

This is the post-refereeing manuscript of an accepted journal article:

Musallam, I I and Abo-Shehada, M and Omar, M and Guitian, J (2015) *Cross-sectional study of brucellosis in Jordan: Prevalence, risk factors and spatial distribution in small ruminants and cattle*. PREVENTIVE VETERINARY MEDICINE, 118 (4). pp. 387-396.

The final publication is available at <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.prevetmed.2014.12.020> . This draft has been made available on the RVC's Open Access publications repository in accordance with the College's Open Access policy.

This manuscript version is made available under the CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 license <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0>.

The full details of the published version of the article are as follows:

TITLE: Cross-sectional study of brucellosis in Jordan: Prevalence, risk factors and spatial distribution in small ruminants and cattle

AUTHORS: Musallam, I I and Abo-Shehada, M and Omar, M and Guitian, J

JOURNAL TITLE: Preventative Veterinary Medicine

VOLUME/EDITION: 118/4

PUBLICATION DATE: March 2015

DOI: 10.1016/j.prevetmed.2014.12.020

1 **Cross-sectional study of brucellosis in Jordan: prevalence, risk factors and spatial distribution in**
2 **small ruminants and cattle**

3
4 **I.I. Musallam^{a,*}, M. Abo Shehada^b, M. Omar^c, J. Guitian^a**

5
6
7 ^a Veterinary Epidemiology, Economics and Public Health Group, Department of Production and
8 Population Health, The Royal Veterinary College, University of London, North Mymms, Hertfordshire
9 AL9 7TA, United Kingdom

10 ^b Faculty of Epidemiology and Population Health, London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine,
11 Keppel Street, Bloomsbury, London WC1E 7HT, United Kingdom

12 ^c Ministry of Agriculture, Zarqa Agriculture department, Zarqa, Jordan

13
14
15
16
17 * Corresponding author:

18 Imusallam@rvc.ac.uk (I. Musallam)

19 Tel.: +44-744518020.

20 Fax: +44-1707667051

21 **Correspondence address:** Veterinary Epidemiology, Economics and Public Health group (VEEPH),
22 Royal Veterinary College, Hawkshead Lane, North Mymms, Hatfield, Hertfordshire, AL9 7TA, United
23 Kingdom

29 **Abstract**

30 Brucellosis is considered endemic in many Middle Eastern countries including Jordan. To determine the
31 frequency, risk factors and spatial distribution of ruminant brucellosis in Jordan, a nationwide cross-
32 sectional study was conducted. Small ruminant flocks (n=333) and cattle herds (n=204) were randomly
33 selected, and their disease status was ascertained by testing individual serum samples using the Rose
34 Bengal Test and a competitive ELISA (sheep and goats) and milk samples using an indirect ELISA
35 (cattle). Information on putative risk factors was collected using standardised questionnaires. A logistic
36 model with a binomial outcome was built to identify risk factors for being seropositive. The estimated
37 true seroprevalence values were 18.1% (95% CI: 11-25.3) (cattle-only herds), 22.2% (95% CI: 16.5-
38 28.8) (sheep flocks), 45.4% (95% CI: 30.3-61.6) (goat herds), 70.4% (95% CI: 55.5-84.9) (mixed sheep-
39 goat flocks), 34.3% (95% CI: 28.4, 40.4) (all small ruminant flocks) and 38.5% (95% CI: 24.3-51.8)
40 (mixed herds of cattle and small ruminants). Only 1.5% of small ruminant flocks were vaccinated. The
41 seroprevalence was higher in northern areas, where livestock density is also higher. The logistic model
42 fitted the data well and had a very high predictive ability. In the small ruminant model, five variables
43 were significantly associated with a higher odds of seropositivity: lending/borrowing rams (OR=8.9,
44 95% CI: 3.0-26.1), feeding aborted material to dogs (OR=8.0, 95% CI: 3.5-18.1) the presence of goats
45 (OR=6.9, 95% CI: 3.1-15.4), introducing new animals to the flock (OR=5.8, 95% CI: 2.5-13.6), and a
46 large flock size (OR=2.2, 95% CI: 1.0-4.6). Conversely, separating newly-introduced animals
47 (OR=0.16, 95% CI: 0.05-0.47), separating animals that had aborted (OR=0.19, 95% CI: 0.08-0.46) and
48 using disinfectants to clean pens (OR=0.37, 95% CI: 0.16-0.83) were significantly associated with a
49 lower odds of being seropositive. The main risk factor for cattle herds being seropositive was the
50 introduction of new animals (OR=11.7, 95% CI: 2.8-49.4); while separation of newly-introduced
51 animals (OR=0.09, 95% CI: 0.03-0.29), herd disinfection (OR=0.04, 95% CI: 0.01-0.15) and having
52 calving pens (OR=0.14, 95% CI: 0.05-0.43) significantly reduced the odds of infection. Brucellosis is
53 endemic at high levels across Jordan, and the current vaccination program, which is limited to small
54 ruminants, has very low coverage. A revised brucellosis control program is required in Jordan. Given
55 the high baseline prevalence, it should be based on vaccination accompanied by measures to promote

56 hygiene and husbandry practices that minimize the risk of introduction and maintenance of *Brucella*
57 spp., and thereby the risk of human infection.

