

Accepted Manuscript

Title: Antimicrobial susceptibility patterns of *Haemophilus parasuis* from pigs in the United Kingdom and Spain

Authors: A.J. Martín de la Fuente, A.W. Tucker, J. Navas, M. Blanco, S.J. Morris, C.B. Gutiérrez-Martín



PII: S0378-1135(06)00399-3
DOI: doi:10.1016/j.vetmic.2006.10.014
Reference: VETMIC 3474

To appear in: *VETMIC*

Received date: 1-8-2006
Revised date: 2-10-2006
Accepted date: 10-10-2006

Please cite this article as: de la Fuente, A.J.M., Tucker, A.W., Navas, J., Blanco, M., Morris, S.J., Gutiérrez-Martín, C.B., Antimicrobial susceptibility patterns of *Haemophilus parasuis* from pigs in the United Kingdom and Spain, *Veterinary Microbiology* (2006), doi:10.1016/j.vetmic.2006.10.014

This is a PDF file of an unedited manuscript that has been accepted for publication. As a service to our customers we are providing this early version of the manuscript. The manuscript will undergo copyediting, typesetting, and review of the resulting proof before it is published in its final form. Please note that during the production process errors may be discovered which could affect the content, and all legal disclaimers that apply to the journal pertain.

1
2
3
4 Short communication

5
6
7 **Antimicrobial susceptibility patterns of *Haemophilus parasuis* from pigs**
8 **in the United Kingdom and Spain**

9
10 A.J. Martín de la Fuente^a, A.W. Tucker^b, J. Navas^c, M. Blanco^c, S.J. Morris^b, and C.B.
11 Gutiérrez-Martín^{a*}

12
13 ^a *Departamento de Sanidad Animal, Unidad de Microbiología e Inmunología, Facultad de*
14 *Veterinaria, Universidad de León, 24007-León, Spain.*

15 ^b *Department of Veterinary Medicine, University of Cambridge, Madingley Road,*
16 *Cambridge CB3 0ES, United Kingdom.*

17 ^c *Departamento de Biología Molecular (Unidad Asociada al Centro de Investigaciones*
18 *Biológicas, C.S.I.C.), Facultad de Medicina, Universidad de Cantabria, 39011, Santander,*
19 *Spain.*

20
21 * Corresponding author

22
23 **Telephone:** 34 987 291 203

24 **Fax no.:** 34 987 291 304

25 **E-mail:** dsacgm@unileon.es

1 **Abstract**

2 A total of 30 British and 30 Spanish *Haemophilus parasuis* isolates were tested
3 for their susceptibility to 19 of the antimicrobials currently used in swine practice with a
4 broth microdilution method in order to know the emergence of resistance against these
5 compounds in this porcine pathogen. All the British isolates were susceptible to penicillin,
6 ceftiofur, erythromycin, tilmicosin, enrofloxacin, and florfenicol, and most of them were
7 susceptible to the remaining antimicrobials (the highest resistance rate found was of 20%
8 to neomycin). In contrast, all the Spanish isolates were susceptible exclusively to
9 florfenicol, and high proportions of resistance were encountered for penicillin, ampicillin,
10 oxytetracycline, erythromycin, tilmicosin, tiamulin and trimethoprim +
11 sulphamethoxazole; in addition, a bimodal or multimodal distribution, or tailing of Spanish
12 isolates over the MIC range was observed for clindamycin, sulphonamides and tylosine
13 tartrate, suggesting the development of acquired resistance. In addition, several
14 multiresistance patterns were found among the Spanish isolates, 23.3% of them being
15 resistant to at least eight antimicrobials, the same rate as that encountered for those being
16 susceptible to all antimicrobials tested. This study showed that in general British *H.*
17 *parasuis* isolates are susceptible to antimicrobial agents routinely used for treatment of
18 porcine respiratory diseases; however, the Spanish isolates need a more continuous
19 surveillance of their susceptibility patterns.

