pest management, and ecological modeling to predict high-risk areas.

Host Immune Response and Pathogenesis

Further investigation into host–pathogen interactions, particularly the immune evasion mechanisms of *E. canis*, is essential. Understanding how the bacterium suppresses monocyte function, induces immune-mediated cytopenias, and persists in tissues can inform both therapeutic and preventive strategies (Rikihisa, 1991).

Public Health Implications

Although *E. canis* is not considered zoonotic, related ehrlichial species pose risks to humans. Studies on tick ecology, co-infections, and pathogen spillover between dogs and humans can provide insights for One Health approaches to vector-borne diseases (Dumler *et al.*, 2001).

Future Directions Summary

- Development of effective vaccines targeting multiple *E. canis* antigens
- Exploration of novel therapeutics and immunomodulatory agents
- Molecular epidemiology studies to map strain diversity and virulence
- Enhanced vector ecology research to improve tick control strategies
- Detailed studies on host immune response and pathogenesis mechanisms
- Integration of One Health principles to monitor and mitigate vector-borne diseases

REFERENCES

Aguiar, D.M., Saito, T.B., Hagiwara, M.K., Machado, R.Z., Labruna, M.B. and Moraes-Filho, J. (2007). Serological diagnosis of canine monocytic ehrlichiosis with Brazilian isolates of *Ehrlichia canis*. *Veterinary Parasitology,* **149**: 286–292.

Amyx, H.L. and Huxsoll, D.L. (1973). Redescription of *Ehrlichia canis* (Donatien and Lestoquard) in the dog. *American Journal of Veterinary Research,* **34**: 145–152.

Beaufils, J.P., Inokuma, H., Martin-Granel, J. and Fournier, P.E. (2002). Transovarial transmission of *Ehrlichia canis* in *Rhipicephalus sanguineus* ticks: A laboratory study. *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences*, **990**: 181–185.

Beugnet, F. and Larsen, D. (2015). A review of the efficacy of isoxazoline compounds against ticks in dogs. *Parasite,* **22**: 28.

Carvalho, F.S., Wenceslau, A.A., Albuquerque, G.R., Munhoz, A.D. and Silva, F.L. (2008). Epidemiological and molecular study of canine ehrlichiosis in northeastern Brazil. *Veterinary Parasitology,* **155**: 159–163.

Cicuttin, G.L., Brambati, D.F., Nava, S. and Guglielmone, A.A. (2015). Seasonal dynamics of *Rhipicephalus sanguineus sensulato* in dogs from Buenos Aires, Argentina. *Veterinary Parasitology,* **210**: 145–149.

Codner, E.C. and Farris-Smith, L.L. (1986). Characterization of the subclinical phase of ehrlichiosis in dogs. Journal of the American Veterinary Medical Association189: 47–50.

Dantas-Torres, F. (2008). The brown dog tick, *Rhipicephalus sanguineus* (Latreille, 1806) (Acari: Ixodidae): From taxonomy to control. *Veterinary Parasitology,* **152**: 173–185.

Dantas-Torres, F. (2010). Biology and ecology of the brown dog tick, *Rhipicephalus sanguineus*. *Parasites and Vectors*, **3**: 26.

Dawson, J.E., Warner, C.K., Baker, V., Ewing, S.A. and Stallknecht, D.E. (1996). The North American human ehrlichiosis agent, *Ehrlichia chaffeensis*: Molecular cloning, expression, and characterization of an immunoreactive protein. *Journal of Clinical Microbiology,* **34**: 1666–1671.

Donatien, A. and Lestoquard, F. (1935). Existence en Algérie d'une rickettsiose du chien. *Bulletin de la Société de Pathologie Exotique,* **28**: 418–419.

Dumler, J.S., Barbet, A.F., Bekker, C.P., Dasch, G.A., Palmer, G.H., Ray, S.C., Rikihisa, Y. and Rurangirwa, F.R. (2001). Reorganization of genera in the families Rickettsiaceae and Anaplasmataceae in the order Rickettsiales: Unification of some species of Ehrlichia with Anaplasma, Cowdria with Ehrlichia and Ehrlichia with Neorickettsia, descriptions of six new species combinations and designation of Ehrlichia equi and 'HGE agent' as subjective synonyms of Ehrlichia phagocytophila. *International Journal of Systematic and Evolutionary Microbiology,* **51**: 2145–2165.