58

59 **Keywords:** brucellosis, Jordan, prevalence, ruminants, risk factors, cross-sectional, *Brucella*

60

61 **1. Introduction**

62 Brucellosis is a highly contagious zoonotic disease affecting humans and a wide range of animals,
63 including all domestic ruminants (Radostits *et al.*, 2000). There are ten known *Brucella* species and five
64 of them have been isolated from human cases (Sohn *et al.*, 2003). The World Health Organisation
65 (WHO) estimates that more than 500,000 new human cases of brucellosis occur worldwide annually
66 (Corbel, 1997); however the number is probably underestimated as a result of underreporting and
67 misdiagnosis (Jennings *et al.*, 2007). The vast majority of human cases are acquired through
68 consumption of contaminated dairy products or contact with infected animals, in particular ruminants,
69 thus the control of ruminant brucellosis is key to the prevention of human infection (Corbel, 2006). In
70 addition to its impact on human health, ruminant brucellosis is responsible for considerable economic
71 losses due to abortion in pregnant animals, loss in milk production and infertility in adult males (OIE,
72 2009). *B. abortus*, which is the species sustained in cattle populations, has been eradicated from many
73 developed countries through a combination of vaccination and test-and-slaughter of positive animals
74 (CFSPH, 2009). However, the control of *B. melitensis*, which mainly infects small ruminants, is proving
75 challenging in most endemic areas (Blasco, 2010). Possible reasons why progress in control of *B.*
76 *melitensis* is slow with the infection persisting at high levels in regions such as the Middle East and
77 Central Asia include i) a higher infectivity and transmissibility of this species compared to *B. abortus*
78 (Cloeckert, 2002), ii) the pastoralist and transhumant small ruminant production systems favouring
79 transmission and iii) control programs that are often intermittent or inadequate when they do exist
80 (Blasco, 2010). Successful control of *B. melitensis* has been achieved in some endemic areas such as in
81 Tajikistan, where the implementation of a vaccination program over five years in eight of the Tajik
82 districts preceded a relative drop in seroprevalence of 80% (Ward *et al.*, 2011).

83 The decision on how to better allocate resources to brucellosis control within a certain country or region
84 should be based on, among other considerations, the existing frequency of infection. However, reliable
85 frequency estimates of ruminant brucellosis are notably lacking in endemic areas such as most Middle
86 Eastern countries including Jordan.

87 In Jordan, some conclusions may be drawn from previous surveys -which have mostly been
88 geographically-circumscribed and non-probabilistic- as follows. Firstly, brucellosis is likely to be

89 endemic both in small and large ruminants; and secondly, *B. melitensis* biovar 3 is present in Jordan and
90 has caused infections in sheep (Al-Talafhah *et al.*, 2003), goats (Al-Majali, 2005), camels (Hawari,
91 2008) and humans (Shehabi *et al.*, 1990). Furthermore, the number of human cases of brucellosis is
92 thought to be increasing (Abo-Shehada & Abu-Halaweh, 2013), and some evidence suggests a
93 heterogeneous distribution of infection with a higher prevalence in the northern parts of the country,
94 which have a higher density of livestock (Al-Talafhah *et al.*, 2003, Samadi *et al.*, 2010).
95 International organisations such as the Food and Agriculture Organisation (FAO) and the World
96 Organisation for Animal Health (OIE) have produced guidelines for the control of brucellosis in
97 endemic areas (FAO, 2009) depending on the level of seroprevalence. At high levels of prevalence,
98 vaccination is preferred; while at low prevalence levels, test-and-slaughter may allow eradication of the
99 disease without vaccination. Consideration of the baseline level of infection is therefore essential for the
100 formulation of appropriate control strategies (Hegazy *et al.* 2009). Moreover, the identification of risk
101 factors for infection and spatial heterogeneities in the disease distribution could allow control efforts to
102 be targeted at selected subpopulations of herds/flocks or parallel control measures to be tailored to
103 vaccination and/or test-and-slaughter programmes. The overall aim of this study is to generate baseline
104 information on the frequency and distribution of ruminant brucellosis in Jordan to inform the national
105 control programme. Our specific objectives are i) to estimate the true seroprevalence of *Brucella* spp.
106 infection in small ruminants and cattle ii) to identify risk factors associated with *Brucella* spp.
107 seropositivity at herd/flock level and iii) to describe the spatial distribution of ruminant brucellosis in
108 Jordan.

109 **2. Materials and methods**

110 **2.1. Study design and study population**

111 A nationwide cross-sectional study was conducted in Jordan from May to October 2013. The study unit
112 was the herd or flock, defined as animals (cows, sheep or goats) owned by the same person/household
113 and usually kept in the same location. The target population included all small ruminant flocks and
114 cattle herds in the country. Ethical approval for this study was granted by the Ethics and Welfare
115 Committee of the Royal Veterinary College. Informed consent for questionnaire administration and
116 collection of biological samples was sought verbally from individual farmers.

117 The climate in Jordan is semi-arid in summer with average temperatures around 35 °C, and around 13°C
 118 in winter, when practically all of the precipitation occurs. The main livestock species in Jordan are
 119 sheep, goats, cattle and camels, with sheep and goats accounting for more than 97% of the total
 120 ruminant population and cattle comprising 2% (MOA, 2012). Sheep and goats are mainly kept in flocks
 121 that are very variable in size or as part of small household flocks, sometimes with other species. Awassi
 122 sheep and Baladi goats are the predominant breeds. The lambing season starts in November and lasts
 123 until May the following year. During the dry period some sheep flocks move from the East to
 124 communal grazing areas in the West of the country. The most predominant cattle breed in Jordan is the
 125 Holstein Friesian, which is kept for milk production and is mainly reared using intensive or semi-
 126 intensive systems, with a smaller number kept in small herds or as household animals. The density of
 127 both small ruminants and cattle is higher in the northern governorates.

128 **2.2. Sampling strategy and sample size**

129 *2.2.1 Sampling of herds/flocks*

130 Administrative divisions in Jordan include governorates (n= 12), departments (also known as districts)
 131 and villages. A list of all herds and flocks present in each governorate was provided by the Ministry of
 132 Agriculture (MOA). This list included: unique identification of herds/flocks, district where they are
 133 registered, the number of animals of different species within each herd or flock and complete
 134 vaccination history (MOA, annual report, 2012). These lists are updated annually, and in the opinion of
 135 the senior author -supported by personal experience- they are reasonably accurate. Selection of
 136 herds/flocks within each governorate was carried out by simple random sampling from the list provided
 137 by the MOA. The owner of each selected herd/flock was contacted by the local veterinarian and visited
 138 to explain the purpose of the study. If the owner refused to participate or if the herd/flock had been
 139 vaccinated against brucellosis during the previous year, the next herd/flock in the list was contacted.
 140 The total number of cattle herds and small ruminant flocks to be sampled in order to generate
 141 herd/flock-level prevalence estimates with a predefined precision was obtained as:

