Parasitol Res (2015) 114:975–982
DOI 10.1007/s00436-014-4263-4

ORIGINAL PAPER

# Current surveys on the prevalence and distribution of *Dirofilaria* spp. and *Acanthocheilonema reconditum* infections in dogs in Romania

**Angela Monica Ionică · Ioana Adriana Matei · Viorica Mircean · Mirabela Oana Dumitrache · Gianluca D'Amico · Adriana Győrke · Nikola Pantchev · Giada Annoscia · Kateřina Albrechtová · Domenico Otranto · David Modrý · Andrei Daniel Mihalca**

Received: 7 November 2014 / Accepted: 15 December 2014 / Published online: 30 December 2014


**Abstract** During the last decades, *Dirofilaria* spp. infection in European dogs has rapidly spread from historically endemic areas towards eastern and northeastern countries, but little or no information is available from these geographical regions. The present study provides a picture of filarial infections in dogs from Romania and compares two tests for the diagnosis of *Dirofilaria immitis*. From July 2010 to March 2011, blood samples were collected from 390 dogs from nine counties of Romania and serological SNAP tests were performed for the detection of *D. immitis* antigen. The remaining blood clots were subsequently used for DNA extraction followed by multiplex PCR for assessing filarioid species diversity (i.e. *D. immitis*, *Dirofilaria repens* and *Acanthocheilonema reconditum*). Based on molecular detection, an overall prevalence of 6.92 % ($n$=27; 95 % confidence interval (CI) 4.70–10.03 %) for *D. repens*, 6.15 % ($n$=24; 95 % CI 4.07–9.14 %) for *D. immitis* and 2.05 % ($n$=8; 95 % CI 0.96–4.16 %) for *A. reconditum* was recorded, with significant variations according to sampling areas. Coinfections of *D. immitis* and *D. repens* were recorded in 23.91 % ($n$=11) positive dogs. A slightly higher prevalence for *D. immitis* was detected at the SNAP test ($n$=28, 7.17 %; 95 % CI 4.91–10.33 %), but this difference was not statistically significant ($p$=0.66). However, only 53.57 % ($n$=15) of antigen-positive dogs were confirmed by PCR, while other dogs ($n$=9) PCR positive for *D. immitis* were negative at the serology. The present study shows that *Dirofilaria* species are endemic in the southern and southeastern areas of Romania, This article also provides, for the first time, an epidemiological picture of the distribution of *A. reconditum* in Romania.

**Keywords** Dogs · *Dirofilaria* · *Acanthocheilonema* · Romania · Prevalence · Distribution · Diagnosis

A. M. Ionică (✉) · I. A. Matei · V. Mircean · M. O. Dumitrache · G. D'Amico · A. Győrke · A. D. Mihalca
Department of Parasitology and Parasitic Diseases, University of Agricultural Sciences and Veterinary Medicine Cluj-Napoca, Calea Mănăştur 3-5, 400372 Cluj-Napoca, Romania
e-mail: ionica.angela@usamvcluj.ro

N. Pantchev
IDEXX Laboratories, 71636 Ludwigsburg, Germany

G. Annoscia · D. Otranto
Dipartimento di Medicina Veterinaria, Università degli Studi di Bari, Str. prov. per Casamassima km 3, 70010 Valenzano, Bari, Italy

K. Albrechtová · D. Modrý
Department of Pathology and Parasitology, University of Veterinary and Pharmaceutical Sciences, 612 42 Brno, Czech Republic

D. Modrý
CEITEC –VFU, University of Veterinary and Pharmaceutical Sciences, Palackého tř. 1/3, 612 42 Brno, Czech Republic

D. Modrý
Institute of Parasitology, Biology Centre of Academy of Sciences of the Czech Republic, v.v.i., České Budějovice, Czech Republic

## Introduction

A series of vector-borne filarioids belonging to the genera *Dirofilaria*, *Acanthocheilonema*, *Onchocerca* and *Cercopithifilaria* (Spirurida, Onchocercidae) infect dogs in Europe. Among these, *Dirofilaria immitis* and *Dirofilaria repens* cause a severe cardio-pulmonary affection and a mild

dermatological condition, respectively (Venco 2007; Albanese et al. 2013). Although both species are regarded as zoonotic agents (Orihel and Eberhard 1998), most human cases in Europe are caused by *D. repens* (Pampiglione and Rivasi 2000; Otranto et al. 2013). During the last decades, *Dirofilaria* spp. have expanded their geographical boundaries towards eastern and northeastern countries, in relation to several factors, such as the availability of vector species and climate (Genchi et al. 2009, 2011). However, *D. repens* seems to be spreading more rapidly than *D. immitis* (Pantchev et al. 2009a, 2011; Genchi et al. 2011), with autochthonous cases reported in several countries previously regarded as non-endemic, such as in Czech Republic (Svobodová et al. 2006; Dobesová et al. 2007), Germany (Hermosilla et al. 2006; Pantchev et al. 2009b; Sassnau and Genchi 2013), Hungary (Fok et al. 2007), Poland (Sapierzyński et al. 2010; Masny et al. 2011), Slovakia (Miterpáková et al. 2010; Bocková et al. 2013), Ukraine (Hamel et al. 2013) and Austria (Silbermayr et al. 2014). Autochthonous cases of *D. immitis* infection in dogs have also been suggested based on detection of DNA in whole mosquitoes (Kronefeld et al. 2014) or reported in all the above mentioned countries, except Austria (Svobodová et al. 2006; Miterpáková et al. 2010; Świątalska and Demiaszkiewicz 2012; Hamel et al. 2013; Krämer et al. 2014; Tolnai et al. 2014). However, the detection of filarioid DNA in mosquitoes is not necessarily a proof of stable transmission within a region, as no identification of infectious third-stage larvae was provided yet. Furthermore, in Czech Republic and Poland, the first suggested cases of autochthonous *D. immitis* infection are questionable, as they relied only on immunological evidence of infection but they were not confirmed by direct (e.g. microfilariae) or molecular methods (species-specific PCR/sequencing) (Svobodová et al. 2006; Świątalska and Demiaszkiewicz 2012). A recent study seems to support this, at least in Poland, where the examination of 1588 canine blood samples (2011–2013) revealed only the presence of *D. repens*, but not that of *D. immitis*, in the country (Demiaszkiewicz et al. 2014).

