

Title: Prevalence of PCR ribotypes among *Clostridium difficile* isolates from pigs, calves and other species

Running Title: PCR ribotypes of *Clostridium difficile* isolates

M., Kevin Keel^{1†}, Jon S. Brazier², Karen W. Post³, Scott Weese⁴ and J. Glenn Songer^{1*}

Department of Veterinary Science and Microbiology, University of Arizona, Tucson,

Arizona 85721,¹ Anaerobe Reference Laboratory, University Hospital of Wales, Heath

Park, Cardiff CF4 4XW, UK,² Rollins Animal Disease Diagnostic Laboratory, Raleigh,

North Carolina 27607, United States of America,³ and Ontario Veterinary College,

University of Guelph, Guelph, Ontario N1G2W1, Canada⁴

*Corresponding author. Mailing address: Department of Veterinary Science and

Microbiology, Bldg. 90, Rm. 229, The University of Arizona, Tucson, AZ 85721.

Phone: (520) 621-2962. Fax: (520) 621-6366. Email: gsonger@u.arizona.edu

†Present address: The Southeastern Cooperative Wildlife Disease Study, College of

Veterinary Medicine, The University of Georgia, Athens, GA 30602

ABSTRACT: PCR ribotypes were obtained for 144 *Clostridium difficile* isolates from neonatal pigs. Porcine isolates comprised four PCR ribotypes but one, ribotype 078, predominated (83%). This was also the most common ribotype (94%) among 33 calf isolates, but was rarely identified in other species.

Numerous epidemiologic investigations of human *Clostridium difficile*-associated disease (CDAD) have employed phenotyping and genotyping to better understand transmission patterns and risk factors (3, 7, 8). In contrast, few studies have typed isolates from animals or environments where they are housed. Most have attempted to test the hypothesis that humans acquire *C. difficile* from animals, and the results have varied (1, 9). We know little about the epidemiology of *C. difficile* within animal populations and uncertainties persist as to the relationships, if any, of such animal strains to those associated with human CDAD.

CDAD has emerged as a significant economic concern for swine producers but little is known about transmission patterns in hog operations (11, 14). The objective of this study was to assess the strain types occurring among various species with CDAD. PCR-ribotyping was used due to its proven discriminatory power, reproducibility, and relative simplicity (2). Different strains of *C. difficile* possess different numbers of rRNA genes and the intergenic sequences vary in size, yielding PCR products of distinct sizes for each designated ribotype. Isolates from five host species were examined, but porcine isolates were most numerous (Table 1). Neonatal pigs were sampled in Iowa, Ohio,

Montana, North Carolina, and Utah. All bovine isolates were collected from male dairy calves (<2 months of age) shipped to Arizona from multiple states (precise origins were not available). Equine isolates were from Kansas (n=1), Arizona (n=1), and Ontario (n=17), or an unknown source (n=1). Canine isolates were from Ontario. Human isolates were from patients in two hospitals in Colorado and one hospital in Louisiana. Ages of dogs, horses, and humans were typically not reported.

Primary isolations were made by culturing stool samples or rectal swabs, using standard techniques (5, 15). Colonies were passed to brain heart infusion (BHI) agar with cysteine (0.05%), yeast extract (0.5%), and defibrinated bovine blood (2%) (BHI-CYE). All isolates were examined for toxin genes, *tcdA* and *tcdB*, by use of an established multiplex PCR technique (6, 13). PCR-ribotyping was performed as previously described (10, 12). Ribotype classifications were based on the typing scheme established at the U.K. Anaerobe Reference Unit in Cardiff, Wales (12).

Nineteen PCR ribotypes were identified from the 232 *C. difficile* isolates examined (Table 1). Bovine and swine isolates were much less diverse than those from dogs, horses or humans. Three PCR ribotypes were identified from calves and four from pigs. PCR-ribotype 078 (Type 078) accounted for 94% of bovine and 83% of swine isolates. This ribotype did not occur among the canine isolates and represented only 5.0% of equine and 4.4% of human isolates.

