

AperTO - Archivio Istituzionale Open Access dell'Università di Torino

Advances in Microbiology, Infectious Diseases and Public Health: Fungal Occurrence in the Hair and Skin of Symptomatic Pets in Turin, Italy [*V.Allizond and V.Tullio contributed equally to this work; ** A.M.Cuffini is the corresponding author]

This is the author's manuscript

Original Citation:

Availability:

This version is available <http://hdl.handle.net/2318/1559866> since 2020-02-06T10:40:55Z

Publisher:

Springer International Publishing Swizerland 2015

Published version:

DOI:10.1007/5584_2015_5004

Terms of use:

Open Access

Anyone can freely access the full text of works made available as "Open Access". Works made available under a Creative Commons license can be used according to the terms and conditions of said license. Use of all other works requires consent of the right holder (author or publisher) if not exempted from copyright protection by the applicable law.

(Article begins on next page)


Metadata of the chapter that will be visualized online

Chapter Title	Advances in Microbiology, Infectious Diseases and Public Health: Fungal Occurrence in the Hair and Skin of Symptomatic Pets in Turin, Italy
Chapter Sub Title	Fungi in Pets
Copyright Year	2015
Copyright Holder	Springer International Publishing Switzerland
Author	Family Name Allizond Particle Given Name Valeria Suffix Division Department of Public Health and Pediatrics, Bacteriology and Mycology Laboratory Organization University of Torino Address Via Santena 9, 10126 Turin, Italy
Author	Family Name Tullio Particle Given Name Vivian Suffix Division Department of Public Health and Pediatrics, Bacteriology and Mycology Laboratory Organization University of Torino Address Via Santena 9, 10126 Turin, Italy
Corresponding Author	Family Name Cuffini Particle Given Name Anna Maria Suffix Division Department of Public Health and Pediatrics, Microbiology Section Organization University of Torino Address Via Santena 9, 10126 Turin, Italy Email annamaria.cuffini@unito.it
Author	Family Name Roana Particle Given Name Janira Suffix Division Department of Public Health and Pediatrics, Bacteriology and Mycology Laboratory Organization University of Torino Address Via Santena 9, 10126 Turin, Italy

Author	Family Name	Scalas
	Particle	
	Given Name	Daniela
	Suffix	
	Division	Department of Public Health and Pediatrics, Bacteriology and Mycology Laboratory
	Organization	University of Torino
	Address	Via Santena 9, 10126 Turin, Italy

Author	Family Name	Marra
	Particle	
	Given Name	Elisa Simona
	Suffix	
	Division	Department of Public Health and Pediatrics, Bacteriology and Mycology Laboratory
	Organization	University of Torino
	Address	Via Santena 9, 10126 Turin, Italy

Author	Family Name	Piersigilli
	Particle	
	Given Name	Giorgia
	Suffix	
	Division	Department of Public Health and Pediatrics, Bacteriology and Mycology Laboratory
	Organization	University of Torino
	Address	Via Santena 9, 10126 Turin, Italy

 Author	Family Name	Mandras
	Particle	
	Given Name	Narcisa
	Suffix	
	Division	Department of Public Health and Pediatrics, Bacteriology and Mycology Laboratory
	Organization	University of Torino
	Address	Via Santena 9, 10126 Turin, Italy

Author	Family Name	Banche
	Particle	
	Given Name	Giuliana
	Suffix	
	Division	Department of Public Health and Pediatrics, Bacteriology and Mycology Laboratory
	Organization	University of Torino

Address Via Santena 9, 10126 Turin, Italy

Abstract

Companion animals, often asymptomatic *reservoir* of fungi, can be important sources of infection in humans, due to the close contact with their owners. The present study was aimed to assess the occurrence of dermatophytes and other fungi isolated from pet dermatological lesions in Turin, Italy. Dermatological specimens were examined for fungal elements by direct microscopy and cultured to detect dermatophytes, other filamentous fungi and yeasts: 247 pets (118 cats, 111 dogs and 18 dwarf rabbits) were positive for fungal detection in culture. *Microsporum canis* was the most frequent dermatophyte in cats and dogs, whereas *Trichophyton mentagrophytes* was the most common in rabbits. Among the other fungi, for all examined pets, dematiaceous fungi were the most isolated, followed by *Mucorales*, penicilli, yeasts and yeast-like fungi, and aspergilli. No gender predisposition was detected for dermatophyte growth; on the contrary, for the other fungi male cats were more susceptible than female. The highest fungal occurrence was recorded in <1-year-old cats for dermatophytes, and in <5-year-old cats and dogs for the other fungi. Autumn was the period associated with a relevant incidence of fungal infection. Finally, fungi were more frequent in non pure-breed cats and in pure-breed dogs. These data underline the importance to timely inform pet owners about the potential health risk of infection caused not only by dermatophytes but also by non-dermatophyte fungi, routinely considered to be contaminants or harmless colonizers, since their role as source of zoonotic infections is not to be excluded.