Other species of filarioids affecting dogs (e.g. *Acanthocheilonema reconditum*, *Dipetalonema (syn. Acanthocheilonema) dracunculoides*, *Cercopithifilaria grassii*, *Cercopithifilaria bainae* and *Onchocerca lupi*) have also been reported in Europe, but due to their minimal clinical importance (with the exception of *O. lupi*), they are poorly known (reviewed by Otranto et al. (2013)).

There are several approaches for the diagnosis of filarial infections in dogs. Classical methods applicable for all species with blood-circulating microfilariae include morphological identification (i.e. blood smears or concentration methods, such as Knott's or filtration test) or histochemical staining of microfilariae. More recently, multiple tools for the highly specific molecular identification of various species of filarioids became available. One disadvantage of all direct methods is that their outcome depends on the presence or the number of microfilariae in the examined sample (Genchi et al. 2007; Pantchev et al. 2011; Latrofa et al. 2012). Other methods (i.e. ELISA and immunocromatographic tests) that can detect circulating antigens of adult female nematodes are currently available only for *D. immitis* and are recommended as the most sensitive by the American Heartworm Society (2014) because they are also useful in the detection of amicrofilaremic infections. However, cross-reactivity of some commercially available antigen tests for *D. immitis* with *Angiostrongylus vasorum* has been recently described and should be taken into consideration in endemic areas where parasites are sympatric (Schnyder and Deplazes 2012; Krämer et al. 2014). Like in most of the countries from Eastern Europe, the current occurrence of filarial infections in dogs from Romania is still unclear. The first extensive epidemiological study was performed in 1933 by Popesco, who described 20 foci of canine filariasis along rivers in the southwest, south and southeast of the country, based on the visualization of microfilariae from blood samples. However, in the report above, morphological details of the microfilariae were not provided. Later on, a nationwide serological screening was performed for *D. immitis* (Mircean et al. 2012), but data regarding *D. repens* were only recorded locally, in four counties in the western (Ciocan et al. 2010, 2013), northeastern (Paşca et al. 2008) and southern (Tudor et al. 2013) regions of Romania. Furthermore, four dogs exported from Romania to Germany were positive for *microfilariae of D. repens*, confirmed by molecular methods (Pantchev et al. 2011). In addition, *A. reconditum* was also diagnosed in Germany in dogs exported from Romania (Hamel et al. 2012) and recently *C. bainae* has been reported in a dog from Danube Delta region (Ionică et al. 2014).

The objectives of the present study were to provide a more detailed view on filarial infections in dogs from Romania by assessing the prevalence and diversity of filarioid species infecting dogs from various areas of the country and to compare two different diagnostic tests employed for diagnosing *D. immitis*.

## Materials and methods

### Study areas and sampling

From July 2010 to March 2011, 390 blood samples were collected from randomly selected owned dogs from nine counties situated in five regions of Romania, presenting different ecological conditions. Most sampling sites were in rural localities, where dogs were housed outdoors and they generally did not receive regular antiparasitic treatments. With the owners' consent, samples were collected from the cephalic

vein of each dog using a clotting activator S-Monovette syringe (SARSTEDT AG & Co., Germany). After separation, serum was collected into a separate, labelled tube and stored at −20 °C until further processing. The remaining blood clots were kept and stored under the same conditions.

### Serological assays

Serum samples were tested for the presence of *D. immitis* antigen by using an in-clinic SNAP® 4Dx® test (IDEXX Laboratories, Inc., Westbrook, ME, USA), in accordance with the manufacturer's instructions. This is a rapid assay test system based on enzyme immunoassay technique and has been validated for dogs, having a sensitivity of 99.2 % (Chandrashekar et al. 2010). The *D. immitis* analyte is derived from antibodies specific to heartworm antigens, which are primarily produced by adult females (Weil 1987).

### Molecular assays

Genomic DNA was extracted from the blood clots using a phenol-chloroform method (Maslov et al. 1996; Albrechtová et al. 2011). Approximately 200 μl of clotted blood was dried at 56 °C for 30 min and then suspended in 1.5 ml lysis buffer (0.1 M NaCl, 0.05 M EDTA, 0.01 M Tris, 4.8 % SDS; pH 8) and digested at 56 °C with 20 μl proteinase K (Bioline, UK) for 1 h. After proteins lysis, the mixture was extracted with a 1:1 blend of phenol and chloroform, followed by one extraction with chloroform alone. Each extraction was performed by 1 min of shaking and a 10-min centrifugation step (13.000×*g*). DNA was precipitated with 96 % ethanol for 15 min and the dried DNA pellet was re-suspended by adding 100 μl of PCR water.