Canine isolates comprised five ribotypes and 42% were Type 010. Most equine isolates (30%) were Type 015. Human isolates included 12 ribotypes. The most common was Type 020 with 22% prevalence. Overall, there was considerable overlap of

equine and human ribotypes with those of other species (Table 1). However, four of the 12 human-associated ribotypes did not occur in any of the other host species.

Though more isolates were examined from pigs and calves, much less ribotype diversity was observed among these species. The limited diversity among porcine isolates is even more remarkable when we consider that they were collected from a large geographic area. In contrast, the origin of canine, equine, and human isolates lacked significant geographic variability.

Type 078 was predominant in both pigs and calves, though it is almost certain that there was no interspecies contact. The swine operations that were the source of isolates maintained strict biosecurity such that pigs at each location were not only isolated from other species, but from other herds of pigs as well. Biosecurity associated with the calves was much more relaxed. Nonetheless, dairy calves are typically kept in confinement with no exposure to other species. The only factor common to both species is close contact with human caretakers. However, only one of the human isolates was Type 078. This ribotype did not occur among the 13 canine isolates and was represented by only one of the equine isolates. Therefore, it appears that Type 078 is the most common PCR ribotype circulating independently among pigs and calves in the United States and among numerous widely separated populations of pigs. An alternative hypothesis is that pigs and calves are exposed to varied *C. difficile* strains but are both more susceptible to colonization by Type 078. It seems unlikely that such different species would share a common susceptibility not seen in the other species examined, but this hypothesis cannot be disproved by our data alone.

Age-specific physiology should also be considered. The calves were functional monogastrics due to their age and, like the pigs, subsisted on milk. Milk, even from two different species, is more similar than the feed rations given to adult hogs and cows. Furthermore, the microbial environment of the two species, as adults, undoubtedly contributes to a great disparity in the normal flora and microbial food chain. It would be interesting to compare ribotypes of *C. difficile* isolates from adult cows and hogs to those occurring in the neonates.

Even though a single ribotype was predominant in the majority of pigs and calves, it is a mistake to assume that there is no heterogeneity among these isolates. Differences in colony morphology were noted among isolates of Type 078 from both species (data not shown), and may reflect some underlying strain differences. PCR-ribotyping is a useful technique, but its discriminatory power is not absolute. Type 001, a common ribotype causing human CDAD, can be subtyped using other methods including randomly amplified polymorphic DNA, ribospacer PCR, and pulsed field gel electrophoresis (4). It cannot be assumed that isolates of Type 078, from pigs and calves are identical, but this technique does demonstrate that they differ significantly from the most common ribotypes occurring in all other species examined.

Table 1. *C. difficile* PCR ribotype prevalence by species.

Ribotype	Bovine	Canine	Equine	Swine	Human
001	-	-	1 (5)	-	3 (13)
002	1 (3) ^a	-	3 (15)	6 (4)	2 (9)
009	-	2 (17)	3 (15)	-	-
010	-	5 (42)	2 (10)	-	3 (13)
012	-	-	1 (5)	-	1 (4)
015	-	1 (8)	6 (30)	-	1 (4)
017	-	-	-	-	1 (4)
020	-	2 (17)	1 (5)	-	5 (22)
031	-	-	-	-	-
033	1 (3)	-	-	3 (2)	-
056	-	-	-	-	2 (9)
077	-	2 (17)	-	-	-
078	31 (94)	-	1 (5)	119 (83)	1 (4)
087	-	-	-	-	-
103	-	-	-	-	1 (4)
126	-	-	-	16 (11)	1 (4)
137	-	-	1 (5)	-	-
151	-	-	-	-	2 (9)
154	-	-	1 (5)	-	-
Others	-	-	-	-	-
Total	33	12	20	144	23

^aNumber of isolates (percentage of total)

