

SEROLOGIC EVIDENCE OF LEPTOSPIROSIS IN A SOUTHERN ARIZONA COYOTE POPULATION 1

Authors: JOHN DREWEK, T.H. NOON, R.J. TRAUTMAN, and E.J. BICKNELL

Source: Journal of Wildlife Diseases, 17(1) : 33-37

Published By: Wildlife Disease Association

URL: <https://doi.org/10.7589/0090-3558-17.1.33>

BioOne Complete (complete.BioOne.org) is a full-text database of 200 subscribed and open-access titles in the biological, ecological, and environmental sciences published by nonprofit societies, associations, museums, institutions, and presses.

Your use of this PDF, the BioOne Complete website, and all posted and associated content indicates your acceptance of BioOne's Terms of Use, available at www.bioone.org/terms-of-use.

Usage of BioOne Complete content is strictly limited to personal, educational, and non-commercial use. Commercial inquiries or rights and permissions requests should be directed to the individual publisher as copyright holder.

BioOne sees sustainable scholarly publishing as an inherently collaborative enterprise connecting authors, nonprofit publishers, academic institutions, research libraries, and research funders in the common goal of maximizing access to critical research.

SEROLOGIC EVIDENCE OF LEPTOSPIROSIS IN A SOUTHERN ARIZONA COYOTE POPULATION[□]

JOHN DREWEK, Jr.,[□] T.H. NOON,[□] R.J. TRAUTMAN,[□] and E.J. BICKNELL[□]

Abstract: Histologic examination of kidney tissue from a morbid coyote (*Canis latrans*) suggested a leptospiral infection. Sera from nine wild coyotes captured subsequently in the same general area were tested by the rapid plate agglutination method. Four of nine sera contained antibodies to *Leptospira canicola*, while one serum also contained antibodies for *L. icterohaemorrhagiae*. Epidemiology and morbidity are discussed.

INTRODUCTION

Leptospirosis is known to occur in a wide variety of wild mammals.^{1*} Among wild Canidae, evidence of the disease has been reported most often among foxes,^{2,3,5,6,9,12,17} but it has also been reported in wolves²⁰ and in jackals.²² Various serotypes have been implicated.

The disease is not unexpected in coyotes. Trainer and Knowlton²¹ reported serologic evidence of *L. canicola* in 1 of 33 coyotes (*Canis latrans*) that they tested in Texas. Cirone, *et al.*¹ while evaluating detection techniques, obtained seropositive results from all of 12 coyotes in California; nine different serotypes were involved. The purpose of this report is to present and discuss serologic evidence of leptospirosis in coyotes in Arizona.

CASE REPORT

During a field investigation related to a coyote ecology study in March, 1973, an extremely ill, weak coyote was encountered on the Santa Rita Experimental Range (SRER) south of Tucson. The animal was shot and its head submitted

to the Arizona State Department of Health Laboratory, where a fluorescent antibody test for rabies yielded negative results.

Necropsy examination revealed no gross abnormalities that could account for the weakened condition of the animal (University of Arizona Department of Veterinary Science Accession No. 73-529). However, the renal cortex appeared unusually pale and histologic examination revealed an interstitial nephritis characterized by multiple foci of mononuclear cells consisting of lymphocytes and occasional plasma cells. Also evident was tubular degeneration in scattered areas along with proteinaceous material in tubular lumens. These changes have been shown to be associated with leptospiral infection in domestic dogs (*C. familiaris*) and coyotes.^{1,16} Additionally, glomerulitis characterized by increased cellularity of glomerular tufts was noted in association with thickening of Bowman's capsule.

Although the interstitial and renal tubular changes noted suggested the possibility of leptospiral infection,

[□] Arizona Agricultural Experiment Station Publication Number 3076. College of Agriculture, University of Arizona, Tucson, Arizona 85721, USA.

[□] P.O. Box 42771, University Station, Tucson, Arizona 85733, USA.

[□] Department of Veterinary Science, Agricultural Sciences 232, University of Arizona, Tucson 85721, USA.

[□] Department of Veterinary Science, P.O. Box 304, Mesa Branch Station, Mesa, Arizona 85201, USA.

definitive changes associated with acute leptospirosis in other organs, notably the liver, were lacking. No leptospirae were seen in sections of kidney or liver stained by the Warthin-Starry silver impregnation method.

Since coyotes were being live-trapped on the SRER in connection with the behavioral phase of the study, blood samples were drawn from subsequently captured animals and tested for the presence of leptospiral antibodies.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Using monoject [□] blood collection tubes, blood samples were drawn by cephalic venipuncture from 9 coyotes captured alive on the SRER during May and June, 1973. These animals represented both sexes and a variety of age classes (see Table 1). Aging was based upon incisor wear.¹¹

Blood samples were allowed to clot and were then centrifuged at 1500 × g in an International CM-1 centrifuge. Serum was drawn off and the rapid plate agglutination test was performed. Commercial antigens prepared by Difco Laboratories were used following the procedure supplied by the manufacturer. Antigen serotypes used were *Leptospira canicola*, *L. icterohaemorrhagiae*, and *L.*

pomona, the three most common serotypes found in North America.¹⁸

Since stagnant ponds may be a source of leptospiral infections, water samples were taken from eight different stock tanks and ponds scattered across the study area in June, 1973. Portions of these samples were spun at 3020 × g for 5 min in a Servall RC-2 centrifuge. Wet mounts of sediment were examined for leptospirae utilizing dark-field microscopy.