Multiplex PCRs amplifying partial cytochrome *c* oxidase subunit 1 (*cox*1) gene regions of different sizes for three filarioid species (*D. immitis*, 169 bp; *D. repens*, 479 bp; and *A. reconditum*, 589 bp) were performed using species-specific forward primers coupled with the reverse primer NTR, following reaction procedures and protocols described in literature (Latrofa et al. 2012). In each set of reactions, a positive control and a sample with no DNA were included in order to test the specificity of the reaction and to assess the presence of contaminants. The positive control sample was obtained by mixing DNA of all three filarioid species, isolated from blood of infected dogs and confirmed through sequencing. PCR products were visualized by electrophoresis in a 2 % agarose gel stained with RedSafe™ 20000x Nucleic Acid Staining Solution (Chembio, UK), and their molecular weight was assessed by comparison to a molecular marker (O'GeneRuler™ 100 bp DNA Ladder, Thermo Fisher Scientific Inc., USA).

### Statistical analysis

Data analysis was performed using EpiInfo 7 software (CDC, USA). The frequency of infection, prevalence and its 95 % confidence intervals were established and the differences of prevalence between identified filarioid species and between the two *D. immitis* diagnostic tests were assessed using chi-square testing. The differences were considered significant if $p$ values were lower than 0.05.

Serological (SNAP®) and molecular (multiplex PCR) methods used for *D. immitis* detection were evaluated in EpiTools (Sergeant 2014). Agreement between SNAP and PCR was calculated using overall agreement measure and Cohen's Kappa statistic. As the overall agreement does not differentiate between the agreement on the positives and agreement on the negatives, positive and negative percent agreements were also calculated. A value of $k$ <0 indicates no agreement, between 0 and 0.20 slight agreement, 0.21–0.40 fair agreement, 0.41–0.60 moderate agreement, 0.61–0.80 substantial agreement, and 0.81–1 almost perfect agreement (Landis and Koch 1977).

## Results

### Molecular diagnosis

Out of 390 sampled dogs, 11.79 % ($n$=46) were positive for DNA of at least one filarial species. The overall prevalence of each species was as follows: 6.15 % (95 % confidence interval (CI) 4.07–9.14 %) for *D. immitis*, 6.92 % (95 % CI 4.70–10.03 %) for *D. repens* and 2.05 % (95 % CI 0.96–4.16 %) for *A. reconditum*, with significant local variation (Table 1). The prevalence of *A. reconditum* was significantly lower ($p$<0.001) compared to *Dirofilaria* spp., but its distribution range was more extended (Fig. 1). Coinfections with *D. immitis* and *D. repens* were detected in 23.91 % ($n$=11) of positive dogs and those with *D. repens* and *A. reconditum* in 4.34 % ($n$=2) of the positive dogs.

### Serology

Meanwhile, 7.18 % (95 % CI 4.91–10.33) of dogs, deriving from three counties, were seropositive for *D. immitis* antigen at SNAP tests.

### Method comparison

Overall, 9.48 % ($n$=37) of dogs were positive for *D. immitis* at least in one of the performed tests. Immunoenzymatic tests have shown a slightly higher prevalence of *D. immitis* infection in dogs compared to the molecular method (Table 2), but

**Table 1** Molecular prevalence of filarial species for each county

| County | *D. immitis* | | *D. repens* | | *A. reconditum* | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | pos/tot (%) | 95 % CI | pos/tot (%) | 95 % CI | pos/tot (%) | 95 % CI |
| Hunedoara | 0/62 | – | 0/62 | – | 0/62 | – |
| Alba | 0/37 | – | 0/37 | – | 0/37 | – |
| Braşov | 2/13 (15.38) | 1.92–45.45 | 0/13 | – | 0/13 | – |
| Argeş | 0/46 | – | 1/46 (2.17) | 0.06–11.53 | 1/46 (2.17) | 0.06–11.53 |
| Teleorman | 7/51 (13.73) | 5.70–26.25 | 5/51 (9.80) | 3.26–21.41 | 1/51 (1.96) | 0.05–10.45 |
| Vâlcea | 0/43 | – | 0/43 | – | 1/43 (2.33) | 0.06–12.29 |
| Dolj | 4/51 (7.84) | 2.18–18.88 | 7/51 (13.73) | 5.70–26.26 | 1/51 (1.96) | 0.05–10.45 |
| Tulcea | 11/69 (15.94) | 8.24–26.74 | 13/69 (18.84) | 10.43–30.06 | 2/69 (2.90) | 0.35–10.08 |
| Constanța | 0/18 | – | 1/18 (5.56) | 0.14–27.29 | 2/18 (11.11) | 1.38–37.41 |
| Total | 24/390 (6.15) | 4.07–9.14 | 27/390 (6.92) | 4.70–10.03 | 8/390 (2.05) | 0.96–4.16 |

*CI* confidence interval

without statistically significant differences ($p>0.5$). However, when considering each positive individual (Table 3), the positive percent agreement was in fact 40.54 %. The negative percent agreement was 90.51 % and the overall agreement scored 94.36 %. The *k* value was of 0.55 (0.38–0.72), indicating a moderate agreement between the two tests. Discordant results consisted in the following: (i) Six samples (16.21 %) were positive only for heartworm antigen, (ii) seven samples (18.91 %) were positive for *D. immitis* antigen but tested positive for *D. repens* at molecular methods, and (*iii*) nine (24.32 %) samples were antigen negative in animals which scored positive for *D. immitis* at PCR.

