

**Rumen ciliates in the African (Cape) buffalo (*Syncerus caffer caffer*) living in the vicinity of the Orpen Gate entrance into Kruger National Park, South Africa**

DIRK G. BOOYSE<sup>1</sup>, BURK A. DEHORITY<sup>2\*</sup> and BJÖRN REININGHAUS<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Department of Anatomy and Physiology, University of Pretoria, Private Bag X04, Onderstepoort 0110, South Africa. E-mail:dirk.booyse@up.ac.za

<sup>2</sup> Department of Animal Sciences, Ohio Agricultural Research and Development Center, The Ohio State University, Wooster, OH 44691 U.S.A. E-mail:dehority.1@osu.edu

<sup>3</sup> State Veterinarian Office, Orpen road 1350, Orpen, South Africa. E-mail:svorpen@gmail.com

\*Corresponding author

**Abstract**

Samples of rumen contents were obtained from 10 African (Cape) buffalo living in the vicinity of the Orpen Gate entrance into Kruger National Park in South Africa. Total number of ciliate protozoa per animal ranged from 3.15 to 23.25 x 10<sup>3</sup>. Forty three different species and forms were observed, of which 35 are a new host record. The total number of species and forms per animal varied from 10 to 17. *Eudiplodinium maggii* occurred in all 10 animals, followed by *Dasytricha ruminantium* in 9 animals. *Diplodinium posterovesiculatum*, *Ediplodinium magnodentatum* and *Ostracodinium mammosum* were present in 7 animals with all other species and forms occurring in 5 or less animals.

**Key words:** African buffalo, ciliate protozoa, rumen, South Africa, *Syncerus caffer*

## **Introduction**

The African buffalo (*Syncerus caffer*) is not closely related to the Asian water buffalo or any of the other larger bovines. There are five subspecies, with *Syncerus caffer caffer* being the typical subspecies which is found primarily in South and East Africa. It is the largest of the subspecies, black in color and commonly called the Cape buffalo. The animals sampled in this study would belong to this subspecies. The other four subspecies are smaller in size and are found in Central and West Africa or the mountains of East Africa. Other than the report by Dogiel in 1932, on rumen protozoa from a single African buffalo in Uganda, no information was found on the fauna of this species. Based on location, it is presumed his animal was of the same subspecies. He reported a total of 21 species of ciliate protozoa.

## **Material and Methods**

The samples were collected in a radius of 50 km from the Hans Hoheisen Wildlife Research Station (24°28'55.60"S, 31°23'09.40"E) next to the Orpen Gate of the Kruger National Park in South Africa during August till October of the year 2012.

For each animal, handfuls of rumen contents were taken randomly and the fluid squeezed out by making a fist with the thumb down so the fluid can run down into the container. This was repeated until a 200 ml sample was obtained. One hundred ml of Formalin was added to each sample for preservation.

In the laboratory, a 10ml subsample of the 300 ml protozoa sample was collected by using a pipette to stir the total sample and collecting 1ml at a time until 10 ml was acquired. Two drops of Brilliant Green Stain were added to this 10 ml sample and left overnight. Using a finnpipet, a 0.025 ml of the 10 ml stained sample was dropped on a microscope glass slide, then fitted with a cover slip and examined under a standard microscope for identification and counts of protozoa. However, protozoa concentrations at this dilution were too high for an accurate count. Thus, 4 ml of the 10 ml subsample was diluted to 10 ml with water and a 0.25 ml of this dilution counted as described above. Protozoa per ml of rumen fluid was calculated by multiplying the results of the counts by 150 ( $40 \times 2.5 \times 1.5$ ).

