

1 **SEROLOGICAL AND MOLECULAR STUDY ON CAPRINE BRUCELLOSIS IN**
2 **PUDUCHERRY (INDIA) AND ITS PUBLIC HEALTH SIGNIFICANCE**

3
4 **Abhishek Madan ^a, Gururaj Kumaresan ^b, Bhanu Rekha V ^a, Dimple Andani ^b, Anil**
5 **Kumar Mishra ^b, Ajay Kumar VJ ^a, Thanislass Jacob ^c, Kavita Vasudevan P ^d**

6
7 ^aDepartment of Veterinary Public Health and Epidemiology, Rajiv Gandhi Institute of Veterinary
8 Education and Research (RIVER), Kurumbapet, Puducherry 605009, India.

9
10 ^bMicrobiology Laboratory, Division of Animal Health, Laboratory Complex, Indian Council for
11 Agricultural Research – Central Institute for Research on Goats (ICAR – CIRG), Makhdoom,
12 Farah (post), Mathura 281122, Uttar Pradesh, India.

13
14 ^cDepartment of Veterinary Biochemistry, Rajiv Gandhi Institute of Veterinary Education and
15 Research (RIVER), Kurumbapet, Puducherry 605009, India.

16
17 ^dDepartment of Community Medicine, Indira Gandhi Medical College and Research Institute,
18 Kadirgamam, Puducherry 605009, India.

19
20 **Corresponding author: Gururaj Kumaresan**, Senior Scientist (Veterinary Microbiology),
21 Indian Council of Agricultural Research – Central Institute for Research on Goats (ICAR –
22 CIRG), Makhdoom, Farah (post), Mathura 281122, Uttar Pradesh, India.

23 E mail: guruvet@gmail.com ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1461-1692>

29

ABSTRACT

30 Caprine brucellosis due to *Brucella melitensis* is an important zoonotic disease. The present
31 study was carried out to address the lack of a comprehensive study on the status of caprine
32 brucellosis in Puducherry, India using serological and molecular tests in goats and to assess the
33 seroprevalence in human risk groups of the aforementioned region to ascertain the public health
34 significance of the disease. Seroprevalence in 120 goats was found to be zero, 3.33% and 18.33%
35 by Rose Bengal agglutination Test (RBT), Standard Tube Agglutination Test (STAT) and
36 Immunoglobulin G Indirect Enzyme Linked Immune Sorbant Assay (IgG iELISA) respectively.
37 Of the 120 goat genital swabs screened, while conventional polymerase chain reaction (PCR)
38 detected genus specific *16S rRNA* and *Brucella melitensis* specific *omp2* genes in 17.50% and
39 5.00% of samples respectively, the *OMP31TaqMan*[®] real time PCR with a positive detection of
40 40.00% was both the most sensitive and specific for detection of *Brucella melitensis*. The study
41 provides insight into the optimization of diagnostic tests following cluster wise sampling for
42 brucellosis in goats. The strain of *Brucella melitensis* in Puducherry was found to be Biovar 3
43 based upon suggestive results of Restriction Fragment Length Polymorphism (RFLP) of *omp2*
44 gene product. Seroprevalence by IgG iELISA was 33.33 % in 30 samples from human subjects.
45 Serological evidence of caprine brucellosis in goats and human subjects and molecular detection
46 of *Brucella melitensis* in Puducherry, India warrants regular screening, surveillance and reporting
47 of disease in goats and human risk groups.

48 **Keywords:** Caprine brucellosis, *Brucella melitensis*, *OMP31TaqMan*[®]PCR, Public health,
49 Puducherry.

50

51 **IMPORTANCE**

- 52 • Brucellosis is an important zoonotic pathogen causing abortions in domestic animals as
53 well as posing risk to livestock keepers and handlers
- 54 • Control of this disease requires proper surveillance programme, and in this study the
55 peninsular coastal region of India was sampled by a cluster method and evaluated for
56 brucellosis in goats as well as people at risk
- 57 • This study compared the diagnostic sensitivity of various serological and molecular tests
58 and found that the OMP31 gene TaqMan probe based Real Time assay to be highly
59 sensitive in diagnosing brucellosis
- 60 • Similarly, in human subjects exposed to risk factors like animal handlers, veterinarians,
61 livestock keepers the sero-positivity was 33.33% by ELISA

62

63 **INTRODUCTION**

64 Caprine brucellosis due to *Brucella melitensis* (*B. melitensis*) is an important zoonotic
65 disease. It is more prevalent in the tropical and sub-tropical regions of the world and is marked as
66 a neglected tropical disease (NTD) with significant economic impact in developing countries
67 such as India (1). The disease manifests itself in the goat populations primarily in the
68 reproductive and placental tissues leading to abortion in female goats while generalized
69 bacteraemia affecting a wide range of organ systems is also possible. The most virulent cause of
70 brucellosis in human subjects is *B. melitensis* (2,3). Human risk groups such as veterinarians,
71 farmers, laboratory personnel etc. may contract infection from goat populations and show wide

72 range of clinical symptoms affecting various organ systems of which Undulating Fever (Pyrexia
73 of Unknown Origin) is the most commonly manifested (4).

74 Although isolation by culture is the gold standard for diagnosis of brucellosis, the
75 zoonotic nature of the bacteria, long incubation conditions and need for bio-safety cabinets form
76 considerable drawbacks (5,6). Thus, various indirect (serological) and direct (molecular) tests are
77 envisaged for the screening and diagnosis of brucellosis in both goats as well as human subjects.
78 Of the indirect tests, the Rose Bengal agglutination Test (RBT), Standard tube agglutination test
79 (STAT), 2 Mercaptoethanol precipitation test (2ME) and Enzyme Linked Immune Sorbant
80 Assays (ELISA's) are used predominantly for knowing the status of brucellosis in goat
81 populations (7) as well as humans due to *B. melitensis* (2). As far as molecular screening is
82 considered, various types of polymerase chain reactions (PCR) such as simple or multiplex, real
83 time systems (SYBR[®]Green or TaqMan[®] probes) and Loop mediated isothermal Amplification
84 (LAMP) have been used which target genes either at the genus level (*bscp31*, *IS1711* or *16S*
85 *rRNA*) or species level (*omp31*, *omp2*, and genes coding for other outer membrane proteins) for
86 *B. melitensis* (7,8). For strain identification, Restriction Fragment Length Polymorphisms
87 (RLFP) of various gene products (*omp22*, *omp25*, *omp31* and *omp2*) has been used. Other
88 methods include sequencing using Multiple Locus Variable tandem Analysis (MLVA) or Multi
89 Locus Sequencing analysis (MLSA) (9).

90 Studies on brucellosis in goats in various states of India show that the seroprevalence
91 ranges from 1.14 % to 18.77 % (10,11). Also, molecular screening from the suspected field
92 samples has revealed that *B. melitensis* DNA can have an occurrence between 13.33 % and 49.05
93 % (12,13) based on nucleic acid amplification tests. Molecular typing suggests that the most
94 predominant variant of the *B. melitensis* is Biovar 3 in the country of India (12) while strain 16M

95 has also been reported (14). In at-risk human subjects, various studies on brucellosis in India
96 show the seroprevalence in the range of 1.60 % to 16.52 % (15,16).

97 Puducherry region of the Union Territory (UT) of Puducherry, India has a population of
98 27,623 goats (17). Although prior work on caprine brucellosis has been carried out in various
99 regions of India, to address the lack of a comprehensive study on caprine brucellosis due to *B.*
100 *melitensis* in Puducherry, India and its public health significance in human risk groups, the
101 present study was carried out with the following objectives: First, to report and analyse the status
102 of caprine brucellosis due to *B. melitensis* based on serological tests and nucleic acid
103 amplification techniques following scientific cluster sampling of the goat populations in
104 Puducherry and second, to know the seroprevalence of brucellosis in human risk groups of
105 Puducherry, India to ascertain the zoonotic implications of the disease.

