

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21

## Is there a higher risk of exposure to *Coxiella burnetii* for pre-clinical veterinary students?

Anne Conan <sup>1,2,\*</sup>, Christa Gallagher <sup>1</sup>, Nicole Erskine <sup>1</sup>, Michael Howland <sup>1</sup>, Marshalette Smith-Anthony <sup>3</sup>, Silvia Marchi <sup>4</sup>, Ioannis Magouras <sup>2</sup>, Ananda Muller <sup>1</sup>, Anne AMJ Becker <sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> One Health Center for Zoonoses & Tropical Veterinary Medicine, Ross University School of Veterinary Medicine, St. Kitts and Nevis.

<sup>2</sup> Centre for Applied One Health Research and Policy Advice, City University of Hong Kong, Hong Kong, China.

<sup>3</sup> Student Health Services, Ross University School of Veterinary Medicine, St. Kitts and Nevis

<sup>4</sup> Department of Biomedical Sciences, Ross University School of Veterinary Medicine, St. Kitts and Nevis

\* Corresponding author: Email: [ayconan@cityu.edu.hk](mailto:ayconan@cityu.edu.hk)

22 **Abstract:**

23 *Coxiella burnetii* is globally distributed but evidence of zoonotic transmission in the Caribbean  
24 region is scarce. The presence of the bacterium is suspected on the Caribbean island of St. Kitts.  
25 The risk of exposure of veterinary students was reported in other regions of the world but is not  
26 documented in the Caribbean region. The present study aimed to evaluate the risk of exposure to  
27 *C. burnetii* for pre-clinical veterinary students attending an island-based veterinary school.  
28 A cross-sectional study was conducted to compare incoming and outgoing veterinary students'  
29 seroprevalence. Serology was performed using indirect immunofluorescence assay to test  
30 *Coxiella burnetii* Phase I and Phase II immunoglobulins M and G. Background data were  
31 gathered using a standardized questionnaire.

32 Of the 98 participants (48 incomings and 50 outgoing), 41 (41.8 %, 95 %CI: 31.9-52.2) were  
33 seropositive to *C. burnetii*. There was no significant difference between the two groups (45.8% for  
34 incoming vs. 38.0% for outgoing) (p=0.4). No risk factors were significantly more reported in the  
35 seropositive group. U.S. state of origin of the students was not associated with seropositivity  
36 either.

37 Pre-clinical veterinary students do not have a higher risk of exposure to *C. burnetii* by attending  
38 the veterinary school in St. Kitts, but they are highly exposed before arrival on the island. Most of  
39 these participants had experience with animals either through farming or previous veterinary  
40 technician employment. This indicates a high exposure in the U.S. young population aiming to  
41 become veterinarians. There is an urgent need to increase *C. burnetii* surveillance in animals and  
42 humans to apply relevant prevention and control measures, including recommendations for  
43 vaccination of students and professionals at risk.

44

## 45 **Author Summary**

46 Q fever is a zoonosis present worldwide. Risk of exposure is higher in livestock farmers and other  
47 animal-related professions, including veterinary students. The presence of the bacterium is  
48 suspected on the Caribbean island of St. Kitts. We aimed to evaluate the risk of exposure to *C.*  
49 *burnetii* for students attending an American veterinary school based in St. Kitts. By comparing  
50 seroprevalence in incoming and outgoing students, we observed no risk of exposure by attending  
51 the school. These findings are different from studies in other veterinary schools. Future studies  
52 could explain these geographical differences and inform veterinary schools worldwide on  
53 appropriate measures to protect students from exposure to *C. burnetii*. Moreover, we detected a  
54 high seroprevalence in the incoming population, proving an anterior exposure. This indicates a  
55 high exposure in the U.S. young population aiming to become veterinarians. There is an urgent  
56 need to increase *C. burnetii* surveillance in animals and humans to apply relevant prevention and  
57 control measures, including recommendations of vaccination of students and professionals at risk.

## 58 **Introduction**

59 *Coxiella burnetii* is an obligate intracellular bacterium responsible for the zoonosis Q fever [1].  
60 All mammalian species including humans and some bird species can be infected by the bacteria.  
61 The infection of animals is usually asymptomatic or manifests as mild fever, with sporadic  
62 abortions in late pregnancies or moribund offspring [2]. In humans, most infections are also  
63 asymptomatic. Acute Q fever is characterized by an influenza-like illness. However, a more  
64 severe form with pneumonia or hepatitis may occur. Some individuals may also develop a  
65 chronic infection with risk of endocarditis [1]. During infection, the bacterium undergoes a phase  
66 of transition, leading to the presence of two serologically distinguishable phases. Phase I type is  
67 the bacterium's virulent form, and Phase II is avirulent. The diagnosis of Q fever in humans is  
68 based on the association between clinical signs and serological status. The course of the disease  
69 is serologically divided into three stages: the onset with high Phase II immunoglobulins IgG and  
70 IgM, the acute phase with higher Phase II IgG, and a chronic phase characterized by high Phase I  
71 IgG [3].