Keywords (separated
by '-')

Dermatophytes - Non-dermatophyte fungi - Pets - Hair and skin lesions

4
5 **Advances in Microbiology, Infectious**
6 **Diseases and Public Health: Fungal**
7 **Occurrence in the Hair and Skin**
8 **of Symptomatic Pets in Turin, Italy**

9 **Valeria Allizond*, Vivian Tullio*, Anna Maria Cuffini,**
10 **Janira Roana, Daniela Scalas, Elisa Simona Marra,**
11 **Giorgia Piersigilli, Marcisa Mandras, and Giuliana Banche**

12 **Abstract**

13 Companion animals, often asymptomatic *reservoir* of fungi, can be
14 important sources of infection in humans, due to the close contact with
15 their owners. The present study was aimed to assess the occurrence of
16 dermatophytes and other fungi isolated from pet dermatological lesions
17 in Turin, Italy. Dermatological specimens were examined for fungal
18 elements by direct microscopy and cultured to detect dermatophytes,
19 other filamentous fungi and yeasts: 247 pets (118 cats, 111 dogs and
20 18 dwarf rabbits) were positive for fungal detection in culture.
21 *Microsporium canis* was the most frequent dermatophyte in cats and
22 dogs, whereas *Trichophyton mentagrophytes* was the most common in
23 rabbits. Among the other fungi, for all examined pets, dematiaceous
24 fungi were the most isolated, followed by *Mucorales*, penicilli, yeasts
25 and yeast-like fungi, and aspergilli. No gender predisposition was
26 detected for dermatophyte growth; on the contrary, for the other fungi
27 male cats were more susceptible than female. The highest fungal occur-
28 rence was recorded in <1-year-old cats for dermatophytes, and in <5-
29 year-old cats and dogs for the other fungi. Autumn was the period
30 associated with a relevant incidence of fungal infection. Finally, fungi
31 were more frequent in non pure-breed cats and in pure-breed dogs. These
32 data underline the importance to timely inform pet owners about the
33 potential health risk of infection caused not only by dermatophytes but

V. Allizond*, V. Tullio*, J. Roana, D. Scalas, E.S. Marra,
G. Piersigilli, N. Mandras, and G. Banche
Department of Public Health and Pediatrics, Bacteriology
and Mycology Laboratory, University of Torino, Via
Santena 9, 10126 Turin, Italy

A.M. Cuffini (✉)
Department of Public Health and Pediatrics,
Microbiology Section, University of Torino, Via Santena
9, 10126 Turin, Italy
e-mail: annamaria.cuffini@unito.it

34 also by non-dermatophyte fungi, routinely considered to be contaminants
 35 or harmless colonizers, since their role as source of zoonotic infections is
 36 not to be excluded.

Keywords

37 Dermatophytes • Non-dermatophyte fungi • Pets • Hair and skin lesions
 38

39 1 Introduction

40 Considering the close contact between pets and
 41 their owners, especially between children and
 42 cats and dogs, these animals, often asymptomatic
 43 carriers of dermatophytes, can be important
 44 sources of infection and/or carriers of infection
 45 (Mattei et al. 2014). In addition, evidence exists
 46 that rodents, such as rabbits, may be a risk of
 47 infection for their owners and for those who work
 48 closely with them (Torres-Rodríguez et al. 1992;
 49 Hata et al. 2000; Spiewak and Szostak 2000). It is
 50 widely known that animals are the *reservoir* of
 51 many dermatophytes belonging to the genera
 52 *Microsporium* spp. and *Trichophyton* spp., and
 53 that dermatophytoses are usually disseminated
 54 among domestic animals. *M. canis*, *M. gypseum*
 55 and *T. mentagrophytes* are the main etiological
 56 agents of clinical dermatophytosis in pets (Bond
 57 2010; Kraemer et al. 2012). The disease is
 58 characterized by alopecia, scaling and crusting;
 59 however, other filamentous fungi could mimic
 60 dermatophyte lesions rendering them indistin-
 61 guishable from that of dermatophytes. These
 62 non-dermatophytic fungi isolated from animal
 63 lesions could have pathogenic potential and/or
 64 keratinolytic activity. In fact many of these spe-
 65 cies, such as *Alternaria* spp., *Scopulariopsis* spp.,
 66 *Penicillium* spp., *Rhizopus* spp. and *Fusarium*
 67 spp., are reported to be involved in fungal disease
 68 development and are increasingly recognized as
 69 agent of diseases both in animals and humans
 70 (Aho 1983; Bagy and Abdel-Mallek 1991;
 71 Seyedmousavi et al. 2015). Therefore, the
 72 aim of this report was to determine the occur-
 73 rence, in Turin (Italy), of dermatophyte and
 74 non-dermatophyte fungi from living indoor cats,
 75 dogs and dwarf rabbits with lesions, referable to

mycoses, for health monitoring since they are out 76
 by an appropriate health check. 77

