#### Check for updates

#### OPEN ACCESS

EDITED BY Lixing Huang, Jimei University, China

REVIEWED BY Amjad Islam Aqib, Cholistan University of Veterinary and Animal Sciences, Pakistan Hazim Khalifa, Kafrelsheikh University, Egypt

\*CORRESPONDENCE Xiaolong Gu xuewu24588@126.com Cuiqin Huang cuiqinh@126.com Weijie Qu 1401075010@qq.com

<sup>†</sup>These authors have contributed equally to this work

#### SPECIALTY SECTION

This article was submitted to Veterinary Infectious Diseases, a section of the journal Frontiers in Veterinary Science

RECEIVED 05 August 2022 ACCEPTED 12 September 2022 PUBLISHED 10 November 2022

#### CITATION

Wang K, Cha J, Liu K, Deng J, Yang B, Xu H, Wang J, Zhang L, Gu X, Huang C and Qu W (2022) The prevalence of bovine mastitis-associated *Staphylococcus aureus* in China and its antimicrobial resistance rate: A meta-analysis. *Front. Vet. Sci.* 9:1006676. doi: 10.3389/fvets.2022.1006676

#### COPYRIGHT

© 2022 Wang, Cha, Liu, Deng, Yang, Xu, Wang, Zhang, Gu, Huang and Qu. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (CC BY). The use, distribution or reproduction in other forums is permitted, provided the original author(s) and the copyright owner(s) are credited and that the original publication in this journal is cited, in accordance with accepted academic practice. No use, distribution or reproduction is permitted which does not comply with these terms.

# The prevalence of bovine mastitis-associated *Staphylococcus aureus* in China and its antimicrobial resistance rate: A meta-analysis

Kuan Wang<sup>1†</sup>, Jinlong Cha<sup>2†</sup>, Kai Liu<sup>1†</sup>, Jianming Deng<sup>1</sup>, Bowen Yang<sup>1</sup>, Hui Xu<sup>1</sup>, Juyu Wang<sup>1</sup>, Limei Zhang<sup>1</sup>, Xiaolong Gu<sup>1\*</sup>, Cuigin Huang<sup>3,4\*</sup> and Weijie Qu<sup>1\*</sup>

<sup>1</sup>College of Veterinary Medicine, Yunnan Agricultural University, Kunming, China, <sup>2</sup>Yunnan Vocational and Technical College of Agriculture, Kunming, China, <sup>3</sup>Department of Animal Science and Veterinary, College of Life, Longyan University, Longyan, China, <sup>4</sup>Fujian Provincial Key Laboratory for Prevention and Control of Animal Infectious Diseases and Biotechnology, Longyan, China

In this study, to optimize the Staphylococcus aureus control program, a meta-analysis was conducted to investigate the epidemiology and antimicrobial resistance (AMR) profile of S. aureus-associated bovine mastitis in China from 2000 to 2020. A total of 33 publications from PubMed, Google Scholar, and China National Knowledge Infrastructure (CNKI) database were included in our research, among which nine publications included the AMR test. The pooled prevalence of S. aureus was 36.23%, and subgroup analysis revealed that the prevalence dropped from 2000-2010 to 2011-2020, which shows that China is on the right track. The pooled AMR rate indicate isolates were most resistant to  $\beta$ -lactams (50.68%), followed by quinolones (36.23%), macrolides (34.08%), sulfonamides (32.25%), tetracyclines (27.83%), aminoglycosides (26.44%), lincosamides (23.39%), and amphenicol (10.33%). Both the pooled prevalence and AMR of S. aureus in China are higher than those in Western countries, such as Germany, Belgium, Ireland, and the United States-countries with a long animal husbandry history and good management. Thus, there is still room to improve the treatment of S. aureus-associated bovine mastitis in China.

#### KEYWORDS

bovine mastitis, *Staphylococcus aureus*, prevalence, antimicrobial resistance, meta-analysis

### Introduction

Bovine mastitis, as one of the most devastating diseases in dairy herds worldwide (1-3), is caused by several pathogenic bacteria, including *Staphylococcus aureus*. *Staphylococcus aureus* is one of the most prevalent pathogens worldwide and causes subclinical infections, resulting in an increased somatic cell count and intramammary

infections in dairy cows (4). *S. aureus* mastitis impacts dairy farms economically because of decreased productivity, premature culling, and prolonged costly antibiotic treatments (5–7).

The resistance of S. aureus to antimicrobials is a growing concern, along with its wide use against the disease, although the overall resistance rates vary widely by region (8). The standard treatment regimen against bovine mastitis with antibiotics is still under debate (9). China has greatly engaged in the global action plan on antimicrobial resistance (AMR) control (10). The National Action Plan to Combat Animal Origin Antimicrobial Resistance (2017-2020) (Beijing: China Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Affairs, 2017) is one of the national protocols to standardize veterinary medications in combination with strict biosecurity measures and prudent use of antimicrobials to alleviate the pressure of resistant pathogen transmission. Significant progress has been made against the AMR by prohibiting certain antibiotics (Announcement No. 194 of the Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Affairs of the People's Republic of China), for instance, officially prohibition of the use of three veterinary drugs, namely, olaquindox ["Chinese Veterinary Pharmacopeia" (2005 Edition)], clenbuterol (Notice of the General Office of the Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Affairs on Launching the Special Rectification Action for "Clenbuterol"), and salbutamol [State Pharmacopeia Commission. 2010 Pharmacopeia of the People's Republic of China (Part 2)] in food animals to ensure the quality and safety of animal products and maintain public health and ecological safety.

The prevalence and AMR rate of *S. aureus*-related bovine mastitis in different regions of China during 2000–2020 were estimated using meta-analysis (11), an innovative tool, by analyzing the findings of published studies. Pooled prevalence and AMR rate, as well as subgroup analysis, from different aspects were conducted.

The purpose of this study was to understand the epidemiology and AMR profiles of *Streptococcus* spp. using meta-analysis to optimize *Streptococcus* spp. control programs.

## Materials and methods

#### Literature search

Literature retrieval steps and results are illustrated in Figure 1. A comprehensive and systematic literature search was conducted to identify studies on *S. aureus*-related bovine mastitis, utilizing PubMed (www.pubmed.gov), Google Scholar (https://scholar.google.com), and China National Knowledge Infrastructure (CNKI) database (https://www.cnki.net/). "Bovine mastitis AND bacteria" were used as key words fothe search of publications in English and Chinese between 2000 and 2020.

#### Selection of published studies

The PRISMA reporting standard was adopted in this study, as previously reported (12-14). Articles were excluded if (a) they were duplicate records; (b) they went off-topic and had small sample size (<3); (c) the study did not involve bacterial identification; (d) the study samples contained non-mastitis diseases; (e) the study involved ambiguous sample size or bacterial isolate quantity, and (f) the study was conducted out of the defined period (before 2000 and after 2020). Microsoft Excel was used to manage the references (Table 1).

#### Data extraction and statistical analysis

Designed forms were used to extract data from the selected publications, and the data included author, year of publication, province, sample size, number of *S. aureus* isolates, degree of mastitis (as per the Laboratory Handbook on Bovine Mastitis, National Mastitis Council), identification method, number of resistant isolates, and laboratory procedure. The methodological quality of each study was independently reviewed by two reviewers based on pre-specified study quality indicators adapted from the Downs and Black checklist.

