

1 **Seroprevalence and risk factors of brucellosis in pastoralists and their livestock in South**

2 **Sudan**

3 Emmanuel P. Lita<sup>1, 2, 4\*</sup>, Erneo B. Ochi<sup>2</sup>, Gerald Misinzo<sup>3, 4</sup>, Henriette van Heerden<sup>5</sup>, Robab

4 Katani<sup>6, 7</sup>, Jacques Godfroid<sup>8</sup>, Coletha Mathew<sup>9</sup>

5 <sup>1</sup>Department of Veterinary Medicine and Public Health, College of Veterinary Medicine and  
6 Biomedical Science, Department of Veterinary Medicine and Public Health, Sokoine University  
7 of Agriculture, Morogoro, Tanzania.

8 <sup>2</sup>School of Veterinary Medicine, University of Juba, Juba, South Sudan

9 <sup>3</sup>Department of Veterinary Microbiology, Parasitology and Biotechnology, College of Veterinary  
10 Medicine and Biomedical Sciences, Sokoine University of Agriculture, Morogoro, Tanzania.

11 <sup>4</sup>SACIDS Foundation for One Health, Sokoine University of Agriculture, Morogoro, Tanzania

12 <sup>5</sup>Department of Veterinary Tropical diseases, University of Pretoria, Faculty of Veterinary  
13 Science, Onderstepoort, South Africa

14 <sup>6</sup>The Huck Institute of the Life Sciences, Pennsylvania State University, University Park,  
15 Pennsylvania, USA

16 <sup>7</sup>The Nelson Mandela African Institution of Science and Technology, Arusha, Tanzania

17 <sup>8</sup>Department of Arctic and Marine Biology, Faculty of Biosciences, Fisheries and Marine  
18 Biology, UiT-The Arctic University of Norway, Tromsø, Norway

19 <sup>9</sup>Department of Veterinary Anatomy and Pathology, College of Veterinary Medicine and  
20 Biomedical Sciences, Sokoine University of Agriculture, Morogoro, Tanzania.

21 \*Corresponding author

22 Emmanuel P. Lita

23 Email: [emma.lita@sacids.org](mailto:emma.lita@sacids.org)

## 24 **Author summary**

25 Brucellosis is a neglected, bacterial zoonotic disease that is caused by several species of the  
26 genus *Brucella*. Cross-species transmission of *Brucella* can occur in mixed or integrated farming  
27 systems. The disease poses serious public health implications and substantial economic losses  
28 particularly in low-income countries including South Sudan.

29 This study was conducted to estimate the seroprevalence of brucellosis in pastoralists, their  
30 livestock as well identifying potential risk factors associated with *Brucella* infection. Knowledge  
31 of the seroprevalence of brucellosis and risk factors is a prerequisite towards planning an  
32 effective mitigation strategy of the disease.

33 The study revealed high seroprevalence of brucellosis in cattle compared to goats, and the  
34 following risk factors were identified; prior history of abortion, age (old) and sex (female)  
35 significantly associated with *Brucella* infection. Surprisingly, sheep were found to be  
36 seronegative.

37

## 38 **ABSTRACT**

39 **Background:** Brucellosis poses serious public health implications and substantial economic  
40 losses in pastoral rural settings in South Sudan. In humans, brucellosis is almost always  
41 originating from animals. Current literature provides scant data regarding the seroprevalence of  
42 brucellosis in South Sudan. This cross-sectional study investigates the seroprevalence of  
43 brucellosis among the pastoral community and livestock and identifies risk factors for the disease  
44 from two counties, Terekeka and Juba in Central Equatoria State (CES), South Sudan.

45 **Methodology:** A total of 986 serum samples from humans (n=143), cattle (n=478), sheep  
46 (n=86), and goats (n=279) were randomly collected from 17 livestock camps in CES. Serum

47 samples for the humans, cattle and goats were screened for *Brucella*-specific antibodies using  
48 rose Bengal plate test (RBPT) and further confirmed by competitive enzyme linked immune  
49 sorbent assay (c-ELISA) in series. All the sera from sheep were tested in parallel using RBPT  
50 and c-ELISA. A camp was considered positive when at least one animal of either species tested  
51 positive on the c-ELISA. Univariate analysis using binary logistic regression with a confidence  
52 interval of 95% at a p-value of  $\leq 0.05$  was used to identify the association between the potential  
53 individual risk factors and *Brucella* seropositivity. The investigated risk factors for livestock  
54 included age, sex, species, prior abortion history, retained placenta, parity, and reproductive  
55 status. Variables found to have associations in univariate analysis ( $p = 0.25$ ) with *Brucella*  
56 seropositivity were further included in multivariable logistic regression. The risk factors  
57 investigated for humans included, gender, age, educational level, occupation, marital status,  
58 drinking of raw milk, aiding female animals during delivery, eating of undercooked meat and  
59 blowing of air into the cow's uterus through the vagina.

