

UNIVERSIDADE FEDERAL DE SANTA MARIA  
CENTRO DE CIÊNCIAS RURAIS  
PROGRAMA DE PÓS GRADUAÇÃO EM MEDICINA VETERINÁRIA

Ana Bárbara Uchoa Soares

**CONCORDÂNCIA ENTRE MÉTODOS DE DIAGNÓSTICO PARA  
BACTERIÚRIA EM CÃES**

Santa Maria, RS

2023

Ana Bárbara Uchoa Soares

**CONCORDÂNCIA ENTRE MÉTODOS DE DIAGNÓSTICO PARA  
BACTERIÚRIA EM CÃES**

Dissertação apresentada ao Curso de Mestrado do Programa de Pós-Graduação em Medicina Veterinária, Área de concentração em Patologia e Patologia Clínica Veterinária, da Universidade Federal de Santa Maria (UFSM, RS), como requisito para obtenção do título de **Mestre em Medicina Veterinária**

Orientadora: Professora Dr<sup>a</sup>. Cinthia Melazzo de Andrade

Santa Maria, RS  
2023

**Ana Bárbara Uchoa Soares**

**CONCORDÂNCIA ENTRE MÉTODOS DE DIAGNÓSTICO PARA BACTERIÚRIA  
EM CÃES**

Dissertação apresentada ao Curso de Mestrado do Programa de Pós-Graduação em Medicina Veterinária, Área de concentração em Patologia e Patologia Clínica Veterinária, da Universidade Federal de Santa Maria (UFSM, RS), como requisito para obtenção do título de Mestre em Medicina Veterinária

**Aprovado em 10 de fevereiro de 2023.**

---

**Cynthia Melazzo de Andrade, Dra. (UFSM)  
(Presidente/Orientadora)**

---

**Juliana Felipetto Cargnelutti, Dra. (UFSM)**

---

**Guilherme Lopes Dornelles, Dr. (URI)**

Santa Maria, RS

## AGRADECIMENTOS

Aos meus pais e a minha irmã por me apoiarem imensamente nessa árdua jornada. Obrigada imensamente por me estimularem a continuar estudando em um país que sofreu tantos ataques a Educação e a Ciência nos últimos quatro anos.

À minha professora e orientadora Cinthia por ter me recebido e me dado a oportunidade de realizar mestrado na UFSM. Sou grata pelos ensinamentos, que com certeza contribuirão para a minha experiência profissional. Ao professor Alexandre Krause, pela paciência e dedicação ao ensinar todos os membros do laboratório.

Agradeço, com todo o meu coração, ao LCV (antigo LACVET) por me receberem tão bem. Nunca tinha me sentindo tão acolhida em pouquíssimo tempo. Certamente, vocês transformaram o ambiente laboratorial em um segundo lar. A capacidade de ajudar ao próximo vai ser algo que levarei para sempre em minha vida.

Gostaria de agradecer aos meus colegas e amigos de laboratório. Bernardo, meu pai gaúcho. Camila, por tirar minhas dúvidas de citologia e ser uma referência como profissional. Andreza e Lara por me ajudarem quando eu mais estava desesperada com trabalhos acadêmicos; Jamile, Renata, Nathalia, por escutarem minhas angústias. Jenifer, me acompanhar nas dificuldades de ser vegetariano. Vini, obrigada por todas as caronas para o RU, companhia nas festas em Santa Maria e por eu poder contar sempre contigo quando preciso, já tem um espaço reservado no meu coração. As R2 do LCV, Bruna e Anne, por terem me auxiliado no meu projeto e por serem lindas, maravilhosas e me aguentar todas as tardes. Obrigada Dani, seu Wilson, Rose por trazerem alegria e bom humor para o laboratório.

Ao Bruno Almeida e Larissa, que por mais que trabalhemos mais juntos, está sempre disponível para me auxiliar quando eu preciso.

À Rose e Belle, por escutarem quando eu estou triste e me motivar a seguir na Medicina Veterinária, um caminho repleto de obstáculos.

Ao Programa de Pós-Graduação em Medicina Veterinária (PPGMV-UFSM) e à CAPES.

Obrigada aos melhores seres vivos do mundo e que aprendo a lidar com a falta deles: Scotch, o melhor cão que já existiu, Berilão, te encontrar com certeza foi um sinal para eu escolher Veterinária, Pussycat, meu primeiro amor felino de Santa Maria, Berilinho Rabo Reto, Minie, Grafite e Filó.

## RESUMO

### CONCORDÂNCIA ENTRE MÉTODOS DE DIAGNÓSTICO PARA BACTERIÚRIA EM CÃES

AUTORA: Ana Bárbara Uchoa Soares

ORIENTADORA: Prof. Dra. Cinthia Melazzo de Andrade

Em medicina veterinária, o diagnóstico de bacteriúria comumente baseia-se somente na avaliação do sedimento urinário não corado, este método não é o mais adequado, pois partículas amorfas presentes na urina podem ser confundidas com bactérias. Portanto as amostras de urina dos pacientes com suspeita de infecção do trato urinário devem ser enviadas para a realização de cultura bacteriológica, considerado “padrão ouro” de diagnóstico. No entanto, devido ao maior tempo exigido para a obtenção dos resultados, esse procedimento nem sempre é realizado. Nesse contexto, a realização da análise do sedimento urinário corado se apresenta como um método potencialmente mais preciso que a avaliação do sedimento não corado. Assim, este estudo tem como objetivo investigar se a análise de sedimentos urinários corados é um método de triagem eficiente, para identificação de bacteriúria quando comparado à cultura microbiológica. As amostras de urina utilizadas foram provenientes das amostras de rotina do Laboratório Clínico Veterinário (LCV) localizado no Hospital Veterinário Universitário (HVU) da Universidade Federal de Santa Maria (UFSM). Na urinalise, foram realizadas as análises físicas, químicas e análise do sedimento não corado e corado com Gram, sendo incluídas neste estudo amostras coletadas pelo método de micção espontânea e cateterismo. Houve exclusão de amostras com menos de 5 ml e de pacientes em tratamento com antibióticos. Foram destinados 10ml de urina para urinalise, enquanto 1ml de urina foi destinada à realização de cultura bacteriológica quantitativa no Laboratório de Bacteriologia (LABAC) da UFSM. Para a técnica de colheita de urina por cateterismo, 55% (n=40) dos resultados foram detectados como falso positivos para análise do Sedimento Urinário (SU) não corado e 2,5% (n=40) dos resultados foram avaliados como falso negativos para análise do SU corado. Por fim, para colheita de urina por micção espontânea, 23,3% (n=60) dos resultados foram detectados como falso positivo na análise do SU não corado e 1,66% (n=60) dos resultados observados no SU foram detectados como falso negativos. A técnica de coloração de Gram do SU aumentou sensivelmente a diferenciação entre detecção de substâncias amorfas e bacteriúria nas amostras de urina de cães, sugerindo a aplicabilidade desta coloração na rotina laboratorial.

