



**Full Length Article**

## Serosurveillance of *Neospora caninum* and *Brucella* species in Dairy Cattle of Konya, Turkey

Ozlem Derinbay Ekici<sup>1\*</sup>, Nermin Isik<sup>1</sup>, Zafer Sayin<sup>2</sup>, Alparslan Coskun<sup>3</sup> and Muhammad Sohail Sajid<sup>4,5</sup>

<sup>1</sup>University of Selcuk, Faculty of Veterinary Medicine, Department of Parasitology, 42031 Konya, Turkey

<sup>2</sup>University of Selcuk, Faculty of Veterinary Medicine, Department of Microbiology, 42031 Konya, Turkey

<sup>3</sup>University of Cumhuriyet, Faculty of Veterinary Medicine, Department of Internal Medicine, 42031 Sivas, Turkey

<sup>4</sup>Department of Parasitology, University of Agriculture, Faisalabad, Pakistan

<sup>5</sup>One Health Laboratory, Center for Advanced Studies in Agriculture and Food Security (CAS-AFS), University of Agriculture, Faisalabad, Pakistan

\*For correspondence: oderinbay@selcuk.edu.tr

### Abstract

This study reports the seroprevalence of *Neospora (N.) caninum* and *Brucella* sp. in aborting and non-aborting dairy cattle in Konya province of Turkey. To this end, blood samples were collected from 560 cattle, 66 of which were not aborting and 494 were aborting, and sera were isolated from these samples through standard protocol. Antibodies against *N. caninum* were determined by using a commercial competitive ELISA (cELISA) kit. *Brucella* sp. antibodies were determined using the Rose Bengal Plate Test (RBPT). According to cELISA results, 222 of 560 cattle (39.64%) were seropositive for *N. caninum* antibodies. Of 494 aborting cattle samples, 213 (43.11%) were positive for *N. caninum* antibodies. Through RBPT, 89 of the 560 cattle tested were positive for *Brucella* sp. Of 494 aborting cattle, 79 (15.99%) were positive for *Brucella* sp. The seropositivity differences between *N. caninum* and *Brucella* sp. were statistically significant in aborting cattle ( $p < 0.001$ ). The co-infection rate of *N. caninum* seropositivity with *B. abortus* was detected 9.5% in aborting cattle. In conclusion, seroprevalence of neosporosis and *Brucella* sp. was 39.64% and 15.89% through cELISA and RBPT, respectively in cattle of Konya. © 2018 Friends Science Publishers

**Keywords:** Abortion; *Brucella* sp.; Dairy cattle; Konya; *Neospora caninum*

### Introduction

The dairy cattle industry suffers economic losses due to abortion. Protozoan, bacterial, viral and fungal agents directly affect the reproductive health of cattle. In cattle, *Neospora (N.) caninum* and *Brucella* sp. are the important abortive agents generally causing abortion during the last 3 months of gestation (Radostits *et al.*, 1997).

*Neospora caninum*, an apicomplexan protozoan, causes abortions, reproductive failure or stillbirth in many warm-blooded animals e.g. cattle, horses, sheep, deer and goats and neurological alterations in dogs and cattle (Barber and Trees, 1996; Dubey and Lindsay, 1996; Dubey, 1999). Neosporosis was reported to increase the susceptibility of the infected hosts to other infectious agents e.g. Bovine Viral Diarrhoea Virus (BVDV) and Bovine Herpes Virus 1 (Bjorkman *et al.*, 2000; Mineo *et al.*, 2006). For the diagnosis of neosporosis in cattle, clinical findings, immunohistochemical methods, serological tests, tissue culture and molecular techniques are used. In the serological diagnosis of the disease, specific antibodies, which react against *N. caninum* ticsolide

antigens, are determined by methods such as the commonly used ELISA and IFA test (Sanderson *et al.*, 2000). Serological studies with these methods report seroprevalence of antibodies against *N. caninum* as 12.5% in England, 30% in Canada, 18% in Spain and 39.4% in the Netherlands (Davison *et al.*, 1999).

