Characterisation of macrocyclic lactone resistance in two field-derived isolates of Cooperia oncophora
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ABSTRACT
The anthelmintic sensitivity of two field-derived isolates (designated FI001 and FI004) of cattle nematodes from beef farms in Scotland were investigated in a controlled efficacy test (CET). Efficacies of ivermectin pour-on (IVM-PO), IVM injectable (IVM-INJ) and moxidectin pour-on (MOX-PO) formulations were assessed. In each group, five helminth-naive calves were infected experimentally with 50,000 third stage larvae from either isolate and administered with anthelmintic at the manufacturers’ recommended dose rate 28 days later. For each isolate, nematode burdens were compared between treatment and control groups to determine efficacy. Nematode species composition, based on data derived from the untreated control groups’ burden estimations, were 39 and 14% Cooperia oncophora and 61 and 86% Ostertagia ostertagi for isolates FI001 and FI004, respectively. Macrocyclic lactone resistance in C. oncophora was confirmed for both FI001 and FI004 isolates. Efficacies (as determined by nematode burden analysis) of 4, 21 and 31% for FI001, and 10, 1 and 74% for FI004, were obtained for IVM-INJ, IVM-PO and MOX-PO, respectively. Efficacy based on faecal egg count reduction at seven days post anthelmintic administration were 8, 99 and 100% for FI001, and 37, 20 and 100% for FI004 for IVM-INJ, IVM-PO and MOX-PO, respectively. In summary, this study details two macrocyclic lactone resistant isolates of C. oncophora obtained from cattle from two distinct geographical locales in the UK.

© 2012 Elsevier B.V. All rights reserved.

1. Introduction

Grazing cattle are susceptible to a number of gastrointestinal nematodes, with Ostertagia ostertagi and Cooperia oncophora being the most prevalent in temperate regions such as the UK (Anderson et al., 1965; Borgsteede, 1977; Claerebout et al., 1998; Rose, 1968). O. ostertagi is considered the more pathogenic of the two species (Bairden and Armour, 1981) and has been shown to cause profuse watery diarrhoea, inappetence and poor weight gain, with low grade infections leading to losses of around 30–60 kg in body weight gain in untreated beef cattle in their first 12 months compared to anthelmintic treated counterparts (Dimander et al., 2000, 2003). In addition to reduced weight gains, infection can reduce milk output significantly in dairy stock (Charlier et al., 2009). Although C. oncophora is generally considered to be a species of relatively low pathogenicity (Anderson et al., 1965; Cooper et al., 1979) studies have indicated that, in co-infections with O. ostertagi, this parasitic nematode contributes to reduced productivity and inappetence (Hawkins, 1993; Stromberg et al., 2012; Sutherland and Leathwick, 2011).

The prophylactic use of anthelmintics is the control option most utilised by livestock producers and has been
shown to increase productivity in both dairy (Gross et al., 1999) and beef (Dimander et al., 2000) cattle. Macro cyclic lactone (ML) anthelmintics hold the major market share for antiparasitics in cattle; partly because of their high efficacy and persistent effect against all developmental stages of parasitic nematodes of relevance, but also because of their additional efficacy against ectoparasites (Gonzalez et al., 2009). Currently, MLS are available for use in cattle as topical pour-on preparations or as a subcutaneous injection. The former method of application is most popular due to the associated reductions in animal handling time and the lower risk of injury to animals and handlers (Bogan and Armour, 1987).

Published reports of ML resistance/inefficacy in cattle nematodes have been documented in nine countries globally (Sutherland and Leathwick, 2011). In New Zealand and the US, for example, resistance to BZ and ML classes in the same nematode population have been identified (Gasbarre et al., 2009a, 2009b; Waghorn et al., 2006) and, in Argentina and Brazil, resistance of Ostertagia, Cooperia, Haemonchus and Oesophagostomum species to all three main classes of anthelmintic has been described (Anziani et al., 2004; Soutello et al., 2007). In the UK, the first reported case of ivermectin (IVM) resistant Cooperia nematodes in cattle was made in 1999 (Coles and Stafford, 1999; Stafford and Coles, 1999). Since then, there have been a few reports of reduced efficacy following administration of MLS in UK cattle (Orpin, 2010; Sargison et al., 2009, 2010; Stafford et al., 2010); however no extensive studies have been conducted. Previously, we reported reduced efficacy of injectable IVM against three field isolates of cattle nematodes (McArthur et al., 2011). Here, for two of these populations, we have investigated the anthelmintic sensitivity phenotype further by undertaking a controlled efficacy test (CET) in experimentally infected cattle.

