The duration of antibiotic treatment is associated with carriage of toxigenic and atoxigenic strains of *Clostridioides difficile* in dogs.

Albuquerque, C¹., Pagnossin^{2,4}, D., Landsgaard, K^{2##}, Simpson, J.⁴, Brown, D.³, Irvine, J.J.⁴., Candlish, D.⁴., Ridyard., A.E.¹., Douce, G^{*4}., and Millins, C^{2,5#*}.

¹Small Animal Hospital, School of Veterinary Medicine, University of Glasgow

²Veterinary Pathology, Public Health and Disease Investigation, School of Veterinary Medicine, University of Glasgow

³Scottish Microbiology Reference Laboratories, New Lister Building, Glasgow Royal Infirmary, Alexandra Parade, Glasgow G31 2ER

⁴Institute of Infection, Immunity and Inflammation, Medical, Veterinary and Life Sciences, University of Glasgow

⁵ Institute of Biodiversity, Animal Health and Comparative Medicine, University of Glasgow

Current address: Department of Livestock and One Health, Institute of Infection, Veterinary and Ecological Sciences, University of Liverpool

Current address: Department of Veterinary Pathobiology, College of Veterinary medicine and Biomedical sciences, Texas A&M University, College Station, Texas

*Joint Corresponding authors

Keywords: *Clostridioides difficile*, dogs, antibiotic-associated disease, reservoir, zoonosis

Abstract (word count = 258, 300 word limit)

Clostridioides difficile is a leading cause of human antibiotic-associated diarrhoeal disease globally. Zoonotic reservoirs of infection are increasingly suspected to play a role in the emergence of this disease in the community and dogs are considered as one potential source. Here we use a canine case-control study at a referral veterinary hospital in Scotland to assess: i) the risk factors associated with carriage of *C. difficile* by dogs, ii) whether carriage of *C. difficile* is associated with clinical disease in dogs and iii) the similarity of strains isolated from dogs with local human clinical surveillance. The overall prevalence of *C. difficile* carriage in dogs was 18.7% (95% CI 14.8-23.2%, n=61/327) of which 36% (n=22/61) were toxigenic strains. We found risk factors related to prior antibiotic treatment were significantly associated with *C. difficile* carriage by dogs. However, the presence of toxigenic strains of *C. difficile* in a canine faecal sample was not associated with diarrhoeal disease in dogs. Active toxin was infrequently detected in canine faecal samples carrying toxigenic strains (2/11 samples). Both dogs in which active toxin was detected had no clinical evidence of gastrointestinal disease. Among the ten toxigenic ribotypes of *C. difficile* detected in dogs in this study, six of these (012, 014, 020, 026, 078, 106) were ribotypes commonly associated with human clinical disease in Scotland, while atoxigenic isolates largely belonged to 010 and 039 ribotypes. Whilst *C. difficile* does not appear commonly associated with diarrhoeal disease in dogs, antibiotic treatment increases carriage of this bacteria including toxigenic strains commonly found in human clinical disease.

Introduction

Clostridioides (formerly *Clostridium*) *difficile* has emerged as a leading cause of antibiotic associated diarrhoeal disease in people globally which is associated with significant morbidity, mortality and healthcare costs (1). In the past this disease was predominately associated with elderly patients treated with antibiotics in healthcare environments, however sentinel surveillance studies have revealed that a substantial proportion of *C. difficile* infections (CDI) are acquired within the community (2–5). Whole genome sequencing has shown that only around a third of hospital cases can be linked to horizontal transmission from symptomatic patients, with the remainder caused by diverse strains of *C. difficile* (6). The source of these infections, and those arising within the community is unknown, and may include asymptomatic human carriers, zoonotic reservoirs, food and the environment (7–9).

Most research on *C. difficile* in animals has focused on production animals and horses with emergence of the 078 ribotype as a significant cause of enteritis in piglets and adult horses occurring around the same time as emergence of CDI in humans (10). The frequent isolation of this organism from the faeces of production animals including pigs, cattle and chickens and food has led to concerns that spread to humans can occur through contamination of the local environment or via the food chain (11–15). Whole genome sequencing of identical strains of *C. difficile* in pig farmers and pigs on the same farm suggests that interspecies transmission is likely, although a common environmental source cannot be excluded (16). In contrast, less is known about the potential of companion animals including dogs, to become colonised with *C. difficile*, develop disease or act as a zoonotic reservoir. The frequency of dog ownership and close living relationships with people justifies evaluation of this species as a potential reservoir host of zoonotic strains of *C. difficile*.

Results from published studies of *C. difficile* carriage by companion animals report prevalence rates in dogs from 0% to 58%, with a lower prevalence in healthy dogs (17–19) and

a higher prevalence reported in hospitalised dogs (20) and those visiting human hospitals (21). Similar ribotypes have been identified in both canines and humans suggesting potential for interspecies transmission (22,23). A small number of studies have looked at risk factors for *C. difficile* carriage in dogs. These risk factors may increase individual susceptibility to colonisation such as antibiotic treatment, or be potential sources of infection such as diet and household factors (24–28). Results to date are often contradictory, which may reflect differences in study design and geographic location.

