# COPROLOGICAL PREVALENCE OF INTESTINAL PARASITES AND STRONGYLE EPG PROFILES OF WORKING HORSES FROM NORTH-EASTERN AND SOUTH-EASTERN ROMANIA

#### Marius Catalin BUZATU, Mariana IONITA, Ioan Liviu MITREA

University of Agronomical Sciences and Veterinary Medicine of Bucharest, Faculty of Veterinary Medicine, Department of Parasitology and Parasitic Diseases, 105 Splaiul Independentei, 050097, Bucharest, Romania

Corresponding author e-mail: buzatumariuscatalin@yahoo.com

#### Abstract

A coprological study was performed in working horses (n=148) from 13 villages in northeastern and southeastern Romania. The aim of this research was to obtain current data on the prevalence of intestinal parasites in working horses and, additionally, to establish strongyle EPG profiles for the horses based on the strongyle eggs per gram of feces (EPG) counts. For this, fresh fecal samples, collected over a 5-months (June-October) period in 2013, were analyzed qualitatively for presence of intestinal parasites using sodium chloride flotation technique, and quantitatively, for strongyle EPG using a modified McMaster egg counting technique. Fecal samples of 104 horses (70.3%) were positive for parasite eggs, with an overall prevalence as follows: 70.3% for strongyles, 12.2% for Parascaris equorum, 4.1% for Strongyloides westeri, and 2.7% for Anoplocephalidae. The highest intensity rate belonged to strongyles, with the EPG counts varying from 25 to 2775. Of them, 58.6% had the EPG count <250, 23.1% between 250-1000, while for 10.6% of the positive animals the EPG counts ranged between 1000–2000, and for 7.7% was bigger than 2000. The average (%) of EPG-positive animals by age group was: <1year (5.8%), 1-5 (20.2%), 6–10 (29.8%), 11–15 (32.6%), and >16 years (11.5%). This research showed the value of strongyle EPG profiling for the working horses, important base for further studies in designing and monitoring sustainable control program of equine parasites.

Key words: intestinal parasites, strongyles, working horses, Romania.

### INTRODUCTION

Horses are hosts to a variety of internal parasites. Some of these parasites, usually depending on their abundance, are known to problems ranging from cause reduced performance and condition up to abdominal disease such as colic or severe diarrhoea (Krecek et al, 1987; Love et al., 1999; Mitrea, 2011). The most important parasite group is the cyathostomins, which today consists of more than 50 identified species (Lichtenfels et al., 1998, 2002). Cyathostomins often comprise 95-100% of the total worm burden (Lyons et al., 1999; Wood et al., 2013). Depending on age, the remainder of the worm burden is dominated by species such as Parascaris equorum, Strongyloides westeri, Oxyuris equi and the large strongyle species: Strongylus vulgaris, S. edentatus, S. equinus. In addition, tapeworm species, especially Anoplocephala perfoliata have been reported to be very common (Gasser et al., 2005).

In the last years, it is well accepted that the assessment of helminth distribution patterns

in managed equine populations will yield useful information for developing improved control methods that are less reliant on chemical compounds (Ionita et al., 2010; Nielsen, 2012). Since the 1960s, numerous studies have reported on increasing levels of cyathostomin resistance to a variety of anthelmintic drugs. The macrocyclic lactones (avermectin / milbemycins) are currently the only fully effective anthelmintic group (reviewed by Kaplan, 2002, 2004). However, it is widely accepted that avermectin / milbemycin resistance in cyathostomins is inevitable (Lloyd and Soulsby, 1998; Sangster, 1999; Kaplan, 2004). Thus, there is a strong need to revise current approaches to parasite control in order to delay the development of resistance as much as possible. It is widely accepted that due consideration of the role of parasite *refugia* is key to preserving the efficacy of anthelmintic drugs in worm control programs (van Wyk, 2001; Pomroy, 2006). One way to maximize refugia is by

applying selective, targeted treatment as part of a sustainable equine nematode control program (Matthews, 2008; Nielsen, 2012).

One of the basic principles of selective anthelmintic treatment is a consistency of the relative magnitude of strongyle FECs of individual horses over time (Duncan and Love, 1991). Identification of high egg shedders within the herd is an essential goal, and the consistency of egg shedding patterns can be exploited to reduce the number of faecal samples (Gomez and Georgi, 1991; Nielsen et al., 2006; Eysker et al., 2008). With this respect, there are some data to show that strongyle eggs per gram of feces (EPG) profiles can be established for equids (Osterman Lind et al. 1999; Döpfer et al. 2004; Çirak et al. 2005; Lyons et al., 2012).