2. Materials and methods

2.1. Parasite isolates

Faecal material was collected and cultured to generate infective larvae (L₃), from first season grazing calves from farms that had been identified through an ongoing anthelmintic sensitivity study (McArthur et al., 2011). In brief, L₃ were cultured from pre-treatment faecal material collected using the techniques described previously (Coop et al., 1995). Resultant L₃ were passaged through two helminth-naïve calves to produce sufficient material for use in the CET. The isolates used in this study were designated FI001 and FI004 and were derived from beef cattle farms in Dumfriesshire and Ayrshire, Scotland, respectively. On-farm IVM-faecal egg count reduction tests (FECRTs) using subcutaneous administration had demonstrated mean faecal egg count (FEC) reductions of 72% (95% confidence intervals: 41, 87) and 87% (95% confidence intervals: 77, 93) for FI001 and FI004, respectively (McArthur et al., 2011).

2.2. Controlled efficacy test

Forty helminth-free, male calves, 4–7 months-old, and housed since birth, were infected per os with 50,000 L₃ each (Day 0 post-infection; PI). A total of 20 calves were infected with each isolate. On day 27 PI, a FEC was performed and the calves weighed. On the basis of these parameters the calves were allocated into blocks, the blocks were then randomly assigned to a treatment group (n=5 per group). Groups 1–4 and Groups 5–8 were infected with isolates FI001 and FI004, respectively. All groups were housed separately. Treatments to groups 1 and 5 were administered on Day 28 PI with IVM by subcutaneous infection (Ivomec Super®, 1% (w/v) IVM, 10% (w/v) clorsulon, Merial Animal Health, 0.2 mg/kg body weight; BW), Groups 2 and 6 were administered with pour-on IVM (Ivomec Pour-On®, 0.5% (w/v) IVM, Merial Animal Health; 0.5 mg/kg BW), Groups 3 and 7 were administered with MOX as a pour-on preparation (Cydectin Pour-On®, 0.5% (w/v) MOX, Pfizer Animal Health Ltd; 0.5 mg/kg BW). The two remaining groups (4 and 8) received no anthelmintic and acted as infection controls for the experiment (Table 1). All anthelmintic treatment doses were calculated according to the respective manufacturer’s instructions, with pour-on doses rounded up to the nearest 1 ml (dosage range 0.50–0.56 mg/kg BW) and injectable doses to the nearest 0.1 ml (0.2 mg/kg BW). Pour-on treatments were applied along the midline of the back from the withers to the tailhead using a syringe, animals were observed closely for 30 min after treatment for any licking behaviour. All experimental procedures described here were approved by the Moreton Research Institute Experiments and Ethics Committee and were conducted under the legislation of a UK Home Office License (reference PPL 60/03899) in accordance with the Animals (Scientific Procedures) Act of 1986.

2.3. Samples

Faecal samples were taken per rectum from each calf prior to infection to confirm that they were negative for helminth eggs, on Day 27 PI prior to treatment allocation, on the day of anthelmintic treatment (Day 28) and then

Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Treatment (dosage)</th>
<th>Number of calves</th>
<th>Dose (L₃)</th>
<th>Day post infection</th>
<th>P.M.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Control – Untreated</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ivermectin injectable (0.2 mg/kg; IVM-INJ)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ivermectin pour-on (0.5 mg/kg; IVM-PO)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moxidectin pour-on (0.5 mg/kg; MOX-PO)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
daily until necropsy seven days later. Faecal egg counts (FECs) were conducted in duplicate using a modification of the technique described by Jackson (1974). Venous blood was collected via jugular venepuncture into 10 ml heparinised Vacutainer tubes (Becton Dickinson vacutainers systems) at 4, 8, 24, 48, 120, 144 and 168 h post administration of anthelmintic. All blood samples were stored in lidded cool boxes to prevent ML degradation. The samples were immediately centrifuged at 1272 × g for 15 min at 4°C; plasma recovered and stored at −20°C.