60 **Results:** The study revealed seroprevalence of 21.7%, 11.8%, and 4.8% in cattle, goats, and  
61 humans, respectively. Our results indicated that all sheep serum samples were negative on both  
62 RBPT and c-ELISA. The seroprevalence in the 13 camps from Terekeka County was 100%  
63 (13/13) compared to 50% (2/4) seropositive from 4 camps in Juba County. All the variables  
64 investigated in the univariate analysis of risk factors in cattle were significantly associated with  
65 *Brucella* seropositivity: sex (OR:4.5, 95% CI: 2.2 – 8.9,  $p < 0.001$ ), age (OR:6.6, 95% CI: 2.3 –  
66 19.1,  $p < 0.001$ ), abortion history (OR:3.1, 95% CI: 1.8 – 5.2,  $p < 0.001$ ), retained placenta  
67 (OR:2.5, 95% CI: 1.4 – 4.4,  $p = 0.001$ ), parity (OR:2.3, 95% CI: 1.1 – 4.7,  $p = 0.020$ ). However, in  
68 small ruminants, none of the potential risk factors were associated with *Brucella* seropositivity.  
69 In humans, blowing air through cow's vagina (OR: 1.4, 95%CI: 0.782 – 2.434,  $p = 0.035$ ) was the

70 only variable found to be significantly associated with *Brucella* seropositivity at the univariate  
71 analysis. The forceful blowing of air into cow's vagina to induce milk is a common practice  
72 among the pastoral communities in South Sudan.

73 The multivariable logistic regression model identified sex, age, and abortion history as  
74 statistically significant factors for *Brucella* seropositivity in cattle. The odds of seropositivity  
75 were nearly threefold (OR: 2.8; 95% CI: 1.3 – 5.8, p: 0.006) higher in cows compared to bulls  
76 (male cattle). Cattle over two years old had higher odds of *Brucella* seropositivity than young  
77 animals (OR: 3.5, 95% CI: 1.2 – 10.3-, p: 0.025). Cows with a history of abortion had higher  
78 odds of *Brucella* seropositivity (OR: 2.8, 95% CI: 1.6 – 4.7, p: <0.001).

79 **Conclusion:** This is the first study to report occurrence of brucellosis in goats and its absence in  
80 sheep in South Sudan. Altogether, our results suggest that *Brucella abortus* infecting primarily  
81 cattle has spilled over to goats but not (yet) to sheep. The present study also shows occurrence of  
82 brucellosis in cattle, goats and people in the pastoral community and recommends  
83 implementation of One Health approach for effective mitigation of this disease.

84 **Key words:** Brucellosis; Seroprevalence; pastoralists; Risk factors; South Sudan.

85

## 86 INTRODUCTION

87 Brucellosis is a significant zoonotic disease affecting many countries in sub-Saharan Africa  
88 including South Sudan. *Brucella* spp. are the etiological agents of the disease that affect both  
89 humans and animals[1]. The species of *Brucella* are well-adapted to their hosts, however, a  
90 spillover can occur when there is an intermingling of various species of animals[2] as in the case  
91 with the agro-pastoral and pastoral system practiced in South Sudan [3]. The disease affecting  
92 livestock and humans is caused by *B. melitensis* mainly in goats and sheep, *B. abortus* mainly in

93 cattle and buffalo as well as *B. suis* in pigs [4]. There are several predisposing factors attributed to  
94 the occurrence of brucellosis in humans and animals.

95 In livestock, the disease causes reduced milk production, longer calving intervals, abortions, still  
96 birth, swollen joints and infertility [5].

97 Transmission of brucellosis to humans occurs through the consumption of infected,  
98 unpasteurized animal-milk products, through direct contact with infected animal parts (such as  
99 the placenta by infection through bruised skin and mucous membranes), and inhalation of  
100 infected aerosolized particles [6]. In humans, clinical brucellosis presents as acute or sub-acute  
101 febrile illness and is characterized by intermittent fever accompanied by malaise, anorexia, and  
102 prostration[7].

103 The economic losses due to brucellosis are enormous and incur costs to humans either directly  
104 (e.g. health care costs for the diagnosis, treatment, and management of clinically ill patients) or  
105 indirectly (e.g. loss of work days, lost leisure time, loss of productive years due to premature  
106 death[8]. Studies have shown that brucellosis is high in pastoral and mixed farming system  
107 where humans have been embedded with livestock, so it constitutes a high risk of infection [9–  
108 13].

109 Furthermore, several studies within the African region have identified several risk factors and  
110 reported varying prevalence levels of brucellosis based on spatial and temporal features,  
111 diagnostic methods, and species.

112 [9,10,13–15].

113 However, few studies have been conducted in South Sudan to assess the prevalence of  
114 brucellosis in

115 humans and cattle[16–19]. These studies have reported seroprevalence of 23.2% (48/250) [17] and  
116 23.3% (97/416) [16] in cattle and humans, respectively. There were no reported studies on  
117 brucellosis in sheep and goats. Despite that, the pastoral communities usually keep their animals  
118 such as cattle, sheep, and goats, in the cattle camps. It is found that keeping different animal  
119 species plays a pivotal role in cross-species transmission and maintenance of brucellosis[20];  
120 [21]. There is inadequate knowledge of the epidemiology and risk factors of brucellosis in other  
121 livestock species and their role in transmission of the infection to humans in South Sudan.  
122 Understanding these gaps in knowledge is a prerequisite for the development of effective  
123 mitigation measures for the disease in South Sudan.  
124 Hence, this study estimates seroprevalence and identifies risk factors associated with *Brucella*  
125 sero-positivity among pastoralists and their cattle, sheep, and goats in Central Equatoria State  
126 (CES), South Sudan.


