

1 **Seroprevalence of Human *Brucella* Antibodies and associated Among Patients Seeking**
2 **Medical Attention at Community Hospitals in Selected Districts of Western Province in**
3 **Zambia**

4 Armand Mayindu Mambote¹, John Bwalya Muma¹, Mary Mubiana¹, Steward Mudenda², Victor
5 Daka³, Melai Mubanga⁴, Flavien Nsoni Bumbangi⁵, Chanda Chitalu⁶, Ruth Lindizyani Mfunne^{3*}
6

7 ¹Department of Disease Control, School of Veterinary Medicine, University of Zambia, Lusaka,
8 Zambia.

9 ²Department of Public Health School of Medicine, The University of Zambia, Lusaka, Zambia.

10 ³Department of Public Health, School of Medicine, The Copperbelt University, Ndola, Zambia

11 ⁴Department of Environmental Health, School of Medicine, Eden University, Lusaka, Zambia.

12 ⁵Department of Medicine and Clinical Sciences, School of Medicine, Eden University, Lusaka,
13 Zambia.

14 ⁶Ministry of Health, Ndeke House, Lusaka, Zambia
15

16 * Corresponding author

17 E-mail: lindizyani@gmail.com
18

19 **ABSTRACT**

20 **Introduction:** Brucellosis is a neglected zoonotic disease that affects humans and animals and can
21 lead to severe illness in humans and financial losses for households that rear livestock. The study
22 aimed to investigate the seroprevalence of human *Brucella* antibodies and associated risk factors
23 among patients seeking medical attention at community hospitals.

24 **Methods:** A cross-sectional seroepidemiological study was conducted from 21st April 2021 to 21st
25 April 2024 among patients seeking medical attention at community hospitals in selected districts
26 of Western province in Zambia. 225 blood samples were collected from consenting participants.
27 Sera were separated and analysed for anti-*Brucella* antibodies using the Rose Bengal Test (RBT)
28 and Competitive enzyme-linked immunosorbent assay (c-ELISA) in parallel. A questionnaire was
29 administered to obtain epidemiological data related to exposure to the *Brucella* pathogen. The data
30 obtained were coded and entered in the Micro-Soft Excel 2013® and analysed using STATA
31 version 15®.

32 **Results:** 197 sera samples were found acceptable for testing and analysis for this study, out of
33 these, the seroprevalence of *Brucella* antibodies was 18.3% (n=36, 95% CI=0.13-0.24) and 4.57%
34 (n=9, 95% CI=-0.68-0.28) on RBT and c-ELISA respectively. Among the risk factors considered,
35 the number of animals was statistically significantly associated with *Brucella* seropositivity (OR
36 6.49, 95% CI=1.10-38.13, p-value = 0.039).

37 **Conclusions:** *Brucella* antibodies are prevalent among patients attending health facilities in the
38 Western province of Zambia. The number of animals were significantly associated with the
39 *Brucella* seropositivity.

40 **Keywords:** *Brucella* antibodies, Human brucellosis, Risk factors, seroprevalence, Western
41 Province, Zambia

42

43 Introduction

44 *Brucellosis* is an infectious zoonotic disease commonly known as "undulant fever",
45 "Mediterranean fever", "gastric remittent fever", or "Malta fever" in humans ^{1,2,3,4}. The disease
46 affects humans, wild animals and domestic livestock ⁵. Of the 12 currently known *Brucella* species,
47 only *B. melitensis*, *B. abortus*, *B. suis*, and, on rare occasions, *B. canis* are responsible for human
48 infections². Humans can become infected by consuming unpasteurised dairy products or through
49 direct contact with secretions from infected animals⁶. High-risk occupational groups that are
50 mostly affected include veterinarians, laboratory workers, abattoir workers, slaughterhouse
51 workers, livestock caretakers, and farmers ⁷. Symptoms include fever, headaches, physical
52 weakness, sweats, and back pain⁵². Humans are incapacitated by the condition, which causes
53 significant debility and a loss of active workdays ⁹. The main clinical signs in cattle include
54 abortion, reproductive failure and decreased milk production and 10% of infertility in animals is
55 attributed to *brucellosis*¹⁰. Abortion-related brucellosis is estimated to be between 30% and 80%
56 in dairy herds under traditional management ¹¹. The economic losses caused by these problems are
57 enormous for farmers and at the national level in countries where the disease is endemic ^{12,13}.

58 *Brucellosis* is among the top seven neglected zoonotic diseases⁵ that continues to have a significant
59 impact globally^{14,15}. The World Health Organization (WHO) reports that more than 500,000 new
60 human cases are reported every year globally ⁵. *Brucellosis* is a significant public health issue
61 identified as an occupational disease¹⁶. Studies on human *brucellosis* have reported varying

62 seroprevalences in Egypt 31.3%¹⁷; Nigeria 24.1%¹⁸; Cameroon 5.6%¹⁹; Kenya 5.7% and 31.8%
63 ²⁰; Uganda 17%²¹ and Tanzania 1.41%²². Due to diverse clinical presentation diverse clinical
64 presentation but on the inadequate diagnostic tools for *Brucella* in most primary healthcare
65 facilities and also considering that Brucellosis is not part of the routine check in the PHC facilities.,
66 only 50% to 60% of cases are detected and recorded^{23,4}.

67 In Zambia, brucellosis is endemic among traditional cattle keepers in the Southern and Western
68 provinces of Zambia, where the practice of raw milk consumption is high²⁴. Brucellosis studies
69 have focused more on animals than humans^{24,25,26}. A few studies of human brucellosis have
70 estimated seroprevalences of 5.0%^{23,27} on occupationally exposed individuals (farmers, abattoir
71 workers). However, studies are scarce on clinical cases in hospitals where patients seek routine
72 health services²⁷. Furthermore, laboratory testing for human *brucellosis* is not routinely done in
73 hospitals.