106

107

108 **MATERIALS AND METHODS**

109 **Ethical and regulatory approval**

110 The study was approved by the Institute Research Committee at Rajiv Gandhi Institute of
111 Veterinary Education and Research (RIVER), Puducherry, India. For human sampling, ethical
112 permission and approval was obtained from Institute Ethics Committee (IEC), Indira Gandhi
113 Medical College and Research Institute (IGMC & RI), Puducherry, India, vide letter No.
114 305/IEC-30/IGMC&RI/PP/2020 dated 02.12.2020.

115 **Sampling plan**

116 For sampling of goats in the study, 12 clusters (3 farms/organized clusters and 9
117 villages/unorganized clusters) were identified randomly in various regions of Puducherry in UT
118 of Puducherry based on National Animal Disease Referral Expert System (NADRES) sampling
119 tool developed at Indian Council of Agricultural Research - National Institute of Veterinary
120 Epidemiology and Disease Informatics (ICAR-NIVEDI), Bengaluru, India. The sampling
121 regions covered all major communes and geographically variable zones (Supplement I) The
122 sampling of goats was carried out during late September to early November of the calendar year
123 2020. The average elevation of the sampling areas was 10 metres above mean sea level. The
124 climatological parameters included average high temperatures of 33.1°C, 31.5°C and 29.8°C and
125 average low temperatures of 24.9°C, 24.5°C and 23.6°C for the months of September, October
126 and November respectively. The average rainfall in millimetres (mm) was usually 132.8, 273.9
127 and 350 for the months of September, October and November respectively (18). Blood (for
128 serum) and genital swabs were collected from 10 goats randomly in each cluster (total of 120)
129 comprising both adult male and female animals above 6 months of age.

130 Thirty (30) blood samples were collected from identified willing human risk groups such
131 as veterinary interns, post graduate students and farmers (under the supervision of medical
132 professional) over 18 years of age from Puducherry, India along with pertinent details such as
133 their age, gender, history of animal handling and other co-morbidities (if any).

134 **Collection and processing of samples**

135 ***Goat blood and genital swabs***

136 From each goat, approximately 6 millilitre (ml) of blood was collected by jugular
137 venepuncture following sterile/aseptic precautions. After clot retraction, the serum obtained was
138 transferred to microfuge tubes and centrifuged at 1200 rpm (rotations per minute) for 7 minutes.

139 Genital swabs were taken from both male and female animals using sterile screw cap
140 swabs (Hi-Media™) giving a contact time of 10 to 20 seconds on the genital mucous membrane.
141 The swabs were reconstituted with 1 ml of sterile phosphate buffered saline (PBS) (pH 7.2 to
142 7.4) and vortexed for 5 minutes.

143 *Human blood samples*

144 Blood (approximately 4 ml) was collected using the standard protocol approved by the
145 Indian Council of Medical Research (ICMR) after obtaining written consent from the
146 participants.

147 All samples (blood serum or reconstituted swabs) obtained were maintained either at 4°C
148 (short term storage) or minus 20°C (long term storage) in sterile cryo-tubes until use.

149

150 **Serological tests on goat blood serum**

151 *RBT*

152 The Rose Bengal Brucella coloured antigen was procured from Institute of Animal
153 Health and Veterinary Biologicals (IAHVB), Bengaluru, India and samples were tested using
154 standard procedure described by Alton et al. (19) and accordingly graded (+++, ++, + or
155 Negative) based on the degree of agglutination.

156 **STAT**

157 The sera samples were tested as per the protocol outlined by OIE (20) with slight
158 modifications (serum was serially double diluted using carbol saline instead of normal saline)
159 using the *Brucella melitensis* killed antigen (produced in-house at ICAR-CIRG according to OIE
160 protocols). Following incubation at 37°C for 48 to 96 hours following the tubes were read either
161 as positive result based on mesh/lattice formation or negative based on pellet formation. Positive
162 and negative controls were maintained for comparison and interpretation of the results. For goat
163 serum, agglutination at 1:40 or above dilutions was taken as positive by STAT.

164 **2ME**

165 Serum samples from goats positive in STAT were subjected to 2ME test as per the
166 standard protocol (20) using killed antigen produced in-house at ICAR-CIRG. The reading of the
167 2ME test was compared with the reading of STAT for goat serum samples and accordingly
168 interpretation was done to decipher the stage of infection.

169

170

171 **IgG iELISA**

172 The procedure followed for IgG iELISA was standardized and developed at microbiology
173 laboratory of ICAR-CIRG using *B. melitensis* protoplasmic antigen (BruLISA[®] Kit) (13,21,22).
174 Absorbance was read at 450 nm (nanometres) in ELISA reader (iMark[™] Microplate Reader,
175 BioRad[®]) and the blanked values of the OD (Optical Density) were used to calculate the sample
176 to positive ratio (S/P ratio) which was then subjected to logical analysis.

177 **Molecular screening of goat genital swabs**

178 From the reconstituted swab samples, DNA was extracted by using QIAmp™ DNA Mini
179 Kit (#51304, Qiagen®, USA) by following the manufacturer's protocol. For molecular screening,
180 the extracted DNA samples were divided into 5 different super-pool sets (n=24 sample cocktail
181 DNA for each super-pool for swab DNA). Only positive super pools were divided into mini-
182 pools (n=6). If any mini-pool showed positivity, all the individual samples in that mini-pool were
183 subjected to PCR/qPCR. Positive control (PC) and No template control /negative control
184 (NC/NTC) were used at every hierarchy of the samples tested.

185 ***Conventional PCR***

186 Conventional PCR was carried out for brucella genus specific *16S rRNA* gene and *B.*
187 *melitensis* specific genes (*omp31* and *omp2*) (Table 1) by the use of standardized PCR conditions
188 (Supplement II). The PCR products thus obtained were subjected to 1.8 % submarine agarose gel
189 electrophoresis at 100 V for 40 minutes. The gel was then visualized under ultra violet
190 transilluminator (Alpha Innotech) following which the images were documented and interpreted
191 as positive or negative based on the appearance of the band or the absence of the specific product
192 band respectively.

193

194 ***OMP31 TaqMan® probe based real time PCR***

195 A TaqMan® probe based real-time PCR for the analysis of *omp31* gene (open reading
196 frame) of *B. melitensis* was developed and standardized at the microbiology laboratory of ICAR-
197 CIRG (13). The reaction was carried out in CFX96™ Real-time system (Bio-Rad®, USA) by

198 using the primer set (Forward: 5'ATG TTC GCC ACG TCC GCT ATGG 3' ; Reverse: 5'ACT
199 TGC CGC CTG CGT AAC CG 3') and probe (6-FAM-5'TCCTGTTGACACCTTCTCGTGG-
200 3'-BHQ-1) under standardized conditions (Supplement II). The Relative Fluorescence Units
201 (RFU) at the beginning and the end of the reaction mixture in concurrence with the Cq value (no.
202 of cycles wherein sample curve intersects threshold line) was obtained following which the
203 average RFU was found out. Sample average RFU of over and above 50 per cent of the average
204 RFU of positive control in the reaction set and based upon logical analysis was considered to be
205 positive whereas an average RFU over and above 100 per cent of the positive control's average
206 RFU was taken as strongly positive for the *B. melitensis* DNA in the samples tested.