72 *Coxiella burnetii* is considered endemic worldwide with the exemption of New Zealand.  
73 Infections are usually sporadic, but major outbreaks in animals and humans have occurred in  
74 Australia [4] and The Netherlands [5]. Outside of these outbreaks, human Q fever is regarded an  
75 occupational disease, with a higher risk of exposure in livestock farmers, abattoir workers, and  
76 veterinarians. Veterinary students are also at risk, with reported seroprevalence of 22 % in Brazil  
77 [6], 35 % in Iran [7], 20 to 30 % in The Netherlands [8], up to 17 % in Spain [9] and 17 to 58 %  
78 in Slovakia [10].

79 In the U.S., the prevalence of *C. burnetii* in livestock and the risk of human exposure are  
80 considered low. Two old studies (1964 and 1974) reported a seroprevalence of 5 and 10 % in

81 veterinary students, respectively [6,11]. More recently however, a national investigation reported  
82 a high exposure in veterinarians (22 %) [12], highlighting the need for further investigations in  
83 the veterinary curriculum and profession.

84 Ross University School of Veterinary Medicine (RUSVM) delivers a pre-clinical Doctor of  
85 Veterinary Medicine (DVM) curriculum in St. Kitts (West Indies). Evidence of *C. burnetii* in the  
86 Caribbean is limited, with few reports from several islands, including Trinidad, Grenada, and  
87 Cuba [13–15]. In St. Kitts, several studies reported seropositive humans or animals [16–18].

88 The main objective of the study was to evaluate the risk of exposure to *C. burnetii* for students  
89 attending RUSVM in St. Kitts by comparing the seroprevalence of on-island incoming students  
90 and outgoing students.

## 91 **Material and Methods**

### 92 Target population

93 At RUSVM, undergraduate students enter the school either in 1<sup>st</sup> semester or in a 15-week  
94 Veterinary Preparatory program. The curriculum is accelerated and one semester lasts four  
95 months (Spring, Summer and Fall semesters). After seven 'semesters' (~two and half years) of  
96 pre-clinical coursework, the students complete their program with a three-semester clinical  
97 curriculum at an affiliated school, usually based in the U.S.

### 98 Enrolment of participants

99 Inclusion criteria for the participants was the registration at RUSVM in the Veterinary  
100 Preparatory program or first semester for incoming group and in seventh semester for outgoing  
101 group. In January 2020, the targeted population varied between 140 (outgoing) to 183  
102 individuals (incoming). Fifty individuals were randomly selected in both groups based on the  
103 registration list of the Registrar's Office. The randomisation was performed in Microsoft Excel™

104 using the function 'RANDOM'. If an invitee declined the participation or did not confirm  
105 participation after six days, the next individual on the random list was invited to participate.  
106 Exclusion criteria for incoming students were their presence in St. Kitts for more than a month  
107 (based on air plane arrival) or a previous visit/vacation in St. Kitts.

#### 108 Enrolment changes due to COVID-19 pandemic

109 Enrolment started in January 2020. Unfortunately, the teaching program at RUSVM was  
110 disrupted from mid-March 2020 onwards due to the COVID-19 pandemic and consequent travel  
111 restrictions. Online teaching was initiated and most of the students left St. Kitts to continue the  
112 curriculum from home. Face-to-face activities on island gradually resumed from September  
113 2020, starting with 7<sup>th</sup> semester, until September 2021 (Veterinary Preparatory). To decrease  
114 temporal bias, incoming student enrolment was adapted from September 2020. Inclusion criteria  
115 were extended to registration in second or third semester at RUSVM. Exclusion criteria (less  
116 than a month in St. Kitts and no previous visit of St. Kitts) remained the same.

#### 117 RUSVM employees

118 In parallel with the student investigation, we provided the opportunity for RUSVM employees  
119 that were in contact with livestock on campus to get tested for antibodies. Contact with livestock  
120 was defined as work with the RUSVM farming animals (cattle and sheep) at less than 5 meters  
121 for more than 30 minutes at least once a month or with opened carcasses of farming animals at  
122 RUSVM during the last 6 months. Due to COVID-19 pandemic, exclusion criterium of being  
123 abroad for more than a month in the last six months was added. Department heads provided the  
124 list of employees who fit the above criteria, and those employees were sent invitations to  
125 participate in the study. Forty-one employees fit our definition and were invited to join.

#### 126 Questionnaire

127 Students responding positively to the study invitation email were scheduled an appointment.  
128 After signing a consent form, a standardized questionnaire was verbally administered to the  
129 participants and directly entered with Qualtrix®. Questions included the possible associated  
130 factors to *C. burnetii* seropositivity as follows: demographic factors, living area, animal  
131 ownership, past veterinary/animal work, consumption of raw milk, and exposure to ticks. The  
132 outgoing students were also asked about their extra-curricular activities with animals during their  
133 time in St. Kitts. The questionnaire is available in Appendix 1.

#### 134 Sampling

135 A blood sample of maximum 8 mL was drawn by venipuncture by a certified nurse at Health  
136 Services of RUSVM. All blood collection tubes were centrifuged within 30 minutes to 3 hours  
137 after collection and the serum was stored at -20°C.