2.4. Necropsy and worm recovery

All animals were necropsied on Day 35 PI (Day 7 post treatment) using post mortem and nematode recovery methods described previously (Patterson et al., 1996). The full length of the small intestine was removed and processed to ensure that any worms that may have been temporarily paralysed and subsequently re-established to a more distal region of the gut were recovered (McKellar et al., 1988). Total nematode burdens were estimated from counts of a 2% sub-sample of the abomasal and intestinal washings and saline digests. Enumerated nematodes were classified to stage and species using criteria described in the Ministry of Agriculture, Fisheries and Food document (MAFF, 1986).

2.5. Ivermectin concentration and kinetic analysis

ML concentrations were determined in plasma by high performance liquid chromatography (HPLC) with fluorescence detection according to previously described and validated methods (Alvierie et al., 1998). Data were analysed using a non-compartmental approach with version 4.2 of the Kinetica Tm computer program (InnaPhase, Philadelphia, USA). The partial area under the plasma concentration–time curve (AUC) from t₀ to tₚ was calculated by the linear trapezoidal rule. Data are expressed as mean ± standard error of the mean (SEM).

2.6. Statistical analyses

Nematode burdens and FECs were square-root transformed to successfully normalize for variance. Burdens were compared using one way ANOVA (Minitab version 13), followed by Fisher’s pairwise comparisons when found to be significant (p < 0.05). The percentage efficacy (PE) of each treatment was calculated by means of the standard equation: \( 1 - (T/C) \times 100 \) where C and T are the arithmetic mean total nematode burdens or FECs of the untreated control and treated groups, respectively (Coles et al., 1992). Anthelmintic resistance was deemed to be present when the PE in reducing nematode burden or FEC was <95%, with a lower 95% confidence limit of <90%. Bootstrap analysis was also conducted, with a re-sampling number of 2000 using the “BootStreat” program (Cabaret and Antoine, 2008) to calculate mean treatment efficacies and upper and lower 95% confidence limits. Statistical analysis for the comparison of mean AUC values was performed using one-way ANOVA followed by Fisher test (Statview software, Abacus concepts, Berkeley, CA, USA). Statistical significance was accepted as p < 0.05.

3. Results

3.1. Observations after treatment

One animal from the FI001 IVM-INJ group had no IVM detected in its plasma and was consequently removed from the trial and any subsequent analysis. No licking was observed in any of the animals administered with the pour-on applications over the entire observation period.

3.2. Nematode burden analysis

The average percentage establishment of nematodes in the control calves was 27% (13,630 nematodes) and 35% (17,560 nematodes) for FI001 and FI004, respectively. In terms of species composition identified at post mortem in these groups, FI001 comprised 61% O. ostertagi and 39% C. oncophora and FI004 comprised 86% O. ostertagi and 14% C. oncophora. In terms of efficacy, when compared to the untreated control group, for FI001, mean reductions in C. oncophora were 38%, 64% and 31% in the IVM-INJ, IVM-PO and MOX-PO treatment groups, respectively (Table 2). For FI004, the observed mean reductions in this nematode species were 10%, 0% and 74% for the IVM-INJ, IVM-PO and MOX-PO treatment groups, respectively. All three anthelmintic treatments produced a mean reduction in O. ostertagi of >99.5% in both isolates. For isolate FI001, no significant differences in nematode burdens were observed when the anthelmintic treated groups were compared with the non-treated control group, whereas with isolate FI004, significant reductions in nematode burdens were only observed in the group administered with MOX-PO (p < 0.05).

3.3. Faecal egg count analysis

Fig. 1A and B shows the mean FECs obtained daily for each group from 0 to 7 days after anthelmintic administration. FECs in the untreated control groups were consistently high throughout the sampling frame, with mean FECs across the 7 days of 1245 and 674 EPG for isolates FI001 and FI004, respectively. In animals that received isolate FI001, FECs declined steadily from 0 to 4 days after administration of IVM-PO and from 0 to 5 days after administration of IVM-INJ and MOX-PO. The pattern of faecal egg output after anthelmintic administration differed with isolate FI004, as only in those animals that received MOX-PO did the FECs reach 0 EPG (at four days after treatment). In the groups that received IVM, although the FECs declined after treatment, they remained >0 EPG throughout. For isolate FI001, at seven days after treatment, the mean FECR observed was 98%, 99% and 100% in the groups that received IVM-INJ, IVM-PO and MOX-PO, respectively. In contrast, for isolate FI004, mean FECRs of 37%, 20% and 100% were observed at seven days after treatment with IVM-INJ, IVM-PO and MOX-PO, respectively (Table 3). Significant differences (p < 0.05) in FEC compared to non-treated control animals were observed with all treatment groups with isolate FI001,
Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Treatment</th>
<th>Isolate FI001 Mean (± S.E.M.)</th>
<th>Isolate FI004 Mean (± S.E.M.)</th>
<th>Total Mean (± S.E.M.)</th>
<th>Percentage efficacy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>2810 (±635) [190–4400]</td>
<td>1720 (±475) [150–3500]</td>
<td>5530 (±1285) [1100–8350]</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>1900 (±625) [160–2600]</td>
<td>920 (±570) [100–1900]</td>
<td>2820 (±485) [100–5000]</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juvenile</td>
<td>60 (±29) [0–150]</td>
<td>0 (±0) [0–0]</td>
<td>20 (±20) [0–100]</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