In Romania, despite of the importance of the horse in various activities (in agriculture, or sport), knowledge and research interests in equine parasites is sparse and fragmentary. Several studies performed in some areas in western, central or eastern Romania, provide only limited data on the prevalence of parasites in horses in Romania. Therefore, the aim of the current study was to acquire further information on the prevalence of intestinal parasites in working horses on several villages in north-eastern and south-eastern Romania and, additionally, to establish strongyle EPG profiles for the horses based on the strongyle eggs per gram of feces (EPG) counts.

## MATERIALS AND METHODS

A coprological study was performed in 148 working horses from 13 villages in northeastern and southeastern Romania. All these horses had access to pasture grazing during the study. The animals were assigned in age and gender groups, as follows: foals (up to 1 year, n = 6), yearlings (1 – 5 years; n = 27), and adults of: 6 - 10 years (n = 50), 11 - 15 years (n = 47), 16 - 20 years (n = 16), >20 years (n = 2). Of the total 142 yearlings and adults, 69 were males and 73 were females (Table 1).

Fresh fecal samples, collected over a 5-months (June-October) period in 2013, were analyzed qualitatively for presence of intestinal parasites using sodium chloride flotation technique. Additionally, samples were analyzed quantitatively for strongyle fecal worm eggs counts (FWECs), described as the number of eggs per gramme (EPG) of feces, using a modified McMaster egg counting technique.

Analysis of distribution of working horses with positive strongyle EPG counts by classes of intensity (< 250, 250 - 1000, 1000 - 2000, and > 2000) was undertaken to help comprise the profile pattern.

The statistical analysis was performed using Quantitatively Parasitology 3.0 free software. P values by Fisher's exact test and Chi-square test were computed.  $P \le 0.05$  was considered as statistically significant.

<b>Region</b> / county <sup>*</sup> (village)	Age and gender category											
	foals <1year	1-5 years		6 – 10 years		11-15 years		16 – 20 years		>20 years		Total
		М	F	М	F	М	F	М	F	М	F	
North-eastern												<i>93</i>
SV(Vm)	0	2	2	1	4	2	1	2	1	0	0	15
SV (V)	2	0	0	0	6	3	5	0	1	0	0	17
IS (C)	1	2	0	4	1	3	3	1	0	0	0	15
IS (S,M)	0	3	4	1	1	1	1	2	4	0	1	18
NT (T)	0	1	1	6	3	5	0	0	0	1	0	17
VN (R.A)	1	2	0	2	3	1	2	0	0	0	0	11
South-eastern												55
BZ (P.S.V)	0	2	4	3	6	6	2	2	0	0	0	25
IL (B.R)	2	1	3	2	7	7	5	1	2	0	0	30
Total	6	13	14	19	31	28	19	8	8	1	1	1.40
			27		50	4	17	j	16		2	148

Table 1. Animals included in the study, stratified by their provenance and age groups

\*Counties included in the study: SV - Suceava; IS - Iasi; NT - Neamt; VN - Vrancea; BZ - Buzau; IL - Ialomita

#### **RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS**

Of the 148 fecal samples analyzed, 104 (70.3%) were positive for parasite eggs. Overall, the most prevalent infection was with strongyles (70.3%), followed by *Parascaris equorum* (12.2%), *Strongyloides westeri* (4.1%), and tapeworms - *Anoplocephalidae* (2.7%). Strongyles, *P. equorum, S. westeri* and tapeworm spp. infections were detected

on 13 (100%), 10 (76.92%), 7 (53.85%) and 3 (23.08%) of villages, respectively (Table 2). The highest mean prevalence of strongyles was detected in foals (6/6; 100%), yearlings (20/27; 74.1%) and horses of the 16 -20 age group (12/16; 75.0%). *P. equorum* was detected mainly in foals (5/6; 83.33%) and animals aging over 16 years (5/18; 27.77%) (Table 3).

 Table 2. Prevalence of intestinal parasites in working horses from 13 villages in northeastern and southeastern

