

Efficacy of Ivermectin Pour-on Administration Against Natural *Ancylostoma caninum* Infestation in Native Dogs of East-Azerbaijan Province, Iran

¹M.H. Khayatnouri and ²Y. Garedaghi

¹Department of Pharmacology, ²Department of Parasitology, Faculty of Veterinary,
Islamic Azad University, Tabriz Branch, Tabriz, Iran

Abstract: One of the real problems that cause the public health risks in small animal yearly is parasitic disease and some of these parasites are zoo noses. To overcome these problems the use of antiparasitic drugs is necessary. Ivermectin is a broad spectrum antiparasitic agent and different routes of its administration such as injection, oral and pour-on were used. The aims of the current study were evaluation of the efficacy of Ivermectin pour-on administration against natural *Ancylostoma caninum* infection in native dog and also determination the prevalence rate of this parasite in East-Azerbaijan province, Iran. In the present study, 60 native dogs were investigated by Egg Per Gram of feces (EPG) feces test. Willis method was applied for feces test and Mack-Master slide method was used for counting nematode eggs. After confirming the infection with worms, Ivermectin (0.5 mg kg⁻¹) pour-on was administrated to infected dogs. Fecal examination was repeated in 1, 7, 21 and 28 days post treatment. Results showed that total prevalence of *Ancylostoma caninum* infection was 28.33% in native dog of East-Azerbaijan province, Iran. Efficacy rate of Ivermectin pour-on was 21.19, 68.21, 91.24 and 98.61% in 1, 7, 21 and 28 days, respectively. In conclusion, the effect of this drug against *Ancylostoma caninum* resulted in reduction in egg count exceeded 98% so, this drug can be used in antiparasitic program in dog. Further investigations are necessary to evaluate the drug effect on other nematodes and parasitic infections.

Key words: *Ancylostoma caninum*, fecal examination, Ivermectin, pour-on, dog, East-Azarbaijan province, Iran

INTRODUCTION

Infections with gastrointestinal nematodes and heart worm are very common on native dog in Iran and all over the world. Parasitic infections of dogs are major factors responsible for public health losses through increased mortality and public health risk and cause zoonotic diseases in human and animals (Kozen *et al.*, 2008; Ahmad *et al.*, 2011; Snyder *et al.*, 2011; Ashraf *et al.*, 2008; Obiukwu and Onyali, 2006). Parasites cause the dogs to be unthrifty which may include the loss of weight. Due to parasitism, the animals become susceptible to other health problems which can lead to death.

Many researches for prevalence rate of gastrointestinal parasites all over the world have been reported but researches for effect of anti parasitic drugs by different administration routes is low and in Iran the study on present subject has not been done (Georgi *et al.*, 1990; Kassai, 1999; Mandal, 2006; Soulsby, 1986). Medicine combinations such as pyrantel pamoate, nitroscanate, milbemycine, Ivermectin, selamectin, moxidectin, praziquantel, pyrantel embonate and febantel,

Ivermectin and pyrantel pamoate have been used in dogs to treat gastrointestinal cestodes and nematodes in the recent years (Kozen *et al.*, 2008). Macrocyclic lactones such as avermectins and milbemycins, ascarids included as well, show a perfect anti-parasitic activity against nematodes. Various formulations of these compounds are used all over the world for many animal groups such as dogs, cattle, sheep, pig and horse (Kozen *et al.*, 2008; Snyder *et al.*, 2011).