**Palavras-chave:** Urinalise. Sedimento urinário corado. Cultura bacteriana. Sensibilidade. Bacteriúria. Gram

## ABSTRACT

### AGREEMENT BETWEEN DIAGNOSTIC METHODS FOR BACTERIURIA IN DOGS

AUTHOR: Ana Bárbara Uchoa Soares  
PROFESSOR: Cinthia Melazzo de Andrade

In veterinary medicine, the diagnosis of bacteriuria is commonly based only on the evaluation of unstained urinary sediment, this method is not the most appropriate, as amorphous particles present in the urine can be confused with bacteria. Therefore, the urine sample of patients with suspected urinary tract infection should be sent for bacteriological culture, which is considered the “gold standard” for diagnosis. However, due to the longer time required to obtain results, this procedure is not always performed. In this context, carrying out the analysis of stained urinary sediment is a potentially more accurate method than the assessment of non-stained sediment. Thus, this study aims to investigate whether the analysis of stained urinary sediments is an efficient screening method for the identification of bacteriuria when compared to microbiological culture. The urine samples used came from the routine samples of the Laboratory of Veterinary Clinical Analysis (LCV) located at the University Veterinary Hospital (HVU) of the Federal University of Santa Maria (UFSM) after the urinalysis in which the physical analyses, chemical analysis and analysis of slides of unstained and Gram-stained urinary sediment, included in this study, collected by the urination method with the cystic catheter. There was exclusion of Exception with less than 5 ml and patients under treatment with antibiotics. 10ml of urine was used for urinalysis, while 1ml of urine was used for quantitative bacteriological culture at the Bacteriology Laboratory (LABAC) at UFSM. For the technique of urine collection by catheterization, 55% (n=40) of the results were detected as false positives for analysis of unstained SU (Urinary Sediment) and 2.5% (n=40) of the results were evaluated as false negative for stained SU analysis. Finally, for spontaneous micturition urine collection, 23.3% (n=60) of the results were detected as false positives in the analysis of the US not detected and 1.66% (n=60) of the results observed in the SU were detected as a false negative. The SU Gram color technique significantly increased the differentiation between detection of amorphous substances and bacteriuria in dog urine samples, suggesting the applicability of this color in laboratory routine.

**Keywords:** Urinalysis. Stained urine sediment. Bacterial culture. Sensitivity. Bacteriuria. Gram

## LISTA DE TABELAS

Tabela 1	Detection of bacteriuria in urine samples from dogs obtained by catheterization or spontaneous urination, analyzed at the Laboratory of Veterinary Clinical Analysis – HVU – UFSM.....	30
Tabela 2	Occurrence of false positive or negative results for bacteriuria in urine samples from dogs collected by catheterization or spontaneous urination analyzed at the Laboratory of Veterinary Clinical Analysis – HVU – UFSM - .....	31
Tabela 3	Comparison of identification of bacterial morphology in culture and optical microscopy methods (stained and unstained sediment).....	32
Tabela 4	Frequency of the distribution of the morphological classification obtained by Culture and Unstained Urinary Sediment.....	33
Tabela 5	Frequency of distribution of morphological classification obtained in Culture and Unstained urinary sediment.....	34

## SUMÁRIO

<b>1 INTRODUÇÃO.....</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>2 MANUSCRITO.....</b>	<b>13</b>
Abstract.....	14
Introduction.....	15
Material and Methods.....	16
<b>Unstained sediment analysis.....</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>Gram stained sediment analysis.....</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>Aerobic urine culture.....</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>Statistical Analysis.....</b>	<b>18</b>
Results and Discussion.....	18
Conclusion.....	25
References.....	26
Appendice.....	30
<b>3 CONCLUSÃO.....</b>	<b>35</b>
<b>REFERÊNCIAS.....</b>	<b>36</b>



## 1 INTRODUÇÃO

A infecção do trato urinário (ITU) é definida como adesão, multiplicação e persistência de um agente infeccioso no sistema urogenital, que geralmente se constitui em uma bactéria (BARTGES, 2004), geralmente, provenientes do intestino ou da pele que circunda o períneo (SMEE et al., 2013). A ITU canina é uma enfermidade comum na rotina clínica, ocorrendo em aproximadamente 14% dos cães que já passaram por alguma avaliação clínico-veterinária (THOMPSON et al., 2011). É mais comum em fêmeas com idade média de 7-8 anos, mais facilmente descoberta quando os animais apresentam sinais clínicos, como hematuria, polaquiúria e aumento da frequência urinária (YAMAKA et al., 2019). No entanto, a ITU pode existir sem sinais clínicos, e nestes casos o diagnóstico é por acaso (CHEW; DIBARTOLA; SCHENCK, 2011).

O diagnóstico de ITU por meio da urinálise pode direcionar para um exame de sedimento urinário normal, enfatizando a necessidade de um resultado de cultura positivo para confirmar o diagnóstico de ITU (THOMPSON et al., 2011). A identificação de bactérias na urina não é sinônimo de ITU, podendo representar contaminação da amostra, especialmente se a amostra for coletada por micção natural ou cateterismo uretral em que bactérias do trato urogenital distal ou a urina pode ser contaminada no procedimento de coleta (BARTGES, 2004).

Em relação à etiologia, a maioria das ITUs em cães envolve um único agente. A bactéria *Escherichia coli* é responsável pela maior parte das infecções registradas em cães seguido por cocos gram-positivos, incluindo *Proteus*, *Klebsiella*, *Pasteurella*, *Pseudomonas*, *Corynebacterium*, e vários outros gêneros raramente relatados (OLIN & BARTGES, 2015). Existem relatos na literatura veterinária que registram a prevalência de bacteriúria em cães com doença clínica, por exemplo, diabetes melito, hiperadrenocorticismos, doença do disco intervertebral, parvovirose canina e urolitíase (MCGHIE; STAYT; HOOSGOOD, 2018).

A ITU inferior pode ser classificada como cistite bacteriana esporádica (não complicada) ou recorrente (complicada) (WEESE et al., 2011; WEESE et al., 2019). Cães acometidos pela cistite bacteriana esporádica normalmente apresentam polaquiúria, disúria e/ou estrangúria como sinais clínicos, manifestando de um a dois episódios de suspeita de cistite em um período de 12 meses (WEESE et al., 2019). A cistite bacteriana recorrente, por sua vez, caracteriza-se pela ocorrência de três ou mais episódios de cistite clínica em um

prazo de 12 meses ou 2 ou mais episódios em um período de seis meses (WEESE et al., 2019). Apesar de ser denominada como cistite bacteriana recorrente, essa terminologia também inclui reinfecções, podendo ser pelo mesmo ou outro agente (WEESE et al., 2019).

A análise apenas do sedimento urinário é inadequada para o diagnóstico de ITU devido a problemas, como a ocorrência de resultados falso positivo de bacteriúria na ausência de infecção clínica (SWENSON et al., 2004). A cultura bacteriana aeróbica e o teste de suscetibilidade devem ser realizados em todos os casos, para confirmar a presença de infecção, identificar a presença de bactérias resistentes, que podem não responder à terapia inicial, e fornecer ao clínico-veterinário quais são as bactérias mais comuns em sua rotina clínica (WEESE et al., 2011; (GRANT; NAPIER; CORRIGAN, 2021).

As amostras de urinas destinadas a cultura microbiológica devem ser coletadas por cistocentese (CHEW; DIBARTOLA; SCHENCK, 2011), pois este método não necessita passar pela uretra distal, que é habitada por bactérias comensais mesmo em cães saudáveis (GRANT; NAPIER; CORRIGAN, 2021). Após a coleta de urina para cultura bacteriológica, a amostra deve ser analisada dentro de 30 minutos, se isso não for possível, essas amostras devem ser refrigeradas a temperaturas em torno de 4 a 5°C por até seis horas sem alteração drástica nas populações bacterianas (DUNNING & STONEHEWER, 2021). No entanto, alguns organismos urinários mais exigentes podem morrer com períodos de armazenamento prolongados, o que pode levar a uma contagem bacteriana quantitativa mais baixa (DUNNING & STONEHEWER, 2021). A realização da cultura bacteriana é importante para descartar a ocorrência de doenças não infecciosas que mimetizam a ITU, direcionando assim tratamento e promover a administração antimicrobiana corretamente, evitando o uso indiscriminado de antimicrobianos, que contribuem para a resistência bacteriana aos antimicrobianos (GRANT; NAPIER; CORRIGAN, 2021). O custo e o tempo necessários para a cultura bacteriana têm sido apontados como possíveis empecilhos para a realização deste exame na prática clínica (DE BRIYNE et al., 2013;).