Similarly, existing studies investigating associations between *C. difficile* and disease in dogs have found contrasting results. *C. difficile* in humans is largely a toxin-mediated disease with most pathogenic isolates of *C. difficile* producing one or both major toxins: toxin A (an enterotoxin) and toxin B (a cytotoxin) (29). Ataxigenic and toxigenic strains of *C. difficile* have been detected by several studies in both healthy dogs and those with diarrhoea by bacterial culture and PCR testing for toxin genes (24,30,31). To assess associations between carriage of toxigenic strains and clinical disease, testing for the presence of active toxin in faecal samples from healthy dogs and those with diarrhoea is also needed (17). Some studies which have tested for active toxin have suggested an association between the presence of toxin in faecal samples and diarrhoeal disease in dogs (17,32,33). However, others have not which may in part be explained by differences in methods used to detect active toxin in samples (34).

To assess the potential role of dogs as a zoonotic reservoir of *C. difficile*, and association with clinical diarrhoeal disease in dogs we designed a case-control study of dogs presenting to a veterinary referral practice in Scotland. Our study had the following objectives; i) to assess the risk factors associated with carriage of *C. difficile* by dogs, ii) to test for associations between carriage of *C. difficile* and diarrhoeal disease in dogs and iii) to determine if dogs carry strains of *C. difficile* that are frequently associated with clinical disease in humans.

Materials and methods

Ethical approval for the study was obtained from the University of Glasgow, School of Veterinary Medicine Ethics and Welfare Committee (Reference number 11a/16). To investigate whether *C. difficile* carriage was associated with disease in dogs we recruited a total of 327 dogs referred from across the west of Scotland to a companion animal veterinary referral hospital. A referral hospital was chosen for the study due to the large geographic catchment area, ability to include dogs with a range of potential risk factors for carriage of *C. difficile* and the capacity to investigate the association of *C. difficile* carriage with diarrhoeal disease. A fresh faecal sample collected by the owner on the day of admission to the hospital or a sample from the first stool passed within 48 hours of admission was used to evaluate *C. difficile* colonisation of dogs within the community (24). Dogs were referred for a range of specialist medical or surgical reasons to the University of Glasgow School of Veterinary Medicine Small Animal Hospital (hereafter described as the referral hospital). Dogs referred for treatment of either acute or chronic diarrhoea (n=101) or for non-gastrointestinal reasons (n=226) were recruited to the study between June 2016 and October 2019.

Assessment of risk factors for *C. difficile* carriage by dogs

A questionnaire designed to assess potential risk factors for the carriage of *C. difficile* by dogs was completed by a subset of owners (n=200) recruited to the study. All owners presenting to the referral hospital with their dog between June to December 2016 were invited to complete the survey unless the dog was critically ill. The survey was designed to provide information on potential risk factors for increased susceptibility for *C. difficile* carriage and to identify potential sources of infection. We requested information on the diet, breed, sex and age of the dog and information on the household, including co-habiting pets, elderly people or infants. Clinical information on antibiotic, antacid, immunosuppressive treatment and the number of

visits to and days as an inpatient at a veterinary hospital within the three months prior to admission to the referral hospital was obtained by examining the clinical records from the referring practice.

Detection and strain typing of *C. difficile* from canine faecal samples

Following collection, canine faecal samples were placed in anaerobic jars and processed within 72 hours. One gram of each faecal sample was emulsified in 2mls of ethanol and incubated at room temperature for 30 minutes to kill vegetative cells and induce sporulation of *C. difficile*. Two hundred microlitres of faecal suspension was plated onto Brazier's taurocholate cycloserine cefoxitin agar (TCCA) supplemented with 5% defibrinated horse blood and egg white emulsion. Each sample was cultured in duplicate and incubated for a maximum of 7 days in an anaerobic chamber (Don Whitley, UK). Colonies showing typical *C. difficile* colony morphology and which appeared black when subcultured onto Biomerieux chromID® *C. difficile* agar were selected. Clones were identified as *C. difficile* by amplification and analysis of the 16S (V4) ribosomal RNA sequence (Supporting information, Table 1). Chromosomal DNA was prepared from each isolate using DNeasy Blood and Tissue kits, (Qiagen, Hilden, Germany), following the manufacturer's instructions. Amplified PCR products were purified using the Qiaquick PCR purification kit, and sequenced by Source Bioscience (Livingston, UK). The bacterial species for each isolate was determined by subjecting each sequenced and trimmed PCR product to BLAST analysis using the National Centre for Biotechnology (NCBI) Nucleotide database.

All isolates were ribotyped at the Scottish Microbiology Reference Laboratory (Glasgow) (35). Ribotype patterns were assigned following analysis using BioNumerics v7.6 software (Applied Maths, Sint-Maartens-Latem, Belgium). Patterns were compared with libraries using the Pearson Correlation Coefficient of similarity with 1% optimisation.

Detection of toxin by PCR assays for *tcdA* and *tcdB* and cytotoxicity assay

All isolates of *C. difficile* were tested for the presence of fragments of the *tcdA* and *tcdB* genes by PCR amplification with primers designed using the annotated *C. difficile* 630 genome (Supporting information, Table 1). Amplification was shown to be specific by inclusion of DNA from the epidemic, toxin-producing strain *C. difficile* R20291 and from a PaLoc negative strain, 1342.