Ivermectin is a member of the macrocyclic lactone class of endectocides. It is labeled for the treatment of internal and external parasites in dogs, cats, horses, pigs, sheep, cattle and birds. Subcutaneous and topical formulations are available for use in animals at a dose of 0.2 and 0.5 mg kg⁻¹ bodyweight, respectively. Ivermectin is a highly potent broad-spectrum anthelmintic that is widely used in different animals. It is available in injectable, oral and topical formulations for use in animals (Kozen *et al.*, 2008; Ahmad *et al.*, 2011; Snyder *et al.*, 2011; Vermunt *et al.*, 1995; Williams *et al.*, 1997; Khayatnouri *et al.*, 2011; Ashraf *et al.*, 2008; Obiukwu and Onyali, 2006). The Food and Drug Administration-Center

for Veterinary Medicine (FDA-CVM) approvals in the United States in the late 1980s and early 1990s of the macrocyclic lactones, ivermectin and milbemyein oxime and intended to be administrated orally at sequential monthly intervals during the heart worm transmission season, led to substantial improvements in chemoprophylaxis to prevent infection with *Dirofilaria immitis* (Snyder *et al.*, 2011). Macrocyclic lactones are safe, effective and convenient drugs for prevention of heart worm diseases in virtually all dogs when used as instructed.

While 100% prevention was not obtained for either macrocyclic lactones with this recent heart worm field isolate, it should be emphasized that these products are not intended to be used for just 1 month during the heart worm transmission season (Snyder *et al.*, 2011). The most important GI nematode and heart worm responsible for public health losses through increased mortality and public health risk and cause zoonotic diseases in human and animals (Kozen *et al.*, 2008; Ahmad *et al.*, 2011; Snyder *et al.*, 2011; Ashraf *et al.*, 2008; Obiukwu and Onyali, 2006). The objective of the present study is the evaluation of the effect of Ivermectin pour-on administration against natural *Ancylostoma caninum* nematode infections and determination of its prevalence rate in native dogs. This study is the first report in Iran.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

In present study a total number of 60 native dogs to *Ancylostoma caninum* infestation, from different region of East-Azerbaijan province, Iran was subjected for fecal examination and EPG. Ivermectin was administrated to treat infected animals at a dose of 0.5 mg kg⁻¹. Also, pour-on form of 0.5% Ivermectin powder in Isopropyl alcohol was made. Before and after treatment of dogs, 3 fecal samples of each animal were taken for fecal examination and egg count was recorded. Fecal examination in days 1, 7, 21 and 28 after treatment were repeated. In the present study, Willis method for fecal examination and Mack-Master slide method for egg examination (EPG) were used (Georgi *et al.*, 1990; Soulsby, 1986). Ivermectin efficacy was calculated according to the following equation:

$$\text{Percentage of drug efficacy} = P-R/P \times 100$$

R = Average number of parasite egg in g of fecal sample after treatment

P = Average number of parasite egg in g of fecal sample before treatment

Data were analyzed by non-parametric Crosscal-Walis and p<0.05 was considered significant.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The results of present study indicated that 17 dogs from a total of 60 were infected with *Ancylostoma caninum* with a prevalence rate of 28.33%. Average number of enumerated egg in infected non treated animals was 217. The average number of enumerated egg in fecal samples after treatment with pour on Ivermectin has been shown in Table 1. Reduction percentages in egg count after 1, 7, 21 and 28 days of treatment with Ivermectin were 21.19, 68.21, 91.24 and 98.61%, respectively (Table 1).

According to results of Crosscal-Walis test it is possible to determine which pour on administration of Ivermectin decreases the natural infestation of dogs with *Ancylostoma caninum*. The efficacy rate of Ivermectin on this parasite is >98%. Recently, Ivermectin has different drug shapes. Half time of intra venal administration of Ivermectin with dose of 300 µg kg⁻¹ in cattle is 2.8 day but in subcutaneous administration with dose of 200 µg kg⁻¹ is 8 days and also has been shown that the effect of sustained-release administration of this drug in cattle is more than to oral and subcutaneous administration (Reinemeyer and Courtney, 2001) but in dog any research was not done. The important base in use of antiparasitic drug is the increase of contact time of drugs with parasites rather than increase the dose of these drugs (Georgi *et al.*, 1990; Kassai, 1999; Reinemeyer and Courtney, 2001; Soulsby, 1986; Urquhart *et al.*, 2003).