O uso histórico de antimicrobianos provocou o desenvolvimento de resistência bacteriana em seres humanos com ITUs, destacando a importância da seleção correta de um antimicrobiano no tratamento de indivíduos com ITU (WONG; EPSTEIN; WESTROPP, 2015). Na Medicina Veterinária, o surgimento de patógenos multirresistentes também torna difícil a realização da terapêutica de pacientes com ITU devido às escolhas limitadas de medicamentos (WEESE et al. 2011). A diminuição da eficácia de fármacos contra bactérias

causadoras de ITU em cães tem sido associada ao uso empírico de antimicrobianos que não deve substituir a cultura na escolha da terapia medicamentosa. O tratamento de infecções causadas por bactérias resistentes é muito difícil, podendo causar morbidade significativa aos animais, além de tornar-se oneroso financeiramente aos tutores (JOHNSTONE, 2019).

O surgimento de bactérias multirresistentes (resistentes a três ou mais categorias de antimicrobianos) em animais de companhia é uma preocupação crescente na medicina veterinária, se constituindo em questão de saúde pública, uma vez que os animais de companhia podem desempenhar um papel na disseminação de bactérias resistentes devido ao seu contato próximo com humanos (MARQUES et al., 2016). A realização da urocultura evita o desenvolvimento de resistência antimicrobiana, reduz o custo geral do tratamento e, mais importante, a morbidade do paciente. Além de aumentar a chance de selecionar o medicamento mais adequado já no início do tratamento (HALL; HOLMES; BAINES, 2014). A administração de antimicrobianos é frequentemente usada empiricamente com base, apenas, na presença de sinais clínicos compatíveis e na urinálise, sem os resultados do exame de urocultura. Geralmente, a terapêutica contra a ITU é implementada para aliviar os sintomas de ITU (MARQUES et al., 2016). Nos casos em que não há possibilidade de realização de cultura bacteriana, a seleção antimicrobiana deve ser baseada em características bacterianas observadas no sedimento urinário. No entanto, existem desvantagens a serem consideradas com a utilização de antibióticos empíricos, por exemplo, a identificação de cocos gram-positivos pode também ser compatível com *Enterococcus* spp., que seria resistente a uma cefalosporina (SMEE et al., 2013). Além disso, partículas amorfas semelhantes a bactérias (pseudobactérias) são comumente detectados na avaliação microscópica do sedimento urinário não coradas, sendo relatadas como bactérias por patologistas clínicos com diferentes tempos de experiência. Foi relatado que o uso da coloração de Gram no sedimento urinário melhorou substancialmente a identificação de bactérias em amostras de urina obtidas de humanos. Similarmente, a coloração do sedimento urinário pelo Wright-Giemsa melhorou significativamente a sensibilidade, especificidade e eficiência do teste de detecção microscópica de bacteriúria em comparação com a do método do sedimento urinário não corado, se constituindo um método rápido, barato e de fácil execução (SWENSON et al., 2011).

Portanto o objetivo desse trabalho foi avaliar os resultados da análise do sedimento urinário não corado e do sedimento corado com Gram em relação ao exame padrão-ouro,

cultura bacteriológica. As amostras de urina utilizadas no presente estudo foram obtidas da rotina de atendimento do Hospital Veterinário Universitário (HVU) da Universidade Federal de Santa Maria com intuito de demonstrar que a utilização da coloração de Gram no sedimento urinário, auxiliaria o patologista clínico na diferenciação de estruturas parecida com bactérias no sedimento urinário, evitando a prescrição de antibióticos de forma desnecessária, já que, muitas vezes, o tutor não dispõem de recursos financeiros para pagar a cultura bacteriológica ou não há a possibilidade de esperar pelos resultados desse exame.

## **2 MANUSCRITO**

Os resultados deste trabalho encontram-se na forma de manuscrito, o qual será submetido para a revista Ciência Rural. As normas da revista podem ser conferidas no site: <http://coral.ufsm.br/ccr/cienciarural/normas.htm>

1 **Agreement between diagnostic methods for bacteriuria in dogs**

2 **<sup>1</sup>Ana Bárbara Uchoa Soares <sup>1\*</sup>Cinthia Melazzo de Andrade**

3 1. Veterinary Clinical Pathology Laboratory, Small Animal Clinic Department, Veterinary  
4 Hospital, University Federal de Santa Maria, Avenue Roraima, 1000, Santa Maria-RS  
5 97105900, Brasil

6 \* Corresponding author:

7 E-mail: cmelazzoandrade1@gmail.com

8

9 **ABSTRACT**

10 Diagnosis of bacteriuria in veterinary medicine is commonly based on unstained urinary  
11 sediment (US) evaluation. Nonetheless amorphous particles can be confused with bacteria.  
12 This study aims to investigate whether the stained sediment increases the sensitivity of  
13 bacteriuria detection. Forty-seven 7ml urine samples from dogs of different breeds, sex, age  
14 and collection method were analyzed, destined for the Veterinary Clinical Analysis  
15 Laboratory (LCV) located at the University Veterinary Hospital (HVU) of the Federal  
16 University of Santa Maria (UFSM). In addition, an aliquot of 2 ml of these samples was  
17 destined for quantitative bacteriological culture, in the bacteriology laboratory (LABAC) of  
18 UFSM to compare the results obtained in the analysis of the US, because it is the gold  
19 standard, for the diagnosis of bacteriuria. For the technique of urine collection by  
20 catheterization, 55% (n=40) of the results were detected as false positives for analysis of  
21 unstained SU (Urinary Sediment) and 2.5% (n=40) of the results were evaluated as false  
22 negative for stained SU analysis. Finally, for spontaneous micturition urine collection, 23.3%  
23 (n=60) of the results were detected as false positives in the analysis of the US not detected

1 and 1.66% (n=60) of the results observed in the SU were detected as a false negative.  
2 Performing GRAM staining of urinary sediment increased the differentiation between  
3 amorphous substances and bacteriuria in urine samples from dogs, which suggests the  
4 applicability of this staining in laboratory routine.

5 **Key words:** Urinalysis, stained urine sediment, bacterial culture, sensitivity, bacteriuria,  
6 Gram.

7

## 8 INTRODUCTION

9 Urinary tract infection (UTI) is a common disease in the clinical routine of small  
10 animals, occurring in approximately 14% of dogs that undergo clinical-veterinary evaluation.  
11 (BARTGES, 2004). Bacterial culture is necessary to confirm the diagnosis of UTI  
12 (THOMPSON et al., 2011), as urinalysis may erroneously lead to an unaltered exam.  
13 Cystocentesis is the most recommended collection method for samples that will be destined  
14 for culture, as this method avoids contact with the distal urethra, which is inhabited by  
15 bacteria, even in healthy dogs (GRANT et al., 2021). Therefore, urine samples may present  
16 contamination, especially if the sample is collected through natural urination or urethral  
17 catheterization (BARTGES, 2004). Opposite to recommendations, many veterinarians send  
18 urine samples by spontaneous urination for culture, even in patients who show signs  
19 consistent with UTI (Urinary Tract Infections), as it is a simple and non-invasive procedure  
20 that can be performed by the tutors themselves (GRANT et al., 2021).

