



Original article

Seroprevalence of *Fasciola hepatica* in cattle in Estonia

Jennifer Petersson^a, Pikka Jokelainen^{b,c,d}, Brian Lassen^{b,e}, Maarja Tagel^b, Arvo Viltrop^b, Adam Novobilský^{a,*}

^a Department of Biomedical Sciences and Veterinary Public Health, Section for Parasitology, Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences (SLU), 75007 Uppsala, Sweden

^b Department of Basic Veterinary Sciences and Population Medicine, Institute of Veterinary Medicine and Animal Sciences, Estonian University of Life Sciences, Tartu, Estonia

^c Faculty of Veterinary Medicine, University of Helsinki, Helsinki, Finland

^d Statens Serum Institut, Copenhagen, Denmark

^e Department of Veterinary and Animal Sciences, Faculty of Health and Medical Sciences, University of Copenhagen, Frederiksberg C, Denmark

ARTICLE INFO

Keywords:

Bovine
Distribution
ELISA
Fasciolosis
Liver fluke
Serology

ABSTRACT

Fasciolosis, an infectious disease caused by the liver fluke *Fasciola hepatica*, affects grazing cattle world-wide. Liver fluke *F. hepatica* is prevalent and well-documented in cattle in many European countries, but for the Baltic countries such information is limited. This study investigated the seroprevalence and distribution of *F. hepatica* in cattle in Estonia. A total of 2461 individual serum samples from 218 farms distributed throughout all 15 Estonian counties, collected between February 2012 and March 2013, were tested for specific anti-*F. hepatica* antibodies using an in-house enzyme-linked immunosorbent assay (ELISA). In total, 144 individual animals tested seropositive, yielding an animal-level seroprevalence of 5.9% (95% CI 5.0–6.9). The herd-level seroprevalence was 28.4% (95% CI 22.8–34.7) and the herds with at least one seropositive animal were located in 13 of the 15 counties. Of the 62 *F. hepatica*-positive herds, 14 (6.4%) had an in-herd seroprevalence higher than 25%. With respect to production type, the herd-level seroprevalence was 20.2%, 35.6%, and 36.4% in dairy, mixed, and beef herds, respectively. Animals from the two large islands had higher odds of testing *F. hepatica*-seropositive than animals from the mainland. Animals from mixed and beef herds had higher odds of testing *F. hepatica*-seropositive than animals from dairy herds. Mixed and beef herds, and herds with more than 100 cattle, had higher odds of having at least one seropositive animal. This study provided the first serological evidence of the presence and distribution of *F. hepatica* in cattle herds in Estonia.

1. Introduction

Fasciola hepatica, the causative organism of fasciolosis in ruminants, is a common liver fluke in temperate climate zones world-wide. In cattle, fasciolosis affects growth, fertility and carcass composition and reduces milk yield (Charlier et al., 2014). The annual financial losses due to fasciolosis in the global agricultural sector are estimated to exceed US \$3 billion (Cwiklinski et al., 2016).

Diagnosis and surveillance of *F. hepatica* in cattle at country level are often performed using detection of *F. hepatica*-specific antibodies in bulk tank milk (Salimi-Bejestani et al., 2005). National surveys of fasciolosis in dairy cattle have been performed in a number of European countries, including Belgium (Bennema et al., 2011), Germany (Kuerpick et al., 2013), Ireland (Selemetas et al., 2015), the UK (Salimi-Bejestani et al., 2005), and Sweden (Novobilský et al., 2015a). Although bulk tank milk ELISA (BTM-ELISA) is a convenient and efficient

tool for detecting exposure to liver fluke, its utility is limited to dairy cattle only. In addition, at least 20–27% of the cattle in the herd must be infected to obtain a positive response in BTM-ELISA (Salimi-Bejestani et al., 2005; Düscher et al., 2011). In beef cattle, serodiagnosis is based on individual serum samples (Novobilský et al., 2015b).

In Estonia, *F. hepatica* has been sporadically reported in cattle (Reek, 1963; Estonian Veterinary and Food Laboratory, 2016), but its distribution and current prevalence are not known. The main aims of this study were to estimate the seroprevalence and evaluate the geographical distribution of *F. hepatica* in cattle in Estonia. An additional aim was to evaluate potential risk factors for seropositivity.