## Results

Concentration and generic distribution of protozoa in the 10 African (Cape) buffalo are shown in Table 1. Total concentration of protozoa ranged from 3.15 to  $23.25 \times 10^3$ , with a mean value of  $8.79 \pm 5.44 \times 10^3$ . In general, the overall highest percentages of protozoa were in the genus *Eudiplodinium* ( $34.4 \pm 9.3\%$ ), followed closely by *Dasytricha* ( $28.7 \pm 16.1\%$ ). Animals 4 and 8 were the exception: *Eudiplodinium*, 30.9 and 12 % and *Dasytricha*, 54.8 and 54.0 %, respectively. *Diplodinium* were present in 9 animals ( $13.1 \pm 8.2\%$ ) followed by *Ostracodinium*, ( $10.3 \pm 7.0\%$ ), present in all 10 animals. Of particular interest is the low overall percentage of *Entodinium*,  $8.1 \pm 10.3\%$ . Two animals, 5 and 8, were devoid of *Entodinium* and only one animal, 6, exceeded 13.7 %. *Metadinium*, *Enoploplastron* and *Epidinium* occurred sporadically in low percentages ( $1.4 \pm 2.4\%$ ,  $0.4 \pm 1.4\%$  and  $3.4 \pm 5.0\%$ , respectively).

A total of 43 different species and forms of protozoa were observed in the 10 buffalo, Table 2. The number of species and forms observed in individual animals varied between 10 and 17 with a mean of  $12 \pm 2.4$ . *Eudiplodinium maggi* was present in all 10 buffalo, and comprised

**Table 1.** Concentration and generic distribution of protozoa in rumen contents of 10 African (Cape) buffalo

	Buffalo number										Overall mean
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	
Total protozoa per ml ( $\times 10^3$ )	4.20	9.45	10.95	23.25	4.65	3.15	7.50	7.50	10.65	6.60	8.79 $\pm$ 5.44
Generic distribution (%)											
<i>Entodinium</i>	10.8	7.9	13.7	0.6	0	33.4	4	0	4.2	6.8	8.1 $\pm$ 10.3
<i>Diplodinium</i>	25	17.5	15	8.9	25.6	4.8	14	10	9.8	0	13.1 $\pm$ 8.2
<i>Eudiplodinium</i>	39.1	35	34.2	30.9	38.6	42.9	28	12	42.3	40.9	34.4 $\pm$ 9.3
<i>Ostracodinium</i>	3.6	6.4	6.8	3.1	6.4	14.3	16	22	19.6	4.6	10.3 $\pm$ 7.0
<i>Metadinium</i>	0	3.2	0	0	6.4	4.8	0	0	0	0	1.4 $\pm$ 2.4
<i>Enoploplastron</i>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4.5	0.4 $\pm$ 1.4
<i>Epidinium</i>	0	0	2.7	1.2	0	0	14	2	2.8	11.4	3.4 $\pm$ 5.0
<i>Dasytricha</i>	21.4	30.2	27.4	54.8	22.6	0	24	54	21.1	31.8	28.7 $\pm$ 16.1

**Table 2.** Percentage species distribution of protozoa in the rumen contents of ten African (Cape) buffalos.

Family Subfamily Genus Species Form	Dogiel (1932)	Animal number										Occurrence
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	
		% of total protozoa										
<b>OPHRYOSCOLECIDAE</b>												
Entodiniinae												
<i>Entodinium</i>												
<i>bicarınatum</i> (da Cunha, 1914)	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<i>biconcavum</i> (K & M <sup>a</sup> , 1930)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1.4	2.3	2/10
<i>bimastus</i> (Dogiel, 192)	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<i>birostratum</i> (Wertheim, 1935)	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<i>bovis</i> (Wertheim, 1935)	-	-	-	-	-	-	4.8	-	-	-	-	1/10
<i>bursa</i> (Stein, 1858)	-	-	-	-	-	-	4.8	-	-	-	-	1/10
<i>ciculum</i> (Dehority, 1979)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	4.5	1/10
<i>dubardi</i> (Buisson, 1923)	-	3.6	7.9	-	-	-	9.5	-	-	-	-	3/10
<i>furca</i> (da Cunha, 1914)	+	-	-	12.3	-	-	4.8	-	-	1.4	-	3/10
<i>indicum</i> (K & M <sup>a</sup> , 1930)	-	-	-	-	-	-	9.5	4.0	-	-	-	2/10
<i>longinucleatum</i> (Dogiel, 1925)	-	-	-	-	0.6	-	-	-	-	1.4	-	2/10
<i>nanellum</i> (Dogiel, 1923)	-	-	-	1.4	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1/10
<i>parvum</i> Buisson, 1923)	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<i>rectangulatum</i> (K & M, 1930)	-	3.6	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1/10
<i>rostratum</i> (Fiorentini, 1889)												
<i>rostratum</i> (Dogiel, 1927)	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<i>bifidum</i> (Dogiel, 1927)	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<i>triacum</i> (Buisson, 1923)												
<i>dextrum</i> (Dogiel, 1927)	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
unidentified species		3.6 <sup>b</sup>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Diplodiniinae												
<i>Diplodinium</i>												
<i>anisacanthum</i> (da Cunha, 1914))	+	-	-	-	-	6.4	-	4.0	4.0	-	-	3/10
<i>anacanthum</i> (Dogiel, 1927)	-	-	1.6	-	0.6	-	-	-	-	-	-	2/10
<i>monocanthum</i> (Dogiel, 1927)	-	-	-	2.7	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1/10
<i>tetracanthum</i> (Dogiel, 1927)	-	3.6	1.6	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2/10
<i>pentacanthum</i> (Dogiel, 1927)	-	3.6	-	-	1.3	-	-	-	-	-	-	2/10
<i>bilobosum</i> (Dogiel, 1927)	+	7.1	1.6	4.1	-	6.4	-	-	-	-	-	4/10