 Romania, according to the age groups of animals

species/ Regin / county - village         Total M         F         M         F	Parasite	No. positive (%) / sampled by age											
Region / county - village         - 1/2 years         0 + 0 years         11-1 years         years         5/20 years         (%)           Strongyles         M         F         M         M         F         M         M         F         M         M         F         M         M         F         M         F         M         F         M         F         M         F         M         F         M         M         M         M         M         M         M         M         M         M         M         M	species/	foals	1.5						16	- 20	Total		
county-village         M         F         M	Region /	<1vear	1 – 5	years	6 - 10	years	11-15 years		ve	ars	>20 years		(%)
Strongyles         Image: Strongyles <th< td=""><td>county - village</td><td></td><td>М</td><td>F</td><td>М</td><td>F</td><td>М</td><td>F</td><td>M</td><td>F</td><td>М</td><td>F</td><td></td></th<>	county - village		М	F	М	F	М	F	M	F	М	F	
North-eastern         NORTH         NORTH         NORTH         NORTH         NORTH         NORTH         NORTH         N	Strongyles												
SV-Vm.       0       2/2       0/2       0/1       3/4       0/2       1/1       2/2       1/1       0       0       9/15         SV-V.       2/2       0       0       0       5/6       1/3       4/5       0       0/1       0       0       1/2/17         IS - C.       1/1       2/2       0       4/4       1/1       3/3       3/3       1/1       0       0       0       1/1       1/3/8         IS - S.M       0       3/3       3/4       0/1       0/1       0/1       1/1       2/2       3/3       0       0       0       0       1/1       1/3/8         NT - T.       0       0/1       1/1       5/6       2/3       3/1       1/2       0       0       0       0       1/1/1       1/1/1         UN - R.A.       1/1       2/2       0/2       1/3       0/6       1/2       0       0       0       8/2.5       0       0       0       8/2.5       0       0       0       3/3.5 (60.0%)       0       0       3/3.5 (60.0%)       0       0       3/3.5 (60.0%)       0       0       3/3.5 (60.0%)       0       0       3/3.5 (60.0%)	North-eastern												
SV-V. $2/2$ 0       0       0 $5/6$ $1/3$ $4/5$ 0 $0/1$ 0       0 $1/2/17$ IS - S.M       0       3/3       3/4       0/1       0/1       1/1 $3/3$ $3/3$ $1/1$ $0$ 0       0 $1/1/1$ $3/18$ NT - T.       0       0/1 $1/1$ $5/6$ $2/3$ $3/5$ 0       0       0       0 $1/1/1$ $3/18$ NT - T.       0       0/1 $1/1$ $5/6$ $2/3$ $3/5$ 0       0       0       0 $1/1/1$ $3/18$ NT - T.       0       0/1 $1/1$ $1/1/4$ $1/1/18$ $1/12$ $5/5$ $0$ 0       0       0 $1/1/17$ $1/11$ $3/16$ $0/22$ $0/1$ $0/1$ $0/1$ $1/11$ $1/11$ $1/11$ $3/3$ $3/3$ $1/1$ $2/2$ 0       0 $2/3/3$ $3/3$ $1/11$ $1/11$ $1/11$ $1/11$ $1/11$ $1/11$ $1/11$ $1/11$ $1/11$ $1/11$ $1/11$ $1/11$	SV- Vm.	0	2/2	0/2	0/1	3/4	0/2	1/1	2/2	1/1	0	0	9/15
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	SV-V.	2/2	0	0	0	5/6	1/3	4/5	0	0/1	0	0	12/17
$ \begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	IS - C.	1/1	2/2	0	4/4	1/1	3/3	3/3	1/1	0	0	0	15/15
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	IS - S.M	0	3/3	3/4	0/1	0/1	0/1	1/1	2/2	3/4	0	1/1	13/18
$ \begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	NT - T.	0	0/1	1/1	5/6	2/3	3/5	0	0	0	0/1	0	11/17
4/4         9/10         4/7         11/14         14/18         8/15         11/12         5/5         4/6         0/1         1/1         71/93 (76.3%)           South-eastern	VN - R.A.	1/1	2/2	0	2/2	3/3	1/1	2/2	0	0	0	0	11/11
South-eastern         Image: boothor of the sector of		4/4	9/10	4/7	11/14	14/18	8/15	11/12	5/5	4/6	0/1	1/1	71/93 (76.3%)
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	South-eastern												
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	BZ – P,S,V	0	2/2	1/4	1/3	0/6	3/6	1/2	0/2	0	0	0	8/25
2/2         2/3         4/7         1/5         5/13         10/13         4/7         1/3         2/2         0         0         33/55 (60.0%)           Total         6/6         12/13         8/14         12/19         19/31         18/28         16/19         6/8         6/8         0/1         1/1         104/148 (70.3%)           Parascaris equorum         -         -         -         -         -         0/6         0/1         2/2         0/1         0         4/14           North-eastern         -         -         -         0/6         0/3         1/5         -         0/1         -         -         2/17           IS -C.         1/1         0/2         -         0/4         0/1         0/3         0/3         0/1         -         -         2/17           IS -S.M         -         0/3         0/4         0/1         0/1         0/1         0/1         0/1         0/1         2/2         0/1         -         2/17           IS -S.M         -         0/1         0/1         0/1         0/1         0/1         0/1         0/1         0/1         2/2         0/1         0/18         2/2	IL – B,R.	2/2	1/1	3/3	0/2	5/7	7/7	4/5	1/1	2/2	0	0	25/30
Total         6/6         12/13         8/14         12/19         19/31         18/28         16/19         6/8         6/8         0/1         1/1         104/148 (70.3%)           Parascaris equorum         -         -         -         -         -         -         -         -         -         -         -         -         0/1         2/2         0/1         0         0         4/14           SV-Vm.         -         1/2         0/2         0/1         0/4         1/2         0/1         2/2         0/1         0         0         4/14           SV-Vm.         -         1/2         0/2         0/1         0/4         1/2         0/1         2/2         0/1         0         4/14           SV-V.         1/2         -         -         0/4         0/1         0/3         0/3         0/1         -         -         2/17           IS-S.M         0/3         0/4         0/1         0/1         0/1         1/1         0/2         0/1         0/1         0/1         0/1           NT-T.         0/1         0/1         0/1         0/1         0/1         0/1         1/12         1/2         -		2/2	2/3	4/7	1/5	5/13	10/13	4/7	1/3	2/2	0	0	33/55 (60.0%)
Parascaris equorum         North-eastern         Image: Second Sec	Total	6/6	12/13	8/14	12/19	19/31	18/28	16/19	6/8	6/8	0/1	1/1	104/148 (70.3%)
$ \begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$	Parascaris												
North-eastern         Image: style	equorum												
$ \begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	North-eastern												
$ \begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	SV- Vm.	-	1/2	0/2	0/1	0/4	1/2	0/1	2/2	0/1	0	0	4/14
$ \begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	SV- V.	1/2	-	-		0/6	0/3	1/5	-	0/1	-	-	2/17