#### 138 Serological testing

139 Two commercially available indirect immunofluorescent assays (IFA) were used to screen all  
140 samples for human IgG and IgM antibodies to *C. burnetii* (Focus Diagnostics Q Fever IFA IgG  
141 and IgM assays, Cypress, CA). Both immunoglobulin-specific assays consisted of slide wells in  
142 which each well contained 2 individual spots with *C. burnetii* (Nine Mile strain) Phase I and  
143 Phase II antigens, respectively. The human positive and negative control samples (Focus  
144 Diagnostics Q Fever ref IF0211 and IF0213) served as the reference markers in identifying  
145 positive and negative results. The presence of bright green fluorescence of coccobacillary  
146 morphology and lack of background fluorescence were used to identify positive samples, while  
147 the total absence of fluorescence identified negative samples. All serum samples were initially  
148 screened at the manufacturer's recommended serum dilution (1:16) with the provided IgG  
149 Sample Diluent (Figure 1A and 1B). Any serum sample found to be positive at the screening

150 dilution for both IgG Phase I and II was further titrated in reconstituted phosphate buffered saline  
151 (PBS) using the manufacturer's recommended serum dilutions of 1:64, 1:128, 1:256, 1:512 and  
152 1:1024 (Figure 1C). Any serum sample found to be positive for only one Phase of IgG was taken  
153 to end titer by threefold serial dilutions. Likewise, serum samples were screened for IgM  
154 antibodies at the manufacturer's recommended serum dilution (1:16) with IgM pre-treatment  
155 diluent and subsequently diluted three- or six-fold to determine end titers (Figure 1D). All IFAs  
156 were consistently performed by the same person, as well was the interpretation of all slides by  
157 another person. Both were blinded for the sample group (incoming, outgoing, employees). A  
158 random number of slide images were additionally sent to the German National Consiliary  
159 Laboratory of *Coxiella burnetii* (Stuttgart, Germany) for confirmation.

#### 160 Case definition

161 Our study did not record symptoms as the objective was to investigate the exposure. An  
162 individual with any immunoglobulin concentration equal or above the threshold of 1:64 was  
163 classified as seropositive. Cases of acute and chronic exposures were also defined and reported  
164 to participants. Acute exposure was suspected when Phase I and/or Phase II IgG were equal or  
165 superior to 1:256 and 1:512, respectively. A high phase I IgG equal or above 1:512 and superior  
166 to Phase II IgG would lead to suspicion of chronic infection. Finally, individuals with negative  
167 IgG and positive Phase II IgM (superior to 1:64) were suspected of developing an early infection  
168 [19–21].

#### 169 Data analyses

170 Seroprevalence was expected to be 5 % for incoming students and 20 % for outgoing students,  
171 respectively. To detect a difference with a power of 80 % and a significance of 5 %, 50  
172 individuals needed to be sampled in each group. All data were merged in a unique database and



173 analysed using R. Confidence intervals of 95 % (95% CI) were computed based on the binomial  
174 distribution. The main exposure variable (incoming/outgoing) was tested by logistic regression.  
175 Other variables were compared using logistic regression with the incoming/outgoing variable  
176 forced in the model. For the sub-population of outgoing students, activities performed during  
177 their stay in St. Kitts were also tested.

178 Among the tested factors, origin location was used in different ways. We collected information  
179 about all world locations where the participant lived for over a year. Residence location scale  
180 was the state for the U.S. and province for Canada, and the country for the rest of the world. As  
181 most participants previously lived in the U.S., only this location information was used for risk  
182 factor analysis. We grouped the states by population of cattle, sheep and/or goats (based on 2019  
183 census, USDA, <https://quickstats.nass.usda.gov/>) and by the number of human Q fever cases  
184 reported in 2019 (CDC data, <https://www.cdc.gov/qfever/stats/index.html>). Each created variable  
185 was binary using the median as the threshold between high and low risk. Absence of data in a  
186 state was considered as no livestock population. An individual who lived in two states differing  
187 in risk (e.g. one state with no cattle and one state with high number of cattle) was attributed with  
188 the highest risk value (variable=1). All created variables were tested using a logistic regression  
189 with the incoming/outgoing variable forced in the model.

#### 190 Ethic statement

191 The ethic approvals were granted by (i) Interim Ethic Review Committee (IERC, Ministry of  
192 health, community development, gender affairs and social services, St. Kitts; protocol #: IERC-  
193 2020-01-037), (ii) the institutional review board of RUSVM) (IRB protocol #19-05-XP) and (iii)  
194 the Human Subjects Ethics Sub-Committee of City University of Hong Kong (protocol #: 41005-  
195 20 Conan, application no H002441A)

196 **Results**

197 Out of the 98 enrolled participants (incoming and outgoing), 41 (41.8 %, 95 % CI: 31.9-52.2)  
 198 were considered as seropositive to *C. burnetii*. The seropositivity of outgoing students was not  
 199 significantly different from the seropositivity of incoming students (p=0.4) (Table 1).  
 200 Seroprevalence in employees was high with 8 seropositives out of 15 sampled individuals  
 201 (53.3 %, 95 %CI: 26.6-78.7).

