Isolation and identification of respiratory tract and intestinal microflora of *Meriones meridianus* in a conventional animal facility
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**Abstract**

**Background:** Culturable bacterial species from the respiratory tract and ileocecal junction of *Meriones meridianus* (midday gerbils) captured in the Xinjiang Luntai area were isolated and identified to confirm the microflora and develop approaches for biological purification of laboratory animals and relevant microbial precautions.

**Methods:** Bacteria from respiratory tracts and ileocecal junctions of 30 wild *M. meridianus* were harvested and isolated by inoculation into culture media. Isolated strains were confirmed by mass spectrometry and 16S rRNA sequencing.

**Results:** Thirty-nine bacterial species from 20 families and 27 genera were identified and isolated from wild *M. meridianus*. Typical bacteria were Enterobacteriaceae, *Enterococcus*, and *Staphylococcus aureus*, and the most common microflora were *Vibrio*, *Staphylococcus aureus*, and *Pseudomonas aeruginosa*.

**Conclusion:** Wild *M. meridianus* carries multiple bacteria, most of which are pathogenic or conditional pathogens. This study provides a basis for the development of animal models and laboratory animals from wild *M. meridianus*.
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**1 | INTRODUCTION**

*Meriones meridianus* (Pallas, 1773; Rodentia, Cricetidae, Meriones, Gerbillinae, Gerbillus) is one of the most widely distributed gerbil species and it is credited with being a plague vector, as well as a distributor of Lester bacterial disease, leishmaniasis, tick-borne relapsing fever, and brucellosis. Because of its strong disease resistance and rapid breeding, *M. meridianus* is of interest as a novel experimental animal resource. At present, there are no reports of microbial flora by *M. meridian*, so we investigated the bacterial species residing in *M. Meridianus* in Xinjiang to establish an assay for identifying microbial flora of this animal. These studies may support the use of *M. meridianus* as a new model species and offer reference values for microbiological studies.

**2 | MATERIALS AND METHODS**

**2.1 | Animal source**

During the season when the food is scarce in the wild (April-May), we placed a rodent cage containing fried peanuts fixed to the cage
with wire in a hole frequented by gerbils, and checked it after 8 hours. A total of more than 30 midday gerbils were captured using this method.

2.2 | Animal samples and environmental facilities

Wild M. meridianus (males 80-100 g; females 60-80 g) were captured in Xinjiang Luntai, China and housed in the animal facilities of Xinjiang Laboratory Animal Research Center (SYXK [new] 2011-0002). Animals were housed at 17-26°C and 30%-65% relative humidity with a 12/12 hour light/dark cycle and automatic fan ventilation throughout the day. Experiments and procedures were approved by the animal welfare committee of the Laboratory Animal Research Center, Xinjiang, China.

2.3 | Culture medium and reagents

Columbia blood agar (batch number: 20140822), SS agar (batch number: 20140927), Staphylococcus selective agar (batch number: 20150416), NAC agar (batch number: 20140329), and modified PSB culture medium base (batch number: 20150812) and additives, anaerobic culture gas bags and oxygen indicators, and porcelain beads species preserved tubes (batch number: 20150522) were purchased from Qingdao Hope Biotechnology Co., Ltd, China. The Bacterial DNA Extraction Kit was from Tiangen Biotechnology Co., Ltd, China. The Vitek MS automated microbial mass spectrometry detection system (bioMerieux, France), NU-437-600E biological safety cabinet (NuAire, USA), Vitrek MS automated microbial mass spectrometry detection system (bioMerieux, France), T100 PCR T100 Thermal Cycler for PCR (BioRad, USA).

2.4 | Equipment

The following equipment was used: BPH-9028 precision constant temperature incubator (Yi heng Scientific Instrument Co., Ltd, Shanghai, China), NU-437-600E biological safety cabinet (NuAire, USA), Vitrek MS automated microbial mass spectrometry detection system (bioMerieux, France), T100 PCR T100 Thermal Cycler for PCR (BioRad, USA).

