Incidence of *Aeromonas* species isolated from fresh fish, canned fish and shrimp in Sohag Governorate, Egypt
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**Abstract**

A total of 180 samples of fish meat and canned fish were randomly collected from different markets and retail shops in Sohag city as the following; fresh water fish (Nile tilapia and catfish), marine water fish (mullet), shrimps, and canned fish (tuna and salmon) with 30 samples of each, to study the incidence of *Aeromonas* species (*Aeromonas* spp.) with special reference to *Aeromonas hydrophila* (*A.hydrophila*) and its virulence genes. The results of this study showed that the mean of *Aeromonas* counts were $0.122 \times 10^2$, $0.504 \times 10^2$, $0.124 \times 10^2$, $0.037 \times 10^2$ cfu/g for Nile tilapia, catfish, mullet and shrimps, respectively. While in canned fish it was uncountable. *Aeromonas* spp. were isolated from 60 of 180 examined samples with a percentage of 33.3%, 7 species were identified: *A. caviae*, *A. hydrophila*, *A. media*, *A. shubertii*, *A. sobria*, *A. veronii biovar sobria* and *A. veronii biovar veronii* were detected at a percentage of 5%, 7.8%, 2.8%, 7.2%, 5%, 2.8% and 2.8%, respectively. The results of PCR showed that, 12 isolates out of 14 were positive for 16S rRNA gene of *A. hydrophila* with a percentage of 85.7 %. Virulence gene like, *Aerolysin AHA* was found in 41.6 % of the examined samples while, the heat stable enterotoxin AST gene was not detected. This study spots the lights on *Aeromonas* spp. especially *A. hydrophila* as potential biological hazard in fish meat and canned fish, as a foodborne pathogen.
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Introduction

Fish is healthy and low-calorie food that provides essential macro and micronutrients as protein, vitamins and minerals (Abisoye et al., 2011). On the other side, fish may act as a vehicle for pathogenic bacteria leading to human gastroenteritis. Mesophilic aeromonads are one of the most common bacteria in water habitats throughout the world, and frequently cause disease in fish and causative agents of acute diarrheal disease in man. *Aeromonas* spp. are emergent food-borne pathogens, belong to the family *Aeromonadaceae*. They are Gram-negative bacteria ubiquitous in soil, aquatic environments, and food products. *Aeromonas* can survive and multiply at low temperatures (2-10°C) that is applied for cold storage of food products (Igbinosa et al. 2012; NCBI, 2020). The genus *Aeromonas* currently comprises 21 validated species, 11 of which are related to human clinical samples (Carnahan and Joseph, 2015). *Aeromonas* spp., as emerging pathogens to humans, cause a broad spectrum of infections, such as gastroenteritis, peritonitis, and hepatobiliary infections, myositis, bacteremia, septicemia, meningitis, soft-tissue and wound infections (Janda and Abbott, 2010; Bravo and Figueras, 2020).

*A. hydrophila* has been isolated from retail foods including fish, seafood, raw milk, poultry and red meat (Tahoun et al., 2016; Sreeremya, 2017; Wamala et al., 2018). *A. hydrophila* has been isolated previously from various fish in Egypt (Abd-El-Malek 2017; Ramadan et al., 2018). Fish can be contaminated with pathogenic bacteria either by polluted water or by handling, processing and unhygienic storage conditions (Sarkar et al., 2013). *A. hydrophila* were responsible for small outbreaks of food poisoning caused by ingestion of raw fermented fish (Igbinosa et al., 2012). To identify isolates of *Aeromonas* spp., biochemical, morphological and molecular techniques are required (Figuera and Hidalgo et al., 2015). The 16S rRNA gene is considered a stable molecular marker for identifying bacterial species, since its distribution is universal and allows comparison of microorganisms (Sánchez, 2015).