Brucellosis, a zoonotic infection, is induced by the bacteria of *Brucella* genus which are small aerobic intracellular coccobacilli localizing the reproductive organs of the animals causing abortions and sterility. Brucellosis is often spread by infected material at the time of calving or abortion. Bovine brucellosis, usually caused by *Brucella (B.) abortus* (OIE, 2009), is a well-recognized cause of abortion in dairy cattle (Shabbir *et al.*, 2011). The buffered *Brucella* antigen tests such as Rose Bengal Plate agglutination Test (RBPT) are appropriate for screening individual animals and herds (Gall and Nielsen, 2004). Numerous epidemiologic studies of neosporosis and brucellosis have been reported worldwide (Shabbir *et al.*, 2011; Lucchese *et al.*, 2016). However, in Turkey, the epidemiological studies about the seroprevalence of both *Brucella* sp.

and *N. caninum* are limited (Yildiz *et al.*, 2009). Therefore, the aim of this study was to detect the serological prevalence of *N. caninum* and *Brucella* sp. in dairy cattle of Konya province, Turkey using competitive ELISA and RBPT, respectively.

## Materials and Methods

### Sampling of Animals

The present study was performed in Konya province of Turkey. Cattle were selected from dairy cattle farms having a history of high abortion rates. Relevant information about the host-related determinants was recorded in a pre-designed questionnaire, which was tested through informal and formal ways (Thrusfield, 2007). Blood samples were obtained from 560 dairy cows with aborting (n = 494), and unknown history of abortion (n = 66).

### Blood Collection

Blood samples (7–8 mL) were collected from the jugular vein of cattle in plain vacutainer tubes using standard blood collection procedure. The samples were transported to the University of Selcuk, Department of Parasitology, Konya, Turkey within 12 h of collection. After centrifugation, sera samples were separated and stored at -20°C until assayed.

### cELISA for *N. caninum*

Sera samples were assayed using commercial *N. caninum* antibody test kit (VMRD, Inc., Pullman, WA, USA) based on competitive ELISA (cELISA). The test was performed according to the manufacturer's recommended protocol. Results were calculated as percent inhibition (% I) using following formula:

$$\% I = 100 - (\text{Sample O.D.} \times 100) / \text{Mean Negative Control O.D.}$$

Kit manufacturer mentioned that the sensitivity and specificity of cELISA tests are 96% and 99%, respectively (VMRD, Inc., Pullman, WA, USA). For interpretation of the results of cELISA, the tested sera samples were declared positive if they caused  $\geq 30$  inhibitions; and negative if they caused  $< 30\%$  inhibitions.

### Rose Bengal Plate Test for *Brucella* sp.

*Brucella* sp. antibodies were determined using RBPT as given by the OIE (2009). Briefly, equal volumes of test serum and RBPT antigen (Vetal AS) were mixed on a clean glass slide with the sterilized toothpick and incubated at room temperature for an hour. Formation of clumps was an indicative of the positive reaction.

## Statistical Analysis

A chi-square ( $\chi^2$ ) test was performed to detect significant differences, a probability of less than 0.05 was considered statistically significant. The statistical software package MINITAB 14 was used.

## Results

Most of the cattle surveyed in this report aborted in the second or third trimesters of their gestation periods. The age of the cattle sampled ranged from one to seven years. Specificity and sensitivity of cELISA test were 99% and 96%, respectively. The overall seroprevalence of *N. caninum* and *Brucella* sp. was detected as 39.64% (222/560) and 15.89% (89/560), respectively. Of 494 aborting cows, 213 sera (43.12%) had positive absorbance values in the cELISA and 79 sera (15.99%) were detected positive in RBPT. The seropositivity differences between *N. caninum* and *Brucella* sp. were statistically significant in the examined cattle ( $p < 0.001$ ). Table 1 details the serological prevalence of *N. caninum* and *Brucella* sp. in aborting and non-aborting dairy cattle population of Konya, Turkey.