20 **Keywords:** *Haemophilus parasuis*; Glässer's disease; Antimicrobial susceptibility;
21 Clinical Isolates; Pig

22

1 **1. Introduction**

2 *Haemophilus parasuis*, a small pleomorphic, nicotinamide adenine dinucleotide
3 (NAD)-dependent Gram-negative rod of the family *Pasteurellaceae*, is an important
4 porcine pathogen and the etiological agent of Glässer's disease. This disease is
5 characterized by fibrinous polyserositis, polyarthritis and meningitis. However, in the acute
6 form it might only be associated with pneumonia and septicemia without polyserositis.
7 Furthermore, some strains of *H. parasuis* are not associated with disease and are
8 considered a commensal of the upper respiratory tract of healthy pigs (Oliveira and Pijoan,
9 2004). Glässer's disease has historically been considered a sporadic, stress-associated
10 disease of young pigs. However, since the establishment of specific pathogen free herds,
11 increased spread of the disease and increased mortality rates have been described. In such
12 herds, infection may spread as a contagious disease of high morbidity, being responsible for
13 increased economic losses in the swine industry worldwide (Smart et al., 1988).

14 There is evidence that *H. parasuis* is heterogeneous in nature. To date, 15 serovars
15 have been recognized, along with a large number of non-typable isolates. It is unclear if
16 there is a strong relationship between serovar and virulence but it is used as an indicative
17 marker. Thus, serovars 1, 5, 10, and 12-14 may lead to the death of pigs and are considered
18 highly virulent; serovars 2, 4, 8 and 15 are virulent, causing lesions in pigs, but serovars 3,
19 6, 7, 9 and 11 are considered to be avirulent (Kielstein and Rapp-Gabrielson, 1992). In
20 Spain, the most prevalent serotypes are 4, 5, 7, 10, and 15, whereas in the United
21 Kingdom, the most prevalent serotypes are 1, 2, 5, 7 and 10 (unpublished results). Control
22 of Glässer's disease can be achieved by use of vaccination; however, serovar diversity and
23 the high number of non-typable isolates reported have affected negatively the development
24 of effective cross-protective vaccines (Oliveira and Pijoan, 2004).

1 For this reason, antibiotic therapy continues to be necessary for the treatment of
2 outbreaks of Glässer's disease, together with other measures that can help to limit
3 outbreaks, such as good animal management including adequate colostral protection. There
4 are few reports on the antimicrobial susceptibility of European *H. parasuis* field isolates
5 (Wissing et al., 2001; Aarestrup et al., 2004; San Millán et al., 2006; Nedbalcova et al.,
6 2006); however, β -lactam-resistant isolates exhibiting β -lactamases have been recently
7 reported in Spain (San Millán et al., 2006). Correct use of antimicrobial agents for
8 treatment of bacterial infections requires knowledge of the susceptibility of the infecting
9 strain to antimicrobial agents, because of the emergence of resistance observed among
10 several organisms, including some of those causing respiratory diseases in pigs, such as
11 *Actinobacillus pleuropneumoniae* (Gutiérrez-Martín et al., 2006) or *Pasteurella multocida*
12 subsp. *multocida* (Vera-Lizarazo et al., 2006). Thus, the purpose of the present work was
13 to determine the antimicrobial susceptibility of a collection of *H. parasuis* strains coming
14 from two geographical origins, the United Kingdom and Spain.

15 **2. Materials and methods**

16 *2.1. Bacterial strains*

17 A total of 30 *H. parasuis* isolates supplied by the Veterinary Laboratory Agency
18 (Bury St Edmunds, Suffolk, United Kingdom), which were recovered between 1995 and
19 2005 from pigs suffering polyseritis, pneumonia or septicemia, as well as 30 other *H.*
20 *parasuis* isolates, which were recovered from 2002 to 2004 from pigs suffering
21 polyserositis or pneumonia from herds located in central and northwest Spain, were
22 included in this study. Identification of the isolates was carried out by NAD-dependency;
23 absence of hemolysis; urease, oxidase and catalase tests, and using the 16S diagnostic PCR

1 (Oliveira et al., 2001). The isolates were serotyped by indirect haemagglutination as
2 previously described (del Río et al., 2003).