This subject has been demonstrated that Ivermectin with dose of 1 mg kg⁻¹ (Oral or injection) have effective antiparasitic role in veterinary. The dose of this drug in cattle for oral and subcutaneous administration is 0.2 mg kg⁻¹ and for pour on administration is 0.5 mg kg⁻¹; these doses of Ivermectin have potent anthelmintic effect between 97-100% on adult form and 4th stage larvae of Haemonchus, Ostertagia, Cooperia, Trichostrongylus, Strongyloides, Bonostomum, Nematodirus, Trichuris, Oesophagostomum, Dictyocaulus and Chabertia ovina and some arthropods (Georgi *et al.*, 1990; Kassai, 1999; Reinemeyer and Courtney, 2001; Soulsby, 1986; Urquhart *et al.*, 2003), therefore we administrated Ivermectin pour on with 0.5 mg kg⁻¹ dosage in dogs. According to findings of previous researches, tablet form

Table 1: Average number of egg in fecal samples before and after treatment with pour on Ivermectin and percentages of egg count reduction

Before treatment	1 day after treatment	7 days after treatment	21 days after treatment	28 days after treatment
217	171 (21.19%)	69 (68.21%)	19 (91.24%)	3 (98.61%)

of Ivermectin with dose of 0.4 mg kg⁻¹ causes reduce in eggs in feces during 10 weeks after treatment but has not protective role for reinfection of cattle (Egerton *et al.*, 1981; Garg *et al.*, 2007; Reinemeyer and Courtney, 2001). Subcutaneous administration of Ivermectin with dose of 0.2 mg kg⁻¹ and pour on of that with 0.5 mg kg⁻¹ dose have high effective role for control of parasites also have important protective role for reinfection in cattle. Also according to findings of researchers, administration of Ivermectin with dose of 0.5 mg kg⁻¹ has high effect between 95-100% on *Haemonchus*, *Oesophagostomum* and *Bunostomum* (Egerton *et al.*, 1981; Garg *et al.*, 2007; Reinemeyer and Courtney, 2001) and also on *Boophilus*, *Damalina* and others arthropods (Barth and Preston, 1988; Borges *et al.*, 2008; Colwell and Jacobsen, 2002; Lonneux *et al.*, 1997; Marley *et al.*, 1993; Reinemeyer and Courtney, 2001).

According to findings of Sharma *et al.* (1990) the efficacy of Ivermectin against *Ascaridia galli* infection was evaluated in chickens under controlled laboratory conditions. The chicks in the treated group were subcutaneously injected with Ivermectin at a dose of 0.3 mg kg⁻¹ body weight. The fall in post-treatment faecal egg counts was 81 and 92% in birds treated on days 10 and 35, respectively. The drug was found to be 90 and 95% effective against immature and adult worms, respectively (Sharma *et al.*, 1990). In present study, the drug effect was observed 28 days after treatment by pour on Ivermectin administration on *Ancylostoma caninum* 98.61% determined. There are studies where macrocyclic lactones such as Ivermectin, moxidectin and selamectin were used for the treatment of ascarid in dogs.

A dose of 0.2 mg kg⁻¹ Ivermectin administered subcutaneously and moxidectin were reported to be 100% effectual against *Toxocara canis*. Also shown that selamectin administered topically at a dose of 6 mg kg⁻¹ to dogs infected with *Toxocara canis* decreased the faeces egg number by (EPG) 99.7% (Kozen *et al.*, 2008). But in dog any research was not done about pour-on administration of Ivermectin. Studies showed that conduction of eight trials in dogs to determine the efficacy of Ivermectin and pyrantel pamoate against *Dirofilaria immitis*, *Ancylostoma caninum*, *Uncinaria stenocephala*, *Toxocara canis* and *Toxascaris leonina*. Three studies involved induced infection with *Dirofilaria immitis* and 5 studies involved induced or natural infection with hookworms and ascarids. Efficacy of the combined product against *Ancylostoma caninum* was 98.5%. In the intestinal parasite trials, each individual component was found not to interfere with the anthelmintic action of the other. Also, declare that pyrantel pamoate was 99.6 and 93.87% effective,