2 Animals and Methods 78

2.1 Animals 79

In the period between March 2007 and 80
 November 2014, clinical dermatological 81
 specimens from 362 indoor domestic animals 82
 (195 cats, 149 dogs and 18 dwarf rabbits) were 83
 collected at Veterinary Clinics located in Turin. 84
 Pets, with suspected dermatophytosis, presented 85
 dermatological clinical signs such as scales, fol- 86
 liculitis, crusts and alopecic areas with variable 87
 degrees of inflammation and itch. Specimens 88
 (hair, scaling, crusts and/or skin scraping) were 89
 taken from head, abdomen, back and legs using 90
 a sterile lancet or pliers. The samples were sub- 91
 mitted to the Bacteriology and Mycology Labo- 92
 ratory, Department of Public Health and 93
 Pediatrics, University of Torino, Turin, and 94
 processed. 95

2.2 Epidemiological Data 96 Collection 97

The age, sex, breed, habitat in which animals 98
 lived and the presence of clinical signs were 99
 recorded for each animal. To assess the seasonal 100
 pattern of fungal infections, the sampling period 101
 was divided into four groups: spring (March– 102
 May), summer (June–August), autumn 103
 (September–November) and winter 104
 (December–February). 105

106 **2.3 Fungal Isolation** 107 **and Identification**

108 Specimens were examined for fungal elements by
109 direct microscopy at 400× magnification after
110 imbibitions in 20 % KOH. Multiple *inocula*
111 (at least five) of the clinical specimens were
112 cultured on Mycosel agar (MYC; Merck,
113 Germany) to detect dermatophytes and Sabouraud
114 dextrose agar (SAB; Sigma, St. Louis, Mo) for
115 other filamentous fungi and yeasts. If the lesions
116 were treated with antimycotics or covered in pus
117 or other materials, they were first carefully
118 washed with soap and water. The plates were
119 incubated at 25 °C for at least 4 weeks and exam-
120 ined twice weekly. Cultures were held for at least
121 4 weeks before being considered negative. Each
122 developing colony was isolated in pure culture on
123 the following media: MYC (dermatophytes),
124 Czapek's dox agar (Merck; aspergilli and
125 penicillia), Potato dextrose agar (Merck; *Fusar-*
126 *ium* spp.), modified Dixon agar (Merck;
127 *Malassezia* spp.) and SAB (other filamentous
128 fungi, yeasts and yeast-like fungi). The filamen-
129 tous fungi, *Malassezia pachydermatis* and the
130 yeast-like fungi were identified according to
131 their colonial morphology and the microscopic
132 appearance of the fungal elements (Raper and
133 Fennell 1965; Rebell and Taplin 1979; Ellis
134 1993; Gueho et al. 1996; Guillot et al. 1996; de
135 Hoog et al. 2000; Pitt 2000), whereas the yeasts
136 were identified by API ID 32C (bioMérieux Italia
137 S.p.A.; Italy).

138 **2.4 Statistical Analysis**

139 The chi-square test was performed for the analy-
140 sis associations of the categorized variables: sex,
141 age, season and breed. A p value of <0.05 was
142 considered significant.

143 **3 Results**

144 This study included 362 symptomatic pets with
145 marked skin lesions, characterized by alopecic

146 areas, more or less itching, scabbed, disseminated 146
147 in several body regions (head, abdomen, back, 147
148 legs; data not shown), indistinguishable between 148
149 dermatophytic and non-dermatophytic ones. 149

150 Out of 362 domestic animals, 282 were posi- 150
151 tive for fungal elements at direct examination and 151
152 247 were positive for fungal detection in culture 152
153 (118 cats, 111 dogs and all 18 dwarf rabbits; 153
154 Table 1). 54.25 % of cat samples, 38.75 % of 154
155 dog samples and 27.78 % of rabbit samples 155
156 were positive for dermatophytes: *M. canis* was 156
157 the most frequent dermatophyte isolated from 157
158 cats and dogs, whereas *M. gypseum* and 158
159 *T. mentagrophytes* were isolated from 2 dogs 159
160 and 5 rabbits, respectively. 160

161 The remaining fungal cultures (54.66%; Table 1) 161
162 were positive for other filamentous fungi and yeasts. 162
163 In details: dematiaceous (*Alternaria alternata*, 163
164 *Epicoccum nigrum*, *Cladosporium cladosporioides*, 164
165 *C. sphaerospermum*, *C. herbarum*, *Aureobasidium*
166 *pullulans* and *Nigrospora* spp.) for 34.44 %; hyaline 166
167 mycetes, represented by penicilli (*Penicillium*
168 *brevi-compactum*, *P. griseofulvum*, *P. waksmanii*), 168
169 aspergilli (*Aspergillus niger*, *A. versicolor* and 169
170 *A. fumigatus*), *Trichoderma harzianum*, *T. viride*
171 and *Fusarium* spp. for 10.11 %; *Mucorales*,
172 represented by *Rhizopus oryzae* and *Mucor*
173 *hiemalis*, for 6.07 %; yeasts and yeast-like fungi,
174 represented by *Candida* spp., *M. pachydermatis* and
175 *Geotrichum candidum*, for 4.04 %.