21 Bacterial culture and susceptibility testing confirms infection, allows identification of  
22 resistant bacteria, and rules out non-infectious diseases that mimic UTI (WEESE et al., 2011).  
23 This approach avoids the indiscriminate use of antimicrobials, which would increase bacterial  
24 resistance to these drugs (GRANT et al., 2021). The advantage of performing a culture lies in

1 the possibility of determining the level of bacterial growth, by counting colony forming units  
2 (CFUs), which can be used in the interpretation of results (WEESE et al.,2011).

3 However, the cost and time required for bacterial culture have been identified as  
4 possible obstacles to performing this test in clinical practice (DE BRIYNE et al., 2013). Thus,  
5 in some cases, the administration of antimicrobials is performed based on clinical signs and  
6 urinalysis findings compatible with UTI (MARQUES et al., 2016).

7 In the microscopic analysis of urinary sediment, amorphous particles similar to bacteria  
8 (pseudobacteria) are commonly reported as bacteria, regardless of the experience of the  
9 clinical pathologist who performs the examination (SWENSON et al., 2004). In addition, the  
10 use of Gram or Wright-Giemsa stains on urinary sediment in dogs and cats substantially  
11 improves the identification of bacteria when compared to analysis of unstained urinary  
12 sediment (SWENSON et al., 2011), which can minimize the previously raised issue.

13 Knowing that the possibility of mistakenly identifying bacteria is a reality in routine and  
14 that the manufacture of stained slides of urinary sediment is a quick, inexpensive and  
15 relatively easy procedure (SWENSON et al., 2011) this study aims to to verify the  
16 concordance between the analysis of the urine sediment stained or not, with the bacterial  
17 culture of urine of dogs for the confirmation of bacteriúria.

18

## 19 **MATERIALS AND METHODS**

20 The study was approved by the Animal Ethics Committee under protocol number  
21 9964140622. Urine samples from female (n=48) and male (n=62) dogs, of different breeds,  
22 ages and collection methods, derived from routine Clinical and surgical tests at the University  
23 Veterinary Hospital (HVU) at the Federal University of Santa Maria (UFSM) were processed  
24 for the detection of bacteriuria by analysis of the sediment stained or not by the Gram method.



1 A 2 mL aliquot of these samples was sent for bacteriological culture. Samples with less than  
2 five ml of urine or urine from animals treated with antibiotics were excluded from the  
3 experimental design.

4

#### 5 *Unstained sediment analysis*

6 Five milliliters of urine were centrifuged at 1500 rpm for 5 minutes. After this process,  
7 the volume of 0.5 mL of supernatant was maintained, which was homogenized with the  
8 sediment. With the aid of a pipette, 10 $\mu$ L of this mixture was placed on a glass slide and  
9 superimposed by a cover slip for microscopy. Ten fields of the sediment were analyzed in an  
10 optical microscope (Zeiss®) with a 10X and 40X objective. The average number of bacteria  
11 was classified in a 400X objective, being classified as none, occasional (<3 bacteria), few (3  
12 to 10 bacteria), moderate (11 to 40 bacteria) and severe (> 40 bacteria) (SWENSON et al.,  
13 2004).

14

#### 15 *Gram stained sediment analysis*

16 The slides with the urinary sediment were subjected to dry fixation and then stained  
17 with a Gram staining kit (Laborclin®) with the methodology according to the manufacturer's  
18 instructions. The stained slides were examined in an immersion objective (1000X) in 20  
19 fields, being classified as none, occasional (1 to 4 bacteria), few (5 to 9 bacteria), moderate  
20 (10 to 20 bacteria) or severe (> 20 bacteria). (SWENSON et al., 2004).

21

#### 22 *Aerobic urine culture*

23 A 0.01 mL aliquot of urine was seeded and enriched in Blood and MacConkey Agar  
24 medium using a sterile calibrated loop. Blood agar medium was used to promote the growth

1 of fastidious organisms. There was a serial dilution of the urine plate ranging from  $10^{-1}$  a  $10^{-6}$   
2 and 0.1 ml of urine was inoculated in each dilution on the surface of each agar plate in  
3 duplicate.

4 In collections by spontaneous urination, it was defined as significant bacteriuria from  
5 100,000 CFU/ml. In urine collected by voided specimens, samples with growth  $< 1000$   
6 CFU/ml were considered evidence of contamination (SWENSON et al., 2004).

7

#### 8 *Statistical analysis*

9 The Kappa coefficient test (95% confidence interval) was performed to calculate the  
10 concordance between the results of the culture with the analysis of the stained sediment and  
11 the unstained sediment. In addition, sensitivity, specificity, accuracy, positive and negative  
12 predictive value were also calculated.

13

## 14 **RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

15 100 urine samples were received during the period from May to July 2022, two samples  
16 were excluded from the study due to contamination in the bacteriological culture, with 60  
17 positive samples and 40 negative samples in the culture. 60 samples were collected through  
18 voided specimens and 40 through catheterization, 48 from females and 52 from males. Two  
19 dogs each provided two urine samples, the rest of the patients only one sample was collected.  
20 Quantitative aerobic urine culture was positive in 15 samples collected by catheterization  
21 (25%) and in 45 samples collected by voided specimens (75%). In this last collection method,  
22 there were 72 bacteria.

23 Microorganisms isolated by free cacth include: *Staphylococcus* sp. (n=21, 29.16%),  
24 *Escherichia coli* (n=15, 20.83%), *Streptococcus* sp. (n=10, 13.88%), *Klebsiella* sp. (n=6,  
25 8.33%), *Acinetobacter* sp. (n=5, 6.94%), *Enterococcus* sp. (n=4, 5.55%), *Pseudopmonas* sp.

1 (n=4, 5.55%), *Proteus* sp. (n=3, 4.16%), *Micrococcus* sp. (n=2, 2.77%), *Neisseria* sp. (n=1,  
2 1.38%) e *Corynebacterium* sp. (n=1, 1.38%). By catheterization, 18 bacteria were isolated.  
3 Microorganisms isolated by were: *Escherichia coli* (n=6, 33.3%); *Staphylococcus* sp. (n=4,  
4 22.2%), *Streptococcus* sp. (n=4, 22.2%); *Proteus* sp. (n=1, 5.55%), *Pseudomonas* sp. (n=1,  
5 5.55%), *Klebsiella* sp. (n=1, 5.55%), *Acinotobacter* (n=1, 5.55%). Bacterial cultures in which  
6 only one species was isolated were 31 of 60 (51.66%) and cultures in which multiple, 2 or  
7 more species were grown were 29 of 60 (48.33%). The bacteria most found in the present  
8 study were *Staphylococcus* sp and *Escherichia coli*, which is in agreement with other authors  
9 (WAY et al., 2013; SWENSON et al., 2004). *Escherichia coli* is one of the most isolated  
10 bacteria in canine UTI patients followed by Gram positive cocci: *Staphylococcus* sp. *Proteus*  
11 sp., *Klebsiella* sp., *Pasteurella* sp., *Pseudomona* sp., *Corynebacterium* sp. (OLIN &  
12 BARTGES, 2015; GATORIA et al., 2006).

13       Regarding the samples collected by catheterization (n=40), bacteriuria was observed in  
14 37 samples by analysis of unstained sediment, in 15 samples by stained sediment and in only  
15 10 by bacterial culture (Table 1). Twenty-two false positive results were observed in the  
16 unstained sediment analysis, five false positive results in the stained sediment analysis and  
17 four false negative results in the stained sediment analysis (Table 2).

18       For samples collected by voided specimens (n=60), bacteriuria was observed in 58  
19 samples in the unstained sediment analysis, 35 in the stained sediment analysis and 15 in the  
20 bacterial culture (Table 1). There were 14 false positive results for the unstained sediment  
21 analysis, 3 false positive results for the stained sediment, one false negative result for the  
22 unstained sediment analysis and one false negative result for the stained sediment analysis  
23 (Table 2).