* Corresponding author at: Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences, Department of Biomedical Sciences and Veterinary Public Health, Section for Parasitology, Box 7036, 75007 Uppsala, Sweden.

E-mail address: anovobilsky@yahoo.com (A. Novobilský).

<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.vprsr.2017.08.013>

Received 28 February 2017; Received in revised form 30 May 2017; Accepted 22 August 2017

Available online 23 August 2017

2405-9390/ © 2017 Elsevier B.V. All rights reserved.

Table 1

Fasciola hepatica seroprevalence in cattle in Estonia, by age, breed, production type, herd size, and farm location. A herd was considered seropositive if at least one of up to 20 serum samples investigated tested positive.

| | No. of farms | No. of positive farms | Prevalence % (95% CI ^d) | No. of animals | No. of positive animals | Prevalence % (95% CI ^d) |
|--------------------------------------|--------------|-----------------------|-------------------------------------|----------------|-------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Age | | | | | | |
| < 1 year | | | | 1 | 0 | 0.00 (0.00–95.00) |
| ≥ 1 < 2 years | | | | 109 | 10 | 9.17 (4.61–15.74) |
| ≥ 2 < 3 years | | | | 845 | 39 | 4.62 (3.35–6.19) |
| ≥ 3 < 4 years | | | | 340 | 18 | 5.29 (3.27–8.08) |
| ≥ 4 < 5 years | | | | 293 | 22 | 7.51 (4.89–10.97) |
| ≥ 5 < 6 years | | | | 224 | 15 | 6.70 (3.94–10.57) |
| ≥ 6 < 7 years | | | | 216 | 13 | 6.02 (3.39–9.82) |
| ≥ 7 < 8 years | | | | 163 | 10 | 6.13 (3.16–10.66) |
| ≥ 8 < 9 years | | | | 82 | 2 | 2.44 (0.41–7.83) (ref) |
| ≥ 9 < 10 years | | | | 65 | 5 | 7.69 (2.87–16.23) |
| ≥ 10 years | | | | 78 | 7 | 8.97 (4.01–16.95) |
| Breed^a | | | | | | |
| Dairy breeds | | | | | | |
| Estonian Holstein | | | | 924 | 40 | 4.33 (3.15–5.79) |
| Estonian Red | | | | 365 | 8 | 2.19 (1.02–4.12) |
| Other ^b | | | | 17 | 0 | 0.00 (0.00–16.16) (ref) |
| Beef breeds | | | | | | |
| Aberdeen-Angus | | | | 225 | 16 | 7.11 (4.27–11.06) |
| Hereford | | | | 391 | 25 | 6.39 (4.27–9.16) (ref) |
| Limousine | | | | 258 | 18 | 6.98 (4.32–10.60) |
| Other ^c | | | | 236 | 34 | 14.41 (10.35–19.33) ^e |
| Production type | | | | | | |
| Dairy | 104 | 21 | 20.19 (13.30–28.72) (ref) | 1309 | 49 | 3.74 (2.81–4.88) (ref) |
| Mixed | 59 | 21 | 35.59 (24.19–48.38) | 591 | 50 | 8.46 (6.41–10.91) ^e |
| Beef | 55 | 20 | 36.36 (24.50–49.63) | 561 | 45 | 8.02 (5.98–10.49) ^e |
| Herd size | | | | | | |
| ≤ 50 | 107 | 24 | 22.43 (15.28–31.05) (ref) | 750 | 36 | 4.80 (3.44–6.51) (ref) |
| 50 < n ≤ 100 | 42 | 14 | 33.33 (20.39–48.51) | 543 | 41 | 7.55 (5.55–10.01) ^e |
| > 100 | 69 | 24 | 34.78 (24.27–46.55) | 1168 | 67 | 5.74 (4.51–7.18) ^e |
| Herd size, by production type | | | | | | |
| Dairy herds | | | | | | |
| ≤ 50 | 30 | 5 | 16.67 (6.37–33.15) | 181 | 7 | 3.87 (1.71–7.50) |