## Discussion

In Romania, data from the first half of the twentieth Century (Popovici 1916; Popesco 1933, 1935) suggest that southern regions are historically endemic for canine dirofilariasis, although it is unclear which filarial species the authors were referring to. The climate of this country is temperate-continental of transitional type, with four clearly defined seasons varying at regional level according mainly to altitude. In this context, periods when the development of both *D. immitis* and *D. repens* can occur are longest (May–October) in the south and southeast, followed by the west and southwest (May–September) and shorter (June–August or September) in the rest of the country (Genchi et al. 2011). The highest prevalence rates of both *Dirofilaria* species were recorded in the counties that include the Danube's floodplains, where the climate is suitable for the development of some mosquito species (i.e. *Anopheles maculipennis*, *Culex pipiens*) which are confirmed vector species for these filarioids (Nicolescu et al. 2003). Similar to the situation described by Popesco (1933), *D. immitis* was only identified in proximity of major rivers (i.e. Olt in Braşov county and Danube in Dolj, Teleorman and Tulcea counties) whereas *D. repens* had a wider distribution range. Indeed, where both species occur in sympatry, the prevalence of *D. repens* generally exceeded that of *D. immitis*, as also recorded in other parts of Europe (Genchi et al. 2011). This might be the effect of a protective cross-immunity at individual level, as inferred by the experimental infection of dogs initially infected with *D. repens*, in which the ability of *D. immitis* to develop was reduced (Genchi et al. 1995).

The distribution of *A. reconditum* is herein investigated for the first time in Romania and it seems to occur in a large territory, despite its relatively low prevalence. Transmission of this filarioid is via fleas or lice (Nelson 1962) and requires proximity between the infected and non-infected dogs (Brianti et al. 2012). Compared to *Dirofilaria* spp., this species appears to be better adapted to dry areas (Constanța county) and colder climate (Vâlcea county), but so far, its development in the vector in relation to temperature or other climatic factors has not been assessed.

Three types of apparent inconsistencies between serological SNAP tests and PCR diagnosis have been identified in the diagnosis of *D. immitis*, but their frequency was significantly lower ($p<0.005$) than the level of agreement between the two tests.

The most frequently encountered situation (17.30 %, $n=9$) was that animals negative for *D. immitis* at SNAP test were positive for *D. immitis* DNA, which suggests the presence of microfilariae or soluble genomic DNA in the blood at sampling time. This may be due to a low number of adult worms, e.g. one to two gravid females, previous adulticidal treatment or delayed antigenaemia based on low worm burdens and chemoprophylaxis (Courtney and Zeng 2001; Nelson et al. 2005; Pantchev et al. 2011). Furthermore, given that *D. immitis* microfilariae have a life span of up to 2.5 years




**Fig. 1** Distribution of identified filarioid species, established by both employed tests

(Abraham 1988), they could persist after the natural death of adult females. Moreover, recent data has revealed that heating the serum samples before laboratory processing renders more sensitivity to the SNAP test, suggesting the existence of inhibitors of a yet unknown nature in the serum (Little et al. 2014; Velasquez et al. 2014).

Interestingly, 13.46 % ($n$=7) of samples were positive for *D. immitis* antigen while molecular methods identified only *D. repens*. Since the possibility of cross-reaction between the two species was excluded by Pantchev et al. (2009b, 2011), this finding may suggest the occurrence of a patent *D. repens* infection associated with an occult *D. immitis* infection, revealing an interesting pattern that deserves further investigation. Since the actual relationship between the two *Dirofilaria* species has only been partially studied (Genchi et al. 1995), these results could represent the outcome of a potential inhibition of *D. immitis* microfilarial production by the presence of *D. repens* and the host immune responsiveness. In addition,

**Table 2** Seroprevalence and molecular prevalence of *D. immitis* for each county

| County | *D. immits* Ag | | *D. immitis* DNA | | *p* |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | pos/tot (%) | 95 % CI | pos/tot (%) | 95 % CI | |
| Hunedoara | 0/62 | – | 0/62 | – | – |
| Alba | 0/37 | – | 0/37 | – | – |
| Braşov | 0/13 | – | 2/13 (15.38) | 1.92–45.45 | 0.48 |
| Argeş | 0/46 | – | 0/46 | – | – |
| Teleorman | 3/51 (5.88) | 1.23–16.24 | 7/51 (13.73) | 5.70–26.25 | 0.31 |
| Vâlcea | 0/43 | – | 0/43 | – | – |
| Dolj | 7/51 (13.72) | 5.70–26.26 | 4/51 (7.84) | 2.18–18.88 | 0.52 |
| Tulcea | 18/69 (26.08) | 16.25–38.06 | 11/69 (15.94) | 8.24–26.74 | 0.14 |
| Constanţa | 0/18 | – | 0/18 | – | – |
| Total | 28/390 (7.18) | 4.91–10.33 | 24/390 (6.15) | 4.07–9.14 | 0.66 |