The number of *S. aureus*, antimicrobial-resistant isolates, and mastitis milk samples of the extracted data were calculated for their proportion in articles. Resistance was considered a dichotomous outcome. The prevalence and AMR rate were separately meta-analyzed by using the "meta" and "metafor" packages in R (version 4.0.5).

The prevalence of *S. aureus* was pooled using the random effects model. Subgroup meta-analyses were conducted on isolation time and region, and mastitis grade to illustrate the heterogeneity between the studies.

The AMR profile was analyzed by groups:  $\beta$ -lactams, quinolones, aminoglycosides, tetracyclines, lincosamides, sulfonamides, macrolides, and amphenicol. The publication bias test was performed by using the Egger test, and a funnel plot was created.

## Results

## Inclusion of publications

A total of 34, 86, and 136 articles were obtained from PubMed, Google Scholar, and CNKI, respectively, among which the following were excluded: 24 publications were duplicates,



11 were published out of the defined period, 121 did not involving *S. aureus*, three were reviews, three did not provide information of sample size or the number of bacterial isolates, 20 did not provide data on the sampling region, and 41 did

not provide grade of mastitis. As a result, 33 publications including 4,215 samples and 1,305 isolates were selected for subsequent analysis, of which nine were included for the AMR test (Figure 1, Table 1).

Author	Year	Sample	Identification assay	Isolates	Grade <sup>a</sup>	<b>Region</b> <sup>b</sup>	AMR method
Meng Dan	2019	186	165	98	С	N	
Weijie Jin	2020	544	165	168	С	S	K-B
Lili Zhang	2016	200	Other	58	С	S	K-B
Qiang Ren	2019	84	16\$	65	S	Ν	K-B
Feng Li Yang	2014	67	Other	12	С	S	
Chenchen Shen	2017	28	Other	18	С	S	K-B
Mingxu Zhou	2019	50	16S	5	S	S	K-B
Huiyun Zhao	2020	110	168	15	С	Ν	K-B
Weize Gan	2020	812	16S	216	S	Ν	K-B
Haiyan Wu	2019	50	Other	18	С	Ν	K-B
Lijun Wu	2019	165	16S	43	S	S	
Wei Liu	2006	60	Other	43	С	Ν	
Lei Liu	2009	92	Other	58	S	Ν	
/u Li	2011	16	Other	12	С	Ν	
in Li	2014	58	Other	53	С	Ν	
in Wang	2015	100	Other	15	С	Ν	
Hongwei He	2015	14	Other	12	С	Ν	
Kiujuan Ye	2004	44	Other	30	С	S	
ianbiao Lu	2006	63	Other	23	С	Ν	
/ing Liu	2008	90	Other	23	С	Ν	
Guiying Wang	2008	115	Other	12	С	Ν	
Yongxin Yang	2009	86	Other	42	S	S	
Lulu Qin	2009	30	Other	4	С	S	
Guixian Zhang	2010	34	Other	6	С	Ν	
Fu Cong	2007	304	Other	91	S	Ν	
long Ma	2009	44	Other	29	С	Ν	
Zhuming Zhang	2009	9	Other	5	С	Ν	
Kiaodong Kang <sup>a</sup>	2014	94	Other	7	С	Ν	
Kiaodong Kang <sup>b</sup>	2014	164	Other	11	С	Ν	
ie Lin	2015	15	16S	10	С	Ν	
Cinpu Li	2015	302	168	18	С	Ν	
Qiuyun Zhao	2016	48	Other	10	С	Ν	K-B
Liming Chen	2004	23	Other	12	С	S	
Yan Liu	2012	114	Other	63	С	S	
Гotal		4,215	-	1,305	_	_	_

TABLE 1 Information of studies included in our study.

aC, clinical bovine mastitis; S, subclinical bovine mastitis. bS, South China; N, North China: cK–B, disk diffusion test; -, publication did not include the AMR test.

## Prevalence of S. aureus

The pooled prevalence of *S. aureus* is 36.23% [95% confidence interval (CI): 29.31–43.76%]. An evident heterogeneity was observed ( $I^2 = 94\%$ ,  $t^2 = 0.7583$ , P < 0.01). Therefore, subgroup analysis was conducted to explore the sources of heterogeneity (Figure 2).

#### Subgroup analysis

The research articles were divided into subgroups based on research period (2000–2010 vs. 2011–2020), sampling sites (North vs. South China), and mastitis grade (clinical vs. subclinical mastitis). The pooled subgroup prevalence of *S. aureus* was 36.56% and 35.75% in North and South China,

130141033	Samples	Prevalence	95% C.I.		
98	186	52.69	[45.51; 59.76]	1	$\rightarrow$
168	544	30.88	[27.14; 34.89]		
58	200	29.00	[23.13; 35.66]		
65	84				>
12	67	17.91	[10.46; 28.95]	<b>B</b>	
18	28	64.29	[45.38; 79.59]		$\rightarrow$
5	50				
15	110	13.64	[8.39; 21.40]		
216	812	26.60	[23.67; 29.75]		
18	50	36.00	[24.00; 50.05]		$\longrightarrow$
43	165	26.06	[19.93; 33.29]	— <b>—</b>	
43	60	71.67	[59.06; 81.60]		>
58	92	63.04	[52.77; 72.26]		>
12	16				*
53	58				>
15	100	15.00	[ 9.25; 23.40]	<b>—</b>	
	14				>
	44				>
				<b>_</b>	
				<b>_</b>	
					>
					>
					$\longrightarrow$
					$\longrightarrow$
63					$\rightarrow$
	4215	36.23	[29.31; 43.76]		
$0.7583, \chi^2_{33} =$	546.38 (p <	0.01)			
			0	10 20 30	40 50
				Prevalence of Klebsi	ella
	$\begin{array}{c} 168\\ 58\\ 65\\ 12\\ 18\\ 5\\ 15\\ 216\\ 18\\ 43\\ 43\\ 58\\ 12\\ 53\\ 15\\ 12\\ 30\\ 23\\ 23\\ 12\\ 42\\ 4\\ 6\\ 91\\ 29\\ 5\\ 7\\ 11\\ 10\\ 18\\ 10\\ 12\\ 63\end{array}$	$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	168 544 30.88 [27.14]; 34.89]   58 200 29.00 [23.13]; 35.66]   65 84 77.38 [67.23]; 85.08]   12 67 17.91 [10.46]; 28.95]   18 28 64.29 [45.38]; 79.59]   5 50 10.00 [4.22]; 21.87]   15 110 13.64 [8.39]; 21.40]   216 812 26.60 [23.67]; 29.75]   43 60 71.67 [59.06]; 81.60]   58 92 63.04 [52.77]; 72.26]   12 16 75.00 [49.18]; 90.29]   53 58 91.38 [80.91; 96.37]   15 100 15.00 [9.25]; 23.40]   12 14 85.71 [57.32]; 96.40]   30 44 68.18 [53.19; 80.16]   23 63 36.51 [25.61]; 48.99]   23 90 25.56 [17.61]; 35.54]   12 115 10.43 [6.02]; 17.48]   4 30 13.33 [5.10]; 36.32]

respectively (Figure 3); 43.22 and 32.62% for the 2000–2010 period and the 2011–2020 period, respectively (Figure 4); and 35.62% and 38.79% in clinical and subclinical mastitis, respectively (Figure 5).