142
$$N = \left(\frac{1.96}{d}\right)^2 * \frac{\{(HSe * P) + (1 - HSp) * (1 - P)\} * \{(1 - HSe * P) - (1 - HSp) * (1 - P)\}}{(HSe + HSp - 1)^2}$$

143 Where N is the sample size (number of herds or flocks to be sampled), 1.96 is the Z-value
144 corresponding to a 95% confidence interval of the standard normal distribution, d is the expected
145 absolute error (6%), P is the expected prevalence at cattle herd or small ruminant flock level (15% and
146 35%, respectively, based on the most recent estimates available) and HSe and HSp are the herd or flock-
147 level sensitivity and specificity of the serological tests used. Based on estimates in published literature,
148 Se and Sp values for the Rose Bengal Test (RBT) are: $0.89 \leq Se \leq 1$; $0.924 \leq Sp \leq 1$ and for cELISA: 0.95
149 $\leq Se \leq 1$; $0.96 \leq Sp \leq 1$ (Ramirez-Pfiffer *et al*, 2007). For iELISA, Se and Sp values were obtained directly
150 from the manufacturer and are as follows: $0.98 \leq Se \leq 1$ and $0.99 \leq Sp \leq 1$. For the purpose of sample size
151 calculations, fixed values of Se and Sp were used. For the series combination of RBT and cELISA, CSe
152 = 0.89 and CSp = 0.97, and for iELISA, Se = 0.98 and Sp = 0.99.

153 The publicly-available application HerdAcc (Jordan, 1995)
154 (<http://epitools.ausvet.com.au/content.php?page=HerdSens4>) was used to estimate the herd-level
155 sensitivities (HSe) and specificities (HSp) achieved by testing different numbers of individual animals
156 (see details in section 2.2.2) with plausible values of individual-animal level sensitivity and specificity.
157 After exploring a range of scenarios, likely (conservative) herd-level sensitivity and specificity values
158 were obtained for cattle herds ($HSe = 0.95$, $HSp = 0.95$) and for small ruminant flocks ($HSe = 0.92$, HSp
159 = 0.96).

160 The total number of cattle herds and small ruminant flocks to be sampled was distributed across
161 governorates in proportion to their weight in the total population. These numbers of herds and flocks
162 would allow us to detect an odds ratio (OR) ≥ 2 for risk factors present in 20% of cattle herds and small
163 ruminant flocks with a study power of 94% and 95% for cattle herds and small ruminant flocks,
164 respectively.

165 2.2.2 Within herd/flock sampling

166 The number of animals that had to be tested within a herd or flock in order to reach a certain confidence
167 of detecting at least one positive animal was calculated as:

$$168 \quad k = \left[1 - \left(1 - p^{1/d} \right) \right] * \left[N - \frac{d}{2} \right] + 1$$

169 Where k is the number of animals to be sampled from each herd or flock; p is the probability of
170 detecting at least one positive animal; d is the expected number of infected animals in an infected herd
171 or flock and N is the average herd or flock size. For the calculations, a 25% seroprevalence of
172 brucellosis within cattle herds and 35% within small ruminant flocks was assumed. The probability of
173 detecting at least one animal if the herd is infected (p) was set as 90% and herd and flock sizes of 30
174 and 100, respectively, were used. The results from these calculations suggested that 9 cows and 8
175 sheep/goats would be sufficient to reach the desired probability of detection under the assumptions
176 above.

177 **2.3 Ascertainment of disease status**

178 Each selected herd/flock was visited between May and October 2013. Individual animals were selected
179 as they passed through the door of the pen, using a flock-size specific sampling interval. When this was
180 not possible, the shepherd or herder was asked to point to individual animals without a specific rule. In
181 cattle herds, 50 ml milk samples were collected from 9 cows- when the number of lactating cows at the
182 time of the visit was more than 9 - or, from all lactating cows if there were 9 or fewer in total. Samples
183 were obtained from each individual cow in a sterile screw cap polyethylene tube; 5 ml of 5% formalin
184 was added immediately after collection. Samples were kept refrigerated until tested. In each of the
185 selected sheep flocks and goat herds, eight blood samples were obtained aseptically from the jugular
186 vein in a sterile centrifuge tube without anticoagulant and transported directly to the laboratory. Both
187 ewes and rams were sampled. Serum was separated by centrifugation and divided into aliquots of 0.5 ml
188 using cryogenic vials and stored at -20°C until being tested.

189 Milk samples were tested by an indirect ELISA (Brucelisa 160M). A cut-off optical density (OD) was
190 calculated as 10% of the mean of the 8 positive control wells. Any test sample giving an OD equal to or
191 above this value was considered positive (OIE, 2009A).

192 Serum samples from sheep and goats were first tested by RBT. Any observed agglutination by the
193 naked eye was considered to be a positive reaction; positive samples by RBT were confirmed by a
194 competitive ELISA (COMPELISA). A cut-off OD was calculated as 60% of the mean of the 4
195 conjugate control wells. Any test sample with an OD equal to or below this value was considered
196 positive. Animals which gave positive results in both RBT and cELISA tests were considered

197 seropositive, while negative animals were those which gave negative results to either RBPT or cELISA
198 (OIE, 2009B).

199 Diagnostic procedures for the two ELISA tests were carried out according to the manufacturer
200 instructions (OIE brucellosis reference centre - Animal Health Veterinary Laboratories Agency
201 (AHVLA)) at the laboratory facilities of the Jordan Food and Drug Administration and optical densities
202 were measured using an ELISA reader (BioTek, ELX800, USA).

203 **2.4 Data collection**

204 A structured questionnaire (with sections for small ruminant flocks and for cattle herds) including
205 closed-ended questions was designed to capture information concerning i) the identification and location
206 of the herd/flock; ii) its structure and composition; and iii) husbandry and health management practices.
207 Variables of interest for cattle herds and small ruminant flocks are shown in Table 1 and Table 2
208 respectively. The questionnaire was piloted in ten herds/flocks. Questionnaires were administered to the
209 owner or person in charge of the herd/flock either by the primary author or by a veterinarian from the
210 local veterinary services at the same time of the visit to collect biological samples. The geographical
211 location of each sampled herd/flock was recorded as the latitude and longitude at the point where
212 animals were kept overnight, by means of a Global Positioning System (GPS) device (Garmin,
213 eTrex20).