127

## 128 **MATERIALS AND METHODS**

### 129 **Study area**

130 The study was conducted in Terekeka and Juba Counties of CES, South Sudan. In Terekeka  
131 County, three Payams namely Reggo, Nyori and Terekeka were randomly selected for the study.  
132 A Payam is the second-lowest administrative division, below Counties, in South Sudan.  
133 Terekeka County is located on both east and west banks of the White Nile River north of Juba.  
134 The county includes low-lying swampy areas that usually flood but provide grazing in the dry  
135 season. Rainfall is about 900 millimeters annually. Livestock rearing is considered an important  
136 part of people's livelihood in Terekeka County, CES. In Juba County, northern Bari and Munuki  
137 payams were randomly selected. Juba is the largest city of South Sudan located in the center of

138 CES. It borders Terekeka County to the north and Kajo-keji and Lainya Counties to the South.  
139 Residents of Juba engage in diverse range of livelihood. A total of 17 cattle camps were  
140 randomly selected, of which 13 were from Terekeka County and four from Juba County as  
141 shown in Figure 1.



142  
143 **Figure 1:** Location of the Central Equatorial State of South Sudan indicated in upper right with  
144 study area showing sampled cattle camps in Terekeka and Juba Counties in lower right  
145 consisting of Reggo, Terekeka Nyori in the Terekeka County and Northern Bari and Munuki  
146 Payams in the Juba County, indicated on left.

147  
148 **Study design and subject**

149 A cross-sectional design was planned using a multistage method of sampling for data collection.  
150 Briefly, cattle camps were identified and randomly selected; a proportional random sampling  
151 was then used to sample individuals. The study subjects comprised humans linked to cattle,  $\geq 18$   
152 years old and of different genders. Livestock species, including cattle, sheep, and goats were  
153 sampled from  $\geq 6$  months old, and from different sexes. These animal species had no previous  
154 record of brucellosis vaccination and were mixed in the same cattle camps and managed entirely  
155 under a pastoral farming system.

### 156 **Sample size determination in animals and humans**

157 The total sample required was determined according to formula given by [22]. An expected  
158 individual animal prevalence (P) of 25.3% [19] and (P) of 50 % were used for calculating the  
159 sample size of cattle and small ruminants, respectively. The 50% expected prevalence for small  
160 ruminants was chosen because of no previous studies conducted to estimate prevalence of  
161 brucellosis in goats and sheep as per the context of South Sudan.

162 Based on the formula, 384 samples were to be collected from small ruminants and 290 from the  
163 cattle.

164 However, a total of 478 cattle, 86 sheep and 279 goats of different ages and sexes were included  
165 in this study.

166 In humans, a total of 143 blood samples were collected from herders in the selected cattle camps  
167 who participated voluntarily.

168

### 169 **Blood collection and seroprevalence**

170 A total of five to seven milliliters of blood were drawn aseptically from the jugular vein of each  
171 randomly selected animal using a needle and plain vacutainer tube. Immediately, the vacutainer



172 tubes were labeled and coded and kept at room temperature overnight. The next day, the samples  
173 were centrifuged, and sera were harvested and placed into labeled cryovial tubes of 2 ml. A case  
174 history, detailed information about each animal sampled, and metadata were recorded in the data  
175 sheet. A medical technician collected a blood sample in humans, and sera separation followed the  
176 same protocol used in the animals. The collected sera were kept at -20 °C pending analysis.

177

### 178 **Rose Bengal Plate Test (RBPT)**

179 The harvested sera from the humans, cattle, sheep and goats were all screened for *Brucella*  
180 antibodies using RBPT according to procedure described by[23]. The sera from the humans,  
181 cattle and goats were tested in series while the sheep sera were tested in parallel using RBPT and  
182 c-ELISA. The antigen was obtained from the Animal and Plant Health Agency (APHA), New  
183 Haw, Addlestone, Surrey, England.

184 A cattle camp was considered positive if at least one positive *brucella* reactor was found among  
185 the animals.

186 The test was conducted at the College of Veterinary Medicine and Biomedical Science, Sokoine  
187 University of Agriculture, Morogoro, Tanzania.

### 188 **Competitive Enzyme Linked Immuno Sorbent Assay (c-ELISA)**

189 Sera found positive on the RBPT were further subjected on c-ELISA kit (Boehringer Ingelheim  
190 Svanonva, Uppsala, Sweden) for confirmation. The test was performed according to the protocol  
191 provided by the manufacturer with positive and negative controls. The samples were run in  
192 duplicates.

193

### 194 **Identification of Risk Factors of the disease**

195 Univariate analysis and chi square test using a confidence interval of 95% at a p-value of  $\leq 0.05$   
196 was used to identify the association between the potential individual risk factors and *Brucella*  
197 seropositivity. Risk factors associated with the disease were identified using multivariable  
198 logistic regression analysis of risk factors for *Brucella* seropositivity in cattle and small  
199 ruminants. Variables with a p-value  $\leq 0.25$  from the univariate analysis were included in the  
200 multivariable analysis. Backward stepwise (Wald) model was used and the validity of the test  
201 was assessed by computing Hosmer-Lemeshow goodness-of-fit.

202

### 203 **Data management and statistical analysis**

204 The study used both qualitative and quantitative methods of data collection and analysis. Data  
205 was analyzed using Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) version 20. Descriptive  
206 statistic was run to obtain the frequency distribution and percentages and univariate analysis was  
207 computed to identify association between variables.

208

## 209 **RESULTS**

### 210 **Socio-demographic characteristics of studied pastoralist**

211 A total of 143 pastoralist comprising females 9.0% (13/143) and males 91% (130/143) were  
212 included in the study. The majorities of the participants were single 68% (97/143) and have not  
213 attended formal education 84% (120/145). The age category “18 – 25 years old” 63% (90/143)  
214 was the majority, followed by age group >32 years old 22.3% (32/143).