3 *2.2. Antimicrobial susceptibilities*

4 The antimicrobial susceptibilities of the isolates were determined by a
5 microdilution method using a commercially prepared, dehydrated 96-well microtitre panel
6 recommended for porcine organisms (CMV1ABPF, Sensititre, Trek Diagnostic Systems
7 Inc., United Kingdom). The antimicrobial agents used and their respective dilution ranges
8 were as follows: penicillin (PEN), 0.12-8 µg/ml; ampicillin (AMP), 0.25-16 µg/ml;
9 ceftiofur (XNL), 0.5-8 µg/ml; gentamicin (GEN), 1-8 µg/ml; apramycin (APR) and
10 neomycin (NEO), 4-32 µg/ml; spectinomycin (SPE), 8-64 µg/ml; oxytetracycline (OXY),
11 0.25-8 µg/ml; clindamycin (CLI), 0.25-2 µg/ml; erythromycin (ERY), 0.25-4 µg/ml;
12 tilmicosin (TYL), 4-32 µg/ml; enrofloxacin (ENRO), 0.12-2 µg/ml; sulphachlorpiridazine
13 (SCP), sulphadimetoxine (SDM) and sulphathiazole (STZ), 32-256 µg/ml; florfenicol
14 (FFC), 0.25-8 µg/ml; tiamulin (TIA), 4-32 µg/ml; tylosin tartrate (TYLT), 2,5-20 µg/ml;
15 and trimethoprim/sulphamethoxazole (COT), 0.5/9.5-2/38 µg/ml. The inocula were
16 prepared from a 24 h chocolate blood agar plate by adjusting to 0.5 McFarland standard
17 and further diluted 1/200 in Veterinary Fastidious Medium (Mueller-Hinton broth -Biolife,
18 Italy- + 2% yeast extract -Biolife, Italy- + 2% lysed horse blood + 2% supplement C
19 -Becton Dickinson Co, MD, USA-) (Clinical and Laboratory Standards Institute -CLSI-,
20 2002). Fifty microlitres of the adjusted inoculum were deposited in each well of the
21 microplate panel. Microdilution panels were covered with a sterile microwell lid and
22 further incubated at 37° C for 24 h in an atmosphere containing 5% CO₂.

1 Performance and evaluation of the minimal inhibitory concentration (MIC)
2 determinations followed the recommendations of the CLSI (2002, 2004). The MIC was
3 defined as the lowest concentration at which no visible growth was detectable. Ranges of
4 susceptibility were recorded along with the MIC that inhibited 50% (MIC₅₀) and 90%
5 (MIC₉₀) of the isolates. The breakpoints used for PEN, AMP, XNL, SPE, OXY, ERY,
6 TYL, FFC, TIA and COT were those previously used by Aarestrup et al. (2004) for Danish
7 *H. parasuis* strains. For GEN, NEO and ENRO, breakpoints values used were those
8 recommended by CLSI (2004) for *A. pleuropneumoniae* or *Histophilus somni*. For the
9 remaining antimicrobials, the distribution of strains over the MIC range was considered.
10 The following control strains were included: *A. pleuropneumoniae* ATCC 27090 and *H.*
11 *somni* ATCC 700025.

12 2.3. Detection of β -lactamases

13 The β -lactamase activity was determined by the nitrocefin test (Becton Dickinson
14 Co, MD, USA).

15 3. Results and discussion

16 In this study, a microdilution method was used to compare the antimicrobial
17 resistance profiles of British and Spanish *H. parasuis* isolates. The British isolates
18 belonged to seven serovars (1-3, 5, 7, 10 and 12), while the Spanish isolates belonged to
19 ten serovars (2, 4, 5, 7-10, 12, 14, and 15). Correlation between distribution of resistances
20 and serovars could not be established because of the small number of isolates belonging to
21 each serovar. The results of the susceptibility testing as distribution of the MICs values,
22 MIC₅₀, MIC₉₀, and the percentage of resistant strains (when breakpoints are available) are
23 shown in Table 1.