RESULTS

Results of serologic screening are presented in Table 1 for 9 coyotes collected during May and June, 1973. In four cases positive reactions were obtained for *L. canicola*, and one of these also proved positive for *L. icterohaemorrhagiae*. No reaction was obtained for *L. pomona* in any case.

Endpoint reactions corresponding to the highest serum dilution showing any agglutination during the plate test were then transposed into titers according to the Difco procedure. Antibody levels are indicated in parentheses in Table 1. Reactions were obtained for dilutions ranging from 1:16 to 1:512.

No spirochetes were observed in water samples collected from the study area.

TABLE 1. Results of rapid plate agglutination testing of Arizona coyote sera for leptospiral antibodies, May-June, 1973.

Coyote Accession Number	Sex	Est. Age (yrs.)	Agglutinating Reaction		
			<i>L. canicola</i>	<i>L. icterohaemorrhagiae</i>	<i>L. pomona</i>
73-820	F	1	N	N	N
73-821	M	2	N	N	N
73-853	F	1	P(1:512)	P (1:512)	N
73-862	F	3	P (1:128)	N	N
73-909	F	1	P (1:512)	N	N
73-933	F	1	N	N	N
73-949	M	2	N	N	N
73-1012	M	5	P (1:16)	N	N
73-1013	M	1	N	N	N

[□] Sherwood Medical Industries, St. Louis, Missouri 63103, USA.

DISCUSSION

An increase in the prevalence of leptospirosis appeared to have occurred among the SRER coyote population during or prior to spring, 1973, as 4 of 9 coyotes showed serologic evidence of infection during May and June of 1973. Three of the four had high titers and one (75-853) apparently cross-reacted or was simultaneously infected with *L. icterohemorrhagiae*. Acute-phase canine sera from dogs infected with *L. canicola* occasionally cross-react with and show an equal or higher titer with *L. icterohemorrhagiae*.¹⁰

Leptospirae are passed in the urine of infected animals and may survive for weeks in moist soils or stagnant ponds.^{16, 18} While none were observed in samples of water sources from the study area, it should be pointed out that these samples were gathered in early June, by which time the occurrence of leptospirae in the environment may have declined. The unusually wet spring of 1973, with precipitation accumulations of as high as 10 cm above normal during March alone,⁸ provided humid conditions favoring survival of the disease organisms in an otherwise arid environment. The coyote's use of urine in scent marking¹⁴ may have provided a convenient means of transmission. Marler, Cook and Kerr¹⁶ demonstrated that leptospirosis occurred in coyotes experimentally infected with *L. canicola*. A more likely means of transmission, however, was direct physical contact during social interactions about common feeding sites, or during the mating season which reaches its peak in February in southern Arizona. Acquisition of leptospirosis by coyotes from rodent prey also was a possibility as rodents have been shown to have antibodies to *L. canicola*.⁴

Because little is known about leptospirosis in wildlife generally, its effect upon wild populations remains largely a matter of conjecture. Roth¹⁸ stated that most leptospiral infections among wildlife are probably self-limiting in that the animals recover from the initial stages of the disease and remain carriers for only a short time. The relatively high prevalence of infection during the spring of 1973 and the apparent drop in the infection rate among SRER coyotes trapped subsequently⁷ seemed to support this contention.

The occurrence of acute infections leading to fatalities are a possibility. Smith, Jones and Hunt¹⁹ note that acute leptospirosis often results in death among domestic dogs, although Marler *et al.*¹⁶ found that no mortality resulted in coyotes experimentally infected with hamster-virulent laboratory strains of *L. canicola*. Jubb and Kennedy¹³ note that the acute disease occurs most often among dogs in the 1 to 3 year age range. If the disease acts similarly among coyotes, morbidity possibly could be substantial, particularly since a large proportion, often over 70%^{11, 15} of wild coyote populations fall in the age classes below the 3 year level.

Animals that survive the acute disease may later succumb to uremia resulting from subsequent nephritis.¹⁹ Evidence of a declining coyote population on the SRER is presented by Danner,⁷ and he mentions chronic leptospirosis as a possible contributing factor. However, in his succeeding study, a series of 16 animals were captured in the SRER from December, 1973, through April, 1975, and only one animal, captured on 28 November, 1974, gave positive serologic results for *L. canicola*.⁷

Acknowledgements

The research was supported partly by the Arizona Cooperative Wildlife Research Unit. Dr. Lyle Sowls, Unit Leader, and Drs. Raymond E. Reed and Glenn Songer, Department of Veterinary Science at the University of Arizona, reviewed the manuscript. Tissue sections were prepared by Helen Thompson of the Department of

Veterinary Science. The Arizona State Department of Health Laboratory, Phoenix, performed a fluorescent antibody test for rabies on the coyote head.