1           The concordance of the format of bacteria found in the stained and unstained sediment  
2 was analyzed with the gold standard method, culture (Table 3). There was the observation of  
3 40 samples without bacterial growth, in samples collected by catheterization and spontaneous  
4 urination, in which in the analysis of the unstained sediment, five samples (12.5%) were  
5 visualized without bacteria and 35 samples with bacteria of the cocci type (87.5%) (Table 4  
6 and 5).

7           When the analysis of the stained sediment was performed, no growth was observed in  
8 32 samples (80%) and in eight (20%) samples, cocci bacteria were observed. As for the  
9 cultures in which coccoid-shaped bacteria were isolated (n=7), the unstained sediment  
10 technique provided six results (85.7%) compatible with cocci and one result compatible with  
11 a mixed population, cocci and bacilli (16.7%). Regarding the cultures in which there was  
12 growth of bacilli (n=10), it was observed in the analysis of the unstained sediment, four  
13 results compatible with cocci (40%) and six compatible with cocci and bacilli (60%). When  
14 the stained sediment was analyzed, two samples (20%) were seen without the presence of  
15 bacteria and 1 (10%) samples had coccus-type bacteria, 6 had bacilli (60%) and one (10%)  
16 mixed population was visualized. As for the bacterial cultures in which mixed populations of  
17 bacteria were isolated (n=8), it was observed in the analysis of the unstained sediment, one  
18 result with no bacteria (12.5%), five results compatible with cocci (62.5%) and two results  
19 (25%) compatible with mixed population. In the analysis of the stained sediment, there were  
20 two samples without bacteria (25%), four samples with only cocci-type bacteria (50%), one  
21 sample (12.5%) with only bacillary bacteria and one that presented (12.5%) mixed population.

22           Analysis of the unstained sediment showed a Kappa coefficient of 0.009 (95% CI 0.057  
23 to 0.077) when compared to the culture. The calculated sensitivity was 98.39%, specificity

1 2.44%, positive predictive value 60.40%, negative predictive value 50.00% and accuracy  
2 60.19%

3 The identification of bacteriuria in the stained sediment showed a Kappa coefficient of  
4 0.460 (95% CI 0.293 to 0.626) when compared with the culture. The calculated sensitivity  
5 was 67.74%, specificity 80.49%, positive predictive value 84.00% and negative predictive  
6 value 62.26% and accuracy of 72.82%.

7 The analysis of the Gram sediment proved lower sensitivity and specificity compared to  
8 other studies (WAY et al., 2013, NEIL et al., 2013). This divergence occurred because of the  
9 different populations included in the study and because the urine collection methods were not  
10 the same, the present study used samples from catheterization and voided specimens, while  
11 the authors mentioned above obtained the samples by cystocentesis.

12 Despite the high sensitivity of unstained urinary sediment analysis (98.9%), and its low  
13 specificity (2.44%), this method is not suitable for use as a screening test for bacteriuria,  
14 requiring values of high specificity and sensitivity (GOULART & CHIARI, 2007). Based on  
15 this study, 27 (67.5%) of 40 samples without bacterial growth, no bacteria were seen in the  
16 analysis of the stained sediment, but when the analysis of the unstained sediment occurred,  
17 there was the observation of bacteria which could result in antimicrobial therapy unnecessary.

18 Analysis of the stained sediment revealed a Kappa coefficient of 0.460 (95% CI 0.293  
19 to 0.626), which indicates a moderate concordance with the culture, while analysis of the  
20 unstained sediment evidenced a Kappa coefficient of 0.009 (95% CI 0.057 to 0.077), which  
21 constitutes a minimal correlation. Therefore, the Gram urinary sediment has a better  
22 concordance with the culture, the gold standard method for detecting bacteriuria, making the  
23 analysis of the stained sediment a more reliable test than the observation of the unstained  
24 sediment.

1 In the present study, the Odds ratio, positive and negative, was also calculated, which  
2 studies the probability of an event occurring in two different tests. The analysis of the stained  
3 sediment showed a higher positive Odds ratio value (3.47) than the unstained sediment (1.01),  
4 indicating a greater chance of simultaneous occurrence of positive results from the sediment  
5 color method with the gold standard test. This data reinforces what was seen by the Kappa  
6 coefficient, a greater association between the analysis of the stained sediment and the culture,  
7 reinforcing the reliability of the Gram urinary sediment. This greater credibility was also  
8 confirmed by the high accuracy presented by the analysis of stained slides (72.87%)  
9 demonstrates that this test is more likely to provide correct results when compared to the  
10 analysis of the unstained sediment, which presented an accuracy of 60.19%.

11 Gram staining of the sediment showed a high positive predictive value, constituting a  
12 good indicator of bacteriuria, but a lower negative predictive value, demonstrating that  
13 negative results in stained urine slides would be less reliable than positive results. The  
14 analysis of the unstained sediment, in other way, presented lower positive and negative  
15 predictive values than the analysis of the stained sediment. These lower values are due to the  
16 low specificity and high sensitivity obtained by the unstained method, which mainly reduced  
17 the negative predictive value of this test. The present study had lower positive and negative  
18 predictive values compared to other studies (WAY et al., 2013; SWENSON et al., 2011;  
19 NEIL et al., 2013). In the study carried out by WAY et al. (2013) the positive and negative  
20 predictive value were 100% and 93%, respectively. In the study carried out by NEIL et al.  
21 (2013), a positive and negative predictive value of 88% and 98%, respectively, was found.  
22 While in the study executed by SWENSON et al. (2004), there was the observation of  
23 positive and negative predictive value, respectively, of 94.5% and 98.7%. This difference may  
24 have been caused by differences in the population used in the studies and by the urine

1 collection method used. Urine samples in the present study were collected by catheterization  
2 and voided specimens, which are methods more susceptible to contamination by bacteria  
3 from the lower urinary tract. Sample contamination can be confirmed by performing a  
4 quantitative bacteriological culture obtained by catheterization and voided specimens  
5 (SMEE et al., 2013). However, it is reliable to use the voided specimens method, if  
6 veterinary reference intervals are used for counting CFUs/ml, if the samples are refrigerated  
7 and cultured within 4 h after collection (SOARESEN et al., 2016). Despite the high  
8 prevalence (60.19%) of positive cultures (n=60), most of these cultures showed CFU count  
9 values (Colony Forming Units) lower than 10,000 CFUs/ml in the collection by  
10 catheterization and below of 100,000 CFU/ml in the collection by voided specimen, not  
11 being sufficient for the detection of bacteriuria. Thirty samples from voided specimen were  
12 observed, representing 66.7% of the cultures with bacterial isolation in this collection method,  
13 and 5 by catheterization, totaling 33.3% of the samples with bacterial growth by  
14 catheterization.

15 All incorrectly identified samples were classified as cocci-type bacteria, both in the  
16 analysis of the stained sediment and the unstained sediment technique. This occurs because  
17 bacilli are easier to differentiate due to their unique shape, resulting in fewer false-positive  
18 results (SØRENSEN et al., 2016; MONTEIRO et al., 2021). However, despite the  
19 morphology of bacillary bacteria being easier to distinguish, bacterial cultures with a mixed  
20 population showed a lower percentage of correct identification of bacilli in the stained and  
21 unstained sediment. In the stained sediment, only one sample was identified the presence of  
22 cocci and bacilli in the Gram and in two samples in the non-stained sediment. Possibly, the  
23 failure in the diagnosis of mixed populations is due to the low presence of CFUs of bacillary  
24 or coccoid bacteria, poor preparation of the urinary sediment slide, contamination of the

1 culture medium and pre-analytical errors (urine storage), which may favor or inhibit bacterial  
2 growth (WAY et al., 2013; MONTEIRO et al., 2021; SWENSON et al., 2004). In six samples  
3 in the unstained sediment and in one sample stained with Gram, mixed populations  
4 originating from culture with growth of only bacilli-type bacteria were visualized. This result  
5 proves the effectiveness of staining the urinary sediment with Gram in the differentiation of  
6 cellular debris (SWENSON et al., 2011).