<i>consors</i> (Dogiel, 1925)	-	-	-	-	2.6	3.2	-	-	-	-	-	2/10
<i>dentatum</i> (Stein, 1858)	-	-	1.6	-	1.3	-	-	-	4.0	4.2	-	4/10
<i>flabellum</i> (K & M, 1932)												
<i>aspinosum</i> (D & P <sup>d</sup> , 1974)	-	-	-	-	0.6	3.2	-	-	2.0	-	-	3/10
<i>lobatum</i> (K & M, 1932)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1.4	-	1/10
<i>posterovesiculatum</i> (Dogiel, 1927)	-	7.1	7.9	4.1	0.6	3.2	-	10.0	-	4.2	-	7/10
<i>rectangulatum</i> (K & M, 1932)	-	3.6	3.2	-	1.9	3.2	4.8	-	-	-	-	5/10
unidentified species	-	-	-	4.1 <sup>b</sup>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<i>Eudiplodinium</i>												
<i>dilobum</i> (Dogiel, 1927)	-	-	-	-	1.3	-	-	-	-	-	-	1/10
<i>impalae</i> (Dogiel, 1925)	-	7.1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1/10
<i>maggi</i> (Fiorentini, 1889)	+	32.0	31.8	34.2	29.0	32.2	28.6	22.0	10.0	25.4	25.0	10/10
<i>magnodentatum</i> (K & M, 1932)	-	-	3.2	-	-	3.2	14.3	2.0	2.0	16.9	11.4	7/10
<i>neglectum</i> (Dogiel, 1925)	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<i>rostratum</i> (Fiorentini, 1889)	+	-	-	-	0.6	3.2	-	4.0	-	-	4.5	4/10
<i>Ostracodinium</i>												
<i>clipeolum</i> (K & M, 1932)	-	-	-	-	0.6	-	-	-	-	4.2	2.3	3/10
<i>dentatum</i> (Fiorentini, 1889)	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<i>gauri</i> (Kofoid & Christenson, 1933)	-	3.6	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1/10
<i>gracile</i> (Dogiel, 1925)	-	-	-	4.1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1/10
<i>monolobum</i> (Dogiel, 1927)	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<i>gladiator</i> (Dogiel, 1925)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	4.0	1.4	-	2/10
<i>mamosum</i> (Railliet, 1890)	-	-	3.2	2.7	1.9	-	-	12.0	16.0	4.2	2.3	7/10
<i>nanum</i> (Dogiel, 1925)	-	-	1.6	-	-	6.4	-	-	-	-	-	2/10
<i>stokyi</i> (Buisson, 1923)	-	-	-	-	0.6	-	-	-	-	-	-	1/10
<i>ventricosum</i> (Buisson, 1923)	-	-	1.6	-	-	-	-	-	2.0	9.8	-	3/10
<i>venustem</i> (K & M, 1932)	-	-	-	-	-	-	14.3	4.0	-	-	-	2/10
<i>Metadinium</i>												
<i>medium</i> (A & M <sup>c</sup> , 1914)	+	-	3.2	-	-	6.4	4.8	-	-	-	-	3/10
<i>fissilaminatum</i> (Imai et al., 1992)	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<i>Enoploplastron</i> species	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	4.5 <sup>e</sup>	1/10
<i>Epidinium</i>												
<i>cattanei</i> (Fiorentini, 1889)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1.4	-	1/10
<i>caudatum</i> (Fiorentini, 1889)	+	-	-	-	0.6	-	-	14.0	-	1.4	9.1	4/10
<i>tricaudatum</i> (Sharp, 1914)	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<i>quadricaudatum</i> (Sharp, 1914)	-	-	-	-	0.6	-	-	-	-	-	2.3	2/10

