IN VITRO ANTIBIOTIC SENSITIVITY AND THERAPEUTIC EFFICACY OF EXPERIMENTAL SALMONELLOSIS, COLIBACILLOSIS AND PASTEURELLOSIS IN BROILER CHICKENS

M. A. Rahman¹, M. A. Samad, M. B. Rahman² and S. M. L. Kabir²

Department of Medicine, Department of Microbiology and Hygiene², Faculty of Veterinary Science, Bangladesh Agricultural University, Mymensingh-2202, Bangladesh

ABSTRACT

Avian salmonellosis (AS), avian colibacillosis (AC) and avian pasteurellosis (AP) have been recognized as important bacterial diseases in poultry associated with morbidity and mortality in Bangladesh. The causative agents of these three diseases were isolated (5 isolates / disease) from dead chickens submitted for diagnosis at the BRAC Poultry Disease Diagnostic Centre, Gazipur during the period from January to December 2002. Five isolates of each of the Salmonella pullorum, Escherichia coli and Pasteurella multocida were evaluated against eight antibiotic containing disc which included ciprofloxacin, gentamicin, ampicillin, chloramphenicol, erythromycin, tetracycline, cephradine and penicillin G. Erythromycin in S. pullorum and Ciprofloxacin both in the E. coli and P. multocida were found highest sensitive, gentamicin, chlorampharicol, cephradine were found moderately sensitive to S. pullorum, gentamicin, tetracycline, erythromycin and ampicillin were found moderately sensitive to E. coli, and gentamicin ampicillin, cephradine and penicillin G were moderately sensitive to P. multocida. Therapeutic trials against experimentally produced S. pullorum, E. coli and P. multocida infection in three groups of broiler chickens showed that cephradine against S. pullorum and ciprofloxacin against both in E. coli and P. multocida were found highly effective both in vitro and in vivo studies, therefore, cephradine against salmonellosis and ciprofloxacin against colibacillosis and pasteurellosis are effective drugs of choice which could be used to control morbidity and mortality in poultry caused by these diseases.

Key words: Antibiotic sensitivity, therapeutic, salmonellosis, colibacillosis, pasteurellosis, broiler chickens

INTRODUCTION

Avian salmonellosis, avian colibacillosis and avian pasteurellosis are the most important highly fatal bacterial diseases of poultry with worldwide distribution including Bangladesh (Calnek et al., 1997; Samad, 2000). Although there is a published inland report on in-vitro sensitivity of Pasteurella multocida isolated from chickens and ducks to various chemotherapeutic agents (Choudhury et al., 1985) but there is no published report on in vitro antibiotic sensitivity of Salmonella pullorum and Escherichia coli organisms, causing morbidity and mortality in poultry in Bangladesh (Rahman and Samad, 2003). In addition, there is also no published report on the therapeutic efficacy of antibiotic drugs against experimentally induced avian salmonellosis, avian colibacillosis and avian pasteurellosis in broiler chickens. Therefore, this paper describes the in vitro antibiotic drug sensitivity pattern and therapeutic efficacy of certain antibiotics against experimentally induced S. pullorum, E. coli and P. multocida infection in broiler chickens.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Fifty bacteriological samples suspected for salmonellosis, colibacillosis and pasteurellosis were collected from the BRAC Poultry Disease Diagnostic Centre, Gazipur at necropsy examination in sterilized cotton swabs and put into the sterilized test tube containing nutrient broth. The Salmonella pullorum, Escherichia coli and Pasteurella multocida organisms were isolated and characterized as described by Rahman et al. (2004). These organisms were used for in vitro antibiotic sensitivity and experimental infection in broiler chickens for the study of therapeutic trials.

