A cross-sectional study: Insubstantial serological evidence for the association between chronic renal disease and leptospirosis in Badulla and Kandy districts, Sri Lanka

Regina Amanda Fonseka[1], Pavani Senarathne[1], Devinda Shameera Muthusinghe[2], Yomani Dilukshi Sarathkumara[1], Nishantha Nanayakkara[3], Lishantha Gunaratne[4], Kumiko Yoshimatsu[2,5], Nobuo Koizumi[6], Chandika Damesh Gamage[1,*]

[1] Department of Microbiology, Faculty of Medicine, University of Peradeniya, Sri Lanka

[2] Graduate School of Infectious Diseases, Hokkaido University, Japan

[3] Nephrology and Transplantation Unit Kandy Teaching Hospital, Sri Lanka

[4] Renal Unit, District Hospital, Girandurukotte, Sri Lanka

[5] Insititute for Genetic Medicine, Hokkaido University, Japan

[6] Department of Bacteriology, National Institute of Infectious Diseases, Japan

[*]Corresponding author

Email: chandika.gamage@med.pdn.ac.lk (CDG)

Abstract

Chronic kidney disease (CKD) and chronic kidney disease of uncertain etiology (CKDu) are chronic renal diseases that pose a significant health burden in Sri Lanka. Leptospirosis is a bacterial zoonosis that primarily damages kidney tissues via colonization of *Leptospira* spp. in the renal tubules and is a suspected etiological agent of CKDu. Since Sri Lanka is a leptospirosis endemic country where outbreaks of the disease have been reported, this study aimed to find the association between leptospirosis and chronic renal disease in two geographically distinct regions of Sri Lanka, Kandy (CKDu non-endemic) and Badulla (CKDu endemic) districts. Forty-nine chronic renal disease patients and 135 controls from Kandy and 89 chronic renal disease patients and 149 controls from Badulla were examined serologically by microscopic agglutination test with a panel of 11 *Leptospira* serogroups. A seroprevalence of 35.3% and 32.5% for leptospirosis was observed in the Girandurukotte CKDu group and Girandurukotte control group respectively, while a seroprevalence of 36.7% and 31.9% were observed in the Kandy CKDu group and Kandy control group respectively. No statistically significant differences in leptospirosis seropositivity were observed between the chronic renal disease and control groups in both districts. However, further longitudinal studies assessing renal colonization among chronic renal patients and healthy individuals are required to conclusively state whether leptospirosis plays an important role in chronic renal disease development and/or progression in Sri Lanka.

1. Introduction

Chronic kidney disease (CKD) is a global public health problem that occurs primarily due to diabetes and hypertension. CKD is defined as any condition that damages kidney tissues leading to a decrease in renal function with a glomerular filtration rate (GFR) of <60 mL/min/1.73 m^2 for ≥ 3 months (1). CKD arising in the absence of diabetes, hypertension and other known risk factors is referred to as chronic kidney disease of uncertain etiology (CKDu) (2). CKDu has been detected in Central America,

46 Egypt, India, and Sri Lanka (3–6). While several hypotheses are being explored to uncover the
47 causative agents/factors responsible for CKDu, a hypothesis that has been overlooked in Sri Lanka is
48 an infectious etiology, such as hantavirus infection and leptospirosis (7).

49 Previous studies have inferred leptospirosis as a possible etiological agent or risk factor for CKDu (7–
50 10). Leptospirosis is one of the most widely prevalent bacterial zoonoses caused by bacteria
51 belonging to the genus *Leptospira*(7). Kidney is the main target organ of *Leptospira* spp., and if left
52 untreated the bacteria could colonize the renal tubules of the kidney tissues (10). Renal colonization
53 by *Leptospira* spp. can result in interstitial tubular nephritis and acute kidney injury (AKI) which carry
54 a risk for CKD (10). Long-term mild subclinical AKI could result in the development of CKD (11). An
55 association between CKD and leptospirosis was suggested for the first time in Taiwan in 2015:
56 participants exposed to *Leptospira* spp. showed a 2.5% decrease of estimated GFR and a higher
57 percentage of CKD compared to those unexposed to the bacteria (12). In the same study, 88
58 individuals with high anti-leptospiral antibody titers were followed up for two years and individuals
59 with microscopic agglutination test (MAT) titer > 400 showed a positive correlation with kidney
60 injury marker KIM–1/Cr (12). In 2018, Yang brought forward two hypothetical pathways through
61 which leptospirosis could progress to CKD: acute *Leptospira* infection could progress to chronic
62 leptospirosis if left untreated, resulting in the development into CKD, whereas subclinical *Leptospira*
63 infection could lead to chronic leptospirosis which can develop into CKD (10). Heat stress and
64 dehydration were postulated to have synergistic effect on the pathways (10). Furthermore, there are
65 several similarities between leptospirosis renal disease and CKDu, such as tubulointerstitial nephritis,
66 interstitial fibrosis, non-proteinuria, proximal tubule dysfunction, and hypokalemia as well as both
67 diseases affect middle-aged males living in hot climates (10).

