REGULAR ARTICLES

Prevalence of three *Mycoplasma* **sp. by multiplex PCR in cattle with and without respiratory disease in central Mexico**

L. M. Maya‑Rodríguez1 · E. M. Carrillo‑Casas² · V. Rojas‑Trejo1 · F. Trigo‑Tavera3 · R. E. Miranda‑Morales[1](http://orcid.org/0000-0001-9340-3519)

Received: 18 May 2021 / Accepted: 9 November 2022 / Published online: 22 November 2022 © The Author(s), under exclusive licence to Springer Nature B.V. 2022

Abstract

This study aimed to identify *Mycoplasma bovis*, *Myc. dispar*, and *Myc. bovirhinis*, which are involved in bovine respiratory disease through a multiplex PCR as an alternative to culture's features that hamper *Mycoplasma* isolation. Nasal swabs were taken from 335 cattle with and without respiratory disease background (RDB) from dairy herds in the central region of Mexico. Each sample was divided in two; the frst part was processed for the direct DNA extraction of the nasal swab and the second for *Mycoplasma* isolation, culture, and then the multiplex PCR was performed. In the nasal swabs, *Myc. bovis* was identifed in 21.1%; *Myc. dispar*, in 11.8%; and *Myc. bovirhinis*, in 10.8% in cattle with RDB. Isolates were identifed as *Myc. bovis*, 20.1%; *Myc. dispar*, 11.8%; and *Myc. bovirhinis*, 6.1%. There is a strong correlation between the presence of *Mycoplasma* identifed by PCR and the clinical history of the disease (*ρ*<0.0000). In animals without RDB, *Myc. bovirhinis* was the only species detected in 6.1% of the samples processed directly for multiplex PCR, and in 2% of the isolates. There is an excellent correlation (kappa 0.803) between the isolation and the 16*S* PCR and a high correlation (kappa 0.75) between the isolation and the multiplex PCR. Therefore, we conclude that the PCR multiplex test is highly sensitive and may be used for the diagnosis and surveillance of the three species in biological samples and mycoplasma isolates.

Keywords Cattle · Bovine respiratory disease · *Mycoplasma* · *Myc. bovis* · *Myc. dispar* · *Myc. bovirhinis*

Introduction

Bovine respiratory disease (BRD) causes estimated losses between \$800 million and \$900 million annually due to death, reduced feed efficiency, and treatment costs (Brooks et al. [2011](#page-5-0)). These losses result from the generalized state of immunosuppression of the animal, favoured by the stress during handling together with environmental factors that contribute to the establishment of its multifactorial

 \boxtimes R. E. Miranda-Morales roelmimo@yahoo.com.mx

- Laboratorio de Mycoplasmas, Facultad de Medicina Veterinaria y Zootecnia UNAM, Departamento de Microbiología e Inmunología, Ciudad Universitaria, 04519 CDMX, CP, Mexico
- ² Hospital General "Dr. Manuel Gea González", Depto. de Biología Molecular e Histocompatibilidad, Dirección de Investigación, Calz. de Tlalpan 4800, Secc XVI, 14080 Tlalpan CDMX, CP, Mexico
- ³ Facultad de Medicina Veterinaria y Zootecnia UNAM, Departamento de Patología, Ciudad Universitaria, 04519 CDMX, CP, Mexico

aetiology (Fulton et al. [2022](#page-6-0); Gaudino et al. [2022\)](#page-6-1). The viruses mainly associated with the BRD are bovine herpesvirus-1, the cause of the infectious bovine rhinotracheitis (IBR) (Jones and Chowdhury, [2007](#page-6-2), [2010\)](#page-6-3); bovine parainfluenza virus-3 (BPIV-3) (Bryson et al., [1979](#page-5-1); Mehinagic et al. [2019\)](#page-6-4); bovine viral diarrhoea virus 1 and 2 (BVDV-1–2) (Burciaga-Robles et al. [2010;](#page-5-2) Goto et al. [2021\)](#page-6-5); bovine respiratory syncytial virus (BRSV) (Fulton et al. [2000;](#page-6-6) Sorden et al. [2000;](#page-7-0) Makoschey and Berge [2021\)](#page-6-7); bovine adenovirus A–D (BAdV-A–D) (Fent et al [2002;](#page-6-8) Fulton, [2009](#page-6-9)) and bovine coronavirus (BCoV) (Storz et al. [1996;](#page-7-1) Frucchi et al [2022;](#page-6-10) Soules et al., [2022](#page-7-2)). The associated bacteria belong to the Pasteurellaceae Family *Mannheimia haemolytica* (Rice et al. [2007;](#page-6-11) Confer and Ayalew. [2018;](#page-5-3) Frucchi et al [2022](#page-6-10)), *Pasteurella multocida* (DeRosa et al. [2000;](#page-5-4) Storz et al. [2000](#page-7-3); Frucchi et al [2022](#page-6-10)), *Histophilus somni* (Corbeil [2007;](#page-5-5) Shirbroun [2020\)](#page-7-4), and the genus *Mycoplasma*: *Myc. bovis*, *Myc. dispar* and *Myc. mycoides* subsp. capri. Additionally, *Myc. bovirhinis*, a species that has been isolated from the nasopharyngeal cavity of healthy and diseased cattle, currently has been recognized as a species associated with BRD (Gourlay

et al. [1979](#page-6-12); Rosengarten and Citti, [1999;](#page-7-5) Angen et al. [2009;](#page-5-6) Bednarek et al. [2012](#page-5-7)).