74 Therefore, this study aimed to fill the existing knowledge gap by determining the seroprevalence
75 of human *Brucella* antibodies and associated risk factors among patients seeking medical attention
76 at community hospitals in selected districts of Western province in Zambia.

77

78 **Materials and methods**

79 **Study area and design**

80 A cross-sectional study was conducted from 21st April 2021 to 21st April 2024 among patients
81 seeking medical attention at community hospitals and health facilities in Senanga, Limulunga and
82 Mongu districts of Western Province in Zambia. The province was purposively selected because
83 it is one of the major livestock-producing provinces where brucellosis has been reported²⁴. The
84 three districts were selected because they are home to the central plain where farmers take cattle
85 for grazing. Blood samples were collected from symptomatic patients who visited the health
86 facilities following their consent. A questionnaire was administered to the participants to collect
87 epidemiological information.

88

89 **Sample size and Sampling strategy**

90 The sample size was estimated using the Ausvetepitool software (<http://epitools.ausvet.com.au/>)
91 assuming an expected prevalence of 20%³¹, a desired absolute precision of 5% and a confidence
92 level of 95%. A minimum sample size of 225 participants was therefore required. The sample size
93 was distributed in the three districts according to the weight index (human population) for each
94 district (Table 1).

95 **Table 1: Sample size of humans weighted per district**

District	Weighting index (Human Population)	Number of person to be sampled
Mongu	197816	120
Senanga	12040	68
Mongu	61102	37
All areas	370958	225

96

97 These individuals were grouped into categories depending on their level of daily activities that
98 could lead to direct contact with suspected *Brucella*-infected animals or the use of infected animal
99 products. Three health facilities were selected in Senanga District namely Ngundi, Sikumbi and
100 Lui Wanya Health Centres, while two were included from Mongu (Lealui Mini Hospital and Sefula
101 Rural Health Centre) and Limulunga Districts (Limulunga Mini Hospital and Ikwichi Rural
102 Health Centre) respectively. Sampling was stratified according to districts weighted using the
103 human population as proxy weighting value for the persons to be sampled.

104

105 **Inclusion criteria**

106 Patients in the selected hospitals during the study period who presented any of the following signs
107 and symptoms: intermittent or persistent fever, headache, weakness, profuse sweating, chills,
108 arthralgia, weight loss and joint pain fever, with a negative result for malaria were included in the
109 study.

110 **Exclusion criteria**

111 Patients with associated confirmed disease diagnoses other than Brucellosis were excluded from
112 the study.

113 **Sampling and Sample Collection**

114 Epidemiological data was collected from consenting participants using a structured questionnaire
115 which was adopted from a similar study by Mubanga et al 2021. The questionnaire consisted of
116 four parts: (i) sociodemographic characteristics of the study participants; (ii) types of slaughtering
117 activities; (iii) work hygiene-related factors (i.e., wearing personal protective equipment, contact
118 with blood or faeces, and presence of skin wound); and (iv) other potential risk factors (cattle
119 breeding, and consumption of raw beef, by-products and milk). The questionnaire was pretested
120 in three similar districts before the commencement of the study and minor corrections were made
121 accordingly. From each participant, four (4) ml of blood was collected by a clinical officer and
122 stored in sterile plain tubes at +4 °C for 24-48 hours. The serum samples were separated using a
123 portable field centrifuge (TOMy Digital MX-300, Japan) and stored in labelled cryovial tubes at
124 -20 °C until transportation to the University of Zambia, School of Veterinary Medicine for
125 laboratory analysis.

126 **Laboratory analysis**

127 Serum samples were screened for *Brucella* antibodies using the Rose Bengal Test (RBT, ID.Vet,
128 innovative Diagnostics, France) followed by a confirmation on c-ELISA (SVANOVIR^R *Brucella*
129 -Ab c-ELISA, Boehringer Ingelheim Svanova, Sweden) according to the manufacturer's
130 guidelines and reagent kit manual. A sample was considered positive if any visible sign of
131 agglutination was observed.

132

133 **Data analysis**

134 The epidemiological data obtained was coded and entered in Microsoft Excel 2016®, cleaned,
135 exported and analysed using STATA version 17 (Stata Corp., College Station, TX, USA) for
136 Windows. Categorical data were expressed in percentage, and seroprevalence was calculated by
137 dividing the number of positive sera samples by the total samples examined. The odds ratio, 95%
138 confidence interval, and Fisher's exact tests were computed to see the degree of association of the
139 risk factors with *Brucella* seropositivity. Using the cut-off of P.I. ≥ 30% and P.I. ≥ 50% for c-ELISA

140 respectively, the independent effects of categorical risk factors on anti-*Brucella* spp. Seropositivity
141 was assessed using Fisher's exact test. Variables with a p -value ≤ 0.25 from the univariable analysis
142 were selected and included in the multivariable logistic model. The multivariable model was built
143 using a backward selection strategy, using a p -value of <0.05 of the likelihood ratio test as
144 inclusion criteria. The model fit was assessed using the Hosmer Lemeshow test, *lroc* and *lsens*
145 procedures in Stata for logistic models.

