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ABSTRACT
Brucellosis is considered to be one of the most widespread zoonoses in the world. According to OIE, it is the second most important zoonotic disease in the world after rabies. The disease affects cattle, swine, sheep, goats, camels and dogs. It may also infect other ruminants and marine mammals. The disease is manifested by late term abortions, weak calves, still births, infertility and characteristic lesions are primarily placenitis, epididymitis and orchitis. The organism is excreted in uterine discharges and milk. The disease is economically important, is one of the most devastating transboundary animal diseases and also a major trade barrier. Although not yet reported, some species of Brucella (e.g., B. abortus) are zoonotic and could be used as bioweapons. Brucellosis has a considerable impact on animal and human health, as well as wide socio-economic impacts, especially in countries in which rural income relies largely on livestock breeding and dairy products. Considering the poor health infrastructure and manpower in rural areas, the focus should be on preventive measures coupled with strengthening the curative health care services for early diagnosis and treatment. The incidence of brucellosis is increasing particularly in large dairy herds in Pakistan. Several studies have been conducted using sero-diagnostic techniques to determine the prevalence of brucellosis in different provinces, districts and livestock farms in government and private sector.

INTRODUCTION
Brucellosis is considered by the Food and Agriculture Organisation (FAO), the World Health Organisation (WHO) and the Office International des Epizooties (OIE) as one of the most widespread zoonoses in the world (Schelling et al., 2003). According to OIE, it is the second most important zoonotic disease in the world after rabies. The disease affects cattle, swine, sheep, goats, camels and dogs. It may also infect other ruminants and marine mammals. Synonyms of Brucellosis include: undulant fever, Malta fever, Mediterranean fever, enzootic abortion, epizootic abortion, contagious abortion, and Bang’s disease. It is an important zoonotic disease and causes significant reproductive losses in sexually mature animals (Forbes and Tessaro, 1996; Wadood et al., 2009). The disease is manifested by late term abortions, weak calves, still births, infertility and characterized mainly by placenitis, epididymitis and orchitis, with excretion of the organisms in uterine discharges and milk (England et al., 2004).

It also causes morbidity and considerable loss of productivity (Pappas, 2006). The disease is important from economic point of view; it is one of the most devastating trans-boundary animal diseases and also a major barrier for trade (Gul and Khan, 2007).

Brucellosis was first recognized as a disease affecting human-beings on the island of Malta in the 19th and early 20th centuries. It represents a cause of health problems in a herd. In addition to its direct effects on animals, brucellosis causes economic losses through abortions, stillbirths or the death of young stock. The disease can also have a blow on exports and have negative impact on the efforts to improve breeding. Brucellosis has a considerable impact on animal and human health, as well as wide socio-economic impacts, especially in countries in which rural income relies largely on livestock breeding and dairy products (Maadi et al., 2011). The economic importance of livestock goes beyond direct food production. Skins, fibers, manure (fertilizer or fuel), draught power, and capital are also livestock benefits. Livestock provides a lifeline for a large proportion of 95% of the world’s rural population that lives in the developing world and cultivates 64% of the world’s arable land (Hoffmann, 1999; Wadood et al., 2009).
Considering the poor health infrastructure and manpower in rural areas, the focus should be on preventive measure together with strengthening the curative health care services for early diagnosis and treatment. Measures against brucellosis should aim at the control and, if possible, the eradication of the agent in the animal reservoir. As the disease often goes undetected the identification of infected herds and animals is of prime importance. Studies by Aulakh et al. (2008) showed that brucellosis is widespread in cattle and buffaloes and the only alternative to control and eradicate the disease is a statutory mass vaccination of livestock.

**Zoonotic importance:** In humans, brucellosis can be caused by *B. abortus, B. melitensis, B. suis* biovars 1-4 and, rarely, *B. canis*. From public health view point, brucellosis is considered to be an occupational disease that mainly affects farm labor, slaughter-house workers, butchers, veterinarians (Yagupsky and Baron, 2005). Transmission typically occurs through contact with infected animals, materials with skin abrasions, inhalation of aerosols or ingestion of contaminated or unpasteurized dairy and food products (Young, 1998; Christopher et al., 2010).

Worldwide prevalence of brucellosis in human population has been studied and reviewed. The Mediterranean Basin, south and Central America, Eastern Europe, Asia, Africa, the Caribbean and the Middle East are considered as high-risk countries. In the Eastern Mediterranean Region, the incidence of disease ranges from 1 per 100,000 to 20 per 100,000 populations. Brucellosis is endemic in Saudi Arabia, where the national sero-prevalence is 15% (Memish, 2001).