202

203 *Table 1: Seroprevalence and 95 % confidence interval of the incoming and outgoing students in St Kitts(case definition: at least one*  
 204 *immunoglobulin dilution equal or above 1:64). Seroprevalence by enrolment group is presented*

	<b>Incoming</b>		<b>Outgoing</b>
	1 <sup>st</sup> /Vet prep no positive/N Seroprevalence (95% CI)	2 <sup>nd</sup> - 3 <sup>rd</sup> semester	7 <sup>th</sup> semester
<b>Spring 2020</b>	10/23 43.5% (23.2-65.5)	Not tested	17/44 38.6% (24.4-54.4)
<b>Summer 2020</b>	Not on island	Not on island	Not tested
<b>Fall 2020</b>	Not on island	Not on island	2/6 33.3% (4.3-77.8)
<b>Spring 2021</b>	Not on island	12/25 48% (27.8-68.7)	Not tested
<b>Positive (≥ 1:64)</b>	22/48 45.8% (31.4-60.8)		19/50 38.0% (24.6-52.8)

205 95% CI: 95 % Confidence interval (binomial distribution)  
 206 N: number of samples

207

208 Distribution of dilution by phase is presented in Table 2. Dilution was not performed until  
 209 negativity, so only thresholds at 1:128 (Phase I) and 1:64 (Phase II) are described. There were  
 210 more individuals positive to Ig Phase II (n=38) than to Ig Phase I (n=26, McNemar’s test  
 211 p=0.002). There were no other differences between particular immunoglobulins (Table 2). None  
 212 of the tested factors were significant during univariate analysis (p>0.05) (Table 3 and Appendix  
 213 2). Looking at the outgoing participants only, none of the tested exposure factors linked with  
 214 their activities at RUSVM were different between seropositive and seronegative individuals. No  
 215 significant association between student club or live animal activities and seropositivity in  
 216 outgoing participants were found (Appendix 3).

217

218 *Table 2: Number and proportions of samples by phase and by positive dilution in the three groups (incoming, outgoing and*  
 219 *employees)*

	Students			p-value*	Employees
	Incoming students	Outgoing students			
<b>No of samples</b>	48	50			15
<b>Mean age</b>	25.3	26.9			38.3
<b>Phase I</b>	≥ 1:16	28	26	0.5	10
		58.3 %	52.0 %		66.7 %
	≥ 1:32	22	20	0.6	7
		45.8%	40.0 %		46.7 %
	≥ 1:64	14	12	0.6	5
		29.2 %	24.0 %		33.3%
	≥ 1:128	6	3	0.3	2
	12.5 %	6.0 %	13.3 %		
IgG (≥ 1:64)	12	7	0.2	2	
	25.0 %	14 %		13.3 %	
IgM (≥ 1:64)	3	7	0.2	3	
	6.2 %	14 %		20.0 %	
<b>Phase II</b>	≥ 1:16	38	36	0.4	13
		79.2 %	72.0 %		86.7 %
	≥ 1:32	32	30	0.5	9
		66.7 %	60 %		60.0 %
	≥ 1:64	22	16	0.2	8
		45.8 %	32.0 %		53.3 %
IgG (≥ 1:64)	18	14	0.3	7	
	37.5 %	28.0 %		46.7 %	
IgM (≥ 1:64)	6	6	0.9	4	
	12.5 %	12.0 %		26.7 %	

220 \* Comparison of positivity was performed between incoming and outgoing students.

221

222 Table 3: Exposure factors for *Coxiella burnetii* seropositivity in the student population.

	Seronegative N=57	Seropositive N=41	OR [95 % CI]	p-value*
<b>Age (median/IQR)</b>	Median: 26 IQR: 24-28	Median: 25 IQR: 24-27	0.92 [0.79-1.07]	0.3
<b>Sex</b>				
Female (ref)	52 91.2%	37 90.2%	1.06 [0.26-4.26]	0.9
Male	5 8.8%	4 9.8%		
<b>Time spent in St. Kitts (months)</b>	Median: 26 IQR: 0.75-30	Median: 1 IQR: 0.75-30	0.89 [0.75-1.06]	0.2
<b>Lived at least 1 year in a location</b>				
Rural	14 24.6%	15 36.6%	1.68 [0.69-4.13]	0.3
Urban	44 77.2%	26 63.4%	0.49 [0.20-1.21]	0.1
Peri-urban	47 82.5%	29 70.7%	0.54 [0.18-1.58]	0.3
<b>Worked previously as a veterinary technician</b>	50 87.7%	33 80.5%	0.55 [0.18-1.69]	0.3
<b>Worked on a farm without being the owner</b>	24 42.1%	17 41.5%	0.92 [0.40-2.11]	0.8
<b>Handled animals during reproductive procedures</b>	24 42.1%	22 53.7%	1.59 [0.71-3.57]	0.3
<b>Animal living on the same property (any time)</b>				
Cattle	10 17.5%	10 24.4%	1.46 [0.54-3.95]	0.5
Goat	7 12.3%	3 7.3%	0.54 [0.13-2.24]	0.4
Sheep	3 5.3%	2 4.9%	0.89 [0.14-5.62]	0.9
Horse	10 17.5%	8 19.5%	1.11 [0.39-3.13]	0.8
Donkey	3 5.3%	3 7.3%	1.34 [0.25-7.09]	0.7
Dog	56 98.2 %	36 87.8 %	0.14 0.01-1.27	0.08
Cat	44 77.2%	33 80.5%	1.36 [0.49-3.79]	0.6
Pig	8 14.0%	4 9.8%	0.61 [0.17-2.23]	0.5
Rabbit	24 42.1%	11 26.8%	0.52 [0.22-1.25]	0.1
Other mammals	23 40.4%	17 41.5%	1.00 [0.44-2.29]	1
Chicken	11 19.3%	6 14.6%	0.67 [0.22-2.01]	0.5
Other birds	14 24.6%	7 17.1%	0.62 [0.22-1.72]	0.4
<b>Consumption of raw milk</b>	3 5.3%	3 7.3%	1.21 [0.22-6.70]	0.8
<b>Known exposure to ticks</b>	6 10.5%	10 24.4%	2.75 [0.91-8.34]	0.07