Fourie, J.J., Beugnet, F., Smidt, J., Otranto, D. and Lebon, W. (2013). Efficacy of topical acaricides in dogs against *Rhipicephalus sanguineus:* A review. *Parasites and Vectors,* **6**: 128.

Gaunt, S.D., Beall, M.J., Stillman, B.A., Lorentzen, L., Diniz, P.P.V.P. and Breitschwerdt, E.B. (1996). Experimental infection and co-infection of dogs with *Ehrlichia canis* and *Ehrlichia chaffeensis*. *Veterinary Parasitology,* **57**: 61–73.

Groves, M.G., Dennis, G.L., Amyx, H.L. and Huxsoll, D.L. (1975). Transmission of *Ehrlichia canis* to dogs by ticks (*Rhipicephalus sanguineus*). *American Journal of Veterinary Research,* **36**: 937–940.

Gupta, S., Bansal, R., Singh, H., Kaur, P. and Singh, N.K. (2018). Experimental transmission of *Ehrlichia canis* by *Haemaphysalis longicornis* ticks. *Journal of Parasitic Diseases*, **42**: 623–627.

Harrus, S. and Waner, T. (2011). Diagnosis of canine monocytic ehrlichiosis. *Veterinary Parasitology*, **181**: 182–186.

Harrus, S., Aroch, I., Lavy, E. and Bark, H. (1997). Clinical manifestations of infectious canine cyclic thrombocytopenia. *Veterinary Record,* **141**: 247–250.

Harrus, S., Perlman-Avrahami, A., Mumcuoglu, K.Y. and Waner, T. (2010). The prevalence of *Ehrlichia canis* infection among dogs in Israel – a retrospective study. *Veterinary Parasitology*, **167**: 55–61.

Harrus, S., Waner, T., Aizenberg, I., Foley, J.E. and Poland, A. (1998). Amplification of *Ehrlichia canis* DNA from blood and spleen aspirates in naturally infected dogs. *Journal of Clinical Microbiology,* **36**: 2680–2682.

Harrus, S., Waner, T., Bark, H., Jongejan, F. and Cornelissen, A.W. (2004). Amplification of DNA of *Ehrlichia canis* from dogs using the polymerase chain reaction. *Veterinary Parasitology*, **119**: 147–155.

Huxsoll, D.L., Amyx, H.L., Hemelt, I.E., Hildebrandt, P.K., Nims, R.M. and Gochenour, W.S. Jr. (1972). Laboratory studies of tropical canine pancytopenia. *Experimental Parasitology*, **31**: 53–59.

Inokuma, H., Oyamada, M., Davoust, B., Boni, M., Dereure, J., Bucheton, B., Hammad, A., Watanabe, M., Itamoto, K., Okuda, M. and Brouqui, P. (2006). Epidemiological survey of *Ehrlichia canis* and related species infection in dogs in eastern Sudan. *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences*, **1078**: 461–463.

Lewis, G.E., Huxsoll, D.L., Ristic, M. and Johnson, A.J. (1977). *Ehrlichia canis*: aetiology of a canine disease in Vietnam. *Veterinary Record*, **100**: 102–105.

McBride, J.W., Corstvet, R.E., Breitschwerdt, E.B., Walker, D.H. and Davidson, W.R. (1999). Characterization of *Ehrlichia canis* antigens by Western immunoblot analysis. *Journal of Clinical Microbiology,* **37**: 381–388.

Mekuzas, Y., Gradoni, L., Oliva, G., Foglia Manzillo, V., Baneth, G. and Shkap, V. (2009). Ehrlichia infection in dogs: a serological and molecular survey in Israel. *Veterinary Parasitology*, **162**: 228–232.

Mylonakis, M.E., Koutinas, A.F., Breitschwerdt, E.B., Hegarty, B.C., Billinis, C.D., Leontides, L.S. and

Kontos, V.S. (2004). Chronic canine ehrlichiosis (*Ehrlichia canis*): a retrospective study of 19 natural cases. *Journal of the American Animal Hospital Association*, **40**: 174–184.