207 **Analyses of battery of tests for caprine brucellosis**

208 The results of the tests *viz.* RBT, STAT, IgG iELISA, *16S rRNA* PCR, *omp31* PCR and
209 *omp 2* PCR were compared for their Sensitivity, Specificity, Diagnostic accuracy, Positive
210 predictive value (PPV) and Negative predictive value (NPV) with respect to *OMP31* TaqMan[®]
211 qPCR (23). The tests were also analyzed in pairs for their goodness of fit by using Kappa Value
212 (24) and McNemar's test (25).

213

214 **PCR - RFLP**

215 Samples positive for *omp2* gene by conventional PCR were subjected to RFLP using the
216 *Pst*I-HF restriction enzyme. The reaction mixture was incubated at 37°C for 30 minutes and
217 followed by inactivation of enzyme at 65°C for 5 minutes and then maintained at 4°C in Veriti[™]
218 96 well thermal cycler (Life Technologies, USA) until loaded into the gel. Digested *omp2* PCR
219 product and undigested *omp2* PCR product (10 µl) were added along with DNA markers.

220 Electrophoresis was then carried out at constant voltage of 80 V for 75 minutes. Then, the gel
221 was visualized under UV trans-illuminator and images were documented and interpreted
222 accordingly (12).

223 **Serological tests on human blood serum samples**

224 Blood serum samples from human subjects were tested for brucellosis using RBT, STAT
225 and IgG iELISA. While the procedure followed for RBT and STAT was similar to that of goat
226 samples; STAT agglutination at dilutions over and above 1:160 were considered positive for
227 human subjects (2). In the case of IgG iELISA, the protocol previously mentioned (21,22) was
228 used with the modification that rabbit anti-human IgG was used as secondary antibody.

229 **Statistical analysis**

230 The categorical data were expressed as percentage and the significance of differences was
231 checked by Chi-squared test (χ^2 Test) using GraphPad[®] Prism (v 5.0) software at 95 %
232 confidence interval ($\alpha = 0.05$).

233

234

235

236 **RESULTS AND DICSUSSION**

237 In total, 120 samples (set of blood and genital swab from each animal) were collected
238 from 3 organized and 9 unorganized clusters in Puducherry, India. The category wise details of
239 the samples revealed that 20 animals were males, 100 were females. Also, it was seen that 63, 54
240 and 3 animals belonged to the up to 1 year, 1 to 2 years and above 2 years age groups,

241 respectively. Thirty animals belonged to the organized group of clusters while 90 belonged to the
242 unorganized group (Table 2).

243 **Serological tests on goat blood serum**

244 The seroprevalence of brucellosis in 120 goat blood serum samples by RBT, STAT and
245 IgG iELISA was zero, 3.33 % and 18.33 %, respectively (Table 3). One of the plate systems of
246 IgG iELISA on goat serum was also shown (Fig. 1). The split up of the results of serological
247 tests in goat serum samples based on the sex of the animal/s, age group and also the major
248 clusters was accordingly tabulated previously (Table 2).

249 **All samples from goats were tested negative by RBT** which was in conflict to other
250 reports in India which have reported a seroprevalence ranging from 1.42 % to 20.83 % (10, 26-
251 29). The reasons for the negative RBT in the present study may be the following: First, the
252 coloured antigen used in the current study was a *Brucella abortus* antigen (as is the one available
253 for field testing conditions). Though cross reactions may occur due to low specificity of RBT, it
254 is possible for the test to miss out on noticeable agglutination leading to false negatives (30) by
255 virtue of the physiological properties of the goat serum (2). Second, there may be the absence of
256 sufficient titre of antibodies. To overcome this, a protocol recommended by the OIE (20) which
257 uses 25µl of the coloured antigen and 75µl of the blood serum may be explored. The present
258 study projects the need for development of standardized *B. melitensis* coloured antigen/s
259 specifically for serological diagnosis of brucellosis in small ruminants, especially goats for tests
260 such as RBT.

261 **While the seroprevalence by STAT in goats** in the present study falls in similar range
262 to a study in Jammu, India i.e. 3.42 % (31), it was below other reports from various parts of India

263 which showed seropositivity ranging from 7.96 per cent to 17.68 per cent (11,32,33). The
264 seroprevalence was higher in female animals (4.00%) which may be due to higher stocking of
265 females compared to males, as the male animals are regularly sent for slaughter (for meat). The
266 higher seroprevalence in some pregnant female animals may also be due to the presence of
267 erythritol in the female genital tracts (34). As brucellae lack fructose 6 phosphate kinase and
268 aldolase, they intend to breakdown sugars which primarily use the HMP pathway for energy
269 production such as erythritol and consequently this favours growth of the bacteria (35). More
270 animals were positive in the 1 to 2 years age group which may be due to the sampling nature of
271 the present study. Also, the STAT results in the present study showed more seroprevalence in the
272 organized group (6.67%) over the unorganized group (2.22%) which is not in line with findings
273 of Sharma et al. (31) who reported the unorganized group (3.44 per cent) to be almost similar in
274 seroprevalence to the organized group (3.33 per cent). The reason for higher seroprevalence in an
275 organized set up animals could be close proximity of the animals and also the transmission
276 dynamics and stage of infection. The source of the antigen used for the STAT may also influence
277 its result. In the present study, an in-house produced killed antigen based upon *B. melitensis* was
278 used unlike the *B. abortus* antigens used elsewhere. Also, STAT is usually done for an endemic
279 herd, where the seroprevalence is expected to be consistently high. However, in the current
280 study, only few organized herds were sampled and majority of the samples were from
281 unorganized clusters where farmers maintain few animals ($n < 10$). Also it is to be noted that
282 STAT produces some false positives due to cross reactivity with *Yersinia enterocolitica* 'O'
283 Antigen and other shared homophilic lipopolysaccharides (LPS) and heterophilic antigens
284 produced during other febrile illness (36). Thus, the STAT results of the present study point to
285 the scope of taking paired sera samples. Also in chronic diseases like brucellosis, a single most
286 test assay cannot be relied for screening and diagnosis owing to the current recommendation of

287 ‘test and slaughter’ policy, by which valuable germplasm might be lost. Hence, a combination or
288 battery of assays needs to be applied to get plausible calls for declaration of results.

289 **In total four samples were subjected to 2ME test.** One of the samples showed a
290 negative result which implied that the agglutination obtained in STAT for this sample could be
291 due to IgM antibodies indicating an acute infection prior to the class switching of the antibodies.
292 Three out of four samples showed agglutination up to the 1:10 dilutions and this could be due to
293 residual IgG. Thus, in these three samples, the disease may be in the chronic transitional phase
294 wherein both IgG and IgM were present. Thus, STAT and 2ME results in combination thus
295 provide evidence of acute infections and infections which are transitioning into the chronic
296 phase.

297 **The results of the present study showed seroprevalence by IgG iELISA** fairly higher
298 to some studies (10,32,33) and slightly lower than a study by Kaur et al. (11). Also the higher
299 seroprevalence in female animals and also in organized group of clusters could be explained by
300 the reasons aforementioned in the discussion on the results of STAT. In the current study, the
301 sampling was logically planned and executed (cluster-wise sampling), where it can be explained
302 that organized farms could have more occurrence of brucellosis due to higher density and close
303 proximity of animals. The results also points to the management practices of the organized sector
304 playing a crucial role in the disease dynamics. Also, it is known that iELISA is a highly sensitive
305 test but it is possible for cross reactions to occur with the S-LPS of other bacteria. Hence, it is
306 very important to have a consistent and standard sampling plan while targeting brucellosis by
307 iELISA. The type of iELISA as in targeting only IgG or both IgG and IgM may also influence
308 the results of iELISA. The results of IgG iELISA in the present study reflect the fact persistent
309 infection in the goat populations may be tested for brucellosis using the IgG iELISA and its use

310 as a screening test may be envisaged for caprine brucellosis which may then be confirmed by
311 using other tests such as STAT or 2ME.