146

147 Results

148 Socio-demographic characteristics of study participants

149 The study had more female 110 (55.8%) than male 87 (44.2%) participants. The mean age of the
150 participants was 36 years, ranging from 10 to 81 years. More than half, 107 (54.31%) of the
151 participants were married. Most participants, 109 (55.33%) had achieved a primary level of
152 education, and 107 (54.31%) were married. Most participants, 134 (68.02%), were unemployed.
153 Senanga District had more participants, 93 (48.23), than Mongu and Limulunga districts (Table
154 2).

155 **Table 2: Socio-demographic variables of study participants**

Variables	Categories	N = 197	Per cent	95% CI	P-value
Gender	Male	110	55.84	0.20-2.50	0.592
	Female	87	44.16	0.37-0.51	
Age	10-20	49	24.97	0.28-1.47	0.811
	21-35	52	26.40	1.19-1.46	
	36-60	79	40.10	0.11-0.05	
	>60	17	8.63	0.15-0.10	
Level of education	None	15	7.61	0.33-2.37	0.924
	Primary	109	55.33	0.13-0.11	
	Secondary	62	33.50	0.13-0.12	
	Tertiary	7	3.55	0.27-0.14	
Marital status	Single	73	37.06	0.64-4.20	0.627
	Married	107	54.31	0.04-0.09	
	Divorced	9	4.57	0.20-0.11	
	Widowed	8	4.06	0.08-0.25	
Occupation	Abattoir worker	1	0.51	0.49-2.45	0.225
	Health worker	3	1.52	0.56-0.85	
	Livestock farmer	25	12.69	0.13-0.05	

	Student	26	13.19	0.04-0.20	
	Other	8	4.06	0.25-0.10	
	Unemployed	134	68.02	0.53-0.38	
District	Mongu	66	33.50	0.08-0.06	0.975
	Limulunga	36	18.27	0.10-0.84	
	Senanga	93	48.23	0.12-0.78	

156

157

158 **Seroprevalence of human *Brucella* antibodies**

159 From the 197 sera samples that were acceptable for testing and analysis, the estimated
 160 seroprevalence of *Brucella* antibodies among the patients attending the community hospitals in
 161 Western Province was 18.3% (n=36, 95% CI=0.13-0.24) on RBT and 4.57% (n=9, 95% CI=
 162 0.6814-0.2807) on c-ELISA (p=0.412). The seroprevalence was higher in Senanga and Mongu
 163 (2.54%) than Limulunga district (Table 3).

164 **Table 3: Distribution of *Brucella* antibody seropositivity per study district**

DISTRICT	Number tested	RBT	C-ELISA
		Seropositive participants (%)	Seropositive participants (%)
Mongu	66	10 (5.08)	4 (2.03)
Senanga	93	19 (9.64)	4 (2.03)
Limulunga	38	7 (3.55)	1 (0.51)
Total	197	36 (18.27%)	9 (4.57%)

165

166 **Knowledge and attitudes of participants regarding Brucellosis**

167 Most of the participants 114 (57.87%) had obtained their information on brucellosis from
 168 veterinary officers, while only a few, 13 (6.60%), were aware that brucellosis can affect humans.
 169 Most participants, 132 (67.01%), were ignorant about the mode of transmission to humans while
 170 only 16 (8.12%) stated the symptoms of brucellosis as shown in Table 4.

171 **Table 4: Knowledge and attitude of participants about Brucellosis**

Variables	Categories	N =197	Per cent	95% C.I	P-value
Information about Brucellosis	Yes	114	57.87	0.09-0.47	0.8
	No	83	42.13	0.08-5.03	

Source of information N=114	Veterinary officer	53	46.49	0.98-5.67	0.734
	Neighbour	12	10.53	0.76-2.56	
	Health worker	39	34.21	0.59-1.81	
	Media	4	3.50	0.08-3.46	
	Patients with Brucellosis	6	5.26	0.34-7.23	
Can humans be affected?	Yes	13	6.60	0.54-6.86	0.663
	No	67	34.01	0.87-4.89	
	I do not know	117	59.39	0.47-4.11	
Mode of transmission	I do not know	132	67.01	0.58-8.14	0.167
	Contact with an infected animal	25	12.69	0.87-9.76	
	Eating undercooked meat and drinking raw milk	40	20.3	0.91-1.84	
Symptoms of Brucellosis	Yes	16	8.12	0.61-2.38	0.004
	No	181	91.88	0.62-3.24	

172

173 **Hygienic and protection practices of study participants regarding** 174 **Brucellosis**

175 A high proportion of the participants drank raw milk 27 (13.71%) and consumed undercooked
176 meat 170 (86.29%). Most participants kept animals 114 (57.87%), and among these about 40
177 (48.19%) had more than ten animals, while 17 (20.48%) had their animals vaccinated against
178 brucellosis (Table 5).

179 **Table 5: Hygienic and vaccination characteristics of study participants about Brucellosis**

Variables	Categories	N (197)	Per cent	95% C.I	P-value
Drinking raw milk and eating undercooked meat	No	27	13.71	0.57-5.84	0.647
	Yes	170	86.29	0.46-4.65	
Keeping animal	No	114	57.87	33.99-39.16	0.818
	Yes	83	42.13	0.68-6.87	
Type of animal owned (N=83)	Only goat	14	16.87	0.76-9.75	0.308
	Only sheep	19	22.89	0.25-0.456	
	Only pigs	8	9.64	9.87-24.45	
	Cattle	25	30.12	1.92-27.82	
	Dogs	9	10.84	2.92-26.75	
	Other	8	9.64	8.89-28.76	

Number of animals (N=83)	One animal	5	6.02	8.96-22.37	0.049
	1-10 animals	38	45.79	3.14-42.17	
	>10 animals	40	48.19	4.67-15.67	
Vaccinated animal (N=83)	Yes	17	20.48	7.896-21.76	0.421
	No	66	79.52	5.87-19.65	

180

181

182 **Clinical signs and symptoms of the study participants**

183 The main reason for seeking medical attention by most participants was fever 161 (81.72%) with
 184 a p-value of 0.004 followed by malaise, 17 (8.63%). Participants who had the onset of symptoms
 185 from 2 to 6 days, 161 (81.72%), were the most likely to attend the health facilities (Table 6).