Neer, T.M. (1998). Canine monocytic ehrlichiosis: diagnosis and treatment. Compendium on Continuing Education for the Practicing Veterinarian, **20**: 601–615.

Neer, T.M., Eddlestone, S.M., Gaunt, S.D. and Corstvet, R.E. (2002). Clinical and laboratory features of *Ehrlichia canis* infection in dogs from Oklahoma and Louisiana. *Journal of the American Animal Hospital Association*, **38:** 105–112.

Nyindo, M.B.A., Ristic, M., Huxsoll, D.L., Kakoma, I. and Brown, J.L. (1980). Cell-mediated and humoral immune responses of German Shepherd dogs to experimental infection with Ehrlichia canis. *American Journal of Veterinary Research,* B: 250–254.

Perez, M., Rikihisa, Y. and Wen, B. (1996). *Ehrlichia canis*-like agent isolated from a man in Venezuela: Antigenic and genetic characterization. *Journal of Clinical Microbiology,* **34**: 2133–2139.

Philip, C.B. (1962). Comments on the classification of rickettsial diseases. *Journal of Infectious Diseases*, **111**: 1–8.

Popov, V.L., Yu, X., Walker, D.H., Chen, S.M., Feng, H.M. and Wear, D. (1998). Ultrastructural study of *Ehrlichia canis* in naturally infected dogs. *Veterinary Pathology,* **35**: 201–209.

Rikihisa, Y. (1991). The tribe Ehrlichieae and ehrlichial diseases. *Clinical Microbiology Reviews*, **4**: 286–308.

Ristic, M. (1991). Canine ehrlichiosis. In: Ristic, M. and Woldehiwet, Z. (eds.), Rickettsial and Chlamydial Diseases of Domestic Animals. Pergamon Press, Oxford, pp. 169–186.

Ristic, M. and Holland, C.J. (1993). Canine ehrlichiosis. In: Woldehiwet, Z. and Ristic, M. (eds.), Rickettsial and Chlamydial Diseases of Domestic Animals. Pergamon Press, Oxford, pp. 169–186.

Stich, R.W., Schaefer, J.J., Bremer, W.G., Needham, G.R. and Jittapalapong, S. (2004). Host acquisition of *Ehrlichia canis* from infected *Rhipicephalus sanguineus* ticks. *Journal of Clinical Microbiology*, **42**: 1358–1363.

Szabó, M.P.J., Castro, M.B., Ramos, H.G., Garcia, M.V., Castagnolli, K.C. and Pinter, A. (2005). Tick infestations on dogs in the state of São Paulo, Brazil: prevalence and seasonal dynamics. *Veterinary Parasitology*, **130**: 1–7.

Trapp, S.M., Messick, J.B., Vidotto, O., Jojima, F.S. and Morais, H.S.A. (2006). Prevalence of *Ehrlichia canis* infection among dogs and ticks from Parana State, Brazil. *Veterinary Parasitology,* **140**: 239–248.

Unver, A., Perez, M., Orellana, N., Huang, H. and Rikihisa, Y. (2001). Molecular and antigenic comparison of *Ehrlichia canis* isolates from dogs, ticks, and a human in Venezuela. *Journal of Clinical Microbiology*, **39**: 2788–2793.

Walker, J.B., Keirans, J.E. and Horak, I.G. (2000). The Genus Rhipicephalus (Acari: Ixodidae): A Guide to the Brown Ticks of the World. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK.

Wen, B., Rikihisa, Y., Mott, J.M., Greene, R., Kim, H.Y., Zhi, N., Couto, G.C., Unver, A. and Bartsch, R. (1997). Comparison of nested PCR with immunofluorescent-antibody assay for detection of *Ehrlichia canis* infection in dogs treated with doxycycline. *Journal of Clinical Microbiology*, **35:** 1852–1855.

Woody, B.J. and Hoskins, J.D. (1991). Ehrlichial diseases of dogs. Veterinary Clinics of North America: *Small Animal Practice,* **21**: 75–98.