223 \* Comparison is performed by logistic regression with the group (incoming/outgoing) forced as covariable in the model

224

225 Interestingly, the four participants suspected of acute infection (2 incoming, 1 outgoing and 1

226 employee) had different backgrounds. Three were females and one was male. While the

227 employee lived exclusively in St. Kitts, the students lived in different states in the U.S.

228 (Michigan, Minnesota, North Dakota, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Utah) and in different environments  
229 (rural N=3, peri-urban N=0, urban N=3). Two had previous experience as veterinary technicians  
230 with ruminants and two had worked on farms. In St. Kitts, the incoming participants lived on  
231 campus and two others in two different island parishes. Species of animals owned by these four  
232 participants also varied among them (cattle N=2, sheep N=2, donkey N=1, cat N=3, pig N=2,  
233 rabbit N=1). All have owned a dog but three of them only in the last year. None of the four have  
234 ever consumed raw milk and one reported to have been bitten by a tick.

235 The participants showing serological evidence of early infections were four incoming, two  
236 outgoing and one employee, all females. However, six out of seven had experience as veterinary  
237 technicians with pets and four indicated previous work on a cattle farm. None of the participants  
238 fit our definition of chronic infection.

## 239 **Discussion**

240 The seroprevalence in the population of students outgoing RUSVM was not significantly  
241 different from the seroprevalence of the incoming students. Therefore, studying pre-clinical  
242 veterinary sciences in St. Kitts doesn't increase the risk of being exposed to *C. burnetii*. These  
243 results differ from what was observed in Spain [9] or in The Netherlands [8,22]. In these  
244 veterinary schools, the risk of being seropositive to *C. burnetii* increased with the number of  
245 years spent at the university. Several hypotheses could explain the difference in our results. First,  
246 RUSVM has a pre-clinical curriculum and therefore, students have less contact with live animals  
247 compared to their subsequent clinical years. However, RUSVM students are exposed to live  
248 animals through different laboratory sessions that include manipulation of sheep and cattle, and  
249 also through extracurricular activities. Secondly, the prevalence of *C. burnetii* in livestock could  
250 be lower in St. Kitts compared to European countries. While the seroprevalence in a male sheep

251 flock was found to be 26.3 %, the prevalence and prevalence of animal shedding are unknown  
252 [18]. Finally, the exposure environment may differ with animals free-roaming in the community  
253 and general animal manipulations occurring outdoors, therefore preventing concentration of the  
254 bacteria in the environment. This, associated with the application of basic personal protective  
255 equipment may lower the transmission risk to students. Different studies, such as follow-up  
256 serology on RUSVM students during their clinical year, a prevalence estimation in St. Kitts’  
257 livestock and testing closed environments in veterinary schools could support these hypotheses.  
258 Such results could inform veterinary schools worldwide on appropriate measures to protect  
259 students from exposure to *C. burnetii*.

260 Although the seroprevalence is not different between the two student groups, the baseline in  
261 incoming students (43.5%) is higher than we expected. Two old studies (1960s-70s) detected  
262 seroprevalence of 5 % in veterinary schools in the U.S. Our results indicate that there is a high  
263 risk of exposure in this young population. We cannot generalize to the entire U.S. population, as  
264 veterinary students tend to have a history of more frequent and diverse contact with animals.  
265 Most study participants had indeed contact with animals through internships, veterinary  
266 technician work or farming prior to enrolment in the veterinary school. Still, the seroprevalence  
267 observed is higher than previously reported in the veterinary profession (22.2%) [12].

268 Seroprevalence among healthy adults has been estimated in the U.S. at 3.1 % with higher rates in  
269 males than females [23]. Our data are closer to the 49 % seroprevalence reported in veterinarians  
270 in Nova Scotia (Canada) [24]. Also, our results don't show a specific location pattern: no states  
271 or regions (based on geography, livestock population, or Q fever human cases) show a  
272 significant association to seropositivity. Finally, it is almost certain that the infection is  
273 underreported in animal and human populations [18,25]. Several authors have already mentioned

274 a possible increase of prevalence in the U.S.[25,26]. Therefore, our results should urge human  
275 and veterinary authorities to improve U.S national surveillance and increase awareness of  
276 animal-related workers. These measures would help with early detection, risk communication,  
277 risk management, and prevention of severe outbreaks similar to those reported in The  
278 Netherlands or in Australia.