186

187 **Table 6: Clinical symptoms of study participants in the study area (Mongu, Limulunga,**
 188 **Senanga)**

Variables	Categories	N (197)	Per cent	CI	P-value
Symptoms	Fever	161	81.20	0.03-0.04	0.004
	Malaise	17	8.63	0.06-0.27	
	Weakness	5	2.54	0.072-1.65	
	Weight lost	6	3.04	0.63-18.58	
	Flu-like symptoms	8	4.06	0.52-51.36	
Onset of symptoms	One day	28	14.21	0.13-0.21	
	2-6 days	161	81.72	0.62-0.87	0.847
	7-13 days	5	2.54	1.16-1.56	
	>14 days	3	1.52	0.68-4.55	

189

190 **Risk factors associated with Brucella seropositivity**

191 The association between the dichotomous outcome variable seroprevalence and potential risk
 192 factors was first examined in the univariable analysis (Table 7). All variables with $p < 0.25$ were
 193 selected for further analysis to build the multivariable logistic regression model. In the
 194 multivariable logistic regression, only the number of animals ($p < 0.039$) was statistically
 195 significantly associated with brucellosis (Table 8).

196 **Table 7: Univariable analysis of Potential Risk factors associated with Brucellosis**

Variables	Categories	Total	Seroprevalence	Per cent	P-value
Gender	Male	110	7	6.3%	0.592
	Female	87	4	4.6%	

Age	10-20	49	4	8.1%	0.811
	21-35	52	2	3.8%	
	36-60	79	4	5.06%	
	>60	17	1	5.8%	
Level of education	None	15	1	6.6%	0.924
	Primary	109	6	5.50%	
	Secondary	66	4	6.06%	
	Tertiary	7	0	0%	
Marital status	Single	73	3	4.11%	0.627
	Married	107	7	6.5%	
	Divorced	9	0	0%	
	Widowed	8	1	12.5%	
Occupation	Abattoir worker	1	0	0%	0.225
	Health worker	3	0	0%	
	Livestock farmer	25	4	16%	
	Unemployed	134	5	3.73%	
	Student	26	2	7.69%	
	Other	8	0	0%	
	District	Mongu	66	4	
Limulunga	36	2	5.56%		
Senanga	93	5	5.38%		
Heard about Brucellosis	Yes	114	6	5.26%	0.8
	No	83	5	6.24%	

Source of information	Vet officer	53	3	5.8%	0.734
	Neighbour	12	1	3.85%	
	Health worker	39	2	5.26%	
	Media	4	0	0%	
	Patients with Brucellosis	6	0	0%	
Can humans become infected?	Yes	13	0	0%	0.663
	No	67	4	5.97%	
	I do not know	117	7	5.98%	
Mode of transmission	I do not know	132	6	4.54%	0.167
	Contact with the infected animal	32	1	3.1%	
	Eating raw meat and drinking raw milk	33	4	12.12%	
Knowledge about Symptoms of Brucellosis	Yes	16	0	0%	0.310
	No	181	11	6.08%	
Drinking raw milk and eating	No	27	1	3.70%	0.647

undercooked					
meat					
	Yes	170	10	5.88%	
Keeping	No	114	6	5.26%	0.818
animal					
	Yes	83	5	6.02%	
Type of	Goat	25			
animal					
owned					
(N=83)					
			1	4%	0.308
	Sheep	3	0	0%	
	Pigs	12	2	16.67%	
	Cattle	15	2	13.33%	
	Dogs	11	0	0%	
	Other	17	0	0%	
Number of	One animal	17	0	0%	0.049
animals					
(N=83)					
	1-10 animals	50	2	4%	
	>10 animals	16	3	18.75%	
	Yes	9	0	0%	0.421
Vaccinated					
animal					
(N=83)					
	No	74	5	6.76%	
Symptoms	Fever	161	6	3.80%	0.004
	Malaise	17	2	11.76%	
	Weakness	5	2	40%	
	Weight lost	6	2	33.33%	

	Flu-like symptoms	8	0	0%	
	Weight lost	6	1	16.67%	
Onset of symptoms	One day	28	1	14.81%	0.847
	2-6 days	161	10	6.21%	
	7-13 days	5	0	0%	
	>14 days	3	0	0%	

197

198

199 **Table 8: Standard Multivariable logistic regression analysis for brucellosis risk factors in**
 200 **humans**

Variables	OR	(95%CI)	P-value
Type of animal owned	0.72	0.42-1.23	0.226
Number of animals	6.49	1.10-38.13	0.039

201

202

203 Discussion

204 To our knowledge, this is the first study to document the seroprevalence of *Brucella* antibodies
 205 among febrile patients seeking medical attention in community hospitals in the Western province
 206 of Zambia.

207 Seroprevalence of human *Brucella* antibodies

208 The seroprevalence of human *Brucella* antibodies among patients seeking medical attention was
 209 4.57%. The current study was based on community health facilities and highlights the
 210 seropositivity in patients from three districts (Mongu, Senanga and Limulunga) in the Western
 211 Province of Zambia. The 4.57% seroprevalence in our study almost corroborates the 5.03% earlier
 212 reported in Southern province²⁹ and the 6% found among febrile patients attending a District
 213 hospital in Rwanda³⁰.