*CI* confidence interval

**Table 3** The complete filarial profile of each positive dog

| No. | County | Ag test | Multiplex PCR | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | *D. immitis* | *D. repens* | *A. reconditum* |
| 1 | Argeş | neg | neg | **pos** | neg |
| 2 | Argeş | neg | neg | neg | **pos** |
| 3 | Braşov | neg | **pos** | neg | neg |
| 4 | Braşov | neg | **pos** | neg | neg |
| 5 | Constanța | neg | neg | **pos** | **pos** |
| 6 | Constanța | neg | neg | neg | **pos** |
| 7 | Dolj | neg | neg | **pos** | neg |
| 8 | Dolj | neg | neg | **pos** | neg |
| 9 | Dolj | neg | neg | **pos** | neg |
| 10 | Dolj | neg | neg | neg | **pos** |
| 11 | Dolj | **pos** | neg | neg | neg |
| 12 | Dolj | **pos** | neg | neg | neg |
| 13 | Dolj | **pos** | neg | **pos** | neg |
| 14 | Dolj | **pos** | **pos** | neg | neg |
| 15 | Dolj | **pos** | **pos** | **pos** | neg |
| 16 | Dolj | **pos** | **pos** | **pos** | neg |
| 17 | Dolj | **pos** | **pos** | **pos** | neg |
| 18 | Teleorman | neg | neg | neg | **pos** |
| 19 | Teleorman | neg | **pos** | neg | neg |
| 20 | Teleorman | neg | **pos** | neg | neg |
| 21 | Teleorman | neg | **pos** | neg | neg |
| 22 | Teleorman | neg | **pos** | **pos** | neg |
| 23 | Teleorman | neg | **pos** | **pos** | neg |
| 24 | Teleorman | **pos** | neg | **pos** | neg |
| 25 | Teleorman | **pos** | **pos** | **pos** | neg |
| 26 | Teleorman | **pos** | **pos** | **pos** | neg |
| 27 | Tulcea | neg | neg | **pos** | neg |
| 28 | Tulcea | neg | neg | **pos** | neg |
| 29 | Tulcea | neg | neg | **pos** | neg |
| 30 | Tulcea | neg | neg | **pos** | neg |
| 31 | Tulcea | neg | neg | neg | **pos** |
| 32 | Tulcea | neg | **pos** | neg | neg |
| 33 | Tulcea | neg | **pos** | **pos** | neg |
| 34 | Tulcea | **pos** | neg | neg | neg |
| 35 | Tulcea | **pos** | neg | neg | neg |
| 36 | Tulcea | **pos** | neg | neg | neg |
| 37 | Tulcea | **pos** | neg | neg | neg |
| 38 | Tulcea | **pos** | neg | **pos** | neg |
| 39 | Tulcea | **pos** | neg | **pos** | neg |
| 40 | Tulcea | **pos** | neg | **pos** | neg |
| 41 | Tulcea | **pos** | neg | **pos** | neg |
| 42 | Tulcea | **pos** | neg | **pos** | **pos** |
| 43 | Tulcea | **pos** | **pos** | neg | neg |
| 44 | Tulcea | **pos** | **pos** | neg | neg |
| 45 | Tulcea | **pos** | **pos** | neg | neg |
| 46 | Tulcea | **pos** | **pos** | neg | neg |
| 47 | Tulcea | **pos** | **pos** | neg | neg |
| 48 | Tulcea | **pos** | **pos** | neg | neg |
| 49 | Tulcea | **pos** | **pos** | **pos** | neg |
| 50 | Tulcea | **pos** | **pos** | **pos** | neg |
| 51 | Tulcea | **pos** | **pos** | **pos** | neg |
| 52 | Vâlcea | neg | neg | neg | **pos** |

a small number of *D. immitis* microfilariae present in the peripheral blood could fall under the detection limit of the employed PCR method (i.e. 26 microfilariae/ml; Latrofa et al. 2012). As microfilaremia fluctuates during the day, false negative results may emerge according to the sampling time. For both species, the periodicity of microfilariae has been assessed and it seems to vary not only with external factors like the feeding behaviour of vector species (indicating the optimum sampling time is during the evening and night), but also with internal (host-related) factors, like the blood oxygen pressure, which decreases while the animal is sleeping, determining a rise in microfilaremia (Hawking 1956; Aoki et al. 2011; Di Cesare et al. 2013).

Some samples (11.53 %, $n=6$) were positive only for *D. immitis* antigen and negative for all filarioid species by PCR, which may indicate occult (amicrofilaremic) infections, such as in the case of prepatency period, unisexual infection, drug-induced sterility of adults, or immune-mediated clearance of microfilariae (Rawlings et al. 1982). Another potential explanation would be a cross-reaction with antigen of the "French" heartworm *A. vasorum* (Schnyder and Deplazes 2012). This parasite has not been reported in Romania so far, but models show that parts of the country may be included in its distribution range (Morgan et al. 2009). Nowadays, a revised version of the test system used for the current study, SNAP® 4Dx® Plus (IDEXX Laboratories, Inc., Westbrook, ME, USA), which does not show any cross-reactivity between *D. immitis* and *A. vasorum* (Schnyder and Deplazes 2012), and a specific rapid *A. vasorum* device (Schnyder et al. 2014) that was not on the market when testing for the present study was performed, are commercially available.

Failure of serological tests in detecting patent infections may have serious implications in the spreading of the disease and in the clinical outcome, so they should not be used as the only screening method in epidemiological studies. Since molecular methods offer the possibility to identify more filarioid species, we regard them as a necessary additional screening tool for surveillance, also taking into consideration the zoonotic potential of *D. repens*.

## Conclusion

The present study shows that in Romania, *Dirofilaria* species are commonly present in the south and southeast of the country The current study is the first to provide a more extensive overview on the prevalence and geographical distribution of *A. reconditum* in dogs from Romania.

**Acknowledgments** The research was financed from grant PCE 236/2011. The work was done under the frame of EurNegVec COST Action TD1303. Dr. Mirabela Dumitrache's work was financed by POSDRU grant no. 159/1.5/S/136893, grant with title "Parteneriat strategic pentru creşterea calităţii cercetării ştiinţifice din universităţile medicale prin acordarea de burse doctorale şi postdoctorale – DocMed.Net_2.0. We are indebted to local veterinary personnel and regional veterinary authorities as well to the Danube Delta Biosphere Reserve for issuing research permits. We also wish to express our gratitude to Martina Gallusová, Moneeb Qablan and Stefania Latrofa.