A subset of 116 faecal samples collected between 2018-19, were tested for the presence of active toxin using a cytotoxicity assay. Of these samples, 22 were from dogs presenting with diarrhoea (8 with acute diarrhoea and 14 with chronic diarrhoea) and 94 samples were from control dogs without diarrhoea. To detect the presence of toxin, aliquots of fresh faeces within 48 hours of collection, were emulsified in 2ml of PBS and solid material removed by centrifugation. The supernatant was filtered through a 0.2µm membrane filter and the resultant material was serially diluted in PBS and added to a prepared monolayer of Vero cells. To confirm specificity of cytotoxicity, a second set of samples, prepared in parallel, were treated with *Clostridium sordellii* antitoxin (NIBSC, 20 IU/ml). This antitoxin cross-reacts with *C. difficile* toxin and has been used to confirm the presence of *C. difficile* toxin activity in human samples (36). Treated cells were then incubated for 18-24 hours at 37°C with 5% CO₂, before cells were fixed with 1% formalin for 30 minutes and stained using Giemsa stain (SIGMA-ALDRICH®, 6% diluted) for 1 hour. Cell rounding, which is associated with *C. difficile* toxin presence, was assessed microscopically and samples were considered positive if cell rounding was observed that was neutralized by addition of the *C. sordellii* antitoxin (36).

Statistical analysis

All statistical analyses were carried out in R version 4.0.2 (R Development Core Team, Vienna, Austria using the package *lme4* (37) for analyses. Collinearity was tested for using the variance

inflation factor in the *car* package in ‘R’ (38). Prevalence was calculated using the prop.test function in ‘R’.

Assessment of risk factors for carriage of *C. difficile*

C. difficile carriage in dogs (present or absent) was modelled in a binomial general linear model (GLM) with a logit link as a function of each of the following potential risk factors listed in Table 1. Risk factors with a p value of < 0.10 based on univariable analysis were included in a multivariable general linear model of *C. difficile* carriage (present or absent) with binomially distributed errors and a logit link. Starting from the maximum global model, stepwise backwards model selection was carried out using likelihood ratio tests.

Testing for an association between *C. difficile* carriage and diarrhoeal disease in dogs

To test whether the carriage of toxigenic strains of *C. difficile* was associated with diarrhoea, the presence or absence of diarrhoea in each dog (n=327) was modelled using a GLM with binomially distributed errors and a logit link, as a function of *C. difficile* carriage, and separately as a function of carriage of a toxigenic strain of *C. difficile* (based on the PCR presence of one or more toxin genes).

Comparison of strains detected in dogs with clinical surveillance for *C. difficile* in humans

To assess the potential for shared strains between dogs and humans, ribotypes detected from dogs in this study were compared to ribotypes recorded from human surveillance of *C. difficile* cases by the National Microbiology Reference laboratory in Scotland between 2015 and 2018.

Results

Prevalence and strain diversity of *C. difficile* in canine faecal samples

The overall prevalence of *C. difficile* from canine faecal samples in this study was 18.7% (95% C.I. 14.8 – 23.2%, n = 61/327). The majority of isolates were atoxigenic strains (63.4% n = 39/61) while 22/61 were toxigenic strains with the PCR presence of either or both *tcdA* and *tcdB* genes. A total of 13 different ribotypes were detected in the canine samples, and 10 of these ribotypes included toxigenic isolates (Figure 1, Supporting information Table 2).

Figure 1: Ribotypes of *C. difficile* from dogs in this study, shown according to whether they were isolated from dogs with or without diarrhoea (A) and whether strains were classed as toxigenic or atoxigenic strains (B) based on PCR testing *tcdA* and *tcdB* genes.

Cytotoxicity Assay

A total of 116 faecal samples were tested for active toxin, and two samples tested positive. Both faecal samples with active toxin present were from dogs with no clinical evidence of diarrhoea. *C. difficile* was subsequently cultured from 26 of the 116 faecal samples tested for active toxin (21 dogs without diarrhoea, and 5 dogs with diarrhoea) and 11 of these isolates tested PCR positive for either or both *C. difficile* toxin genes (*tcdA* and *tcdB*). This included

both samples which tested positive with the cytotoxicity assay. Ribotype analysis revealed these strains to be 020 and 106 types respectively (Supporting information, Table 2).

Risk factors for carriage of *C. difficile* by dogs

Results of univariable analysis of risk factors and carriage of *C. difficile* are shown in Table 1. In a multivariable model, dogs were more likely to carry *C. difficile* with an increasing length of treatment on antibiotics, for each day of antibiotic treatment (OR = 1.08, 95% C.I. 1.04 - 1.11), $p < 0.001$ (Table 2). Other explanatory variables including age (months), treatment with multiple antibiotics and the presence of multiple pets in the household were not maintained in the final model.

Table 1: Univariable analysis of risk factors potentially associated with the carriage of *C. difficile* in dogs presented to the University of Glasgow, Small Animal Hospital referral hospital.

Explanatory Variable	Sample	Factor level	Odds ratio (95% CI)	p value*
Sex and neutering status	5/29	Female	1.0 (reference)	0.92
	8/55	Female (N)	0.82 (0.24-2.95)	
	10/51	Male	1.17 (0.37-4.13)	
	11/61	Male (N)	0.98 (0.32-3.38)	
Age (months)	200	NA	1.01 (1.002-1.02)	0.016
Raw meat in diet	32/182	No	1.0 (reference)	0.46
	2/18	Yes	0.59 (0.09-2.20)	
Cooked meat in diet	21/119	No	1.0 (reference)	0.77
	13/81	Yes	0.89 (0.41-1.88)	
Other pets in household	21/98	No	1.0 (reference)	0.10
	13/102	Yes	0.54 (0.25-1.13)	
Number of people in household	18/106	Two or less	1.0 (reference)	0.94
	16/92	More than two	1.03 (0.49-2.16)	
Infant (< 2 years) or person > 65 years in household	29/174	No	1.0 (reference)	0.75
	5/26	Yes	1.19 (0.37-3.21)	
Antibiotic treatment last 3 months	10/99	No	1.0 (reference)	0.009
	24/101	Yes	2.77 (1.28-6.42)	
Length of antibiotic treatment (days)	200	NA	1.08 (1.04-1.11)	<0.001
Treatment with more than 1 antibiotic	200	No antibiotic	1.0 (reference)	0.024
		One antibiotic	2.2 (0.89-5.58)	
		>1 antibiotic	3.52 (1.38-9.16)	
Immunosuppressive treatment	30/182	No	1.0 (reference)	0.55