214 **2.5 Data analysis**

215 *2.5.1 Seroprevalence Estimation*

216 A herd/flock was considered to be positive if at least one animal tested positive. The apparent
217 seroprevalence of brucellosis among cattle herds (AP_{CH}) and small ruminant flocks (AP_{SRF}) was
218 calculated as the total number of seropositive herds or flocks divided by the total number of herds or
219 flocks sampled. Herd/flock sensitivity (HSe) and specificity (HSp) were calculated as follows:

$$220 \quad HSe = 1 - (1 - AP_{POS})^n$$

$$221 \quad AP_{POS} = P * Se + (1 - P) (1 - Sp)$$

$$222 \quad HSp = Sp^n$$

223 Where P is the within herd/flock prevalence, Se is the individual level sensitivity, Sp is the individual
224 level specificity and n is the number of tested animals in the herd/flock.

225 The true seroprevalence at herd (TP_H) and flock (TP_F) levels were calculated after adjusting for HSe and
226 HSp as $TP_H = (AP_H + HSp - 1) / (HSe + HSp - 1)$. Monte-Carlo simulation implemented in @Risk 6.2
227 for Excel (Palisade Corporation Inc., Newfield, NY, USA) was used to account for variability and
228 uncertainty in the performance of the diagnostic tests at individual-animal level and the effect of the
229 within-herd/flock sampling fraction. The 95% confidence intervals for the estimated seroprevalence at
230 herd/flock levels were obtained from the outputs of a simulation of 10,000 iterations.

231 2.5.2 Univariate associations between herd/flock-level serological status and potential risk factors

232 A conceptual framework was developed to represent causal pathways and assist with selection of
233 candidate variables identified as putative risk factors. Candidate variables were selected based on the
234 biological plausibility of their contribution to the risk of introduction of *Brucella* spp. in the herd/flock
235 or to the maintenance of the infection in the herd/flock following its introduction (Tables 1 and 2).
236 Univariate analysis of associations was carried out considering the serological status of the herd/flock as
237 a binary outcome (positive or negative). The variable representing herd/flock size was categorised into
238 three levels based on percentiles. With regard to small ruminants, flock species was categorized as:
239 flocks with goats (goats only or goats and sheep) vs. flocks without goats (sheep only). Following
240 exploration of the data, this was considered an appropriate categorisation given the small number of
241 goat (only) flocks and the fact that goats are more susceptible to brucellosis than sheep, therefore
242 “presence of goats” regardless of the presence of sheep was considered to be a plausible risk factor.
243 Each risk factor was tested for significant association with the serological status using the Chi-squared
244 test of association. Prevalence ratios and their 95% confidence intervals for herd and flock-level risk
245 factors were obtained, as shown in Table 1 and Table 2 respectively.

246 2.5.3 Multivariable analysis

247 Significant variables in the univariate analysis ($p \leq 0.05$) were assessed for collinearity by means of
248 Cramer’s phi-prime (ϕ) statistic; variables were considered collinear if ($\phi > 0.7$). When a pair of
249 variables was found to be collinear, only the more biologically plausible variable was kept for further
250 analysis by means of logistic regression. Analysis was carried out considering the serological status of
251 the herd/flock as a binary outcome. The least significant variables were removed using a backwards
252 stepwise procedure when $p \geq 0.05$ and if removal of the variable did not alter the odds ratio of other

253 variables by more than 20%. The analysis was then repeated using forward selection starting with
254 variables with lowest p value in the univariate analysis to ensure that the same results were obtained.
255 Only variables with $p < 0.05$ were retained in the final model. Hosmer-Lemeshow χ^2 was used as a
256 goodness of fit test and the area under the Receiver Operating Characteristic (ROC) curve (AUC) was
257 obtained as a measure of the predictive ability of the model. Univariate and multivariable data analyses
258 were carried out using R (3.0.2) and STATA v.12.1 (STATA Corporation, Texas, USA).

259 *2.5.4 Spatial distribution of infection*

260 In order to visualize the geographic distribution of ruminant brucellosis in Jordan, two choropleth maps
261 representing the estimated true prevalence of seropositive small ruminant flocks and cattle herds per
262 governorate were created using ArcGIS 10 (ESRI, 2010).

263 **3. Results**

264 **3.1 Seroprevalence estimation**

265 A total of 2,664 blood samples from 333 small ruminant flocks were collected: 229 sheep flocks, 52
266 goat herds and 52 mixed (sheep and goat) flocks. On ten occasions owners refused to participate
267 because they did not want their animals to be sampled, and on five occasions flocks were not sampled
268 because they had previously been vaccinated against brucellosis.

269 With regard to cattle herds, a total of 1,810 milk samples were collected from 204 herds. Nine samples
270 per herd were obtained except on 12 occasions when the number of lactating cows in the herd was fewer
271 than 9. The HSe and HSp were estimated at 0.85 and 0.96 (sheep flocks), 0.85 and 0.96 (goat herds),
272 0.89 and 0.96 (mixed sheep-goat flocks), 0.84 and 0.94 (all small ruminant flocks), 0.85 and 0.96 (cattle
273 herds) and 0.92 and 0.97 (mixed herds of cattle and small ruminants). The true seroprevalence values of
274 herds/flocks with at least one seropositive animal were in ascending order: 18.1% (95% CI: 11, 25.3) in
275 cattle herds, 22.2% (95% CI: 16.5, 28.8) in sheep flocks, 38.5% (95% CI: 24.3-51.8) for mixed herds of
276 cattle and small ruminants, 45.4% (95% CI: 30.3, 61.6) in goat herds and 70.4% (95% CI: 55.5, 84.9) in
277 mixed sheep-goat flocks. The true prevalence across all small ruminant flocks was estimated as 34.3%
278 (95% CI: 28.4, 40.4) and. Figure 1 summarizes the seroprevalence estimates for the different types of
279 flocks and herds.

