Geographic Range Expansion for the Rat Lungworm in North America
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Using quantitative PCR analysis and DNA sequencing, we provide evidence for the presence of the rat lungworm (Angiostrongylus cantonensis) in Oklahoma, USA, and identify a potentially novel rat host (Sigmodon hispidus). Our results indicate a geographic range expansion for this medically and ecologically relevant parasite in North America.

Emerging infectious diseases negatively impact humans and wildlife, causing disease outbreaks and deaths and local and global extinctions (1). Zoonotic disease emergence or re-emergence results from numerous factors (e.g., globalization of trade, increased interaction of humans and animals, anthropogenic climate change) that function independently or synergistically (2,3). Consequently, the means by which parasitic zoonoses are studied must be constantly advanced to promote identification, control, and prevention of outbreaks.

The rat lungworm, Angiostrongylus (Parastrongylus) cantonensis, causes eosinophilic meningitis in humans (4) and various disease manifestations (meningoencephalitis, neurologic disorders) in atypical host species, including wildlife and captive animals (5). Transmission of these worms occurs by ingestion of third-stage larvae in raw or undercooked intermediate or paratenic hosts (6). Although variable among geographic regions and within host species, the prevalence of rat lungworms might be high under favorable conditions (7).

The occurrence of A. cantonensis rat lungworms has been documented worldwide, and its distribution has been attributed largely to the spread of intermediate molluscan host species (e.g., Achanta fulica) and definitive rodent host species (e.g., Rattus spp.) (8). Moreover, host specificity of rat lungworms is highly plastic, which contributes to its continuous geographic expansion (4). These factors indicate that the rat lungworm is an emerging zoonotic pathogen of concern to humans and wildlife, and therefore provides an excellent opportunity to evaluate the sensitivity and effectiveness of epidemiologic surveying techniques.

The Study
We evaluated the current distribution and potential spread of the rat lungworm within areas of the Gulf Coast region and midwestern United States by sampling rodent populations in regions of Louisiana and Oklahoma that were predicted by an ecologic niche model to contain suitable and unsuitable habitat (9). We used a quantitative PCR (qPCR) TaqMan assay (Life Technologies, Foster City, CA, USA) (10) to test for the parasite in tissue samples and further evaluated these samples through DNA sequencing analysis.

We trapped animals during the spring, summer, and fall months during 2010–2012. A total of 42 rodents and 3 shrews were collected from McCurtain County in southeastern Oklahoma, and 47 rodents were collected in Louisiana (online Technical Appendix, http://wwwnc.cdc.gov/EID/article/21/7/14-1980-Techapp.pdf). We also obtained 56 Rattus norvegicus rat brain and lung tissue samples from the City of New Orleans Mosquito, Termite, and Rodent Control Board. Blood, lung, and brain tissue samples were collected from the rodents. Flotation was performed on all 148 lung samples, and all samples were negative for adult A. cantonensis rat lungworms.

Known adult rat lungworms were used as controls for molecular analyses (online Technical Appendix). Cellular DNA was extracted from rodent blood and brain samples. We tested for rat lungworm internal transcribed spacer 1 (ITS1) DNA by using a TaqMan qPCR on an ABI 7500 system (10). A total of 134 blood samples and 137 brain samples contained DNA suitable for analysis. After qPCR, 34 of the 271 total tissue samples were classified as putatively positive for rat lungworm and sequenced, generating a 267-bp fragment of the ITS1 region (online Technical Appendix).

On the basis of DNA sequencing, 3 brain samples were identified as containing A. cantonensis DNA (GenBank accession nos. KP231729, KP231728, and KP231727). These brain tissue samples were obtained from 3 rodents (host catalog nos. 32, 70, and 76), which were identified as 1 Hispid cotton rat (Sigmodon hispidus) and 2 brown rats (Rattus norvegicus), respectively (Table 1). A comparison of the 3 brain samples with those in GenBank by BLAST analysis (http://blast.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/Blast.cgi) showed a match with rat lungworm (GenBank accession nos. GU587762.1 and GU587759.1) (Table 2).

All sequences were aligned by using MUSCLE in MEGA 5.2 (http://www.megasoftware.net/), manually inspected for consensus, and compared with the 267-bp fragment generated from the known sample of rat lungworm. Maximum-likelihood phylogenetic analysis was performed by using sequence data for the ITS1 region of A. cantonensis (GenBank accession no. GU587759.1), 2 closely related species, A. vasorum...
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Rat lungworm was found in a previously undocumented mammalian host, *S. hispidus* rats, which strongly suggests that this parasite is an endemic pathogen. Although vegetation is their primary food source, *S. hispidus* rats will eat invertebrates (13). Whether these rats directly (by intentional consumption of host) or indirectly (by consumption of host or free third-stage larvae on vegetation) consume the parasite, we cannot rule out the possibility that acquisition of the parasite could occur in this species and enable further range expansion for rat lungworms. Positive samples were collected from densely populated areas with high tourist activity, thereby increasing the risk for transmission to humans.
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parasite. Although wildlife might become infected with the parasite, not all wildlife are definitive hosts (5,11). Additional field and laboratory studies will clarify the role that S. hispidus rats play in the spread of the rat lungworm.