68 Although leptospirosis is an endemic and notifiable disease in Sri Lanka, it is still largely
69 underdiagnosed and thus most likely untreated, which may lead to a chronic state of infection with
70 no symptoms. The highest burden of CKDu lies in the North Central Province (NCP), where

leptospirosis outbreaks are also common (13,14). Since most of the CKDu-affected population in the NCP comprise of middle-aged men involved in agriculture, it is possible that the renal tissue damages caused by *Leptospira* infection progress to a chronic state due to incomplete recovery from mild AKI, recurring exposure, and infection with *Leptospira* spp., and heat stress and dehydration. Therefore, this study investigated the involvement of leptospirosis as a causative agent or risk factor towards chronic renal disease by comparing leptospirosis seroprevalence between chronic renal patients and healthy controls in a CKDu endemic district, Badulla and a CKDu non-endemic district, Kandy, Sri Lanka.

2. Methods

2.1. Study design and ethical clearance

This is a hospital and community-based cross-sectional study with unmatched cases and controls. The study areas were Mahiyangana Divisional Secretariat, Badulla district, a CKDu endemic region and Yatinuwara Divisional Secretariat, Kandy district, a CKDu non-endemic region, Sri Lanka.

Ethical clearance for this study was obtained from the institutional Ethical Review Committee, Faculty of Medicine, University of Peradeniya (2016/EC/64). The collection of blood samples and demographic data was approved by the Regional Director of Health Services, Kandy, and informed consent was obtained from all study participants via a signature or thumbprint (Supplementary Materials S1). The authors did not have access to information that would help identify the recruited participants during or after sample collection.

2.2. Sample collection

Sample collection was carried out between January 2017 to February 2018. The determination of sample size is described in Supplementary Materials S2. Clinically diagnosed chronic renal patients

(age ≥18) residing in Kandy (n=48) and Badulla (n=85) districts who attended the renal clinics at the nephrology and transplantation unit, Teaching Hospital Kandy (Kandy) and the Girandurukotte District Hospital (Badulla) were recruited to the study as cases via a convenience-based sampling strategy. Individuals with a history of alcoholism were excluded from the study. For the control groups, the Medical Office of Health areas were randomly selected within the Kandy and Badulla Districts. Individuals (age ≥18) residing in Kandy (n=135) and Badulla (n=149) districts who were not clinically diagnosed with kidney disease and had normal serum creatinine levels (0.5–1.2 mg/dL), volunteered to take part in this study. Individuals with a history of alcoholism or kidney disease were excluded from the study.

Five milliliters of blood were collected into sterile tubes containing no anticoagulant. The tubes were left undisturbed for 30 min at room temperature, which was centrifuged at 2000×*g* for serum separation. The serum separation was carried out at the sample collection site and immediately transported to the Department of Microbiology, Faculty of Medicine, University of Peradeniya in insulated cool boxes and the serum samples were stored at -20°C prior to analysis.

At the time of sample collection, demographic information was collected using a structured questionnaire. The questionnaire covered the following information: basic demographic data (age and gender), family and past medical history, occupational information, agricultural activity, and exposure to rodents (Supplementary materials S3). A survey-based interview method was used to administer the questionnaire, to eliminate the issue of missing demographic data during self-reporting. However, this may have introduced some bias as participants may have answered questions incorrectly, especially the questions with regard to sightings of rodents and rodent excreta around their homes.