280 **3.2 Spatial distribution of infection**

281 Figure 2A shows the study area in relationship to other countries of the region and the distribution of
282 seropositive cattle herds and small ruminant flocks in each of the 12 Jordanian governorates (Figures 2B
283 and 2C respectively). The choropleth maps show that there was marked spatial variation in
284 seroprevalence, which was higher for both small ruminant flocks and cattle herds in the northern
285 governorates.

286 **3.3 Risk Factor Analysis**

287 *Small ruminant flocks*

288 Out of 14 studied variables, ten were significantly associated ($p < 0.05$) with seropositive status in the
289 univariate analysis, as shown in Table 1. The final logistic regression model included eight variables of
290 which large flock size, presence of goats in the flock, lending/borrowing a ram for reproduction, feeding
291 aborted material to dogs and introducing new animals into the flock in the previous year were associated
292 with higher odds of seropositive status. Separating newly-introduced animals, disinfecting pens and
293 isolating aborted animals were negatively associated with the odds of infection (Table 3). The Hosmer –
294 Lemeshow test of goodness of fit was not significant ($p = 0.79$) and the AUC was 0.94, indicating that
295 the model fit the data well and had a high predictive ability.

296 *Cattle Herds*

297 Six out of 12 studied variables were significantly associated ($p < 0.05$) with the serological status of
298 cattle herds against *Brucella* spp. in the univariate analysis (Table 2). The final logistic regression model
299 included four variables: adding new animals during the last year was associated with higher odds of
300 being positive and separating newly-introduced animals, having calving pens and herd disinfection
301 were negatively associated with the odds of infection (Table 4). As in the small ruminant model, the
302 Hosmer-Lemeshow test was not significant ($p = 0.86$) and the high AUC (0.93) suggested that the
303 model was good at discriminating between seropositive and seronegative herds.

304 **4. Discussion**

305 Brucellosis remains a major public health concern in the Middle East, where similar livestock systems,
306 environmental conditions and cultural aspects are shared across countries (Refai, 2002; Gwida, 2010).
307 Ruminants are assumed to be the main source of human infection and a number of control options exist,
308 with vaccination and/or test-and-slaughter of positive animals being the cornerstones of most control

309 programs. The suitability of different control strategies largely depends on the baseline frequency and
310 distribution of infection across ruminant subpopulations (FAO, 2009). It is therefore surprising that, to
311 our knowledge, this is the first nationwide survey of ruminant brucellosis in the region formally
312 designed to generate unbiased prevalence estimates.

313 The results of this study confirm that ruminant brucellosis is widespread in Jordan with approximately
314 one in five cattle herds and one in three small ruminant flocks estimated to be seropositive in the
315 absence of vaccination, and therefore presumed to be infected. Although comparisons are difficult due
316 to different methodologies, our results are similar to those obtained in a smaller scale survey conducted
317 in Jordan more than 10 years ago (Al-talafaha *et al*, 2003) and to estimates from neighbouring countries
318 such as Egypt, where in 2008, Hegazy *et al.* (2011) estimated that 41% of sheep flocks and 32% of goat
319 flocks in a Governorate of the Nile Delta were seropositive. Compared to other endemic countries in the
320 Mediterranean such as Morocco, Greece and Turkey (Benkirane, 2006; Iyisan *et al*, 2000), the
321 prevalence in Jordan appears to be higher which could partly be explained by less intensive control
322 efforts to date. *Rev 1* vaccine is used for the vaccination of small ruminants, but vaccination coverage is
323 minimal and no vaccine is used for cattle in Jordan. Based on our findings - during the process of
324 identifying eligible flocks and herds for this study- only 1.5% of small ruminant flocks were vaccinated
325 in 2013.

326 *Brucella* spp. is transmitted either in-utero or by direct contact between infected and susceptible animals
327 (Radostits *et al.*, 2000). The high seroprevalence estimates found in this study are indicative of long-
328 term maintenance of infection within herds/flocks and/or high frequency of contact between
329 flocks/herds as is likely to be the case in Jordan, where a considerable number of small ruminant flocks
330 move freely across the country. This uncontrolled movement of flocks compromises the usefulness of
331 vaccination and must be taken into consideration should the existing vaccination programme be revised.
332 The higher seroprevalence found in small ruminant flocks compared to cattle herds indicates that
333 introduction and/or within-herd/flock circulation of *Brucella* spp. following introduction is more intense
334 in small ruminant flocks than cattle herds. A higher risk of introduction in small ruminant flocks could
335 possibly be explained by the itinerant or semi-nomadic management of many of them. Furthermore,
336 previous studies isolating *B. melitensis* suggest that this species, which is more adapted to small

337 ruminants (and in particular goats) than cattle, is the predominant strain in Jordan (Crespo, 1994; Elzer
338 *et al.*, 2002; Al-Talafhah *et al.*, 2003; Al-Majali, 2005; Hawari, 2008; Samadiet *et al.*, 2010).
339 Accordingly, in our study small ruminant flocks with goats had much higher odds of positive status than
340 flocks with sheep only (adjusted OR: 6.9; 95% CI: 3.1, 15.4).

341 The risk of seropositivity is heterogeneous across the country, with northern governorates having a
342 higher seroprevalence, in both small ruminants and cattle. This is probably associated with higher
343 livestock density in these governorates. Other factors such as different environmental conditions
344 influencing the persistence of *Brucella* spp. in the environment and differences in husbandry systems
345 may also contribute to the spatial variability in seroprevalence. Regional differences are of interest as
346 they may offer opportunities for targeted control effort in those areas with higher prevalence, perhaps in
347 combination with zoning/compartmentalization within the country as proposed by FAO and WHO
348 (FAO, 2009).

349 As expected, a number of flock/herd characteristics were associated with the likelihood of a herd/flock
350 being seropositive. The different statistical modelling approaches (binary vs. multinomial outcome,
351 backwards vs. forward variable selection) yielded very similar results and the high AUC obtained for
352 the binary model confirms that the model is a very good classifier of flocks or herds as either
353 seropositive or seronegative.