whereas with isolate FI004, significant reductions in FEC were only observed with the group administered with MOX-PO.

3.4. Analysis of IVM and MOX concentration kinetics in plasma

Fig. 2A and B shows the mean plasma concentrations of IVM or MOX measured over time for each treatment group for both isolates and area under plasma concentration–time curves. In the IVM-INJ groups, the mean peak IVM concentration was between 20.4 and 38.6 ng/ml. In the IVM-PO groups, the mean peak IVM concentration was between 24.5 and 26 ng/ml, whereas the mean peak MOX concentration in MOX-PO treatment groups was 7.9 and 12.4 ng/ml.

4. Discussion

The current study demonstrated a lack of ML (IVM and MOX) efficacy against C. oncophora present in nematode isolates derived from two UK beef cattle enterprises. To date, reports of resistance/inefficacy in the UK have only described experiments in which pour-on IVM (Coles et al., 2001; Sargison et al., 2010) or doramectin (Sargison et al., 2009) were administered and these reports were
Table 3
Arithmetic mean (± S.E.M) [range] faecal egg counts and percentage efficacy (P.E.) of anthelmintic treated groups of calves relative to untreated control calves seven days post-treatment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Treatment</th>
<th>Faecal egg count (eggs per gram)</th>
<th>Percentage efficacy (95% CI)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Day 0</td>
<td>Day 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isolate FI001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Untreated</td>
<td>1425 (±472) [446–2624]</td>
<td>1491 (±421) [675–2741]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Injectable ivermectin (IVM-INJ)</td>
<td>596 (±91) [486–869]</td>
<td>30 (±9) [4–44]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pour-on ivermectin (IVM-PO)</td>
<td>1132 (±357) [491–2453]</td>
<td>13 (±11) [2–57]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pour-on moxidectin (MOX-PO)</td>
<td>795 (±268) [252–1715]</td>
<td>4 (±2) [0–12]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isolate FI004</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Untreated</td>
<td>613 (±165) [189–1184]</td>
<td>515 (±249) [126–1458]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Injectable ivermectin (IVM-INJ)</td>
<td>781 (±243) [365–1562]</td>
<td>323 (±41) [221–428]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pour-on ivermectin (IVM-PO)</td>
<td>578 (±172) [116–972]</td>
<td>411 (±208) [113–1215]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pour-on moxidectin (MOX-PO)</td>
<td>798 (±178) [347–1305]</td>
<td>1 (±0) [3–0]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on FEC reduction alone. Although there have been no reports of MOX resistance in cattle nematodes in the UK, there has been data describing this phenomenon in cattle from Argentina (Anziani et al., 2001), Belgium (El-Abdellati et al., 2010), Brazil (Condi et al., 2009), New Zealand (Vermunt et al., 1996) and the US (Gasbarre et al., 2009a, 2009b). As in the case of ovine nematodes (Pomroy and Whelan, 1993), reports of side resistance between members of the ML class in bovine nematodes are not unexpected (Conder et al., 1993; Vermunt et al., 1996). Here, for isolate FI004, the mean efficacy of MOX-PO was greater than IVM-PO and IVM-INJ, as assessed by nematode burden analysis, although this was not the case with isolate FI001. In previous reports of ML resistance in cattle, where both compounds were tested, MOX treatment generally resulted in higher percentage reductions in nematode burden and FEC than IVM (Anziani et al., 2001; El-Abdellati et al., 2010; Gasbarre et al., 2009b) although this was not always the case (Vermunt et al., 1996). The higher efficacy of MOX is believed to be due the compound’s greater lipophilicity, as well as higher potency and persistency when compared to avermectins such as IVM (Kieman, 1994).