## Discussion

*Neospora caninum* was first detected in 1984 in a dog with encephalomyelitis and myositis. During an abortion epidemic in Mexico in 1987, dairy cows were identified in cattle with *N. caninum*, which is notorious for being among the most important abortion causing pathogens of cattle in the world. Conrad *et al.* (1993) isolated the agent from waste fetus. Damages caused by *N. caninum* in cattle are abortions and associated infant deaths. It is reported that abortion risk in seropositive animals is 3–7.4 times higher than in other animals (Thurmond and Hietala, 1997; Davison *et al.*, 1999). It has been observed that in the recent years, it has caused considerable abortions all over the world (Landmann *et al.*, 2011; Shabbir *et al.*, 2011; Mazuz *et al.*, 2014). Neosporosis, which is cosmopolitan in distribution, is quite common in North America (Anderson *et al.*, 2000). Seropositivity of neosporosis was 12.5% in England and Wales, 36.8% in Spain, 15.5% in Poland, 56.9% in Argentina, 43.8% in Pakistan, 35.5% in Israel, 16.7% in Ethiopia and 59% in Mexico (Campero *et al.*, 1998; Davison *et al.*, 1999; Quintanilla-Gozalo *et al.*, 1999; Wladyslaw *et al.*, 2000; Vazquez *et al.*, 2002; Shabbir *et al.*, 2011; Asmare, 2014; Mazuz *et al.*, 2014). Campero *et al.* (2003) reported that 7.30% of waste fetuses are positive for *N. caninum*. Anderson *et al.* (1995) found the cause of 45.5% abortions, indicating that *N. caninum* is an important waste cause in cattle. In Pakistan, *N. caninum* antibodies were determined in 43.8% dairy cattle and the prevalence of antibodies against *B. abortus* ranged from 0% to 23.8% in different farms (Nasir *et al.*, 2014).

**Table 1:** The serological status of *Neospora caninum* and *Brucella* sp. in aborting and non-aborting dairy cattle of Konya, Turkey

Pathogens	Aborted		non- aborted		Total Seropositivity
	+	-	+	-	
<i>N. caninum</i>	213 <sup>a</sup>	281	9 <sup>a</sup>	57	39.64% <sup>a</sup> (222/560)
<i>Brucella</i> sp.	79 <sup>b</sup>	415	10 <sup>a</sup>	56	15.89% <sup>b</sup> (89/560)

<sup>a,b</sup>: different superscript letters (a, b) are statistically significant ( $P < 0.001$ , chi square)

In Turkey, various studies have been conducted to determine the seropositivity of neosporosis in cattle e.g. Akça and Gökçe (2003) reported 2% in Kars region, Öncel and Bıyıkoğlu (2003) reported 9.2% in Sakarya, Sevgili *et al.* (2005) reported 7.5% in Sanliurfa, İça *et al.* (2006) reported 7% in Kayseri region, Vural *et al.* (2006) found 5.1% to 32.7% in central Anatolian provinces, Aktaş *et al.* (2005) reported 4–15% and Şimşek *et al.* (2008) reported 8.19% in eastern Anatolia, and recently, Aytekin *et al.* (2013) found 8.83% seropositivity of *N. caninum* in Konya. Our results (39.64% prevalence of *N. caninum*) are closer to those reported elsewhere from different regions of the world and Turkey (Sevgili *et al.*, 2005; Vural *et al.*, 2006). Some investigators reported the seroprevalence between the groups (aborted and non-aborted) of cattle was statistically significant (Locatelli-Dittrich *et al.*, 2001; Romero-Salas *et al.*, 2010). On the contrary, Sadrebazzaz *et al.* (2004) and Aktaş *et al.* (2005) stated that the difference between the two groups was nonsignificant which are in accordance with our findings.