LITERATURE CITED

1. BLOOM, F. 1941. The histopathology of canine leptospirosis. *Cornell Vet.* 31: 266-288.
2. BROWNLOW, W.J. and J.D. DEDEAUX. 1964. Leptospirosis in animals of upper Egypt. *Am. J. Trop. Med. & Hyg.* 13: 311-318.
3. CARBREY, E.A., L.G. CLARK and J.L. KRESSE. 1963. *Leptospira icterohaemorrhagiae* subserotype *incompleta* isolated from wildlife in Pennsylvania. *Public Hlth. Rpt.* 78: 355-358.
4. CIRONE, S.M., H.P. RIEMANN, R. RUPPANNER, D.E. BEHYMER and C.E. FRANTI. 1978. Evaluation of the hemagglutination test for epidemiologic studies of leptospiral antibodies in wild mammals. *J. Wildl. Dis.* 14: 193-202.
5. CLARK, L.G., J.L. KRESSE, R.R. MARSHAK and C.J. HOLLISTER. 1960. *Leptospira pomona* infection in an eastern red fox (*Vulpes fulva fulva*). *Nature* 188 (4755): 1040-1041.
6. ———, ———, ——— and ———. 1961. Natural occurrence of *Leptospira icterohaemorrhagiae* in the eastern grey fox and the eastern raccoon. *Nature* 192 (4809): 1312-1313.
7. DANNER, D.A. 1976. Coyote home range, social organization and scent post visitation. M.S. Thesis. University of Arizona, Tucson. 86 pp.
8. Environmental Science Services Administration (ESSA). 1973. Climatological data, Arizona. U.S. Dept. Com., ESSA. Vol. 77, Nos. 1-13.
9. GALTON, M.M., N. HIRSCHBERG, R.W. MENGES, M.P. HINES and R. HABERMANN. 1959. An investigation of possible wild animal hosts of leptospires in the area of the "Fort Bragg Fever" outbreaks. *Am. J. Pub. Hlth.* 49: 1343-1348.
10. ———, D.K. POWERS, A.D. HALL and R.G. CORNELL. 1958. A rapid macroscopic-slide screening test for the serodiagnosis of leptospirosis. *Am. J. Vet. Res.* 19: 505-512.
11. GIER, H.T. 1968. *Coyotes in Kansas*. *Kan. St. Univ. Agr. Exp. Stat. Bull.* 393. 118 pp.
12. GORMAN, G.W., S. McKEEVER and R.D. GRIMES. 1962. Leptospirosis in wild mammals from southwestern Georgia. *Am. J. Trop. Med. & Hyg.* 11: 518-524.
13. JUBB, K.V.F. and P.C. KENNEDY. 1970. *Pathology of Domestic Animals*. Vol. 1. Academic Press, New York, New York. 697 pp.
14. KLEIMAN, D. 1966. Scent marking in the Canidae. *Symp. Zool. Soc. London.* 18: 167-177.
15. KNOWLTON, F.F. 1972. Preliminary interpretations of coyote population mechanics with some management implications. *J. Wildl. Manage.* 36: 369-382.
16. MARLER, E.J., J.E. COOK and A.L. KERR. 1979. Experimentally induced leptospirosis in coyotes (*Canis latrans*). *Am. J. Vet. Res.* 40: 1115-1119.
17. ROTH, E.E., W.V. ADAMS, G.E. SANFORD, B. GREER and P. MAYEUX. 1961. Leptospirosis in wildlife and domestic animals in the United States. *S.W. Vet.* 14: 274-278.

—

18. ———. 1970. Leptospirosis. Pp. 293-303. In: *Infectious Diseases of Wild Mammals*. J.W. Davis, L.H. Karstad and D.O. Trainer, eds. The Iowa State University Press, Ames.
19. SMITH, H.A., T.C. JONES and R.D. HUNT. 1972. *Veterinary Pathology*. Lea and Febiger, Philadelphia. 1521 pp.
20. TONKONozHENKO, A.P., E.I. GURBANOVA and M. Kh. AGUZAROVA. 1965. Role of game animals in the formation of natural leptospiral foci in North Osetian ASSR. *Zh. Mikrobiol. Epidemiol. Immunobiol.* 42: 48-49.
21. TRAINER, D.O. and F.F. KNOWLTON. 1968. Serologic evidence of diseases in Texas coyotes. *J. Wildl. Manage.* 32: 981-983.
22. van der HOEDEN, J. 1955. Epizootiology of leptospirosis (Canicola) in the bovine and other species in Israel. *J. Am. vet. med. Ass.* 126: 207-210.

Received for publication 13 November 1979