279 In our risk factor analysis of *C. burnetii*, none of the tested factors showed a significant  
280 difference between seronegative and seropositive participants. While the power of the exposure  
281 analysis may be too low for this study (as the sample size was calculated for a difference of  
282 seroprevalence between groups) and there is a certain recall bias, some trends can be observed  
283 and hypothesis posed. First, most of the participants (seronegative or seropositive) worked  
284 previously as veterinary technicians which confirms the population particularity of our target  
285 population compared to the general population. Second, four factors were more frequent (but not  
286 significant) in seropositives: known exposure to ticks, residence location in rural areas,  
287 reproductive procedures (particularly in cattle) and working as a cattle veterinary technician.  
288 These factors are known to be risk factors of *C burnetii* exposure. Usually, risk factors on the  
289 American continent would include living on a farm [12,27]. In the Netherlands, the veterinary  
290 student seropositivity was associated with the number of years lived on farms [8]. Interestingly,  
291 the factors "owning a dog" and "work on an equine farm" were more frequent in seronegatives.  
292 Further investigation focusing on these risk factors should be performed to better understand the  
293 risk of transmission of *C. burnetii*. Finally, no geographical difference could be observed. This  
294 would indicate that the infection is actually endemic in most of the U.S. territory. It is possible  
295 that the state differences in CDC-reported human case result from better surveillance in some  
296 states compared to others.

297 The employee population was not added to our exposure factor analyses because of the high  
298 disparity in their demographics, country origin, and professional background compared to a  
299 homogenous student population. We also observed high seroprevalence in this population  
300 (53.3 %) but due to the low sample size no conclusions can be made about potential risk factors.  
301 However, this confirms the risk of exposure to *C. burnetii* in the veterinary and related  
302 professions [1]. A larger seroprevalence study could be conducted in veterinary school workers  
303 in North America and other regions to identify potential risk activities. Awareness of animal  
304 workers should be raised and regular testing recommended. Moreover, the provision of  
305 vaccination should be considered for staff working in veterinary and agricultural schools where  
306 the employees are in regular contact with animals.

307 In total, four participants were suspected to be in the acute form of the disease, but none of the  
308 participants fits the definition of chronic disease. These four participants were encouraged to  
309 visit the RUSVM Health Services or their personal doctors. One of the study limitations is the  
310 absence of questions related to current or recent symptoms. The detection of acute disease  
311 followed by appropriate treatment could reduce the risk of progression to chronic disease.  
312 Therefore, awareness campaigns for veterinary students, veterinary-related workers, and human  
313 practitioners to increase the testing of *C. burnetii* in case of flu-like symptoms is recommended.

314 Other limitations of our study include the lag between incoming participant arrival and sampling  
315 and the IFA interpretation. First, the incoming students tested in the month after arrival could  
316 have been exposed at arrival on St. Kitts. Indeed, IgM can be detected within two weeks after  
317 exposure [28,29]. However, this hypothesis is unlikely as the comparisons between group by  
318 phase and immunoglobulin were not significant. The IgG seroprevalence would be low if there  
319 was exposure during this first month [30]. Also, the incoming students have no direct animal



320 contact during the first month of the curriculum. Moreover, the 2<sup>nd</sup> cohort of incoming  
321 participants arrived in St. Kitts while COVID-19 restrictions were still in place and were  
322 therefore quarantined in their accommodation for two weeks.

323 The second limitation is the IFA test, that can be prone to subjective interpretation. We  
324 implemented several safeguards to decrease this bias: the high cut-off of 1:64 (also avoiding  
325 cross-reactions with *Rickettsia*), consistent interpretation by a singular, and a random  
326 confirmatory reading by the German National Consiliary Laboratory of *Coxiella burnetii* .

327 Therefore, we believe the bias of IFA interpretation has been minimized.

328 In conclusion, our study does not indicate an increased risk of exposure to *C. burnetii* for  
329 students attending RUSVM. However, we report a high seroprevalence in the incoming student  
330 population, indicating a high risk of exposure in the U.S. young population aiming to become  
331 veterinarians. This highlights the need for urgent and necessary measures to increase surveillance  
332 of *C. burnetii* in the human and animal populations in the U.S. Measures of prevention and  
333 control, and awareness of the animal-worker population should be improved, and vaccination of  
334 animals and humans should be considered at the farm, veterinary school, and national levels.

### 335 **Acknowledgement**

336 We are grateful to Mary Cartwright (Research Assistant), Juliet Battice (Student Health  
337 Services) and Shianne England (Student Health Services) for helping with the data collection.  
338 We thank Dr. Larissa Dangel (German National Consiliary Laboratory of *Coxiella burnetii*,  
339 Stuttgart, Germany; State Health Office Baden-Württemberg, Stuttgart, Germany) for her  
340 support. AC, CG, MSA, AB obtained financial support by the One Health Center for Zoonoses  
341 & Tropical Veterinary Medicine, Ross University School of Veterinary Medicine, St. Kitts and  
342 Nevis (Intramural grant # 41005-20). The funding source had no involvement in the study

343 design, in the collection, analysis, and interpretation of data, in the writing of the paper or the  
344 decision to submit the paper for publication.

### 345 **Data Sharing Statement**

346 The data that support the findings of this study are available on request from the corresponding  
347 author (AC, [ayconan@cityu.edu.hk](mailto:ayconan@cityu.edu.hk)). This includes only deidentified (names, date of enrolment,  
348 semester and origin data removed) student data. Data from RUSVM employees will not be  
349 shared. The data are not publicly available due to ethical restrictions. The containing information  
350 could compromise the privacy of research participants.