176 In all positive animals, males were more than 176
177 females (Table 2); however no gender predispo- 177
178 sition was detected for dermatophyte growth; on 178
179 the contrary, male cats were significantly 179
180 ($p = 0.0224$) more susceptible than female for 180
181 other fungi. It can be highlighted the highest 181
182 dermatophyte occurrence in <1 -year-old cats 182
183 ($p < 0.0001$) and the presence of other fungi in 183
184 <5 -year-old positive cats ($p < 0.0001$) and dogs 184
185 ($p = 0.0276$; Table 2). All positive rabbits were 185
186 less than 1-year-old. Positive samples for 186
187 dermatophytes and other fungi were recorded in 187
188 autumn (September–November) for all compan- 188
189 ion animals: a significant seasonal difference was 189
190 detected for dogs ($p = 0.0168$; Table 2). Finally, 190
191 fungi were more frequent in pure-breed dogs and 191
192 in non pure-breed cats (Table 2), without statisti- 192
193 cal significant differences. 193

t.1 **Table 1** Isolation and occurrence of fungal species (%)

t.2	Cats		Dogs		Rabbits		Total		
t.3	118/195 ^a		111/149		18/18		247/362		
t.4	(60.51 %)		(74.50 %)		(100 %)		(68.23 %)		
t.5	Positive animals examined								
t.6	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	
t.7	Dermatophytes								
t.8	<i>Microsporium canis</i>	64	54.25	41	36.95	–	–	105	42.51
t.9	<i>M. gypsum</i>	–	–	2	1.80	–	–	2	0.81
t.10	<i>Trichophyton mentagrophytes</i>	–	–	–	–	5	27.78	5	2.02
t.11	Total	64	54.25	43	38.75	5	27.78	112	45.34
t.12	Dematiaceous mycetes								
t.13	<i>Alternaria alternata</i>	16	13.56	18	16.22	–	–	34	13.78
t.14	<i>Epicoccum nigrum</i>	11	9.32	14	12.61	–	–	25	10.12
t.15	<i>Cladosporium cladosporioides</i>	5	4.24	7	6.31	–	–	12	4.87
t.16	<i>C. sphaerospermum</i>	2	1.69	2	1.80	–	–	4	1.62
t.17	<i>C. herbarum</i>	–	–	2	1.80	–	–	2	0.81
t.18	<i>Aureobasidium pullulans</i>	–	–	2	1.80	4	22.22	6	2.43
t.19	<i>Nigrospora</i> spp.	2	1.69	–	–	–	–	2	0.81
t.20	Total	36	30.50	45	40.54	4	22.22	85	34.44
t.21	Hyaline mycetes								
t.22	<i>Penicillium brevi-compactum</i>	5	4.24	2	1.80	4	22.22	11	4.46
t.23	<i>P. griseofulvum</i>	1	0.85	–	–	–	–	1	0.40
t.24	<i>P. waksmanii</i>	–	–	2	1.80	–	–	2	0.81
t.25	<i>Aspergillus niger</i>	2	1.69	–	–	–	–	2	0.81
t.26	<i>A. versicolor</i>	–	–	1	0.90	–	–	1	0.40
t.27	<i>A. fumigatus</i>	–	–	4	3.61	–	–	4	1.62
t.28	<i>Trichoderma harzianum</i>	1	0.85	–	–	–	–	1	0.40
t.29	<i>T. viride</i>	1	0.85	–	–	–	–	1	0.40
t.30	<i>Fusarium</i> spp.	–	–	2	1.80	–	–	2	0.81
t.31	Total	10	8.48	11	9.91	4	22.22	25	10.11
t.32	Zygomycetes								
t.33	<i>Rhizopus oryzae</i>	3	2.54	5	4.50	5	27.78	13	5.26
t.34	<i>Mucor hiemalis</i>	2	1.69	–	–	–	–	2	0.81
t.35	Total	5	4.23	5	4.50	5	27.78	15	6.07
t.36	Yeasts and yeast-like fungi								
t.37	<i>Candida tropicalis</i>	1	0.85	–	–	–	–	1	0.40
t.38	<i>C. albicans</i>	–	–	2	1.80	–	–	2	0.81
t.39	<i>Malassezia pachydermatis</i>	2	1.69	3	2.70	–	–	5	2.02
t.40	<i>Geotrichum candidum</i>	–	–	2	1.80	–	–	2	0.81
t.41	Total	3	2.54	7	6.30	–	–	10	4.04

t.42 ^aPositive/total; n = number of cases of isolation; % = percentage frequency of occurrence (calculated per number of positive animals sampled)