Antibiotic in vitro sensitivity test of S. pullorum (5 isolates), E. coli (5 isolates) and P. multocida (5 isolates) was performed with the standardized commercial sensitivity discs (Mast Diagnostics, Mast Group Ltd., Merseyside, UK). Sensitivity to antibiotic was studied mostly on blood agar plates with penicillin G (PG) 10 IU, gentamicin (GM) 10 μ g, ampicillin (AP) 10 μ g, chloramphenicol (C) 30 μ g, tetracycline (T) 30 μ g, erythromycin (E) 15 μ g, cephradine (CRD) 30 μ g and ciprofloxacin (CIP) 5 μ g. An amount of 0.5 ml freshly grown pure culture of the bacteria was poured on BA plates and allowed to spread gently over the entire surface with a glass rod spreader. After 1 to 2 minutes the antibacterial discs were placed on the inoculated plates keeping a distance of about 1 cm apart and incubated at 37° C for overnight. The inhibitory effect of the antibacterial to the growth of the culture was recorded.

Present address: ¹Department of Medicine and Surgery, Barisal Government Veterinary College, Khanpura, Babugonj, Barisal.

The *in vivo* therapeutic efficacy trial was conducted on 12 healthy broiler birds at the age of 52 days. These 12 birds were divided into four equal groups (A to D), each consisting of three birds. Each bird of group A was inoculated with 1.0 ml (5.75 x 10⁶ CFU) suspension of *S. pullorum*, group B with 1.0 ml (4.5 x 10⁷ CFU) suspension of *E. coli* and group C with 1.0 ml (6.25 x 10⁶ CFU) suspension of *P. multocida* orally whereas, birds of group D served as uninfected healthy controls. All these birds were allowed to rear on same feed, water and environmental condition and were observed for clinical signs at every six hours interval. After drug sensitivity test of the re-isolated organisms from cloacal swabs of all the three groups of experimentally infected birds, therapeutic efficacy was conducted in two infected birds of all the three infected groups (A to C) and one infected bird of each of the three groups as untreated infected controls. Each of the two birds of group A was experimentally infected with *S. pullorum* treated with cephradine (Lebac®, Square Pharmaceuticals Ltd.) @ 50 mg/kg body weight at every six hours interval orally for 3 days. Each of the two birds of group B (*E. coli* infected) and group C (*P. multocida*) was treated with ciprofloxacin (Ciprocin® Tab., Square Pharmaceuticals Ltd.) @ 10 mg/kg body weight twice daily orally for 3 days. The therapeutic efficacy was assessed finally on post-mortem examination of all the slaughtered experimental birds.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The results of *in-vitro* antibiotic sensitivity of the isolated *Salmonella pullorum*, *Escherichia coli* and *Pasteurella multocida* from naturally dead chickens are presented in Table 1 and from isolated organisms from cloacal swabs of experimentally infected broilers are shown in Table 2.

Table 1. Antibiotic sensitivity grade to the different bacteria isolated from the different organs of dead and experimentally infected chickens

S/N	Bacteria isolated	No. of isolate tested	-	Number (%) of sensitivity to different antibiotics							
				CIP	GM	AP	С	Т	Е	CRD	PG
1.	Salmonella pullorum	5	3 ⁺	0	0	0	0	0	3 (60)	0	0
			2+	5 (100)	5 (100)	0	5 (100)	0	0	5 (100)	0
			1+	0	0	5 (100)	0	0	0	0 .	2 (40)
			R	0	0	0	0	5 (100)	2 (40)	0	3 (60)
2.	Escherichia coli	5	3 ⁺	5 (100)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
			2+	0	5 (100)	2 (40)	2 (40)	3 (60)	3 (60)	0	0
			1+	0	0	3 (60)	0	0	2 (40)	0	2 (40)
			R	0	0	0	3 (60)	2 (40)	0	5 (100)	3 (60)
3.	Pasteurella	5	3+	5 (100)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
			2+	0	5 (100)	3 (60)	2 (40)	0	0	3 (60)	3 (60)
			1+	0	0	0	0	0	2 (40)	2 (40)	0
			R	0	0	2 (40)	3 (60)	5 (100)	3 (60)	0 ′	2 (40)

CIP = Ciprofloxacin, GM = Gentamicin, AP = Ampicillin, C = Chloramphenicol, E = Erythromycin, T = Tetracycline, CRD = Cephradine, PG = Penicillin G, 3^* = Highly sensitive, 2^* = Moderately sensitive, 1^* = Sensitive, R = Resistant.