$ \begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	IS - C.	1/1	0/2	-	0/4	0/1	0/3	0/3	0/1		-	-	1/15
$ \begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	IS - S.M	-	0/3	0/4	0/1	0/1	0/1	0/1	0/2	0/4	-	0/1	0/18
$ \begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	NT - T.	-	0/1	0/1	0/6	0/3	0/5	-	-		0/1	-	0/17
$ \begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	VN - R.A.	1/1	0/2	-	0/2	0/3	0/1	1/2	-	-	-	-	2/11
		3/4	1/10	0/7	0/14	0/18	1/15	1/12	2/5	0/6	0/1	1/1	9/93 (10.7%)
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	South-eastern												
IL - B,R.         2/2         0/1         0/3         0/2         0/7         0/7         0/5         0/1         0/2         -         -         2/30           2/2         1/3         0/7         2/5         2/13         0/13         0/7         2/3         0/2         0         0         9/55 (6.4%)           Total         5/6         2/13         0/14         2/19         2/31         1/28         1/19         4/8         0/8         0/1         1/1         18/148 (12.2%)           Strongyloides westeri         westeri         -         -         2/11         0/4         0/2         0/1         0/1         1/1         18/148 (12.2%)           SV- Vm.         -         1/2         0/2         1/1         0/4         0/2         0/1         0/1         -         -         2/14           SV- Vm.         -         1/2         0/2         1/1         0/4         0/2         0/1         0/1         -         -         2/14           SV- Vm.         -         1/2         0/2         -         0/4         0/1         0/3         3         0/1         -         -         0/17           SV- V.         0/2	BZ-P,S,V	-	1/2	0/4	2/3	2/6	0/6	0/2	2/2	-	-	-	7/25
2/2         1/3         0/7         2/5         2/13         0/13         0/7         2/3         0/2         0         0         9/55 (6.4%)           Total         5/6         2/13         0/14         2/19         2/31         1/28         1/19         4/8         0/8         0/1         1/1         18/148 (12.2%)           Strongyloides	IL – B,R.	2/2	0/1	0/3	0/2	0/7	0/7	0/5	0/1	0/2	-	-	2/30
Total         5/6         2/13         0/14         2/19         2/31         1/18         1/19         4/8         0/8         0/1         1/1         18/148 (12.2%)           Strongyloides westeri         -         -         -         -         -         -         -         -         -         -         -         -         -         0/1         -         -         -         0/17           SV-Vm.         -         1/2         0/2         1/1         0/4         0/2         0/1         0/2         -         -         2/14           SV-Vm.         -         1/2         0/2         1/1         0/4         0/2         0/1         0/1         -         -         2/14           SV-Vm.         -         1/2         0/2         1/1         0/4         0/2         0/1         0/1         -         -         0/17           SV-V.         0/2         -         -         0/4         0/1         0/3         3         0/1         -         -         0/15           IS - S.M         -         0/3         1/4         0/1         0/1         0/1         1         0/2         0/4         -         0/1 <td></td> <td>2/2</td> <td>1/3</td> <td>0/7</td> <td>2/5</td> <td>2/13</td> <td>0/13</td> <td>0/7</td> <td>2/3</td> <td>0/2</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td>9/55 (6.4%)</td>		2/2	1/3	0/7	2/5	2/13	0/13	0/7	2/3	0/2	0	0	9/55 (6.4%)
Strongyloides westeri         Strongyloides         Strongyloides <ths< td=""><td>Total</td><td>5/6</td><td>2/13</td><td>0/14</td><td>2/19</td><td>2/31</td><td>1/28</td><td>1/19</td><td>4/8</td><td>0/8</td><td>0/1</td><td>1/1</td><td>18/148 (12.2%)</td></ths<>	Total	5/6	2/13	0/14	2/19	2/31	1/28	1/19	4/8	0/8	0/1	1/1	18/148 (12.2%)
westeri         North-eastern         Image: Constraint of the system         Image:	Strongyloides												
North-eastern         -         -         -         -         -         -         -         2/14           SV-Vm.         -         1/2         0/2         1/1         0/4         0/2         0/1         0/2         0/1         -         -         2/14           SV-Vm.         0/2         -         -         0/6         0/3         5         -         0/1         -         -         2/14           SV-V.         0/2         -         0/4         0/1         0/3         3         0/1         -         -         0/17           IS - C.         0/1         0/2         -         0/4         0/1         0/3         3         0/1         -         -         0/15           IS - S.M         -         0/3         1/4         0/1         0/1         0/1         1         0/2         0/4         -         0/1         1/18	westeri									-			
$ \begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	North-eastern												
$ \begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	SV- Vm.	-	1/2	0/2	1/1	0/4	0/2	0/1	0/2	0/1	-	-	2/14
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	SV- V.	0/2	-	-	-	0/6	0/3	5	-	0/1	-	-	0/17
IS - S.M - 0/3 1/4 0/1 0/1 0/1 1 0/2 0/4 - 0/1 1/18	IS - C.	0/1	0/2	-	0/4	0/1	0/3	3	0/1	-	-	-	0/15
	IS - S.M	-	0/3	1/4	0/1	0/1	0/1	1	0/2	0/4	-	0/1	1/18
NT - T 0/1 0/1 0/6 0/3 0/5 0/1 - 0/17	NT – T.	-	0/1	0/1	0/6	0/3	0/5	-	-	-	0/1	-	0/17
VN - R.A. 0/1 1/2 - 0/2 0/3 0/1 2 1/11	VN – R.A.	0/1	1/2	-	0/2	0/3	0/1	2	-	-	-	-	1/11
$0/4  2/10  1/7  1/14  0/18  0/15  0/12  0/5  0/6  0/1  0/1  4/93 \ (4.3\%)$		0/4	2/10	1/7	1/14	0/18	0/15	0/12	0/5	0/6	0/1	0/1	4/93 (4.3%)
South-eastern	South-eastern												
BZ - P,S,V - 0/2 0/4 0/3 0/6 0/6 0/2 0/2 0/25	BZ – P,S,V	-	0/2	0/4	0/3	0/6	0/6	0/2	0/2	-	-	-	0/25
IL - B,R. $1/2$ 0/1 1/3 0/2 0/7 0/7 0/5 0/1 0/2 2/30	IL – B,R.	1/2	0/1	1/3	0/2	0/7	0/7	0/5	0/1	0/2	-	-	2/30
<u>1/2</u> 0/3 1/7 0/5 0/13 0/13 0/7 0/3 0/2 2/55 (3.6%)		1/2	0/3	1/7	0/5	0/13	0/13	0/7	0/3	0/2	-	-	2/55 (3.6%)
Total 1/6 2/13 2/14 1/19 0/31 0/28 0/19 0/8 0/8 0/1 0/1 6/148 (4.1%)	Total	1/6	2/13	2/14	1/19	0/31	0/28	0/19	0/8	0/8	0/1	0/1	6/148 (4.1%)
Anoplocephalidae	Anoplocephalidae												
North-eastern 0/4 0/10 0/7 0/14 0/18 0/15 0/12 0/5 0/6 0/1 0/1 0/03 (0%)	North-eastern	0/4	0/10	0/7	0/14	0/18	0/15	0/12	0/5	0/6	0/1	0/1	0/93 (0%)
South-castern 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0,	South-eastern	U/ T	5/10	0/7	0/17	5/10	0/15	5/12	0/5	0/0	0/1	0/1	0,75 (070)
RZ = PSV = 0/2 0/4 2/3 2/6 2/6 0/2 2/2 = - 4/25	BZ – PSV	-	0/2	0/4	2/3	2/6	2/6	0/2	2/2	-	-	-	4/25
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	DL = 1.5.V. II = R P	0/2	0/1	0/3	0/2	0/7	0/7	0/5	0/1	0/2			0/30
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	IL - D.K.	0/2	0/3	0/7	1/5	2/13	1/13	0/7	0/3	0/2			4/55 (7.3%)
$\frac{1}{100} \frac{1}{100} \frac{1}$	Total	0/2	0/13	0/14	1/19	2/31	1/28	0/19	0/8	0/2	-	-	4/148 (2 7%)