### 351 **Authors' contributions**

352 Conceptualisation: AC; Methodology: AC, MSA, AB; Supervision: AC, CG, AM; Formal  
353 analysis: AC, AB, Funding acquisition: AC, CG, MSA, AB; Investigation: NE, MH, MSA, SM;  
354 Writing – Original draft: AC; Writing - review & editing: CG, IM, AM, AB

### 355 **References**

- 356 1. Bauerfeind R, Graevenitz A von, Kimmig P, Schiefer HG, Schwarz T, Slenczka W, et al.  
357 Zoonoses: Infectious diseases transmissible from animals and humans, fourth edition.  
358 American Society of Microbiology; 2016. doi:10.1128/9781555819262
- 359 2. Coetzer JAW, Tustin RC. Infectious diseases of livestock. Oxford University Press; 2004.
- 360 3. Blondeau JM, Williams JC, Marrie TJ. The immune response to Phase I and Phase II  
361 *Coxiella burnetii* antigens as measured by western immunoblotting. Annals of the New  
362 York Academy of Sciences. 1990;590: 187–202. doi:10.1111/j.1749-6632.1990.tb42220.x
- 363 4. Sloan-Gardner TS, Massey PD, Hutchinson P, Knope K, Fearnley E. Trends and risk  
364 factors for human Q fever in Australia, 1991-2014. Epidemiol Infect. 2017;145: 787–795.  
365 doi:10.1017/S0950268816002843
- 366 5. Schimmer B, Morroy G, Dijkstra F, Schneeberger PM, Weers-Pothoff G, Timen A, et al.  
367 Large ongoing Q fever outbreak in the south of The Netherlands, 2008. Eurosurveillance.  
368 2008;13: 18939. doi:10.2807/ese.13.31.18939-en

- 369 6. Riemann HP, Brant PC, Franti CE, Reis R, Buchanan AM, Stormont C, et al. Antibodies to  
370 *Toxoplasma gondii* and *Coxiella burnetii* among students and other personnel in veterinary  
371 colleges in California and Brazil. *American Journal of Epidemiology*. 1974;100: 197–208.  
372 doi:10.1093/oxfordjournals.aje.a112028
- 373 7. Khalili M, Qorbani A, Sharifi H, Golchin M. Prevalence and risk factor of Q fever among  
374 veterinary students in Iran. 2015;32: 704–709.
- 375 8. de Rooij MMT, Schimmer B, Versteeg B, Schneeberger P, Berends BR, Heederik D, et al.  
376 Risk factors of *Coxiella burnetii* (Q Fever) seropositivity in veterinary medicine students.  
377 Zamboni DS, editor. *PLoS ONE*. 2012;7: e32108. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0032108
- 378 9. del Carmen Simón Valencia M, Rodríguez CO, Puñet OG, de Blas Giral I. Q fever  
379 seroprevalence and associated risk factors among students from the Veterinary School of  
380 Zaragoza, Spain. *European Journal of Epidemiology*. 2000;16: 469–476.  
381 doi:10.1023/A:1007605414042
- 382 10. Dorko E, Rimárová K, Kecerová A, Pilipčinec E, Dudríková E, Lovayová V, et al. Potential  
383 association between *Coxiella burnetii* seroprevalence and selected risk factors among  
384 veterinary students in Slovakia. *Ann Agric Environ Med*. 2011;18: 47–53.
- 385 11. Sánchez A, Prats-van der Ham M, Tatay-Dualde J, Paterna A, de la Fe C, Gómez-Martín Á,  
386 et al. Zoonoses in Veterinary Students: A Systematic Review of the Literature. Cloeckaert  
387 A, editor. *PLoS ONE*. 2017;12: e0169534. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0169534
- 388 12. Whitney EAS, Massung RF, Candee AJ, Ailes EC, Myers LM, Patterson NE, et al.  
389 Seroepidemiologic and occupational risk survey for *Coxiella burnetii* antibodies among US  
390 veterinarians. *Clinical Infectious Diseases*. 2009;48: 550–557. doi:10.1086/596705
- 391 13. Adesiyun AA, Cazabon EPI. Séroprévalences de brucellose, fièvre Q et toxoplasmose chez  
392 des animaux de boucherie à Trinidad. *Revue d'élevage et de médecine vétérinaire des pays*  
393 *tropicaux*. 1996;49: 28–30. doi:10.19182/remvt.9541
- 394 14. Stone DM, Kumthekar S, Chikweto A, Thomas D, Tiwari K, Sharma RN. Exposure to  
395 zoonotic abortifacients among sheep and goats in Grenada. *International Journal of Animal*  
396 *and Veterinary Advances*. 2012;4: 113–118.
- 397 15. Noda AA, Rodríguez I, Miranda J, Contreras V, Mattar S. First molecular evidence of  
398 *Coxiella burnetii* infecting ticks in Cuba. *Ticks and Tick-borne Diseases*. 2016;7: 68–70.  
399 doi:10.1016/j.ttbdis.2015.08.008
- 400 16. Wood H, Drebot MA, Dewailly E, Dillon L, Dimitrova K, Forde M, et al. Seroprevalence  
401 of seven zoonotic pathogens in pregnant women from the Caribbean. *The American Journal*  
402 *of Tropical Medicine and Hygiene*. 2014;91: 642–644. doi:10.4269/ajtmh.14-0107
- 403 17. Johnson JW, Lucas H, King S, Caron T, Wang C, Kelly PJ. Serosurvey for *Brucella* spp.  
404 and *Coxiella burnetii* in animals on Caribbean islands. *Veterinary Medicine and Science*.  
405 2019 [cited 18 Feb 2020]. doi:10.1002/vms3.214