Mycoplasma participates in host immunosuppression during the development of BRD (Simmons and Dybvig [2007;](#page-7-6) Maina et al., [2019](#page-6-13)) and causes acute clinical symptoms during viral coinfection. *Mycoplasma* is difficult to eliminate in herds, due to its ability to evade the defence mechanisms of the host's immune system such as its surface variable lipoproteins (Christodoulides, et al. [2018](#page-5-8)), its ability to form bioflms (McAulife, et al. [2006](#page-6-14)) and adhesins that allow it to bind to neutrophils and lymphocytes (Askar, et al. [2021](#page-5-9); Yiwen, et al. [2021](#page-7-7)). These characteristics, together with inadequate treatment and stress, perpetuate its persistence and spread in the cattle herd.

In dairy herds, the frst 45 days of life are crucial in breeding cattle since in this period, the largest number of animals dies due to respiratory problems. Therefore, preventive measures such as the isolation of the animals and the use of vaccines are implemented to mitigate the economic impact of BRD (Loneragan et al. [2001](#page-6-15); Dubrovsky et al. [2019\)](#page-5-10). Hence, it is necessary to identify the causal agents to carry out the corrective biosecurity measures and the appropriate treatments for their control.

This study aimed to identify *Myc. bovis*, *Myc. dispar* and *Myc. bovirhinis* through their isolation and the application of a multiplex PCR in cattle with and without respiratory disease background to validate its use as a rapid diagnostic method allowing the reduction of the diagnosis time through culture.

Material and methods

Animals

A random sampling of cattle under 1 year of age was carried out in dairy herds of the central area of Mexico: Hidalgo, Aguascalientes, Guanajuato and Puebla. We considered clinically healthy animals that had not shown clinical symptoms of respiratory disease at the moment of the sampling, and according to the herd's records, they had no respiratory disease reports in their lifetime. Animals considered to have respiratory disease were those that at the time of sampling had nasal discharges, cough, fever and/or pneumonia.

Each swab was stored in a sterile modified Hayflick medium (Jasper, [1981\)](#page-6-16), transported to the laboratory at 4° C, and then divided into two aliquots. The frst one was for DNA extraction and the second for bacterial isolation. In compliance with the formula $n = Z^2$ p.q/ d^2 , the sample size was 335 cattle, from which 194 (57.91%) were sick animals with respiratory disease and 141 (42.08%) healthy animals.

Bacterial isolation

The *Mycoplasma* isolation was performed as stated by the methodology of Tully [\(1983\)](#page-7-8); each sample was inoculated into modifed Hayfick media, resuspended and divided into two aliquots. The frst was used for DNA extraction directly from the nasal swab, and the second was serially diluted into a liquid medium from 10^{-1} to 10^{-3} for mycoplasma isolation. Each dilution was spread in a solid medium and further incubated at 37 °C in microaerophilic conditions in a candle jar. The pH changes, indicated by phenol-red, and/or slight turbidity were periodically examined as indicative of the bacteria development. Single *Mycoplasma* colonies were excised within tiny sections of agar, and they were inoculated into liquid media. The reseeding process was repeated at least three times until colonies had the typical fried egg appearance in a solid medium. Each *Mycoplasma* culture was assessed by 0.45 and 0.22 μ m filtration, non-reversion to L-forms and digitonin sensitivity (Tully [1983;](#page-7-8) Howard and Rosenbusch, [1994\)](#page-6-17).

DNA extraction

DNA was extracted from the nasal swabs by the guanidine thiocyanate protocol (Green and Sambrook, [2012](#page-6-18)). *Mycoplasma* has a long replication time, small size and small genome. Therefore, in order to harvest enough DNA, each *Mycoplasma* isolate was scaled up to 50 ml in Hayfick medium as follows. The frst homogenization was performed by shaking the swab into 2 ml of Hayfick medium, from which 200 µl was added to 1.8 ml of fresh medium, and seeded in solid media to obtain single colony isolates. Then, each isolation was seeded in a fresh liquid medium, and as soon as the colour change of the prime culture was observed, approximately 12 h later, the prime culture was enriched with twice its volume to promote the development of *Mycoplasma.* This procedure was repeated until the required volume was obtained and harvested by centrifugation at 11,300 \times g for 45 min at 4 °C, washed in triplicate with PBS (7.2 pH) and kept frozen at−20 °C until the DNA extraction by the above-mentioned protocol. In our experience, a minimum of 20 ml of culture is sufficient for DNA extraction and will take about 15 to 20 days of incubation.

Endpoint PCR and multiplex PCR

The genus-specific PCR based on the 16*S* rRNA, with the primers forward 5′-CTGGCTGTGTGCCTAATACATGC-3′ and reverse 5′-CTTCGGGCATTACCAGCTCC-3′, was applied (L'Abee-Lund et al. [2003](#page-6-19)) with the following conditions: 96 °C for 5 min, followed by 30 cycles of 94 °C for 45 s, 68 °C for 1 min and 72 °C for 2 min, and a final extension at 72 °C for 5 min. The amplified product was 1370 bp. *Myc. bovis* DNA was used as positive control and *Mannheimia haemolytica* DNA as a negative control. The nasal swab samples and the isolates that were 16*S* rRNA PCR positive were subsequently assessed by multiplex PCR.