194 **4 Discussion**

195 Over the past two decades, studies of
 196 dermatophytoses from domestic or wild animals
 197 have been described worldwide (Brilhante

et al. 2003; Khosravi and Mahmoudi 2003; 198
 Cafarchia et al. 2004; Bond 2010; Kraemer 199
 et al. 2012). In some countries, such as Italy 200
 and France, *M. canis* is the most common etio- 201
 logical agent, whereas in Spain it varies in rela- 202
 tion to the geographical area (Torres-Rodríguez 203

Table 2 Prevalence of dermatophytes and other fungi in cats, dogs and rabbits in relation to epidemiological variables^a

	Cats			Dogs			Rabbits			
	Dermatophytes	Other fungi		Dermatophytes	Other fungi		Dermatophytes	Other fungi		
	Positivity/n	%	Positivity/n	%	Positivity/n	%	Positivity/n	%	Positivity/n	
Sex										
Male	34/121	28.10	39/121	32.23	24/85	28.23	39/85	45.88	13/13	100
Female	30/74	40.54	15/74	20.27	19/64	29.69	29/64	45.31	5/5	100
	p = 0.0224			p = 0.7867			p < 0.0001			
Age										
< 1 year	41/96	42.71	17/96	17.71	22/62	35.48	24/62	38.71	5/18	27.78
1–5 years	16/81	19.75	33/81	40.74	9/45	20.0	25/45	55.55	–	–
> 5 years	7/18	38.89	4/18	22.22	12/42	28.57	19/42	45.24	–	–
	p < 0.0001			p = 0.0276			N.A.			
Seasons										
Spring	14/38	36.84	9/38	23.68	4/21	19.04	12/21	57.14	–	4/4
Summer	4/15	26.67	5/15	33.33	7/23	30.43	10/23	43.48	–	–
Autumn	32/101	31.68	29/101	28.71	22/78	28.21	36/78	46.15	5/5	100
Winter	14/41	34.15	11/41	26.83	10/27	37.04	10/27	37.04	–	9/9
	p = 0.3695			p = 0.0168			N.A.			
Breed										
Cross-breed	–	–	–	–	15/39	38.46	14/39	35.90	–	–
Pure-breed	23/59	38.98	13/59	22.03	28/110	25.45	54/110	49.09	5/18	27.78
Other breed	41/136	30.15	41/136	30.15	–	–	–	–	–	–
	p = 0.1216			p = 0.1216			N.A.			

^aThe chi-square test was used for the analysis associations of the categorized variables: sex, age, season and breed
A *p* value of <0.05 was considered significant

204 et al. 1992). In our study (Table 1) *M. canis* was
205 the most frequent dermatophyte isolated in cats
206 and dogs, confirming previous reports in Turin
207 and in other sites in Italy, indicating that this
208 fungus did not vary over the years (Marchisio
209 et al. 1995; Mantovani 1978; Chermette
210 et al. 2008; Bond 2010); *M. gypseum* and
211 *T. mentagrophytes* were isolated from dogs and
212 rabbits, respectively, underlying that these
213 dermatophytes affect other pets (Chermette
214 et al. 2008; Bond 2010). Additionally, our data
215 report 5 *M. canis* isolated from asymptomatic
216 cats (data not shown) whose owners manifested
217 skin mycoses, indicating that cats are at present
218 recognized as major sources of infection for their
219 owners, confirming literature data (Cafarchia
220 et al. 2006). As reported by Bond (2010), asymp-
221 tomatic carriers cats are especially risky for
222 humans, because no precautions are taken to
223 prevent potential transfer; however, such cats
224 may progress to develop overt infection and
225 more abundant arthroconidia shedding. Infected
226 cats have been shown to cause substantial envi-
227 ronmental contamination and a significant air-
228 borne load of viable fungal elements, whereas
229 dogs are of lesser importance in this regard.

230 Other filamentous fungi are common in the
231 environment and their conidia are transported by
232 air currents and settled on pet fur. Among these
233 moulds, dematiaceous fungi and *Fusarium* spp.,
234 isolated in this study (Table 1), are nowadays
235 well recognized as etiological agents of mycosis
236 in animals and humans too (Bagy and Abdel-
237 Mallek 1991; Noble et al. 1997; Huttova
238 et al. 1998; Kluger et al. 2004; Walsh
239 et al. 2004; Sanchez and Larsen 2007; Fan
240 et al. 2009; Ryoo et al. 2009). For example, a
241 case of *Alternaria* peritonitis after contact with a
242 cat and the involvement in pet skin infections of
243 *Fusarium* spp., a well-recognized cause of
244 human diseases, were reported (Kluger
245 et al. 2004; Ryoo et al. 2009). In this study
246 *Alternaria*, *Epicoccum*, *Cladosporium* and
247 *Fusarium* isolates probably played a role in the
248 pathogenicity: they were no sporadic and many
249 colonies were seen on the plates in each case.