Pathogenicity of *Aeromonas* depends on several virulence factors which allow them to adhere, invade, and destroy the host cells, overcoming the immune host response, such as cytotoxins, adhesins, hemolysins, proteases and lipases, as well as their ability to form biofilms (Hidalgo and Figueras, 2013). *A. hydrophila* strains contain aerocytotoxin enterotoxin (AST) gene that releases a toxin (aerolysin) to cause tissue damage. Aerolysin *AHA* is a cytolytic and a hemolytic exotoxin, binds to specific glycoreceptors on the surface of eukaryotic cells before inserting into the lipid bilayer and forms holes, this plays a key role in the pathogenesis of *A. hydrophila* infection. Severe disease and watery diarrhea caused by strains with AST gene which produces a heat stable cytotoxic enterotoxin. Cytotoxin and hemolysin activity increases when temperatures increase to 37°C (Bravo and Figueras, 2020).

This study aimed to identify the incidence of *Aeromonas* species in fish meat and canned fish as well as the incidence of *A. hydrophila* and its virulence genes, which play important roles in human gastro-intestinal infections, by using cultural and molecular methods.

Materials and methods

Collection and preparation of samples:

A total of 180 samples of fish meat represented in freshwater fish (Nile tilapia and catfish), marine fish (mullet), shrimps as well as canned fish (tuna and salmon) with 30 samples of each, were collected randomly from different shops and supermarkets located in Sohag Governorate. Samples were prepared according to FDA, 2018.
**Determination of Aeromonas counts:**

Surface counting method was used according to (Austin, 2014). Inoculate 0.1 ml of the diluted samples and subsequent decimal dilutions onto plates of *Aeromonas* medium base (Himedia) supplemented with Ampicillin (Oxoid, SR0136), incubate plates at 30°C for 24hr. Examine the plates and count typical colonies "dark green, opaque colonies with a darker center" (Fig.1). Subculture five typical colonies (or all if fewer than five) to a nutrient agar slope, then incubate at 30°C for 18–24 h. Perform an oxidase test. Retain oxidase-positive strains and identify by biochemical tests.

**Isolation and identification of Aeromonas spp.**

Samples were homogenized into Alkaline peptone water (APW) with 2.5mg/L Ampicillin selective supplement, Oxoid and incubated at 30º C for 18-24hr. A loopful of the enriched culture was inoculated on *Aeromonas* medium base plates, Himedia, then incubated at 30ºC for 24hr (Austin, 2014). Identification is made by morphological, and biochemical characteristics according to Carnahan and Joseph (2015)

**Identification of A. hydrophila and its virulence genes by PCR**

Suspected isolates examined for 16S rRNA gene and then the positive isolates examined for virulence genes such as AHA and AST. Three pairs of primers were supplied from Metabion, Germany as shown in Table 1.

tml: Oligonucleotide primers sequences for A. hydrophila and its virulence genes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gene</th>
<th>Primer sequence (5'-3')</th>
<th>Product size</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16S rRNA</td>
<td>CTACTTTTGCCGGCGAGCGG</td>
<td>953 bp</td>
<td>Gordon et al., 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TGATTCGGAGCGACTCCC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aerolysin</td>
<td>CACAGCCAATATGTCGGTGAAAG</td>
<td>326 bp</td>
<td>Singh et al., 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AHA</td>
<td>GTCACCTTCTCGTCAAGG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AST</td>
<td>TCTCCATGCTTCCCTTCCACT</td>
<td>331 bp</td>
<td>Nawaz et al., 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GTGTAGGGATGGAAGCGG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Molecular identification of A. hydrophila by PCR**

DNA was extracted from the suspected isolates using QIAamp DNA mini kit, Qiagen. PCR was done for the detection of 16S rRNA gene using specific primer for *A. hydrophila* using an applied biosystem thermal cycler. PCR condition
was initial denaturation at 94°C for 5 minutes, 35 cycles at 94°C for 30 sec., then 50°C for 40 sec., 72°C for 45 sec. and final extension for 10 minutes 72°C according to Gordon et al. (2007). The products of PCR were examined in agarose gel electrophoresis (1.5%) with ethidium bromide and photographed by light transilluminator (Biometra).