Mukhtar and Kokab (2008) showed that brucellosis is also a public health problem in Pakistan by conducting a sero-prevalence study of brucellosis in abattoir workers of Lahore. Symptoms in human brucellosis can be highly variable, ranging from non-specific, flu-like symptoms (acute form) to undulant fever which may progress to a more chronic form and can also produce serious complications affecting the musculoskeletal, cardiovascular, and central nervous systems, other problems like arthritis, orchitis and epididymitis. It also gives rise to a chronic granulomatous infection, causing clinical morbidity that requires combined prolonged antibiotic treatment (Baba et al., 2001; Grillo et al., 2006).

Human incidence of brucellosis can only be controlled by decreasing the incidence of disease in animals, especially livestock species. It is a serious public health challenge having socio-economic problems and an unaccounted financial burden which needs joint efforts, promotion of inter-sectoral action, regional and international cooperation, as well as technical and financial support.

**ETIOLOGY**

Worldwide, six species of the genus *Brucella* have been recognized. The genus *Brucella* contains a group of very closely related bacteria. The first member of the group, *B. melitensis*, affects primarily sheep and goats, the second member of the group, *B. abortus*, affects primarily cattle while the other members include *B. suis, B. ovis, B. neotomae* and *B. canis* (Corbel, 1998). Cross transmission of brucellosis can occur between cattle, swine, sheep, goats and other species including dogs, horses, bison, reindeer and camels (FAO, 2003).

*Brucella* is small, non-motile, anaerobic, Gram-negative cocacobilli. The cells are short and slender; the axis is straight; the ends are rounded; the sides may be parallel or convex outwards. In length they vary from about 0.5 - 0.7 μm, in breadth vary from 0.5 - 1.5 μm, occurring singly, in pairs or short chains (Leslie et al., 1998).

Unlike most bacteria, *Brucella* species are facultative intracellular pathogens (Jarvis et al., 2002) and can usually be found in the reticuloendothelial and reproductive systems. They grow rather slowly on ordinary nutrient media while their growth is improved by serum or blood. The ability of *Brucella* to replicate and persist in host cells is directly associated with its capacity to cause persistent disease and to circumvent innate and adaptive immunity (Fichi, 2003). The presence of rough or smooth lipo-polysaccharide correlates with the virulence of the disease and smooth are generally more virulent. *Brucella* species and their different biotypes are currently distinguished by differential tests based on serotyping, phage typing, dye sensitivity, CO₂ requirement, H₂S production, and metabolic properties.

**TRANSMISSION**

*B. abortus* is transmitted by contact with the placenta, fetus, fetal and vaginal fluids from infected animals. Animals are infectious after either abortion or full-term parturition. *B. abortus* may also be found in the milk, semen, feces and hygroma fluids. Shedding in milk can be prolonged or lifelong or may be intermittent (Bercovich, 1998). Few infected cattle become chronic carriers. Infection usually occurs by ingestion and through mucous membranes, but *B. abortus* can be transmitted through broken skin. Although the mammary gland is usually colonized during the course of an infection, it can also be infected by direct contact, with subsequent shedding of the organisms in the milk (Stableforth, 1959).

Disease is spread through contamination of placental material and vaginal discharges of aborting animal (Woodhead and Aitken, 1889). *B. abortus* can also be spread through fomites. Reservoirs of infection have been reported in a wide range of domestic animals, birds and carnivores such as dogs. The transmission of brucellosis by ticks, fleas or mosquitoes from an infected herd to a non-infected herd has never been proven (OIE, 2009).

*Brucella* can survive for longer periods in conditions of high humidity, low temperatures, no sunlight and in soil; and can remain viable for several months in water, aborted fetuses, and manure under appropriate conditions. However, the importance of their environmental persistence in manure and soil in regards to transmission is unclear as direct contact with infectious material appears to be most important for lateral transmission (McEwen and Paterson, 1939). In previously unexposed and unvaccinated cattle, *B. abortus* spreads rapidly and abortion storms are common. The most significant feature of bovine brucellosis epidemiology is the shedding of large numbers of organisms during the 10 days after abortion or calving of infected cows and the consequent contamination of the environment. The movement of
infected cattle into a herd can result in transfer of the disease when cattle ingest the bacteria from aborted fetuses, placenta, and discharges from cows that have aborted or contaminated pasture or water (Park et al., 2005).

