

OBSERVATION ON THE INTESTINAL PARASITIC INFECTIONS

M. Rezaeian, Ph.D.

Key words: Parasites, infection, Iran

ABSTRACT

During 1980-82, a total number of 4143 stool samples, from 2332 males and 1811 females, referred to the Central laboratory of the School of Public Health, were examined for intestinal parasites. All the specimens were examined by formol-ether concentration and wet-mount (ringer solution) techniques. The main prevalent pathogenic parasites were Entamoeba histolytica (8.7%), Giardia lamblia (16.1%), Ascaris lumbricoides (9.1%), Trichuris trichiura (3.1%), and Hymenolepis nana (3.2%). The Overall infection rate with protozoa, metazoa and both were 45%, 18.3% and 53.8% respectively.

INTRODUCTION

Intestinal parasitic infection has a widespread distribution in the world, specially in the tropics. The Infection is more or less prevalent in all parts of Iran, particularly in the rural areas (3,5,7,14,15,2).

* School of Public Health, Teh. Med. Sc. Univ. P.O. Box
14155-6446, Teheran - Iran.

As a rule, the infection mostly occurs in poor communities with low standards of hygiene. The present paper reports the protozoal and helminthic infections in outpatients who were referred from different parts of Iran to the Central Laboratory, School of Public Health, University of Tehran during 1980 to 1982.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

A total of 4143 stool samples collected from 2332 males and 1811 females were examined. The patients belonged to different social categories from Tehran and suburban areas or occasionally from other parts of the country. The stool specimens, collected fresh in Paper cups were examined by formol-ether concentration and direct (wet mount ringer solution and MIF), techniques. On some occasions, permanent staining and culture techniques were also used. For diagnosis of oxyuriasis the adhesive cellulose tape (Graham method) was applied. In suspected negative cases the stool examination was repeated three times on different occasions.

RESULTS

The main purpose of this study was to determine the intestinal parasitic infection in Tehran area as shown in Tables 1 and 3. The prevalence of pathogenic protozoan parasites for Giardia lamblia was 16.7% and 8.7% for Entamoeba histolytica and for non pathogenic proto-

Observation on the

zoa, Entamoeba coli was 18.4%, Entamoeba hartmanni 2.8%, Dientamoeba fragilis 1.5%, Endolimax nana 2.9%, Iodamoeba butschlii 3.5%, Trichomonas hominis 2.4% and Chilomastix mesnili 1.1%. According to the age distribution the most infected individuals with Giardia lamblia were found in the age group 1-15 years old with an infection rate of 20% to 27%. Entamoeba histolytica was observed in adults with highest infection rate of 7.4% to 12.2% (Table 1), without any significant differences between males and females (Table 2). The prevalence of intestinal helminthic infection as shown in Table 3, was 9.1%, for Ascaris lumbricoides, Trichuris trichiura, 3.7% Trichostrongylus spp. 0.6%, Enterobius vermicularis 1.7%, Strongyloides stercoralis 0.6%, Taenia saginata 0.6% and Hymenolepis nana 3.2%. No significant differences in age and sex distribution were noticed in infected individuals with these parasites (Table 4). As shown in Table 5, single infection showed much higher rate than multiple infections, particularly in helminthic parasites (17% single and 1.3% multiple).

DISCUSSION

The patients, who were mostly from Tehran, in addition to other parts of Iran, had different occupations.

Studies on the prevalence of protozoan infections in Iran were mostly undertaken in the rural areas (10,14, 15,1), whereas there has been no complete record from the

urban areas. The pathogenic protozoa (Entamoeba histolytica and Giardia lamblia) were mostly prevalent in the age groups of 21-40 and 6-10 years respectively. According to Piekarski, 1956 (11), the high prevalence of Giardia in the younger age groups (children) was due to the high carbohydrate consumption, but we believe that in Iran in addition to this fact, neglect of hygiene and the high risk of exposure to the organism can also play an important role.

In this study, in contrast to Japanese investigators, "Belding 1964"(6), there were no significant differences between male and female groups.

METAZOA:

As shown by different investigators, the metazoa parasites are a major health problem in various parts of Iran (3,5,7,8,9,12). Some like Ascaris, Trichocephalus, Hymenolepis and Trichostrongylus are more or less uniformly scattered all over the country, whereas some others (hookworms) have a local distribution (Caspian areas and Khuzestan Province). In our findings the prevalence of 9.1% for Ascaris and 3.7% for Trichocephalus infections was much lower than those reported from the rural sectors by other investigators(7,8,9,13). As reported by Ghadiri-an et al.(2) and Massoud et al.(6) the prevalence of metazoan parasites in urban areas was much lower than the rural areas, which indicated the effect of poor sanitati-

Observation on the

on and environmental health factors in the transmission of helminthic infection in this country. Hymenolepis and Entrobilus infections were mostly prevalent in the younger age groups than the adults. Hookworm infection, in our study was very low (17 cases) originating mostly from the Caspian region. Fasciola and Dicrocoelium ova were found in 16 and 12 cases respectively, which after administering meat free diet, after a few days all stools became free of ova except 5 cases which retained the egg of Fasciola as the concrete infection. Fasciola infection in human, in Iran, has been previously reported from different parts of the country by different investigators (4).