	No. positive (%) / sampled by age											
Parasite species	foals	1 – 5	years	6 - 10	years	11-15 years		16 – 20 years		>20 years		Total (%)
	<1 year	М	F	М	F	М	F	М	F	М	F	
Strongyles	6/6	12/13	8/14	12/19	19/31	18/28	16/19	6/8	6/8	0/1	1/1	
	6/6	20/	/27	31/	/50	34/47		12/16		1/2		104/148
	(100%)	(74.	1%)	(62.	0%)	(72	.3%)	(75.	.0%)	(50.	0%)	(70.3%)
					P =	0.407						
Parascaris	5/6	2/13	0/14	2/19	2/31	1/28	1/19	4/8	0/8	0/1	1/1	
equorum	5/6	2/	27	4/50		2/47		4/16		1/2		18/148
-	(83.3%)	(7.4	4%)	(8.0%)		(4.3%)		(25.0%)		0%		12.2%
			P = 0.000									
Strongyloides	1/6	2/13	2/14	1/19	0/31	0/28	0/19	0/8	0/8	0/1	0/1	
westeri	1/6	4/	27	1/50		0/47		0/16		0/2		6/148
	(16.7)	(14.8%) (2%)				(0%) (0%)			(0%)		(4.05%)	
		P = 0.018										
Anoploce-	0/2	0/13	0/14	1/19	2/31	1/28	0/19	0/8	0/8	-	-	
phalidae	0/6	0/.	27	3/	50	1/47		0/16		0/2		4/148
-	(0%)	(0)	%)	(6.0	)%)	(2.	(2.1%) (0			(0%) (0%)		
					P =	0.721						