215

### 216 **Overall seroprevalence of brucellosis in different animal species**

217 A total of 143 human sera and 843 of livestock comprising of cattle (478), sheep (86) and goats  
 218 (279), of different age and sexes were screened for anti-*Brucella* antibodies. The seroprevalence  
 219 in humans revealed 4.9% (7/143) and 4.2% (6/143) based on series testing using RBPT and c-  
 220 ELISA, respectively. A seroprevalence of 21.7% (104/478) and 11.8% (33/278) based on RBPT  
 221 were revealed in cattle and goats respectively. In contrast, c-ELISA revealed a seroprevalence of  
 222 21.3% (102/478) and 11.8% (33/278) in cattle and goats, respectively. Surprisingly, all the 86  
 223 serum samples from sheep tested on RBPT and further subjected to c-ELISA were found to be  
 224 negative giving a seroprevalence of 0% (0/86) as shown in Table 1.

225  
 226 **Table 1: Overall seroprevalence of brucellosis in human, cattle, goats and sheep based on**  
 227 **RBPT and c-ELISA**

Species	Number of sera tested	Seroprevalence	
		Total number of RBPT positive reactors n(%)	Total number of c-ELISA positive reactors n(%)
Human	143	7 (4.8)	6(4.2)
Cattle	478	104 (21.7)	102 (21.3)
Goats	279	33 (11.8)	33(11.8)
Sheep	86	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)

228  
 229 **Seroprevalence of brucellosis in cattle camps**  
 230 The seroprevalence in the cattle camps of Terekeka County was 100% (13/13) compared to Juba  
 231 County which was 50% (2/4) as shown in Table 2.The following species of livestock were  
 232 sampled from the camps, cattle 56.7%, followed by goats at 33.1% and sheep 10.2%.Cattle were

233 the dominant species in the camps of Terekeka County 89.5% (428/478) compared to Juba  
 234 County 10.5% (50/478).

235

236 **Table 2: Seroprevalence of brucellosis in different Counties, Payams and cattle camps,**  
 237 **CES, South Sudan**

		number of animals tested			
		(Positive)			
County	Cattle camp	Cattle	Goats	Sheep	Total
Terekeka	Bukoworpio	30(11)	52(50)	18(0)	100 (16)
	Pawe	13(5)	0	0	13 (5)
	Lokurak	31(4)	0	0	31 (4)
	Lopipiyo	65(20)	6(1)	1(0)	72 (21)
	Gwondolo	26(7)	0	0	26 (8)
	Libina	32(8)	0	0	32 (8)
	Nadula	20(7)	20(1)	0	40 (8)
	Pojulu	0	49(9)	1(0)	50 (9)
	Wun-mabior	30 (5)	30(6)	0	60 (11)
	Temi	91(6)	0	0	91 (6)
	Jongor	49(12)	0	0	49 (12)
	Jebel Namusia	0	43(2)	4(0)	47 (2)
	Sure	41(5)	19(0)	0	60 (5)
Juba	Gerekek	17(6)	44(9)	13(0)	74 (15)

Dura	33(8)	1(0)	0	34 (7)
Toch Manga	0	5(0)	21(0)	26 (0)
Yasin farm	0	10(0)	28(0)	38 (0)
	<b>478(104)</b>	<b>279(33)</b>	<b>86(0)</b>	<b>843(137)</b>

238

239

240 **Risk factors associated with *Brucella* sero-positivity in humans, cattle and small ruminants**  
 241 **in CES, South Sudan**

242 **Univariate logistic regression analysis**

243 All the variables investigated in the univariate analysis of risk factors in cattle were significantly  
 244 associated with *Brucella* seropositivity as shown in Table 3: sex (OR:4.5, 95% CI: 2.2 – 8.9,  
 245 p:<0.001), age (OR:6.6, 95% CI: 2.3 – 19.1, p:<0.001), abortion history (OR:3.1, 95% CI: 1.8 –  
 246 5.2, p:<0.001), retained placenta (OR:2.5, 95% CI: 1.4 – 4.4, p: 0.001), parity (OR:2.3, 95% CI:  
 247 1.142 – 4.739, p:0.02) and reproductive status (category “dry” OR:3.329, 95%CI: 1.598 – 6.934,  
 248 p:0.001). The analysis shows a statistically significant association between sex and the  
 249 occurrence of the condition at the univariate analysis. Females have a significantly higher  
 250 likelihood of testing positive compared to males, as indicated by the low p-value (<0.001). There  
 251 was also statistically significant association between age and the occurrence of the condition.  
 252 Individuals over 5years old have the highest likelihood (OR: 6.6) of testing positive, followed by  
 253 those aged 2-5 years old.

254 Nevertheless, in the univariate analysis of risk factors associated with *Brucella* seropositivity in  
 255 small ruminants, animal species ( $X^2 = 11.183$ , p-value 0.001) and parity level ( $X^2 = 10.394$ , P=  
 256 0.034) were found to be associated with *Brucella* seropositivity as showed in Table 4. The risk of

257 occurrence of brucellosis in goats is higher compared to sheep as supported by the low p-value  
 258 (<0.001).

259 In humans, blowing air through cow's vagina (OR: 1.4, 95%CI: 0.782 – 2.434, p: 0.035) was the  
 260 only variable found to be significantly associated with *Brucella* seropositivity at the univariate  
 261 analysis of risk factors.

262 Furthermore, variables with p-value $\leq$ 2.5 were included in a multivariable regression analysis  
 263 (Table 5).