- 406 18. Conan A, Becker AAMJ, Alava V, Chapwanya A, Carter J, Roman K, et al. Detection of  
407 *Coxiella burnetii* antibodies in sheep and cattle on a veterinary campus in St. Kitts:  
408 Implications for one health in the Caribbean region. *One Health*. 2020; 100163.  
409 doi:10.1016/j.onehlt.2020.100163
- 410 19. Wegdam-Blans MCA, Kampschreur LM, Delsing CE, Bleeker-Rovers CP, Sprong T,  
411 Kasteren MEE van, et al. Chronic Q fever: Review of the literature and a proposal of new  
412 diagnostic criteria. *Journal of Infection*. 2012;64: 247–259. doi:10.1016/j.jinf.2011.12.014
- 413 20. Wegdam-Blans MCA, Wielders CCH, Meekelenkamp J, Korbeeck JM, Herremans T, Tjhie  
414 HT, et al. Evaluation of commonly used serological tests for detection of *Coxiella burnetii*  
415 antibodies in well-defined acute and follow-up sera. *Clinical and Vaccine Immunology*.  
416 2012;19: 1110–1115. doi:10.1128/CVI.05581-11
- 417 21. Morroy G, Hoek W van der, Albers J, Coutinho RA, Bleeker-Rovers CP, Schneeberger  
418 PM. Population screening for chronic Q-fever seven years after a major outbreak. *PLOS*  
419 *ONE*. 2015;10: e0131777. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0131777
- 420 22. de Lange MMA, van der Hoek W, Schneeberger PM, Swart A, Heederik DJJ, Schimmer B,  
421 et al. High *Coxiella burnetii* seroconversion rate in veterinary students, the Netherlands,  
422 2006–2010. *Emerg Infect Dis*. 2020;26: 3086–3088. doi:10.3201/eid2612.200063
- 423 23. Anderson AD, Kruszon-Moran D, Loftis AD, McQuillan G, Nicholson WL, Priestley RA,  
424 et al. Seroprevalence of Q fever in the United States, 2003–2004. *The American Journal of*  
425 *Tropical Medicine and Hygiene*. 2009;81: 691–694. doi:10.4269/ajtmh.2009.09-0168
- 426 24. Marrie TJ, Fraser J. Prevalence of antibodies to *Coxiella burnetii* among veterinarians and  
427 slaughterhouse workers in Nova Scotia. *Can Vet J*. 1985;26: 181–184.
- 428 25. Kaufman HW, Chen Z, Radcliff J, Batterman HJ, Leake J. Q fever: an under-reported  
429 reportable communicable disease. *Epidemiology & Infection*. 2018;146: 1240–1244.  
430 doi:10.1017/S0950268818001395
- 431 26. McQuiston JH, Holman RC, McCall CL, Childs JE, Swerdlow DL, Thompson HA.  
432 National surveillance and the epidemiology of human Q fever in the United States, 1978-  
433 2004. *Am J Trop Med Hyg*. 2006;75: 36–40. doi:10.4269/ajtmh.2006.75.1.0750036
- 434 27. Echeverría G, Reyna-Bello A, Minda-Aluisa E, Celi-Eraza M, Olmedo L, García HA, et al.  
435 Serological evidence of *Coxiella burnetii* infection in cattle and farm workers: is Q fever an  
436 underreported zoonotic disease in Ecuador? *Infection and Drug Resistance*. 2019;12: 701–  
437 706. doi:doi.org/10.2147/IDR.S195940
- 438 28. Maurin M, Raoult D. Q Fever. *Clinical Microbiology Reviews*. 1999;12: 518–553.
- 439 29. Boden K, Brasche S, Straube E, Bischof W. Specific risk factors for contracting Q fever:  
440 lessons from the outbreak Jena. *International Journal of Hygiene and Environmental*  
441 *Health*. 2014;217: 110–115. doi:10.1016/j.ijheh.2013.04.004

- 442 30. Schneeberger PM, Hermans MHA, van Hannen EJ, Schellekens JJA, Leenders ACAP,  
443 Wever PC. Real-time PCR with serum samples is indispensable for early diagnosis of acute  
444 Q fever. *Clinical and Vaccine Immunology*. 2010;17: 286–290. doi:10.1128/CVI.00454-09

445

446 Figure 1: Examples of results for the indirect immunofluorescent assay A) Negative; B) Positive  
447 for IgG screening at dilution 1:16; C) Positive for IgG dilution 1:64; D) Positive for IgM dilution  
448 1:64

449 Appendix 1: Standardized questionnaire administered to all study participants.

450 Appendix 2: Exposure factors for *Coxiella burnetii* seropositivity in the student population  
451 (Continued Table 3)

452 Appendix 3: Exposure factors for *Coxiella burnetii* seropositivity in the outgoing student  
453 population




Figure 1A




Figure 1B






Figure 1C




Figure 1D