| 50 < n ≤ 100 | 21 | 3 | 14.29 (3.77–34.14) (ref) | 244 | 12 | 4.92 (2.69–8.21) |
| > 100 | 53 | 13 | 24.53 (14.38–37.40) | 884 | 30 | 3.39 (2.34–4.75) (ref) |
| Mixed herds | | | | | | |
| ≤ 50 | 41 | 10 | 24.39 (13.11–39.18) (ref) | 308 | 16 | 5.19 (3.11–8.13) |
| 50 < n ≤ 100 | 9 | 3 | 33.33 (9.27–66.76) | 126 | 5 | 3.97 (1.47–8.57) (ref) |
| > 100 | 9 | 8 | 88.89 (56.14–99.44) ^e | 157 | 29 | 18.47 (12.98–25.12) ^e |
| Beef herds | | | | | | |
| ≤ 50 | 36 | 9 | 25.00 (12.94–40.95) (ref) | 261 | 13 | 4.98 (2.80–8.16) (ref) |
| 50 < n ≤ 100 | 12 | 8 | 66.67 (37.69–88.39) ^e | 173 | 24 | 13.87 (9.31–19.64) ^e |
| > 100 | 7 | 3 | 42.86 (12.27–78.40) | 127 | 8 | 6.30 (2.97–11.61) |
| Counties | | | | | | |
| Northern counties | | | | | | |
| Hiiumaa | 98 | 23 | 23.47 (15.88–32.61) | 1132 | 52 | 4.59 (3.49–5.93) (ref) |
| Läänemaa | 6 | 3 | 50.00 (14.66–85.34) ^e | 90 | 7 | 7.78 (3.47–14.78) ^e |
| Raplamaa | 14 | 7 | 50.00 (25.13–74.87) ^e | 187 | 24 | 12.83 (8.59–18.22) ^e |
| Järvamaa | 19 | 3 | 15.79 (4.18–37.21) | 203 | 8 | 3.94 (1.85–7.35) ^e |
| Harjumaa | 18 | 4 | 22.22 (7.49–45.31) | 197 | 4 | 2.03 (0.65–4.82) |
| Lääne-Virumaa | 13 | 3 | 23.08 (6.23–50.86) | 130 | 5 | 3.85 (1.42–8.32) ^e |
| Ida-Virumaa | 17 | 3 | 17.65 (4.69–40.89) | 205 | 4 | 1.95 (0.62–4.64) |
| Ida-Virumaa | 11 | 0 | 0.00 (0.00–23.84) (ref) | 120 | 0 | 0.00 (0.00–2.47) (ref) |
| Southern counties | | | | | | |
| Võrumaa | 120 | 39 | 32.50 (24.58–41.26) | 1329 | 92 | 6.92 (5.65–8.38) ^e |
| Valgamaa | 18 | 8 | 44.44 (23.21–67.34) ^e | 175 | 13 | 7.43 (4.19–12.06) ^e |
| Põlvamaa | 15 | 5 | 33.33 (13.38–59.21) ^e | 179 | 7 | 3.91 (1.73–7.58) ^e |
| Pärnumaa | 4 | 1 | 25.00 (1.25–75.77) | 44 | 1 | 2.27 (0.11–10.70) |
| Saaremaa | 12 | 6 | 50.00 (23.38–76.62) ^e | 154 | 27 | 17.53 (12.13–24.15) ^e |
| Viljandimaa | 41 | 15 | 36.59 (22.99–52.02) ^e | 403 | 32 | 7.94 (5.59–10.89) ^e |
| Tartumaa | 5 | 2 | 40.00 (7.35–81.76) | 56 | 8 | 14.29 (6.86–25.33) ^e |
| Jõgevamaa | 14 | 0 | 0.00 (0.00–19.26) (ref) | 208 | 0 | 0.00 (0.00–1.43) (ref) |
| Jõgevamaa | 11 | 2 | 18.18 (3.17–48.27) | 110 | 4 | 3.64 (1.17–8.54) ^e |
| Total | 218 | 62 | 28.44 (22.75–34.70) | 2461 | 144 | 5.85 (4.98–6.83) |

^a Breeds represented by more than 100 samples investigated are shown.

^b Other dairy breeds: Estonian Native.

^c Other beef breeds: Blonde d'Aquitaine, Belgian Blue, Charolais, Galloway, Highland cattle, Piedmontese, Simmental.

^d Confidence interval, Mid-P exact.

^e Significantly higher (*P*-value, Mid-P exact < 0.05) seroprevalence than the lowest (ref) seroprevalence within the variable.

Download English Version:

<https://daneshyari.com/en/article/5545990>

Download Persian Version:

<https://daneshyari.com/article/5545990>

[Daneshyari.com](https://daneshyari.com)