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The authors would like to thank Dr.J. Massoud and Dr.A. Sadighian for their valuable advice, Mr. Gh.Misaghian and Mrs.M. Djavan and Miss.Sh. Farnia for their assistance.

Table 1. Prevalence of different protozoal infections in different age groups.

| Age group | No. Exam. | Percent infected with | | | | | | | | | |
|-------------|-----------|-----------------------|--------|---------|------|--------|--------|--------|--------|------|------|
| | | E.his | E.coli | E.hart. | D.f. | E.nana | I.but. | G.lam. | T.hom. | Ch.m | |
| <1 | 69 | 1.4 | 7.2 | - | - | - | - | 2.9 | - | - | - |
| 1-5 | 474 | 3.1 | 8.4 | 1.05 | 0.84 | 1.8 | 1.4 | 20.2 | 1.4 | 0.2 | 0.2 |
| 6-10 | 574 | 5.5 | 17.2 | 1.7 | 1.5 | 2.4 | 1.7 | 27.3 | 2.6 | 0.8 | 0.8 |
| 11-15 | 470 | 7.4 | 15.9 | 2.7 | 2.1 | 4.04 | 3.6 | 21.2 | 4.6 | 1.06 | 1.06 |
| 16-20 | 590 | 10.5 | 20 | 2.7 | 0.6 | 1.8 | 4.06 | 12.5 | 1.6 | 1.8 | 1.8 |
| 21-40 | 1433 | 12.2 | 26.3 | 3.7 | 1.6 | 3.9 | 4.8 | 14.02 | 3.4 | 1.4 | 1.4 |
| 41-60 | 484 | 7.4 | 20.2 | 4.5 | 2.4 | 2.6 | 2.4 | 7.6 | 2.8 | 1.2 | 1.2 |
| 61+and over | 49 | 10.2 | 28.5 | - | - | 2.04 | - | 4.08 | 6.1 | - | - |
| Total | 4143 | 8.7 | 18.4 | 2.8 | 1.5 | 2.9 | 3.3 | 16.1 | 2.4 | 1.1 | 1.1 |

Table 2. Prevalence of different protozoal infections in males and females.

| Sex | No. Exam | Percent infected with | | | | | | | | | |
|-------|-------------|-----------------------|--------|---------|------|--------|--------|--------|--------|-------|--|
| | | E.his. | E.coli | E.hart. | D.f. | E.nana | I.but. | G.lam. | T.hom. | Ch.m. | |
| M | 2332 | 8.4 | 17.4 | 2.8 | 1.2 | 2.6 | 3.7 | 16.7 | 2.7 | 1.5 | |
| F | 1811 | 9.05 | 19.7 | 2.9 | 1.8 | 3.4 | 2.9 | 15.4 | 1.9 | 0.7 | |
| Total | 4145 | 8.7 | 18.4 | 2.8 | 1.5 | 2.9 | 3.3 | 16.1 | 2.4 | 1.1 | |

E.his.= Entamoeba histolytica, E.coli= Entamoeba coli, E.hart.=Entamoeba-hartmanni,
D.f.=Dientamoeba fragilis, E.nana= Endolimax nana, I.but.= Iodamoeba butschlii, G.lam.=
Giardia lamblia, T.hom.=Trichomonas hominis Ch.m.=Chilomastix mesnili.

Table 3. Prevalence of different helminthic infection in different age groups.

| Age group | No. Exam | Percent infected with | | | | | |
|-------------|----------|-----------------------|------|------|------|------|--------|
| | | A.i. | T.t. | Tr. | E.v. | S.s. | H.nana |
| <1 | 69 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 1-5 | 474 | 5.4 | 1.2 | 0.2 | 1.8 | 0.2 | 2.1 |
| 6-10 | 574 | 7.6 | 2.4 | - | 4.3 | 0.7 | 5.05 |
| 11-15 | 470 | 8.5 | 3.4 | 0.8 | 2.7 | 0.6 | 3.8 |
| 16-20 | 590 | 11.5 | 4.7 | 0.6 | 1.01 | 0.5 | 3.7 |
| 21-40 | 1433 | 10.7 | 5.3 | 0.97 | 1.1 | 0.9 | 3.5 |
| 41-60 | 487 | 9 | 2.9 | 0.4 | 0.4 | 0.4 | 0.6 |
| 61+and over | 49 | 6.1 | 2.04 | - | - | 2.04 | 2.04 |
| Total | 4143 | 9.1 | 3.7 | 0.6 | 1.7 | 0.6 | 3.2 |