	4/18	Yes	1.45 (0.39-4.37)	
Antacid treatment	23/153	No	1.0 (reference)	0.19
	11/47	Yes	1.73 (0.75-3.81)	
Overnight stay in veterinary hospital	20/131	No	1.0 (reference)	0.33
	14/67	Yes	1.47 (0.68-3.11)	
Visits to veterinary hospital	6/48	One or less	1.0 (reference)	0.54
	20/104	2-5	1.71 (0.67-4.96)	
	8/48	>5	1.40 (0.45-4.59)	

*p value from likelihood ratio tests compared to a null model

Table 2: Results from the final selected multivariable general linear model to explain carriage of *C. difficile* by dogs.

Model description	Fixed effects	Mean (Estd)	SE	Odds ratio (95% CI)	p value*
<i>C. difficile</i> carriage (presence/absence)	Intercept	-2.1	0.25	NA	NA
	Length of antibiotic treatment (days)	0.047	0.012	1.08 (1.04-1.11)	<0.001

*p value from LRT

Testing for an association between *C. difficile* carriage and diarrhoeal disease in dogs

Neither carriage of *C. difficile* (OR = 1.33 95% CI = 0.74 - 2.38, p = 0.34), or the presence of toxigenic strains of *C. difficile* in a faecal sample (OR = 0.60, 95% CI = 0.19-1.55, p = 0.31) was associated with diarrhoea in dogs. Toxigenic strains of *C. difficile* were detected both in dogs with diarrhoea and in dogs with no evidence of gastrointestinal disease (Figure 1).

Comparison of strains detected in dogs with clinical surveillance for *C. difficile* in humans

The most commonly detected ribotypes from human clinical surveillance during the time period of the study are shown in Supporting information Table 3. Six of these ribotypes, 012, 014, 020, 026, 078, 106 were isolated from dogs in this study.

Discussion

This study has found that *C. difficile* can be frequently isolated from diarrheic and non-diarrheic canine faecal samples, and carriage of toxigenic strains by dogs is not associated with diarrhoeal disease. As in humans and other species, antibiotic treatment was significantly associated with the carriage of *C. difficile* by dogs. Several toxigenic ribotypes detected in dogs in this study are among the most frequently reported ribotypes from clinical surveillance of people in the same locality over the period of the study.

The overall prevalence of *C. difficile* carriage in dogs in this study was 18.7%, similar to previous studies from referral hospitals in other countries which reported rates of 18.4% and 13.7% (20,26). Prevalence rates in healthy dogs presenting to primary care veterinary clinics and those living in shelters are reported to be lower, ranging from 0% to 6.1% (19,30). Several factors could contribute to these apparent differences, including geographic area, laboratory methods and age and clinical history of dogs recruited to these studies. In our study toxigenic isolates accounted for 36% of positive cultures (n=22/61); previous studies have reported a prevalence of toxigenic isolates of 36.8% to 69% (20,22,24,27). The most commonly isolated ribotypes in our study cohort were ribotypes 039 and 010, followed by 020, a toxigenic ribotype that was recovered most frequently from non-diarrheic dogs (Figure 1). In contrast to studies of production animals and horses where the 078 ribotype often dominates, no dominate strain appears to be present across canine studies (19,23,25,28,39,40). Other European studies have reported the 010 ribotype as being among the most common strains isolated from dogs including those from Germany, Holland, Spain and Italy (19,23,28,39,40). In these studies, ribotypes 014 and 020 were also frequently isolated.

We found risk factors related to antibiotic treatment within the previous three months were significantly associated with carriage of *C. difficile* by dogs. The length of antibiotic treatment was the only factor supported in a multivariable model, with a seven-day course of

treatment predicted to increase the risk of carriage by 1.67 times (95% CI 1.30-2.13, $p < 0.001$). Some previous studies in dogs have found an association between previous antibiotic administration and *C. difficile* carriage (26,28,41) whereas other studies did not (20,24,27). As in humans and horses the mechanism underpinning the positive relationship between antibiotic treatment and *C. difficile* carriage is likely due to loss of microbiome diversity within the gut (42). As a result, *C. difficile* is able to germinate and rapidly multiply in the available niche. Age was also positively associated with carriage of *C. difficile* on univariable analysis with a slightly increased risk of carriage per year OR = 1.13 (95% CI = 1.02-1.25, $p = 0.016$), as reported by other studies (20,27). This positive relationship could suggest an extended duration of colonisation, though no longitudinal studies of carriage in dogs have been carried out to date. Alternatively, there could be increased host susceptibility with age. We were unable to identify a potential source of *C. difficile* colonisation of dogs from our questionnaire survey. Previous studies have found that dogs living with an immunocompromised person or contact with a person with diarrhoea can increase the risk of colonisation in dogs while feeding a dry food diet reduces risk (18,28,43,44). Although comparison of the results of published studies in dogs is limited by difference in study design and geographic area, a potential explanation for variation in ribotypes detected in dogs could be that carriage is driven mainly by host susceptibility. If this hypothesis is true, the strains isolated from dogs may be reflective of those which they are exposed to on a daily basis in food and the environment (9,14).