1 All the British isolates were susceptible to penicillin, which is in accordance to the
2 results obtained in Switzerland using disk diffusion (Wissing et al., 2001). Unlike British
3 strains, only 40% of the Spanish isolates were susceptible to this β -lactam antimicrobial. A
4 high degree of resistance (56.7%) was also recorded for ampicillin among the Spanish
5 isolates; however, only two British isolates (6.7%) had a MIC outside the breakpoint.
6 Similarly, ampicillin-resistant isolates exhibiting β -lactamases have been recently reported
7 in Spain (San Millán et al., 2006). The nitrocefin test was carried out with the 18 isolates
8 having MICs $\geq 4 \mu\text{g/ml}$ to penicillin, and a positive reaction was observed for 14 isolates,
9 while a clearly negative reaction was yielded by the remaining isolates. These four
10 nitrocefin-negative strains suggest that, in addition to β -lactamases, there are likely other
11 additional mechanisms involved in resistance towards penicillins. All the British strains
12 were susceptible to ceftiofur, but two of the Spanish strains (6.7%) showed a MIC greater
13 than the breakpoint given for this β -lactam. These two isolates also displayed resistance to
14 penicillin and ampicillin. In contrast to our results, 52 Danish *H. parasuis* isolates were
15 fully susceptible to β -lactams, especially to ceftiofur, with all isolates being inhibited by a
16 dose as low as $0.03 \mu\text{g/ml}$ of this compound (Aarestrup et al., 2004).

17 With regard to aminoglycosides, a certain degree of resistance was found towards
18 gentamicin, neomycin and spectinomycin, with percentages considerably lower among the
19 British isolates. Resistance to gentamicin has been also reported among Swiss isolates
20 (Wissing et al., 2001). The results obtained for spectinomycin (MIC range of 8-128 $\mu\text{g/ml}$)
21 differed from those previously reported in Denmark, where all *H. parasuis* isolates were
22 susceptible to 8 $\mu\text{g/ml}$ (Aarestrup et al., 2004). Since no CLSI-breakpoint has been defined
23 for apramycin, the percentage of resistant isolates could not be determined. Nevertheless,

1 the MIC₅₀ and MIC₉₀ values of apramycin were quite similar to those observed for
2 neomycin, being identical the dilution ranges tested for both aminoglycosides;
3 consequently, a similar activity to that obtained for neomycin might be deduced for
4 apramycin.

5 A high rate of resistance to oxytetracycline (40%) was found among the Spanish
6 isolates; however, a substantially lower resistance (6.7%) was observed among the British
7 strains. A considerably lower percentage of resistance to tetracyclines was found in the
8 Czech Republic when compared with the Spanish isolates, with 21.9% of the Czech
9 isolates being resistant (Nedbalcova et al., 2006). Again, Aarestrup et al. (2004) did not
10 report resistance towards tetracyclines among the Danish *H. parasuis* isolates. In addition,
11 *tet(B)* gene associated with two plasmids has been reported in some tetracycline-resistant
12 *H. parasuis* isolates (Lancashire et al., 2005). The high prevalence of resistance ascribed to
13 this antimicrobial group in the present work could be related with its excessive use in
14 therapy for the treatment of infectious diseases caused by respiratory pathogens in Spanish
15 porcine husbandry in recent decades (Gutiérrez et al., 1993), quite different from the more
16 rational use in the United Kingdom.

17 A high proportion of the Spanish isolates (40%) were resistant to erythromycin
18 and tilmicosin; however, all the British isolates were susceptible to these compounds. The
19 results observed among the British isolates were quite similar to those previously reported
20 in Denmark (Aarestrup et al., 2004), where no resistance was recorded against these
21 antimicrobials. On the contrary, a substantially higher resistance rate (84.4%) was reported
22 to erythromycin among Czech *H. parasuis* isolates (Nedbalcova et al., 2006). Tailing was
23 present for clindamycin among the British *H. parasuis* isolates (with a MIC₅₀ of ≤ 0.25

1 $\mu\text{g/ml}$), whereas the Spanish isolates seem to form a bimodal population of susceptibility
2 to this compound (with a MIC_{50} of $2 \mu\text{g/ml}$), both cases suggesting a possible development
3 of a certain degree of resistance. Tylosine tartrate had MICs of $20 \mu\text{g/ml}$ against 50% of
4 the Spanish isolates, and of $\leq 2.5 \mu\text{g/ml}$ against 50% of the British isolates. Again, the
5 multimodal distribution or the tailing showed respectively by the Spanish or British
6 isolates suggest the development of acquired resistance, especially among the Spanish
7 strains. Tylosine has been used in swine in Spain as growth promoter until it was banned in
8 1999. It is possible that the high MIC values observed in our investigation arose from long-
9 term exposure of the Spanish isolates to this antimicrobial agent.