The multiplex PCR was based on the previously reported amplification of *oppD* and *oppF* from *Myc. bovis* (Hotzel et al. [1996\)](#page-6-20), the *rpo*B gene for *Myc. dispar* identification (Rojas-Trejo, [2013\)](#page-7-9) and new primers based on the *rpo*B gene of *Myc. bovirhinis*, GenBank accession number FJ765326.1 (Table [1\)](#page-2-0). Reference strains of *Myc. bovis* (strain Donetta, ATCC 25,523), *Myc. dispar* (ATCC 27,140) and *Myc. bovirhinis* (ATCC 27,748) were used as controls. The reaction was prepared in 25 µl volume: 7.5 µl of H₂O, 2.5 µl of $10 \times$ buffer, 3.5 mm MgCl₂, 200 mM dNTP, 10 µl DNA, 20 mM of each primer and 1.25 U Taq polymerase. The amplification program was 95 °C for 5 min, followed by 33 cycles of 94 °C for 45 s, 55 °C for 1 min, 72 °C for 1 min and a final extension at 72 °C for 7 min. PCR products were visualized by electrophoresis at 75 V for 55 min on a 1.5% agarose gel and stained with 0.5 mg/ml of ethidium bromide. DNA bands were visualized on a UV transilluminator and documented with a Gel Logic 212 Pro (Carestream, Woodbridge, CT, USA). As a molecular weight marker, a lane with 1 kb plus (Invitrogen) was included.

Statistical analysis

The non-parametric statistical analysis of chi-square was applied with 95% confidence (ρ = 0.005), with Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS), Windows, version 20.0. The accuracy measures for the multiplex PCR and *Mycoplasma* isolation were calculated, and the agreement measures between the multiplex PCR and isolation results were estimated by the Cohen's kappa statistic (Cohen, [1960\)](#page-5-11).

Results

The isolation of *Mycoplasma* spp. was possible in eightyseven (25.97%) of the 335 nasal swabs; nine (10.34%) from healthy cattle, and seventy-eight (89.65%) from cattle with respiratory disease background. In three (3.4%) nasal swabs, more than one colony morphology was observed. All the isolates were bacteriologically typifed as *Mycoplasma* spp. as they were digitonin sensitive, 0.45 and 0.22 µm flterable, retained their form and were positive to the genus-specifc PCR based on the 16*S* rRNA (Supplementary Fig. S1; Diagram S1).

The PCR based on the 16*S* rRNA identified 115 (34.32%) positive nasal swabs; 99 (51.03%) from the 194 cattle with respiratory disease background and 16 (11.34%) from the 141 healthy cattle (Diagram S1). When the multiplex PCR was applied to the 99 nasal swabs from cattle with respiratory disease background, 79 were positive and 20 were negative to the species identifed by this molecular tool remaining as *Mycoplasma* spp. in the light of the genus-specifc PCR. When the multiplex PCR was applied to the 16 nasal swabs from healthy cattle, seven were positive and nine were negative, and also remained as *Mycoplasma* spp. (Table S1; Table [3;](#page-3-0) Diagram S1). These results mean that only 86 (74.78%) out of the 115 nasal swabs, previously identifed by the 16*S*-PCR, were positive when the multiplex PCR was applied. These 86 positive nasal swabs to the multiplex PCR yielded 101 individual results as follows: *Myc. bovis* 43 (42.57%), *Myc. bovirhinis* 35 (34.65%) and *Myc. dispar* 23 (22.77%).

Regarding the isolation, from the eighty-seven samples that showed bacterial growth, ffteen samples (17.24%) had more than one result for the mycoplasma species identifed by the multiplex PCR, from which *Myc. bovis* was the most frequently isolated (Table [2](#page-3-1); Tables S1, S2; Diagram S1). Twenty-nine samples that previously were positive for the 16*S*-PCR were negative for the mycoplasma species identifed by the multiplex PCR, and 43 remained positive for only one mycoplasma species.

Table 2 Comparison between the results of the multiplex PCR performed in the complete nasal swab samples and in the individual *Mycoplasma* colonies

Table 3 Comparison between the results of the multiplex PCR performed in healthy cattle and cattle with diseased backgrounds and the isolation results within both groups

a 3 of them had no isolation

^b₁₅ had more than one result

^cNasal swabs that were 16S-PCR positive and negative to the multiplex PCR

The multiplex PCR discriminates among the three mycoplasma species based on the length of the amplifed products: 1907 bp (*Myc. bovis*), 548 bp (*Myc. dispar*) and 397 bp *(Myc. bovirhinis*) as shown in Supplementary Fig. 2. The limit of detection was calculated based on the genome sequences of each species and established at 2568 genome equivalents (GE) for the *Myc. dispar* PCR, at 6737 GE for the *Myc. bovirhinis* PCR and at 6730 GE for the *Myc. bovis* PCR. For the multiplex PCR, we used a mixture of the three DNAs to establish the limit of detection at 3516 GE. The estimation of GE was based on the 1,003,404 bp *Myc. bovis* ATCC 25,523 genome (Wise et al. [2011](#page-7-10)), the 1,065,810 bp *Myc. dispar* GS01 strain genome (Chen et al. [2019](#page-5-12)), the 948,039 bp *Myc. bovirhinis* strain HAZ141_2 genome (Hata et al. [2017](#page-6-21)) and the average molecular weight of a base pair of 617.96 g/mol.