Detection of virulence genes by PCR

*A. hydrophila* strains were examined for the presence of two virulence genes such as *AHA* and *AST*. The aerolysin *AHA* gene cycling condition was primary denaturation at 94°C for 5 minutes, then 30 cycles at 94°C for 30 sec., 52°C for 30 sec., 72°C for 30 sec. and final extension for 10 minutes 72°C according to Singh et al. (2008). The *AST* gene cycling condition was initial denaturation at 94°C for 2 minutes, then 35 cycles at 94°C for 30 sec., 50 sec at 1°C, and 72°C for 10 min. according to Nawaz et al. (2010).

Statistical analysis

The mean value and the standard error of *Aeromonas* spp. counts of the tested samples were analyzed by SPSS 18 software.

**Results**

*Aeromonas* spp. represented highly count in catfish with mean 0.504 ± 0.154, followed by mullet 0.124±0.042, Nile tilapia 0.122±0.032, and shrimp 0.037±0.008, and cannot be counted in canned fish samples (Table 2). The incidence of *Aeromonas* spp. in mullet samples was 63.3% which reported the highest percent, followed by catfish 60%, Nile tilapia 53.3%, shrimp 13%, tuna 10%, and cannot be detected in salmon samples (Table 3 and Fig.1). *A. hydrophilla* was identified in 14 (7.8%) of the examined fish samples using biochemical tests (Figs. 2&3). PCR using specific 16S rRNA gene reported that 12 (85.7%) out of 14 samples were positive for *A. hydrophilla* (Fig. 4). Two virulence genes of *A. hydrophilla* of such as *AHA* and *AST* genes was examined by PCR and *AHA* was detected in 5 out of 12 samples, while *AST* gene cannot be detected (Fig. 5 and Fig. 6).

**Table 2: Aeromonas counts (cfu/g) in the examined samples of fish, canned fish and shrimp**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
<th>Mean±SE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nile tilapia</td>
<td>0.01 X 10^2</td>
<td>0.25 X 10^2</td>
<td>0.122 ± 0.032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catfish</td>
<td>0.05 X 10^2</td>
<td>2 X 10^2</td>
<td>0.504 ± 0.154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mullet</td>
<td>0.05 X 10^2</td>
<td>0.5 X 10^2</td>
<td>0.124 ± 0.042</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shrimps</td>
<td>0.02 X 10^2</td>
<td>0.06 X 10^2</td>
<td>0.037 ± 0.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canned fish</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Fig. 2.** Incidence of *Aeromonas* spp. in fish meat, canned fish and shrimp by using biochemical method
Table 3: Incidence of *Aeromonas* spp. isolated from fish meat, canned fish and shrimp by using biochemical method.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Species</th>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>Nile tilapia n=30</th>
<th>Catfish n=30</th>
<th>Mullet n=30</th>
<th>Shrimp n=30</th>
<th>Canned Tuna n=30</th>
<th>Canned Salmon n=30</th>
<th>Total (n=180)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>A. caviae</em></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>A. hydrophilla</em></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>A. media</em></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>A. shubertii</em></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>26.6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>A. sobria</em></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>A. veronii biovar sobria</em></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>A. veronii biovar veronii</em></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>53.3</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>63.3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4: PCR results of *A. hydrophilla* and its virulence genes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>16S rRNA n=14</th>
<th>AHA gene n=12</th>
<th>AST gene n=12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nile tilapia</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catfish</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mullet</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shrimp</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canned fish</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>12 (85.7%)</td>
<td>5 (41.7%)</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 3. Incidence of *A. hydrophila* in fish meat, canned fish and shrimp by using biochemical method
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Fig. 4. PCR result for 16srRNA gene of A. hydrophila, Lane L: 100 bp DNA marker. Lane P: Control positive (953 bp); Lane N: Control negative; Lanes 1-5: positive strains of A. hydrophila isolated from mullet. Lane 6: negative strains isolated from canned tuna. Lane 7: positive strains isolated from shrimp. Lanes 8: negative strains isolated from catfish. Lanes 9, 10 & 11: positive strains isolated from catfish. Lanes 12, 13 & 14 positive strains isolated from Nile tilapia.