10 The resistance observed to enrofloxacin among the Spanish isolates (20%) is of
11 particular note, since no resistance was recorded amongst the UK isolates, all of them
12 susceptible to $1 \mu\text{g/ml}$ of this antimicrobial agent. Similar to this latter result, no resistance
13 has been documented among Swiss isolates (Wissing et al., 2001). Resistance to
14 enrofloxacin has not been described among *H. parasuis* isolates to date; however, in a
15 recent study conducted on 94 field isolates in the Czech Republic using disk diffusion
16 (Nedbalcova et al., 2006), a low resistance (6.3%) was found towards norfloxacin, another
17 fluoroquinolone. On the other hand, florfenicol exhibited an excellent activity against all
18 the 60 isolates tested, regardless of their geographical origin. The investigation performed
19 by Aarestrup et al. (2004) in Denmark also encountered no resistant isolates to florfenicol,
20 with a MIC range even lower than that reported in the present study. Therefore, florfenicol,
21 which was first used in 2000 in the United Kingdom and Spain, remains as useful for
22 treatment of swine with Glässer's disease. Prudent use and guidelines are necessary in
23 order to avoid emergence of resistance to this compound, because its use has increased
24 considerably since then in these countries (J. M. Bollo Bernabé, personal communication).

1 Similar distributions (bimodal or tailing) of isolates over the MIC range were
2 found for the three sulphonamides tested, independently of the source of the strains, also
3 indicating a supposed resistance mechanism. Resistance to sulphonamides has been
4 previously reported among Swiss isolates using disk diffusion (Wissing et al., 2001). Most
5 Spanish isolates (53.3%) were also resistant to the combination of trimethoprim and
6 sulphamethoxazole, whereas this rate decreased to 10% when testing the British strains.
7 This latter resistance is rather similar to the 3% reported towards trimethoprim +
8 sulphamethoxazole among Danish isolates (Aarestrup et al., 2004).

9 Finally, a high rate of the Spanish isolates (40%) was found resistant to tiamulin,
10 while all the British isolates were susceptible except one (3.3%). The frequent use of this
11 pleuromutilin derivative for decades in Spain for treating respiratory infectious diseases,
12 mainly porcine pleuropneumonia caused by *A. pleuropneumoniae* (Gutiérrez et al., 1993)
13 could justify the high resistance profile showed by the Spanish *H. parasuis* isolates against
14 tiamulin.

15 Antimicrobial susceptibility profiles were constructed taking into account only the
16 Spanish isolates and those antimicrobials for which breakpoint was available (Table 2).
17 Only seven isolates (23.3%) were susceptible to all the antimicrobials tested, and several
18 multiresistance patterns were found among the remaining 23 strains. Thus, seventeen
19 isolates (56.7%) were resistant to at least four antimicrobials; seven (23.3%), to at least
20 eight antimicrobials, and only one isolate (3.3%) was resistant to twelve antimicrobials
21 simultaneously. This is the first report showing as many multiresistance patterns for this
22 veterinary pathogen, although one *H. parasuis* isolate being resistant to ten antimicrobial
23 agents has been recently reported in the Czech Republic (Nedbalcova et al., 2006). In

1 contrast, a total of 24 British isolates (80%) were susceptible to the 19 antimicrobials
2 compared, three isolates were resistant to at least two antimicrobials and only one was
3 resistant simultaneously to GEN, OXY, TIA and COT. Further studies are required with
4 the aim of elucidating the molecular mechanisms involved in these resistances.