264

265 **Table 3: Univariate analysis of potential risk factors associated with *Brucella* seropositivity**  
 266 **in cattle in CES, South Sudan**

Variable	Category	No. sampled	No. positive	OR	95% CI	p-value
Sex	Male	132	10			
	Female	346	93	4.485	2.256 – 8.915	< 0.001
Age	$\geq$ 1year old	75	4			
	2 - 5 years old	201	44	4.975	1.721 – 14.376	0.003
	>5 years old	202	55	6.641	2.315 – 19.050	< 0.001
Abortion	No	264	56			
	Yes	82	37	3.054	1.806 – 5.166	<0.001
Retained Placenta	No	281	65			
	Yes	65	28	2.515	1.431 – 4.419	0.001
Reproductive	Not	91	17	-	-	-

status	produced					
	Pregnant	37	12	2.089	0.878 – 4.972	0.096
	Lactating	158	38	1.378	0.726 – 2.617	0.326
	Dry	60	26	3.329	1.598 – 6.934	0.001
	NA	132	10	-	-	-
Parity	Not	90	17	-	-	-
	produced					
	Produced	62	16	1.494	0.687 – 3.245	0.311
	once					
	Produced	74	26	2.326	1.142 – 4.739	0.020
	twice					
	Produced	120	34	1.698	0.877 – 3.286	0.116
	more than					
	twice					

267

268

269 **Table 4: Univariable analysis of potential risk factors associated with *Brucella***  
 270 **seropositivity in small ruminants**

Variable	Category	No. sampled	No. positive	X <sup>2</sup>	p-value
Sex	Male	64	2	3.303	0.069
	Female	301	31		
Age	≤ 1year old	97	5	2.426	0.119
	> years old	268	28		
Animal species	Goats	279	33	11.183	0.001

	Sheep	86	0		
Retained	Yes	16	1	3.640	0.162
placenta history	No	285	30		
	N/A	64	2		
Abortion history	Yes	39	4	3.303	0.192
	No	262	27		
	N/A	64	2		
Reproductive status	Not produced	25	0	8.043	0.090
	Pregnant	64	7		
	Lactating	182	19		
	Dry	30	5		
	NA	64	2		
	Not produced	26	0	10.394	0.034
	Produced once	38	2		
	Produced	69	6		
	twice				
	Produced	168	23		
Parity level	more than twice				
	NA	64	2		

271

272

273 **Table 5: Univariate analysis of potential risk factors associated with *Brucella* seropositivity**

274 **in humans**

Variable	Category	No.	No.	OR	95%CI	p-value
----------	----------	-----	-----	----	-------	---------



		Sample	positive			
		d				
Gender	Male	130	5	2.083	0.225 – 19.321	0.518
	Female	13	1	-	-	-
Age	18 – 25 years old	90	4	-	-	-
	25 – 32 years old	21	2	2.263	0.386 – 13.268	0.235
	> 32 years	32	0	0.000	0.000 -	0.998
Marital status	Single	97	3	2.425	0.469 – 12.528	0.290
	Married	40	3	-	-	-
Educational level	No formal education	120	6			0.753
	Primary education	16	0	0.000		
	Secondary education	6	0	0.000		
	Tertiary education	1	0	0.000		
Occupation	Pastoralist	130(6)	6			0.960
	Farmer	8(0)	0			
	Butcher	1(0)	0			
	Student	2(0)	0			
	Other	2(0)	0			
Consumed raw meat	Yes	124(6)	6	0.86	0.805 – 0.921	0.327
	No	19(0)	0	-	-	-

Consumed	Yes	135(6)	6	0.942	0.903 – 0.982	0.542
raw milk	No	8(0)	0			
Blowing	Yes	130	4	1.4	0.782 – 2.434	0.035
through	No	13	2	-	-	-
vagina						

275

276

### 277 **Multivariable logistic regression analysis**

278 In cattle, all the six variables from the univariate analysis were included in the multivariable  
 279 model. The multivariable logistic regression model identified sex, age, and abortion history as  
 280 statistically significant factors of *Brucella* seropositivity in cattle. The odds of seropositivity  
 281 were nearly threefold (OR: 2.8; 95% CI: 1.3 – 5.8, p: 0.006) higher in cows compared to bulls  
 282 (male cattle). Older cattle over two years had higher odds of *Brucella* seropositivity than young  
 283 animals (OR: 3.5, 95% CI: 1.2 – 10.3-, p: 0.025). Cows with a history of abortion had higher  
 284 odds of *Brucella* seropositivity (OR: 2.8, 95% CI: 1.6 – 4.7, p: <0.001).

285 The Hosmer-Lemeshow goodness-of-fit test showed that the model fairly fitted the data ( $X^2 =$   
 286 10.281, p-value: 0.113).

287 However, in small ruminants, none of the variables was found to be statistically significant (P <  
 288 0.05) at the multivariate analysis with *Brucella* seropositivity.

289

### 290 **Table 5: Multivariable logistic regression analysis of risk factors for *Brucella* seropositivity** 291 **in cattle and small ruminants**

---

**Multivariate analysis of risk factors in cattle**

---

<b>Variable</b>	<b>Category</b>	<b>OR</b>	<b>p-value</b>	<b>95 % CI</b>
Sex	Male			
	Female	2.783	0.006	1.346 – 5.755
Age	< 1year old			
	2 – 5 years old	3.463	0.024	1.174 – 10.211
	> 5years old	3.474	0.025	1.168 – 10.328
Abortion history	No*			
	Yes	2.781	<0.001	1.631 – 4.739

---

292

293 **DISCUSSION**

294 This study has for the first time revealed seroprevalence of brucellosis in, goats, and the pastoral  
295 communities, and the absence of seropositive sheep in CES, South Sudan. The study revealed  
296 higher seroprevalence of brucellosis in cattle than in goats and identified the following risk  
297 factors; age, sex and previous history of abortion as significantly associated with *Brucella*  
298 seropositivity.