According to the aforementioned meta-analysis results, we speculate that the difference in prevalence between South China and North China and the difference between periods 2000–2010 and 2011–2020 may be related to the difference in climate between North and South China and the increased emphasis on *Streptococcus agalactiae*, which is related to

factors such as the improvement of biological prevention and control.

## Antimicrobial resistance rate of S. aureus

The pooled antimicrobial resistant rate revealed that *S. aureus* was most resistant to  $\beta$ -lactams, 50.68% (95% CI: 42.55–58.77%); followed by quinolones, 36.23% (95% CI: 28.45–44.79%); macrolides, 34.08% (95% CI: 26.89–42.08%);

Study	Proportion	95% C.I.	
Region = N			1
Meng Dan	52.6882	[45.5069; 59.7599]	<b>-</b>
Qiang Ren	77.3810	[67.2341; 85.0827]	
Huiyun Zhao	13.6364	[8.3910; 21.3950]	
Weize Gan	26.6010	[23.6743; 29.7485]	- <b></b>
Haiyan Wu		[23.9974; 50.0524]	
Wei Liu		[59.0605; 81.6004]	, ,
Lei Liu		[52.7658; 72.2605]	$ \rightarrow $
Yu Li		[49.1757; 90.2929]	$\rightarrow$
Jin Li		[80.9061; 96.3659]	>
Lin Wang		[9.2499; 23.4029]	
Hongwei He		[57.3174; 96.4039]	-→
Jianbiao Lu		[25.6112; 48.9878]	<b>#</b>
Ying Liu		[17.6120; 35.5365]	
Guiying Wang		[ 6.0219; 17.4801]	
Guixian Zhang		[8.1498; 34.1027]	
Fu Cong		[25.0511; 35.3206]	
Long Ma		[50.8974; 78.2891]	
Zhuming Zhang		[25.1310; 82.3163]	<b></b> >
Xiaodong Kang1		[ 3.5915; 14.8050]	-
Xiaodong Kang2		[3.7530; 11.7045]	-
Jie Lin		[40.6038; 85.4042]	- 
Xinpu Li		[3.7870; 9.2606]	<b>-</b>
Qiuyun Zhao		[11.5926; 34.5606]	i
Random effects model		[27.8265; 46.2793]	
Heterogeneity: $l^2 = 95\%$ , $\tau^2 =$		450 (p < 0.01)	
Region = S			i
		[27.1404; 34.8931]	
Weijie lin	30 8824		
Weijie Jin Lili Zhang			
Lili Zhang	29.0000	[23.1331; 35.6644]	
Lili Zhang Feng Li Yang	29.0000 17.9104	[23.1331; 35.6644] [10.4621; 28.9471]	
Lili Zhang Feng Li Yang Chenchen Shen	29.0000 17.9104 64.2857	[23.1331; 35.6644] [10.4621; 28.9471] [45.3824; 79.5891]	
Lili Zhang Feng Li Yang Chenchen Shen Mingxu Zhou	29.0000 17.9104 64.2857 10.0000	[23.1331; 35.6644] [10.4621; 28.9471] [45.3824; 79.5891] [ 4.2243; 21.8695]	
Lili Zhang Feng Li Yang Chenchen Shen Mingxu Zhou Lijun Wu	29.0000 17.9104 64.2857 10.0000 26.0606	[23.1331; 35.6644] [10.4621; 28.9471] [45.3824; 79.5891] [ 4.2243; 21.8695] [19.9341; 33.2872]	
Lili Zhang Feng Li Yang Chenchen Shen Mingxu Zhou Lijun Wu Xiujuan Ye	29.0000 17.9104 64.2857 10.0000 26.0606 68.1818	[23.1331; 35.6644] [10.4621; 28.9471] [45.3824; 79.5891] [4.2243; 21.8695] [19.9341; 33.2872] [53.1897; 80.1631]	
Lili Zhang Feng Li Yang Chenchen Shen Mingxu Zhou Lijun Wu Xiujuan Ye Yongxin Yang	29.0000 17.9104 64.2857 10.0000 26.0606 68.1818 48.8372	[23.1331; 35.6644] [10.4621; 28.9471] [45.3824; 79.5891] [4.2243; 21.8695] [19.9341; 33.2872] [53.1897; 80.1631] [38.4775; 59.2978]	
Lili Zhang Feng Li Yang Chenchen Shen Mingxu Zhou Lijun Wu Xiujuan Ye Yongxin Yang Lulu Qin	29.0000 17.9104 64.2857 10.0000 26.0606 68.1818 48.8372 13.3333	[23.1331; 35.6644] [10.4621; 28.9471] [45.3824; 79.5891] [ 4.2243; 21.8695] [19.9341; 33.2872] [53.1897; 80.1631] [38.4775; 59.2978] [ 5.0957; 30.5948]	
Lili Zhang Feng Li Yang Chenchen Shen Mingxu Zhou Lijun Wu Xiujuan Ye Yongxin Yang Lulu Qin Liming Chen	29.0000 17.9104 64.2857 10.0000 26.0606 68.1818 48.8372 13.3333 52.1739	[23.1331; 35.6644] [10.4621; 28.9471] [45.3824; 79.5891] [4.2243; 21.8695] [19.9341; 33.2872] [53.1897; 80.1631] [38.4775; 59.2978] [5.0957; 30.5948] [32.4948; 71.2006]	
Lili Zhang Feng Li Yang Chenchen Shen Mingxu Zhou Lijun Wu Xiujuan Ye Yongxin Yang Lulu Qin Liming Chen Yan Liu	29.0000 17.9104 64.2857 10.0000 26.0606 68.1818 48.8372 13.3333 52.1739 55.2632	[23.1331; 35.6644] [10.4621; 28.9471] [45.3824; 79.5891] [4.2243; 21.8695] [19.9341; 33.2872] [53.1897; 80.1631] [38.4775; 59.2978] [5.0957; 30.5948] [32.4948; 71.2006] [46.0613; 64.1181]	
Lili Zhang Feng Li Yang Chenchen Shen Mingxu Zhou Lijun Wu Xiujuan Ye Yongxin Yang Lulu Qin Liming Chen	29.0000 17.9104 64.2857 10.0000 26.0606 68.1818 48.8372 13.3333 52.1739 55.2632 <b>35.7495</b>	[23.1331; 35.6644] [10.4621; 28.9471] [45.3824; 79.5891] [4.2243; 21.8695] [19.9341; 33.2872] [53.1897; 80.1631] [38.4775; 59.2978] [5.0957; 30.5948] [32.4948; 71.2006] [46.0613; 64.1181] [23.8790; 49.6705]	
Lili Zhang Feng Li Yang Chenchen Shen Mingxu Zhou Lijun Wu Xiujuan Ye Yongxin Yang Lulu Qin Liming Chen Yan Liu <b>Random effects model</b> Heterogeneity:/ <sup>2</sup> = 89%, τ <sup>2</sup> =	29.0000 17.9104 64.2857 10.0000 26.0606 68.1818 48.8372 13.3333 52.1739 55.2632 <b>35.7495</b> = 0.8396, $\chi^2_{10}$ =	[23.1331; 35.6644] [10.4621; 28.9471] [45.3824; 79.5891] [4.2243; 21.8695] [19.9341; 33.2872] [53.1897; 80.1631] [38.4775; 59.2978] [5.0957; 30.5948] [32.4948; 71.2006] [46.0613; 64.1181] [ <b>23.8790; 49.6705</b> ] 94 (p < 0.01)	
Lili Zhang Feng Li Yang Chenchen Shen Mingxu Zhou Lijun Wu Xiujuan Ye Yongxin Yang Lulu Qin Liming Chen Yan Liu Random effects model Heterogeneity: $J^2 = 89\%, \tau^2$ =	$\begin{array}{c} 29.0000\\ 17.9104\\ 64.2857\\ 10.0000\\ 26.0606\\ 68.1818\\ 48.8372\\ 13.3333\\ 52.1739\\ 55.2632\\ 35.7495\\ = 0.8396, \chi^2_{10} = \\ 36.2926\end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} [23.1331; 35.6644] \\ [10.4621; 28.9471] \\ [45.3824; 79.5891] \\ [4.2243; 21.8695] \\ [19.9341; 33.2872] \\ [53.1897; 80.1631] \\ [38.4775; 59.2978] \\ [5.0957; 30.5948] \\ [32.4948; 71.2006] \\ [46.0613; 64.1181] \\ [23.8790; 49.6705] \\ 94 (p < 0.01) \end{array}$	
Lili Zhang Feng Li Yang Chenchen Shen Mingxu Zhou Lijun Wu Xiujuan Ye Yongxin Yang Lulu Qin Liming Chen Yan Liu Random effects model Heterogeneity: $J^2 = 89\%$ , $\tau^2 =$ Random effects model Heterogeneity: $J^2 = 94\%$ , $\tau^2 =$	29.0000 17.9104 64.2857 10.0000 26.0606 68.1818 48.8372 13.3333 52.1739 55.2632 <b>35.7495</b> = $0.8396, \chi^2_{10} =$ <b>36.2926</b> = $0.8396, \chi^2_{33} =$	$ \begin{bmatrix} 23.1331; 35.6644 \\ [10.4621; 28.9471] \\ [45.3824; 79.5891] \\ [4.2243; 21.8695] \\ [19.9341; 33.2872] \\ [53.1897; 80.1631] \\ [38.4775; 59.2978] \\ [5.0957; 30.5948] \\ [32.4948; 71.2006] \\ [46.0613; 64.1181] \\ [23.8790; 49.6705] \\ 94 (p < 0.01) \\ \end{bmatrix} $	
Lili Zhang Feng Li Yang Chenchen Shen Mingxu Zhou Lijun Wu Xiujuan Ye Yongxin Yang Lulu Qin Liming Chen Yan Liu Random effects model Heterogeneity: $J^2 = 89\%, \tau^2$ =	29.0000 17.9104 64.2857 10.0000 26.0606 68.1818 48.8372 13.3333 52.1739 55.2632 <b>35.7495</b> = $0.8396, \chi^2_{10} =$ <b>36.2926</b> = $0.8396, \chi^2_{33} =$	$ \begin{bmatrix} 23.1331; 35.6644 \\ [10.4621; 28.9471] \\ [45.3824; 79.5891] \\ [4.2243; 21.8695] \\ [19.9341; 33.2872] \\ [53.1897; 80.1631] \\ [38.4775; 59.2978] \\ [5.0957; 30.5948] \\ [32.4948; 71.2006] \\ [46.0613; 64.1181] \\ [23.8790; 49.6705] \\ 94 (p < 0.01) \\ \end{bmatrix} $	) 10 20 30 40 50 60 Proportion (%)
Lili Zhang Feng Li Yang Chenchen Shen Mingxu Zhou Lijun Wu Xiujuan Ye Yongxin Yang Lulu Qin Liming Chen Yan Liu Random effects model Heterogeneity: $J^2 = 89\%$ , $\tau^2 =$ Random effects model Heterogeneity: $J^2 = 94\%$ , $\tau^2 =$	29.0000 17.9104 64.2857 10.0000 26.0606 68.1818 48.8372 13.3333 52.1739 55.2632 <b>35.7495</b> = $0.8396, \chi^2_{10} =$ <b>36.2926</b> = $0.8396, \chi^2_{33} =$	$ \begin{bmatrix} 23.1331; 35.6644 \\ [10.4621; 28.9471] \\ [45.3824; 79.5891] \\ [4.2243; 21.8695] \\ [19.9341; 33.2872] \\ [53.1897; 80.1631] \\ [38.4775; 59.2978] \\ [5.0957; 30.5948] \\ [32.4948; 71.2006] \\ [46.0613; 64.1181] \\ [23.8790; 49.6705] \\ 94 (p < 0.01) \\ \end{bmatrix} $	