7       Our data suggest that the collection method does not interfere with the observation of  
8 false positive results, probably due to the previously established bacteriuria criteria for  
9 bacterial culture for the different methods of obtaining urine (SMEE et al., 2013). The false-  
10 positive results were due to the presence of small particles that resembled bacteria in size,  
11 shape and Brownian motion. These particles are usually small lipid molecules, cytoplasmic  
12 organelles, amorphous crystals or debris that do not grow in culture, but contribute to false-  
13 positive results due to the analysis of unstained urinary sediment (SWENSON et al., 2004).  
14 SWENSON et al. (2004) descreveu o mesmo efeito quando o sedimento foi corado pela  
15 coloração de Wright Giemsa. A coloração de Gram tem como vantagem a possibilidade de  
16 diferenciação das bactérias entre Gram-positiva e negativa (WAY et al., 2013). SWENSON et  
17 al. (2004) described the same effect when the sediment was stained with the Wright Giemsa  
18 stain. Gram staining has the advantage of being able to differentiate between Gram-positive  
19 and Gram-negative bacteria (WAY et al., 2013).

20       The stained sediment was not able to detect bacteriuria in 4 samples collected by  
21 catheterization and in one collected by voided specimens. This occurrence cannot be  
22 attributed to a low count of Colony Forming Units (CFUs), since these were similar to the  
23 samples classified as having bacteriuria in the sediment analysis. Therefore, perhaps there



1 could have been contamination of the culture medium or poor preparation of the sediment, as  
2 suggested by WAY et al. (2013).

3         The empirical use of antibiotics has been considered the main cause of the emergence  
4 of microorganisms resistant to multiple drugs. The World Health Organization (WHO) (2019)  
5 considers this the biggest problem to be faced in public health in the next century. In  
6 Veterinary Medicine, the treatment of probable UTI based on the results of bacteriuria  
7 analysis of urinary sediment is the major cause of the indiscriminate use of antimicrobials.  
8 Therefore, our preliminary results strongly suggest that stained urinary sediment analysis  
9 should be routinely implemented to mitigate the false detection of bacteriuria in urinalysis,  
10 thus reducing the misprescription of antibiotics.

11

## 12 **CONCLUSION**

13         The Gram staining technique of urinary sediment significantly increases the detection  
14 of bacteria in sediment analysis and decreases the occurrence of false positive results in  
15 urinalysis. Therefore, as it is an easy, fast and low-cost technique, it should be implemented in  
16 the laboratory routine.

17

## 18 **Acknowledgment**

19         Este estudo foi financiado pela Coordenação de Aperfeiçoamento de Pessoal de Nível  
20 Superior (CAPES), Financial code 001, Brazil.

21

## 22 **CONFLICT OF INTEREST DECLARATION**

23         The authors declare no conflict of interest.

24

## 1 REFERENCES

- 2 BARTGES, J.W. Diagnosis of urinary tract infections. **Veterinary Clinics Small Animal**  
3 **Practice**. v.34, n.4, p. 923–933, jul. 2004. Available from:<  
4 <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/S0195561604000294?via%3Dihub>>.  
5 Accessed: Mar. 20, 2022. doi: 10.1016/j.cvsm.2004.03.001.
- 6 DE BRIYNE N. et al. Factors influencing antibiotic prescribing habits and use of sensitivity  
7 testing among veterinarians in Europe. **Veterinary Record**. v.173, n.19, p.475, nov. 2013.  
8 Available from: <<https://bvajournals.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/full/10.1136/vr.101454>>.  
9 Accessed: Apr. 8, 2022. doi: 10.1136/vr.101454.
- 10 GATORIA, I. S. et al. Comparison of three techniques for the diagnosis of urinary tract  
11 infections in dogs with urolithiasis. **Journal of Small Animal Practice**, v.47, n. 12, p.727-  
12 732, dec. 2006. Available from: <[https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1748-](https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1748-5827.2006.00169.x)  
13 [5827.2006.00169.x](https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1748-5827.2006.00169.x)>. Accessed: Jan. 3, 2023. doi:10.1111/j.1748-5827.2006.00169.x.
- 14 GOULART, B. N. G.; CHIARI, B. M. Testes de rastreamento x testes de diagnóstico:  
15 atualidades no contexto da atuação fonoaudiológica. **Pró-Fono Revista de Atualização**  
16 **Científica**, v. 19, n. 2, p. 223-232, apr-jun. 2007. Available from:  
17 <<https://www.scielo.br/j/pfono/a/HTnjkfXqtzVNBBGbkV3gPxK/abstract/?lang=pt>>.  
18 Accessed: Jan. 6, 2023. doi:10.1590/S0104-56872007000200011.
- 19 GRANT, D.C; NAPPIER, M.T; CORRIGAN, V.K. Diagnostic accuracy of a point-of-care  
20 test using voided urine samples for detection of bacteriuria in dogs with signs of lower urinary  
21 tract disease. **Journal of Veterinary Internal Medicine**. v.35, n.2, p.993-996, mar. 2021.  
22 Available from:< <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/full/10.1111/jvim.16040>> Accessed:  
23 Apr. 8, 2022. doi: 10.1111/jvim.16040.

- 1 MARQUES, C. et al. European multicenter study on antimicrobial resistance in bacteria  
2 isolated from companion animal urinary tract infections. **BMC Veterinary Research**. v.213,  
3 n.12, sep. 2016. Available from:<  
4 <https://bmcvetres.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/s12917-016-0840-3>> Accessed: Mar. 5,  
5 2022. doi: 10.1186/s12917-016-0840-3.
- 6 MONTEIRO, A.C.M.P. et al. Comparative analysis of bacteriuria results on routine urinalysis  
7 and urine culture: a retrospective study. **Research, Society and Development**, v.10, n.12,  
8 e327101219711, 2021. Available from:  
9 <<https://rsdjournal.org/index.php/rsd/article/view/19711>.> Accessed: Jan. 5, 2023. Epub 22-  
10 Set-2023. doi:10.33448/rsd-v10i12.19711.
- 11 NEIL, E. et al. Comparison of wet-mount, Wright-Giemsa and Gram-stained urine sediment  
12 for predicting bacteriuria in dogs and cats. **The Canadian Veterinary Journal**. v.54, n.11,  
13 p.1061-1066, nov. 2013. Available from :<  
14 <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC3801283/>>. Accessed: Apr. 20, 2022. doi:  
15 10111/vcp.12004.
- 16 OLIN, S. J.; BARTGES, J.W. **Urinary Tract Infections Treatment/Comparative**  
17 **Therapeutics. Veterinary Clinics of North America - Small Animal Practice**. v.45, n. 4, p.  
18 721-746, sep. 2015. Available from:< <https://www.vetsmall.theclinics.com/article/S0195->  
19 [5616\(15\)00027-3/fulltext](https://www.vetsmall.theclinics.com/article/S0195-5616(15)00027-3/fulltext)>. Accessed: Dec. 15, 2022. doi:10.1016/j.cvsm.2015.02.005.
- 20 OMS- ORGANIZAÇÃO MUNDIAL DE SAÚDE (2019) New report calls for urgent action  
21 to avert antimicrobial resistance crisis. International organizations unite on critical  
22 recommendations to combat drug-resistant infections and prevent staggering number of  
23 deaths each year. Joint News Release: NY.