214 However, the seroprevalence in this study is lower than the 20.2% reported in the Southern
215 Province of Zambia³¹. While this present study was focused on screening febrile patients seeking
216 medical attention, that of Mubanga et al targeted occupationally exposed humans (herdsmen and
217 abattoir workers), who were at high risk of exposure to brucellosis ³¹. This could explain the
218 observed differences in the studies.

219 Our study findings are also lower than the 14.9% observed among community hospital patients in
220 Southwestern Uganda³². This variation can be due to various possible reasons. Southwestern
221 Uganda has a high rate of milk production, with a daily output of 100,000 litres, accounting for
222 35% of the country's total production. As a result, the population in this area is likely to be exposed
223 to health risks due to cultural practices involving the consumption of raw milk.³² A similar study
224 in Saudi Arabia reported a seroprevalence of 12.8% among patients with fever³³. The difference
225 could be due to the fact that *Brucella melitensis* has been reported to be the most prevalent pathogen
226 causing human brucellosis in Saudi Arabia, ³⁴, while Zambia has reported *Brucella abortus* ³⁴.
227 *Brucella melitensis* is known to be the most pathogenic species among the *Brucella* species ³⁵.

228

229 **Knowledge and attitude of participants about Brucellosis**

230 More than half of the respondents (57.87%) were knowledgeable about the disease. Some studies
231 have demonstrated low knowledge levels of the disease as a risk factor that increases the risk of
232 *Brucella* infection in the community, has a detrimental effect on *brucellosis* control measure
233 compliance, and may contribute to underreporting of disease incidence in the nation ^{36,37}. In
234 contrast, only 6.60% of participants were aware that *Brucella* can affect humans, and most
235 respondents 67.01% were ignorant about the mode of transmission to humans, which agrees with
236 the study findings reported in Uganda ³⁸ and Jordan ³⁹. This is also similar to the findings by
237 Munyeme et al. who noted that the population's low awareness of *Brucellosis* was caused by a lack
238 of health education programs, inadequate training in handling and rearing animals, a lack of
239 extension services, the absence of health facilities, and remote participant locations⁴⁰. The low
240 awareness levels of human brucellosis in this study may be attributed to the limited formal
241 education received by individuals in the research locations. Due to the lack of education on
242 zoonotic diseases, farmers may not be well-informed about transmission paths, which could lead
243 to a lack of preventative measures against brucellosis, as explained by Bouzoukeev²⁹. *Brucella*

244 seropositivity was higher in Senanga district than in Mongu and Limulunga districts. This can be
245 attributed to the fact that most of the samples collected in Senanga were from rural health centres,
246 while in Mongu and Limulunga districts, most samples were collected from mini hospitals. In rural
247 health centres, poor knowledge levels concerning the disease can positively impact preventive
248 measures regarding consuming raw meat and unpasteurised milk, which are major risk factors in
249 the transmission of Brucellosis⁴². According to Ruano and Aguayo, low levels of awareness like
250 those found in the current study put the population at risk of contracting *Brucella* and have a
251 detrimental effect on *brucellosis* control measures compliance³¹. It may cause underreporting of
252 disease occurrence in the nation. It is also noted that some rural people keep animals in their houses
253 ⁴³. Access to personal medical or veterinary care to educate people about the disease is sometimes
254 very difficult compared to urban areas. Moreover, most medical personnel have a low brucellosis
255 suspicion rate among febrile patients ⁴⁴. Similarly, a case-control study in Iran demonstrated
256 awareness regarding modes of brucellosis transmission, for example consuming raw milk cheese
257 was associated with a reduced risk of human brucellosis⁴³.

258

259 **Risk factors associated with *Brucella* seropositivity**

260 In this study, it was found that the number and types of animals were statistically significant risk
261 factors that were associated with *Brucella* seropositivity. The close contact between domestic
262 animals and human beings is still a critical mode of disease transmission^{49,50}. Most humans have
263 animals that can transmit *Brucella* pathogens, so the exposure risk is higher. Among the number
264 of animals, those who had more than ten animals, 23.08% (3/13) were more likely to be exposed
265 ⁴⁶. The importance of the number of animals favours migration or mobility, which increases the
266 risk of Brucellosis transmission ⁴⁷. The study conducted in Kenya by Kairu et al. found the number
267 of animals was a significant risk factor⁴⁸ with larger herds having a significantly higher risk of
268 exposure to the disease. Large herds are often associated with poor sanitation, clustering of
269 animals, and mixing of animals from different herds and species. Several studies in Africa have
270 revealed a consistent correlation between brucellosis seropositivity and the number of animals ⁴⁸.
271 Another study in Mexico found that the number of animals is a risk factor⁵¹.

272 The sample size was less than the target but enough to carry out the planned analysis of this study
273 without affecting its validity. However, some of the samples were hemolysed, and it is possible

274 that other positive cases were not detected due to the exclusion of these samples. Despite these
275 limitations, the study findings provide information on the seroprevalence of *Brucella* antibodies
276 and associated risk factors among febrile patients in community hospitals in Western province of
277 Zambia.

278 **Conclusions**

279 *Brucella* antibodies were present at 4.57% among patients in community hospitals in Western
280 Province. Most participants were unaware that *Brucella* can affect humans and were ignorant about
281 the mode of disease transmission to humans. The number and types of animals were significantly
282 associated with *Brucella* seropositivity.

283

284 **Acknowledgements**

285 We acknowledge the participants who took part in this study. We are also grateful to the University
286 of Zambia for providing all the references in this publication.