The significance of *C. difficile* as cause of disease in dogs is unclear, since toxigenic strains can be isolated from healthy, as well as diarrheic dogs (24,30). Our study was in agreement with others which did not find an association between carriage of toxigenic strains of *C. difficile* and diarrhoea (24,33). Using a cytotoxicity assay, we found that production of active toxin in dogs was uncommon when toxigenic strains were isolated. This was also found by another recent study (45). In our study only two of eleven samples which carried toxigenic

strains tested positive for active toxin and both of these samples were from non-diarrheic dogs. Some previous studies which indicated a relationship between the presence of active toxin and *C. difficile* associated disease in dogs may have been affected by low sensitivity and specificity of ELISA's used to detect toxin in dogs (34). We were limited in our study cohort in evaluating associations between diarrhoea and carriage of toxigenic strains of *C. difficile* due to the relatively low numbers of diarrheic samples carrying toxigenic strains of *C. difficile* (n=5). One of these samples was tested with the cytotoxicity assay and tested negative. Due to time and logistical constraints we were only able to implement the cytotoxicity assay for part of the study period. Although *C. difficile* may still be a potential cause of diarrhoea in dogs, our results suggest that the frequency of disease is likely to be low. The availability of reliable tests for active toxin which are suitable for use in a diagnostic laboratory setting is likely to limit clinical investigations into the significance of toxigenic isolates. Cytotoxicity assays are labour intensive and unlikely to be widely available.

There is evidence that the epidemiology of CDI in humans is changing, with increasing numbers of cases reported from patients residing within the community and attribution of the source of infections in most of these cases is unknown (7,46). This study, in agreement with other recent studies shows that ribotypes associated within human clinical disease can be carried asymptomatically with the canine gut. Six of the ten toxigenic ribotypes of *C. difficile* detected in dogs in this study (012, 014, 020, 026, 078, 106) are also some of the most common isolates detected by human clinical surveillance in Scotland from 2015-2018 (Appendix Table 3) (47–49). A subset of these ribotypes (014, 020 and 078) are amongst the most prevalent causes of *C. difficile*-associated diarrhoea in Europe (50,51). Results from this and other companion animal studies demonstrating shared ribotypes amongst dogs and humans suggest that dogs could contribute to a reservoir for human infections, either directly or by contaminating the environment. Understanding the potential significance of carriage of

toxigenic strains of *C. difficile* by companion animals to human community CDI is likely to be challenging and will require integrated molecular epidemiology studies of community CDI with investigation of food, environment and potential zoonotic sources.

Conclusions

We have found that prevalence of *C. difficile* carriage in dogs presenting to a referral hospital in Scotland is relatively common, and an increasing length of antibiotic therapy is associated with a higher risk of *C. difficile* carriage. The findings of this study and others suggest that *C. difficile* is not commonly associated with diarrhoeal disease in dogs. Dogs carried several toxigenic strains associated with human clinical disease and could potentially act as a source of infection for humans, or spore accumulation within the environment.

Acknowledgements

This research was supported by a Petplan Charitable Trust pump primer award and the University of Glasgow Small Animal Fund. The authors are grateful for support of staff and technicians at the University of Glasgow Small Animal Hospital with the recruitment of animals and collection of samples for the study and for advice on the statistical analysis from Paul Johnson. KL was supported by a BBSRC STARS scholarship. JS was supported by a vacation scholarship from The Carnegie Trust.

Contributions:

GRD and CM conceived the study with advice from AR, CA and DP collected faecal samples and clinical information, DP performed cytotoxin testing, DP, KL, JI, DC, GRD undertook culture, DNA extraction, toxin and 16S PCR analysis, DB evaluated isolate ribotype, CM

carried out the data analysis, CM and GRD produced the first draft of the manuscript, all authors read and approved the final manuscript.

References

1. Balsells E, Shi T, Leese C, Lyell I, Burrows J, Wiuff C, et al. Global burden of *Clostridium difficile* infections: A systematic review and meta-analysis. J Glob Health. 2019;9(1):010407.
2. Dumyati G, Stevens V, Hannett GE, Thompson AD, Long C, Maccannell D, et al. Community-associated *Clostridium difficile* Infections, Monroe County, New York, USA. Emerg Infect Dis. 2012;18(3):392–400.
3. Banks A, Brown DJ, Mather H, Coia JE, Wiuff C. Sentinel community *Clostridium difficile* infection (CDI) surveillance in Scotland, April 2013 to March 2014. Anaerobe. 2016;37:49–53.
4. Kotila SM, Mentula S, Ollgren J, Virolainen-Julkunen A, Lyytikäinen O. Community- and Healthcare- Associated *Clostridium difficile* Infections, Finland, 2008–2013. Emerg Infect Dis. 2016;22(10):1747–53.
5. Cassir N, Fahsi N, Durand G, Lagier JC, Raoult D, Fournier PE. Emergence of *Clostridium difficile* tcdC variant 078 in Marseille, France. Eur J Clin Microbiol Infect Dis. 2017;36(10):1971–4.
6. Eyre DW, Cule ML, Wilson DJ, Griffiths D, Vaughan A, O'Connor L, et al. Diverse Sources of *C. difficile* Infection Identified on Whole-Genome Sequencing. N Engl J Med. 2013;369(13):1195–205.
7. Freeman J, Bauer MP, Baines SD, Corver J, Fawley WN, Goorhuis B, et al. The Changing Epidemiology of *Clostridium difficile* Infections. Clin Microbiol Rev. 2010;23(3):529–49.
8. Janezic S, Zidaric V, Pardon B, Indra A, Kokotovic B, Blanco JL, et al. International