2.3. Detection of anti-leptospiral antibodies by MAT

119 The MAT panel antigens used in this study was obtained from the Veterinary Research Institute and
120 contained 12 serovars belonging to 11 serogroups: serogroup Autumnalis (serovar Autumnalis),
121 Bataviae (Bataviae), Canicola (Canicola), Grippotyphosa (Grippotyphosa), Hebdomadis
122 (Hebdomadis), Javanica (Javanica), Panama (Panama), Sejroe (Hardjo and Wolffi), Semaranga
123 (Patoc), Shermani (Shermani), and Tarassovi (Tarassovi). The strains were maintained in a liquid
124 Ellinghausen McCullough Johnson and Harris medium supplemented with *Leptospira* enrichment (BD
125 Difco, USA) and 5-flurouracil (final concentration of 200 µg/mL). Four to 7-day old cultures that
126 showed a growth equivalent to a 0.5 McFarland (approximately 1-2×10^8 organisms/mL) were used
127 for MAT as previously described (15,16). A MAT titer of ≥1:400 was considered as seropositive for
128 leptospirosis, as the titer of ≥1:320, is considered clinically significant in Sri Lanka (17).

129

130 2.4. Statistical analysis

131 All statistical analyses were conducted using Statistical Package for the Social Sciences version 25
132 (IBM, USA) and the online tool MedCalc. Using MedCalc, the odds ratio and its accompanying 95%
133 confidence interval (CI) was calculated to compare the proportions of the number of individuals
134 exposed group and unexposed group to *Leptospira* spp in both chronic renal patients and controls.

135 Using SPSS, univariate descriptive analysis was performed to identify risk factors associated with
136 exposure to *Leptospira* spp. This was evaluated by 2×2 contingency tables and Yate's corrected
137 Pearson's chi-square test. Yate's correct was added to Fisher's exact test was used when counts
138 were less than 5. A *P* value lower than 0.05 ($p \leq 0.05$) was considered statistically significant. Only
139 samples with complete data were subject to MAT and statistical analysis.

140

141 **3. Results**

142 3.1. Seroprevalence for leptospirosis in Kandy and Badulla

143 Seroprevalences of 2.1% and 18.5% for leptospirosis were observed in the chronic renal disease and
144 control groups in Kandy, respectively (Table 1). The seroprevalence in disease group was significantly
145 lower than that in control group in Kandy (p=0.02). Seroprevalence of 7.1% and 13.4% were
146 observed in the chronic renal disease and control groups in Badulla, respectively (Table 1). There was
147 no statistically significant difference between the disease and control groups in Badulla (p=0.14).

148

149 Table 1. Difference in leptospiral seropositivity between the chronic renal disease patients and
150 healthy individuals in Kandy and Badulla.

District	**Group**	**No. of MAT positives (%)**	**Odds Ratio (95% CI)**	***P* value**
Kandy	Chronic renal patients (n=49)	1 (2.1)	0.09 (0.01–0.70)	0.02
	Controls (n=135)	25 (18.5)		
Badulla	Chronic renal patients (n=85)	6 (7.1)	0.49 (0.19–1.27)	0.14
	Controls (n=149)	20 (13.4)		

151

152 3.2. Comparison of demographic characteristics and seropositivity in Kandy and Badulla

153 There were no statistically significant differences between demographic characteristics and
154 leptospirosis seropositivity in the chronic renal disease and control groups in Kandy and Badulla
155 (Table 2).

156 Table 2. Comparison of demographic characteristics and seropositivities in chronic renal patients and
157 controls in Kandy and Badulla

	Kandy												
	Chronic renal patients (n=49)					**Controls (n=135)**					**Chronic renal pat**		
	Total	**MAT results**		χ^2	***P* value**	**Total**	**MAT results**		χ^2	***P* value**	**Total**	**MAT results**	
	n	**(+)ve**	**(-)ve**			**n**	**(+)ve**	**(-)ve**			**n**	**(+)ve**	**(-)ve**
Age													
≥50 years	26	1	25	0.9	0.3420	53	11	42	0.1	0.756	62	4	58

<50 years	23		23			82	14	68			23	2	21
Gender													
Male	27		27	0.01	0.918	73	10	63	1.8	0.18	57	4	53
Female	22	1	21			62	15	47			28	2	26
Occupation													
Farming	3		3	0.07	0.796	10	1	9	0.09	0.766	75	6	69
Non-farming	46	1	45			125	24	101			10	0	10
Risk factors for CKD													
Presence	42	1	41	0.170	0.6800	27	5	22	0.000	1.000	53	5	48
Absence	7		7			108	20	88			32	1	31
Exposure to agriculture													
Yes	13		13	0.37	0.544	26	4	22	0.03	0.86	80	6	74
No	36	1	35			109	21	88			5	0	5
Storing crop at house													
Yes	6		6	0.14	0.706	15	4	11	0.26	0.611	79	5	74
No	43	1	42			125	21	99			6	1	5
Rats seen at home or surroundings													
Yes	32	1	31	0.54	0.462	103	20	83	**0.05**	0.824	66	5	61
No	17		17			32	5	27			19	1	18
Dried rodent faeces seen at home or surrounding													
Yes	17	0	17	0.54	0.462	50	7	43	0.65	0.42	57	6	51
No	32	1	31			85	18	67			28	0	28