The drug concentration data indicates adequate uptake of the anthelmintics administered and confirms that the nematodes are ML resistant. Macrocyclic lactones have systemic action and their concentration and persistence in plasma and in tissues where parasites are located, contribute to their efficacy against the target parasite species. In this study, the ML concentration profiles in plasma were within the limits expected in cattle for each of the treatment groups (Gayard et al., 1999; Lifsicht et al., 1999a, 1999b; Sallowitz et al., 2002). Generally, subcutaneous

Fig. 2. (A) Plasma profile of macrocyclic lactone concentration in field derived nematode infected cattle: isolate FI001 (full line) and isolate FI004 (dotted line) treated at time 0. IVM-INJ (■), IVM-PO (□) and MOX-PO (▲). (B) Area under plasma concentration–time curve (AUC): isolate FI001 (■) and isolate FI004 (□). Values are arithmetic means ± S.E.M. Values are significantly different when compared with MOX-PO (a) or when compared with IVM-PO (b).
injection is the most efficient route for ML administration in terms of bioavailability in cattle and other species, when compared to oral and topical administration (Gayraud et al., 1999; Laffont et al., 2001; Lespine et al., 2005). Ivermectin and MOX have different plasma and tissue kinetics which affect the duration of activity and generally, MOX has a longer persistence of activity than IVM does in hosts infected with ML sensitive nematodes.

The principal species surviving ML treatment in both isolates was *C. oncophora*. This is consistent with previous findings in the EU, where this species predominated after IVM treatment (Demeler et al., 2009; El-Abdellati et al., 2010; Hamilton et al., 2001). *C. oncophora* was also demonstrated to dominate larval cultures derived from samples obtained after IVM treatment failure in the field in Scotland (Sargison et al., 2009). *Cooperia*, including *C. oncophora*, are known to be one of the dose-limiting species for IVM (Benz and Ernst, 1979; Bisset et al., 1990; Egerton et al., 1979; McKenna, 1995), with similar findings reported for MOX (Ranjan et al., 1992; Vermunt et al., 1996; Whang et al., 1994).

*Cooperia* species have often been cited as relatively non-pathogenic (Anderson et al., 1965; Coop et al., 1979); however, ill thrift has been reported in cattle harbouring suspected or confirmed anthelmintic resistant nematodes of this species (Anziani et al., 2001; McKenna, 1995; Sargison et al., 2010). Indeed, recent studies in New Zealand have indicated that failure to control this nematode species in yearlings results in a 14 kg difference in live-weight gain over a grazing season compared to uninfected control animals (Sutherland et al., 2011). Previous studies in Scotland also indicated that this was the case (Armour et al., 1987). Some authors have suggested that anthelmintic resistant *C. oncophora* are more pathogenic than ML sensitive worms of the same species (Coles et al., 2001; Njue and Prichard, 2004). The trial here was of too short a duration to assess the clinical effects of the parasite isolates investigated and further studies need to be performed to explore this further.

Lower FECs were observed in calves infected with FI004 compared to those infected with FI001. This difference may be attributable to higher proportions of *O. ostertagi* in the FI004 isolate. *O. ostertagi* is known to be less fecund than *Cooperia* species (Kloosterman, 1971).

Examination of the FEC data following anthelmintic administration demonstrated that there was suppression of egg production from worms that survived treatment. It is believed that although nematodes are able to survive in therapeutic concentrations of the compound, IVM is still able to paralyse the uterine musculature (McKenna, 1997; Scott et al., 1991) resulting in a suppression in egg output in surviving worms. Egg output may then resume as the local anthelmintic concentrations fall over time, although one report detailed the effect of IVM on the reproductive potential of *Cooperia curvata*, with reduced numbers of eggs observed in worms from IVM treated animals compared to worms in untreated controls (McKellar et al., 1988). Although assessed at 7 days after anthelmintic administration, all treatments for isolate FI001 gave FECR efficacies >95%, whereas for isolate FI004, only MOX-PO treatment resulted in a FECR >95%. Whilst the faecal egg counts of the treated groups may have increased if left until 14 days after anthelmintic administration, as per the current WAAVP guidelines (Coles et al., 2006), it highlights the limitation of examining FECs in isolation when assessing anthelmintic efficacy.

The data generated here and in other trials reaffirms the need to ensure that appropriate guidelines are followed when assessing anthelmintic efficacy (Coles et al., 2006).
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