### Table 3. Summarized data on number of positive animals for intestinal parasites stratified by age groups

Table 4. Number of animals positive for strongyle EPG counts stratified by class of intensity

Leasting	Total	number	Total no. (%) with positive EPG counts							
Location	sampled	positive	< 250	250-1000	1000-2000	> 2000				
North-eastern										
SV- Vm.	15	9	6	2	1	0				
SV-V.	17	12	9	0	1	2				
IS - C.	15	15	10	2 1		2				
IS - S.	19	13	6	3	4	0				
NT - T.	17	11	10	0	0	1				
VN - R.A.	11	11	1	7	1	2				
South-eastern										
BZ-P,S,V	25	8	8	8 0		0				
IL – B,R.	30	25	11	10	3	1				
Total	148	104	61 (58.6%)	24 (23.1%)	11 (10.6%)	8 (7.7%)				

Table 5. Distribution	of working hors	es with positi	ve strongyle EPG cou	ints according to th	ie age groups
-----------------------	-----------------	----------------	----------------------	----------------------	---------------

FPC value	Number of animals positive for strongyle EPG counts grouped by age (%)											Total
EIG value	foals	1-5 years		6 – 10 years		11-15 years		16 - 20		>20 years		(%)
	<1year	М	F	М	F	М	F	М	F	М	F	
< 250	2	5	4	8	8	16	11	3	3	0	0	60 (57 7)
	33.3%	41.7%	44.4%	72.7%	42.1%	88.9%	68.8%	50%	50%	U	0	00 (37.7)
250 - 1000	3	4	1	1	7	1	3	1	3	0	1	25 (24 1)
	50%	33.3%	11.1%	9.1%	36.8%	5.6%	18.8%	16.7%	50%	0	100%	23 (24.1)
1000 - 2000	0	1	4	1	1	0	2	2	0	0	0	11 (10.5)
	0	8.3%	44.4%	9.1%	5.3%	0	12.5%	33.3%	U	0	0	11 (10.5)
> 2000	1	2	0	1	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	8 (77)
	16.7%	16.7%	0	9.1%	15.8%	5.6%	U	0	U	U	0	0(/./)
	6/6	12/13	9/14	11/19	19/31	18/28	16/19	6/8	6/8	0/1	1/1	104/148

A high intensity rate for strongyles was registered, with the EPG counts varying from 25 to 2775. Of them, 57.7% had the EPG count <250, 24.1% between 250-1000, while for 10.5% of the positive animals the EPG counts ranged between 1000–2000, and for 7.7% was bigger than 2000 (Table 4).

The average (%) of EPG-positive animals by age group was: <1year (5.8%), 1-5 (20.2%), 6–10 (28.8%), 11–15 (32.6%), and >16 years (12.5%). Proportion of strongyle EPG-positive animals, stratified by class of intensity and the age groups are presented in Table 5.