250 Furthermore, we isolated some saprophytic
251 fungi, commonly found in air and soil, such as

Mucorales besides penicillin and aspergilli 252
(Table 1). Albeit the recovery of these fungi 253
was consistent with the findings of other authors 254
(Bagy and Abdel-Mallek 1991; Keller 255
et al. 2000; Efuntoye and Fashanu 2002; 256
Ledbetter et al. 2007), further studies are 257
required to verify and confirm their pathogenesis 258
in companion animals. 259

Trichoderma spp., a saprophytic fungus com- 260
monly found in soil, isolated only from a cat in 261
our study, has been reported among emerging 262
fungal pathogens for both animals and humans 263
(Table 1) (Kluger et al. 2004; Kantarcioğlu 264
et al. 2009). 265

From a veterinary point of view, our findings 266
related to the yeast *M. pachydermatis* from cat 267
and dog skin lesions may have a great signifi- 268
cance (Table 1). It can be found in very large 269
proportion on the skin of healthy animals and it is 270
the only lipid-independent species in the genus 271
Malassezia; however since the early 1990s 272
M. pachydermatis was isolated from lesions of 273
atopic dermatitis, flea allergic dermatitis, otitis 274
externa, pyoderma and seborrheic dermatitidis in 275
dogs and cats (Aizawa et al. 2001; Dorogi 2002; 276
Khosravi et al. 2010). Although 277
M. pachydermatis is not normally isolated from 278
human skin, there have been several reports of 279
M. pachydermatis-associated fungaemia in 280
infants in neonatal intensive care unit and in 281
adults with serious internal diseases (Bond 282
et al. 2010; ESCCAP Guideline 2011). 283

Literature data on sex, age, seasonality and 284
breed are still controversial (Khosravi and 285
Mahmoudi 2003; Cafarchia et al. 2004; Cabanes 286
et al. 1997). With regard to the sex, from our 287
results, in both cats and dogs no significant dif- 288
ference between the sexes for dermatophyte 289
growth has been detected. Among cats, males 290
were significantly more susceptible than females 291
to other fungi occurrence (Table 2); this may be 292
accounted for a different composition of sebum 293
between males and females, as suggested by 294
Cafarchia et al. (2004). For age, our data show 295
that young animals are more susceptible to fun- 296
gal infections (Table 2). Adult animals tend to be 297
more resistant to infections than young animals 298
in relation to their changes in the skin and 299

300 secretions (quantity and nature of sebaceous
 301 lipids in the epidermis), hair replacement cycle,
 302 and development of an immune response to
 303 keratinophylic moulds (Bond 2010; Cafarchia
 304 et al. 2004; Rotstein et al. 1999; Khosravi and
 305 Mahmoudi 2003). Although the risk of dermato-
 306 phyte infection is greater for puppies, kittens and
 307 aged or debilitated animals, the infection is not
 308 strictly age or health status-related, and so the
 309 risk continues throughout life. Consideration
 310 should be given to provide all dogs and cats
 311 with appropriate dermatophyte control through-
 312 out their lives (ESCCAP Guideline 2011). From
 313 our study autumn was the period with the highest
 314 risk for fungal infection (Table 2), according to
 315 Mancianti et al. (2002) and Iorio et al. (2007).
 316 The prevalence of non-dermatophyte and derma-
 317 tophyte filamentous fungi varies according to the
 318 climate, temperature, relative humidity and rain-
 319 fall of different geographical regions or natural
 320 reservoir (Brilhante et al. 2003; Cabanes
 321 et al. 1997; Mancianti et al. 2002; Iorio
 322 et al. 2007). Moreover, the life style such as the
 323 tendency to live in the outdoor environment in
 324 contact with soil, in groups, in isolation or in
 325 proximity to humans; the hygiene; the
 326 differences in non-specific cutaneous defenses
 327 are the general conditions related to the higher
 328 prevalence of fungal infections (de Hoog
 329 et al. 2000; Brilhante et al. 2003; Cafarchia
 330 et al. 2006). In our study in both cats and dogs
 331 there was difference in fungal isolation related to
 332 breed since fungi were more frequent in non
 333 pure-breed cats and in pure-breed dogs
 334 ($p < 0.05$; Table 2). Actually, breed is not
 335 proved to be a predisposing factor for infection
 336 (Cafarchia et al. 2006; Mancianti et al. 2002).
 337 “The disease is not clear, unless we seek it”:
 338 contact with animals or contaminated
 339 environments represents the major risk of infec-
 340 tion for humans and people in contact with
 341 infected animals should be advised of the risk.
 342 In fact, nowadays, lack of connection between
 343 the monitoring of diseases in animals and
 344 humans is still great. The best way to bypass
 345 infection is to prevent the contact: this prophyl-
 346 actic strategy is very simple but not always
 347 feasible because infected animals do not show

obvious clinical signs. When lesions are evident, 348
 the dermatophyte clinical lesion appearance is 349
 often indistinguishable from that caused by 350
 other fungi, suggesting the need for greater and 351
 accurate control, monitoring and identification of 352
 these last species to avoid the overestimated 353
 clinical diagnosis of dermatophytoses and to 354
 address the appropriate therapy. The role of 355
 animals as source of zoonoses in dermatophyte 356
 is widely accepted; on the contrary further 357
 investigations to evaluate the considerable zoo- 358
 notic and zoopathogenic potential of other fungi, 359
 routinely considered to be contaminants or harm- 360
 less colonizers, are necessary. A better under- 361
 standing of diseases in pets could have direct 362
 relevance for the prevention and the fight against 363
 infectious diseases of humans. 364