**Conflict of interest** There are no commercial associations for author N.P. of IDEXX Laboratories; there is no commercial conflict of interest since the information generated here is solely for scientific dissemination. There are no conflicts of interest to report by any author.

## References

Abraham D (1988) Biology of *Dirofilaria immitis*. In: Boreham PFL, Atwell RB (eds) Dirofilariasis. CRC Press, London, pp 29–46

Albanese F, Abramo F, Braglia C, Caporali C, Venco L, Vercelli A, Ghibaudo G, Leone F, Carrani F, Giannelli A, Otranto D (2013) Nodular lesions due to infestation by *Dirofilaria repens* in dogs from Italy. Vet Dermatol 24:255–256. doi:10.1111/vde.12009

Albrechtová K, Sedlák K, Petrželková KJ, Hlaváč J, Mihalca AD, Lesingirian A, Kanyari PWN, Modrý D (2011) Occurrence of filaria in domestic dogs of Samburu pastoralists in Northern Kenya and its associations with canine distemper. Vet Parasitol 182:230–238. doi:10.1016/j.vetpar.2011.05.042

American Heartworm Society (2014) Current canine guidelines for the prevention, diagnosis and management of heartworm (*Dirofilaria immitis*) infection in dogs. www.heartwormsociety.org (consulted June 2014)

Aoki Y, Yasunori F, Tada I (2011) Basic studies on filaria and filariasis. Trop Med Health 39:51–55. doi:10.2149/tmh.39-1-suppl_2-51

Bocková E, Rudolf I, Kočišová A, Betášová L, Venclíková K, Mendel J, Hubálek Z (2013) *Dirofilaria repens* microfilariae in *Aedes vexans* mosquitoes in Slovakia. Parasitol Res 112:3465–3470. doi:10.1007/s00436-013-3526-9

Brianti E, Gaglio G, Napoli E, Giannetto S, Dantas-Torres F, Bain O, Otranto D (2012) New insights into the ecology and biology of *Acanthocheilonema reconditum* (Grassi, 1889) causing canine subcutaneous filariosis. Parasitology 139:530–536. doi:10.1017/S0031182011002198

Chandrashekar R, Mainville CA, Beall MJ, O'Connor T, Eberts MD, Alleman AR, Gaunt SD, Breitschwerdt EB (2010) Performance of a commercially available in-clinic ELISA for the detection of antibodies against *Anaplasma phagocytophilum*, *Ehrlichia canis*, and *Borrelia burgdorferi* and *Dirofilaria immitis* antigen in dogs. Am J Vet Res 71:1443–1450. doi:10.2460/ajvr.71.12.1443

Ciocan R, Darăbuş G, Jascó O, Fok É (2010) Detection of *Dirofilaria* spp. in dogs by PCR. USAMV Bull 67:40–44

Ciocan R, Mederle N, Jacsó O, Tánczos B, Fok É (2013) Autochthonous cases of *Dirofilaria* in dogs from Timiş County (Western Part) Romania. Global Journal of Medical Research XIII: 29-34

Courtney CH, Zeng QY (2001) Comparison of heartworm antigen test kit performance in dogs having low heartworm burdens. Vet Parasitol 96:317–322

Demiaszkiewicz AW, Polańczyk G, Osińska B, Pyziel AM, Kuligowska I, Lachowicz J, Sikorski A (2014) Prevalence and distribution of *Dirofilaria repens* Railliet et Henry, 1911 in dogs in Poland. Pol J Vet Sci 17:515–517

Di Cesare A, Otranto D, Di Giulio E, Simonato G, Latrofa MS, La Torre F, Coccia G, Traversa D (2013) Microfilarial periodicity of *Dirofilaria repens* in naturally infested dogs. Parasitol Res 112:4273–4279. doi:10.1007/s00436-013-3619-5

Dobesová R, Svobodová Z, Svobodová V (2007) Dirofilariosis in dogs - the actual situation in the Czech Republic. In Genchi C, Rinaldi L, Cringoli G (eds), Mappe Parassitologiche 8 - *Dirofilaria immitis* and *D. repens* in dog and cat and human infections. Rolando Editore, Naples, p. 198

Fok É, Kiss G, Majoros G, Jacsó O, Farkas R, Gyurkovszky M (2007) Preliminary results of an epidemiological survey on dirofilariosis of dogs and cats in Hungary. In Genchi C, Rinaldi L, Cringoli G (eds), Mappe Parassitologiche 8 - *Dirofilaria immitis* and *D. repens* in dog and cat and human infections. Rolando Editore, Naples, pp. 195-196

Genchi C, Solari Basano F, Bandi C, Di Sacco B, Venco L, Vezzoni A, Cancrini G (1995) Factors influencing the spread of heartworms in Italy: interaction between *Dirofilaria immitis* and *Dirofilaria repens*. In: Proceedings of Heartworm Symposium '95. American Heartworm Society, Batavia, Illinois, pp. 65-71

Genchi C, Venco L, Genchi M (2007) Guideline for the laboratory diagnosis of canine and feline *Dirofilaria* infections. In Genchi C, Rinaldi L, Cringoli G (eds), Mappe Parassitologiche 8 - *Dirofilaria immitis* and *D. repens* in dog and cat and human infections. Rolando Editore, Naples, pp. 138-144

Genchi C, Rinaldi L, Mortarino M, Genchi M, Cringoli G (2009) Climate and *Dirofilaria* infection in Europe. Vet Parasitol 163:286–292. doi:10.1016/j.vetpar.2009.03.026

Genchi C, Mortarino M, Rinaldi L, Cringoli G, Traldi G, Genchi M (2011) Changing climate and changing vector-borne disease distribution: the example of *Dirofilaria* in Europe. Vet Parasitol 176:295–299. doi:10.1016/j.vetpar.2011.01.012