**GEOGRAPHICAL DISTRIBUTION**

Brucellosis is the most common zoonosis in the world, accounting for more than 500,000 cases in animals and humans alike, annually (Pappas et al., 2006). Though its distribution is worldwide; yet brucellosis is more common in countries with poorly standardized animal and public health programs. Advances in control and eradication practices have led to complete eradication from many developed countries like USA, Israel, Canada, Japan & New Zealand, however it remains an uncontrolled problem in highly endemic areas such as Africa, Middle East, Asia and Latin America (Refai, 2000).

Geographically brucellosis has been reported in Asia, Africa, South and Central America, the Mediterranean Basin, Sahara (McDermott and Arimi, 2002) and the Caribbean and these are the regions where cattle raising are mostly preferred. Infected or exposed animals have also been found along the Atlantic and Pacific coasts of North America; the coasts of Peru, Australia, New Zealand and Hawaii (OIE, 2009).

Incidence of brucellosis is reported to be the highest in bovines and prevalence range of 0.85-23.3% has been reported from a wide range of countries. In camels, brucellosis has been reported from Arabian and African countries (0.0-17.20%) (Refai, 2000). Brucellosis is widespread in African countries, although with varying prevalence (Thimm and Wundt, 1976).

The worldwide distribution of brucellosis has been reviewed by Memish and Balkhy (2004). They observed that in Central American countries, bovines are the most affected hosts with herd infection rates ranging from 10-25%. In Mexico, brucellosis is one of the most serious bacterial diseases in livestock and humans alike, even after the development of control strategies at national level. Brucellosis has been a well-known disease in Latin American countries with prevalence rates of 10-25%. The Netherlands and England were considered to be free of bovine brucellosis by the turn of the century (Godfroid and Kashbohrer, 2002).

Brucellosis-positive herds were still reported in France, Ireland and Italy, but the incidence has been declining (Godfroid et al., 2002). In the countries of central and south-eastern Europe, namely Greece, Macedonia, Yugoslavia and Bulgaria, sheep and goats remain a major reservoir of the disease, while cows are less important hosts (Taleski et al., 2002). While bovine, caprine, ovine and porcine brucellosis exist in most sub-Saharan African countries, the true prevalence is either poorly reported or completely unknown (McDermott and Arimi, 2002). High incidence of brucellosis has also been reported from Sub continent particularly India and Pakistan (Park et al., 2005).

**OCCURRENCE IN PAKISTAN**

Although the exact incidence of bovine brucellosis in Pakistan is unknown but it has been reported to vary from 3.25 to 4.4% in different areas of Pakistan (Naeem et al., 1990). The incidence of brucellosis in Pakistan is increasing particularly in large dairy herds. Several studies have been conducted using sero-diagnostic techniques to determine the prevalence of brucellosis in different provinces, districts and livestock farms in government and private sector. A very limited review literature is present about the prevalence of brucellosis at national level.

In a cross-sectional study conducted by Abubakar et al. (2010) to determine sero-prevalence of B. abortus in Punjab at village level, it was found to be 5.06% in cattle as compared to 7.74% in buffaloes. They further confirmed that the incidence of brucellosis increased with age after testing the sera of animals from different age groups utilizing ELISA as confirmatory diagnostic tool. Shafee et al. (2011) found the overall prevalence of Brucellosis in Quetta to be 3 and 8.5% in cattle and buffaloes using MRT and i-ELISA, respectively.

To assess the current situation of brucellosis at various government and private farms in Kohat, serological survey in cattle & sheep/goats was conducted by Hamidullah et al. (2009). In their study, 17.58% cattle and 32.5% sheep/goats were found sero-positive. Earlier, Qureshi and Masood (1988) reported 14.2% brucellosis in cattle at livestock farms. Ahmed and Munir (1995a) reported the prevalence of brucellosis in different livestock species in Pakistan to be 5.78, 9.33, 4.05 and 5.56% in horses, dogs, poultry, buffaloes and cattle, respectively.

**Relationship of disease with livestock production systems:** In Ethiopia, Gebretsadik et al. (2007) conducted sero-epidemiological investigation of bovine brucellosis in the extensive cattle production system. Herd-level sero-prevalence in the transhumant management system which was found to be 80% was significantly higher than prevalence in the sedentary system. Similar observations are made by several researchers from other countries (Kagumba and Nandokha, 1978; Maiga et al., 1996).