312 **Molecular screening in goat genital swabs**

313 Out of the 120 samples screened, 21 samples (17.50 %), no sample and 6 samples (5.00
314 %) were positive for the genus specific *16S rRNA* gene for *Brucella* (Table 3; Fig. 2), species
315 specific *omp31* and *omp2* (Table 3; Fig. 3) genes, respectively by conventional PCR. Also, 48
316 (40.00 %) samples were positive by TaqMan[®] real time PCR for *omp31* gene of *B. melitensis*
317 (Table 3). The amplification curve of unknown super-pools in the real time system has been
318 depicted (Fig. 4). The split up of the results of molecular screening in goat genital swabs based
319 on the sex, age group and also, the major clusters were also tabulated previously (Table 2).

320 **Conventional PCR**

321 The detection of genus specific *16S rRNA* gene was in nearly similar order to an earlier
322 study conducted in Mathura, India (16.66%) which included genital swabs (37). The
323 immunological status of the animal with respect to age may be responsible for the susceptibility
324 of the animal to the brucellae. With regard to conventional PCR of the species specific *omp31*
325 and *omp2* genes, *omp31* was not detected in any of the samples but *omp2* was detected in 5.00%
326 of the samples. The reason for missing out on *omp31* may be the low copies of amplicon in the
327 sample and a lower gene base pairs target, which requires a minimum of 10 ng (nanograms) for
328 appreciation of results in EtBr stained gel. Thus for *omp31* gene of *B. melitensis*, the use of
329 nested PCR's may be explored. However, the *omp2* gene of *B. melitensis* was detected and so it
330 can be targeted for species specific detection of *B. melitensis* from field samples such as genital
331 swabs (38,39).

332 ***OMP31 TaqMan[®] qPCR***

333 A study on suspected field samples from goats in U.P., India reported the detection per cent by
334 TaqMan[®] chemistry to be 49.05 per cent (13) which was higher than the present study. Whereas,
335 a study on breeding bucks in Northern India, did not detect any positives by TaqMan[®] qPCR in
336 the preputial swab samples (40). Reasons for detection of *omp31* by real time PCR over
337 conventional PCR may be due to the fact that TaqMan[®] real time PCR is highly specific and
338 sensitive (ability to detect as low as 40 femtograms of the bacterial DNA) (13). Also, specific
339 geographical and climatic conditions which include soil pH, soil type and rainfall and humidity
340 which may influence the survival of the brucellae. Contaminated environment may also reflect
341 on real time PCR owing to its sensitivity (41). Advancing age may be a reason for increased
342 susceptibility to brucellosis. In the present study, the higher occurrence of brucellae in
343 unorganized group of clusters fits an earlier explanation of more occurrence and detection in
344 open grazing systems (42). Also, Another the fact favouring detection is that in an endemic herd
345 there is always an infection cycle maintained in the form of transmission dynamics
346 encompassing various animal, carrion eating birds' in the vicinity acting as mechanical carriers.
347 However the presence of the organism alone may not be the evidence of disease as confirmation
348 requires concurrence with clinical picture as well as a range of diagnostic techniques.

349 **Analyses of battery of tests**

350 The analyses of the various diagnostic parameters such as sensitivity, specificity, diagnostic
351 accuracy, positive predictive value (PPV) and negative predictive value (NPV) with respect to
352 *OMP31* TaqMan[®] qPCR (Table 4) and goodness of fit between various pairs of tests based on
353 Kappa value and McNemar's Test (Table 5) respectively.

354 For any epidemiological setting, one standard test may not be conclusive and so using a
355 battery of tests is recommended for diagnosis of brucellosis (19). Also, a combination of tests
356 (both direct and indirect) for confirming the disease is recommended over reliance on a single
357 test (43). Considering the above aspects, it was also suggested that evaluation of diagnostic tests
358 was required on a study-to-study basis as no universal standard is available for either direct or
359 indirect diagnosis of caprine brucellosis caused by *B. melitensis* because of a number of variables
360 in each study (43). Hence, serological tests were compared with the molecular tests in the present
361 study to show the extent of difference in their diagnostic abilities. It is not rational to compare
362 the serological with molecular, but often diagnosis is made solely on serological tests for
363 brucellosis which is misleading and cause poor decisions. Again, higher sensitivity with low
364 specificity (iELISA etc.) is reason for over-reporting of brucellosis. Consolidated results of
365 diagnostic parameters of STAT, IgG iELISA, *16S rRNA* PCR and *omp2* PCR with respect to
366 *OMP3*/TaqMan® qPCR as standard show that with respect to the serological tests, the IgG
367 iELISA was more sensitive (14.58%) compared to STAT (6.25%). However the STAT showed
368 more specificity and diagnostic accuracy compared to IgG iELISA (Table 4). This points to the
369 higher sensitivity of iELISA in detecting antibodies and that its combination with STAT for
370 diagnosis of disease may be used for obtaining fairly higher specificity notwithstanding the fact
371 that only slight agreement may be obtained in the results (Table 5). With respect to the molecular
372 tests, the *omp2* PCR showed 100% specificity and positive predictive value while the *16S rRNA*
373 PCR had higher diagnostic accuracy. This shows the fact that qPCR is more sensitive to other
374 conventional PCRs as reported earlier (13). Also, while targeting species specific genes for *B.*
375 *melitensis*, a combination of *omp2* PCR with qPCR may be explored to obtain higher specificity
376 and sensitivity. Also, the agreement among the various tests based upon the Kappa value and
377 McNemar's test has been shown which reaffirm the fact the findings stated above (Table 5).

378 PCR-RFLP

379 The suggestive results of RFLP of the *omp2* gene product revealed the strain of *B.*
380 *melitensis* in Puducherry to be Biotype/Biovar 3 which is a first of its kind report from
381 Puducherry region (Fig. 5).

382 Prior study in Mathura India, reported similar findings wherein *B. melitensis* Biovar 3 was the
383 most prevalent in India (12) and it is the most predominant of all the biovars reported otherwise
384 (44). However, it is to be noted that other workers have reported Biotype 1 strain of *B. melitensis*
385 from Bengaluru, India, based on PCR – RFLP analysis of the *omp2* gene product (14). The use
386 of PCR – RFLP for the *omp2* gene product is a fairly quick method for strain analysis on
387 suspected field samples for *B. melitensis* (12). Thus, for field isolates of *B. melitensis*, The RFLP
388 of *omp2* gene product is a reliable tool for strain identification of *B. melitensis*.

389 Serological tests on human blood serum

390 Out of 30 samples tested from human subjects, while no sample was positive by RBT or
391 STAT, 10 samples (33.33 %) were positive by IgG iELISA. The results of serological tests in
392 human subjects based on the broad groups, gender and age of the subjects have also been
393 accordingly tabulated (Table 6).

394 **The inability of the RBT to detect positivity in human subjects** in the present case
395 may be due to the targeted heterogeneous population. Lower titres of antibody in case of a
396 waning or chronic infection may not show macroscopic agglutination by a coloured antigen test
397 alone and hence require confirmation by other tests (2). The nature of the antigen used in the test
398 may also play a significant role in detecting brucellosis in human subjects. Another drawback
399 with using the RBT is its cross reactions with other S-LPS of bacteria such as *Yersinia*

400 *enterocolitica* O:9, *Escherichia coli* O:157, *Vibrio cholera*, *Salmonella* O:30 and others (2).
401 Hence the RBT in case of human subjects for the use of screening brucellosis may be used as a
402 preliminary test but it is prone to drawbacks and hence reliance on RBT alone is not
403 recommended for diagnosis of brucellosis in humans risk groups.