Acknowledgments The authors are indebted to 365
 Dr. Gianmario Baralis and Dr. Rosanna Barbero (Veteri- 366
 nary Clinics) for providing pet samples. 367





References 368

- Aho R (1983) Saprophytic fungi isolated from the hair of 369
 domestic and laboratory animals with suspected 370
 dermatophytosis. *Mycopathologia* 83:65–73 371
- Aizawa T, Kano R, Nakamura Y et al (2001) The genetic 372
 diversity of clinical isolates of *Malassezia* 373
pachydermatis from dogs and cats. *Med Mycol* 374
 39:329–334 375
- Bagy MM, Abdel-Mallek AY (1991) Saprophytic and 376
 keratinolytic fungi associated with animals hair from 377
 Riyadh, Saudi Arabia. *Zentralbl Mikrobiol* 378
 146:305–310 379
- Bond R (2010) Superficial veterinary mycoses. *Clin* 380
Dermatol 28:226–236 381
- Bond R, Guillot J, Cabanes J et al (2010) *Malassezia* 382
 yeasts in animal diseases. In: Boekhout T, Guého- 383
 Kellermann E, Maysner P, Velegraki A (eds) 384
Malassezia and the skin. Springer, Berlin, pp 271–299 385
- Brilhante RS, Cavalcante CS, Soares-Junior FA 386
 et al (2003) High rate of *Microsporum canis* feline 387
 and canine dermatophytoses in Northeast Brazil: epi- 388
 demiological and diagnostic features. *Mycopathologia* 389
 156:303–308 390
- Cabanes FJ, Abarca ML, Bragulat MR (1997) 391
 Dermatophytes isolated from domestic animals in 392
 Barcelona, Spain. *Mycopathologia* 137:107–113 393
- Cafarchia C, Romito D, Sasanelli M et al (2004) The 394
 epidemiology of canine and feline dermatophytoses 395
 in southern Italy. *Mycoses* 47:508–513 396