Hamel D, Silaghi C, Lescai D, Pfister K (2012) Epidemiological aspects on vector-borne infections in stray and pet dogs from Romania and Hungary with focus on *Babesia* spp. Parasitol Res 110:1537–1545. doi:10.1007/s00436-011-2659-y

Hamel D, Silaghi C, Zapadynska S, Kudrin A, Pfister K (2013) Vector-borne pathogens in ticks and EDTA-blood samples collected from client-owned dogs, Kiev, Ukraine. Ticks Tick-Borne Dis 4:152–155. doi:10.1016/j.ttbdis.2012.08.005

Hawking F (1956) The periodicity of microfilariae. IV. Stimuli affecting the migration of the microfilariae of *Dirofilaria aethiops*, *D. immitis*, *D. repens*, *Dipetalonema blanci* and *Litomosoides carinii*. Trans R Soc Trop Med Hyg 50:397–417

Hermosilla C, Pantchev N, Dyachenko V, Gutmann M, Bauer C (2006) First autochthonous case of canine ocular *Dirofilaria repens* infection in Germany. Vet Rec 158:134–135

Ionică AM, D'Amico G, Mitková B, Kalmár Z, Annoscia G, Otranto D, Modrý D, Mihalca AD (2014) First report of *Cercopithifilaria* spp. in Eastern Europe with an overview of their geographic distribution in Europe. Parasitol Res 113:2761–2764. doi:10.1007/s00436-014-3931-8

Krämer F, Schaper R, Schunack B, Połozowski A, Piekarska J, Szwedko A, Jodies R, Kowalska D, Schüpbach D, Pantchev N (2014) Serological detection of *Anaplasma phagocytophilum*, *Borrelia burgdorferi* sensu lato and *Ehrlichia canis* antibodies and *Dirofilaria immitis* antigen in a countrywide survey in dogs in

Poland. Parasitol Res 113:3229–3239. doi:10.1007/s00436-014-3985-7

Kronefeld M, Kampen H, Sassnau R, Werner D (2014) Molecular detection of *Dirofilaria immitis*, *Dirofilaria repens* and *Setaria tundra* in mosquitoes from Germany. Parasit Vectors 16:7–30. doi:10.1186/1756-3305-7-30

Landis JR, Koch GG (1977) The measurement of observer agreement for categorical data. Biometrics 33:159–174

Latrofa MS, Weigl S, Dantas-Torres F, Annoscia G, Traversa D, Brianti E, Otranto D (2012) A multiplex PCR for the simultaneous detection of species of filarioids infesting dogs. Acta Trop 122:150–154. doi:10.1016/j.actatropica.2012.01.006

Little SE, Munzing C, Heise SR, Allen KE, Starkey LA, Johnson EM, Meinkoth J, Reichard MV (2014) Pre-treatment with heat facilitates detection of antigen of *Dirofilaria immitis* in canine samples. Vet Parasitol 203:250–252. doi:10.1016/j.vetpar.2014.01.007

Maslov DA, Lukeš J, Jirků M, Simpson A (1996) Phylogeny of trypanosomes as inferred from the small and large subunit rRNAs: implications for the evolution of parasitism in the trypanosomatid protozoa. Mol Biochem Parasitol 75:197–205. doi:10.1016/0166-6851(95)02526-X

Masny A, Lewin T, Salamatin R, Golab E (2011) Autochthonous canine *Dirofilaria repens* in the vicinity of Warsaw. Pol J Vet Sci 14:659–661. doi:10.2478/v10181-011-0098-4

Mircean V, Dumitrache MO, Györke A, Pantchev N, Jodies R, Mihalca AD, Cozma V (2012) Seroprevalence and geographic distribution of *Dirofilaria immitis* and and tick-borne infections (*Anaplasma phagocytophilum*, *Borrelia burgdorferi* sensu lato and *Ehrlichia canis*) in dogs from Romania. Vector-borne and Zoonotic Dis 12:595–604. doi:10.1089/vbz.2011.0915

Miterpáková M, Antolová D, Hurníková Z, Dubinský P, Pavlacka A, Németh J (2010) *Dirofilaria* infections in working dogs in Slovakia. J Helminthol 84:173–176. doi:10.1017/S0022149X09990496

Morgan ER, Jefferies R, Krajewski M, Ward P, Shaw SE (2009) Canine pulmonary angiostrongylosis: the influence of climate on parasite distribution. Parasitol Int 58:406–410. doi:10.1016/j.parint.2009.08.003

Nelson GS (1962) *Dipetalonema reconditum* (Grassi, 1889) from the dog with a note on its development in the flea, *Ctenocephalides felis* and the louse, *Heterodoxus spiniger*. J Helminthol 36:297–308

Nelson CT, McCall JW, Rubin SB, Buzhardt LF, Dorion DW, Graham W, Longhofer SL, Guerrero J, Robertson-Plouch C, Paul A (2005) Guidelines for the diagnosis, prevention and management of heartworm (*Dirofilaria immitis*) infection in dogs. Vet Parasitol 133:255–266

Nicolescu G, Vladimirescu A, Ciolpan O (2003) The distribution of mosquitoes in Romania (Diptera: Culicidae). Part III: Detailed maps for *Anopheles*, *Aedes* and *Culex*. Eur Mosquito Bull 14:25–31