404 The results of the present study resembled reports on STAT in a study conducted in
405 Gujarat (45) and a study carried out earlier in Puducherry (46). On the other hand, studies in
406 Kerala and Jammu found the seroprevalence in human subjects to exhibit a range from 1.60 % to
407 9.09 % by STAT (15,16). The source of the plain antigen may be a cause for the results of the
408 STAT i.e. the present study used a *Brucella melitensis* plain antigen in contrast to *B. abortus*
409 plain antigen used elsewhere. Also, insufficient titre of antibodies in the case of chronic or
410 waning infections may result in absence of macroscopic agglutination. Another reason for the
411 inability of STAT in the present study to show positives may be because of prozone phenomenon
412 and hence pre-treating the serum with heat may be explored in certain cases (2). While cross
413 reactions have a chance of occurring in STAT even in the case of human subjects; the use of
414 STAT alone as a confirmatory diagnostic test may be contraindicated in diagnosis of human
415 brucellosis owing to its shortcomings.

416 **In the present study, seroprevalence by IgG iELISA in human subjects was 33.33**
417 **%.** In contrast, a study conducted earlier in Puducherry by Ranganathan et al. (46) did not show
418 any positives. Whereas, a study on human patients with PUO in Goa, India showed lower
419 seroprevalence of 4.96% by IgG iELISA (47). A study in Karnataka, India on 1050 human sera
420 samples from risk groups showed lower seroprevalence at 6.76% (48). Another study by Padher
421 et al. (45) in central Gujarat also showed lower seroprevalence by IgG iELISA at 12.00%. The
422 detection by IgG iELISA alone may not give a comprehensive detail of the disease in human

423 subjects until it is co-related with results of other tests, clinical signs, co-morbidities, risk factors,
424 etc. (48). Lower titres of antibodies in the case of waning infections and possibility of previous
425 exposure to the antigens may be detected by IgG iELISA. Also, in chronic cases and relapse of
426 the disease in human subjects, the use of IgG iELISA may be of value as previously described
427 (2).

428 Higher seroprevalence of brucellosis human risk groups such as veterinary students
429 reinstates the need to follow safe handling practices Serological evidence by IgG iELISA shows
430 probability of previous exposure and also provides considerable insight into circulation of the
431 bacteria among both unorganized and organized sectors. The higher seroprevalence in farmers
432 group may reflect the higher prevalence of the organism in the field conditions and hence higher
433 risk in the farming communities to whom appropriate education and hygienic handling
434 techniques need to be explained by prospective intervention studies.

435 CONCLUSION

436 The seroprevalence of caprine brucellosis in Puducherry, India by RBT, STAT and IgG
437 iELISA was zero, 3.33% and 18.33% respectively in goats. With regard to RBT, the need to
438 develop *B. melitensis* specific coloured antigens is required. The IgG iELISA may be used as a
439 screening test for caprine brucellosis in larger goat populations owing to its better sensitivity and
440 confirmation may be carried out by other tests such as STAT and 2ME. The higher
441 seroprevalence by IgG iELISA in goats indirectly suggests that large number of animals in the
442 geographical areas sampled could be continuously exposed to the pathogen. Population screening
443 also emphasises the need to evaluate the on-going control programmes in a politico-geographical
444 entity for devising better control methodologies in the future. However, for detecting the current

445 status of Brucella infection, IgM iELISA should be used. Molecular screening revealed
446 occurrence of genus specific *I6S rRNA* gene in 17.50% and species specific *omp2* gene in 5.00%
447 of the genital washings by conventional PCR. The *OMP31*TaqMan® qPCR is advocated for the
448 molecular detection of *B. melitensis* as it detected 40 % positivity (which included all samples
449 positive in conventional PCR) in the genital swab samples. The optimization and use of a battery
450 of tests is projected to be of value on knowing the status of caprine brucellosis. Also, in future,
451 steps are required to differentiate the live brucellae from dead bacilli using mRNA based PCR
452 detection methods which precisely could improve the understanding of the passive and active
453 carrier status. By this, it is possible to accurately report and adjust the brucella prevalence as
454 serological tests and other tests with higher sensitivity tend to over-report the prevalence of
455 brucellosis. In a first, the strain of *B. melitensis* in Puducherry is reported to be Biovar 3 based on
456 the suggestive result of the RFLP of the *omp2* gene product. Serological and molecular evidence
457 of caprine brucellosis establishes the need for regular screening, monitoring of movement,
458 surveillance and reporting of disease in goats. Also, vaccination in goats may be explored.
459 Human risk groups need to be screened for brucellosis on a regular basis as there is evidence of
460 seroprevalence by IgG iELISA (33.33 %) indicating indirectly the exposure to the pathogen.
461 Also, in human handlers such as farmers, intervention studies to train them on safe management
462 and handling practices need to be carried out. The present study apart from being cross-sectional,
463 serves as a base warranting and providing the scope for detailed spatial and temporal studies to
464 be carried out in future regarding caprine brucellosis and its public health significance. Knowing
465 the public health implications of brucellosis due to *B. melitensis*, the multi-sectorial “One Health
466 Approach” to frame diagnostic, control and eradication strategies needs to be explored given the
467 always evolving disease dynamics and epidemiology.

468 **Acknowledgements:** The research was carried out under a memorandum of understanding
469 between Rajiv Gandhi Institute of Veterinary Education and Research (RIVER), Puducherry,
470 India and Indian Council for Agricultural Research – Central Institute for Research on Goats
471 (ICAR – CIRG), Uttar Pradesh, India. The authors acknowledge the grants and infrastructure aid
472 provided by the participating institutions for this Master’s programme research work.

473 **Competing Interests/Conflict of Interest**

474 The authors do not have any conflict of interests.

475 **REFERENCES**

- 476 1. Rossetti CA, Arenas-Gamboa AM, Maurizio E. 2017. Caprine brucellosis: A historically
477 neglected disease with significant impact on public health. PLoS Neglected Tropical
478 Diseases 11(8):e0005692. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pntd.0005692>.
- 479 2. Corbel MJ .2006. Brucellosis in humans and animals. World Health Organization.
- 480 3. Benkirane A. 2006. Ovine and caprine brucellosis: World distribution and control/eradication
481 strategies in West Asia/North Africa region. Small Ruminant Res 62(1-2):19-25.
482 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.smallrumres.2005.07.032>.
- 483 4. Jim K. (2012). Public Health Implications of. *Brucella canis*. In: Summary Findings and
484 Recommendations of the *Brucella canis* Workgroup. Publisher: National Association of State
485 Public Health Veterinarians (NASPHV).
- 486 5. Seleem MN, Boyle SM, Sriranganathan N. 2010. Brucellosis: a re-emerging zoonosis. Vet
487 Microbiol 140(3-4):392-398. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.vetmic.2009.06.02>.

