## R. RAUTELA<sup>1</sup>, G.K. DAS<sup>2\*</sup>, S. PRASAD<sup>3</sup>, A. KUMAR<sup>4</sup>, ABHISHEK<sup>5</sup>, K. NARAYANAN<sup>6</sup> AND J.K. PRASAD<sup>7</sup>

Division of Animal Reproduction, Indian Veterinary Research Institute, Izatnagar - 243 122

Received: 09.09.2017

Accepted: 05.10.2017

## ABSTRACT

Twelve cows with the clinical history of repeat breeding were sampled for uterine swab followed by the identification and isolation of bacteria using various conventional and biochemical tests. Out of 12 samples collected, five types of isolates were identified. Among the isolates, *Corynebacterium* spp. (32%) was the most predominant bacteria followed by *Bacillus* spp. (28%), *Staphylococcus* spp. (24%), *E. coli* (12%) and *Salmonella* spp. (4%).

Keywords: Bacteria, Cow, Endometritis, Identification, Isolation, Uterine swab

Endometritis, the inflammation of the superficial layers of uterus, alters the uterine health leading to conception failure and repeat breeding condition in bovines. The causes of endometritis are multifactorial, of which bacterial endometritis has drawn research attention. In most Indian reports, isolation was carried out from the cervico-vaginal mucus of the infected cows and uterine infection was considered based on the nature of cervical mucus (Sarkar et al., 2006). However, this does not represent the true picture of bacteria present in uterus. Uterine swab is the most accurate method of obtaining samples for the identification of bacteria (Bonnett et al., 1991). In the present study, the isolation, identification and biochemical characterization of the various bacterial isolates was done from the uterus of endometritic cows using uterine swab.

Twelve apparently healthy cross-bred (Holstein-Friesian) cows having normal duration of estrus cycle were selected. Initially, the clinical condition of endometritis was diagnosed by visual observation of cervico-vaginal mucus and the presence of pus flakes the uterine lavage. The subsequent confirmation was done on the basis of polymorphonuclear (PMN) cell count (Gilbert *et al.*, 2005). The cows with or without muco-purulent to purulent cervical discharge during trans-rectal examination, the presence of pus flakes in the uterine lavage and with PMN cell count above  $\geq$ 5% were diagnosed with clinical endometritis. The uterine samples were collected using swabs and identification of bacteria was done.

Out of 12 cows, five (41.3%) were suffering from clinical endometritis as evidenced by the presence of mucopurulent cervico-vaginal discharge and 9.2% PMN cell count in the uterine lavage. The remaining seven (58.3%) cows had sub-clinical endometritis as evidenced by the presence of pus flakes and 7.3% PMN cell count in the uterine lavage (Gilbert *et al.*, 2005). The higher proportion of sub-clinical endometritis can be speculated as the major cause of repeat breeding in such cows as reported earlier (Salasel *et al.*, 2010). Nevertheless, irrespective of the type of endometritis, the higher mean number of PMN cell count ( $8.08\pm0.6\%$ ) than the threshold cut off (>5.0%) for endometritis confirm the state of infection in the cows of present study.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup>PG Scholar, <sup>2</sup>Principal Scientist, <sup>6</sup>Senior Scientist, <sup>7</sup>Senior Scientist; <sup>5</sup>Senior Scientist, Division of Bacteriology and Mycology; <sup>3</sup>Professor cum Head, Department of Veterinary Gynaecology and Obstetrics, 4Associate Professor, Department of Microbiology, G.B.P.U.A.T., Pantnagar – 263145; \*gkdasivri@gmail.com

Out of 25 isolates obtained from 12 endometritic cows, the majority were dominated by Corynebacterium spp. (32%) followed by Bacillus spp. (28%), Staphylococcus spp. (24%), E. coli (12%) and Salmonella spp. (4%). The pattern and type of bacteria reported from the endometritic cows in our study is supported by previous report (Pothmann et al., 2015). In present study, Corynebacterium spp. was isolated from 80% cows with clinical endometritis. The present finding supports previous report suggesting predominance of the species (Pothmann et al., 2015) and is associated with severe endometritis (Huszenicza et al., 1999). Moreover, the proportion of Bacillus spp. and *Staphylococcus* spp. isolated in the present study were similar to the earlier report (Rao and Seshagiri, 1997). In contrast to previous report (Barman et al., 2013), the proportion of E. coli in endometritis was relatively less in the present study. This might be due to the difference in the type of sample obtained for isolation. Salmonella spp. was isolated only from one cow with clinical endometritis in the present study. Allied reports are meager in this line. However, the present finding supports the only report communicated elsewhere (Deori et al., 2004).