Ninety-nine individual *Mycoplasma* colonies were retrieved from the 87 nasal swabs that were positive for the isolation. All of them were assessed by the multiplex PCR and identifed as *Myc. bovis* 40 (40.40%), *Myc. bovirhinis* 20 (20.20%) and *Myc. dispar* 23 (23.23%) and sixteen colonies (16.16%) as *Mycoplasma* spp. (Table [2](#page-3-1); Diagram S1).

The comparison between the isolation-positive nasal swabs from healthy cattle and cattle with disease backgrounds shows that in the nine healthy cattle, only four were identified by the multiplex PCR and five remained as *Mycoplasma* spp. in the light of the 16*S*-PCR. Aside from the seventy-eight isolation-positive nasal swabs from cattle with disease background, sixty-six were identifed by the multiplex PCR with multiple results, and twelve remained positive to only *Mycoplasma* spp. in the light of the 16*S*-PCR (Table S1; Table [3;](#page-3-0) Diagram S1)*.*

When comparing the individual colonies' results with the multiplex PCR results, only four colonies out of nine isolated from healthy cattle were identifed by the multiplex PCR as *Myc. bovirhinis* and fve remain as *Mycoplasma* spp. Regarding the ninety individual colonies retrieved from cattle with disease backgrounds, 40 were identifed as *Myc. bovis*, 23 as *Myc. dispar*, 16 as *Myc. bovirhinis* and 11 remained as *Mycoplasma* spp. (Table [3;](#page-3-0) Diagram S1). When *Mycoplasma* isolation is regarded as the gold standard, the kappa statistic (kappa 0.803) between the isolation and the 16*S* PCR was interpreted with "excellent agreement" (Fleiss et al., [2003\)](#page-6-22) and that between isolation and the multiplex PCR was a high correlation (kappa 0.75). Regarding the measures of accuracy between the multiplex PCR results and isolation, based on the species level, the multiplex PCR showed 82% sensitivity and 46% specificity.

The prevalence of the *Mycoplasma* genus in dairy herds in the central region was 34.32%. There is a positive correlation between the previous background of respiratory disease and the presence of *Mycoplasma* identifed by PCR in nasal swabs *ρ*<0.0000. Additionally, *Myc. bovirhinis* was the most significant of the three species $\rho = 0.005$ (<0.05) in healthy cattle and *Myc. bovis* in cattle with disease background. Both species were successfully identifed by the multiplex PCR.

Discussion

The BRD at necropsy is associated with caseous bronchopneumonia and coagulative necrosis, with poor response to antibiotic treatment in chronic pneumonia, and the main species associated with this presentation is *Myc. bovis*. (Gagea et al. [2006](#page-6-23); Caswell and Archambault [2007;](#page-5-13) Kleinschmidt et al. [2013\)](#page-6-24). *Myc. dispar* has been reported mostly in adults, and it causes pneumonic lesions (Pirie and Allan [1975](#page-6-25); Gourlay and Howard [1982\)](#page-6-26), and in young animals, it causes immunosuppression. In this study, we identifed *Myc. dispar* in cattle between ages of 180 and 225 days. Given that *Myc. bovirhinis* is part of the normal microbiota of cattle (Gourlay et al. [1979;](#page-6-12) Allen et al. [1992](#page-5-14)), we can explain why we identifed this mycoplasma species in only 6.1% of healthy animals; these cattle were also identifed as negative by the multiplex PCR, probably caused by a low yield of DNA during the extraction that may have been under the PCR limit of detection. On the other hand, *Myc. bovis* has been also identifed in asymptomatic cattle and as the cause of mild pneumonia (Prysliak et al. [2011](#page-6-27); Franca Dias de Oliveira et al. [2016;](#page-5-15) Murray et al. [2017\)](#page-6-28). However, when there is the coinfection of bacteria and viruses, it will cause severe disease (Tegtmeier et al. [1999;](#page-7-11) Angen et al. [2009](#page-5-6)).

This genus has the feature of lacking a cell wall; it may survive in the environment for several days at temperatures up to 4 °C (Pfutzner, [1984](#page-6-29)) and perpetuates itself to take part in long-lasting mastitis, arthritis and otitis. These genus features explain why *Myc. bovis*, *Myc. dispar* and *Myc. bovirhinis* are species with a high incidence of up to 50% in the cattle herd in the country centre and the correlation between their identifcation by PCR and the respiratory disease background in the assessed cattle.

The isolation of a microorganism is subjected to its requirements, the bacterial load and other factors including the presence of inhibitory substances in the sample such as enzymes, antibodies and/or antibiotics, the disease stage and culture conditions; therefore, it is understandable the greater efficiency of PCR for the identification of the *Mycoplasma* genus. As for other mycoplasma species, the application of molecular techniques has more accuracy and sensitivity than culture (Stellrecht et al. [2004](#page-7-12); Garcia et al. [2005](#page-6-30); Hong et al. [2011](#page-6-31); Jamalizadeh Bahaabadi et al. [2014](#page-6-32)). The multiplex PCR herein applied has a detection limit of 3515 GE. This limit follows previous reports of other applications for *Mycoplasma* spp. which are above 1000 GE (Stemke et al. [1994](#page-7-13); Strait et al. [2008](#page-7-14); Charlebois et al. [2014\)](#page-5-16), or between $10³$ and $10⁶$ colony forming units (Razin, [1994](#page-6-33)). Additionally, results can be obtained in less than a week compared to the culture which can take 30 days.