3.3. Infecting *Leptospira* serogroups in Kandy and Badulla

Serogroup Sejroe was the predominant infecting serogroups both in Kandy and Badulla (Table 3). Although the MAT titer ≥1:400 was judged as positive for leptospiral antibodies indicating acute infection in this study, individuals with lower antibody titers were also observed (Supplementary Materials S4).

Table 3. Results of MAT in Kandy and Badulla districts

	Kandy	**Badulla**

	Chronic Renal Patients (n=49)	Controls (n=135)	Chronic Renal Patients (n=85)	Controls (n=149)
Serogroups	**No. of positives (%)**	**No. of positives (%)**	**No. of positives (%)**	**No. of positives (**
Autumnalis	0 (0)	1 (0.7)	1 (1.2)	1 (0.7)
Bataviae	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	1 (0.7)
Canicola	0 (0)	0 (0)	1 (1.2)	0 (0)
Serjoe	1 (2.0)	17 (12.6)	4 (4.7)	18 (12.1)
Javanica	0 (0)	4 (3.0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
Semaranga	0 (0)	3 (2.2)	0 (0)	0 (0)
Total	1 (2.0)	25 (18.5)	6 (7.1)	20 (13.4)

4. Discussion

This study suggests that there is no association between chronic renal disease and leptospirosis seroprevalence. This finding was consistent with a recent study carried out in the NCP of Sri Lanka in 2020, where leptospirosis seroprevalence among the CKDu and the control groups was not statistically significant (18). On the other hand, the results are contradictory to the findings of a study carried out in Taiwan which showed an association between *Leptospira* seroprevalence and CKD and lower eGFR (12). The cause of CKDu could vary regionally and be geographically specific. Epidemics of kidney disease with unknown etiologies have previously been reported: Itai-itai disease and Balkan endemic nephropathy (BEN) are nephropathic epidemics whose etiology was identified much later. Itai-itai disease which surfaced in Japan in 1912 was found to be caused by Cadmium poisoning in 1968, while BEN that surfaced in the 1950s was found to be caused by aristocholic acid in 1993 (19). In addition, the present only assessed the seroprevalence of leptospirosis in the study populations (18). It has been shown that renal colonization can occur asymptomatically and sometimes in the absence of serological evidence or anti-leptospiral antibodies (12,20,21). To conclusively state that leptospirosis has no association to chronic renal disease in Sri Lanka, renal colonization must be investigated.

183 This study revealed that the predominant infecting *Leptospira* serogroup was Sejroe, of which
184 serovar Hardjo was the most reactive serovar both in Kandy and Badulla (Table 3 and Supplementary
185 Table 1). It is well-known that Serovar Hardjo is maintained by cattle and the transmission of the
186 strain to humans occurs commonly through contact with cattle (22). The high seroprevalence for
187 serogroup Sejroe (serovar Hardjo) can be explained by the population's exposure to agricultural
188 activities involving direct/indirect contact with cattle in Badulla (Table 2). However, high
189 seroprevalence for serogroup Sejroe (serovar Hardjo) was also observed among Kandy population
190 despite most of them not being engaged in agriculture (Table 2). Hardjo infections in dogs and cats
191 have been reported previously in Brazil, Croatia, Italy, Scotland, and the USA (23–29). Furthermore,
192 a previous serological study on companion dogs in the Kandy district revealed that serogroup Sejroe
193 was the most common serogroup (16).

194 There are some limitations in this study: the chronic renal disease cohort in this study consisted of
195 CKD and CKDu patients, whereas it would have been ideal to only recruit CKDu patients.
196 Distinguishing between CKDu and CKD cases is only possible via a renal biopsy, an invasive procedure
197 that's rarely followed in Sri Lanka. It must also be noted that the antigen panel used for MAT was not
198 locally isolated strains, and this was due to a lack of information on circulating serogroups/serovars
199 in the study regions. This may have resulted in the underestimation of leptospirosis seropositivity in
200 this study.