Study	Proportion	95% C.I.	
Year = 2011-2020			1
Meng Dan	52.6882	[45.5069; 59.7599]	
Weijie Jin	30.8824	[27.1404; 34.8931]	
Lili Zhang	29.0000	[23.1331; 35.6644]	
Qiang Ren	77.3810	[67.2341; 85.0827]	>
Feng Li Yang	17.9104	[10.4621; 28.9471]	
Chenchen Shen	64.2857	[45.3824; 79.5891]	¦→
Mingxu Zhou	10.0000	[4.2243; 21.8695]	
Huiyun Zhao	13.6364	[8.3910; 21.3950]	
Weize Gan	26.6010	[23.6743; 29.7485]	-#-
Haiyan Wu	36.0000	[23.9974; 50.0524]	
Lijun Wu		[19.9341; 33.2872]	<b></b>
Yu Li		[49.1757; 90.2929]	$\downarrow \longrightarrow$
Jin Li		[80.9061; 96.3659]	i >
Lin Wang		[ 9.2499; 23.4029]	
Hongwei He		[57.3174; 96.4039]	→ →
Guixian Zhang		[ 8.1498; 34.1027]	<b>-</b>
Xiaodong Kang1		[ 3.5915; 14.8050]	
Xiaodong Kang2		[ 3.7530; 11.7045]	
Jie Lin		[40.6038; 85.4042]	<b>``</b>
Xinpu Li		[3.7870; 9.2606]	<b>-</b>
Qiuyun Zhao		[11.5926; 34.5606]	
Yan Liu		[46.0613; 64.1181]	<b></b> -→
Random effects model		[24.6082; 41.7832]	
Heterogeneity: $l^2 = 95\%$ , $\tau^2 =$	$0.7688, \chi_{21}^{-} =$	388 (p < 0.01)	1
Year = 2000-2010			1
Wei Liu	71.6667	[59.0605; 81.6004]	÷
Lei Liu	63.0435	[52.7658; 72.2605]	$i \rightarrow$
Xiujuan Ye	68.1818	[53.1897; 80.1631]	$\rightarrow$
Jianbiao Lu		[25.6112; 48.9878]	
Ying Liu		[17.6120; 35.5365]	<b></b>
Guiying Wang		[ 6.0219; 17.4801]	- <b>-</b>
Yongxin Yang		[38.4775; 59.2978]	¦ ─── <b>■</b> ───
Lulu Qin		[ 5.0957; 30.5948]	
Fu Cong		[25.0511; 35.3206]	
Long Ma		[50.8974; 78.2891]	
Zhuming Zhang		[25.1310; 82.3163]	
Liming Chen		[32.4948; 71.2006]	
Random effects model Heterogeneity: $l^2 = 92\%$ , $\tau^2 =$	43.2189 0.7688 $\gamma^2$ =	[30.9035; 56.4338] 130 (p < 0.01)	
	A11		
Random effects model		[29.2817; 43.8156]	
Heterogeneity: $l^2 = 94\%$ , $\tau^2 = 10^{-2}$	$0.7688, \chi_{33}^{*} =$	546 (p < 0.01)	
Residual heterogeneity: $I^2 = I$	NA%, χ <sup>-</sup> = NA	(p = NA) (	) 10 20 30 40 50 60 Proportion (%)