The herd and individual prevalence of cattle brucellosis is reported as 7.8 and 2.7%, respectively in Turkey (Anonymous, 2012). However, the data is limited to co-infection of cattle in Turkey with *N. caninum* and *B. abortus*. Yıldız *et al.* (2009) reported 13.82% prevalence of *N. caninum* as concurrent seropositivity with *B. abortus* in dairy cattle in Turkey. Castilleja *et al.* (2010) reported 21.2% of the brucellosis-positive cattle also had antibodies against *N. caninum* in Mexico. Similarly, Nasir *et al.* (2014) stated that 13.2% of buffaloes were infected with *Neospora* sp. as well as *Brucella* sp. in Pakistan. In agreement with the previous studies, we detected the co-infection rate of *N. caninum* seropositivity with *B. abortus* as 9.5% in aborting cattle of Konya, Turkey.

## Conclusion

In conclusions, seroprevalence of neosporosis and *Brucella* sp. were found 39.64% and 15.89% through cELISA and RBPT, respectively in cattle of Konya. Hence, *N. caninum* should also be taken into account with other abortion causing pathogens. Further investigations should include identification of pathogens from the aborted fetuses. Cattle breeders and growers should be aware of and trained of effective preventive management strategies

for the control of these economically significant diseases in Konya, Turkey.

## Acknowledgements

The authors want to thank to BAP (The coordination of Scientific Research Projects, University of Selcuk, Project No. 16401108).

## References

- Akça, A. and H. Gökçe. 2003. *Kars yöresi yerli ve kültür ırkı ithal sığırlarında Neospora caninum'un seroprevalansı*. XII. Ulusal Parazitoloji Kongresi, Konya, Turkey
- Aktaş, M., C.E. Şaki, K. Altay, S. Şimşek, A.E. Ütük, E. Köroğlu and N. Dumanlı. 2005. Doğu Anadolu Bölgesinin bazı illerinde bulunan sığırlarda *Neospora caninum*'un araştırılması. *T. Parazitol. Derg.*, 29: 22–25
- Anderson, M.L., C.W. Palmer, M.C. Thurmond, J.P. Picanso, P.C. Blanchard, R.E. Breitmeyer, A.W. Layton, M. McAllister, B. Daft and H. Kinde, 1995. Evaluation of abortions in cattle attributable to neosporosis in selected dairy herds in California. *J. Am. Vet. Med. Assoc.*, 207: 1206–1210
- Anderson, M.L., A.G. Andrianarivo and P.A. Conrad, 2000. Neosporosis in cattle. *Animal Reprod. Sci.*, 60/61: 417–431
- Anonymous, 2012. *Brusellanın Konjunktival Aşı ile Kontrol ve Eradikasyonu Projesi*. Gıda Tarım ve Hayvancılık Bakanlığı, Gıda ve Kontrol Genel Müdürlüğü, Genelgesi
- Asmare, K. 2014. *Neospora caninum* versus *Brucella* spp. Exposure among dairy cattle in Ethiopia: A case control study. *Trop. Anim. Health. Prod.*, 46: 961–966
- Aytekin, H., K. Kamburgil, E. Handemir and F. Altnoz, 2013. Konya Yöresindeki Sığırlarda *Neospora caninum*'un Yaygınlığının Serolojik Olarak Araştırılması. *Etlik Vet. Mikrobiyol. Derg.*, 24: 49–53
- Barber, J.S. and A.J. Trees, 1996. Clinical aspects of 27 cases of neosporosis in dogs. *Vet. Res.*, 139: 439–443
- Bjorkman, C., S. Alenius, U. Manuëlsson and A. Uggla, 2000. *Neospora caninum* and bovine virus diarrhoea virus infections in Swedish dairy cows in relation to abortion. *Vet. J.*, 159: 201–206
- Campero, C.M., D.P. Moore, A.C. Odeon, A.L. Cipolla and E. Odriozola, 2003. Aetiology of bovine abortion in Argentina. *Vet. Res. Commun.*, 27: 359–369
- Campero, C.M., M.L. Anderson, G. Conosciuto, H. Odriozola, G. Bretschneider and M.A. Poso, 1998. *Neospora caninum* associated abortion in a dairy herd in Argentina. *Vet. Res.*, 143: 228–229
- Castilleja, S.Y.M., J.G. Rodríguez Diego and M. Pedroso, 2010. Correlación Serológica De *Brucella abortus* Y *Neospora caninum*. En Ganado Bovino En El Estado De Hidalgo, México. *Rev. Salud. Anim.*, 32: 57–59
- Conrad, P.A., B.C. Barr, K.W. Sverlow, M.L. Anderson, B. Daft, H. Kinde, J.P. Dubey, L. Munson and A. Ardans, 1993. *In vitro* isolation and characterization of a *Neospora* spp. from aborted bovine fetuses. *Parasitol.*, 106: 239–249
- Davison, H.C., A. Otter and A.J. Trees, 1999. Significance of *Neospora caninum* in British dairy cattle determined by estimation of seroprevalence in normally calving cattle and aborting cattle. *Int. J. Parasitol.*, 29: 1189–1194
- Dubey, J.P., 1999. Recent advances in *Neospora* and neosporosis. *Vet. Parasitol.*, 84: 349–367
- Dubey, J.P. and D.S. Lindsay, 1996. A review of *Neospora caninum* and Neosporosis. *Vet. Parasitol.*, 67: 1–59
- Gall, D. and K. Nielsen, 2004. Serological diagnosis of bovine brucellosis: a review of test performance and cost comparison. *Rev. Sci. Tech. Off. Int. Epiz.*, 23: 989–1002