Table 4. Prevalence of different helminthic infection in males and females.

| Sex | No. Exam | Percent infected with | | | | | |
|-------|----------|-----------------------|------|-----|------|------|--------|
| | | A.l. | T.t. | Tr. | E.v. | S.s. | H.nana |
| M | 2332 | 9.3 | 3.7 | 0.5 | 1.6 | 0.8 | 3.5 |
| F | 1811 | 8.8 | 3.7 | 0.7 | 1.7 | 0.4 | 2.8 |
| Total | 14143 | 9.1 | 3.7 | 0.6 | 1.7 | 0.6 | 3.2 |

A.l.=*Ascaris lumbricoides*, T.t.= *Trichuris trichiura*
 Tr.=*Trichostrongylus* spp, E.v.=*Enterobius vermicularis*
 S.s.=*Strongyloides stercoralis*, H.nana.=*Hymenolepis nana*

Table 5. Percentage of single and multiple parasitic infection.

| Parasite | No. inf. | % infected | |
|-----------|----------|------------|----------|
| | | Single | Multiple |
| Protozoa | 1894 | 27.1 | 18.6 |
| Helminths | 800 | 17 | 1.3 |
| Mixed | 2231 | 28.9 | 24.2 |

REFERENCES

- ۱- دکتر جلاپیر (طهمورث) دکتر فرید (حسین) و دکتر شمس (محمدعلی) ۱۳۵۵، و فور انگلهای رودهای در ساکنین قریه سگزی اصفهان، مجله بهداشت ایران سال پنجم شماره ۲ صفحه ۱۱۸-۱۲۵.
- ۲- دکتر قدیریان (اسماعیل)، دکتر معتبر (منصور)، دکتر برزگر (محمدعلی) ۱۳۵۴ مطالعه انگلهای رودهای در منطقه بحر خزر ۵-۱۳۴۹ (شهرستان رودسر) مجله دانشکده پزشکی تهران سال سی و سوم شماره پنجم صفحه ۲۰۸-۲۲۳.
- 3- Alemi AA. Arfaa F. (1978). Prevalence of intestinal helminthiasis in the rural area Sowmehsara Gilan Province (Caspian littoral). Iranian J. Publ. Hlth. Vol. 7, No. 1, 25-34.
- 4- Arfaa F. (1975) and 1976). Medical Helminthology. 2nd and 3rd Edition. Publication of the University of Tehran, Tehran-Iran.
- 5- Arfaa F. Kayvan E. Ghadirian E. Missaghian GH. (1977). Studies on intestinal helminthiasis in Conbadkavus area North-east of the Caspian littoral. Iranian J. Publ. Hlth. Vol. 6, No. 1, 24-26.
- 6- Belding D.L. (1964). Textbook of Parasitology, third edition. Appleton-Century Crofts. Division of Meredith Publishing. New York, 89.
- 7- Ghadirian, E. Arfaa, F. (1978). Some epidemiological aspects of soiltransmitted helminths in Isfahan, Central Iran. Iranian J. Publ. Hlth. Vol. 7, No. 3, 130-138.
- 8- Ghadirian, E. Arfaa, F: Missaghian, GH. and Bahrani, H. (1973). Prevalence of intestinal helminthiasis in Kermanshah city and some villages in the province.

- Iranian J. Publ. Hlth. Vol. 2, No. 2, 90-101.
- 9- Massoud, J. Arfaa, F. Jalali, H. and Keyvan, S. (1980). Prevalence of intestinal helminths in Khuzestan, South-west Iran. Am. J. Trop. Med. Hyg., 29(3), 389-392.
- 10- Momani, H.A. (1976). Epidemiology of intestinal protozoa in Amoui Village, Kazeroon area, Iran. Thesis of the MPH degree, No. 1007 Sch. Publ. Hlth. Tehran University.
- 11- Pikarski, G. (1954). Lehrbuch der Parasitologie, Springer Verlag Berlin. Gottingen, Heidelberg.
- 12- Sahba, G.H. Arfaa, F. (1967). The effect of sanitation on ascariasis in an Iranian Village. J. Trop. Med. Hyg. Vol. 70, 37-41.
- 13- Sahba, G.H. Arfaa, F. and Bijan, H. (1967). Intestinal helminthiasis in the rural area of Khuzestan South-west Iran. Ann. Trop. Med. Parasit. 61, 352-357.
- 14- Sheiban, F. Rezaian, M. (1981). Study on intestinal protozoa in seven villages of Bandarabass (1978). Iranian J. Publ. Hlth. Vol. 10, No. (1-4). 45-53.
- 15- Sheiban, F. and Sanati, A. (1973). Change in the prevalence of intestinal parasites in the Robat-karim area 1963-1972. Cento Scientific Symposium on Parasitic Diseases in Shiraz, Iran Report 2, 49-52.