The species-specifc fragments amplifed by the multiplex PCR were easily distinguished on the electrophoresis gel, showing their capacity for the identifcation with the minimum concentration of genomic DNA of the diferent species. In this study, *Myc. dispar* and *Myc. bovirhinis* were identifed based on the *rpo*B gene. As confrmation, the products of the hypervariable region of the *rpo*B gene of some isolates were sequenced, which allows us to guarantee the specifcity of the assay (Das et al. [2014\)](#page-5-17).

Among the limitations of the study, the mycoplasmas that were not identifed by multiplex PCR had to be preserved for later studies. Likewise, conventional PCR was chosen over qPCR because there are many places in our country that do not have access to sophisticated laboratories. In those locations, producers and feld veterinarians have easier, faster and cheaper access to small laboratories with conventional equipment that may make this test available and affordable.

To the best of our knowledge, mucus does not have inhibitors in great amounts (Schrader et al. [2012](#page-7-15)), and the guanidine thiocyanate DNA extraction protocol removes some inhibitory substances, including mycoplasma growth inhibitors. Therefore, the inclusion of internal control was not considered since it must be included in the same reaction and multiplexed at the same time as the multiplex PCR, and a serious drawback is that it can cause the reaction to fail or give a false-positive result. Instead, external positive control, negative control and non-template control were included.

Altogether, the results herein presented showed that the multiplex PCR compared to *Mycoplasma* isolation was highly sensitive (82%), and it can be used as a diagnostic test and for the surveillance of the disease allowing the simultaneous identifcation of *Myc. bovis*, *Myc. dispar* and *Myc. Bovirhinis.*

Supplementary Information The online version contains supplementary material available at <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11250-022-03398-y>.

Acknowledgements LMMR is a MSc student from Programa de Maestría en Ciencias de la Salud y Producción animal, Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México (UNAM) and received fellowships 348956 and 283499 from CONACyT.

Author contribution LMMR performed the material preparation, experiments, and feldwork. VT contributed to the design and implementation of the research. EMCC provided critical feedback; did data analysis and wrote the manuscript. FTT and REMM designed and directed the research and provided critical feedback. All authors read and approved the fnal manuscript.

Funding This work was supported by grants DGAPA-UNAM-PAPIIT IN222412-3 and DGAPA-UNAM-PAPIIT IN222515.

Data availability Supplementary tables are included.

Code availability Not applicable.

Declarations

Ethics approval This study was performed with the consent of all farmers. All handing of animals in connection with sampling was performed, considering animal welfare and following international and national guidelines.

Consent to participate Verbal informed consent was obtained prior to the interview of the dairy farmers.

Consent for publication The interviewed dairy farmers have consented to the submission of the results of this study to the journal.

Conflict of interest The authors declare no competing interests.

References

Allen, J.W., Viel, L., Bateman, K.G., Rosendal, S., 1992. Changes in the bacterial fora of the upper and lower respiratory tracts and bronchoalveolar lavage diferential cell counts in feedlot calves treated for respiratory diseases, Canadian journal of veterinary research = Revue canadienne de recherche veterinaire, 56, 177-183.