parvicaudatum (A & M, 1914)	-	-	-	2.7 <sup>7</sup>	-	-	-	-	2.0	-	-	2/10
ISOTRICHIDAE												
<i>Dasytricha</i>												
<i>ruminantium</i> (Schuberg, 1888)	+	21.4	30.2	27.4	54.8	22.6	-	24.0	54.0	21.1	31.8	9/10
BLEPHAROCORYTHIDAE												
<i>Blepharocorys</i>												
<i>bovis</i> (Dogiel, 1926)	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total number of species and forms observed	21	11	14	10	17	12	10	10	10	15	11	

<sup>a</sup>Kofoid & MaLennan.

<sup>b</sup>Cells distorted, could only be identified to the genus level. Not included in total number of species observed.

<sup>c</sup>Awerinzew & Mutafova.

<sup>d</sup>Dehority & Potter.

<sup>e</sup>Could not be identified to species level, but was included in total number of species since all protozoa observed in this genus were similar.

between 10 and 34.2% of the total population. Next most prevalent was *Dasytricha ruminantium*, which occurred in 9 of the animals and ranged from 21.1 to 54.8% of the total population. Three species were found in 7 of the 10 buffalo: *Diplodinium posterovesiculatum* (0.6 to 10% of total); *Eudiplodinium magnodentatum* (2.0 to 16.9%); and *Ostracodinium mammosum* (1.9 to 16%). All of the remaining 38 species occurred in 5 or less animals.

## **Discussion**

The indigenous ruminants in East Africa can be classified as browsers or concentrate selectors, as grazers or roughage eaters or as mixed feeders (Hoffman 1988). When ruminants consume a diet containing 60% or more of concentrates (i.e., grains or highly digestible browse), there is generally a decrease in the concentration of total protozoa and an increase in the percentage of *Entodinium* (Dehority and Orpen 1997). This can result in an “*Entodinium* - only” fauna or in some cases, with a 100% concentrate diet, complete elimination of protozoa (Dehority 1990, Dennis et al. 1983, Vance et al. 1972). In contrast, the grazers and mixed feeders tend to have a lower percentage of *Entodinium* with a more diverse fauna. Dehority (2003) studied eight species of indigenous wild ruminants from Kenya and found their fauna to match fairly well the expected distribution based on feeding type. Although it has been suggested that these differences between fauna and feeding type result from the lowering of rumen pH by the rapid bacterial fermentation of concentrate-type substrates, studies by Franzolin and Dehority (1996) and Dehority (2005) do not support this concept. Perhaps a lowering of rumen pH causes environmental changes in the rumen which favor growth of *Entodinium* species. Rumen contents from 10 wildebeest (four Blue and 6 Black), living in South Africa and consuming natural forages were studied by Booyse and Dehority (2012), and the percentage *Entodinium* was found to range between 0 and 22.4. In the present study with African buffalo, also described as a grazer



or grass eater, the percentage of *Entodinium* ranged from 0 in two animals up to 33.4%. The major difference between the fauna in these two animal species appeared to be the percentage of *Dasytricha*. Except for one buffalo without *Dasytricha*, percentages in the other nine ranged from 21.1 up to 54.8% with an overall mean of  $28.7 \pm 16.1\%$ . *Dasytricha* in four blue wildebeest ranged from 12.2 to 29.8% and 4.9% were present in a single black wildebeest.

Dogiel (1932) identified 21 species of protozoa in the single African buffalo from Uganda. The number of species in a single animal in the present study ranged from 10 to 17 and only eight of the 21 species listed by Dogiel were present in the 10 South African buffalo. For individual animals the highest number of species also found in the Uganda buffalo was 6, five in four animals and three in the remaining four buffalo. Most probably this difference in the fauna between the two sites is related to differences in the vegetation available in the two different areas. Also, no information is given on the subspecies of the animal from Uganda.