287 **Funding**

288 The work was supported by the International Foundation Sciences (IFS) grant number 13-B-6519-
289 1 which funded the brucellosis project.

290 **Ethical statement**

291 Ethical approval for the study protocol was obtained from Excellence in Research Ethics and
292 Science (ERES) (Ref No. 2018-Dec-004). The authority to conduct the research was granted by
293 the National Health Research Authority (NHRA), while permission to conduct the study at the
294 health facilities was obtained from the Provincial Health Director in Western Province before the
295 commencement of the study. Written informed consent was obtained from all the participants
296 enrolled in the study. For participants below 18 years, written informed consent was obtained from
297 their parents or legal guardians, followed by assent, to ensure they understood the study before
298 agreeing to participate voluntarily. The participant consent outlined the purpose of the study,
299 procedures, risk of minimal pain and discomfort at the injection site during blood sample
300 collection, benefits, and the right to withdraw at any time. The site of needle puncture during blood
301 collection and their right to withdraw at any given time during the study. All data for the study
302 were restricted to the investigators and treated in confidence, no participant identifiers were used.

303

304 **Transparency declarations**

305 All authors declare no conflict of interest.

306

307 **References**

- 308 1. Corbel M. Microbiology of genus *Brucella*. In: *Brucella*. Cambridge: Academic Press;
309 2020. p. 53-72.
- 310 2. Ducrotoy M, Bertu WJ, Matope G, Cadmus S, Conde-Álvarez R, Gusi AM, et al.
311 Brucellosis in Sub-Saharan Africa: Current challenges for management, diagnosis and
312 control. *Acta Trop*. 2017;165:179–193.
- 313 3. Bennett NJ, Bronze MS. Brucellosis. 2022. Available from:
314 <https://emedicine.medscape.com/article/213430-print>.
- 315 4. World Health Organization. Brucellosis in Humans and Animals. 2017.
- 316 5. Rossetti CA, Arenas-Gamboa AM, Maurizio E. Caprine Brucellosis: A historically
317 neglected disease with a significant impact on public health. *PLoS Negl Trop Dis*.
318 2017;11.
- 319 6. Mia M, Hasan M, Pory FS. Occupational exposure to livestock and risk of tuberculosis
320 and Brucellosis: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *One Health*. 2020;100432.
321 Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.onehlt.2022.100432>
- 322 7. Jiangnan X. Ontology-based Meta-Analysis of Animal and Human Adverse Events
323 Associated with licensed brucellosis vaccines. *Front Pharmacol*. 2018;9:503. Available
324 from: <https://doi.org/10.3389/fphar.2018.00503>
- 325 8. Ayoola MC, Akinseye VO, Cadmus E, Awosanya E, Popoola OA. Prevalence of bovine
326 Brucellosis in slaughtered cattle and barriers to better protection of abattoir workers in
327 Ibadan, South-Western Nigeria. *Pan Afr Med J*. 2017;28:68.
- 328 9. Zolzaya B, TseSelenge, Tsegeen Narangarav, Dorj Gantsetseg, Dashzevge
329 Erdenechimeg, Jakob Zinsstag, Ester Schelling. Representative Seroprevalences of
330 human and livestock brucellosis in two Mongolian provinces. *Asian Pacific J Trop Med*.
331 2014;7(5):356-371.
- 332 10. Esmaeili H. Brucellosis in the Islamic Republic of Iran. *J Med Bacteriol*. 2014;3–4:47–
333 57.
- 334 11. Zeng JY, Robertson ID, Ji QI, Dawa YL, Mieghan B. Evaluation of the economic impact
335 of Brucellosis in domestic yaks of Tibet. 2019. p. 476-487.
- 336 12. Shalby NA. Acute phase biomarkers, oxidants, antioxidants, and trace minerals of mobile
337 sheep flocks naturally infected with Brucellosis. 2021. p. 559-573.
- 338 13. Lokamar PN, Kutwah MA, Atieli H, Gumo S, Ouma C. Socio-economic impacts of
339 brucellosis on livestock production and reproduction performance in Koibatek and
340 Marigat regions, Baringo County, Kenya. *BMC Vet Res*. 2020;16:305. doi:
341 10.1186/s12917-020-02283-w.