respectively against *Ancylostoma caninum*. No side effects were observed (Ashraf *et al.*, 2008). Also studies showed that Eprinomectin (100 µg kg⁻¹) was given to treatment group dogs orally and eggs per gram were determined in the faeces on the day of pre-treatment and the 2nd, 4th, 6th, 8th and 10th days of posttreatment. No side effects associated with nervous, respiratory, gastrointestinal systems and some haematological parameters were observed. Also, eprinomectin was determined to be 100% effectual against *Toxocara canis* (Kozen *et al.*, 2008). In other study contaminated dogs with *Toxocara canis* that were treated with Ivermectin and Levamisole hydrochloride, respectively.

The efficacy of the drugs was calculated on the basis of reduction in the number of ova discharged in faeces. Those results showed that Ivermectin and Levamisole hydrochloride were 97.3 and 97.4% effective, respectively. Levamisole hydrochloride is much cheaper than Ivermectin and it was slightly more effective. Also, Ivermectin at the rate of 0.2 mg kg⁻¹ body weight was 97.3% effective on 18th day (Ahmad *et al.*, 2011). In study of Snyder *et al.* (2011) in evaluation of effect of Ivermectin and milbemycin oxime in experimental adult heart worm (*Dirofilaria immitis*) infection of dogs showed that two drugs <100% effective against a recent heart worm field isolate, supporting the hypothesis that the effectiveness of a single dose of those preventives can vary (Snyder *et al.*, 2011). Cunningham *et al.* (2006) showed that the covered-rod silicone implant containing Ivermectin containing 7.3 mg of Ivermectin was 100% effective in preventing experimental infection with *Dirofilaria immitis* larvae and resulted in negative results for heartworm antigen in a field trial.

This product has the potential to alleviate poor owner compliance with monthly prevention regimens (Cunningham *et al.*, 2006). Obiukwu and Onyali (2006) in the study of comparative efficacy of ivermectin, mebendazole and piperazine against *Ancylostoma caninum* in experimentally infected pups showed that ivermectin at both normal (1 mg/kg/BW) and elevated dose level (1.5 mL/kg/BW) showed 93.15 and 93.87% (Based on worm count) and 93.13 and 93.75 % (Based on epg count), respectively. Where as Ivermectin at normal dose level (1 mL/50 kg) and elevated dose level (1.5 mL/50 kg) was found to be effective. The results were 79.48 and 86.81% based on worm count and 89.44 and 92.50% based on epg count. Mebendazole and piperazine even at elevated dose level was observed ineffective. Pups treated at normal and elevated dose level revealed acute toxicosis whereas those treated with Mebendazole showed cough and vomiting tendencies which later subsided and also there was no risk involved in the administration of the drugs

(Obiukwu and Onyali, 2006). In other study by Williams *et al.* (1999) on comparison the effect of pour on administration of Ivermectin, Doramectin, Eprinomectin and Moxidectin in cattles, they observed that maximum and minimum effect was with Eprinomectin and Ivermectin, respectively (Williams *et al.*, 1999). Whang *et al.* (1994) reported which pour on and injection administration of Moxidectin has positive effect more than 90% on gastrointestinal nematodes and significant different between these two types of administration were not reported (Whang *et al.*, 1994). Skogerboe *et al.* (1999) and Rehbein *et al.* (1999) reported that pour on administration of Ivermectin during rain has antiparasitic effect >90% and rain has not specific effect on reduction the role of Ivermectin (Rehbein *et al.*, 1999; Rolfe *et al.*, 1997; Skogerboe *et al.*, 1999). In fact pour on administration of Ivermectin is very easy for farmers and so far, any specific side effects of Ivermectin administration have not been reported (Hooke *et al.*, 1997; Reinemeyer and Courtney, 2001). Collectively, Ivermectin is very effective drug for control of gastrointestinal parasites and heart worm in animals and its use is very easy and has not need specific tools. Effect of pour on administration of Ivermectin on other helminths and arthropods needs more studies.