Fig. 5. PCR results for AHA gene, Lane L: 100 bp DNA marker; Lane P: Control positive; Lane N: Control negative; Lanes 1, 2 & 3: negative results for AHA gene of A. hydrophila strains isolated from mullet. Lanes 4 & 5: positive results from mullet. Lane 6: negative result from shrimp. Lanes 7 & 8: positive results from catfish. Lane 9: negative results from catfish. Lane 10: positive result from Nile tilapia. Lanes 11 & 12: negative results from Nile tilapia.

Fig. 6. PCR results for AST gene, Lane L: 100 bp DNA marker; Lane P: Control positive Lane N: Control negative; Lanes 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13 & 14: negative.

Discussion

Aeromonas counts

Aeromonas contamination was detected in Nile tilapia, catfish, mullet and shrimp samples with mean counts 0.122 ± 0.032, 0.504 ± 0.154, 0.124 ± 0.042 and 0.037 ± 0.008, respectively. While cannot be detected by direct plating in canned fish samples (Table 2). These results were lower than mean counts that was reported by Manna et al. (2013) where all or most of the samples of Indian major carps, tilapia and shrimp were contaminated with mean count $1.1 \times 10^3$, $2.1 \times 10^3$ and $1.6 \times 10^4$ cfu/g and Ramadan et al. (2018) who mentioned that Aeromonas sp. were found with $3.35 \log_{10}$ cfu/g in mullet samples. Variable counts and incidences between studies may be attributed to the difference in the examined samples, the status of fish prior to sampling time and place and geographical range. Also, fish may be contaminated with several pollutants during the production chain, transporting and retailing through bad hygiene, as well as absence of monitoring programs at farms (Eltholth et al., 2015; Hafez et al., 2018)

Incidence of Aeromonas spp. in fish meat and canned fish samples

Results in Table 3 and Fig. 2 showed that Aeromonas spp. incidence in fish meat and canned fish was 60 of 180 (33.3%). This result agrees with Elgohary et al. (2020) who detected Aeromonas spp. in 33.3 % of fish samples and disagrees with Yucel et al. (2005) and Yucel and Erdogan (2010) who reported 80.3% and 18.4%, respectively. While, in Egypt, Attia et al. (2018) found Aeromonas spp. in 44.3% of raw fish. Our results revealed that highest incidence of Aeromonas spp. was found in mullet 19(63.3%) followed by catfish 18
(60%), tilapia 16 (53.3%), shrimps 4 (13.3%) and canned tuna 3 (10%) while couldn’t be detected in canned salmon.

The incidence of *Aeromonas* spp. in Nile tilapia was 53.3% (Table 3). This result agrees with Ebeed et al. (2017) and El-ghareeb et al. (2019) who revealed that *Aeromonas* was isolated from Nile tilapia fish with a percentage of 51.4 % and 57.33%, respectively. However, our results were lower than that were reported by Kishk et al. (2020) who found *Aeromonas* spp. in farmed tilapia with a percentage of 68%, and higher than El-Gamal et al. (2018) and Salem et al. (2020) who found *Aeromonas* spp. in 25.9% and 29.84 % of Nile tilapia samples. The frequency distribution of isolated *Aeromonas* species of examined Nile tilapia samples was *A. hydrophila*, *A. caviae* and *A. veronii biovar veronii* 3 (10%) for each, followed by *A. media*, *A. sobria* and *A. veronii biovar sobria* 2 (6.6%) for each, and *A. shubertii* 1 (3.3%). These results disagree with El-Gamal et al. (2018) who detected *A. hydrophila* in (23.3%) and *A. caviae* in (2.6%), and Kishk et al. (2020) who found *A. caviae* 13 (40.6%), *A. hydrophila* 8 (25%), *A. sobria* 7 (21.9%), and *A. fluvialis* 1 (3.1%) while *A. veronii* 3 (9.4%) represented slightly similar results.