In the present study, mixed colonies were found in 83.3% cases whereas single isolates were found in 16.6% cases. The incidence of Gram positive bacteria was higher in present study and is supported by the earlier report in which samples were directly taken from the uterus (Shukla and Sharma, 2005). However, in contrast to the previous report (Sarkar *et al.*, 2006), the occurrence of Gram negative bacteria was lower in this study. The difference in the source of collection of the samples as uterine swab in this study and cervicovaginal mucus in previous study, for bacterial isolation may be one of the reasons for the discrepancy.

In conclusion, the results of this study revealed that *Corynebacterium* spp. (32%) appears as the most predominant bacteria followed by *Bacillus* spp. (28%), *Staphylococcus* spp. (24%), *E. coli* (12%) and *Salmonella* spp. (4%) causing endometritis in cows.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The authors like to thank the Director, Indian Veterinary Research Institute and Dean, C.V.Sc., G.B.P.U.A.T., Pantnagar. Thanks, are also due to the Indian Council of Agricultural Research, Government of India for the financial support provided in the form of Fellowship to the first author.

## REFERENCES

- Barman, P., Yadav, M.C., Bangthai, A. and Kumar, H. 2013. Antibiogram of bacteria isolated from bovine endometritis. *Vet. Res. Int.*, **1**: 20-24.
- Bonnett, B.N., Martin, S.W., Gannon, V.P., Miller, R.B and Etherington, W.G. (1991). Endometrial biopsy in Holstein–Friesian dairy cows. III. Bacteriological analysis and correlations with histological findings. *Can. J. Vet. Med.*, **55**: 168-173.
- Deori, S., Kumar, H., Yadav, M.C., Rawat, M. and Srivastava, S.K. (2004). Intrauterine Administration of Bacterial Moddins: An Alternative Therapy for Endometritis. J. Appl. Anim. Res., 26: 117-121.
- Gilbert, R.O., Shin, S.T., Guard, C.L., Erb, H.N. and Frajblat, M. (2005). Prevalence of endometritis and its effects on reproductive performance of dairy cows. *Theriogenology*, **64**: 1879-1888.
- Huszenicza, G., Fodor, M., Gacs, M., Kulcsar, M., Dohmen, M.J.W., Vamos, M., Porkolab, L., Kegl, T., Bartyrik, J., Lohuis, J.A.C.M., Janosi, S. and Szita G. (1999). Uterine bacteriology, resumption of cyclic ovarian activity and fertility in postpartum cows kept in large-scale dairy herds. *Reprod. Domest. Anim.*, **34:** 237-245.
- Pothmann, H., Prunner, I., Wagener, K., Jaureguiberry, M., de la Sota, R.L. Erber, R., Aurich, C. Ehling-Schulz, M. and Drillich, M. (2015). The prevalence of subclinical endometritis and intrauterine infections in repeat breeder cows. *Theriogenology*, **83**: 1249-1253.
- Rao, K.S. and Seshagiri, V.N. (1997). Bacterial flora and antibiotic sensitivity pattern of endometritis

cows. Indian J. Anim. Reprod., 18: 161-162.

- Salasel, B., Mokhtari, A. and Taktaz, T. (2010). Prevalence, risk factors for and impact of subclinical endometritis in repeat breeder dairy cows. *Theriogenology*, **74**: 1271-1278.
- Sarkar, P., Kumar, H., Rawat, M., Varshney, V.P., Goswami, T.K., Yadav, M.C. and Srivastava, S.K. (2006). Effect of Administration of Garlic Extract

and  $PGF_{2\alpha}$  on Hormonal Changes and Recovery in Endometritis Cows. *Asian-Aust. J. Anim. Sci.*, **19**: 964-969.

Shukla, S.P. and Sharma, R.D. (2005). Bacteriological studies on the uterine biopsy and conception rate following treatment in repeat breeding crossbred cows. *Indian J. Anim. Reprod.*, **26**: 17-19.