CONCLUSION

The effect of Ivermectin pour-on against *Ancylostoma caninum* resulted in reduction in egg count exceeded 98% so, this drug can be used in antiparasitic program in dogs. Further investigations are necessary to evaluate the drug effect on other nematodes and parasitic infections.

REFERENCES

- Ahmad, N., A. Maqbool, K. Saeed, K. Ashraf and M.F. Qamar, 2011. Toxocarasis, its zoonotic importance and chemotherapy in dogs. J. Anim. Plant Sci., 21: 142-145.
- Ashraf, K., S. Rafique, H.A. Hashmi, A. Maqbool and Z.I. Chaudhary, 2008. Ancylostomosis and its therapeutic control in dogs. J. Vet. Anim. Sci., 1: 40-44.
- Barth, D. and J.M. Preston, 1988. Efficacy of topically administered ivermectin against chorioptic and sarcoptic mange of cattle. Vet. Rec., 123: 101-104.
- Borges, F.A., H.C. Silva, C. Buzzulini, V.E. Soares, E. Santos, G.P. Oliveira and A.J. Costa, 2008. Endectocide activity of a new long-action formulation containing 2.25% ivermectin + 1.25% abamectin in cattle. Vet. Parasitol., 155: 299-307.
- Colwell, D.D. and J.A. Jacobsen, 2002. Persistence activity of topical ivermectin against artificial infestation with hypodermal lineatum (Diptera: Ostridae). Vet. Parasitol., 105: 247-256.
- Cunningham, C.P., J.M. Brown, G.A. Jacobson, M.R. Brandon and S.R. Martinod, 2006. Evaluation of a covered-rod silicone implant containing ivermectin for long-term prevention of heartworm infection in dogs. Am. J. Vet. Res., 67: 1564-1569.
- Egerton, J.R., C.H. Eary and D. Suhayda, 1981. The anthelmintic efficacy of ivermectin in experimentally infected cattle. Vet. Parasitol., 8: 59-70.
- Garg, R., R.R. Kumar, C.L. Yadav and P.S. Banerjee, 2007. Duration of anthelmintic effect of three formulations of ivermectin (Oral, Injectable and Pour-on) against multiple anthelmintic-resistant *Haemonchus contortus* in sheep. Vet. Res. Commun., 31: 749-755.
- Georgi, J.R., M.E. Georgi and V.J. Theodorides, 1990. Parasitology for Veterinarians. 5th Edn., W.B. Saunders Co., Philadelphia, pp: 53-61.
- Hooke, F.G., P. Clement, D. Dell'Osa, R.M. Porter, D. MacColl and R.S. Rew, 1997. Therapeutic and protective efficacy of doramectin injectable against gastrointestinal nematodes in cattle in New Zealand: A comparison with moxidectin and ivermectin pour-on formulations. Vet. Parasitol., 72: 43-51.
- Kassai, T., 1999. Veterinary Helminthology. 1st Edn., Butterworth-Heinemann, Oxford, Pages: 260.
- Khayatnouri, M.H., Y. Garedaghi, A.R. Arbati and H. Khalili, 2011. The effect of ivermectin pour-on administration against natural heterakis gallinarum infestation and its prevalence in native poultry. Am. J. Anim. Vet. Sci., 6: 55-58.
- Kozen E., F.K. Sevimli, F.M. Birdane and R. Adanir, 2008. Efficacy of eprinomectin against *Toxacara canis* in dogs. Parasitol. Res., 102: 397-400.
- Lonneux, J.F., T.Q. Nguyen and B.J. Losson, 1997. Efficacy of pour-on and injectable formulations of moxidectin and ivermectin in cattle naturally infected with *Psoroptes ovis*: Parasitological, clinical and serological data. Vet. Parasitol., 69: 319-330.
- Mandal, S.C., 2006. Veterinary Parasitology at a Glance. 1st Edn., International Book Distributing Company, Lucknow, India, Pages: 203.
- Marley, S.E., R.D. Hall and R.M. Corwin, 1993. Ivermectin cattle pour-on: Duration of a single late spring treatment against horn flies, *Haematobia irritans* (L.) (Diptera: Muscidae) in Missouri, USA. Vet. Parasitol., 51: 167-172.
- Obiukwu, M.O. and I.O. Onyali, 2006. Comparative efficacy of ancylool, ivomec, mebendazole and piperazine against *Ancylostoma caninum* in experimentally infected pups. Anim. Res. Int., 3: 540-544.