- 342 14. Bosilkovski M, Keramat F, Arapovic J. The current therapeutic strategies in human
343 Brucellosis. *Infect Dis.* 2021;49:823–832.
- 344 15. Mablesen HE, Okello A, Picozzi K, Welburn S. Neglected zoonotic diseases long and
345 winding road to advocacy. *PLoS Negl Trop Dis.* 2014;8
- 346 16. Mirnejad R, Jazi FM, Mostafaei S, Sedighi M. Epidemiology of Brucellosis in Iran: A
347 comprehensive systematic review and meta-analysis study. *Microb Pathog.*
348 2017;109:239–247.
- 349 17. Awah-ndukum J, Moctar M, Mouiche M, Kouonmo-ngnoyom L, Bayang HN, Manchang
350 TK, et al. Seroprevalence and risk factors of Brucellosis among slaughtered indigenous
351 cattle, abattoir personnel and pregnant women in Ngaoundéré, Cameroon. *Pan Afr Med J.*
352 2018;31:1-13.
- 353 18. Dean AS, Crump L, Greter H, Hattendorf J, Schelling E, Zinsstag J. Clinical
354 manifestations of human Brucellosis. *Lancet Infect Dis.* 2012;12(12):937-45.
- 355 19. Ogola E, Thumbi S, Osoro E, Munyua P, Omulo S, Mbatha P, et al. Sero-prevalence of
356 Brucellosis in Humans and their Animals: A Linked Cross-sectional Study in Two
357 Selected Counties in Kenya. *Online J Public Health Inform.* 2014;6(1). doi:
358 10.5210/ojphi.v6i1.5166.
- 359 20. Tumwine G, Matovu E, Kabasa JD, Owiny DO, Majalija S. Human Brucellosis:
360 seroprevalence and associated risk factors in Kiboga District Central Uganda agro-
361 pastoral communities. *BMC Public Health.* 2015;15:900. doi: 10.1186/s12889-015-2242-
362 z.
- 363 21. Sagamiko FD, Mfuno RL, Hang BM, Karimuribo ED, Mwanza AM, Sindato C, et al.
364 Seroprevalence of human Brucellosis and associated risk factors among high-risk
365 occupations in Mbeya Region of Tanzania. *J Epidemiol Res.* 2020;6(1):1-10. doi:
366 10.5430/jer.v6n1p1.
- 367 22. Aworh MK, Okolocha E, Kwaga J, Fasina F, Lazarus D, Suleman I, et al. Human
368 Brucellosis: seroprevalence and associated exposure factors among abattoir workers in
369 Abuja, Nigeria - 2011. *Afr Health Sci.* 2013;13(3):868-72.
- 370 23. Muma JB, Samui KL, Oloya J, Munyeme M, Skjerve E. Risk factors for Brucellosis in
371 indigenous cattle reared in livestock–wildlife interface areas of Zambia. *Prev Vet Med.*
372 2007;80(4):306–317.
- 373 24. Muma JB, Pandey GS, Munyeme M, Mumba C, Mkandawire E, Chimana HM.
374 Brucellosis among smallholder cattle farmers in Zambia: public health significance. *Trop*
375 *Anim Health Prod.* 2012;44(4):915–920. doi: 10.1007/s11250-011-9987-x.
- 376 25. Muma JB, Syakalima M, Munyeme M, Zulu VC, Simuunza M, Kurata M. Bovine
377 tuberculosis and Brucellosis in traditionally managed livestock in selected districts of the
378 Southern Province of Zambia. *Vet Med Int.* 2013;2013:730367. doi:
379 10.1155/2013/730367.
- 380 26. Mfuno RL, Mubanga M, Silwamba I, Sagamiko F, Mudenda S, Daka V, et al.
381 Seroprevalence and characterisation of *Brucella* spp. Isolated from humans and cattle in
382 the southern and Western provinces of Zambia. PhD Thesis, The University of Zambia;
383 2021.
- 384 27. Jaeger FN, Bechir M, Harouna M, Moto DD, Utzinger J. Challenges and opportunities
385 for healthcare workers in a rural district of Chad. *BMC Health Serv Res.* 2018;18(1):7.
- 386 28. Central Statistical Office. Zambia. 2020.

- 387 29. Muma JB, Pandey GS, Munyeme M, Mumba C, Mkandawire E, Chimana HM.
388 Brucellosis among smallholder cattle farmers in Zambia: public health significance. *Trop*
389 *Anim Health Prod.* 2012;44(4):915–920. doi: 10.1007/s11250-011-9987-x.
- 390 30. Gafirita J, Kiiiza G, Murekatete A, Ndahayo LL, Tuyisenge J, Mashengesho V, et al.
391 Seroprevalence of Brucellosis among Patients Attending a District Hospital in Rwanda.
392 *Am J Trop Med Hyg.* 2017;97(4):1071-5. doi: 10.4269/ajtmh.16-0632. PMID: 28749771;
393 PMID: PMC5590564.
- 394 31. Mubanga M, Mfuno RL, Kothowa J, Mohamud AS, Chanda C, Mcgiven J, et al. *Brucella*
395 Seroprevalence and Associated Risk Factors in Occupationally Exposed Humans in
396 Selected Districts of Southern Province, Zambia. *Front Public Health.* 2021;9:745244.
397 doi: 10.3389/fpubh.2021.745244.
- 398 32. Migisha R, Nyehangane D, Boum Y, Page AL, Zúñiga-Ripa A, Conde-Álvarez R, et al.
399 Prevalence and risk factors of brucellosis among febrile patients attending a community
400 hospital in southwestern Uganda. *Sci Rep.* 2018;8(1):15078. doi: 10.1038/s41598-018-
401 33915-9.
- 402 33. Alkahtani AM, Assiry MM, Chandramoorthy HC, Al-Hakami AM, Hamid ME. Sero-
403 prevalence and risk factors of brucellosis among suspected febrile patients attending a
404 referral hospital in southern Saudi Arabia (2014-2018). *BMC Infect Dis.* 2020;20(1):26.
405 doi: 10.1186/s12879-020-4763-z.
- 406 34. Al Anazi M, HSQM, AlFayyad I, AlOtaibi RA, Abu-Shaheen A. Epidemiology of
407 Brucellosis in Saudi Arabia. *Saudi Med J.* 2019;40(10):981–988. doi:
408 10.15537/smj.2019.10.24027.
- 409 35. Mazwi KD, Kolo FB, Jaja IF, Byaruhanga C, Hassim A, van Heerden H. Polyphasic
410 Characterization of *Brucella* spp. in Livestock Slaughtered from Abattoirs in Eastern
411 Cape, South Africa. *Microorganisms.* 2024;12(1):223. doi:
412 10.3390/microorganisms12010223.
- 413 36. Franc KA, Krecek RC, Häsler BN, Arenas-Gamboa AM. Brucellosis remains a neglected
414 disease in the developing world: a call for interdisciplinary action. *BMC Public Health.*
415 2018;18:125. doi: 10.1186/s12889-017-5016-y.
- 416 37. Govindasamy K, Etter EMC, Harris BN, Rossouw J, Abernethy DA, Thompson PN.
417 Knowledge of Brucellosis, Health-Seeking Behaviour, and Risk Factors for *Brucella*
418 Infection amongst Workers on Cattle Farms in Gauteng, South Africa. *Pathogens.*
419 2021;10(11):1484. doi: 10.3390/pathogens10111484.
- 420 38. Tumwine G, Matovu E, Kabasa JD, Owiny DO, Majalija S. Human brucellosis:
421 seroprevalence and associated risk factors in agro-pastoral communities of Kiboga
422 District, Central Uganda. *BMC Public Health.* 2015;15(1):900. doi: 10.1186/s12889-015-
423 2242-z.
- 424 39. McDermott JJ, Grace D, Zinsstag J. Economics of brucellosis impact and control in low-
425 income countries. *Rev Sci Tech.* 2013;32(1):249-61.
- 426 40. National Research Council (US) Committee on Achieving Sustainable Global Capacity
427 for Surveillance and Response to Emerging Diseases of Zoonotic Origin. *Sustaining*
428 *Global Surveillance and Response to Emerging Zoonotic Diseases.* Washington (DC):
429 National Academies Press (US); 2009.
- 430 41. Kansime C, Atuyambe LM, Asiimwe BB, Mugisha A, Mugisha S, Guma V, et al.
431 Community perceptions on integrating animal vaccination and health education by