Higher sero-prevalence rate in extensive cattle production system could be attributed mainly to the large herd size and movement of herds. According to one finding, large herd size enhances the exposure potential through increased contact within the herd and with other infected herds, common feeding and watering points and relatively poor management, thus promoting transmission of disease (Hellmann et al., 1984; Omer et al., 2010).

Moreover, it was observed that cattle herds in sedentary system are small in size and sedentary with little possibility of contact with other infected herds, thus, there was less risk of acquiring the disease. Several studies in this regard have also been conducted in Pakistan. It was shown that the incidence of disease is higher in animals kept at organized farms rather than small holdings (Ahmad et al., 1990; Ahmad et al., 1994; Ahmed and Munir 1995b; Lodhi et al., 1995). The reason being increased herd densities and lack of proper management facilities at farm level.

**Risk Factors for Brucellosis:** There are so many factors that can affect the pervasiveness of brucellosis in various species of livestock. Prevalence of brucellosis can vary
according to climatic conditions, geography, species, sex and age (Gul and Khan, 2007). Brucellosis occurs in sexually mature animals, the bacteria localizing mainly in the reproductive tract especially in pregnant animals; there is also evidence that mammary gland may be even more favored for localization than the reproductive tract (Anonymous, 2007).

Age-wise prevalence has also been studied by Abubakar et al. (2010) who showed that the incidence of brucellosis increased with age, and the incidence is high in sexually mature animals. Similar results were presented by Aulakh et al. (2008) who studied age-wise prevalence of brucellosis in cattle in Punjab (India). It has been reported by different workers that brucellosis is highly prevalent in mature females and males are less affected (Hussein et al., 2005). However, there are controversies regarding this statement.

In general, brucellosis can be found in any season of the year. The epidemic peak occurs from February to July and is closely related to the months associated with delivery and abortion in animals (Shang et al., 2002). In humans, prevalence of the disease is high (39.5%) in summer season (Salari et al., 2003).

### DIAGNOSIS OF BRUCELLOSIS

The development of a definitive diagnostic test for brucellosis remains an elusive target. Ever since the development of the first serologic test for brucellosis by Bruce more than a century ago; a definitive diagnostic technique has been actively pursued. In a herd, the most important tool for correct diagnosis of disease without laboratory aid is on the basis of the most obvious clinical sign i.e., persistent late-term abortion rates of >5% in the herd (Martin-Moreno et al., 1983). However, other causes of abortion should also be considered and the disease should be differentially diagnosed from other diseases like trichomoniasis, vibriosis, leptospirosis, listeriosis, infectious bovine rhinotracheitis and various mycoses on the basis of clinical signs, history and the most important serological analysis. As signs and symptoms of brucellosis are unspecific, culture and serology are necessary for diagnosis (Colmenero et al., 1996). Some general laboratory findings might suggest the diagnosis e.g., leukopenia and relative lymphocytosis (Martin-Moreno et al., 1983; Schussler et al., 1997). Liver enzymes are also found to be elevated in many cases.

Serological tests are relatively easy to perform and provide a practical advantage in detecting the prevalence of *Brucella* infection. Classically, direct diagnosis is performed by cultivation in artificial media, with posterior identification of the isolates by its morphology and growth characteristics of the colonies, however; disadvantages of these procedures are the high costs, time necessary for growth and identification of the isolates, apart from high risk for personnel (Fekete et al., 1992).

The criterion standard test for diagnosis of brucellosis is the isolation of the organism from the blood or tissues (e.g., bone marrow, liver aspiration). The sensitivity of blood cultures is usually between 40-50%. Any fluid can be cultured (e.g., synovial, pleural, cerebrospinal), but the yield is usually low. Evaluation of cerebrospinal fluid reveals a mild-to-modest lymphocytic pleocytosis in 88-98%. Protein levels are elevated in conjunction with normal glucose levels (Gotuzzo et al., 1986).

Accurate diagnosis of brucellosis requires bacteriological isolation and detection of the pathogen in the laboratory, which is impractical for regular screening of large populations (Lulu et al., 1988; Yagupsky, 1994). Serological tests can be nonspecific owing to cross-reaction or sub-sensitive or high immunity reactions, depending on sub-clinical or endemic prevalence of the disease (Ariza et al., 1992; Weynants et al., 1996; Godfroid et al., 2002). However, accurate diagnosis of brucellosis has some constraints.