Analysis of distribution of working horses with positive strongyle EPG counts by classes of intensity (< 250, 250 - 1000, 1000 - 2000, and > 2000) was undertaken to help comprise the profile pattern. The mean EPG by year of age was lowest (<250) for males of the 6-10 (72.7%), 11–15 (88.9%), and 16 – 20 (50%) age group. The higher mean EPG values (>250) were registered in foals (66.7%). vearlings (57.1%), and females of the 6 - 10(57.9%), 16 - 20 (50%) age group, and over 20 years (100%). However, of the strongyle positive animals, seven (7.7%) passed high egg counts, over 2000 EPG; of them three were females (42.9%) of 6 - 10 years of age. The remainders were two yearlings, one foal, and one male of the 6 - 10 age group.

The results of the present survey clearly demonstrate that strongyle infections are highly prevalent in working horses in eastern and southern Romania. These findings are consistent with previous reports in Romania which indicate prevalence rates varying between 80.7%, 87.9%, and 100% (Cernea et al., 2003; Covasa and Miron, 2011; Ionita et al., 2013). A similar study in the UK, based on fecal worm egg count (FWECs) has recently reported a mean prevalence of strongyles, *P. equorum*, tapeworm spp. and *S. westeri* of 56, 9, 4 and 8%, respectively (Relf et al., 2012).

The overall highest prevalence of strongyles (up to 70.3% in our study) is not unexpected. All horses with access to pasture are exposed to strongyle infections. Strongyles are considered the most prevalent parasites in horses. particularly small strongyles (Cyathostominae) in well managed farms (Kaplan, 2004). Today, it is generally accepted that cyathostomins (small

strongyles) are the most common parasites in horses and the most prevalent cause of disease, ill-thrift and poor performance.

Animal age, last anthelmintic type administered and management practices (for example, group rotation on grazing) most strongly influence strongyle prevalence and level of egg shedding (Relf et al., 2012). Previous studies indicate that, within populations, a relatively small of proportion individual horses are responsible for excreting the majority of strongyle eggs and that there is an element of consistency in the excretion patterns. It is proposed that by identifying animals regarded as 'high egg shedders', this will enable farms and studs to implement more targeted treatment approaches to helminth control (Nielsen et al., 2006).

The acquisition of information on natural distribution patterns will help in establishing appropriate FWEC thresholds at which horses should be treated with an adulticidal anthelmintic (commonly quoted as 200 - 250 EPG (Uhlinger, 1993; Kaplan and Nielsen, 2010). Subsequently, the judicious application of targeted treatments has potential to control equine strongyle populations by protecting individual horses from high burdens, whilst promoting refugia for anthelmintic susceptible genotypes (Relf et al., 2012; Becher et al., 2010). In the current dataset, a cut-off value of 250 strongyle EPG would indicate that only 42.3% of the population sampled would have required treatment at the time of sampling.

## CONCLUSIONS

The results of the present study provide further evidence that the egg shedding levels are influenced by both the age of the horse and level of pasture hygiene. Moreover, these results confirm the value of strongyle EPG profiling for the working horses, as important base for further studies in designing and monitoring sustainable control program of equine parasites.

### REFERENCES

Becher A.M, Mahling M, Nielsen M.K, Pfister K., 2010. Selective anthelmintic therapy of horses in the Federal states of Bavaria (Germany) and Salzburg (Austria): an investigation into strongyle egg shedding consistency. Veterinary Parasitology, 171(1-2), 116-122.