5 Our study demonstrated strongly that the British isolates were much more
6 susceptible to 19 of the antimicrobials routinely used in swine practice than those of
7 Spanish origin. One first explanation for this difference could be related with the sampling
8 period. The recovery period for the British isolates was 10 years, while the Spanish
9 samples were collected only for two years. This fact could have biased the results, so that
10 the isolates collected earlier might be biased a bit towards susceptibility, while the isolates
11 collected later might be biased towards resistance. However, a more likely explanation
12 could be that antimicrobial agents are still excessively used for the treatment or prevention
13 of infectious diseases in pig husbandry in Spain, in a much less rational way than in the
14 United Kingdom. Furthermore, the scarcity of reliable information about the amount of
15 antimicrobial agents used annually in pig practice in Spain (unlike other European
16 countries) does not help to avoid its hurtful use (EMEA, 1999).

17 In conclusion, our results emphasize the importance of prudent use of
18 antimicrobials in the treatment of Glässer's disease and, in particular, for routine
19 monitoring of the susceptibility patterns of clinical isolates of *H. parasuis* before the
20 administration of a given therapy. Besides, preventive measures such as good hygiene and
21 proper animal handling practices, which limit the use of antimicrobial agents, are essential
22 to keep the number of Glässer's disease outbreaks low.

1 **Acknowledgements**

2 We are grateful to the Veterinary Laboratory Agency (Bury St Edmunds, Suffolk,
3 United Kingdom) and Proinserga (Segovia, Spain) for providing us respectively with the
4 British and Spanish *H. parasuis* field isolates, and Jesús María Bollo Bernabé for
5 providing data on florfenicol.

Accepted Manuscript

1 **References**

- 2 Aaerstrup, F. M., Seyfarth, A. M, Angen, Ø., 2004. Antimicrobial susceptibility of
3 *Haemophilus parasuis* and *Histophilus somni* from pigs and cattle in Denmark. Vet.
4 Microbiol. 101, 143-146.
- 5 Clinical and Laboratory Standards Institute, 2002. Performance standards for antimicrobial
6 disk and dilution susceptibility test for bacteria isolated from animals, 2nd ed, approved
7 standard M31-A2, Clinical and Laboratory Standards Institute, Wayne, Pennsylvania,
8 USA.
- 9 Clinical and Laboratory Standards Institute, 2004. Performance standards for antimicrobial
10 disk and dilution susceptibility test for bacteria isolated from animals; informational
11 supplement M31-A2, Clinical and Laboratory Standards Institute, Wayne,
12 Pennsylvania, USA.
- 13 del Río, M.L., Gutiérrez, C.B., Rodríguez Ferri. 2003. Value of indirect hemagglutination
14 and coagglutination tests for serotyping *Haemophilus parasuis*. J. Clin. Microbiol. 41,
15 880-882.
- 16 European Agency for the Evaluation of Medicinal Products, Veterinary Medicines
17 Evaluation Unit. Antibiotic Resistance in the European Union Associated with
18 Therapeutic Use of Veterinary Medicines. Report and Qualitative Risk Assessment by
19 the Committee for Veterinary Medicinal Products. EMEA/CVMP/342/1999.
- 20 Gutiérrez, C.B., Píriz, S., Vadillo, S., Rodríguez Ferri, E.F. 1993. In vitro susceptibility of
21 *Actinobacillus pleuropneumoniae* strains to 42 antimicrobial agents. Am. J. Vet. Res.
22 54, 546-550.
- 23 Gutiérrez-Martín, C.B., García del Blanco, N., Blanco, M., Navas, J., Rodríguez-Ferri, E.F.
24 2006. Changes in antimicrobial susceptibility of *Actinobacillus pleuropneumoniae*
25 isolated from pigs in Spain during the last decade. Vet. Microbiol. 115, 218-222.