- 1 SMEE, N.; LOYD, K; GRAUER, F.G. UTIs in Small Animal Patients: Part 2: Diagnosis,  
2 Treatment, and Complications. **Journal of the American Animal Hospital Association**.  
3 v.49, n.2, p.84-94, jan. 2013. Available from: <<https://europepmc.org/article/med/23325594>>.  
4 Accessed: May.3, 2022. doi:10.5326/jaaha-ms-5944.
- 5 SWENSON, C. L. et al. Evaluation of modified Wright-staining of urine sediment as a  
6 method for accurate detection of bacteriuria in dogs. **Journal of the American Veterinary**  
7 **Medical Association**, v.224, n.8, p.1282-1289, apr. 2004. Available from:<  
8 <https://avmajournals.avma.org/view/journals/javma/224/8/javma.2004.224.1282.xml>>  
9 Accessed: Apr. 2, 2022. doi: 10.2460/javma.2004.224.1282.
- 10 SWENSON, C. L. et al. Evaluation of modified Wright-staining of dried urinary sediment as  
11 a method for accurate detection of bacteriuria in cats. **Veterinary Clinical Pathology**. v.40,  
12 n.2, p.256-264, jun.2011. Available: <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/21554364/>. Accessed:  
13 April 3, 2022. doi:10.1111/j.1939-165X.2011.00314.x.
- 14 SØRENSEN, T. M. et al. Evaluation of different sampling methods and criteria for  
15 diagnosing canine urinary tract infection by quantitative bacterial culture. **The Veterinary**  
16 **Journal**, v.216, p. 168-173, oct. 2016. Available:  
17 <<https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/S1090023316301216?via%3Dihub>>  
18 Accessed: Jan 8, 2023. doi:10.1016/j.tvjl.2016.08.007.
- 19 THOMPSON, M. F. et al. Canine bacterial urinary tract infections: New developments in old  
20 pathogens. **The Veterinary Journal**. v.190, n.1, p.22-27, oct. 2011. Available from:<  
21 <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/S1090023310004004?via%3Dihub>>.  
22 Accessed: Apr.7, 2022. doi: 10.1016/j.tvjl.2010.11.013.
- 23 WAY, L. I. et al. Comparison of routine urinalysis and urine Gram stain for detection of  
24 bacteriuria in dogs. **Journal of Veterinary Emergency and Critical Care**. v.23, n.1, p.23-

1 28, jan-feb.2013. Available from:< <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/vec.12012>>.

2 Accessed: Apr. 1,2022. doi:10.1111/vec.12012.

3 WEESE, J. S. A review of multidrug resistant surgical site infections. **Veterinary and**

4 **Comparative Orthopaedics and Traumatology**. v.21, n.1, p.1-7,2008. Available from:<

5 <https://www.thieme-connect.com/products/ejournals/abstract/10.3415/VCOT-07-11-0106>>.

6 Accessed: Mar.27, 2022. doi: 10.3415/VCOT-07-11-010

1 Table 1: Detection of bacteriuria in urine samples from dogs obtained by catheterization or  
2 spontaneous urination, analyzed at the Laboratory of Veterinary Clinical Analysis – HVU –  
3 UFSM.

4

5

	Catheterization (n=40)	Voided specimen (n=60)
Unstained sediment	37	57
Stained sediment	15	33
Culture	10	15

6 Source: Own authorship

7

1 Table 2: Occurrence of false positive or negative results for bacteriuria in urine samples from  
 2 dogs collected by catheterization or spontaneous urination analyzed at the Laboratory of  
 3 Veterinary Clinical Analysis – HVU – UFSM

4

5

	Voided specimen		Catheterization	
	False negative	False positive	False negative	False positive
Stained sediment	1	3	4	5
Unstained sediment	1	14	-	22

6 Source: Own authorship; (-): not observed

1 Table 3: Comparison of identification of bacterial morphology in culture and optical  
 2 microscopy methods (stained and unstained sediment)

3

4

Morfology	Culture	Unstained		Stained	
		N° correct	N° uncorrect	N° correct	N° uncorrect
Coccus	7	5	2	6	1
Bacillus	10	1	9	5	5
Mix*	8	1	7	1	7
Total	25	7	18	12	13

5

Source: Own authorship; Mix: bacillus e coccus\*



1 Table 4: Frequency of the distribution of the morphological classification obtained by

2 Culture and Unstained Urinary Sediment

3

Culture	Absence	Coccus	Bacillus	Mix Population	Total
Absence	5 (12,5%)	35 (87,5%)	-	-	40
Coccus	-	6 (85,7%)	-	1 (16,7%)	7
Bacillus	-	4 (40%)	-	6 (60%)	10
Mix Population	1 (12,5%)	5 (62,5%)	-	2 (25%)	8

4 Source: Own autorship; (-): not observed

1 Table 5: Frequency of distribution of morphological classification obtained in Culture and

2 Unstained urinary sediment

3

Culture	Absence	Coccus	Bacillus	Mix Population	Total
Absence	32 (80%)	8 (20%)	-	-	40
Coccus	1 (14,3%)	6 (85,7%)	-	-	7
Bacillus	2 (20%)	1 (10%)	6 (50%)	1 (10%)	10
Mix population	2 (25%)	4 (50%)	1 (12,5%)	1 (12,5%)	8

4 Source: Own authorship; (-) not observed

## CONCLUSÃO

A partir da análise de dados pode-se concluir que a realização do sedimento corado com Gram diminui, substancialmente o número de resultados falsos positivos, quando comparado a análise do sedimento não corado. Essa diminuição na falsa detecção de microorganismos está relacionada a maior capacidade da coloração de Gram de diferenciar estruturas parecidas com bactérias, tanto em forma como em tamanho.

Em adição, a análise do sedimento corado possibilitou que menos pacientes utilizassem antibioticoterapia de forma desnecessária, já que a observação do sedimento não corado, comumente está relacionada com resultados não acurados. A crescente prescrição de antibióticos de forma desnecessária favorece a resistência bacteriana, sendo um grave problema em Medicina Humana e Veterinária e tornando o tratamento de indivíduos, que realmente precisam desses medicamentos, cada vez mais difícil e oneroso.

O presente estudo relatou menores valores de sensibilidade, especificidade, valor preditivo negativo e positivo, menores que outros estudos. Essa diferença ocorreu, provavelmente, devido a diferença no tamanho da população e dos métodos de colheita de urina obtidos no nosso estudo. Portanto, novas pesquisas com maior número de amostras são necessárias para melhorar a eficiência da coloração de Gram na diferenciação de bactérias e debris celulares.

Dessa forma, nosso estudo auxiliará no direcionamento terapêutico mais eficiente dos pacientes, principalmente dos pacientes graves que não possuem condições de esperar os resultados da cultura bacteriológica.