In field conditions, it is quite difficult to differentiate between the antibody titers of vaccinated and infected animal and there is not even a single test which is able to do so. Thus, sera are usually screened with any simple test of high sensitivity and then positive results are confirmed with a more elaborate test of high specificity. For this purpose, some indirect (Alonso et al., 1988) and competitive (Asarta, 1989) enzyme-linked immunosorbent assays, the complement fixation test and gel precipitation tests (Alonso et al., 1988) have been proposed or used as confirmatory tests.

**Screening tests:** *Brucella* Milk Ring Test can be for screening the herd and to indicate level of infection in a herd. The test can be applied to monitor the dairy herds at regular intervals. Although relatively cheap and easy to perform, this test does not give accurate results. There are a high percentage of false positive results.

**Standard tests:** Standard tests for the diagnosis of brucellosis are Rose Bengal Precipitation Test (RBPT), Serum Agglutination Test (SAT) and Complement Fixation Test (Memish and Balkhy, 2004). Rose Bengal Precipitation Test and Serum Agglutination Test are quantitative measurements of antibodies and are affected by many factors. RBPT which was officially introduced in Britain in 1970 is rapid, simple and sensitive but it has moderate specificity (Falade, 1983). Thus, the positive predictive value of this test is low and a positive result is required to be confirmed by some other more specific test like ELISA. However, the negative predictive value of RBPT is high as it excludes active brucellosis with a high degree of certainty (Gul and Khan, 2007). A test based prevalence study of brucellosis in Pakistan using RBPT by Omer et al. (2000) showed the incidence of 35.90% in cattle, 33.3% in sheep, 16.70% in goats and 3.10% in camels.

A sero-surveillance study conducted by Lodhi et al. (1995), for Faisalabad and surrounding areas revealed that sero-positive percentage obtained through RBPT and SAT was 12.6 and 2.4%, respectively. They suggested further studies to recommend more accurate and standard protocol for diagnosis. In another study, by Nasir et al. (2004), sero-prevalence of Brucellosis at government and private farms in Punjab was confirmed using RBPT and SAT. Results of two sero-diagnostic tests indicated that RBPT detected higher percentage of sero-positive animals as compared to SAT.

**Bacteriological Identification:** The absolute diagnosis of brucellosis requires isolation of the bacterium from blood...
or tissue samples. The sensitivity of blood culture varies, depending on individual laboratory practices and how actively the obtaining of cultures is pursued. The percentage of cases with positive cultures ranges from 15 to 70% (Memish et al., 2000).

A variety of samples can be collected for culture and microscopic examination. Milk samples and vaginal swabs are particularly useful for diagnosis in live cattle. In addition, B. abortus can often be isolated from the secretions of non-lactating udders. This organism can also be cultured from aborted fetuses (stomach contents, spleen and lung) or the placenta. The spleen, mammary and genital lymph nodes, udder and late pregnant or early post-parturient uterus are the most reliable samples to collect at necropsy. B. abortus can also be cultured from semen, the testis or epididymis, and arthritis or hygroma fluids. Serum samples and milk samples can be collected for serology (OIE, 2009).

Brucella can be microscopically examined through modified Ziehl-Neelsen staining method which is not a definitive test. Brucella species are not truly acid-fast, but they are resistant to decolorization by weak acids, and stain red against a blue background (Mitchell and Humphreys, 1931). Other organisms such as Chlamyphila abortus and Coxiella burnetti can resemble Brucella (OIE, 2009).

A definitive diagnosis can be made if B. abortus is cultured from the animal. However, it is stated after evaluation of bacteriological culture techniques that the sensitivity of the B. abortus culturing is low (Navarro et al., 2004). In addition, the culture technique is time-consuming and presents a great threat of infection for the laboratory personnel, as Brucella species are class III pathogens.

**Serological Diagnosis:** Serological diagnosis of brucellosis is used widely in most of the countries as criteria for control and eradication of disease. Conventionally, several techniques are used for the detection of Brucella antibodies. Each one of the technique detects different antibody isotypes, to determine an animal seropositive to brucellosis (Nielsen et al., 1996). Although the serological tests have higher sensitivities as compared to culture techniques, but their specificities are generally low (Al-Attas et al., 2000).