354 The small ruminant binary model included five variables significantly associated with higher odds of a
355 flock being seropositive and three variables significantly associated with lower odds of seropositivity
356 (Table 3). It is reasonable that a larger flock size increases the risk of infection by increasing the contact
357 rate between susceptible and infected animals (Coelho *et al.*, 2008). The remaining factors highlight the
358 importance of management and hygiene practices to mitigate the risk of introduction and/or persistence
359 of *Brucella* spp. in a flock. Specifically, the implementation of biosecurity and quarantine measures and
360 appropriate management of cases of abortion including proper disposal of aborted materials could make
361 a significant contribution to any control strategy for ruminant brucellosis in Jordan. Our results strongly
362 suggest that the facilitation and promotion of such practices should be part of a control programme in
363 addition to the use of vaccines. The significant role of exchanging rams for service highlights the
364 importance of including these animals in vaccination or other control programs as it has been shown that

365 rams can be infected with *Brucella* spp. in the absence of clinical signs such as orchitis and epididymitis
366 (CFSPH, 2009).

367 The main risk factor for seropositivity in cattle herds was the introduction of new animals. Separation of
368 newly-introduced animals, using disinfectant to clean pens and having calving pens significantly
369 reduced the odds of infection. The interpretation of these findings is similar to those of small ruminant
370 herds, highlighting the potential contribution of quarantine and restricted movement of animals from
371 infected herds and hygienic management within the herd as important components of a control program.
372 The use of milk rather than serum to detect the presence of antibodies in cattle was a limitation of the
373 study as this meant that non-lactating animals including bulls and cows that had aborted were not
374 sampled, which would have had an impact on herd-level sensitivity. The reasons for including only
375 lactating cows were logistics, costs and acceptability by livestock keepers. However, our sampling and
376 testing strategy is likely to have achieved a high sensitivity of 95% and we therefore considered the
377 exclusion of non-lactating animals to be a reasonable approach.

378 Ruminant brucellosis is endemic at high levels in Jordan and although not quantified in this study, it is
379 reasonable to assume that it poses a high public health burden on the Jordanian population and
380 considerable financial losses for livestock keepers. The existing control programme relies on
381 vaccination of small ruminants with *B. melitensis* Rev. 1 vaccine and achieves very low coverage. At
382 the moment there is no vaccine used for cattle in Jordan. A revised control programme is needed and,
383 given the high baseline prevalence, it is recommended that it is based on vaccination. Consideration
384 should be given to concentrating control efforts in areas of higher prevalence or that are central in the
385 network of uncontrolled animal movement. It seems reasonable that the control strategy focuses, at least
386 initially, on small ruminants given that all *Brucella* spp. isolates from all host species (humans, sheep,
387 goats, cattle and camel) so far have been *B. melitensis*. We have shown that the risk of flock/herd
388 infection is highly dependent on biosecurity and hygiene practices. Based on our models, a small
389 number of flock/herd attributes determine to a large extent whether the flock is infected or not.
390 Accordingly, while vaccination should be the cornerstone of the control effort, it should be accompanied
391 also by measures to facilitate and promote the adoption of hygiene and husbandry practices that
392 minimise the risks of introduction and maintenance of *Brucella* spp. as well as the risk of human

393 infection. Some questions that could provide a stronger rationale for the formulation of an improved
394 brucellosis control programme remain unanswered, in particular the incidence of human infection, the
395 likely public health impact of reducing prevalence in ruminants, and the role of cattle in sustaining
396 infection. Restricting vaccination to small ruminants could be justified if cattle simply act as spill-over
397 hosts.

398 **6 Conclusions**

399 Brucellosis is endemic at high levels in domestic ruminant species in Jordan. The infection is
400 heterogeneously distributed, with some farms at high risk as a result of practices such as exchanging
401 rams for service and introducing new animals without quarantine. Mass vaccination of small ruminants,
402 in addition to the adoption of hygiene and biosecurity practices, is recommended as a control strategy in
403 Jordan.

404 **Acknowledgments**

405 The authors are grateful to Yousef Jamel scholarship for sponsoring this study as part of the PhD
406 studentship of IM. However, this sponsor played no part in the study design, in the collection, analysis
407 or interpretation of data, in the writing of the manuscript or in the decision to submit this manuscript for
408 publication.

409

410 **References**

- 411 Abo-Shehada, M.N., Abu-Halaweh, M., 2013. Risk factors for human brucellosis in northern Jordan.
412 East. Mediterr Health J. 19, 135-140.
- 413 Al-Majali, A.M., 2005. Seroepidemiology of caprine Brucellosis in Jordan. Small Rum. Res. 58, 13-18.
- 414 Al-Talafhah, A.H., Lafi, S.Q., Al-Tarazi, Y., 2003. Epidemiology of ovine brucellosis in Awassi sheep
415 in Northern Jordan. Prev. Vet. Med. 60, 297-306.
- 416 Benkirane, A., 2006. Ovine and caprine brucellosis: world distribution and control/eradication strategies
417 in West Asia/North Africa region. Small Rum. Res. 62, 19–25.
- 418 Blasco, J., 2010. Control and eradication strategies for brucella melitensis infection in sheep and goats.
419 Prilozi 31, 145-165.
- 420 CFSPH, 2009. Ovine and caprine brucellosis: Brucella melitensis. CFSPH, Iowa State University, Iowa,
421 USA. Last accessed May, 2013
422 http://www.cfsph.iastate.edu/Factsheets/pdfs/brucellosis_melitensis.pdf
- 423 Cloeckaert, A., Vizcaíno, N., Paquet, J.-Y., Bowden, R.A., Elzer, P.H., 2002. Major outer membrane
424 proteins of *Brucella* spp.: past, present and future. Vet. Microbiol. 90, 229-247.
- 425 Coelho, A.M., Coelho, A.C., Góis, J., Pinto, M.d.L., Rodrigues, J., 2008. Multifactorial correspondence
426 analysis of risk factors for sheep and goat brucellosis seroprevalence. Small Rum. Res. 78, 181-185.
- 427 Corbel, M.J., 1997. Brucellosis: an overview. Emerg. Infect. Dis. 3, 213–21.
- 428 Corbel, M.J., 2006. Brucellosis in Humans and Animals. WHO Press, World Health Organization,
429 Geneva.
- 430 Crespo, F., 1994. Brucellosis Ovinay Caprina. OIE, Paris, France.
- 431 Elzer, P., Hagius, S., Davis, D., DelVecchio, V., Enright, F., 2002. Characterization of the caprine
432 model for ruminant brucellosis. Vet. Microbiol. 90, 425-431.
- 433 FAO, 2009. Brucella Melitensis in Eurasia and the Middle East. Proceeding of a joint technical meeting
434 FAO/WHO/OIE. Rome, May, 2009. Last accessed May, 2013.
435 <http://www.fao.org/docrep/012/i1402e/i1402e00.pdf>.
- 436 Gwida, M., Al Dahouk, S., Melzer, F., Rosler, U., Neubauer, H., Tomaso, H., 2010. Brucellosis -
437 regionally emerging zoonotic disease? Croat. Med. J. 51, 289-295.