- İça, A., A. Yıldırım, Ö. Duzlu and A. İnci, 2006. Kayseri yöresinde sığırlarda *Neospora caninum*'un seroprevalansı. *T. Parazitol. Derg.*, 30: 92–94
- Landmann, J.K., A.A. Gunn, P.J. O'Donoghue, W.P. Tranter and M.R. McGowan, 2011. Epidemiology and impact of *Neospora caninum* infection in three Queensland tropical dairy herds. *Reprod. Dom. Anim.*, 46: 734–737
- Locatelli-Dittrich, R., V.T. Soccol, R.R. Richartz, M.E. Gasino-Joineau, R. Vinne and R.D. Pinckney, 2001. Serological diagnosis of neosporosis in a herd of dairy cattle in southern Brazil. *J. Parasitol.*, 87: 1493–1494
- Lucchese, L., A. Benkirane, I. Hakimi, A. El Idrissi and A. Natale, 2016. Seroprevalence study of the main causes of abortion in dairy cattle in Morocco. *Vet. Italiana*, 52: 13–19
- Mazuz, M.L., L. Fish, D. Reznikov, R. Wolkomirsky, B. Leibovitz, I. Savitzky, J. Golenser and V. Shkap, 2014. Neosporosis in naturally infected pregnant dairy cattle. *Vet. Parasitol.*, 205: 85–91
- Mineo, T.W., S. Alenius, K. Naslund, H.J. Montassier and C. Bjorkman, 2006. Distribution of antibodies against *Neospora caninum*, BVDV and BHV-1 among cows in brasilian dairy herds with reproductive disorders. *Rev. Bras. Parasitol. Vet.*, 15: 188–192
- Nasir, A., M. Ashraf, A. Shakoor, M. Adil, T. Abbas, M. Kashif, M. Younus and M.P. Reichel, 2014. Co-infection of water buffaloes in Punjab, Pakistan, with *Neospora caninum* and *Brucella abortus*. *Turk. J. Vet. Anim. Sci.*, 38: 572–576
- OIE, 2009. *Bovine Brucellosis*. Terrestrial Manual. Chapter 2.4.3 [https://web.oie.int/eng/normes/MANUAL/2008/pdf/2.04.03 BOVINE BRUCCELL.pdf](https://web.oie.int/eng/normes/MANUAL/2008/pdf/2.04.03_BOVINE_BRUCCELL.pdf)
- Öncel, T. and G. Bıyıkoğlu, 2003. Sakarya yöresi süt sığırlarında *Neospora caninum*. *Uludag. Univ. J. Fac. Vet. Med.*, 22: 87–89
- Quintanilla-Gozalo, A., J. Pereira-Bueno, E. Tabares, E.A. Innes, R. Gonzales-Paniello and L.M. Ortega-Mora, 1999. Seroprevalance of *Neospora caninum* infection in dairy and beef cattle in Spain. *Int. J. Parasitol.*, 29: 1201–1208
- Radostits, O.M., D.C. Blood and C.C. Gay, 1997. *Veterinary Medicine A Textbook of the Diseases of Cattle, Sheep, Pigs, Goats and Horses*, 8<sup>th</sup> edition. WB Saunders, London, UK