201 **5. Conclusions**

202 According to the findings of this study, there is no significant differences in leptospirosis
203 seropositivity were observed between the chronic renal disease patients and healthy community
204 people in Badulla and Kandy, Sri Lanka.

205

206 **Acknowledgments**

The authors would like to extend their gratitude to Mr. Athula Kumara and all staff members of the Department of Microbiology, Faculty of Medicine, employed from 2019-2022 for the technical support rendered for the completion of this project. Final acknowledgments go toward Ms. Nishanthi Weerakoon and all staff members of the Microbiology Division of the Veterinary Research Institute employed from 2020-2021 for their technical support to this study.

Funding

This study was partly supported by a research grant from University of Peradeniya (URG/2018/28M) and National Science Foundation of Sri Lanka (RPHS/2016/CKDu/06).

References

1. Levey AS, Eckardt KU, Tsukamoto Y, Levin A, Coresh J, Rossert J, et al. Definition and classification of chronic kidney disease: A position statement from Kidney Disease: Improving Global Outcomes (KDIGO)z. Kidney Int. 2005;67(6):2089–100.

2. Weaver VM, Fadrowski JJ, Jaar BG. Global dimensions of chronic kidney disease of unknown etiology (CKDu): A modern era environmental and/or occupational nephropathy? Vol. 16, BMC Nephrology. BioMed Central Ltd.; 2015.

3. González-Quiroz M, Pearce N, Caplin B, Nitsch D. What do epidemiological studies tell us about chronic kidney disease of undetermined cause in Meso-America? A systematic review and meta-analysis. Clin Kidney J. 2018;11(4):496–506.

4. O'Callaghan-Gordo C, Shivashankar R, Anand S, Ghosh S, Glaser J, Gupta R, et al. Prevalence of and risk factors for chronic kidney disease of unknown aetiology in India: Secondary data analysis of three population-based cross-sectional studies. BMJ Open. 2019;9(3):1–12.

229 5. Ruwanpathirana T, Senanayake S, Gunawardana N, Munasinghe A, Ginige S, Gamage D, et al.
230 Prevalence and risk factors for impaired kidney function in the district of Anuradhapura, Sri
231 Lanka: A cross-sectional population-representative survey in those at risk of chronic kidney
232 disease of unknown aetiology. BMC Public Health. 2019;19(1):1–11.

233 6. Minshawy O el. Renal Data from the Arab World End-Stage Renal Disease in the El-Minia
234 Governorate, Upper Egypt: An Epidemiological Study [Internet]. Vol. 22, Saudi J Kidney Dis
235 Transpl. 2011. Available from: http://www.sjkdt.org

236 7. Gamage CD, Sarathkumara YD. Chronic kidney disease of uncertain etiology in Sri Lanka: Are
237 leptospirosis and Hantaviral infection likely causes? Med Hypotheses [Internet]. 2016;91:16–
238 9. Available from: http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.mehy.2016.04.009

239 8. Carrillo-Larco RM, Altez-Fernandez C, Acevedo-Rodriguez JG, Ortiz-Acha K, Ugarte-Gil C.
240 Leptospirosis as a risk factor for chronic kidney disease: A systematic review of observational
241 studies. PLoS Negl Trop Dis. 2019;13(5):1–10.

242 9. Correa-Rotter R, Wesseling C, Johnson RJ. CKD of unknown origin in Central America: The
243 case for a mesoamerican nephropathy. American Journal of Kidney Diseases. 2014;63(3):506–
244 20.

245 10. Yang CW. Leptospirosis renal disease: Emerging culprit of chronic kidney disease unknown
246 etiology. Nephron. 2018;138(2):129–36.

247 11. Kupferman J, Ramírez-Rubio O, Amador JJ, López-Pilarte D, Wilker EH, Laws RL, et al. Acute
248 Kidney Injury in Sugarcane Workers at Risk for Mesoamerican Nephropathy. American
249 Journal of Kidney Diseases. 2018;72(4):475–82.

250 12. Yang HY, Hung CC, Liu SH, Guo YG, Chen YC, Ko YC, et al. Overlooked Risk for Chronic Kidney
251 Disease after Leptospiral Infection: A Population-Based Survey and Epidemiological Cohort
252 Evidence. PLoS Negl Trop Dis. 2015;9(10):1–15.

253 13. Wanigasuriya K. Update on uncertain etiology of chronic kidney disease in Sri Lanka's north-
254 central dry zone. MEDICC Rev. 2014;16(2):61–5.