- 1 Kielstein, P., Rapp-Gabrielson, V.J., 1992. Designation of 15 serovars of *Haemophilus*
2 *parasuis* on the basis of immunodiffusion using heat-stable antigen extracts. J. Clin.
3 Microbiol. 30, 862-865.
- 4 Lancashire, J.F., Terry, T.D., Blackall, P.J., Jennings, M.P., 2005. Plasmid-encoded Tet B
5 tetracycline resistance in *Haemophilus parasuis*. Antimicrob. Agents Chemother. 49,
6 1927-1931.
- 7 Nedbalcova, K.; Jaglic, R.; Ondriasova, R.; Kucerova, Z. 2006. Monitoring of antibiotic
8 resistance in isolates of *Haemophilus parasuis* in the Czech Republic between 2004
9 and 2005. Proceedings of the 19th IPVS Congress, Copenhagen, Denmark, volume 2,
10 p. 436.
- 11 Oliveira, S., Galina, L., Pijoan, C., 2001. Development of a PCR test to diagnose
12 *Haemophilus parasuis* infections. J. Vet. Diagn. Invest. 13, 495-501.
- 13 Oliveira, S., Pijoan, C., 2004. *Haemophilus parasuis*: new trends on diagnosis,
14 epidemiology and control. Vet. Microbiol. 99, 1-12.
- 15 San Millán, A., Escudero, J.A., Catalán, A.M., Porrero, M.C., Domínguez, L., Moreno,
16 M.A., González-Zorn, B., 2006. Beta-lactam resistance in *Haemophilus parasuis*. Clin.
17 Microbiol. Infect. 12 Suppl 4, 1.
- 18 Smart, N.L., Miniats, O.P., MacInnes, J.I., 1988. Analysis of *Haemophilus parasuis*
19 isolates from southern Ontario swine by restriction endonuclease fingerprinting. Can.
20 Vet. Res. 52, 319-324.
- 21 Vera-Lizarazo Y.A., Rodríguez-Ferri, E.F., Martín de la Fuente, A.J., Gutiérrez-Martín,
22 C.B., 2006. Evaluation of changes in antimicrobial susceptibility patterns of
23 *Pasteurella multocida* subsp. *multocida* isolates from pigs in Spain in 1987-1988 and
24 2003-2004. Am. J. Vet. Res. 67, 663-668.
- 25 Wissing, A., Nicolet, J., Boerlin, P., 2001. The current antimicrobial resistance situation in
26 Swiss veterinary medicine. Schweiz. Arch. Tierheilkd. 143, 503-510.

27

1

2

Table 1. MICs for 19 antimicrobial agents of the British and Spanish *Haemophilus parasuis* clinical isolates.

3

Antimicrobial	Source of isolates	No. of isolates with MIC of ($\mu\text{g/ml}$)													MIC ₅₀	MIC ₉₀	% re-sistance		
		0.12	0.25	0.5	1	2	4	8	16	32	64	128	256	512					
PEN	UK	22	2	4	1	1											≤ 0.12	0.5	0
	Spain	4	2	2	2	2	2	2	14								8	>8	60.0
AMP	UK		22	3	1	1	1		1	1							≤ 0.25	2	6.7
	Spain		6	2	2	2	1	1	2	14							16	>16	56.7
XNL	UK			24	4	2											≤ 0.5	1	0
	Spain			21	2	3	2	1	1								≤ 0.5	4	6.7
GEN	UK				16	3	2	6	3								1	8	10.0
	Spain				3	3	6	10	8								8	>8	26.7
APR	UK						11	4	5	6	4						8	>32	---
	Spain						8	6	9	4	3						16	32	---
NEO	UK						10	3	5	6	6						16	>32	20.0
	Spain						5	3	2	10	10						32	>32	33.3
SPE	UK							17	2	6	2		3				4	64	10.0
	Spain							12	1	6	4	7					32	>64	23.3
OXY	UK		13	5	6	2	1	1	2								0.5	4	6.7
	Spain		5	3	3	2	2	3	12								4	>8	40.0
CLI	UK		18	4	4	3	1										≤ 0.25	2	---
	Spain		5	4	3	4	14										2	>2	---
ERY	UK		6	12	4	8											0.5	2	0
	Spain		8	2	1	2	5	12									4	>4	40.0
TYL	UK						20	10									<4	8	0
	Spain						9	3	6	5	7						16	>32	40.0
ENRO	UK	23	4	2	1												≤ 0.12	0.25	0
	Spain	12	3	4	5	2	4										0.25	>2	20.0
SCP	UK									10	4	10	3	3			128	256	---
	Spain									5	8	5	4	8			128	>256	---
SDM	UK									6	4	12	6	2			128	256	---
	Spain										3	7	3	17			>256	>256	---
STZ	UK									7	3	6	11	3			128	256	---
	Spain											5	6	19			>256	>256	---
FFC	UK		23	3	2	1	1										≤ 0.25	1	0
	Spain		12	8	7	2	1										0.5	1	0
TIA	UK						22	2	5	1							≤ 4	16	3.3
	Spain						12	2	4	7	5						16	>32	40.0