Study	Proportion	95% C.I.	
Grade = C			1
Meng Dan	52.6882	[45.5069; 59.7599]	
Weijie Jin		[27.1404; 34.8931]	
Lili Zhang		[23.1331; 35.6644]	— <b>—</b> —
Feng Li Yang		[10.4621; 28.9471]	<b></b>
Chenchen Shen		[45.3824; 79.5891]	$\rightarrow$
Huiyun Zhao		[8.3910; 21.3950]	
Haiyan Wu		[23.9974; 50.0524]	
Wei Liu		[59.0605; 81.6004]	· · · · ·
Yu Li		[49.1757; 90.2929]	
Jin Li		[80.9061; 96.3659]	
Lin Wang		[9.2499; 23.4029]	
Hongwei He		[57.3174; 96.4039]	- i -
Xiujuan Ye		[53.1897; 80.1631]	
Jianbiao Lu		[25.6112; 48.9878]	
Ying Liu		[17.6120; 35.5365]	
Guiying Wang		[6.0219; 17.4801]	
Lulu Qin		[5.0957; 30.5948]	
Guixian Zhang		[8.1498; 34.1027]	
-		[50.8974; 78.2891]	
Long Ma Zhuming Zhong			
Zhuming Zhang Xiaodong Kang1		[25.1310; 82.3163] [3.5915; 14.8050]	
Xiaodong Kang2		[3.7530; 11.7045]	
Jie Lin			-
		[40.6038; 85.4042]	-
Xinpu Li		[3.7870; 9.2606]	
Qiuyun Zhao		[11.5926; 34.5606]	
Liming Chen		[32.4948; 71.2006]	
Yan Liu Pandam affaata madal		[46.0613; 64.1181]	i
Random effects model Heterogeneity: $l^2 = 94\%$ , $\tau^2 =$		[27.5293; 44.6242]	
	A26		
Grade = S			1
Qiang Ren		[67.2341; 85.0827]	}
Mingxu Zhou		[ 4.2243; 21.8695]	
Weize Gan	26.6010	[23.6743; 29.7485]	-#-
Lijun Wu		[19.9341; 33.2872]	
Lei Liu	63.0435	[52.7658; 72.2605]	
Yongxin Yang	48.8372	[38.4775; 59.2978]	¦
Fu Cong	29.9342	[25.0511; 35.3206]	
Random effects model Heterogeneity: $l^2 = 95\%$ , $\tau^2 =$	38.7874	[23.7762; 56.2786]	
neterogeneny.r = 00%, t =	0.0074.76-	127 (0 < 0.01)	
Random effects model	36.3061	[29.0228; 44.2770]	
Heterogeneity: $l^2 = 94\%$ , $\tau^2 =$			
Residual heterogeneity: $I^2 =$	NA%, $\chi^2 = NA$	(p = NA) (	0 10 20 30 40 50 60 Proportion (%)
E 5			



sulfonamides, 32.25% (95% CI: 20.81–46.30%); tetracyclines, 27.83% (95% CI: 21.29–35.46%); aminoglycosides, 26.44% (95% CI: 19.33–35.02%); lincosamides, 23.39% (95% CI: 16.70–31.74%); and amphenicol, 10.33% (95% CI: 6.07–17.18%) (Figure 6).

# Publication bias of the prevalence and AMR rate of *S. aureus*

As shown by the funnel plot (Figures 7, 8), the studies exhibited an even distribution around the mean effect size, which suggested the publication bias is negligible.

# Discussion

Bovine mastitis is a disease of dairy cows worldwide (2, 15). *S. aureus* is one of the main pathogens causing the disease (16,

17) and is also the third largest foodborne pathogen in the world, posing a huge threat to animal husbandry and human public health (4), causing economic losses up to  $\leq 300$  per cow per year (18, 19), and thus fueling the increase of clinical, subclinical, and recurrent cow mastitis (6, 20). It is essential to understand the prevalence and AMR rate of bovine mastitis-related *S. aureus* to improve therapeutic interventions and prevention strategies.

The pooled prevalence of *S. aureus* in China (36.23%) is lower than that in the United States (46.6 ~ 62.4%, 118 of 189 herds) (21), Hungary (70%) (22), Northern Greece (40%) (23), and northern Ethiopia (41.7%) (24), but is higher than that in Denmark (34%) (25), Germany (7.3 ~ 11.5%) (26), Belgium (7.6%) (26), Iran (25%) (27), Japan (28.2%) (28), Nepal (15.2%) (29), and Korea (5.6%) (30). The difference in prevalence between China and the United States may be due to the fact that the scale of the United States is generally larger than that in China, and the farms covered in our study are only partial farms, and there may also be some high prevalence undetected. Apart from that, Patel et al. (21) suggested that caution should