299 The current seroprevalence of brucellosis among the pastoral community was 4.1% (6/143)  
300 based on c-ELISA performed on RBPT seropositive sera. This seroprevalence is lower compared  
301 to the finding by [16] in Wau, Western Bahr el Ghazal state (WBeGS), who revealed a  
302 seroprevalence of 23.3% (97/416) based on c-ELISA. Additionally, a higher seroprevalence of  
303 44% (56/126) based on serum agglutination test (SAT) was reported by [18] in Terekeka County,  
304 CES. These variations on the seroprevalence could be attributed to the nature and design of those  
305 previous studies. The seroprevalence reported in this study was community-based, participants  
306 were randomly selected, and the design was across-sectional compared to the previous studies,

307 which were hospital-based and targeted suspected febrile patients. In Tanzania, a lower  
308 seroprevalence of 1.6 % in humans, has been reported by[24] and high prevalence of  
309 7.7%reported by[25]. In Uganda on the other side,[26]reported a seroprevalence of 7.5%  
310 (15/200) among febrile out patients in Wakiso district, Central Uganda.

311 The variations on brucellosis seroprevalence could be attributed to spatial and temporal features  
312 and animal husbandry practices, pastoralists lifestyles, availability of veterinary services and  
313 control programs[9].

314 In South Sudan, livestock production systems are categorized as pastoral and agro-pastoral. A  
315 variety of livestock species including cattle, sheep and goats are reared collectively and kept in  
316 camping called ‘cattle camps’. The dominant species kept is cattle, followed by goats and to a  
317 lesser extent the sheep as this correlate with number sample collected in this study.

318 In cattle, the study revealed higher seroprevalence, 21.3% (102/478), compared to goats, 11.8%  
319 (33/279). This finding is in agreement with[24], those who reported a significantly higher  
320 prevalence in cattle than in goats in Tanzania.[25] had reported that cattle were more at risk of  
321 contracting *Brucella* infection than goats. Comparatively, the seroprevalence reported in cattle in  
322 this study is less compared to the 25.3% (86/340) reported by [19] and 29.3% (147/502) by  
323 [17]in South Sudan. However, another study reported a higher individual animal seroprevalence  
324 of 30.8% (88/285) and a lower herd prevalence of 77.7% compared to the findings of this study  
325 [12]. The high seroprevalence in cattle could be due to their dominance in the cattle camps in the  
326 study area. In South Sudan, cattle are kept for prestige, and the pastoralists rarely contemplate  
327 selling or culling them out. Hence, cattle harboring *Brucella* could have a chance of living longer  
328 than small ruminants in the cattle camps and would continue shedding infection given that the  
329 seroprevalence rises with age.

330 The study also revealed a seroprevalence of 11.8% (33/279) in goats. The seroprevalence was  
331 high in female goats 8.5% (31/365) compared to male goats 0.5% (2/365). Similarly, the  
332 prevalence of this study is in agreement with [27] who revealed higher prevalence of brucellosis  
333 in females 10.3% (31/301) compared to males 3.1% (2/64) in Arsi zone, Oromia, Ethiopia.  
334 [28] also reported a higher seroprevalence of brucellosis in female goats 1.4% (4/276) than males  
335 0% (0/84) in Korahey zone, Somali regional state, eastern Ethiopia. The seroprevalence of goats  
336 in this study is also in agreement with a prevalence of 11.4% (35/307) reported by [15] on  
337 caprine in Khartoum State, Sudan. [29] in Borona pastoral areas in Southern Ethiopia reported  
338 higher prevalence 17.36% (137/789) of brucellosis in goats than the seroprevalence reported on  
339 this study.

340 Additionally, [10] reported a higher seroprevalence of 3.92% (13/332) in goats compared to  
341 1.23% (1/81) in sheep in Karega District, Uganda.

342 The fact that none of the well-established risk factors for *B. melitensis* infection in goats were  
343 found associated with seropositivity in goats in our study suggests that not *B. melitensis* but most  
344 likely *B. abortus* spilling over from cattle could be the cause for seropositivity in goats. Indeed,  
345 although reports of *B. abortus* infection in small ruminants are scarce, such infections have been  
346 reported worldwide [30].

347 This study revealed a 0.0% seroprevalence of brucellosis in sheep (0/86). This is in line with [27]  
348 in Ethiopia who reported a 0.0% seroprevalence of brucellosis.

349 In West Africa, there is no report of *B. melitensis* infection in small ruminants. Seropositivity in  
350 small ruminants was documented in Nigeria to be associated with *B. abortus* infection that had  
351 spilled over from infected cattle [31]. In Latin America, sheep are not significantly infected with  
352 *B. melitensis* even when kept in close contact with goats [32]. Moreover, they do not easily

353 become infected with *B. abortus* [33]. This could be attributed to factors such as breed  
354 susceptibility, predominance species, husbandry practices and the self-limiting nature of the  
355 disease in sheep [34]. Reports from Egypt and Iran suggest that sheep are less susceptible to *B.*  
356 *abortus* infections than goats [30,35]

357 The fact that brucellosis seropositivity was not detected in sheep means that this species cannot  
358 be recognized as a source of human infection, which is an important epidemiological feature  
359 with implications in prospective One Health control measures. Moreover, it raises interesting  
360 questions regarding the etiology of brucellosis in South Sudan. In this perspective, a point of  
361 concern is the potential emergence of *Brucella* species infecting non-preferential hosts.