2.5 | Tissue sample methods

All cultures except for the CIN-1 agar plates (26°C) were incubated at 36°C. All cultures were incubated for 48 hours, except for the SS agar plate, which was incubated for 24 hours, and the NAC agar plate, which was incubated for 72 hours. Columbia blood agar plates were incubated in anaerobic conditions.

Animal cages were sterilized by autoclave (132°C, 8 minutes). Bacteria sampling was done according to published methods (GB/T14926, 42-2001). M. meridianus were anesthetized with carbon dioxide (50 mg/kg) and killed by cervical vertebra dislocation. The animals were then placed on a laminar flow cabinet and the body surface was disinfected with 75% alcohol. A “T”-shaped incision was made in the trachea and larynx and respiratory secretions from a ring of tissue were inoculated into medium. Next, the abdominal cavity was opened and the ileum and cecum were isolated. The ileocecal valve was cut and the contents were inoculated onto plates.

2.6 | Inoculation of samples from the respiratory tract of animals

Samples from animal respiratory secretions were inoculated and cultured in media as described above. After incubation, colony morphology and Gram staining was performed. All colonies were inoculated onto Columbia blood agar plates as described and final purified culture media were transferred to porcelain bead strain preservation tubes and stored at −80°C until analysis. The analysis results are shown in Table 1.

2.7 | Inoculation of samples from ileocecal junctions

Samples from ileocecal junctions were inoculated and cultured in media as described. Samples inoculated with CIN-1 culture medium were initially inoculated into modified PBS for 10 days at 4°C, and then inoculated onto the CIN-1 agar plate. NAC agar plates were cultured for up to 5 days. After incubation, colony morphology and Gram stains were assessed and classified. All colonies were inoculated onto Columbia blood agar plates under the same conditions and final purified culture media were transferred to porcelain bead strain preservation tubes and stored at −80°C until analysis. The analysis results are shown in Table 2.

2.8 | Identification of isolated bacterial strains by mass spectrometry

Frozen strains were inoculated onto Columbia blood agar plates and cultured as described. Strain colonies were selected and added to the target plate of the Vitrek MS microbial mass spectrometry system. The supporting matrix liquid was applied and allowed to dry under ambient temperatures after loading the target plate for testing.

2.9 | 16S rRNA sequencing

For the microbial mass spectrometry detection system, the identification results cannot be given, and the samples with lower confidence levels are subjected to 16S rRNA sequencing. Bacterial

| TABLE 1 | Culture medium and culture condition of respiratory tract secretion |
|----------|-----------------------------|
| **Culture medium** | **Culture condition(°C)** | **Culture time(h)** |
| Columbia blood agar plate | 36 | 48 |
| Columbia blood agar plate | 36 | 48 |
| SS agar plate | 36 | 24 |
genome DNA was extracted using a bacterial DNA extraction kit. The 16S rRNA gene was amplified by PCR with a 5′-AGAGTTTGATCCTGGCTCAG-3′ forward primer and a 5′-ACGGCTACCTTGTTACGACTT-3′ reverse primer. Amplification conditions were as follows: 94°C denaturation, 5 minutes; 94°C, 30 seconds; 53°C, 30 seconds; 72°C, 90 seconds for 35 cycles, with a final extension at 72°C, for 10 minutes. Next, 5 μl samples of PCR product were separated using SDS-PAGE, and the target strips were sequenced by Beijing BoMaiDe Gene Fragment Purification Technology Co. Ltd. The sequences were submitted to Genbank for a BLAST analysis.