- Angen, Ø., Thomsen, J., Larsen, L.E., Larsen, J., Kokotovic, B., Heegaard, P.M.H., Enemark, J.M.D., 2009. Respiratory disease in calves: Microbiological investigations on trans-tracheally aspirated bronchoalveolar fuid and acute phase protein response, Veterinary Microbiology, 137, 165-171.
- Askar, H., Chen, S., Hao, H., Yan, X., Ma, L., Liu, Y., Chu, Y., 2021. Immune Evasion of *Mycoplasma bovis, Pathogens,* 10, 297.
- Bednarek, D., Ayling, R.D., Nicholas, R.A.J., Dudek, K., Szymańska-Czerwińska, M., 2012. Serological survey to determine the occurrence of respiratory *Mycoplasma* infections in the Polish cattle population, Veterinary Record, 171, 45.
- Brooks, K.R., Raper, K.C., Ward, C.E., Holland, B.P., Krehbiel, C.R., Step, D.L., 2011. Economic efects of bovine respiratory disease on feedlot cattle during backgrounding and fnishing phases 1, The Professional Animal Scientist, 27, 195-203.
- Bryson, D.G., McNulty, M.S., Ball, H.J., Neill, S.D., Connor, T.J., Cush, P.F., 1979. The experimental production of pneumonia in calves by intranasal inoculation of parainfuenza type III virus. The Veterinary record, 105, 566-573.
- Burciaga-Robles, L.O., Step, D.L., Krehbiel, C.R., Holland, B.P., Richards, C.J., Montelongo, M.A., Confer, A.W., Fulton, R.W., 2010. Efects of exposure to calves persistently infected with bovine viral diarrhea virus type 1b and subsequent infection with *Mannheimia haemolytica* on clinical signs and immune variables: model for bovine respiratory disease via viral and bacterial interaction, Journal of animal science, 88, 2166-2178.
- Caswell, J.L., Archambault, M., 2007. *Mycoplasma bovis* pneumonia in cattle, Animal health research reviews, 8, 161-186.
- Charlebois, A., Marois-Crehan, C., Helie, P., Gagnon, C.A., Gottschalk, M., Archambault, M., 2014. Genetic diversity of *Mycoplasma hyopneumoniae* isolates of abattoir pigs, Veterinary microbiology, 168, 348-356.
- Chen, S., Hao, H., Yan, X., Liu, Y., Chu, Y., 2019. Genome-wide analysis of *Mycoplasma dispar* provides insights into putative virulence factors and phylogenetic relationships, G3 (Bethesda), 9, 317-325.
- Christodoulides, A., Gupta, N., Yacoubian, V., Maithel, N., Parker, J., Kelesidis, T., 2018. The Role of lipoproteins in *Mycoplasma*mediated immunomodulation. *Frontiers in Microbiology*, 9, 1682.
- Cohen, J. 1960. A coefficient of agreement for nominal scales. Educational and Psychological Measurement, 20, 37–46.
- Confer, A.W., Ayalew, S., 2018. *Mannheimia haemolytica* in bovine respiratory disease: immunogens, potential immunogens, and vaccines, Animal health research reviews, 19, 79–99.
- Corbeil, L., 2007. *Histophilus somni* host-parasite relationships, Animal health research reviews, 8, 151-160.
- Das, S., Dash, H.R., Mangwani, N., Chakraborty, J., Kumari, S., 2014. Understanding molecular identifcation and polyphasic taxonomic approaches for genetic relatedness and phylogenetic relationships of microorganisms, Journal of Microbiological Methods, 103, 80-100.
- DeRosa, D.C., Mechor, G.D., Staats, J.J., Chengappa, M.M., Shryock, T.R., 2000. Comparison of *Pasteurella* spp. simultaneously isolated from nasal and transtracheal swabs from cattle with clinical signs of bovine respiratory disease, Journal of clinical microbiology, 38, 327-332.
- Dubrovsky, S.A., Van Eenennaam, A.L., Karle, B.M., Rossitto, P.V., Lehenbauer, T.W., Aly, S.S., 2019. Epidemiology of bovine respiratory disease (BRD) in preweaned calves on California dairies: The BRD 10K study, Journal of dairy science*,* 102, 7306-7319.
- Franca Dias de Oliveira, B.A., Carrillo Gaeta, N., Mendonca Ribeiro, B.L., Reyes Aleman, M.A., Miranda Marques, L., Timenetsky, J., Melville, P.A., Avansi Marques, J., Marvulle, V., Gregory, L., 2016. Determination of bacterial aetiologic factor on tracheobronchial lavage in relation to clinical signs of bovine respiratory disease, Journal of medical microbiology, 65, 1137-1142.
- Fent, G.M., Fulton, R.W., Saliki, J.T., Caseltine, S.L., Lehmkuhl, H.D., Confer, A.W., Purdy, C.W., Briggs, R.E., Loan, R.W., Duff, G.C., 2002. Bovine adenovirus serotype 7 infections in postweaning calves. American journal of veterinary research, 63, 976–978.
- Fleiss, J. L., Levin, B., Paik, M. C., 2003. Statistical Methods for Rates and Proportions. Wiley Series in Probability and Statistics, Hoboken, NJ. pp 768. <https://doi.org/10.1002/0471445428>.
- Frucchi, A., Dall Agnol, A. M., Bronkhorst, D. E., Beuttemmuller, E. A., Alferi, A. A., Alferi, A. F., 2022. Bovine coronavirus co-infection and molecular characterization in dairy calves with or without clinical respiratory disease, Frontiers in veterinary science, 9, 895492.
- Fulton, R.W., Purdy, C.W., Confer, A.W., Saliki, J.T., Loan, R.W., Briggs, R.E., Burge, L.J., 2000. Bovine viral diarrhea viral infections in feeder calves with respiratory disease: interactions with *Pasteurella* spp., parainfuenza-3 virus, and bovine respiratory syncytial virus, Canadian journal of veterinary research = Revue canadienne de recherche veterinaire, 64, 151-159.
- Fulton, R.W., Cook, B.J., Step, D.L. Confer, A.W., Saliki, J.T., Payton, M.E., Burge, L.J., Welsh, R.D., Blood, K.S., 2022. Evaluation of health status of calves and impact on feedlot performance: assessment of retained ownership program for postweaning calves. Canadian journal of veterinary research = Revue canadienne de recherche veterinaire, 66, 173–180.