Study	Proportion	95% C.I.	
Antimicrobials = β-L	actams		1
Weijie Jin	38.5714	[31.5179; 46.1399]	
Lili Zhang		[80.9061; 96.3659]	
Qiang Ren		[19.4865; 41.3455] [15.8007; 57.1221]	
Chenchen Shen Mingxu Zhou		[15.8007, 57.1221]	
Huiyun Zhao		[34.8072; 80.8216]	
Weize Gan	60.9524	[51.3308; 69.7913]	$\rightarrow$
Haiyan Wu		[69.3477; 99.2232]	
Qiuyun Zhao Random effects mo		[13.9920; 67.9510] [42.5478; 58.7682]	
Heterogeneity: $l^2 = 87\%$ .			
Antimicrobials = Qu			
Weijie Jin Lili Zhang		[49.3747; 64.2401] [21.2369; 44.8594]	
Qiang Ren		[1.4962; 13.3555]	
Chenchen Shen		[2.7938; 35.2180]	
Huiyun Zhao		[0.1926; 35.0276]	
Weize Gan		[43.7856; 62.6430]	
Haiyan Wu	16.6667	[ 5.4732; 40.8578] [ 0.0817; 53.9220]	
Qiuyun Zhao Random effects mo	3.0000 del 36.2251	[0.0817; 53.9220] [28.4481; 44.7971]	
Heterogeneity:/ <sup>2</sup> = 88%.			
Antimicrobials = An			
Lili Zhang		[21.2369; 44.8594]	
Qiang Ren Chanchan Shan		[6.2762; 22.7299]	
Chenchen Shen Mingxu Zhou		[ 6.9873; 43.6807] [ 0.5002; 62.1792]	
Huiyun Zhao		[2.0152; 37.5110]	
Weize Gan	46.6667	[37.3570; 56.2144]	·
Haiyan Wu	1.6667	[ 0.0459; 38.4864]	<b>→</b>
Qiuyun Zhao		[0.2783; 44.8314]	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •
Random effects mo Heterogeneity: 1 <sup>2</sup> = 78%,		[19.3305; 35.0231] 31 (p < 0.01)	
Antimicrobials = Tel Weijie Jin	3.8690	[ 1.8043; 8.1016]	-
Lili Zhang		[10.8252; 31.0929]	
Qiang Ren		[10.7939; 29.7589]	
Chenchen Shen		[42.8779; 84.1993]	$\longrightarrow$
Mingxu Zhou	0.0000	[ 0.5002; 62.1792]	
Huiyun Zhao		[3.3553; 40.5379]	
Weize Gan		[50.3758; 68.9097]	
Haiyan Wu Random effects mo		[15.8007; 57.1221] [21.2889; 35.4636]	
Heterogeneity:1 <sup>2</sup> = 92%,			
Antimicrobials = Lin	icosamides		
Weijie Jin	5.3571	[2.8107; 9.9739]	
Lili Zhang Oiong Ron	10.3448	[4.7221; 21.1747]	
Qiang Ren Chenchen Shen		[28.8702; 52.2676]	
Mingxu Zhou		[23.9971; 66.9638] [ 0.5002; 62.1792]	
Haiyan Wu		[69.3477; 99.2232]	
Qiuyun Zhao	30.0000	[ 9.9768; 62.3682]	
Random effects mo Heterogeneity: I <sup>2</sup> = 90%,		[16.7089; 31.7367] 59 (p < 0.01)	
Antimicrobials = Su			
Weijie Jin	41.0714	[33.8859; 48.6592]	
Qiang Ren	0.0000		·
Mingxu Zhou	20.0000		
Qiuyun Zhao Random effects mo		[0.2783; 44.8314] [20.8116; 46.3014]	
Heterogeneity: $l^2 = 78\%$			
Antimicrobials = Ma		14 6400. 7 700.	
Weijie Jin Lili Zhang	3.5714	[ 1.6132; 7.7201] [ 9.5356; 29.1665]	
Qiang Ren		[33.0644; 56.7787]	
Chenchen Shen		[15.8007; 57.1221]	
Huiyun Zhao	33.3333	[14.5958; 59.3962]	
Weize Gan	63.3333	[53.7337; 71.9799]	$\downarrow \rightarrow$
Haiyan Wu	61.1111	[37.8565; 80.2123]	→
Qiuyun Zhao Random effects mo		[1.3882; 46.7237]	
Random effects mo Heterogeneity:/ <sup>2</sup> = 92%,		[26.8950; 42.0819] 89 (p < 0.01)	
Antimicrobials = Am			
Weijie Jin	10.7143	[ 6.8551; 16.3644]	
Qiang Ren	1.5385	[0.2163; 10.1227]	•
Chenchen Shen		[8.5963; 46.4667]	
Mingxu Zhou		[0.5002; 62.1792]	
Huiyun Zhao Random effects mo	0.0000	[0.1926; 35.0276]	
Random effects mo Heterogeneity: $l^2 = 45\%$ ,	$\tau^2 = 0.0841, \gamma_4^2 = 0.0841$	[6.0174; 17.1823] 7 (p = 0.12)	
Random effects mo		[28.9848; 35.0513]	4
Heterogeneity:12 = 89%.	$\tau^2 = 0.0841, \gamma_{10}^2 =$	517 (p < 0.01)	
Residual heterogeneity:	$l^2 = NA\%, \chi^2 = NA$	(p = NA)	0 10 20 30 40 50 60 Proportion (%)
			Proportion (%)
FIGURE 7			
	prevalence	bias of Staphyl	ococcus aureus.
-		. ,	

be exercised when generalizing the findings of smaller herds, so prevalence will still vary considerably between China and other developed countries. The fact that China is the third largest milk producer in the world may be the reason for the higher prevalence. It could be concluded that further measures need to be taken against bacterial resistance and to improve related managements in farms (2, 31, 32).

Song et al. (32) and Gao et al. (31) suggested that the higher prevalence in North China may due to colder winters and lack of heat, reluctance to keep up with the rapid development of farming technology and so forth. Another important reason may lie in the fact that the dairy industry is much more developed in North China, where the main dairy zone and the large-scale farms are located. However, in the study by Gao et al. (31), some samples were stored at 4°C, instead of a freezer; repeated freeze–thaw of the sample reduces the culture sensitivity of the bacteria. In addition, as mentioned in the study of Gao et al. we were unable to interpret the findings because of the lack of management details of the studied herds (31).

In our analysis, the prevalence of subclinical mastitis caused by *S. aureus* is higher than that of clinical mastitis, which is inconsistent with the fact that clinical mastitis is more common than subclinical mastitis (32) but is consistent with the fact that a higher incidence of subclinical mastitis is predominant (33). Meanwhile, the incidence of the clinical type of bacteriologic bovine mastitis was roughly 20  $\sim$  22% in Canada (34), and that of subclinical mastitis was about 20.8  $\sim$  23.3% in the United States (35). Moreover, considering the different research angles and the limitations of the sample size used in the analysis, the difference is not surprising (34, 35). The specific prevalence of clinical and subclinical mastitis in China requires further meticulous studies to draw more accurate conclusions.

The lower prevalence in the recent decade of 2011–2020 than the decade of 2000–2010 (32.62 vs. 43.22%) might imply the decline in the prevalence due to the rapid technology development against *S. aureus* and biosecurity measures undertaken by the farms. This may be a good sign that *S. aureus* could be more effectively controlled in future along with the development of more advanced technology and increased attention paid to the industry (36). Mammary gland health is further complicated by differences in farm management systems, farm sizes, cow cleanliness, and housing styles across countries and regions (37).

In our study, *S. aureus* is the most resistant bacterium to  $\beta$ -lactams (50.68%). It was shown in the study by Perovic that *S. aureus* may have an acquired gene that makes it resistant to methicillin and to all other  $\beta$ -lactam antibiotics (28, 38). In addition, penicillin belongs to the  $\beta$ -lactam class of drugs, the drug has been used for long-term and repeated administration in cattle, for example, for the treatment of diarrhea and other diseases, which may result in increased resistance to its use in the treatment of clinical mastitis (39); hence,  $\beta$ -lactams might



be the most resistant antibiotic against *S. aureus*. This result is supported by studies conducted in Iran (27) and Brazil (40), both showing that *S. aureus* is highly resistant to  $\beta$ -lactam antibiotics compared with other antibiotics. In India, resistance to oxacillin (a penicillin drug) can reach 20.5% (41). In Japan, the resistance to ampicillin can reach 76.1%~89.7% (28). In Nepal, *S. aureus* isolates were totally (100%) resistant to ampicillin, 75.9% to cefazolin, and 48.3% to tetracycline (29).

China and other countries follow different practices regarding the use of antibiotics (42–44). However, rational evaluation, drug screening, and cautious and responsible use are meaningful to all countries to gradually reduce the use of antibiotics in veterinary practice in future.