Because many terrestrial species remain taxonomically undescribed, there is strong potential for continual emergence of unknown pathogens worldwide (14). Global travel, human encroachment into wildlife habitat, and climate change will influence distribution and emergence of disease (2,15). By incorporating field epidemiology with molecular genetic techniques to determine the geographic distribution of pathogens, major advances can be made in preventing the spread of wildlife diseases to human populations. Our results illustrate this point and highlight the need for future work to incorporate and refine these techniques and their application to epidemiology and wildlife disease surveillance.
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**Technical Appendix**

**Table 1.** Location, species, and number of mammals collected from each area that were tested for *Angiostrongylus cantonensis* rat lungworms, United States

| Trapping location | Species | Common name                      | No. caught |
|-------------------|---------|----------------------------------|------------|
| McCurtain County, OK | *Neotoma floridana* | Eastern wood rat | 2          |
| McCurtain County, OK | *Blarina carolinensis* | Southern short-tailed shrew | 3          |
| McCurtain County, OK | *Oryzomys palustris* | Marsh rice rat | 2          |
| McCurtain County, OK | *Peromyscus leucopus* | White-footed mouse | 1          |
| McCurtain County, OK | *Reithrodontomys fulvescens* | Fulvous harvest mouse | 7          |
| New Orleans Parish, LA | *Rattus norvegicus* | Brown rat | 36         |
| East Baton Rouge Parish, LA | *Rattus* | Black rat | 3          |
| Calcasieu Parish, LA | *Rattus norvegicus* | Brown rat | 8          |

**Table 2.** DNA sequence fragments of the ITS1 region generated from a known *Angiostrongylus cantonensis* rat lungworm specimen, United States *

| Region | Sequence, 5'→3' |
|--------|----------------|
| Species-specific region, 105 bp | TTTCATGGATGGCGAACCTGATAGTATCATCGCATATATACGTATGACACCTGTATGACAGGAAATCTTAATGACCCAAGTATAATGTTTCAATGGGCGC |
| 267-bp fragment used in phylogenetic analysis | TTCATGGATGGCGAACCTGATAGTATCATCGCATATATACGTATGACACCTGTATGACAGGAAATCTTAATGACCCAAGTATAATGTTTCAATGGGCGC |

*ITS1, internal transcribed spacer 1.

**Table 3.** Presence of *Angiostrongylus cantonensis* DNA in tissue types from host species, United States

| Host species         | Common name         | Tissue type | No. samples positive/no. samples screened |
|----------------------|---------------------|-------------|------------------------------------------|
| *Rattus norvegicus*  | Brown rat           | Brain       | 2/97                                     |
|                      |                     | Blood       | 0/98                                     |
|                      |                     | Lung        | 0/100                                   |
| *Rattus*             | Black rat           | Brain       | 0/3                                      |
|                      |                     | Blood       | 0/3                                      |
|                      |                     | Lung        | 0/3                                      |
| *Sigmodon hispidus*  | Hispid cotton rat   | Brain       | 1/27                                     |
|                      |                     | Blood       | 0/26                                     |
|                      |                     | Lung        | 0/30                                     |
| *Neotoma floridana*  | Eastern wood rat    | Brain       | 0/2                                      |
|                      |                     | Blood       | 0/2                                      |
|                      |                     | Lung        | 0/2                                      |
| *Oryzomys palustris* | Marsh rice rat      | Brain       | 0                                        |
|                      |                     | Blood       | 0                                        |
|                      |                     | Lung        | 0/2                                      |
| *Peromyscus leucopus*| White-footed mouse  | Brain       | 0/1                                      |
|                      |                     | Blood       | 0/1                                      |
|                      |                     | Lung        | 0/1                                      |
| *Reithrodontomys fulvescens* | Fulvous harvest mouse | Brain | 0/7                                      |
|                      |                     | Blood       | 0/4                                      |
|                      |                     | Lung        | 0/7                                      |
| Host species         | Common name                  | Tissue type | No. samples positive/no. samples screened |
|---------------------|------------------------------|-------------|------------------------------------------|
| *Blarina carolinensis* | Southern short-tailed shrew | Brain       | 0                                        |
|                     |                              | Blood       | 0                                        |
|                     |                              | Lung        | 0/3                                      |