- Romero-Salas, D., Z. Garcia-Vazquez, F. Montiel-Palacios, T. Montiel-Pena, M. Aguilar-Dominguez, L. Medina-Esparza and C. Cruz-Vazquez, 2010. Seroprevalence of *Neospora caninum* antibodies in cattle in Veracruz, Mexico. *J. Anim. Vet. Adv.*, 9: 1445–1451
- Sadrebazzaz, A., H. Haddadzadeh, K. Esmailnia, I.G. Habib, M. Vojgani and R. Hashemifesharaki, 2004. Serological prevalence of *Neospora caninum* in healthy and aborted dairy cattle in Mashhad, Iran. *Vet. Parasitol.*, 124: 201–204
- Sanderson, M.W., J.M. Gay and T.V. Baszler, 2000. *Neospora caninum* seroprevalence and associated risk factors in beef cattle in the northwestern United States. *Vet. Parasitol.*, 90: 15–24
- Sevgili, M., M.G. Altaş and O. Keskin, 2005. Seroprevalence of *Neospora caninum* in cattle in the province of Şanlıurfa. *Turk. J. Vet. Anim. Sci.*, 29: 127–130
- Shabbir, M.Z., M.M. Nazir, A. Maqbool, M. Lateef, M.A.B. Shabbir, A. Ahmad, M. Rabbani, T. Yaqub, M.U. Sohail and M. Ijaz, 2011. Seroprevalence of *Neospora caninum* and *Brucella abortus* in dairy cattle herds with high abortion rates. *J. Parasitol.*, 97: 740–742
- Şimşek, S., A.E. Utuk, E. Köroğlu et al., 2008. Seroprevalence of *Neospora caninum* in repeat breeder dairy cows in Turkey. *Arch. Tierzucht.*, 51: 143–148
- Thrusfield, M., 2007. *Veterinary Epidemiology*. Blackwell Science, Ames, Iowa, USA
- Thurmond, M.C. and S.K. Hietala, 1997. Effect of congenitally acquired *Neospora caninum* infection on risk of abortion and subsequent abortions in dairy cattle. *Am. J. Vet. Res.*, 58: 1381–1385
- Vazquez, Z.G., C.C. Vazquez, L.M. Espinosa, D.G. Tapia and B.C. Martinez, 2002. Serological survey of *Neospora caninum* infection in dairy cattle herds in Aguascalientes, Mexico. *Vet. Parasitol.*, 106: 115–120
- Vural, G., E. Aksoy, M. Bozkir, U. Kuçukayan and A. Erturk, 2006. Seroprevalence of *Neospora caninum* in dairy cattle herds in central Anatolia, Turkey. *Vet. Arch.*, 76: 343–349
- Wladyslaw, C., C. Leszek, R. Sandy, M. Bozena and M. Andrzej, 2000. *Neospora caninum* infections in aborting dairy cows in Poland. *Acta Parasitol.*, 45: 113–114
- Yildiz, K., O. Kul, C. Babur, S. Kılıç, A.N. Gazyacı, B. Celebi and I.S. Gurcan, 2009. Seroprevalence of *Neospora caninum* in dairy cattle ranches with high abortion rate: special emphasis to serologic coexistence with *Toxoplasma gondii*, *Brucella abortus* and *Listeria monocytogenes*. *Vet. Parasitol.*, 164: 306–310

(Received 21 November 2017; Accepted 07 December 2017)