# Conclusion

The pooled prevalence of *S. aureus* was 36.23%, and subgroup analysis revealed that the prevalence was higher in North China in 2000–2010 and in subclinical bovine mastitis cases. Pooled AMR rates revealed *S. aureus* is highly resistant to  $\beta$ -lactams and quinolones; therefore, caution should be taken against treatments involving these two types of antibiotics for bovine mastitis.

#### Data availability statement

The original contributions presented in the study are included in the article/supplementary material, further inquiries can be directed to the corresponding author.

## Author contributions

KW, JC, and KL contributed to conception and design of the study. KL organized the database. KW performed the statistical analysis and wrote the first draft of the manuscript. KL, JD, BY, HX, and JW wrote sections of the manuscript. LZ, CH, and XG performed the literatures research and review. WQ critically reviewed and revised the manuscript. All authors read and approved the final version.

## Funding

This study was funded by the National Natural Science Foundation of China (Grant No. 31660730), Open Fund Project of Longyan University and Fujian Provincial Key Laboratory for Prevention and Control Infectious of Animal Diseases and Biotechnology (ZDSYS2022003), Yunnan Expert Workstation (Grant No. 202005AF150041), and Veterinary Public Health Innovation Team of Yunnan Province (Grant No. 202105AE160014).

# Conflict of interest

The authors declare that the research was conducted in the absence of any commercial or financial relationships

# References

1. Krömker V, Leimbach S. Mastitis treatment-reduction in antibiotic usage in dairy cows. *Reprod Dom Anim.* (2017) 52 (Suppl. 3): 21–9. doi: 10.1111/rda.13032

2. Ruegg PL. A 100-year review: mastitis detection, management, and prevention. J Dairy Sci. (2017) 100:10381–97. doi: 10.3168/jds.2017-13023

3. Zaatout N, Ayachi A, Kecha M. *Staphylococcus aureus* persistence properties associated with bovine mastitis and alternative therapeutic modalities. *J Appl Microbiol.* (2020) 129:1102–19. doi: 10.1111/jam.14706

4. Monistero V, Graber HU, Pollera C, Cremonesi P, Castiglioni B, Bottini E, et al. *Staphylococcus aureus* isolates from bovine mastitis in eight countries: genotypes, detection of genes encoding different toxins and other virulence genes. *Toxins*. (2018) 10:247. doi: 10.3390/toxins10060247

5. Liu H, Li S, Meng L, Dong L, Zhao S, Lan X, et al. Prevalence, antimicrobial susceptibility, and molecular characterization of *Staphylococcus aureus* isolated from dairy herds in northern China. *J Dairy Sci.* (2017) 100:8796–803. doi: 10.3168/jds.2017-13370

6. Käppeli N, Morach M, Corti S, Eicher C, Stephan R, Johler S. *Staphylococcus aureus* related to bovine mastitis in Switzerland: clonal diversity, virulence gene profiles, and antimicrobial resistance of isolates collected throughout 2017. *J Dairy Sci.* (2019) 102:3274–81. doi: 10.3168/jds.2018-15317

7. Zaatout N, Hezil D. A meta-analysis of the global prevalence of methicillin-resistant *Staphylococcus aureus* (MRSA) isolated from clinical and subclinical bovine mastitis. *J Appl Microbiol.* (2022) 132:140–54. doi: 10.1111/jam. 15192

8. Mekonnen SA, Lam TJ, Hoekstra J, Rutten VP, Tessema TS, Broens EM, et al. Characterization of *Staphylococcus aureus* isolated from milk samples of dairy cows in small holder farms of North-Western Ethiopia. *BMC Vet Res.* (2018) 14:246. doi: 10.1186/s12917-018-1558-1

9. du Preez JH. Bovine mastitis therapy and why it fails. *J S Afr Vet Assoc.* (2000) 71:201–8. doi: 10.4102/jsava.v71i3.714

10. Yin J, Wang Y, Xu X, Liu Y, Yao L, Sun Q. The progress of global antimicrobial resistance governance and its implication to china: a review. *Antibiotics.* (2021) 10:1356. doi: 10.3390/antibiotics10111356

11. Tonin FS, Wiecek E, Torres-Robles A, Pontarolo R, Benrimoj SC, Fernandez-Llimos F, et al. An innovative and comprehensive technique to evaluate different measures of medication adherence: the network meta-analysis. *Res Social Adm Pharm.* (2019) 15:358–65. doi: 10.1016/j.sapharm.2018.05.010

12. Moher D, Liberati A, Tetzlaff J, Altman DG, PRISMA Group. Preferred reporting items for systematic reviews and metaanalyses: the PRISMA statement. *Ann Intern Med.* (2009) 151:264–9, W64. doi: 10.7326/0003-4819-151-4-200908180-00135

13. Shamseer L, Moher D, Clarke M, Ghersi D, Liberati A, Petticrew M, et al. Preferred reporting items for systematic review and meta-analysis protocols (PRISMA-P) 2015: elaboration and explanation. *BMJ.* (2015) 350:g7647. doi: 10.1136/bmj.g7647

14. Page MJ, McKenzie JE, Bossuyt PM, Boutron I, Hoffmann TC, Mulrow CD, et al. Updating guidance for reporting systematic reviews: development of the PRISMA 2020 statement. *J Clin Epidemiol.* (2021) 134:103–12. doi: 10.1016/j.jclinepi.2021.02.003

that could be construed as a potential conflict of interest.

#### Publisher's note

All claims expressed in this article are solely those of the authors and do not necessarily represent those of their affiliated organizations, or those of the publisher, the editors and the reviewers. Any product that may be evaluated in this article, or claim that may be made by its manufacturer, is not guaranteed or endorsed by the publisher.

15. Demontier E, Dubé-Duquette A, Brouillette E, Larose A, Ster C, Lucier JF, et al. Relative virulence of *Staphylococcus aureus* bovine mastitis strains representing the main Canadian spa types and clonal complexes as determined using *in vitro* and *in vivo* mastitis models. *J Dairy Sci.* (2021) 104:11904–21. doi: 10.3168/jds.2020-19904

16. Cote-Gravel J, Malouin F. Symposium review: features of *Staphylococcus aureus* mastitis pathogenesis that guide vaccine development strategies. *J Dairy Sci.* (2019) 102:4727–40. doi: 10.3168/jds.2018-15272

17. Cheng WN, Han SG. Bovine mastitis: risk factors, therapeutic strategies, and alternative treatments – a review. *Asian Austral J Anim Sci.* (2020) 33:1699–713. doi: 10.5713/ajas.20.0156

18. Deb R, Kumar A, Chakraborty S, Verma AK, Tiwari R, Dhama K, et al. Trends in diagnosis and control of bovine mastitis: a review. *Pak J Biol Sci.* (2013) 16:1653–61. doi: 10.3923/pjbs.2013.1653.1661

19. Gomes F, Henriques M. Control of bovine mastitis: old and recent therapeutic approaches. *Curr Microbiol.* (2016) 72:377–82. doi: 10.1007/s00284-015-0958-8

20. Zhou K, Li C, Chen D, Pan Y, Tao Y, Qu W, et al. A review on nanosystems as an effective approach against infections of *Staphylococcus aureus*. *Int J Nanomedicine*. (2018) 13:7333–47. doi: 10.2147/IJN.S169935