## REFERÊNCIAS

- BARTGES, J. Diagnosis of urinary tract infections. **Veterinary Clinics of North America: Small Animal Practice**, v. 34, n. 4, p. 923-933, jul. 2004. Disponível em: <[https://www.vetsmall.theclinics.com/article/S0195-5616\(04\)00029-4/fulltext](https://www.vetsmall.theclinics.com/article/S0195-5616(04)00029-4/fulltext)>. Acesso em: 7 abril 2022. doi: 10.1016/j.cvsm.2004.03.001.
- CHEW, D.; DIBARTOLA, S.; SCHENCK, P. Urinálise. In: **Urologia e Nefrologia do cão e gato**. Philadelphia: Saunders Elsevier, 2011. p 9-31.
- DE BRIYNE, N; ATKINSON, J.; POKLUDOVÁ, L; BORRIELLO, S. P.; PRICE, S. Factors influencing antibiotic prescribing habits and use of sensitivity testing amongst veterinarians in Europe. **Veterinary Record**, London, v. 173, n. 19, set. 2013. Disponível em: <<https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC3841786/>>. Acesso em: 12 fevereiro 2022. doi:10.1136/vr.101454.
- DUNNING, M.; STONEHEWER, J. Urinary tract infections in small animals: pathophysiology and diagnosis. **In Practice**, Londres, v.24, n.4, p.418-432, mai. 2021. Disponível em: <<https://bvajournals.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1136/inpract.24.8.418>>. Acesso: 11 fevereiro 2022. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1136/inpract.24.8.418>.
- GRANT, D; NAPIER, M; CORRIGAN, V. K. Diagnostic accuracy of a point-of-care test using voided urine samples for detection of bacteriuria in dogs with signs of lower urinary tract disease. **Journal of Veterinary Internal Medicine**. Philadelphia, v.35, n.2, p.993-996, jan. 2021. Disponível em: <<https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/full/10.1111/jvim.16040>>. Acesso: 10 fevereiro 2022. doi: /10.1111/jvim.16040.
- HALL, J; MARK, H; BAINES, S. Prevalence and antimicrobial resistance of canine urinary tract pathogens. **Veterinary Record**, Londres, v.173, n.22, p.549-555, mai. 2014. Disponível em: <<https://bvajournals.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/full/10.1136/vr.101482>>. Acesso: 25 Fevereiro 2022. doi: /10.1136/vr.101482.
- JONHSTONE, T. A clinical approach to multidrug-resistant urinary tract infection and subclinical bacteriuria in dogs and cats. **New Zealand Veterinary Journal**, v.68, n.2, p.69-83, nov. 2019. Disponível em: <<https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/31707934/>>. Acesso: 9 abril 2022. doi:10.1080/00480169.2019.1689196.
- MARQUES, C. et al. European multicenter study on antimicrobial resistance in bacteria isolated from companion animal urinary tract infections. **BMC Veterinary Research**, v.12, n.213, p.2-17, 2016. Disponível em: <<https://bmcvetres.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/s12917-016-0840-3>>. Acesso: 8 abril 2022. doi:10.1186/s12917-016-0840-3.
- MCGHIE, J., STAYT, J.; HOSGOOD, G. Prevalence of bacteriuria in dogs without clinical signs of urinary tract infection presenting for elective surgical procedures. **Australian Veterinary Journal**. v.92, n.6, p.33-37, jan-fev. 2014. Disponível em: <<https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/avj.12140>>. Acesso: 13 fevereiro 2022. doi: /10.1111/avj.12140.
- MONTEIRO, A. C. M. P. et al. Comparative analysis of bacteriuria results on routine urinalysis and urine culture: a retrospective study. **Research, Society and Development**, v.

10, n. 12, p. e327101219711, 2021. Disponível em: <<https://rsdjournal.org/index.php/rsd/article/view/19711>>. Acesso em: 9 abr. 2022. doi: 10.33448/rsd-v10i12.19711.

OLIN, S; BARTGES, J. Urinary Tract Infections Treatment/Comparative Therapeutics. *Veterinary Clinics: Small Animal Practice*. Philadelphia, v.45, n.4, p.721-746, mar. 2015. Disponível em: <[https://www.vetsmall.theclinics.com/article/S0195-5616\(15\)00027-3/fulltext](https://www.vetsmall.theclinics.com/article/S0195-5616(15)00027-3/fulltext)>. Acesso: 11 fevereiro 2022. doi: /10.1016/j.cvsm.2015.02.005.

SMEE, N; LOYD, K.; GRAUER, G. F. UTIs in Small Animal Patients: Part 2: Diagnosis, Treatment, and Complications. *Journal of the American Animal Hospital Association*. **South Bend**, v. 49, n. 2, p. 83-94, mar/abril. 2013. Disponível em: <<https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/23325594/>>. Acesso: 8 abril 2022. doi: 10.5326/JAAHA-MS-5944.

SWENSON, C.; BOISVERT, A. M.; KRUGER J. M.; GIBBONS-BURGENER, S. N. Evaluation of modified Wright-staining of urine sediment as a method for accurate detection of bacteriuria in dogs. *Journal of the American Veterinary Medical Association*. **Chicago**, v.224, n.8, p.1282-1289, abr. 2004. Disponível em: <<https://avmajournals.avma.org/view/journals/javma/224/8/javma.2004.224.1282.xml>>. Acesso: 12 fevereiro 2022. doi:10.2460/javma.2004.224.1282.

SWENSON, C. BOISVERT, A. M.; GIBBONS-BURGENER, S. N., KRUGER J. M. Evaluation of modified Wright-staining of dried urinary sediment as a method for accurate detection of bacteriuria in cats. *Veterinary Clinical Pathology*. v.40, n.2, p.256-264, 2011. Disponível: <<https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/15112776/>>. Acesso: 9 abril 2022. doi: 10.2460/javma.2004.224.1282.

THOMPSON, M.; LITSTER, A. L.; PLATELL, J. L.; DARREN J. Trott Canine bacterial urinary tract infections: New developments in old pathogens. *The Veterinary Journal*. Londres, v.190, n.1, p. 22-27, out. 2011. Disponível em: <<https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/S1090023310004004?via%3Dihub>>. Acesso: 6 abril 2022. doi: 10.1016/j.tvjl.2010.11.013.

WAY, L. I.; SULLIVAN, L. A; JOHNSON V.; MORLEY, P. S. Comparison of routine urinalysis and urine Gram stain for detection of bacteriuria in dogs. *Journal of Veterinary Emergency and Critical Care*. Londres, v.23, n.1, p.23-28, jan. 2013. Disponível em: <<https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/vec.12012>>. Acesso: 11 fevereiro 2022. doi:10.1111/vec.12012.

WEESE, S. et al. Antimicrobial Use Guidelines for Treatment of Urinary Tract Disease in Dogs and Cats: Antimicrobial Guidelines Working Group of the International Society for Companion Animal Infectious Diseases. *Veterinary Medicine International*. West Yorkshire, v.2011, março, 2011. Disponível em: <<https://www.hindawi.com/journals/vmi/2011/263768/#references>>. Acesso: 11 fevereiro 2022. doi:/10.4061/2011/263768.

WEESE, J. S. et al. International Society for Companion Animal Infectious Diseases (ISCAID) guidelines for the diagnosis and management of bacterial urinary tract infections in dogs and cats. *Veterinary Journal*, London, v. 247, maio, 2019. Disponível em: <<https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S109002331830460X?via%3Dihub>>. Acesso em: 9 abril 2022. doi: 10.1016/j.tvjl.2019.02.008.

WONG, C.; EPSTEIN, S.; WESTROPP, J. Antimicrobial Susceptibility Patterns in Urinary Tract Infections in Dogs (2010–2013). **Journal of Veterinary Internal Medicine**. Philadelphia, v.29, n.4, p.1045-1052, mai. 2015. Disponível em: <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/full/10.1111/jvim.13571>. Acesso: 25 fevereiro 2022. doi:/10.1111/jvim.13571.

YAMANKA, A. et al. The Occurrence of Multidrug Resistant Bacteria in the Urine of Healthy Dogs and Dogs with Cystitis. **Animals**, v.9, n.12, p.1087-1093, dez. 2019. Disponível em:< <https://www.mdpi.com/2076-2615/9/12/1087/htm>>. Acesso: 10 abril 2022. doi:10.3390/ani9121.