3 | RESULTS

In order to investigate the pathogenicity of the isolates, reference was made to the relevant literature on M. meridianus (Table 3 for details). A total of 182 bacterial strains were isolated and cultured in each medium. The Vitek MS microbiological mass spectrometry system identified 141 isolates to the species level (77.5%). The other strains were sequenced by 16S rRNA sequencing. The results of both methods were statistically analyzed and compared with published results (Table 4). Mass spectrometer and 16S rRNA sequencing analysis showed that the respiratory and intestinal tracts of wild M. meridianus had a total of 39 bacterial species from 20 families and 27 genera, of which 23 bacterial species were isolated from the intestine, 11 were from the respiratory tract, and 5 were found in both intestinal and respiratory tracts (Table 4 for details). Staining combined with microscopy analysis found that 23 species were Gram-positive, 17 were Gram-negative, 18 were coccus and 22 were bacillus. Escherichia coli, which constitutes normal intestinal flora, had the highest detection rate (80%). The most commonly detected pathogenic bacteria were river Vibrio, Staphylococcus aureus, and Pseudomonas aeruginosa, with Staphylococcus aureus detected with the highest rate (40%) in both the respiratory and intestinal tracts. The conditional pathogens with higher detection rates were Staphylococcus sciuiri (23.3%), Staphylococcus xylosus (40%), Staphylococcus lentus (20%), Proteus mirabilis (10%), Oligella urethralis (20%), Enterococcus durans (10%), Enterococcus faecalis (16.6%), Haemophilus parahaemolyticus (16.6%) and swine Actinobacillosis (10%).

4 | DISCUSSION

An investigation of the bacteria carried by new species of laboratory animal, M. meridianus, was carried out. The purpose of this study was to describe the general composition of the bacteria in the respiratory and intestinal tracts of M. meridianus and the key pathogenic of microbial flora. M. meridianus is currently under study for biological purification for use as an experimental animal but there are no microbiological data available for this species. We measured culturable bacteria in this animal and noted that they were diverse and most were pathogenic (conditional pathogens). Among them, 25 kinds of bacteria such as Staphylococcus and Enterococcus were human pathogenic bacteria. Based on the Laboratory Animal—Microbiological Standards and Monitoring guidelines (GB 14922.2–2010), specific pathogen free (SPF) rodents should not carry pathogens such as Staphylococcus aureus and Pseudomonas aeruginosa, so these pathogens should be removed before this species is experimentally viable. Du et al⁶ and Solomon et al⁷ isolated Staphylococcus aureus in M. meridianus, which is consistent with the results of this study. Six strains isolated from wild Mongolian gerbils were the same as in this study, which may be related to the habitat and feeding habits of M. meridianus.

In this study, we detected Actinobacillus hominis, an important swine conditional pathogen in pigs, in the respiratory tract of three M. meridianus.⁸ Feng et al⁹ and Du et al⁶ isolated this bacterial strain and other pathogenic strains in M. meridianus. Although this type of bacteria is not pathogenic to humans, we should consider the potential threat to other experimental animals in experimental animal facilities, and should focus on monitoring and eliminating the strain as part of future biological purification programs. We isolated Vibrio fluvialis, which has some pathogenicity in humans,¹⁰ from the intestine of one M. meridianus animal. This species too should be considered in future detection and purification work, since it is clear that the bacteria are sporadically or permanently present in animal populations.

The data from this study were measured within 3 days of the capture of the wild gerbils. The animals were kept in a normal animal experimental facility, and were given sterile water and feed, a regime that maintains the characteristics of the bacterial communities in the wild species. The bacterial strains were identified using a variety of media for culture and isolation, with the aim of improving the detection rate. However, we should recognize the limitations of the culture and isolation methods. Studies have shown that most bacteria

| Classification | Pathogenic bacteria | Conditional pathogenic bacteria | Non-pathogenic bacteria |
|----------------|---------------------|-------------------------------|------------------------|
| Species        | 3                   | 26                            | 10                     |
| Mean detection rate (%) | 15.53 | 10.61 | 14.63 |
| Percentage (%)  | 43.3(13/30)         | 70(21/30)                     | 83.3(25/30)            |

*aThe average value of the detection rate of each bacteria.