438 Hawari, A.D., Brucellosis in Camels (*Camelus dromedarius*) in the south province of Jordan. *Am. J.*
439 *Agric. Biol. Sci.* 3, 623-626.

440 Hegazy, Y.M., Ridler, A.L., Guitian, F.J., 2009. Assessment and simulation of the implementation of
441 brucellosis control programme in an endemic area of the Middle East. *Epidemiol Infect* 137, 1436-
442 1448.

443 Hegazy, Y.M., Moawad, A., Osman, S., Ridler, A., Guitian, J., 2011. Ruminant brucellosis in the Kafr
444 El Sheikh Governorate of the Nile Delta, Egypt: prevalence of a neglected zoonosis. *PLoS Negl Trop*
445 *Dis* 5, e944.

446 Iyisan, A., Akmaz, Ö., Düzgün, S., Ersoy, Y., Eskiizmirliler, S., Güler, L., Gündüz, K., Isık, N.,
447 İçyeriöglü, A., Kalender, H., 2000. Sero-epidemiology of brucellosis on cattle and sheep in Turkey.
448 *Pendik Veteriner Mikrobiyoloji Dergisi* 31, 21-75.

449 Jennings, G.J., Hajjeh, R.A., Girgis, F.Y., Fadeel, M.A., Maksoud, M.A., Wasfy, M.O., El-Sayed, N.,
450 Srikantiah, P., Luby, S.P., Earhart, K., Mahoney, F.J., 2007. Brucellosis as a cause of acute febrile
451 illness in Egypt. *Trans. R. Soc. Trop. Med. Hyg.* 101, 707-713.

452 Jordan D: Herdacc: a program for calculating herd level (aggregate) sensitivity and specificity.
453 Department of population medicine, University of Guelph, Guelph, ON, Canada 1995.

454 Ministry of Agriculture (MOA): Annual report, animal production 2012. Last accessed May, 2013.
455 http://www.dos.gov.jo/dos_home_e/main/index.htm.

456 OIE, 2009A. Manuals of Diagnostic Tests and Vaccines for Terrestrial Animals, Chapter 2.4.3 (Bovine
457 brucellosis). http://www.oie.int/fr/normes/mmanual/A_00069.htm (last accessed May, 2013).

458 OIE, 2009B. Manuals of Diagnostic Tests and Vaccines for Terrestrial Animals, Chapter 2.3.1 (Caprine
459 and Ovine brucellosis). http://www.oie.int/fr/normes/mmanual/A_00069.htm (last accessed May,
460 2013).

461 Radostits, O.M., Arundel, J.H., Gay, C.C., Blood, D.C., Hinchcliff, K.W., 2000. *Veterinary medicine: a*
462 *textbook of the diseases of cattle, sheep, pigs, goats and horses.* WB Saunders Company,
463 Philadelphia.

464 Refai, M., 2002. Incidence and control of brucellosis in the Near East region. *Vet. Microbiol.* 90, 81-
465 110.

466 Samadi, A., Ababneh, M.M., Giadinis, N.D., Lafi, S.Q., 2010. Ovine and Caprine Brucellosis (*Brucella*
467 *melitensis*) in Aborted Animals in Jordanian Sheep and Goat Flocks. *Vet. Med. Int.* 2010, 458695.
468 Shehabi, A., Shakir, K., el-Khateeb, M., Qubain, H., Fararjeh, N., Shamat, A.R., 1990. Diagnosis and
469 treatment of 106 cases of human brucellosis. *J. Infect.* 20, 5-10.
470 Sohn, A.H., Probert, W.S., Glaser, C.A., Gupta, N., Bollen, A.W., Wong, J.D., Grace, E.M., McDonald,
471 W.C., 2003. Human neurobrucellosis with intracerebral granuloma caused by a marine mammal
472 *Brucella* spp. *Emerg. Infect. Dis.* 9, 485-488.
473 Ward, D., Jackson, R., Karomatullo, H., Khakimov, T., Kurbonov, K., Amirbekov, M., Stack, J., El-
474 Idrissi, A., Heuer, C., 2011. Brucellosis control in Tajikistan using Rev 1 vaccine: change in
475 seroprevalence in small ruminants from 2004 to 2009. *Vet. Rec.* 170, 100. doi: 10.1136/vr.100012
476 WHO, 2009. Seven Neglected Endemic Zoonoses – some basic facts. Last accessed May
477 2013).http://www.who.int/zoonoses/neglected_zoonotic_diseases/en/
478

479 **Table 1** Descriptive statistics and univariate associations between potential flock-level risk factors and
 480 *Brucella* spp. serological status in small ruminants flocks in Jordan. Results from 333 small ruminant
 481 flocks included in a nationwide cross-sectional study carried out between May and October 2013.