21. Patel K, Godden SM, Royster EE, Crooker BA, Johnson TJ, Smith EA, et al. Prevalence, antibiotic resistance, virulence and genetic diversity of *Staphylococcus aureus* isolated from bulk tank milk samples of U.S. dairy herds. *BMC Genomics*. (2021) 22:367. doi: 10.1186/s12864-021-07603-4

22. Peles F, Wagner M, Varga L, Hein I, Rieck P, Gutser K, et al. Characterization of Staphylococcus aureus strains isolated from bovine milk in Hungary. *Int J Food Microbiol.* (2007) 118:186–93. doi: 10.1016/j.ijfoodmicro.2007.07.010

23. Kotzamanidis C, Vafeas G, Giantzi V, Anastasiadou S, Mygdalias S, Malousi A, et al. *Staphylococcus aureus* isolated from ruminants with mastitis in northern Greece dairy herds: genetic relatedness and phenotypic and genotypic characterization. *Toxins.* (2021) 13:176. doi: 10.3390/toxins13030176

24. Haftu R, Taddele H, Gugsa G, Kalayou S. Prevalence, bacterial causes, and antimicrobial susceptibility profile of mastitis isolates from cows in large-scale dairy farms of Northern Ethiopia. *Trop Anim Health Prod.* (2012) 44:1765–71. doi: 10.1007/s11250-012-0135-z

25. Kirkeby C, Zervens L, Toft N, Schwarz D, Farre M, Hechinger S, et al. Transmission dynamics of *Staphylococcus aureus* within two Danish dairy cattle herds. *J Dairy Sci.* (2019) 102:1428–42. doi: 10.3168/jds.2018-15106

26. Tenhagen BA, Hansen I, Reinecke A, Heuwieser W. Prevalence of pathogens in milk samples of dairy cows with clinical mastitis and in heifers at first parturition. *J Dairy Res.* (2009) 76:179–87. doi: 10.1017/S0022029908003786

27. Hassani S, Moosavy MH, Gharajalar SN, Khatibi SA, Hajibemani A, Barabadi Z. High prevalence of antibiotic resistance in pathogenic foodborne bacteria isolated from bovine milk. *Sci Rep.* (2022) 12:3878. doi: 10.1038/s41598-022-07845-6

28. Thongratsakul S, Usui M, Higuchi H, Takahashi T, Sato T, Poolkhet C, et al. Prevalence and characterization of *Staphylococcus aureus* isolated in raw milk from cows in Hokkaido, Japan. *Trop Anim Health Prod.* (2020) 52:1631–7. doi: 10.1007/s11250-019-02169-6

29. Shrestha A, Bhattarai RK, Luitel H, Karki S, Basnet HB. Prevalence of methicillin-resistant *Staphylococcus aureus* and pattern of antimicrobial resistance in mastitis milk of cattle in Chitwan, Nepal. *BMC Vet Res.* (2021) 17:239. doi: 10.1186/s12917-021-02942-6

30. Moon JS, Lee AR, Kang HM, Lee ES, Kim MN, Paik YH, et al. Phenotypic and genetic antibiogram of methicillin-resistant staphylococci isolated from bovine mastitis in Korea. J Dairy Sci. (2007) 90:1176–85. doi: 10.3168/jds.S0022-0302(07)71604-1

31. Gao J, Barkema HW, Zhang L, Liu G, Deng Z, Cai L, et al. Incidence of clinical mastitis and distribution of pathogens on large Chinese dairy farms. *J Dairy Sci.* (2017) 100:4797–806. doi: 10.3168/jds.2016-12334

32. Song X, Huang X, Xu H, Zhang C, Chen S, Liu F, et al. The prevalence of pathogens causing bovine mastitis and their associated risk factors in 15 large dairy farms in China: an observational study. *Vet Microbiol.* (2020) 247:108757. doi: 10.1016/j.vetmic.2020.108757

33. Rocha LS, Silva DM, Silva MP, Vidigal PM, Silva JC, Guerra ST, et al. Comparative genomics of *Staphylococcus aureus* associated with subclinical and clinical bovine mastitis. *PLoS ONE*. (2019) 14:e0220804. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0220804

34. Levison LJ, Miller-Cushon EK, Tucker AL, Bergeron R, Leslie KE, Barkema HW, et al. Incidence rate of pathogen-specific clinical mastitis on conventional and organic Canadian dairy farms. *J Dairy Sci.* (2016) 99:1341–50. doi: 10.3168/jds.2015-9809

35. Mullen KA, Sparks LG, Lyman RL, Washburn SP, Anderson KL. Comparisons of milk quality on North Carolina organic and conventional dairies. *J Dairy Sci.* (2013) 96:6753–62. doi: 10.3168/jds.2012-6519

36. Ren Q, Liao G, Wu Z, Lv J, Chen W. Prevalence and characterization of *Staphylococcus aureus* isolates from subclinical bovine mastitis in southern Xinjiang, China. *J Dairy Sci.* (2020) 103:3368–80. doi: 10.3168/jds.2019-1 7420

37. Hill AE, Green AL, Wagner BA, Dargatz DA. Relationship between herd size and annual prevalence of and primary antimicrobial treatments for common diseases on dairy operations in the United States. *Prev Vet Med.* (2009) 88:264–77. doi: 10.1016/j.prevetmed.2008.12.001

38. Perovic O, Koornhof H, Black V, Moodley I, Duse A, Galpin J. *Staphylococcus aureus* bacteraemia at two academic hospitals in Johannesburg. *Trop Anim Health Prod.* (2019) 96:3460–5. doi: 10.7196/SAMJ.1201

39. Gao J, Ferreri M,Yu F, Liu X, Chen L, Su J, Han B. Molecular types and antibiotic resistance of *Staphylococcus aureus* isolates from bovine mastitis in a single herd in China. *Vet J.* (2012) 192:550–2. doi: 10.1016/j.tvjl.2011. 08.030

40. Freu G, Tomazi T, Filho AF, Heinemann MB, Dos Santos MV. Antimicrobial resistance and molecular characterization of *Staphylococcus aureus* recovered from cows with clinical mastitis in dairy herds from southeastern Brazil. *Antibiotics.* (2022) 11:424. doi: 10.3390/antibiotics11040424

41. Annamanedi M, Sheela P, Sundareshan S, Isloor S, Gupta P, Jasmeen P, et al. Molecular fingerprinting of bovine mastitis-associated *Staphylococcus aureus* isolates from India. *Sci Rep.* (2021) 11:15228. doi: 10.1038/s41598-021-94760-x

42. Garcia-Migura L, Hendriksen RS, Fraile L, Aarestrup FM. Antimicrobial resistance of zoonotic and commensal bacteria in Europe: the missing link between consumption and resistance in veterinary medicine. *Vet Microbiol.* (2014) 170:1–9. doi: 10.1016/j.vetmic.2014.01.013

43. Roth N, Käsbohrer A, Mayrhofer S, Zitz U, Hofacre C, Domig KJ. The application of antibiotics in broiler production and the resulting antibiotic resistance in *Escherichia coli*: a global overview. *Poult Sci.* (2019) 98:1791–804. doi: 10.3382/ps/pey539

44. Patel SJ, Wellington M, Shah RM, Ferreira MJ. Antibiotic stewardship in food-producing animals: challenges, progress, and opportunities. *Clin Ther.* (2020) 42:1649–58. doi: 10.1016/j.clinthera.2020.07.004