362 In the analysis of the risk factors, the study identified a significant association of *Brucella*  
363 seropositivity with sex, age, and abortion history in cattle. A Higher prevalence of brucellosis  
364 was identified in females cattle, 19.5 % (93/346) compared to males, 2.1% (10/132), and this  
365 difference was statistically significant (OR = 2.783, P-value < 0.006). This finding is in  
366 agreement with [13] who reported a significant association of *Brucella* seropositivity with sex on  
367 which female animals had higher level of exposure compared to males. Other researchers have  
368 reported similar findings of significant association of *Brucella* seropositivity in female  
369 animals [24,36].

370 The current study also revealed that cows with a prior history of abortion had higher odds of  
371 *Brucella* seropositivity (OR: 2.8, 95% CI: 1.6 – 4.7, p: <0.001). Our finding is in agreement with  
372 a previous study conducted in South Sudan [17] as well as with the findings from multiple  
373 studies [37–40] which reported an association of *Brucella* seropositivity with abortion.

374 This could be due to repeated exposure to *Brucella* spp. as female animals stay for longer periods  
375 in herds than males. Furthermore, the female reproductive tract provides a potential reservoir for

376 the organism to propagate due to the presence of erythritol sugar which stimulates the growth of  
377 *Brucella* organism. The study revealed that, older cattle over two years of age (OR: 3.5, 95% CI:  
378 1.2 – 10.3-, p: 0.025) had higher odds of *Brucella* seropositivity than younger ones. This finding  
379 is in agreement with several studies [37,38] that also identified age as a risk factor for *Brucella*  
380 seropositivity in cattle. In contrast to the current's study finding, another study had revealed a  
381 higher odds of *Brucella* infection in young compared to adults [41].

382 The fact that older cattle showed higher seropositivity to *Brucella* infection than the young ones  
383 could be attributed to continued exposure to pathogen, especially in the cattle camps where cattle  
384 are kept over long periods. The seroprevalence of brucellosis in the herds within cattle camps of  
385 Terekeka County was 100% compared to Juba County which was 50%. This finding is in  
386 agreement with [17] who reported herd seroprevalence based on c-ELISA at 61.4% and 90.0%  
387 for peri-urban Juba town and rural Terekeka County cattle herds, respectively. Our results  
388 suggest that cattle are a reservoir of brucellosis in livestock, because of the highest  
389 seroprevalence found in this species, most likely due to *B. abortus*, its preferential host. The  
390 lower seroprevalence in goats suggests that *B. abortus* may have spilled over from cattle to goats.  
391 The absence of seropositivity in sheep suggest that *B. melitensis* not endemic in this species and  
392 that *B. abortus* has not yet spilled over to the sheep due to the husbandry systems, with spatial  
393 and temporal segregation mainly between cattle and sheep.

394

## 395 **CONCLUSION**

396 This study report for the first time seroprevalence of brucellosis in goats in South Sudan where  
397 it's prevalence in livestock and pastoral community revealed its endemicity.

398 Female cattle have a higher risk of infection compared to males. Previous history of abortion and  
399 older cattle were significantly associated with *Brucella* seropositivity. Based on our findings, we  
400 recommend that control measures should be directed to cattle to reduce production losses and  
401 possible spillover to goats and to prevent human contamination. Moreover, strategies for  
402 nationwide awareness campaigns and implementing One Health approach are needed to mitigate  
403 brucellosis in South Sudan effectively.

404 Efforts should be put on the isolation of *Brucella* spp. from cattle and goats to document that *B.*  
405 *abortus* has spilled over from its cattle reservoir to goats and to prevent its further spill over to  
406 sheep.

407 Additionally, control measures should first be directed to cattle to reduce production losses and  
408 possible spillover to goats and to prevent human contamination from a One Health perspective.

409

#### 410 **ETHICAL CLEARANCE**

411 The study protocol was approved by the Institutional Review Board of Sokoine University of  
412 Agriculture under reference number (DPRTC/R/186/16) and the National Ministry of Health  
413 Research Ethics Review Board (RERB-P No: 13/14/02/2023), South Sudan.

414 Additionally, permissions for data collection were obtained from the State Ministry of Animal  
415 Resources, Fisheries and Tourism and the Ministry of Health, CES, South Sudan.

416 Moreover, Export and Import permits for shipment of the biological samples were obtained from  
417 the National Ministry of Livestock and Fisheries, South Sudan, and the Ministry of Livestock  
418 and Fisheries, United Republic of Tanzania.

419 Informed consent was obtained from each study participant who agreed to participate in the  
420 study prior to data collection.



421

## 422 **ACKNOWLEDGMENTS**

423 The authors are grateful to acknowledge the State Ministries of Health and that of Animal  
424 Resources, Fisheries and Tourism in CES, Juba for granting permission for data collection.

425 We would like to appreciate the National Ministries of Livestock and Fisheries and of Trade and  
426 Industries in South Sudan for issuing an Export Permit. The Ministry of Livestock and Fisheries  
427 in Tanzania is greatly appreciated for issuing the Import permit of the biological samples. We are  
428 indebted to Sokoine University of Agriculture for availing laboratory facility. Additionally, we  
429 would like to express our appreciation to all field and laboratory technicians for technical  
430 assistance. Many thanks, to Dr. Lazarus Lugoi, University of Juba for producing the map of the  
431 study area. We acknowledge the cattle owners in the cattle camps for their effective participation  
432 and amicable cooperation during data collection.