Orihel T, Eberhard ML (1998) Zoonotic filariasis. Clin Microbiol Rev 11:366–381

Otranto D, Dantas-Torres F, Brianti E, Traversa D, Petrić D, Genchi C, Capelli G (2013) Vector-borne helminths of dogs and humans in Europe. Parasit Vectors 6:16. doi:10.1186/1756-3305-6-16

Pampiglione S, Rivasi F (2000) Human dirofilariasis due to *Dirofilaria* (*Nochtiella*) *repens*: an update of world literature from 1995 to 2000. Parassitologia 42:231–254

Pantchev N, Schaper R, Limousin S, Norden N, Weise M, Lorentzen L (2009a) Occurrence of *Dirofilaria immitis* and tick-borne infections caused by *Anaplasma phagocytophilum*, *Borrelia burgdorferi* sensu lato and *Ehrlichia canis* in domestic dogs in France: results of a countrywide serologic survey. Parasitol Res 105(Suppl 1):S101–S113. doi:10.1007/s00436-009-1501-2

Pantchev N, Norden N, Lorentzen L, Rossi M, Rossi U, Brand B, Dyachenko V (2009b) Current surveys on the prevalence and distribution of *Dirofilaria* spp. in dogs in Germany. Parasitol Res 105 (Suppl 1):S63–S74. doi:10.1007/s00436-009-1497-7

Pantchev N, Etzold M, Daugschies A, Dyachenko (2011) Diagnosis of imported canine filarial infections in Germany 2008-2010. Parasitol Res 109:S61–S76. doi:10.1007/s00436-011-2403-7

Paşca S, Miron L, Acatrinei D, Mihalachi S (2008) Both cardio-vasculary and subcutaneous forms of dirofilariosis in dog: a case report. In: Miron L, Mareş M (Eds) Scientific Papers Veterinary Medicine Iaş i, vol. 51, pp. 123-127

Popesco F (1933) Des foyers de filariose canine en Roumanie. Arh Vet 5–6:145–148

Popesco F (1935) Contribution a l'étude hématologique et au traitement de la filariose canine. Arch Roum Pathol Exp 2:215–261

Popovici TA (1916) La filariose chez le chien, recherches cliniques et experimentales. Arh Vet 13:33–34

Rawlings CA, Dawe DL, McCall JW, Keith JC, Prestwood AK (1982) Four types of occult *Dirofilaria immitis* infection in dogs. J Am Vet Med Assoc 180:1323–1326

Sapierzyński R, Fabisiak M, Sałamaszyńska A (2010) Several cases of dirofilariosis accidentally diagnosed in dogs from Poland, including two PCR positive *Dirofilaria repens* cases. Pol J Vet Sci 13:545–547

Sassnau R, Genchi C (2013) Qualitative risk assessment for the endemisation of *Dirofilaria repens* in the state of Brandenburg (Germany) based on temperature-dependent vector competence. Parsitol Res 112:2647–2652. doi:10.1007/s00436-013-3431-2

Schnyder M, Deplazes P (2012) Cross-reactions of sera from dogs infected with *Angiostrongylus vasorum* in commercially available *Dirofilaria immitis* test kits. Parasit Vectors 5:258. doi:10.1186/1756-3305-5-258

Schnyder M, Stebler K, Naucke TJ, Lorentz S, Deplazes P (2014) Evaluation of a rapid device for serological in-clinic diagnosis of canine angiostrongylosis. Parasit Vectors 7:72. doi:10.1186/1756-3305-7-72

Sergeant, ESG (2014) Epitools epidemiological calculators. Aus Vet Animal Health Services and Australian Biosecurity Cooperative Research Centre for Emerging Infectious Disease. Available at: http://epitools.ausvet.com.au

Silbermayr K, Eigner B, Joachim A, Duscher GG, Seidel B, Allerberger F, Indra A, Hufnagl P, Fuehrer HP (2014) Autochthonous *Dirofilaria repens* in Austria. Parasit Vectors 7:226. doi:10.1186/1756-3305-7-226

Svobodová Z, Svobodová V, Genchi C, Forejtek P (2006) The first report of authochthonous dirofilariosis in dogs in the Czech Republic. Helminthologia 43:242–245. doi:10.2478/s11687-006-0046-5

Świątalska A, Demiaszkiewicz AW (2012) First autochthonous case of *Dirofilaria immitis* invasion in dog in Poland. Życie Weterynaryjne 87:685–686

Tolnai Z, Széll Z, Sproch Á, Szeredi L, Sréter T (2014) *Dirofilaria immitis*: an emerging parasite in dogs, red foxes and golden jackals in Hungary. Vet Parasitol 203:339–342. doi:10.1016/j.vetpar.2014.04.004

Tudor P, Mateescu R, Tudor N (2013) *Dirofilaria* infection in dogs from Târgoviște area, Romania. Current Opinion in Biotechnology 24 Supplement1: S51-S52. doi: 10.1016/j.copbio.2013.05.123

Velasquez L, Blagburn BL, Duncan-Decoq R, Johnson EM, Allen KE, Meinkoth J, Gruntmeir J, Little SE (2014) Increased prevalence of *Dirofilaria immitis* antigen in canine samples after heat treatment. Vet Parasitol, 206:67–70. doi: 10.1016/j.vetpar.2014.03.021

Venco L (2007) Heartworm (*Dirofilaria immitis*) disease in dogs. In Genchi C, Rinaldi L, Cringoli G (eds), Mappe Parassitologiche 8 - *Dirofilaria immitis* and *D. repens* in dog and cat and human infections. Rolando Editore, Naples, pp. 117-125

Weil GJ (1987) *Dirofilaria immitis*: identification and partial characterization of parasite antigens in the serum of infected dogs. Exp Parasitol 64:244–251