- Cernea M., Cozma V., Cernea C, Gall A., 2003. The strongilidosis in horses from Mures district: epidemiology and diagnosis. Bulletin USAMV Cluj Napoca, 60, 196-201.
- Çirak V.Y., Güleğen E., Bauer C., 2005. The prevalence of strongyle infections and persistent efficacy of pyrantel embonate, ivermectin and moxidectin in Turkish horses. Turk J Vet Anim Sci 29, 175–181.
- Covasa C.T., Miron L.D., 2011. Prevalence study of digestive and the serous cavities endoparasitosis in horses from Iassy city area. Lucr. şt. UŞAMV Iaşi, Seria Medicină Veterinară, 54 (13), 302-306.
- Döpfer D., Kerssens C.M., Meijer Y.G., Boersema J.H., Eysker M., 2004. Shedding consistency of strongyle-type eggs in Dutch boarding horses. Vet Parasitol. 124(3-4), 249-258.
- Duncan J.L., Love S., 1991. Preliminary observations on an alternative strategy for the control of horse strongyles. Equine Veterinary Journal 23, 226–228.
- Eysker M., Bakker J., van den Berg M., van Doorn D. C.K., Ploeger H.W., 2008. The use of ageclustered pooled faecal samples for monitoring worm control in horses. Veterinary Parasitology 151, 249–255.
- Gasser R.B., Williamson R.M.C., Beveridge I., 2005. Anoplocephala perfoliata of horses - significant scope for further research improved diagnosis and control. Parasitology 131, 1–13.
- Gomez H.H., Georgi J.R., 1991. Equine helminth infections: control by selective chemotherapy. Equine Vet. J. 23, 198–200.
- Ionita M., Howe D.K., Lyons E.T., Tolliver S.C., Kaplan R.M., Mitrea I.L., Yeargan M., 2010. Use of a reverse line blot assay to survey small strongyle (Strongylida: Cyathostominae) popu-lations in horses before and after treatment with ivermectin. Veterinary Parasitology, 168(3-4):332-337.
- Ionita M., Buzatu M.C., Enachescu V., Mitrea I.L., 2013. Coprological prevalence and intensity of gastrointestinal parasites in horses in some Romanian studs: preliminary data. Agrolife Scientific Journal, 2(1), 207-212.
- Kaplan R.M., 2002. Anthelmintic resistance in nematodes of horses. Veterinary Research 33, 491–507.
- Kaplan R. M., 2004. Drug resistance in nematodes of veterinary importance: a status report. Trends in Parasitology 20, 477–481.
- Kaplan R.M., Nielsen M.K., 2010. An evidence-based approach to equine parasite control: It isn't the 60s anymore. Equine Veterinary Education, 22(6), 306-316.
- Krecek R.C., Malan F.S., Reinecke R.K., de Vos V., 1987. Nematode parasites from Burchell's zebras in South Africa. J. Wildl. Dis. 23, 404-411.
- Lichtenfels J.R., Gibbons L.M., Krecek R.C., 2002. Recommended terminology and advances in the systematics of the Cyathostominea (Nematoda: Strongyloidea) of horses. Vet. Parasitol. 107, 337–342.

- Lichtenfels J.R., Kharchenko V.A., Krecek R.C., Gibbons L.M., 1998. An annotated checklist by genus and species of 93 species level names for 51 recognised species of small strongyles (Nematoda: Strongyloidea: Cyathostominea) of horses, asses and zebras of the world. Vet. Parasitol. 79, 65–79.
- Lloyd S, Soulsby E.J., 1998. Is anthelmintic resistance inevitable: back to basics? Equine Vet J., 30(4), 280-288.
- Love S., Murphy D., Mellor D., 1999. Pathogenicity of cyathostome infection. Veterinary Parasitology, 85, 113–122
- Lyons E.T., Tolliver S.C., Kuzmina T.A., 2012. Investigation of strongyle EPG values in horse mares relative to known age, number positive, and level of egg shedding in field studies on 26 farms in Central Kentucky (2010-2011). Parasitol Res., 110(6), 2237-2245.
- Lyons E.T, Tolliver S.C., Drudge J.H., 1999. Historical perspective of cyathostomes: prevalence, treatment and control programs. Vet Parasitol 85, 97–112.
- Matthews J. B., 2008. An update on cyathostomins: Anthelmintic resistance and worm control. Equine Veterinary Education 20, 552–560.
- Mitrea I.L., 2011. Parazitologie si boli parazitare. Editura Ceres, Bucuresti.
- Nielsen M.K., Haaning N., Olsen S.N., 2006. Strongyle egg shedding consistency in horses on farms using selective therapy in Denmark. Veterinary Parasitology 135 (3-4), 333–335.
- Nielsen M.K., 2012. Sustainable equine parasite control: Perspectives and research needs. Vet. Parasitol. 185, 32-44.
- Osterman Lind E., Höglund J., Liungström B.L., Nilsson O., Uggla A., 1999. A field survey on the distribution of strongyle infections of horses in Sweden and factors affecting faecal egg counts. Equine Vet J 31, 68–72.
- Pomroy W.E., 2006. Anthelmintic resistance in New Zealand: a perspective on recent findings and options for the future. N.Z. Vet. J. 54, 265–270.
- Relf V.E., Morgan E.R., Hodgkinson J.E., Matthews J.B., 2013. Helminth egg excretion with regard to age, gender and management practices on UK Thoroughbred studs. Parasitology. 140(5), 641-652.
- Sangster N.C., 1999. Pharmacology of anthelmintic resistance in cyathostomes: will it occur with the avermectin/milbemycins? Veterinary Parasitology 85, 189–201.
- Uhlinger C.A., 1993. Uses of fecal egg count data in equine practice. Comp. Cont. Ed. Pract. Vet. 15 (5), 742–748.
- van Wyk, J. A., 2001. Refugia: overlooked as perhaps the most potent factor concerning the development of anthelmintic resistance. Onderstepoort Journal of Veterinary Research 68, 55–67.
- Wood E.L., Matthews J.B., Stephenson S., Slote M., Nussey D.H., 2013. Variation in fecal egg counts in horses managed for conservation purposes: individual egg shedding consistency, age effects and seasonal variation. Parasitology. 140(1), 115 - 128.