- 381 *Clostridium difficile* animal strain collection and large diversity of animal associated
382 strains. BMC Microbiol. 2014;14(1).
- 383 9. Janezic S, Potocnik M, Zidaric V, Rupnik M. Highly divergent *Clostridium difficile*
384 strains isolated from the environment. PLoS One. 2016;11(11):1–12.
- 385 10. Elliott B, Androga GO, Knight DR, Riley T V. *Clostridium difficile* infection:
386 Evolution, phylogeny and molecular epidemiology. Infect Genet Evol. 2017;49:1–11.
- 387 11. Keel K, Brazier JS, Post KW, Weese S, Songer JG. Prevalence of PCR ribotypes
388 among *Clostridium difficile* isolates from Pigs, Calves, and Other Species. J Clin
389 Microbiol. 2007;45(6):1963–4.
- 390 12. Keessen EC, Gaastra W, Lipman LJA. *Clostridium difficile* infection in humans and
391 animals, differences and similarities. Vet Microbiol. 2011;153:205–17.
- 392 13. Songer JG. The emergence of *Clostridium difficile* as a pathogen of food animals .
393 Anim Heal Res Rev. 2004;5(2):321–6.
- 394 14. Weese JS. *Clostridium difficile* in food - innocent bystander or serious threat? Clin
395 Microbiol Infect. 2010;16(1):3–10.
- 396 15. Casey JA, Kim BF, Larsen J, Price LB, Nachman KE. Industrial Food Animal
397 Production and Community Health. Curr Environ Heal reports. 2015;2(3):259–71.
- 398 16. Knetsch CW, Connor TR, Mutreja A, van Dorp SM, Sanders IM, Browne HP, et al.
399 Whole genome sequencing reveals potential spread of *Clostridium difficile* between
400 humans and farm animals in the Netherlands, 2002 to 2011. Eurosurveillance.
401 2014;19(45):1–12.
- 402 17. Weese JS, Staempfli HR, Prescott JF, Kruth SA, Greenwood SJ, Weese HE. The roles
403 of *Clostridium difficile* and enterotoxigenic *Clostridium perfringens* in diarrhea in
404 dogs. J Vet Intern Med. 2001;15(4):374–8.
- 405 18. Weese JS, Finley R, Reid-Smith RR, Janecko N, Rousseau J. Evaluation of

- 406 *Clostridium difficile* in dogs and the household environment. Epidemiol Infect.
- 407 2010;138(8):1100–4.
- 408 19. Schneeberg A, Rupnik M, Neubauer H, Seyboldt C. Prevalence and distribution of
- 409 *Clostridium difficile* PCR ribotypes in cats and dogs from animal shelters in Thuringia,
- 410 Germany. Anaerobe. 2012;18(5):484–8.
- 411 20. Struble AL, Tang YJ, Kass PH, Gumerlock PH, Madewell BR, Silva J. Fecal shedding
- 412 of *Clostridium difficile* in dogs: A period prevalence survey in a veterinary medical
- 413 teaching hospital. J Vet Diagnostic Investig. 1994;6(3):342–7.
- 414 21. Lefebvre SL, Waltner-Toews D, Peregrine AS, Reid-Smith R, Hodge L, Arroyo LG, et
- 415 al. Prevalence of zoonotic agents in dogs visiting hospitalized people in Ontario:
- 416 implications for infection control. J Hosp Infect. 2006;62:458–66.
- 417 22. Usui M, Suzuki K, Oka K, Miyamoto K, Takahashi M, Inamatsu T, et al. Distribution
- 418 and characterization of *Clostridium difficile* isolated from dogs in Japan. Anaerobe.
- 419 2016;37:58–61.
- 420 23. Orden C, Blanco JL, Álvarez-Pérez S, Garcia ME, Blanco JL, Garcia-Sancho M, et al.
- 421 Isolation of *Clostridium difficile* from dogs with digestive disorders, including stable
- 422 metronidazole-resistant strains. Anaerobe. 2017;43(April 2012):78–81.
- 423 24. Clooten J, Kruth S, Arroyo L, Weese JS. Prevalence and risk factors for *Clostridium*
- 424 *difficile* colonization in dogs and cats hospitalized in an intensive care unit. Vet
- 425 Microbiol. 2008;129(1–2):209–14.
- 426 25. Álvarez-Pérez S, Blanco JL, Harmanus C, Kuijper EJ, García ME. Prevalence and
- 427 characteristics of *Clostridium perfringens* and *Clostridium difficile* in dogs and cats
- 428 attended in diverse veterinary clinics from the Madrid region. Anaerobe. 2017;48:47–
- 429 55.
- 430 26. Hussain I, Sharma RK, Borah P, Rajkhowa S, Hussain I, Barkalita LM, et al. Isolation