Table 2. Reisolation and identification of different bacteria from the cloacal faeces of experimentally infected chickens and their sensitivity to antibiotics

Sample used	Isolated bacteria (n = 3)	Sensitivity results								
	(n = 3)	CIP	GM	AP	С	Т	Е	CRD	PG	
Cloacal swabs	Salmonella pullorum	2+	2+	1+	2+	R	2+	3 ⁺	R	
Cloacal swabs	Escherichia coli	3+	2+	1*	R	2+	2+	R	R	
Cloacal swabs	Pasteurella multocida	3+	2+	3+	R	R	R	2+	2+	

CIP = Ciprofloxacin, GM = Gentamicin, AP = Ampicillin, C = Chloramphenicol, E = Erythromycin, T = Tetracycline, CRD = Cephradine, PG = Penicillin G, 3^* = Highly sensitive, 2^* = Moderately sensitive, 1^* = Sensitive, R = Resistant.

The in vitro drug sensitivity test of bacterial isolates was done for selection of effective therapeutic measures and control. There were slight variations in the sensitivity of antibiotic to the field isolates of bacteria and experimentally isolated bacteria from broiler birds. As for example, field isolates of Salmonella pullorum found resistant to erythromycin whereas, experimentally isolated one isolate was highly sensitive to erythromycin and field isolates of Salmonella pullorum were found sensitive to penicillin G whereas, experimentally isolated one isolate was found resistant to penicillin G. The field isolates of E. coli were found moderately sensitive to chloramphenicol, resistant to tetracycline and less sensitive to erythromycin and penicillin G whereas experimentally isolated E. coli isolates were found resistant to chloramphenicol, moderately sensitive to tetracycline and erythromycin, and resistant to penicillin G. The field isolates of P. multocida were found moderately sensitive to chloramphenicol, less sensitive to erythromycin, and moderately sensitive to penicillin G. The variation in the sensitivity of antibiotics of field isolates may be due to outcome of choice and also the indiscriminate use of antibiotic in different disease stage to various birds.

Drug sensitivity pattern of S. pullorum showed highly sensitive to erythromycin, moderately sensitive to ciprofloxacin, gentamicin, chloramphenicol, cephradine and less sensitive to ampicillin and resistant to penicillin G. These findings are in agreement with the result of Sharma and Katock (1996) who reported the isolates of Salmonella typhimurium sensitive to chloramphenicol, gentamicin and tetracycline; Mitra et al. (1997) who reported that the highest number of isolates of Salmonella were sensitive to ciprofloxacin and norfloxacin; Dhruba et al. (1999) reported that 80% or more of the Salmonella isolates were sensitive to gentamicin; chloramphenicol and ciprofloxacin; Jindal et al. (1999) reported that majority of the Salmonella isolates were sensitive to ciprofloxacin, gentamicin, chloramphenicol and cephalothin; and Shivhare et al. (2001) who reported that most of the Salmonella typhimurium isolates in birds were sensitive to ciprofloxacin, eurofloxacin and sparfloxacin. The isolates of Salmonella sp. were moderately sensitive to gentamicin, pefloxacin, chloramphenicol, doxycycline and ampicillin (Mitra et al., 1997); less sensitive to gentamicin, ampicillin, chloramphenicol and doxycycline (Shivhare et al., 2001). The resistance of S. pullorum to penicillin G found in the present study is supported by Sharma and Katock (1996) who reported that S. typhimurium was resistant to penicillin, ampicillin and oxytetracycline. The variation in the sensitivity of antibiotic of the isolates of S. pullorum from infected chickens may be due to indiscriminate or common use of these antibiotics as feed additives / growth promoters or as preventive and curative purpose as reported by Jindal et al. (1999) and Dhruba et al. (1999) who found Salmonella gallinarum were resistant to 3 to 5 antibiotics.