- 488 6. Yu WL, Nielsen K. 2010. Review of detection of *Brucella* spp. by polymerase chain
489 reaction. *Croat Med J* 51(4):306-313. <http://dx.doi.org/10.3325/cmj.2010.51.306>.
- 490 7. Garin-Bastuji B, Blasco JM, Marin C, Albert D. 2006. The diagnosis of brucellosis in sheep
491 and goats, old and new tools. *Small Ruminant Res* 62(1-2):63-70.
492 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.smallrumres.2005.08.004>.
- 493 8. Romero C, Gamazo C, Pardo M, Lopez-Goñi I. 1995. Specific detection of *Brucella* DNA by
494 PCR. *J Clin Microbiol* 33(3): 615-617. <https://doi.org/10.1128/jcm.33.3.615-617.1995>.
- 495 9. Gupta VK, Nayakwadi S, Kumar A, Gururaj K, Kumar A, Pawaiya RS. 2014. Markers for the
496 molecular diagnosis of brucellosis in animals. *Adv Anim Vet Sci* 2(3):31-39.
497 <http://dx.doi.org/10.14737/journal.aavs/2014/2.3s.31.39>.
- 498 10. Sharma HK, Kotwal SK, Singh DK, Malik MA, Kumar A, Katoch R, Singh M. 2016.
499 Seroprevalence studies on brucellosis in goats of Jammu region. *Indian J Small Ruminants*
500 22(2):198-201. <http://dx.doi.org/10.5958/0973-9718.2016.00056.8>.
- 501 11. Kaur N, Sharma NS, Kaur P, Sandhu Y, Kashyap N. 2019. Seroprevalence Studies on
502 Caprine Brucellosis in Punjab (India). *Int J Curr Microbiol App Sci* 8(12):851-859.
- 503 12. Gupta VK, Vohra J, Kumari R, Gururaj K, Vihan VS. 2012. Identification of *Brucella*
504 isolated from goats using Pst I site polymorphism at Omp2 gene loci. *Indian J Ani*
505 *Sci* 82(3):240. ISSN: 0367-8318.
- 506 13. Saini S, Gupta VK, Gururaj K, Singh DD, Pawaiya RVS, Gangwar NK, Goswami TK. 2017.
507 Comparative diagnostic evaluation of OMP31 gene based TaqMan® real-time PCR assay with

- 508 visual LAMP assay and indirect ELISA for caprine brucellosis. Trop Anim Health
509 Prod 49(6):1253-1264. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11250-017-1323-7>.
- 510 14. Sumathi BR, Veeregowda BM, Byregowda SM, Rathnamma D, Isloor S, Shome R,
511 Narayanaswamy HD. 2018. Isolation, identification and molecular confirmation of *Brucella*
512 *melitensis* from ovine and caprine flocks in Karnataka, India. Int J Curr Microbiol Appl
513 Sci 7(5):3224-3231. <https://doi.org/10.20546/ijcmas.2018.705.376>.
- 514 15. Kumar VA, Nanu E. 2005. Sero-positivity of brucellosis in human beings. Ind J Public
515 Health 49(1):22-24.
- 516 16. Sharma HK, Kotwal SK, Singh DK, Malik MA, Kumar A, Singh M. 2016. Seroprevalence of
517 human brucellosis in and around Jammu, India, using different serological tests. Veterinary
518 World 9(7), 742.
- 519 17. Livestock Census. 2019. Department of Animal Husbandry and Animal welfare, Government
520 of Puducherry (India). As retrieved from: <https://ahd.py.gov.in/animal-husbandry-statistics>.
- 521 18. Pondicherry (Puducherry): As retrieved from: <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Pondicherry>.
- 522 19. Alton GG, Jones LM, Angus RD, Verger JM. 1988. Techniques for the brucellosis
523 laboratory. In: Paris, Institut National de la Recherche Agronomique.
- 524 20. OIE. 2008. Caprine and Ovine Brucellosis (excluding *Brucella ovis*). Manual of diagnostic
525 tests and vaccines for terrestrial animals.
- 526 21. Collins MT. 2002. Interpretation of a commercial bovine paratuberculosis enzyme-linked
527 immunosorbent assay by using likelihood ratios. Clin Vaccine Immunol 9(6): 1367-1371.
528 <https://doi.org/10.1128/CDLI.9.6.1367-1371.2002>.

- 529 22. Gupta, VK, Verma DK, Singh SV, Vihan VS. 2007. Serological diagnostic potential of
530 recombinant outer membrane protein (Omp31) from *Brucella melitensis* in goat and sheep
531 brucellosis. Small Ruminant Res 70(2-3):260-266.
532 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.smallrumres.2006.01.012>.
- 533 23. Thrusfield M. 2007. Diagnostic Testing. In: Veterinary Epidemiology 3rd Edition Blackwell
534 Publishing company, London, pp 313-316.
- 535 24. Graphpad Kappa Interrater Agreement: As retrieved from:
536 <https://www.graphpad.com/quickcalcs/kappa1/>.
- 537 25. Graphpad McNemar's Test: As retrieved from:
538 <https://www.graphpad.com/quickcalcs/mcNemar1/>.
- 539 26. Suryawanshi SN, Tembhurne PA, Gohain S, Ingle VC. 2016. Prevalence of *Brucella*
540 antibodies in sheep and goats in Maharashtra. Indian Res J Ext Edu 14(4):75-77.
- 541 27. Chandrashekar KM, Pasha S, Sharada R, Kumar GN, Dodamani S, Shivakumar MC. 2018.
542 Seroprevalence of brucellosis in small ruminants in and around Hassan, Karnataka, India. Vet
543 Pract 19(1):101-104.
- 544 28. Sai P, Shakya S, Chandrakar C, Ali SL. 2018. Sero-prevalence of Brucellosis in Small
545 Ruminants and Human in Chhattisgarh. J Anim Res 8(3):531-535.
546 <http://dx.doi.org/10.30954/2277-940X.06.2018.32>.
- 547 29. Saikia GK, Konch P, Boro A, Shome R, Rahman H, Das SK. 2019. Seroprevalence of
548 caprine brucellosis in organised farms of Assam, India. J Entomol Zool Stud 7(1):21-25.E-ISSN:
549 2320-7078.

- 550 30. Gupta VK, Kumari R, Vohra J, Singh SV, Vihan VS. 2010. Comparative evaluation of
551 recombinant BP26 protein for serological diagnosis of *Brucella melitensis* infection in
552 goats. *Small Ruminant Res* 93(2-3):119-125. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.smallrumres.2010.05.009>.
- 553 31. Sharma V, Sharma HK, Ganguly S, Berian S, Malik MA. 2017. Seroprevalence studies of
554 brucellosis among goats using different serological tests. *J Entom Zool Stud* 5(2):1512-1516. E-
555 ISSN: 2320-7078.
- 556 32. Sadhu DB, Panchasara HH, Chauhan HC, Sutariya DR, Parmar VL, Prajapati HB. 2015.
557 Seroprevalence and comparison of different serological tests for brucellosis detection in small
558 ruminants. *Vet World* 8(5):561-566. <https://doi.org/10.14202/vetworld.2015.561-566>.
- 559 33. Saxena N, Singh BB, Gill JPS, Aulakh RS. 2017. A Serological Study on Incidence of
560 Brucellosis in Sheep in Ludhiana District of Punjab State of India. *Int J Curr Microbiol App*
561 *Sci* 6(9):3066-3072. <https://doi.org/10.20546/ijcmas.2017.609.377>.
- 562 34. Colmenero JD, Munoz-Roca NL, Bermudez P, Plata A, Villalobos A, Reguera JM. 2007.
563 Clinical findings, diagnostic approach, and outcome of *Brucella melitensis* epididymo-
564 orchitis. *Diagn Micr Infec Dis* 57(4):367-372.
565 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.diagmicrobio.2006.09.008>.
- 566 35. Sperry JF, Robertson DC. 1975. Erythritol catabolism by *Brucella abortus*. *J Bacteriology*
567 121(2):619-630. <https://doi.org/10.1128/jb.121.2.619-630.1975>.
- 568 36. Saxena N, Singh BB, Saxena HM. 2018. Brucellosis in sheep and goats and its serodiagnosis
569 and epidemiology. *Int J Curr Microbiol Appl Sci* 7(1):1848-1877.
570 <https://doi.org/10.20546/ijcmas.2018.701.225>.