Table 1 (continued)

Antimicrobial	Source of isolates	No. of isolates with MIC of ($\mu\text{g/ml}$)					MIC ₅₀	MIC ₉₀	% resistance
		2.5	5	10	20	40			
TYLT	UK	21	4	4		1	≤ 2.5	10	---
	Spain	11	1	2	1	15	20	>20	---

Antimicrobial	Source of isolates	No. of isolates with MIC of ($\mu\text{g/ml}$)				MIC ₅₀	MIC ₉₀	% resistance
		0.5/9.5	1/19	2/38	4/76			
COT	UK	22	3	2	3	$\leq 0.5/9.5$	2/38	10.0
	Spain	6	2	6	16	>2/38	>2/38	53.3

The dilution ranges tested for each antimicrobial agent are those contained within the white area. Values above this range indicate MIC values higher than the highest concentration in the range. Values corresponding to the lowest concentration tested indicated MIC values smaller or equal to the lowest concentration in the range. CLSI resistance breakpoints are indicated with vertical black lines when available.

Abbreviations: PEN, penicillin; AMP, ampicillin; XNL, ceftiofur; GEN, gentamicin; APR, apramycin; NEO, neomycin; SPE, spectinomycin; CTET, chlortetracycline; OXY, oxytetracycline; CLI, clindamycin; ERY, erythromycin; TYL, tilmicosin; ENRO, enrofloxacin; SCP, sulphachlorpiridazine; SDM, sulphadimethoxine; STZ, sulphathiazole; FFC, florfenicol; TIA, tiamulin; TYLT, tylosine tartrate; COT, trimethoprim/sulphamethoxazole.

1
2
3
4**Table 2.** Antimicrobial resistance profiles of the Spanish *Haemophilus parasuis* field isolates in this study

No. of isolates	No. of antimicrobial agents	Resistance to:
7	0	No antimicrobial resistance
1	1	ENRO
1	1	COT
1	2	GEN+COT
1	3	PEN+AMP+SPE
1	3	PEN+AMP+COT
1	3	PEN+AMP+TIA
1	4	PEN+AMP+GEN+NEO
1	4	PEN+ERY+TYL+TIA
1	5	PEN+AMP+NEO+OXY+COT
1	5	GEN+NEO+SPE+ERY+TYL
1	5	NEO+SPE+OXY+ERY+COT
1	6	PEN+AMP+GEN+NEO+TYL+COT
1	6	PEN+AMP+OXY+ERY+TIA+COT
1	7	PEN+AMP+NEO+OXY+ERY+TIA+COT
1	7	PEN+AMP+SPE+OXY+TYL+TIA+COT
1	7	PEN+AMP+OXY+ERY+TYL+TIA+COT
1	8	PEN+AMP+GEN+OXY+ERY+TYL+TIA+COT
1	8	PEN+AMP+NEO+ERY+TYL+ENRO+TIA+COT
1	8	PEN+AMP+SPE+OXY+ERY+TYL+ENRO+COT
1	8	PEN+AMP+OXY+ERY+TYL+ENRO+TIA+COT
1	10	PEN+AMP+XNL+GEN+NEO+OXY+ERY+TYL+TIA+COT
1	10	PEN+AMP+GEN+NEO+SPE+OXY+TYL+ENRO+TIA+COT
1	12	PEN+AMP+XNL+GEN+NEO+SPE+OXY+ERY+TYL+ENRO+TIA+COT

5 Abbreviations are as defined in the legend of Table 1.