- Rehbein, S., R.A. Barrick, A.F. Batty, M.D. Drag, P.F. Rolfe and J.L. Cox, 1999. Evaluation of the effect of simulated rainfall on the efficacy of Ivomec Pour-on against *Cooperia* spp. infection in cattle. *Parasitol. Res.*, 85: 783-786.
- Reinemeyer, C.R. and C.H. Courtney, 2001. Antinematodal Drugs, Section 11, Chemotherapy of Parasitic Diseases. In: *Veterinary Pharmacology and Therapeutics*, Adams, H.R. (Ed.). 8th Edn. Iowa State University Press, Ames, pp: 963-971.
- Rolfe, P.F., K.L. Dawson, G.N. Nichols, M. Webster and W.G. Ryan, 1997. Efficacy of topical ivermectin following exposure of treated cattle to rains. *Vet. Rec.*, 141: 269-270.
- Sharma, R.L., T.K. Bhat and Hemaprasanth, 1990. Anthelmintic activity of ivermectin against experimental *Ascaridia galli* infections in chickens. *Vet. Parasitol.*, 37: 307-317.
- Skogerboe, T.L., V.C. Cracknell, D.J. Walstrom, L. Ritzhaupt and V.K. Karle, 1999. The effect of simulated rainfall on the efficacy of doramectin pour-on against nematode parasites of cattle. *Vet. Parasitol.*, 86: 229-234.
- Snyder, D.E., S. Wiseman, L.R. Cruthers and R.L. Slone, 2011. Ivermectin and milbemycin oxime in experimental adult heartworm (*Dirofilaria immitis*) infection of dogs. *J. Vet. Int. Med.*, 25: 61-64.
- Soulsby, E.J., 1986. *Helminths, Arthropods and Protozoa of Domesticated Animals*. 6th Edn., Williams and Wilkins Co., Baltimore.
- Urquhart, G.M., J. Armour, J.L. Duncan, A.M. Dunn and F.W. Jenngs, 2003. *Veterinary Parasitology*. 2nd Edn., Blackwell Science Ltd., Oxford, pp: 53-138.
- Vermunt, J.J., D.M. West and W.E. Pomroy, 1995. Multiple resistance to ivermectin and oxfendazole in *Cooperia* species of cattle in New Zealand. *Vet. Rec.*, 137: 43-45.
- Whang, E.M., C. Bauer, D. Kollmann and H.J. Burger, 1994. Efficacy of two formulations (injectable and pour on) of moxidectin against gastrointestinal nematode infections in grazing cattle. *Vet. Parasitol.*, 51: 271-281.
- Williams, J.C., A.F. Loyacano, A. De Rosa, J. Gurie, B.C. Clymer and F. Guerino, 1999. A comparison of persistent anthelmintic efficacy of topical formulations of doramectin, ivermectin, eprinomectin and moxidectin against naturally acquired nematode infections of beef calves. *Vet. Parasitol.*, 85: 277-288.
- Williams, J.C., A.F. Loyacano, A. De Rosa, J. Gurie, D.F. Coombs and T.L. Skogerboe, 1997. A comparison of the efficacy of two treatments of doramectin injectable, ivermectin injectable and ivermectin pour-on against naturally acquired gastrointestinal nematode infections of cattle during a Winter-Spring grazing season. *Vet. Parasitol.*, 72: 69-77.