The overall species distribution in the South African buffalo is of interest, in that in all but one animal (number 6), *Dasytricha ruminantium* and *Eudiplodinium maggii* comprised 46% or more of the total population (mean of nine animals =  $58.8 \pm 11.4\%$ ). Buffalo number six was free of *Dasytricha*, but contained the highest percentage of *Entodinium* and *Eudiplodinium* species.

Buffalo numbers five and eight were *Entodinium*-free. In animal five, *Diplodinium*, *Eudiplodinium* and *Dasytricha* accounted for 86.8% of the total fauna. For animal 8, 76 % of the fauna were *Ostracodinium* and *Dasytricha*. In comparison (Booyse and Dehority 2012), one wildebeest was *Entodinium*-free, with *Diplodinium bubalidus*, *Ostracodium damaliscus* and *Ostracodinium gracile* comprising 98% of the total. Although diets were different, Towne et al. (1990) sampled 364 steers in feedlot fed high concentrate, of which 47 were *Entodinium*-free.

*Isotricha* was the predominant species replacing *Entodinium*, followed by either *Polyplastron* or *Epidinium*. It is of interest that the two genera, *Isotricha* and *Polyplastron*, have not been found in this study or in the wildebeest from South Africa (Booyse and Dehority 2012). Neither were they present in the fauna of the hartebeest or wildebeest sampled in Kenya (Dehority 2003).

## References

- Booyse D. G. & Dehority, B. A. (2012) Protozoa and digestive tract parameters in Blue wildebeest (*Connochaetes taurinus*) and Black wildebeest (*Connochaetes gnou*) with description of *Entodinium taurinus* n. sp. *European Journal of Protistology*, 48, 283-289.
- Dehority, B. A. (1990) Rumen ciliate protozoa in Ohio white-tailed deer (*Odocoileus virginianus*). *Journal of Protozoology*, 37, 473-475.
- Dehority, B. A. (2003) Influence of diet on the rumen protozoal fauna of indigenous African wild ruminants. *Journal of Eukaryotic Microbiology*, 50, 220-223.
- Dehority, B. A. (2005) Effect of pH on viability of *Entodinium caudatum*, *Entodinium exiguum*, *Epidinium caudatum* and *Ophryoscolex purkynjei* in vitro. *Journal of Eukaryotic Microbiology*, 52, 339-342.
- Dehority, B. A. & Orpin, C. G. (1997) Development of, and natural fluctuations in rumen microbial populations. In: Hobson, P. N. & Stewart, C. S. (Eds), *The Rumen Microbial Ecosystems*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed., Blackie Academic & Professional, London, pp.196-245.
- Dennis, S. M., Arambel, M. J., Bartley, E. E. & Dayton, A. D. (1983) Effect of energy concentration and source of nitrogen on numbers and types of rumen protozoa. *Journal of Dairy Science*, 66, 1248-1254.

- Dogiel, V. (1932) Beschreibung einiger neuer Vertreter der Familie Ophryoscolecidae aus afrikanischen Antilopen nebst Revision der Infusorienfauna afrikanischer Wiederkäuer. *Archiv für Protistenkunde*, 77, 92-107.
- Franzolin, R. & Dehority, B. A. (1996) Effect of prolonged high-concentrate feeding on ruminal protozoal concentrations. *Journal of Animal Science*, 74, 2803-2809.
- Hoffman, R.R. (1988) Morphophysiological evolutionary adaptations of the ruminant digestive system. In: Dobson, A. & Dobson, M.J. (Eds), *Aspects of Digestive Physiology in Ruminants*. Comstock Publishing Association, Ithaca, NY, pp. 1-20.
- Towne, G., Nagaraja, T. G., Brandt, T. Jr. & Kemp, K. E. (1990) Ruminal ciliated protozoa in cattle fed finishing diets with or without supplemental fat. *Journal of Animal Science*, 68, 2150-2155.
- Vance, R. D., Preston, R. L., Klosterman, E. W. & Cahill, V. R. (1972) Utilization of whole, shelled and crimped corn grain with varying proportions of corn silage by growing-finishing steers. *Journal of Animal Science*, 35, 598-605.