- and characterization of *Clostridium difficile* from pet dogs in Assam, India. Anaerobe. 2015;36:9–13.
27. Silva ROS, Santos RLR, Pires PS, Carlos Pereira L, Trindade Pereira S, Carvalho Duarte M, et al. Detection of toxins A/B and isolation of *Clostridium difficile* and *Clostridium perfringens* from dogs in Minas Gerais, Brazil. Brazilian J Microbiol. 2013;44(1):133–7.
28. Rabold D, Espelage W, Sin MA, Eckmanns T, Schneeberg A, Neubauer H, et al. The zoonotic potential of *Clostridium difficile* from small companion animals and their owners. PLoS One. 2018;13(2):1–12.
29. Voth DE, Ballard JD. *Clostridium difficile* toxins: Mechanism of action and role in disease. Clin Microbiol Rev. 2005;18(2):247–63.
30. Ghavidel M, Salari Sedigh H, Razmyar J. Isolation of *Clostridium difficile* and molecular detection of binary and A/B toxins in faeces of dogs. Iran J Vet Res. 2016;17(4):273–6.
31. Wetterwik K-J, Trowald-Wigh G, Fernström L-L, Krovacek K. *Clostridium difficile* in faeces from healthy dogs and dogs with diarrhea. Acta Vet Scand. 2013;55:23.
32. Cave NJ, Marks SL, Kass PH, Melli AC, Brophy MA. Evaluation of a routine diagnostic fecal panel for dogs with diarrhea. J Am Vet Med Assoc. 2002;221(1):52–9.
33. Marks SL, Kather EJ, Kass PH, Melli AC. Genotypic and phenotypic characterization of *Clostridium perfringens* and *Clostridium difficile* in diarrheic and healthy dogs. J Vet Intern Med. 2002;16(5):533–40.
34. Chouicha N, Marks SL. Evaluation of five enzyme immunoassays compared with the cytotoxicity assay for diagnosis of *Clostridium difficile*-associated diarrhea in dogs. J Vet Diagnostic Investig. 2006;18(2):182–8.
35. Stubbs SLJ, Brazier JS, O'Neill GL, Duerden BI. PCR targeted to the 16S-23S rRNA

- gene intergenic spacer region of *Clostridium difficile* and construction of a library consisting of 116 different PCR ribotypes. J Clin Microbiol. 1999;37(2):461–3.
36. Chang TW, Gorbach SL, Bartlett JB. Neutralization of *Clostridium difficile* toxin by *Clostridium sordellii* antitoxins. Infect Immun. 1978;22(2):418–22.
37. Bates D, Maechler M, Bolker B, Walker S. lme4: Linear mixed-effects , models using Eigen and S4. 2019.
38. Fox J, Weisberg S. An R Companion to Applied Regression. Third. Thousand Oaks CA: Sage; 2019.
39. Koene MGJ, Mevius D, Wagenaar J a., Harmanus C, Hensgens MPM, Meetsma a. M, et al. *Clostridium difficile* in Dutch animals: Their presence, characteristics and similarities with human isolates. Clin Microbiol Infect. 2012;18(8):778–84.
40. Spigaglia P, Drigo I, Barbanti F, Mastrantonio P, Bano L, Bacchin C, et al. Antibiotic resistance patterns and PCR-ribotyping of *Clostridium difficile* strains isolated from swine and dogs in Italy. Anaerobe. 2015;31:42–6.
41. Riley T V., Adams JE, O’neill GL, Bowman RA. Gastrointestinal carriage of *Clostridium difficile* in cats and dogs attending veterinary clinics. Epidemiol Infect. 1991;107(3):659–65.
42. Theriot CM, Young VB. Interactions between the Gastrointestinal Microbiome and *Clostridium difficile*. Annu Rev Microbiol. 2015;69(1):445–61.
43. Lefebvre SL, Reid-Smith RJ, Waltner-Toews D, Scott Weese J. Incidence of acquisition of methicillin-resistant *Staphylococcus aureus*, *Clostridium difficile*, and other health-care-associated pathogens by dogs that participate in animal-assisted interventions. J Am Vet Med Assoc. 2009;234(11):1404–17.
44. Hensgens MPM, Keessen EC, Squire MM, Riley T V., Koene MGJ, De Boer E, et al. *Clostridium difficile* infection in the community: A zoonotic disease? Clin Microbiol

- Infect. 2012;18(7):635–45.
45. Thanissery R, McLaren MR, Rivera A, Reed AD, Betrapally NS, Burdette T, et al. *Clostridioides difficile* carriage in animals and the associated changes in the host fecal microbiota. Anaerobe. 2020;66:102279.
46. Turner NA, Smith BA, Lewis SS. Novel and emerging sources of *Clostridioides difficile* infection. PLoS Pathog. 2019;15(12):1–6.
47. Health Protection Scotland. Healthcare associated infections, Annual Report 2016. 2016. Available from: <https://www.hps.scot.nhs.uk/web-resources-container/healthcare-associated-infection-annual-report-2016/>. Accessed 7/10/2020
48. Health Protection Scotland. Healthcare Associated infection, Annual Report 2017. 2017. Available from: <https://www.hps.scot.nhs.uk/publications/hps-weekly-report/volume-52/issue-18/hps-publish-2017-hai-annual-report/> Accessed 7/10/2020
49. Health Protection Scotland. Healthcare Associated infection Annual Report 2018. 2018. Available from: <https://www.hps.scot.nhs.uk/web-resources-container/healthcare-associated-infection-annual-report-2018/>. Accessed 7/10/2020
50. Freeman J, Vernon J, Morris K, Nicholson S, Todhunter S, Longshaw C, et al. Pan-European longitudinal surveillance of antibiotic resistance among prevalent *Clostridium difficile* ribotypes. Clin Microbiol Infect. 2015;21(3):248.e9-248.e16.
51. Davies KA, Ashwin H, Longshaw CM, Burns DA, Davis GL, Wilcox MH. Diversity of *Clostridium difficile* PCR ribotypes in Europe: results from the European, multicentre, prospective, biannual, point-prevalence study of *Clostridium difficile* infection in hospitalised patients with diarrhoea (EUCLID), 2012 and 2013. Eurosurveillance. 2016;21(29):1–11.