REFERENCES

1. **Arroyo, L. G., S. A. Kruth, B. M. Willey, H. R. Staempfli, D. E. Low, and J. S. Weese.** 2005. PCR ribotyping of *Clostridium difficile* isolates originating from human and animal sources. *J Med Microbiol* **54**:163-6.
2. **Bidet, P., V. Lalande, B. Salauze, B. Burghoffer, V. Avesani, M. Delmee, A. Rossier, F. Barbut, and J. C. Petit.** 2000. Comparison of PCR-ribotyping, arbitrarily primed PCR, and pulsed-field gel electrophoresis for typing *Clostridium difficile*. *J Clin Microbiol* **38**:2484-7.
3. **Brazier, J. S.** 2001. Typing of *Clostridium difficile*. *Clin Microbiol Infect* **7**:428-31.
4. **Fawley, W. N., J. Freeman, and M. H. Wilcox.** 2003. Evidence to support the existence of subgroups within the UK epidemic *Clostridium difficile* strain (PCR ribotype 1). *J Hosp Infect* **54**:74-7.
5. **George, W. L., V. L. Sutter, D. Citron, and S. M. Finegold.** 1979. Selective and differential medium for isolation of *Clostridium difficile*. *J Clin Microbiol* **9**:214-9.
6. **Gumerlock, P. H., Y. J. Tang, J. B. Weiss, and J. Silva, Jr.** 1993. Specific detection of toxigenic strains of *Clostridium difficile* in stool specimens. *J Clin Microbiol* **31**:507-11.
7. **Hubert, B., V. G. Loo, A. M. Bourgault, L. Poirier, A. Dascal, E. Fortin, M. Dionne, and M. Lorange.** 2007. A portrait of the geographic dissemination of the *Clostridium difficile* North American pulsed-field type 1 strain and the

- epidemiology of *C. difficile*-associated disease in Quebec. *Clin Infect Dis* **44**:238-44.
8. **Kuijper, E. J., B. Coignard, and P. Tull.** 2006. Emergence of *Clostridium difficile*-associated disease in North America and Europe. *Clin Microbiol Infect* **12 Suppl 6**:2-18.
 9. **O'Neill, G., J. E. Adams, R. A. Bowman, and T. V. Riley.** 1993. A molecular characterization of *Clostridium difficile* isolates from humans, animals and their environments. *Epidemiol Infect* **111**:257-64.
 10. **O'Neill, G., F. Ogunsoola, J. Brazier, and B. Duerden.** 1996. Modification of a PCR ribotyping method for application as a routine typing scheme for *Clostridium difficile*. *Anaerobe* **2**:205-209.
 11. **Songer, J., K. Post, D. Larson, B. Jost, and R. Glock.** 2000. Infection of neonatal swine with *Clostridium difficile*. *Swine Health and Production* **8**:185-189.
 12. **Stubbs, S. L., J. S. Brazier, G. L. O'Neill, and B. I. Duerden.** 1999. PCR targeted to the 16S-23S rRNA gene intergenic spacer region of *Clostridium difficile* and construction of a library consisting of 116 different PCR ribotypes. *J Clin Microbiol* **37**:461-3.
 13. **Tang, Y. J., P. H. Gumerlock, J. B. Weiss, and J. Silva, Jr.** 1994. Specific detection of *Clostridium difficile* toxin A gene sequences in clinical isolates. *Mol Cell Probes* **8**:463-7.

14. **Waters, E. H., J. P. Orr, E. G. Clark, and C. M. Schaufele.** 1998. Typhlocolitis caused by *Clostridium difficile* in suckling piglets. *J Vet Diagn Invest* **10**:104-8.
15. **Wilson, K. H., M. J. Kennedy, and F. R. Fekety.** 1982. Use of sodium taurocholate to enhance spore recovery on a medium selective for *Clostridium difficile*. *J Clin Microbiol* **15**:443-6.

ACCEPTED