Ciprofloxacin (100%) was found highly sensitive to all the isolates of *Escherichia coli* followed by gentamicin, tetracycline, and erythromycin were moderately sensitive while ampicillin, penicillin G were less sensitive. This organism was found highly resistant to cephradine (100%) followed by penicillin G (60.0%), chloramphenicol (60.0%) and tetracycline (40.0%). These findings are similar to Prasad *et al.* (1997) who reported highest sensitivity to norfloxacin (80.50%), pefloxacin (77.60%) chloramphenicol (65.60%), ciprofloxacin (53.73%), gentamicin (49.20%) and least sensitive to penicillin and ampicillin. Pandey *et al.* (1998) reported that majority of *E. coli* strains were sensitive to gentamicin, ampicillin and were resistant to tetracycline, benzylpenicillin and chloramphenicol which support the present findings. But there is some variation in the sensitivity tests result with the earlier reports because some antibiotic became resistant due to their commonly used in poultry feed and their disease treatment. Prasad *et al.* (1997) concluded that highest sensitivity to quinolone antibiotics i.e., norfloxacin, pefloxacin and ciprofloxacin because they are recently introduced, have broad spectrum of action and limited use so far, by the poultry farmers which is also suggestive for the present study.

Ciprofloxacin (100%) was found highly sensitive against *Pasteurella multocida*, followed by moderately sensitive to gentamicin (100%), ampicillin (60%), cephradine (60.0%), penicillin G (60.0%), less sensitive to erythromycin (40%) and highly resistant to tetracycline (100%), followed by chloramphenicol (60%), ampicillin (40%), penicillin G (40%); while Prasad *et al.* (1997) showed chloramphenicol (78.9%) was highly effective, followed by pefloxacin (73.6%), gentamicin (73.6%), doxycycline (57.8%), ciprofloxacin (56.1%), cephalexin (40.3%) and penicillin (38.5%). The variation in the sensitivity grade may be due to the indiscriminate use of antibiotics in the poultry industry.

Development of antibiotic resistant strains of bacterial isolates not only pose considerable threat to clinicians and poultry farmers, but is also of public health concern as these resistant strains after ingestion are capable of transferring resistance factor. Thus, judicious use of antibiotics based on their sensitivity pattern should be practiced.

However, it is clear from the drug sensitivity test and therapeutic results that the drug sensitivity may be valuable as background information for future therapy for the effective control of the bacterial diseases, otherwise indiscriminate use of the antibacterial drugs may lead to serious hazards of drug resistance. However, routine laboratory isolation and drug sensitivity test being impracticable, periodical check on the pattern of the drug sensitivity of the organisms becomes all the more significant.

The therapeutic trials against experimentally produced S. pullorum, E. coli and P. multocida infections were carried out in broilers on the basis of drug sensitivity test and the results are presented in Table 3.

Table 3. Evaluation of the treatment of experimentally infected chickens

S/N	Parameters	S. pullorum (n = 3)	E. coli (n = 3)	P. multocida (n = 3)
1.	Infection	1.0 ml (5.75 x 10 ⁶ CFU) orally	1.0 ml (4.5 x 10 ⁷ CFU) orally	1.0 ml (6.25 x 10 ⁶ CFU) orally
2.	Incubation period	96 hours	96 hours	96 hours
3.	Sub-grouping	Treated ($n = 2$) Untreated ($n = 1$)	Treated (n = 2) Untreated (n = 1)	Treated (n = 2) Untreated (n = 1)
4.	Cephradine	All cured Chronic carrier	-	_ .=
5.	Ciprofloxacin	_	All cured Chronic carrier	1 cured Moribund
6.	Gross lesions	Catarrhal to haemorrhagic enteritis, chalky white materials in the vent, mild congestion of intestine	Congestion and haemorrhagic streaks in the intestine, air sac cloudy, mild pericarditis and peri-hepatitis	In non-cured one, white nodular granule on liver, pale, and emaciated, hemorrhage on the intestinal mucosa Same as the treated one