Different studies and trials have been conducted throughout the world for evaluation of Brucella diagnostic techniques. In a study, ELISA was compared with other serological techniques and was found to be more sensitive and specific. It is also confirmed from the findings that the standard tests like RBPT and SAT have low specificity because these tests detect only the antibodies to the LPS (lipopolysaccharide) antigen of B. abortus (Al-Attas et al., 2000), which is similar to that of other Gram negative bacteria like Salmonella, E. coli, Yersinia enterocolitica, Vibrio cholerae etc. This antibody cross reactivity contributes towards low specificity of these tests.

**Enzyme linked immuno-sorbent assay (ELISA):** The protocol for Indirect ELISA for the detection of Brucella antibodies in milk & serum has been described by Limet et al. (1998). The introduction of indirect immunoenzymatic techniques in serological diagnosis has allowed the achievement of higher sensitivity and specificity levels than most commonly used conventional techniques (Nielsen et al., 1996). Indirect enzyme-linked immuno-sorbent assays (ELISAs) typically use cytoplasmic proteins as antigens. ELISA measures class M, G, and A immunoglobulins, which allows for a better interpretation of the clinical situation and overcomes some of the shortcomings of the serum agglutination test. A comparison with the serum agglutination test yields higher sensitivity and specificity (Almuneef and Memish, 2003). At present, application of the ELISA technique is considered a better test in early detection of infection than classical diagnostic tests like complement fixation, agglutination and precipitation (Rojas and Alonso, 1995). These ELISA assays have also been approved by International Office of Epizootics (OIE, 2009).

In certain studies conducted worldwide and even in Pakistan for the comparison of standard diagnostic tests and other serological techniques, it was concluded that ELISA assays are more accurate than tests like SAT and MRT, revealing high percentages of sero-positive samples. In this regard, Shafee (2007) confirmed the prevalence of Brucellosis in Quetta city using indirect ELISA assays. The overall prevalence was found to be 3% and 8.5% in cattle using MRT and i-ELISA, respectively. Indirect enzyme linked immunosorbent assays (I-ELISAs) have been used in various countries for sero-diagnosis of brucellosis in cattle and other animals (Romero et al., 1995; Dajer et al., 1998; Omer et al., 2001) however, none of the diagnostic test has been standardized in buffaloes (Guarino et al., 2001).

In contrast to above study, Munir et al. (2008) developed Immuno-capture ELISA assay using lipopolysaccharide (LPS), reported high sensitivity values and approved this test for the screening of buffalo herds. Results of study conducted by Hussain et al. (2008) to determine seroprevalence of brucellosis in cattle, buffalo and human population in Pakistan showed that RBPT and ELISA can be used efficiently for mass screening of Brucella antibodies in both animals and humans but ELISA is more sensitive and reliable. Moreover, the efficiency of ELISA has been evaluated for diagnosis of brucellosis in other species as well. El-Razik et al. (2007) have suggested its efficiency as a screening and confirmatory diagnostic test in goats and sheep.

**Polymerase Chain Reaction (PCR):** Molecular studies have now highlighted the pathogenesis of Brucella, for the development of newer diagnostic tools that will be useful in developing countries where brucellosis is a common disease. PCR testing for Brucellae is a recent advance with promising potential. It would allow for rapid and accurate diagnosis of brucellosis. PCR was first developed in the early 1990s and recently it has been used routinely for more accurate and specific diagnosis of brucellosis and other infectious agents (Asif et al., 2009).

Two major genetic targets are the Brucella gene BCSFP31 and the 16S-23S rRNA operon (Debeaumont et al., 2005; Navarro et al., 2006). The 16S-23S rRNA operon has now highlighted the pathogenesis of Brucella, for the development of newer diagnostic tools that will be useful in developing countries where brucellosis is a common disease. PCR testing for Brucellae is a recent advance with promising potential. It would allow for rapid and accurate diagnosis of brucellosis. PCR was first developed in the early 1990s and recently it has been used routinely for more accurate and specific diagnosis of brucellosis and other infectious agents (Asif et al., 2009).
PCR-ELISA, but the clinical role for these tests remains to be defined (Mitka et al., 2007).

Asif et al. (2009) demonstrated that PCR is the most authenticated test for diagnosis of brucellosis. They presented the first ever report of molecular characterization of B. abortus BSCP31 gene from Pakistan. Their study revealed that SAT, RBPT and other standard tests should be only used for screening the herds but not for confirmatory diagnosis in individual animals. The sero-positive SAT samples should be subjected to PCR.