- 432 veterinary and public health workers in the prevention of Brucellosis among pastoral
433 communities of South Western Uganda. PLoS One. 2015;10(7). doi:
434 10.1371/journal.pone.0132206.
- 435 42. Abdi RD, Abdurahman O, Tesfaye B. Sero-prevalence and Risk Factors of Brucellosis in
436 Humans and Livestock in Somali Region, Eastern Ethiopia. J Vet Sci Technol.
437 2015;6:268. doi: 10.4172/2157-7579.1000268.
- 438 43. Hossain A, Rahman AKMA, Ahmed S, Re-emergence of Brucellosis in Bangladesh:
439 Seroprevalence and Associated Risk Factors. J Vet Sci Technol. 2016;7:302. doi:
440 10.4172/2157-7579.1000302.
- 441 44. Tadesse G, Tessema TS, Tsehayneh KE, Molla B. Sero-prevalence of small ruminant
442 brucellosis and its public health awareness in selected sites of Dire Dawa region, Eastern
443 Ethiopia. J Vet Med Anim Health. 2016;8(2):24-30. doi: 10.5897/JVMAH2015.0457.
- 444 45. Mufinda FC, Boinas F, Nunes C. Seroprevalence and risk factors of human Brucellosis in
445 Luanda, Angola. Acta Trop. 2018;182:242-246. doi: 10.1016/j.actatropica.2018.03.030.
- 446 46. Muckle CA, Gorman J, Bastian I, Bosnjak E, Stern R, Toward a risk-based strategy for
447 controlling brucellosis in nomadic pastoralist communities in southern Mongolia. Rev Sci
448 Tech. 2013;32(3):835-847.
- 449 47. Njeru J, Melzer F, Wareth G, El-Adawy H, Henning K, Pletz MW, et al. Human
450 brucellosis in febrile patients seeking treatment at remote hospitals, northeastern Kenya,
451 2014-2015. Emerg Infect Dis. 2016;22(12):2160-2164. doi: 10.3201/eid2212.160692.
- 452 48. Ducrot MJ, Ammary K, Ait Lbacha H, Zouagui Z, Mick V, Prevost L, et al. Narrative
453 overview of animal and human brucellosis in Morocco: intensification versus emergence.
454 Microbes Infect. 2015;17(12):833-8.
- 455 49. Zinsstag J, Schelling E, Roth F, Bonfoh B, de Savigny D, Tanner M. Human benefits of
456 animal interventions for zoonosis control. Emerg Infect Dis. 2007;13(4):527-31.
- 457 50. Matope G, Bhebhe E, Muma JB, Lund A, Skjerve E. Herd-level factors for *Brucella*
458 seropositivity in cattle reared in smallholder dairy farms of Zimbabwe. Prev Vet Med.
459 2010;94(3-4):213-21.
- 460 51. McDermott J, Grace D, Zinsstag J. Economics of brucellosis impact and control in low-
461 income countries. Rev Sci Tech. 2013;32(1):249-61.
- 462 52. Zhou H, Guan P, Fu C, Liu J, Zheng Y. The global epidemiology of Brucellosis in
463 domesticated animals: a systematic review and meta-analysis. BMC Vet Res.
464 2018;14(1):16. doi: 10.1186/s12917-018-1333-6.
- 465 53. Hegazy Y, Elmonir W, Abdel-Hamid NH, Elbauomy E, Abbas M, Hessain A, et al.
466 Seroepidemiology, risk factors and economic impact of Brucellosis in Fayoum
467 Governorate, Egypt. BMC Infect Dis. 2019;19(1):875. doi: 10.1186/s12879-019-4483-2.
- 468 54. Ducrot MJ, Muñoz PM, Conde-Álvarez R, Blasco JM, Moriyón I. A systematic review
469 of current immunological tests for the diagnosis of cattle brucellosis. Prev Vet Med.
470 2018;151:57-72. doi: 10.1016/j.prevetmed.2018.01.013.
- 471 55. Poester FP, Samartino LE, Santos RL. Pathogenesis and pathobiology of brucellosis in
472 livestock. Rev Sci Tech. 2013;32(1):105-15.

473