Cephradine (Lebac*, Square Pharmaceuticals Ltd.) @ 50 mg/kg body weight at six hours interval orally for 3 days, Ciprofloxacin (Tab Ciprocin*, Square Pharmaceuticals Ltd.) @ 10 mg/kg body weight twice daily orally for 3 days.

The cephradine was found moderately sensitive *in-vitro* against the isolated *S. pullorum* organism which was used @ 50 mg / kg body weight but only at 6 hours interval and resulted disappearance of all the clinical signs at 12 hours of post-treatment and started improvement of the health status of the treated birds. Similarly, ciprofloxacin was found highly sensitive against both the isolated *E. coli* and *P. multocida* organisms, and accordingly, ciprofloxacin @ 10 mg / kg body weight but resulted recovery of all the colibacillosis affected birds, but except one bird, other all pasteurellosis affected chickens were recovered at 12 hours of post-treatment. The non-responsive bird showed lameness, which was not responded due to severely affected conditions.

REFERENCES

- Calnek BW, Barnes HJ, Beard CW, McDougald LR and Saif YM (1997). Diseases of Poultry. 10th edn., Iowa State University Press, Ames, Iowa, USA.
- Choudhury KA, Amin MM, Rahman A and Ali MR (1985). Investigation of natural outbreak of fowl cholera. Bangladesh Veterinary Journal 19: 49-56.
- Dhruba, Chakraborty, Chakraborty GC and Chatterjee A (1999). Studies on avian salmonellosis in West Bengal. Indian Journal
 of Animal Sciences 69: 1-3.
- 4. Jindal N, Raja N, Kumar S, Narang G and Mahajan NK (1999). Salmonella gallinarum and Salmonella enteritidis infections in poultry in some parts of Haryana. Indian Veterinary Journal 76: 563-564.
- Mitra M, Bhattacharjee HM, Guha C and Pramanik AK (1997). Studies on salmonellosis following infectious bursal disease in poultry. Indian Veterinary Journal 74: 434-435.
- Pandey GS, Tuchili LM, Kaneuchi C, Waya W and Nyeleti G (1998). Studies on avian colibacillosis outbreaks and drug sensitivity of Escherichia coli isolates in Luraka. Indian Veterinary Journal 75: 754-755.
- 7. Prasad V, Murthy KK and Rao TVJ (1997). In-vitro antibiogram studies of Escherichia coli in chickens. Indian Veterinary Journal 74: 616-617.
- 8. Rahman MA and Samad MA (2003). Pattern of occurrence of single and concurrent diseases associated with mortality in commercial chickens in Bangladesh. Bangladesh Journal of Veterinary Medicine 1: 15-20.
- 9. Rahman MA, Samad MA, Rahman MB and Kabir SML (2004). Bacterio-pathological studies on salmonellosis, colibacillosis and pasteurellosis in natural and experimental infections in chickens. *Bangladesh Journal of Veterinary Medicine* 2: 1-8.
- Samad MA (2000). An overview of livestock research reports published during the twentieth century in Bangladesh. Bangladesh Veterinary Journal 34: 53-149.
- 11. Sharma M and Katock RC (1996). Deadly outbreak in chicks owing to Salmonella typhimurium. Indian Journal of Poultry Science 31: 60-62.
- 12. Shivhare S, Sharda R, Reddy AG, Sharma RK and Sharma V (2001). Antibiotic sensitivity of Salmonella typhimurium isolates from domestic poultry. Indian Veterinary Journal 77: 998-999.