In Pakistan, a study was conducted by Akhtar et al. (2010) which was aimed at comparing the efficacy of conventional diagnostic methods and evaluation of PCR for the diagnosis of bovine brucellosis. The efficacy for RBPT and MRT was calculated in terms of specificity and sensitivity in cattle and buffaloes. In the continuation of this study polymerase chain reaction (PCR) was evaluated for its diagnostic efficacy of quick B. abortus isolation from same samples. The antigenic detection of Brucella using PCR gave more positive results than conventional RBPT and MRT. Therefore, the combination of both conventional tests along with serum PCR can be recommended. Moreover, in our circumstances PCR cannot be used as initial screening tests for large herds because of high cost as compared to other two tests, unchecked quality control measures, sample contamination and time consumption.

**Diagnostic Plans in Pakistan:** In Pakistan, veterinarians mostly rely on the above described conventional serological tests due to the lack of more specific diagnostic facilities and economic constraints. The most widely performed tests at government livestock laboratories in Pakistan are Rose Bengal Precipitation Test and Serum Agglutination Test (Gul and Khan, 2007; Asif et al., 2009).

**PREVENTION AND CONTROL**

Compatible relationships of Brucella species with the hosts including variable incubation periods, long survival time in both extracellular and intracellular environments, asymptomatic carrier stages and resistance to treatment are the major problems. These and animal husbandry factors such as nomadism, co-mingling, and increasing population sizes assure difficulties in control of disease (Rahman et al., 2006). Brucellosis control programs based on various strategies, including vaccination and/or test-and-slaughter of infected animals, has been successful in controlling the disease in animals in several countries. Brucellosis can be prevented in humans by controlling, or better, eliminating the disease in the animal population, avoiding consumption of raw milk, raw milk products and adopting hygienic practices. Proper heat treatment of milk or milk products is important for effective prevention of brucellosis in humans. Moreover, brucellosis must be included in public health education, and public awareness programs, particularly in the rural areas of Pakistan and efforts should be directed towards preventive measures but not curative services.

The World Health Organization (WHO) has long been involved in brucellosis surveillance and control including research and development of vaccines to prevent animal brucellosis (Munir et al., 2010). Efforts are directed at detection and prevention because no practical treatment is available. WHO has been implementing regional control programs in Middle East and Latin American countries with collaboration of OIE and FAO.

Brucellosis is a neglected disease in Pakistan, where few studies have been carried out to estimate its prevalence. A full description of the epidemiology of the disease is needed for planning interventional strategies for its prevention and control. Mukhtar and Kokab (2008) provided the following guidelines which should be considered for control of brucellosis:

- Proper diagnosis
- Scheduled vaccination programs for young animals
- Screening of herds, livestock markets, abattoirs & subsequent removal of diseased
- Awareness among the farmers, livestock & public health authorities

**Strategies for Control:** Like all other bacterial diseases, brucellosis is highly infectious and contagious disease with rapid intra and inter-herd spreading potential (Ahmad, 2005). Thus, a single control strategy could not be recommended. However, several countries have been declared brucellosis free because of continuous efforts and implementation of strategic control measures for eradication.

There are three kinds of control measures:

1. Reducing or eliminating the source or reservoir of infection by quarantine, destruction of reservoir, early detection of disease and environmental control (Ahmad, 2005). Quarantine is usually imposed on animals entering a country or establishment so that any disease they may be carrying or incubating can be identified. In this way, Brucella infections have been eliminated from the United States.

2. Breaking the connection between the source of the infection and susceptible animals by general cleaning and sanitation measures.

3. Reducing the number of susceptible population by immunization. This concept is called herd immunity. Mass immunization as a preventive technique has the advantage of allowing the freedom of movement to resistant animals, unlike environmental control, in which the animal is confined to the controlled area.

The countries which are qualified as brucellosis free are those where all the cattle herds are serologically negative for the disease and none of the animals have been found positive for the past five years (WHO). The system for control is decided by the country concerned. However, tactics such as on farm quarantine, movement restrictions and biosecurity are used, at some stage in at least all the eradication programs. Surveillance, either passive or active, has been an underlying feature of most programs led by many countries, abattoirs being the major source of data. New Zealand is free from brucellosis and the methods used for eradication exemplify a range of disease control strategies such as stamping out affected herds, compulsory treatment, vaccination, and test and removal (Davidson, 2002). Similar strategies for control have been reported by America. In Egypt, two approaches
are used, one is to test the animals and then slaughter the infected ones having positive serologic tests; while the other approach is vaccination of the animal population (Fathey and Moghney, 2004).