255 14. Agampodi SB, Dahanayaka NJ, Bandaranayaka AK, Perera M, Priyankara S, Weerawansa P, et
256 al. Regional Differences of Leptospirosis in Sri Lanka: Observations from a Flood-Associated
257 Outbreak in 2011. PLoS Negl Trop Dis. 2014;8(1):22.

258 15. Branda AP, Camargo ED, da Silva ED, Silva M v, Abra R v, Oswaldo Cruz F, et al. Macroscopic
259 Agglutination Test for Rapid Diagnosis of Human Leptospirosis. Vol. 36, JOURNAL OF CLINICAL
260 MICROBIOLOGY. 1998.

261 16. Athapattu T, Fernando R, Abayawansha R, Fernando P, Fuward M, Samarakoon N, et al.
262 Carrier Status of Leptospira spp. in Healthy Companion Dogs in Sri Lanka. Vector-Borne and
263 Zoonotic Diseases. 2022;22(2):93–100.

264 17. Epidemiology Unit E, Ministry of Health N and IMSL. National Guidelines on Management of
265 Leptospirosis. Epidemiology Unit, Epidemiology Ministry of Health, Nutrition and Indigenous
266 Medicine Sri Lanka. 2016. 1 p.

267 18. Sunil-Chandra NP, Jayaweera JAAS, Kumbukgolla W, Jayasundara MVML. Association of
268 Hantavirus Infections and Leptospirosis With the Occurrence of Chronic Kidney Disease of
269 Uncertain Etiology in the North Central Province of Sri Lanka: A Prospective Study With
270 Patients and Healthy Persons. Front Cell Infect Microbiol. 2020;10(October):1–10.

271 19. Gifford FJ, Gifford RM, Eddleston M, Dhaun N. Endemic Nephropathy Around the World.
272 Kidney Int Rep. 2017;2(2):282–92.

273 20. Ganoza CA, Matthias MA, Saito M, Cespedes M, Gotuzzo E, Vinetz JM. Asymptomatic renal
274 colonization of humans in the Peruvian Amazon by Leptospira. PLoS Negl Trop Dis. 2010;4(2).

275 21. Sivasankari K, Shanmughapriya S, Natarajaseenivasan K. Leptospiral renal colonization status
276 in asymptomatic rural population of Tiruchirapalli district, Tamilnadu, India. Pathog Glob
277 Health. 2016;110(4–5):209–15.

278 22. White FH, Sutherland GE, Raynor LE, Cottrell CR, Sulzer KR. Leptospira interrogans serovars
279 hardjo and pomona: Causes of Infections in Dairy Cows and Humans in Florida.

280 23. Adin CA, Cowgill LD. Treatment and outcome of dogs with leptospirosis: 38 cases (1990-
281 1098). J Am Vet Med Assoc. 2000;216(3):371–5.

282 24. Agunloye CA, Nash AS. Investigation of possible leptospiral infection in cats in Scotland.
283 Journal of Small Animal Practice. 1996;37(3):126–9.

284 25. Kikuti M, Langoni H, Nobrega DN, Corrêa APFL, Ullmann LS. Occurrence and risk factors
285 associated with canine leptospirosis. Journal of Venomous Animals and Toxins Including
286 Tropical Diseases. 2012;18(1):124–7.

287 26. Majetić ZŠ, Habuš J, Milas Z, Perko VM, Starešina V, Turk N. Serological survey of canine
288 leptospirosis in Croatia - The changing epizootiology of the disease. Vet Arh. 2012;82(2):183–
289 91.

290 27. Piredda I, Ponti MN, Piras A, Palmas B, Pintore P, Pedditzi A, et al. New insights on leptospira
291 infections in a canine population from north sardinia, Italy: A sero-epidemiological study.
292 Biology (Basel). 2021;10(6):1–11.

293 28. Rubanick J V., Fries RC, Waugh CE, Pashmakova MB. Severe hyperkalemia presenting with
294 wide-complex tachycardia in a puppy with acute kidney injury secondary to leptospirosis.
295 Journal of Veterinary Emergency and Critical Care. 2016;26(6):858–63.

296 29. Shropshire SB, Veir JK, Morris AK, Lappin MR. Evaluation of the Leptospira species
297 microscopic agglutination test in experimentally vaccinated cats and Leptospira species
298 seropositivity in aged azotemic client-owned cats. J Feline Med Surg. 2016;18(10):768–72.