- Fulton, R.W., 2009. Viral diseases of the bovine respiratory tract abstract - Europe PMC. Food Animal Practice, Jan, 171–191.
- Gagea, M.I., Bateman, K.G., Shanahan, R.A., van Dreumel, T., McEwen, B.J., Carman, S., Archambault, M., Caswell, J.L., 2006. Naturally occurring *Mycoplasma bovis*-associated pneumonia and polyarthritis in feedlot beef calves, Journal of veterinary diagnostic investigation: official publication of the American Association of Veterinary Laboratory Diagnosticians, Inc, 18, 29-40.
- Garcia, M., Ikuta, N., Levisohn, S., Kleven, S.H., 2005. Evaluation and comparison of various PCR methods for detection of *Mycoplasma gallisepticum* infection in chickens, Avian diseases, 49, 125-132.
- Gaudino, M., Nagamine, B., Ducatez, M.F., Meyer, G., 2022. Understanding the mechanisms of viral and bacterial coinfections in bovine respiratory disease: a comprehensive literature review of experimental evidence, Veterinary research, 53, 70.
- Goto, Y., Yaegashi, G., Fukunari, K., Suzuki, T., 2021. Clinical analysis for long-term sporadic bovine viral diarrhea transmitted by calves with an acute infection of bovine viral diarrhea virus 2, *Viruses*, 13, 621.
- Gourlay, R.N., Howard, C.J., 1982. Respiratory mycoplasmosis, Advances in Veterinary Science and Comparative Medicine, 26, 289-332.
- Gourlay, R.N., Howard, C.J., Thomas, L.H., Wyld, S.G., 1979. Pathogenicity of some *Mycoplasma* and *Acholeplasma* species in the lungs of gnotobiotic calves, Research in veterinary science, 27, 233-237.
- Green, M.R. and Sambrook J., 2012. 4th edition, Molecular Cloning: A Laboratory Manual (Cold Spring Harbor, NY, USA: CSH Press), pp1936.
- Hata, E., Nagai, K., Murakami, K., 2017. Complete genome sequence of *Mycoplasma bovirhinis* Strain HAZ141_2 from bovine nasal discharge in Japan, Genome Announcements, 5, e01000-01017.
- Hong, S., Lee, H.A., Park, S.H., Kim, O., 2011. Sensitive and specifc detection of *Mycoplasma* species by consensus polymerase chain reaction and dot blot hybridization, Laboratory animal research, 27, 141-145.
- Hotzel, H., Sachse, K., Pfutzner, H., 1996. Rapid detection of *Mycoplasma bovis* in milk samples and nasal swabs using the polymerase chain reaction, The Journal of applied bacteriology, 80, 505-510.
- Howard, C.J. and Rosenbusch, R.F., 1994. Mycoplasmosis in Animals: Laboratory Diagnosis. (Iowa State University Press, Ames).
- Jamalizadeh Bahaabadi, S., Mohseni Moghadam, N., Kheirkhah, B., Farsinejad, A., Habibzadeh, V., 2014. Isolation and molecular identifcation of *Mycoplasma hominis* in infertile female and male reproductive system, *Nephro-urology monthly,* 6, e22390.
- Jasper, D.E., 1981. Bovine mycoplasmal mastitis, Advances in veterinary science and comparative medicine, 25, 121-157.
- Jones, C., Chowdhury, S., 2007. A review of the biology of bovine herpesvirus type 1 (BHV-1), its role as a cofactor in the bovine respiratory disease complex and development of improved vaccines, Animal health research reviews, 8, 187–205.
- Jones, C., Chowdhury, S., 2010. Bovine herpesvirus type 1 (BHV-1) is an important cofactor in the bovine respiratory disease complex, The Veterinary clinics of North America. Food animal practice, 26, 303–321.
- Kleinschmidt, S., Spergser, J., Rosengarten, R., Hewicker-Trautwein, M., 2013. Long-term survival of *Mycoplasma bovis* in necrotic lesions and in phagocytic cells as demonstrated by transmission and immunogold electron microscopy in lung tissue from experimentally infected calves, Veterinary microbiology, 162, 949-953.
- L'Abee-Lund, T.M., Heiene, R., Friis, N.F., Ahrens, P., Sorum, H., 2003. *Mycoplasma canis* and urogenital disease in dogs in Norway, The Veterinary record, 153, 231-235.
- Loneragan, G.H., Dargatz, D.A., Morley, P.S., Smith, M.A., 2001. Trends in mortality ratios among cattle in US feedlots, Journal of the American Veterinary Medical Association, 219, 1122-1127.
- Maina, T., Prysliak, T., and Perez-Casal, J., 2019. *Mycoplasma bovis* delay in apoptosis of macrophages is accompanied by increased expression of anti-apoptotic genes, reduced cytochrome C translocation and inhibition of DNA fragmentation.Veterinary immunology and immunopathology, 208, 16–24.
- Makoschey, B., Berge, A.C., 2021. Review on bovine respiratory syncytial virus and bovine parainfluenza - usual suspects in bovine respiratory disease - a narrative review, BMC veterinary research,17, 261.
- McAulife, L., Ellis, R.J., Miles, K., Ayling, R.D., Nicholas, R.A.J., 2006. Bioflm formation by *Mycoplasma* species and its role in environmental persistence and survival. Microbiology, 152,913-922.
- Mehinagic, K., Pilo, P., Vidondo, B., Stokar-Regenscheit, N., 2019. Coinfection of Swiss cattle with bovine parainfuenza virus 3 and *Mycoplasma bovis* at acute and chronic stages of bovine respiratory disease complex, Journal of veterinary diagnostic investigation: official publication of the American Association of Veterinary Laboratory Diagnosticians, Inc, 31, 674–680.