- 571 37. Singh A, Gupta VK, Kumar A, Singh VK, Nayakwadi S. 2013. 16S rRNA and omp31 gene
572 based molecular characterization of field strains of *B. melitensis* from aborted foetus of goats in
573 India. *Sci World J.* <https://doi.org/10.1155/2013/160376>.
- 574 38. Bricker BJ. 2002. PCR as a diagnostic tool for brucellosis. *Vet Microbiol* 90(1-4):435-446.
575 [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0378-1135\(02\)00228-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0378-1135(02)00228-6) .
- 576 39. Kumar V, Bansal N, Nanda T, Kumar A, Kumari R, Maan S. 2019. PCR based molecular
577 diagnostic assays for brucellosis: a review. *Int J Curr Microbiol App Sci* 8(2):2666-2681.
578 <https://doi.org/10.20546/ijcmas.2019.802.312>.
- 579 40. Gangwar C, Kumaresan G, Mishra AK, Kumar A, Pachoori A, Saraswat S, Kharche SD.
580 2020. Molecular detection of important abortion-causing microorganisms in preputial swab of
581 breeding bucks using PCR-based assays. *Reprod Domest Anim* 55(11):1520-1525. [https://doi.](https://doi.org/10.1111/rda.13801)
582 [org/10.1111/rda.13801](https://doi.org/10.1111/rda.13801).
- 583 41. Roest HJ, Van Gelderen B, Dinkla A, Frangoulidis D, Van Zijderveld F, Rebel J, Van Keulen
584 L. 2012. Q fever in pregnant goats: pathogenesis and excretion of *Coxiella burnetii*. *PloS*
585 *One* 7(11):e48949. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0048949>.
- 586 42. McDermott JJ, Arimi SM. 2002. Brucellosis in sub-Saharan Africa: epidemiology, control
587 and impact. *Vet Microbiol* 90(1-4):111-134. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0378-1135\(02\)00249-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0378-1135(02)00249-3).
- 588 43. Gupta VK, Shivasharanappa N, Kumar V, Kumar A. 2014. Diagnostic evaluation of
589 serological assays and different gene based PCR for detection of *Brucella melitensis* in
590 goat. *Small Ruminant Res* 117(1):94-102. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.smallrumres.2013.11.022>.

- 591 44. Rao SB, Gupta VK, Kumar M, Hegde NR, Splitter GA, Reddanna P, Radhakrishnan GK.
592 2014. Draft genome sequence of the field isolate *Brucella melitensis* strain Bm IND1 from India.
593 *Genome announcements* 2(3):e00497-14. <https://doi.org/10.1128/genomeA.00497-14>.
- 594 45. Padher R R, Nayak JB, Brahmabhatt MN, Patel SM, Chaudhary JH. 2018. Seroprevalence of
595 *Brucella melitensis* Among Small Ruminants and Humans in Anand Region of Central Gujarat,
596 India. *Int J Curr Microbiol App Sci* 7(3):3522-3530.
597 <https://doi.org/10.20546/ijcmas.2018.703.405>.
- 598 46. Ranganathan U, Bhaskar MM, Narasimha HB. 2019. Low incidence and the prevalence of
599 brucellosis among patients with pyrexia of unknown origin based on real-time polymerase chain
600 reaction, enzyme-linked immunosorbent assay and standard agglutination test results in
601 Puducherry, South India. *J Acad Clin Microbiol* 21(2):100.
602 https://doi.org/10.4103/jacm.jacm_15_19.
- 603 47. Pathak AD, Dubal ZB, Doijad S, Raorane A, Rodrigues S, Naik R, Barbuddhe SB. 2014.
604 Human brucellosis among pyrexia of unknown origin cases and occupationally exposed
605 individuals in Goa Region, India. *Emerg Health Threats J* 7(1):23846.
606 <https://doi.org/10.3402/ehth.v7.23846>.
- 607 48. Shome R, Kalleshmurthy T, Shankaranarayana PB, Giribattanvar P, Chandrashekar N,
608 Mohandoss N, Rahman H. 2017. Prevalence and risk factors of brucellosis among veterinary
609 health care professionals. *Pathog Glob Health* 111(5): 234-239.
610 <https://doi.org/10.1080/20477724.2017.1345366>.

611 **FIGURES**

612 **FIG 1** Plate depicting IgG iELISA in goat blood serum: (+) Positive samples, pc (Positive
613 Control), nc (Negative Control), sc (Substrate control) and Blank

614 **FIG 2** Gel picture of conventional PCR for *16S rRNA* for genus *Brucella* (Lane 1 – 100 bp
615 DNA marker; Lanes 2, 3, 4, 7, 8, 10, 11, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18 – Negative samples; Lanes 5, 6, 9,
616 12 – Positive Samples; Lane 19 – Positive control; Lane 20 - Negative control)

617 **FIG 3** Gel picture of the amplification of *B. melitensis omp2* gene by conventional PCR (Lane
618 1- 100bp DNA ladder; Lane 2, 4 – Negative samples; Lane 3 – Unknown sample (Positive);
619 Lane 5 – Positive control - *B. melitensis* Biovar 3 ‘Ind’ strain; Lane 6 – Negative control)

620 **FIG 4** Cq amplification plot of *Brucella melitensis OMP31* TaqMan[®] Probe real-time PCR for
621 unknown superpools (5) along with positive and negative controls

622 **FIG 5** Gel picture showing PCR-RFLP of *omp2* gene of *Brucella melitensis*. Lane 1- 100bp
623 DNA ladder; 2,4 & 6 –*Pst*I digested *omp2* product (238bp and 44bp fragments) suggestive of *B.*
624 *melitensis* Biovar 3; 3, 5 & 7- Undigested *omp2* gene amplicon (282bp) of *Brucella melitensis*

625

626

627

628

629

630

631

632 **TABLE 1** List of genes targeted by conventional PCR for *Brucella*

Target gene	Primer	Primer sequence (5'→ 3')	Product size (base)	Reference
-------------	--------	-----------------------------	------------------------	-----------

			pairs)	
<i>16S rRNA</i> (<i>Brucella</i> genus)	F	TCG AGCGCC CGC AAG GGG	905	Romero et al. ()
	R	AAC CAT AGT GTC TCC ACT AA		
<i>omp31</i> (<i>B. melitensis</i>)	F	ATG TTC GCC ACG TCC GCT ATGG	121	Saini et al. (12)
	R	ACT TGC CGC CTG CGT AAC CG		
<i>omp2</i> (<i>B. melitensis</i>)	F	TGG AGG TCA GAA ATG AAC	282	Gupta et al. (8)
	R	GAG TGC GAA ACG AGC GC		

633

634

635

636

637

638

639

640 **TABLE 2** Tabulation of category wise results of battery of tests for Caprine Brucellosis (RBT, STAT, IgG iELISA, *16S rRNA*
 641 **PCR, omp31 PCR, omp 2 PCR and OMP31 TaqMan® qPCR)** and their per cent positivity in various clusters of Puducherry