**Vaccination:** Vaccination as the sole means of brucellosis control has been proven to be effective. Reduction in the number of positive animals in a herd is directly related to the percentage of vaccinated animals. However, when proceeding from a control to an eradication program, a test and slaughter program is necessary. Modified live vaccines are available against *Brucella* spp. *B. abortus* S19, RB51 and *B. melitensis* Rev.1 are proven effective vaccines against *B. abortus* in cattle and against *B. melitensis* and *B. ovis* in sheep and goats, respectively (Elberg, 1996). Despite the availability, these vaccines have several drawbacks, including residual virulence for animals and humans (Gamboa et al., 2009).

**Choice of Ideal Brucellosis Vaccine:** Live vaccines have proved superior to inactivated products for the prevention of brucellosis (Nicoletti, 1990). They are effective, inexpensive, and immunity is more persistent. The ideal live vaccine should not produce disease in vaccinated animals; it should prevent infection in both sexes at any age, it should not stimulate persistent antibodies interfering with accurate sero-diagnosis (it should give very few false positive results), it should be biologically stable, free of reversion to virulence in vitro and in vivo and non-pathogenic for humans (Adams, 1990). The ideal live vaccine should also contain specific genetic or phenotypic markers that would make it easy to differentiate from field isolates.

**S19 vaccine:** *B. abortus* “strain 19” or S19 (hereafter, S19) is a spontaneously attenuated strain discovered by Dr. John Buck in 1923 (Graves, 1943). Live, attenuated strain S19 had been used worldwide since the early 1930s as an effective vaccine to prevent brucellosis in cattle, until it was replaced by RB51 in 1990s. *Brucella* Strain 19 maintains its smooth appearance derived from the presence of the extracellular lipopolysaccharide (LPS) (Mukherjee et al., 2005). Caporale et al. (2010) studied to evaluate the efficacy of RB51 in water buffalo compared to the *B. abortus* S19 vaccine (S19). A statistical significant difference was found when evaluation was performed to assess the immunogenicity values obtained in buffalo vaccinated with S19, compared to those obtained in buffalo vaccinated with the RB51 vaccine and in the unvaccinated control group.

**RB51 vaccine:** *B. rucella abortus* strain RB51 vaccine has been developed in United States and tested for its efficacy and safety. This mutant strain of *B. abortus* does not produce cross-reacting antibodies in vaccinated cattle that are detected in the routine surveillance tests. It means that cattle vaccinated with RB51 remain negative on the brucellosis surveillance tests and do not give false positive results (Edmondson and Bremtey, 1996). This is because *Brucella* strain RB51 is rough as it lacks the lipopolysaccharide O chain, this feature gives it an advantage because it does not induce the antibodies that are detected by official diagnostic tests, resulting in the differentiation of vaccinated from infected animals (Herrera et al., 2010).

At present, over 5 million calves have been vaccinated subcutaneously with the recommended dose of 1-3.4 x 10⁶ organisms without deleterious effects. Unpublished observations regarding protective efficacy suggest that immunization should start with animals not younger than 4 months (OIE, 2004). Pregnant cattle can be safely vaccinated without the induction of abortion or placentalitis (Young, 1998).

Both vaccines have the disadvantages of causing abortion in a proportion of pregnant animals, and of being pathogenic for humans. Several approaches have been followed to overcome the main problem encountered in animal vaccination with live attenuated smooth *Brucella* strains, i.e. inability to distinguish vaccinated animals from infected animals by the current standard serological tests (Fensterbank et al., 1986).

**SITUATION IN PAKISTAN**

As stated earlier, brucellosis is a neglected disease and no official policy for brucellosis eradication exists in Pakistan. Therefore, no mandatory measures have been adopted to curtail the spread of the disease in government and private herds (Akhtar et al., 1990). Veterinary Services, economic conditions and methods of farming in the country, suggest that the appropriate method for the control of brucellosis is immuno-prophylaxis, although vaccines against brucellosis are not manufactured in the country (Akhtar et al., 1990; Afzal et al., 2000).

The most popular vaccine for brucellosis in large ruminants is *Brucella abortus* strain 19 (Afzal et al., 2000). Owing to the high prices of cattle and buffalo, the test-and-slaughter method is not a pragmatic approach to the eradication of bovine brucellosis in Pakistan. Testing, isolation and separate management of reactors is the only viable option to limit the spread of brucellosis in official and large private herds. However, the impact of such a policy in Pakistan has yet to be demonstrated.
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