Variable	Role ¹	Categories	No +ve/total (%)	<i>p</i>
Flock size	I&M	Small: ≤127 animals	21/111 (19)	0.01
		Medium: 127-200 animals	28/111 (25)	
		Large: >200 animals	47/111 (42)	
Flock species	I&M	Sheep only	43/229 (19)	< 0.01
		Goats (only or with sheep)	53/104 (51)	
Presence of a dog (if the flock owner keeps a dog with the flock)	I&M	No	13/57 (23)	0.27
		Yes	83/276 (30)	
Presence of equines (horses or donkeys)	I&M	No	30/90 (33)	0.21
		Yes	66/243 (27)	
Mix with other flocks for water or grazing, regularly	I	No	69/284 (24)	0.01
		Yes	27/49 (55)	
Lending /borrowing ram for service	I	No	72/286 (25)	< 0.01
		Yes	24/47 (51)	
Flock type	I	Non- nomadic	83/318 (26)	0.01
		Nomadic	13/15 (87)	
Introducing new animals to the flock in the previous year	I	No	19/153 (12)	0.01
		Yes	77/180 (43)	
Newly-introduced animals are kept in separate pen or house for a certain period	I	No	89/239 (37)	0.01
		Yes	7/94 (7)	
Pen disinfection (whether pens are regularly cleaned with disinfectant)	M	No	75/181 (41)	0.01
		Yes	21/152 (14)	
Using sponges for oestrus synchronization	M	No	30/103 (29)	0.93
		Yes	66/230 (29)	
Disinfect synchronization gun between animals	M	No	33/72 (31)	0.36
		Yes	33/92 (26)	
Isolation of aborted animals (kept separate for some time after abortion)	M	No	83/192 (43)	0.01
		Yes	13/141 (9)	
Feeding aborted material to dog	M	No	25/225 (11)	0.01
		Yes	71/108 (66)	

482 ¹ Plausible role as risk factor for seropositive status: facilitates introduction of *Brucella* into the flock (I),
 483 facilitates maintenance of *Brucella* following introduction (M), facilitates both, introduction and
 484 maintenance (I&M)

485 **Table 2** Descriptive statistics and univariable associations between potential herd-level risk factors and
 486 *Brucella* spp. serological status in cattle in Jordan. Results from 204 cattle herds included in a nationwide
 487 cross-sectional study carried out between May and October 2013

Variable	Role ¹	Categories (code)	No. +ve/ total (%)	<i>p</i>
Herd size	I&M	Small: <27 animals	9/ 68 (14)	0.09
		Medium 27–44 animals	17/ 68 (25)	
		Large >44 animals	12/68 (18)	
Presence of small ruminants (if the herd owner keeps sheep or goats within the herd)	M	No	24/ 171 (15)	0.01
		Yes	14/33 (43)	
Method of service (What is the method of service that herd owners use regularly)	I&M	Natural AI	30/179 (17) 8/25 (32)	0.09
Borrowing /lending bulls for service	I	No	32/181 (18)	0.34
		Yes	6/23 (27)	
Introducing new animals to the herd in the previous year	I	No	3/86 (4)	0.01
		Yes	35/118 (30)	
Separate new animals (when new animals are introduced from other herds they are always or almost always kept in a separate pen or herd for a certain period of time)	I	No	30/62 (49)	0.01
		Yes	8/142 (6)	
Having calving pens	M	No	31/97 (32)	0.01
		Yes	7/107 (7)	
Herd disinfection (whether the herd owner applies disinfectant to clean herd pens routinely)	M	No	32/75 (43)	0.01
		Yes	6/129 (5)	
Having visitors on the farm, regularly	I	No	19/104 (19)	0.89
		Yes	19/100 (19)	
Isolating aborted animals (keep aborted animals separate in a place for a period of time)	M	No	24/97 (25)	0.04
		Yes	14/107 (14)	
Feeding aborted material to dog	M	No	29/168 (18)	0.29
		Yes	9/36 (25)	
Throwing aborted material in fields	M	No	24/150 (16)	0.12
		Yes	14/54 (26)	

488 ¹ Plausible role as risk factor for seropositive status: facilitates introduction of *Brucella* spp. into the herd (I),
 489 facilitates maintenance of *Brucella* spp. following introduction (M), facilitates both, introduction and
 490 maintenance (I&M)

491 **Table 3** Results of a multivariable logistic regression on serological status of small ruminant flocks against
 492 *Brucella* spp. (333 small ruminant flocks included in a nationwide cross-sectional study carried out between
 493 May and October 2013 in Jordan)

Variable (category)	Odds Ratio	95% CI	<i>p</i>
Lending/Borrowing ram (yes)	8.9	3.0, 26.1	< 0.01
Feeding aborted material to dog (yes)	8.0	3.5, 18.1	< 0.01
Flock species (flocks with goats)	6.9	3.1, 15.4	< 0.01
Introducing new animals to the flock in the last year (yes)	5.8	2.5, 13.6	< 0.01
Flock size (linear trend)	2.2	1.0, 4.6	0.04
Separate newly-introduced animals (yes)	0.16	0.05, 0.47	< 0.01
Isolating aborted animals (yes)	0.19	0.08, 0.46	< 0.01
Pen disinfection (yes)	0.37	0.16, 0.83	0.02

494 ¹Hosmer – Lemeshow $\chi^2 = 4.67$; $p = 0.79$ at 8 d.f.; AUC = 0.94

495


496 **Table 4** Results of a multivariable logistic regression on serological status of cattle herds against *Brucella*
 497 spp. (204 cattle herds included in a nationwide cross-sectional study carried out between May and October
 498 2013 in Jordan.)

Variable (category)	Odds Ratio	95% C.I.	<i>p</i>
Adding new animals to the herd in the last year (yes)	11.7	2.8, 49.4	< 0.01
Herd disinfection (yes)	0.04	0.01, 0.15	< 0.01
Separate newly-introduced animals (yes)	0.09	0.03, 0.29	< 0.01
Having calving pens (yes)	0.14	0.05, 0.43	< 0.01

499 ¹Hosmer – Lemeshow $\chi^2 = 3.24$, $p = 0.86$, at 7d.f.; AUC = 0.93


500

501 **Figure 1** Estimated true seroprevalence of herd/flocks by species of animals and 95% Confidence
502 Intervals of the estimates.



503
504

505 **Figure 2** Choropleth maps representing the study area (A) and the estimated true prevalence of seropositive
 506 small ruminant flocks (B) and cattle herds (C) in the Jordanian Governorates (May – October, 2013).



507