Category	T	RBT		STAT		IgG iELISA		Conventional PCR						OMP31TaqMan® qPCR	
		P	%	P	%	P	%	<i>16S rRNA</i>		<i>omp31</i>		<i>omp2</i>		P	%
<i>Sex wise</i>															
Male	20	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	5.00	3	15.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	8	40.00
Female	100	0	0.00	4	4.00	21	21.00	18	18.00	0	0.00	6	6.00	40	40.00
χ^2 Test		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA		2.963 ^{NS} (<i>p</i> =0.0851)	
<i>Age group wise</i>															
Up to 1 yr.	63	0	0.00	1	1.59	11	17.46	11	17.46	0	0.00	4	6.35	20	31.75
1 to 2 years	54	0	0.00	3	5.56	11	20.37	8	14.81	0	0.00	2	3.70	26	48.15
Above 2 yrs.	3	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	2	66.67	0	0.00	0	0.00	2	66.67
χ^2 Test		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA	
<i>Major Clusters wise</i>															
Organized	30	0	0.00	2	6.67	8	26.67	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	3	10.00
Unorganized	90	0	0.00	2	2.22	14	15.56	21	23.33	0	0.00	6	6.67	45	50.00
χ^2 Test		NA		NA		1.855 ^{NS} (<i>p</i> =0.1731)		NA		NA		NA		NA	

642 T – No. tested

P – No. positive

% - Per cent positive

NA – Not applicable

NS – Not significant

643

644

645

646

647 **TABLE 3** Tabulation of results of battery of tests for Caprine Brucellosis (RBT, STAT, IgG iELISA, *16S rRNA* PCR, *omp31*
 648 PCR, *omp 2* PCR and *OMP31* TaqMan® qPCR) and their per cent positivity in various clusters of Puducherry

Cluster (Cluster code)	T	RBT		STAT		IgG iELISA		Conventional PCR						<i>OMP31</i> TaqMan® qPCR	
		P	%	P	%	P	%	<i>16S rRNA</i>		<i>omp31</i>		<i>omp2</i>		P	%
Cluster 1 (BF)	10	0	0.00	1	10.00	1	10.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	3	30.00
Cluster 2 (AK)	10	0	0.00	1	10.00	6	60.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00
Cluster 3 (CF)	10	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	10.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00
Cluster 4 (KK)	10	0	0.00	0	0.00	2	20.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00
Cluster 5 (BG)	10	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	10.00	4	40.00	0	0.00	2	20.00	10	100.00
Cluster 6 (ST)	10	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00
Cluster 7 (S)	10	0	0.00	1	10.00	2	20.00	4	40.00	0	0.00	4	40.00	9	90.00
Cluster 8 (KL)	10	0	0.00	1	10.00	2	20.00	6	60.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	10	100.00
Cluster 9 (MD)	10	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	10.00	3	30.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	8	80.00
Cluster 10 (MG)	10	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	10.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00
Cluster 11 (V)	10	0	0.00	0	0.00	3	30.00	4	40.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	8	80.00
Cluster 12 (TT)	10	0	0.00	0	0.00	2	20.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00
Total	120	0	0.00	4	3.33	22	18.33	21	17.50	0	0.00	6	5.00	48	40.00

649 **T – No. tested P – No. positive % - Per cent positive**

650

651

652

653

654

655 **TABLE 4 Consolidated results of diagnostic parameters of STAT, IgG iELISA, 16S rRNA**
 656 **PCR and omp2 PCR with respect to OMP31TaqMan® qPCR as standard**

Test	Sensitivity (%)	Specificity (%)	PPV (%)	NPV (%)	Diagnostic Accuracy (%)
STAT	6.25	98.61	75.00	61.21	61.67
IgG iELISA	14.58	79.17	31.82	58.16	53.00
16S rRNA PCR	41.67	98.61	95.24	71.72	75.83
omp2 PCR	12.50	100	100	63.18	65.00

657 PPV – Positive Predictive Value NPV – Negative Predictive Value

658

659

660

661

662 **TABLE 5 Comparison of agreement of diagnostic tests for caprine brucellosis based upon**
 663 **Kappa value (for agreement) and McNemar’s test (for p value)**

Diagnostic tests compared	Kappa value	95 % Confidence Interval	p value	Strength of agreement
STAT vs OMP31 TaqMan® qPCR	0.057	-0.029 to 0.144	0.0001	Slight agreement
IgG iELISA vs OMP31 TaqMan® qPCR	-0.069	-0.219 to 0.082	0.0008	No agreement
16S rRNA PCR vs OMP31TaqMan® qPCR	0.444	0.294 to 0.594	0.0001	Moderate agreement
omp2 PCR vs OMP31 TaqMan® qPCR	0.146	0.038 to 0.255	0.0001	Slight agreement
STAT vs PCR (omp2)	0.167	-0.173 to 0.506	0.7237	Slight agreement
IgG iELISA vs PCR (omp2)	-0.008	-0.143 to 0.128	0.0033	No agreement
16S rRNA PCR vs PCR (omp2)	0.398	0.170 to 0.625	0.0003	Fair agreement
STAT vs IgG iELISA	0.022	-0.115 to 0.158	0.0005	Slight agreement
STAT vs 16S rRNA PCR	0.110	-0.128 to 0.258	0.0005	Slight agreement
IgG iELISA vs 16S rRNA PCR	0.065	-0.128 to 0.158	1.000	Slight agreement

664 **Kappa value** (< 0: No agreement; 0.00 and 0.20: Slight; 0.21 and 0.40: Fair; 0.41 and 0.60: Moderate;
 665 0.61 and 0.80: Substantial; 0.81 and 1.00: Almost perfect)

666

667

668

669 **TABLE 6 Tabulation of the results of serological tests on human subjects for brucellosis**
 670 **in Puducherry**

Category of human subjects	T	RBT		STAT		IgG iELISA	
		P	%	P	%	P	%
Group wise							
Interns/Post Graduate students	15	0	0.00	0	0.00	3	20.00
Farmers	15	0	0.00	0	0.00	7	46.67
Gender wise							
Male	18	0	0.00	0	0.00	5	27.78
Female	12	0	0.00	0	0.00	5	41.67
Age wise							
Up to 25 years	12	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	8.33
25 to 50 years	17	0	0.00	0	0.00	8	47.06
Above 50 years	1	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	100
Total	30	0	0.00	0	0.00	10	33.33

671

T-Number tested

P-Number positive

672

673

674

675




FIG 1 Plate depicting IgG iELISA in goat blood serum: (+) Positive samples, pc (Positive Control), nc (Negative Control), sc (Substrate control) and Blank




FIG 2 Gel picture of conventional PCR for *16S rRNA* for genus *Brucella* (Lane 1 – 100 bp DNA marker; Lanes 2, 3, 4, 7, 8, 10, 11, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18 – Negative samples; Lanes 5, 6, 9, 12 – Positive Samples; Lane 19 – Positive control; Lane 20 - Negative control)




FIG 3 Gel picture of the amplification of *B. melitensis omp2* gene by conventional PCR (Lane 1- 100bp DNA ladder; Lane 2, 4 – Negative samples; Lane 3 – Unknown sample (Positive); Lane 5 – Positive control - *B. melitensis* Biovar 3 ‘Ind’ strain; Lane 6 – Negative control)




FIG 4 Cq amplification plot of *Brucella melitensis* OMP31 TaqMan[®] Probe real-time PCR for unknown superpools (5) along with positive and negative controls




FIG 5 Gel picture showing PCR-RFLP of *omp2* gene of *Brucella melitensis*. Lane 1- 100bp DNA ladder; 2,4 & 6 –*Pst*I digested *omp2* product (238bp and 44bp fragments) suggestive of *B. melitensis* Biovar 3; 3, 5 & 7- Undigested *omp2* gene amplicon (282bp) of *Brucella melitensis*