- 397 Cafarchia C, Romito D, Capelli G et al (2006) Isolation of
398 *Microsporum canis* from the hair coat of pet dogs and
399 cats belonging to owners diagnosed with *M. canis*
400 tinea corporis. *Vet Dermatol* 17:327–331
- 401 Chermette R, Ferreira L, Guillot J (2008)
402 Dermatophytoses in animals. *Mycopathologia*
403 166:385–405
- 404 de Hoog GS, Gene J, Figueras MJ et al (2000) Atlas of
405 clinical fungi, 2nd edn. Centraalbureau voor
406 Schimmelcultures, Utrecht
- 407 Dorogi J (2002) Pathological and clinical aspects of the
408 diseases caused by *Malassezia* species. *Acta*
409 *Microbiol Immunol Hung* 29:363–369
- 410 Efuntoye MO, Fashanu SO (2002) Fungi isolated from
411 skins and pens of healthy animals in Nigeria.
412 *Mycopathologia* 153:21–23
- 413 Ellis MB (1993) Dematiaceous hyphomycetes. Interna-
414 tional Mycological Institute, Wallingford
- 415 European Scientific Counsel Companion Animal
416 Parasites (ESCCAP) (2011) The Mews Studio,
417 Portland Road Malvern, Worcestershire, United King-
418 dom. WR14 2TA. First Published by ESCCAP 2011
- 419 Fan YM, Huang WM et al (2009) Onychomycosis caused
420 by *Nigrospora sphaerica* in an immunocompetent
421 man. *Arch Dermatol* 145:611–612
- 422 Gueho E, Midgley G et al (1996) The genus *Malassezia*
423 with description of 4 new species. *Antonie Van*
424 *Leeuwenhoek* 69:337–355
- 425 Guillot J, Gueho E et al (1996) Identification of
426 *Malassezia* species. A practical approach. *J Mycol*
427 *Med* 6:103–110
- 428 Hata Y, Amagai M, Naka W et al (2000) Two cases of
429 *Trichophyton mentagrophytes* infection contracted
430 from a hamster and a chinchilla. *Nippon Ishinkin*
431 *Gakkai Zasshi* 41:269–273
- 432 Huttova M, Kralinsky K, Horn J et al (1998) Prospective
433 study of nosocomial fungal meningitis in children-
434 report of 10 cases. *Scand J Infect Dis* 30:485–487
- 435 Iorio R, Cafarchia C, Capelli G et al (2007)
436 Dermatophytoses in cats and humans in central Italy:
437 epidemiological aspects. *Mycoses* 50:491–495
- 438 Kantarcioğlu AS, Celkan T, Yücel A et al (2009) Fatal
439 *Trichoderma harzianum* infection in a leukemic pedi-
440 atric patient. *Med Mycol* 47:207–215
- 441 Keller M, Krehon S, Stanek C et al (2000) Keratino-
442 pathogenic mould fungi and dermatophytes in healthy
443 and diseased hooves of horses. *Vet Rec* 147:619–922
- 444 Khosravi AR, Mahmoudi M (2003) Dermatophytes
445 isolated from domestic animals in Iran. *Mycoses*
446 46:222–225
- 447 Khosravi AR, Shokri H, Rad MA et al (2010) Occurrence
448 of *Malassezia* species in Persian and domestic short
449 hair cats with and without otitis externa. *J Vet Med Sci*
450 72:293–296
- 451 Kluger EK, Della Torre PK, Martin P et al (2004) Con-
452 current *Fusarium chlamydosporum* and
Microsphaeropsis arundinis infections in a cat. *J*
453 *Feline Med Surg* 6:271–277 454
- Kraemer A, Mueller RS, Werckenthin C (2012) 455
Dermatophytes in pet Guinea pigs and rabbits. *Vet*
456 *Microbiol* 157:208–213 457
- Ledbetter EC, Patten VH, Scarlett JM et al (2007) *In vitro* 458 AU4
susceptibility patterns of fungi associated with
459 keratomycosis in horses of the northeastern United
460 States: 68 cases (1987–2006). *J Am Vet Med Assoc*
461 231:1086–1091 462
- Mancianti F, Nardoni S, Cecchi S et al (2002) 463
Dermatophytes isolated from symptomatic dogs and
464 cats in Tuscany, Italy during a 15-year-period.
465 *Mycopathologia* 156:13–18 466
- Mantovani A (1978) The role of animals in the epidemi-
467 ology of the mycoses. *Mycopathologia* 65:61–66 468
- Marchisio VF, Gallo MG, Tullio V et al (1995) 469
Dermatophytes from cases of skin disease in cats and
470 dogs in Turin, Italy. *Mycoses* 38:239–244 471
- Mattei AS, Beber MA, Madrid IM (2014) 472
Dermatophytosis in small animals. *SOJ Microbiol*
473 *Infect Dis* 2:1–6 474
- Noble JA, Crow SA, Ahearn DG et al (1997) Allergic 475
fungal sinusitis in the southeastern USA: involvement
476 of a new agent *Epicoccum nigrum* Ehrenb. ex
477 Schlecht. 1824. *J Med Vet Mycol* 35:405–409 478
- Pitt JI (2000) A laboratory guide to common *Penicillium* 479
species, 3rd edn. Food Science Australia CSIRO,
480 North Ryde 481
- Raper KB, Fennell DI (1965) The genus *Aspergillus*. The 482
Williams & Wilkins Company, Baltimore 483
- Rebell G, Taplin D (1979) Dermatophytes. Their recogni- 484
tion and identification. University of Miami Press,
485 Coral Gables 486
- Rotstein DS, Thomas R, Helmick K et al (1999) Derma- 487
tophyte infections in free-ranging Florida panthers
488 (*Felis concolor coryi*). *J Zoo Wildl Med* 30:281–284 489
- Ryoo NH, Ha JS, Jeon DS et al (2009) *Alternaria* perito- 490
nitis after contact with a cat. *Perit Dial Int* 29:235–236 491
- Sanchez A, Larsen R (2007) Emerging fungal pathogens 492
in pulmonary disease. *Curr Opin Pulm Med*
493 13:199–204 494
- Seyedmousavi S, Guillot J, Tolooe-Zarrin A, et al (2015) 495
Neglected fungal zoonoses: hidden threats to man and
496 animals. *Clin Microbiol Infect*. doi:10.1016/j.cmi.
497 2015.02.031. Review 498
- Spiewak R, Szostak W (2000) Zoophilic and geophilic 499
dermatophytoses among farmers and non-farmers in
500 Eastern Poland. *Ann Agric Environ Med* 7:125–129 501
- Torres-Rodríguez JM, Dronca MA, Rossell J et al (1992) 502
Incidence of dermatophytoses in rabbit farms in
503 Catalonia, Spain, and its repercussion on human
504 health. *Eur J Epidemiol* 8:326–329 505
- Walsh TJ, Groll A, Hiemenz J (2004) Infections due to 506
emerging and uncommon medically important fungal
507 pathogens. *Clin Microbiol Infect* 10:48–66 508

Author Queries

Chapter No.: 5004 0002617590

Queries	Details Required	Author's response
AU1	Please check the chapter title.	
AU2	Please confirm if contributors of this chapter is okay.	
AU3	The citation Bond et al. (2010a) has been changed to Bond (2010) in here and all other occurrences. Please check.	
AU4	Please check the inserted volume number for Ref. [28].	

Uncorrected Proof