As shown in Table 3 and Fig. 3, *A. hydrophila* was detected in 16.6 % of the examined mullet, this result is lower than the results obtained in Kafr El-sheikh and Dakahlia Governorate by Ebeed et al. (2017) and Ramadan et al. (2018) who reported 62% and 37% contamination percentage in mullet samples, respectively. Frequency distribution of *Aeromonas* spp. in mullet samples were *A. shubertii* 8 (26.6%), *A. hydrophila* 5 (16.6%), *A. caviae* 3 (10%) and *A. veronii biovar sobria* 2 (6.6%) and *A. sobria* 1 (3.3%). These results disagree with Kishk et al. (2020) who found several species of *Aeromonas* as *A. sobria* 11 (44%), *A. caviae* 7 (28%), *A. hydrophila* 5 (20%), and *A. veronii* 2 (8%). *Aeromonas* spp. were detected in 6 shrimp samples at a percentage of 13.3%, of which *A. hydrophila* was 3.3%, this result disagreed with Khamesipour et al. (2014) in Iran who reported that incidence of *A. hydrophila* in shrimp was 13.89%. while, Kahraman et al. (2017) detected *A. hydrophila* in 15% of shrimp samples.

From previous results, it is denoted the ability of *Aeromonas* spp. to survive in freshwater and marine water environments with slight differences in incidence rates. The variations of *Aeromonas* species incidence could be attributed to various species, time and place of sampling, geographical area, and post-capture contamination, the type of water, fish species, handling, and manipulations during catching, storage, and transportation. and this agrees with Hafez et al. (2018). *Aeromonas* spp. were detected in 3(10%) canned tuna and not isolated in canned salmon. The identified species were 2 *A. sobria* (6.6%) and 1 *A. hydrophila* (3.3%), this may be attributed to treatments which applied to these products, as temperature, lack of Oxygen in vacuum packaging, salt or brine concentration and preservatives.

*A. hydrophila* has the highest incidence (14 out of 60) among the isolated *Aeromonas* spp. in the examined samples collectively; 5 mullet, 4 catfish,3 Nile tilapia, 1 shrimp and 1 canned tuna while it was not found in canned salmon (Fig. 3). These isolates were tested for 16S rRNA gene as well as AHA and AST genes.

**PCR results of *A. hydrophila* and its virulence genes**

Results in Table 4 and Figure 4 showed that 16S rRNA gene of *A. hydrophila* was detected in 12 of 14 examined samples with
a percentage of (85.7%), distributed as 25% (3/12) in each of freshwater (Nile tilapia and catfish) samples, 5 mugil (41.6%) and 1 shrimp (8.3%). While, it was not detected in canned fish. A higher incidence was reported by Abd-El-Malek (2017) who detected 16S rRNA gene in 35% of A. hydrophila isolated from tilapia samples.

Our findings revealed that the AHA gene (Fig. 5) was encoded in 5 (41.7%) of A. hydrophila isolates, with the highest incidence in catfish 2/3 (66.7%), mugil 2/5 (40 %) and Nile tilapia1/3 (33.3%). While, it was not detected in shrimp isolates. Wang et al. (2003) reported A. hydrophila AHA gene at a percentage of (37.5%). However, Blaszk (2014) reported that 85% A. hydrophila were encoding aerolysin gene. Also, Abd-Elall et al. (2014), Attia et al. (2018); Mansour et al., (2019) and Salem et al. (2020) reported that Aerolysin AHA gene was found in 100%, 55%,51% and 83.3 %, respectively. While, lower 13.15% incidence was reported by Sharma et al. (2010).

AST gene give negative results in all A. hydrophila isolates (Fig. 6), similar results were reported by Ghenghesh et al. (2014) and Silva et al. (2017). Opposite to De Jagoda et al. (2014) and Mansour et al. (2019) who reported that AST gene was encoded in 38% and 34% of A. hydrophila isolates, respectively.

Conclusion

The present study highlights the incidence of Aeromonas sp. in different fish species inhabit fresh and marine water and focused on A. hydrophila with its virulence genes as AHA and AST which may pose possible public health threats, given the importance of aeromonads as emerging human pathogens. Good hygienic practices are needed to provide safe and wholesome foods.
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