- Murray, G.M., O'Neill, R.G., Lee, A.M., McElroy, M.C., More, S.J., Monagle, A., Earley, B., Cassidy, J.P., 2017. The bovine paranasal sinuses: Bacterial fora, epithelial expression of nitric oxide and potential role in the in-herd persistence of respiratory disease pathogens, PloS one, 12, e0173845.
- Pfutzner, H., 1984. Tenazität von Mycoplasma bovis. Zentralblatt fur Bakteriologie, Mikrobiologie, und Hygiene Series A, Medical microbiology, infectious diseases, virology, parasitology, 258, 38-41.
- Pirie, H.M., Allan, E.M., 1975. *Mycoplasmas* and cuffing pneumonia in a group of calves, The Veterinary record, 97, 345-349.
- Prysliak, T., van der Merwe, J., Lawman, Z., Wilson, D., Townsend, H., van Drunen Littel-van den Hurk, S., Perez-Casal, J., 2011. Respiratory disease caused by *Mycoplasma bovis* is enhanced by exposure to bovine herpes virus 1 (BHV-1) but not to bovine viral diarrhea virus (BVDV) type 2, The Canadian veterinary journal = La revue veterinaire canadienne, 52, 1195-1202.
- Razin, S., 1994. DNA probes and PCR in diagnosis of mycoplasma infections, Molecular and cellular probes, 8, 497-511.
- Rice, J.A., Carrasco-Medina, L., Hodgins, D.C., Shewen, P.E., 2007. *Mannheimia haemolytica* and bovine respiratory disease, Animal health research reviews, 8, 117–128.
- Rojas-Trejo, V., 2013. Tipifcación de micoplamas aislados de bovinos con problemas respiratorios en México. (MSc thesis, Department of Microbiology and Immunology. National Autonomous University of Mexico, Mexico) p.87.
- Rosengarten, R. and Citti, C., 1999. The role of ruminant mycoplasmas in systemic infections. In: L. Stipkovits, L., Rosengarten, R., and J. Frey. (eds), COST 826: Agriculture and biotechnology, Mycoplasmas of ruminants: pathogenicity, diagnostics, epidemiology and molecular genetics. European Cooperation on Scientifc and Technical Research, Belgium. 3, p.14–17.
- Schrader, C., Schielke, A., Ellerbroek , L., Johne, R., 2012. PCR inhibitors-occurrence, properties, and removal, Journal of applied microbiology, 113, 1014-1026.
- Shirbroun, R.M., 2020. *Histophilus somni*: Antigenic and Genomic Changes Relevant to Bovine Respiratory Disease. The Veterinary clinics of North America. Food animal practice, 36, 279–295.
- Simmons, W.L., Dybvig K., 2007 How some *Mycoplasma*s evade Host Immune Responses., Microbe, 2, 537-543.
- Sorden, S.D., Kerr, R.W., Janzen, E.D., 2000. Interstitial pneumonia in feedlot cattle: concurrent lesions and lack of immunohistochemical evidence for bovine respiratory syncytial virus infection, Journal of veterinary diagnostic investigation: official publication of the American Association of Veterinary Laboratory Diagnosticians, Inc, 12, 510-517.
- Soules, K.R., Rahe, M.C., Purtle, L., Moeckly, C., Stark, P., Samson, C., Knittel, J.P., 2022. Bovine coronavirus infects the respiratory tract of cattle challenged Intranasally, Frontiers in veterinary science, 9, 878240.
- Stellrecht, K.A., Woron, A.M., Mishrik, N.G.,Venezia, R.A., 2004. Comparison of multiplex PCR assay with culture for detection of genital mycoplasmas, Journal of clinical microbiology, 42, 1528-1533.
- Stemke, G.W., Phan, R., Young, T.F., Ross, R.F., 1994. Diferentiation of *Mycoplasma hyopneumoniae, M. focculare*, and *M. hyorhinis* on the basis of amplification of a 16S rRNA gene sequence, American journal of veterinary research, 55, 81-84.
- Storz, J., Stine, L., Liem, A. Anderson, G.A., 1996. Coronavirus isolation from nasal swab samples in cattle with signs of respiratory tract disease after shipping, Journal of the American Veterinary Medical Association, 208, 1452-1455.
- Storz, J., Lin, X., Purdy, C.W., Chouljenko, V.N., Kousoulas, K.G., Enright, F.M., Gilmore, W.C., Briggs, R.E., Loan, R.W., 2000. Coronavirus and *Pasteurella* infections in bovine shipping fever pneumonia and Evans' criteria for causation, Journal of clinical microbiology, 38, 3291-3298.
- Strait, E.L., Madsen, M.L., Minion, F.C., Christopher-Hennings, J., Dammen, M., Jones, K.R., Thacker, E.L., 2008. Real-time PCR assays to address genetic diversity among strains of *Mycoplasma hyopneumoniae*, Journal of clinical microbiology, 46, 2491-2498.
- Tegtmeier, C., Uttenthal, A., Friis, N.F., Jensen, N.E., Jensen, H.E., 1999. Pathological and microbiological studies on pneumonic lungs from Danish calves, Zentralblatt fur Veterinarmedizin Reihe B Journal of veterinary medicine Series B, 46, 693-700.
- Tully, J.G., 1983. C12 - Cloning and fltration techniques for Mycoplasmas. In: S. Razin and J.G. Tully (eds), Methods in Mycoplasmology,1983, (Academic Press),173–177.
- Wise, K.S., Calcutt, M.J., Foecking, M.F., Röske, K., Madupu, R.,Methé, B.A., 2011. Complete genome sequence of *Mycoplasma bovis* type strain PG45 (ATCC 25523), Infection and Immunity*,* 79, 982.
- Yiwen, C., Yueyue, W., Lianmei, Q., Cuiming, Z., Xiaoxing, Y. 2021. Infection strategies of mycoplasmas: Unraveling the panoply of virulence factors, Virulence, 12, 788–817.

Publisher's note Springer Nature remains neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.

Springer Nature or its licensor (e.g. a society or other partner) holds exclusive rights to this article under a publishing agreement with the author(s) or other rightsholder(s); author self-archiving of the accepted manuscript version of this article is solely governed by the terms of such publishing agreement and applicable law.