bThe percentage of bacteria in this animal was determined.
| Strain classification microscopy | Microscopic examination | Detection rate (n = 30) | Separation site | Literature pathogenicity |
|---------------------------------|-------------------------|------------------------|-----------------|------------------------|
| **Vibrionaceae** Vibrio         |                         |                        |                 |                        |
| Staphylococcaceae Staphylococcus|                         |                        |                 |                        |
| Staphylococcus aureus           | G+ coccus               | 40 (12/30)             | 3               | 9                      |
| Staphylococcus pasteuri         | G+ coccus               | 3.3 (1/30)             | 0               | 1                      |
| Staphylococcus cohnii           | G+ coccus               | 3.3 (1/30)             | 0               | 1                      |
| Staphylococcus sciuri           | G+ coccus               | 23.3 (7/30)            | 1               | 6                      |
| Staphylococcus xylosus          | G+ coccus               | 40 (12/30)             | 1               | 11                     |
| Staphylococcus lentus           | G+ coccus               | 20 (6/30)              | 3               | 3                      |
| Staphylococcus epidermidis      | G+ coccus               | 6.6 (2/30)             | 1               | 1                      |
| Pseudomonadaceae Pseudomonas    |                         |                        |                 |                        |
| Pseudomonas aeruginosa          | G-Bacillus              | 3.3 (1/30)             | 0               | 1                      |
| Pseudomonas putida              | G-Bacillus              | 6.6 (2/30)             | 0               | 2                      |
| Burkholderiaceae Ralstonia      |                         |                        |                 |                        |
| Ralstonia mannitolyltica        | G-Bacillus              | 3.3 (1/30)             | 0               | 1                      |
| Burkholderia cepacia           | G-Bacillus              | 3.3 (1/30)             | 0               | 1                      |
| Moraxellaceae Acinetobacter     |                         |                        |                 |                        |
| Acinetobacter baumannii         | G-Bacillus              | 3.3 (1/30)             | 0               | 1                      |
| Aerococcaceae Aerococcus        |                         |                        |                 |                        |
| Aerococcus viridans             | G+coccus                | 40 (12/30)             | 1               | 4                      |
| Enterobacteriaceae Serratia     |                         |                        |                 |                        |
| Serratia plymuthica             | G-Bacillus              | 3.3 (1/30)             | 0               | 1                      |
| Proteus                         | G-Bacillus              | 10 (3/30)              | 1               | 2                      |
| Providencia rettgeri            | G-Bacillus              | 3.3 (1/30)             | 0               | 1                      |
| Escherichia coli                | G-Bacillus              | 80 (24/30)             | 2               | 22                     |
| Morganella morganii             | G-Bacillus              | 3.3 (1/30)             | 0               | 1                      |
| Alcaligenaceae Alcaligenes      |                         |                        |                 |                        |
| Alcaligenes faecalis            | G-Bacillus              | 16.6 (5/30)            | 0               | 5                      |
| Oligella                        | G-Bacillus              | 20 (6/30)              | 3               | 1                      |
| Flavobacteriaceae Flavobacterium|                         |                        |                 |                        |
| Myroides odoratus               | G-Bacillus              | 3.3 (1/30)             | 0               | 1                      |
| Enterococcaceae Enterococcus    |                         |                        |                 |                        |
| Enterococcus hirae              | G+coccus                | 6.6 (2/30)             | 0               | 2                      |
| Enterococcus gallinarum         | G+ coccus               | 3.3 (1/30)             | 0               | 1                      |
| Enterococcus catusellflavus     | G+ coccus               | 6.6 (2/30)             | 1               | 1                      |
| Enterococcus mundtii            | G+ coccus               | 3.3 (1/30)             | 0               | 1                      |
| Enterococcus durans             | G+coccus                | 10 (3/30)              | 0               | 3                      |
| Enterococcus faecalis           | G+coccus                | 16.6 (5/30)            | 0               | 5                      |

(Continues)
cannot easily be cultured. In future purification studies, the frequency of detection and number of samples should be increased and other detection techniques and methods used to give a more comprehensive picture the microbial flora carried by the animals.

In conclusion, using selected culture and isolation methods, this study found a limited number of bacteria present in *M. meridianus*, but we may not have found all important species. Future work on the purification of *M. meridianus* should increase the frequency of detection and sampling amount to fully characterize this new model species.
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