Supporting Information

Table 1: Primers and amplification conditions for 16S and (*tcdA* and *tcdB*) PCR.

Target gene	F/R*	Primer sequence	PCR Conditions
16S ribosomal RNA	F	YT GGG YDT AAA GNG	95°C 5 min, 35 cycles 95°C, 50s, 50°C, 1min, 72°C, 1min; with a final extension 72°C, 10 mins.
	R	CCC GTC AAT TYY TTT RAG TTT	
<i>tcdA</i>	F	ATG TCT TTA ATA TCT AAA GAA GAG	95°C 2 min, 35 cycles 95°C, 30s, 52°C, 30s, 72°C 60s with a final extension of 72°C for 10 mins.
	R	CCT TTT TTA GTG TAT TGA CTA AG	
<i>tcdB</i>	F	ATG AGT TTA GTT AAT AGA AAA CAG	95°C 5 min, 35 cycles 95°C, 50s; 50°C, 1 minute; 72°C, 60s with a final extension 72°C for 10 mins.
	R	GTT TAT CAA AAA TGC ATT ACT ATC	

* F = Forward, R = Reverse

Table 2: Table to show *C. difficile* isolates from dogs referred for investigation of diarrhoea, or for a non-gastrointestinal complaint. Ribotype and results of *tcdA* and *tcdB* PCR testing and cytotoxicity testing for active toxin presence are shown.

Clinical presentation	Ribotype	<i>tcdA</i>	<i>tcdB</i>	Cytotoxicity assay
Diarrhoea	009	0	0	0
	010	0	0	0
	039	0	0	0
	039	0	0	NA
	026	1	1	0
	039	0	0	NA
	078	1	1	NA
	010	0	0	NA
	010	0	0	NA
	010	0	0	NA
	009	0	0	NA
	010	0	0	NA
	010	0	0	0
	017	0	1	NA
	039	0	0	NA
	039	1	1	NA
	039	0	0	NA
	039	0	0	NA

	039	0	0	NA
	039	0	0	NA
	039	1	1	NA
	010	0	0	NA
No diarrhoea	011	1	1	0
	009	0	0	0
	039	0	0	0
	020	1	1	0
	009	0	0	0
	106	1	1	1
	010	0	0	0
	154	1	1	0
	039	0	0	0
	NA	0	0	NA
	039	0	0	NA
	020	1	1	NA
	NA	NA	NA	NA
	039	0	0	NA
	020	1	1	NA
	020	1	1	NA
	020	1	1	NA
	009	0	0	0
	031	0	0	0
	106	1	1	0
	012	1	1	0
	010	0	0	0
	020	1	1	0
	039	0	0	0
	009	0	0	0
	020	1	1	1
	020	0	1	0
	039	0	0	0
	014	1	1	0
	010	0	0	NA
	010	0	0	NA
	039	0	0	NA
	106	1	1	NA
	014	1	1	NA
	010	0	0	NA
	012	0	0	NA
	010	0	0	NA
	039	0	0	NA
	020	1	1	NA

513

514

Table 3: Human clinical surveillance for *Clostridium difficile* in Scotland. Data from Health Protection Scotland Annual Reports 2016-2018 (1-3).

Ribotype	2015		2016		2017		2018	
	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
1	015	3.9	10	3.2	NA	NA	NA	NA
2	050	13.2	32	10.4	36	10.4	45	12.9
5	033	8.7	23	7.4	32	9.2	26	7.4
12	015	3.9	1	0.3	NA	NA	NA	NA
14	032	8.4	33	10.7	32	9.2	31	8.9
15	035	9.2	22	7.1	32	9.2	34	9.7
20	025	6.6	22	7.1	23	6.6	26	7.4
23	015	3.9	19	6.1	15	4.3	28	8
26	013	3.4	5	1.6	NA	NA	NA	NA
27	NA	NA	NA	NA	1	0.3	2	0.6
78	040	10.5	25	8.1	34	9.8	41	11.7
106	NA	NA	NA	NA	13	3.8	8	2.3
Others	107	28.2	117	37.9	128	37	108	30.9

References

1. Health Protection Scotland. Healthcare associated infections, Annual Report 2016. 2016. Available from: <https://www.hps.scot.nhs.uk/web-resources-container/healthcare-associated-infection-annual-report-2016/>. Accessed 7/10/2020
2. Health Protection Scotland. Healthcare Associated infection, Annual Report 2017. 2017. Available from: <https://www.hps.scot.nhs.uk/publications/hps-weekly-report/volume-52/issue-18/hps-publish-2017-hai-annual-report/> Accessed 7/10/2020
3. Health Protection Scotland. Healthcare Associated infection Annual Report 2018. 2018. Available from: <https://www.hps.scot.nhs.uk/web-resources-container/healthcare-associated-infection-annual-report-2018/>. Accessed 7/10/2020