433

## 434 **CONFLICT OF INTEREST**

435 The authors declare that they have no conflict of interests

436

## 437 **REFERENCES**

- 438 1. Saeed U, Ali S, Khan TM, El-Adawy H, Melzer F, Khan AU, Iftikhar A, & Neubauer H.  
439 Seroepidemiology and the molecular detection of animal brucellosis in Punjab, Pakistan.  
440 *Microorganisms*. 2019; 7(10):1–12. <https://doi.org/10.3390/microorganisms7100449>
- 441 2. Moreno E. Retrospective and prospective perspectives on zoonotic brucellosis. *Front*  
442 *Microbiol*. 2014; 5:1–18. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fmicb.2014.00213>
- 443 3. . Emmanuel T.AJ, Tijjani KI, Çakır A. Challenges and Possible Improvement of Livestock

- 444 Sector in South Sudan: Review Paper. *Int J Res - GrantHaalayah*. 2018; 6(2):214–23
- 445 4. World Organization for Animal Health. Infection with *Brucella abortus*, *B. melitensis* and  
446 *B. suis*. *Terr Anim Heal Code* [Internet]. 2018; 1–48. Available from:  
447 [http://www.oie.int/index.php?id=169&L=0&htmfile=chapitre\\_bovine\\_brucellosis](http://www.oie.int/index.php?id=169&L=0&htmfile=chapitre_bovine_brucellosis).
- 448 5. Lokamar PN, Kutwah MA, Atieli H, Gumo S, Ouma C. Socio-economic impacts of  
449 brucellosis on livestock production and reproduction performance in Koibatek and  
450 Marigat regions, Baringo County, Kenya. *BMC Vet Res*. 2020; 16(1):1–13.  
451 <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12917-020-02283>
- 452 6. Pappas G, Akritidis N, Bosilkovski M, Tsianos E. review article. Brucellosis. *The New*  
453 *England Journal of Medicine*. 2005; 2325–2336.
- 454 7. Corbel MMJ. Brucellosis in humans and animals Brucellosis in humans and animals.  
455 WHO Libr Cat Publ Data. 2006; 1–88.
- 456 8. Franc KA, Krecek RC, Häsler BN, Arenas-Gamboa AM. Brucellosis remains a neglected  
457 disease in the developing world: A call for interdisciplinary action. *BMC Public Health*.  
458 2018; 18(1):1–9. DOI 10.1186/s12889-017-5016-y
- 459 9. Tulu D. Bovine Brucellosis : Epidemiology , Public Health Implications , and Status of  
460 Brucellosis in Ethiopia. Dovepress. 2022; 21–30.
- 461 10. Akwongo CJ, Kakooza S. Exposure to *Brucella* spp. in Goats and Sheep in Karenga  
462 District, Uganda Diagnosed by Modified Rose Bengal Method. *Zoonotic Dis*. 2022; 163–  
463 171. <https://doi.org/10.3390/zoonoticdis2030015>
- 464 11. Muema J, Oboge H, Mutono N, Makori A, Oyugi J, Bukania Z, Njuguna J, Jost C, Ogoti  
465 B, Omulo S, Thumbi SM. Epidemiology of brucellosis in people and their livestock : A  
466 linked human – animal cross-sectional study in a pastoralist community in Kenya. *Front*.

- 467 Vet. Sci. 9:1031639. doi: 10.3389/fvets 2022.1031639
- 468 12. Swai ES, Mkumbukwa AJ, Chaula SL, Leba BG. Case Report: Epidemiological  
469 Investigation of Bovine Brucellosis in Indigenous Cattle Herds in Kasulu District of  
470 Tanzania. YJBM. 2021; 94:285–296.
- 471 13. Akoko JM, Pelle R, Kivali V, Schelling E, Shirima G, Machuka E, Mathew C, Fevre EM,  
472 Kyallo V, Falzon LC, Lukambagire AS, Halliday JEB, Bonfoh B, Kazwala R, Ouma C.  
473 Serological and molecular evidence of *Brucella* species in the rapidly growing pig sector  
474 in Kenya. BMC Vet Res. 2020;16 (1):1–7.
- 475 14. Nguna J, Dione M, Apamaku M, Majalija S, Mugizi DR, Odoch T, Drago CK, Tumwine  
476 G, Kabaasa JD, Curtis K, Graham M, Ejobi F, and Graham T. Seropositivity in cattle,  
477 goats and humans in Iganga District, Uganda. Pan African Medical Journal, ISSN 1937-  
478 8688. <https://doi.org/10.116011604/pamj>. 2019; 33.99.16960
- 479 15. Mohamed EM-A, Elfadil AAM, El-sanousi EM, Ibrahaem HH, Mohamed-Noor SE,  
480 Abdalla MA, and Shuaib YA. Seroprevalence and risk factors of caprine brucellosis in  
481 Khartoum state, Sudan. Vet World, ISSN: 1937--8688. 2018; 11:511–8.  
482 <http://www.panafrican-med-journal.com/content/article/33/99/full/>
- 483 16. Madut NA, Nasinyama GW, Muma JB, Sube L KL, Ocan M, Muwongge Adrian,  
484 Godfroid J, Jubara AS, Kankya C. Prevalence of brucellosis among patients attending  
485 Wau Hospital, South Sudan. PloS ONE. 2018; 1–12. e0199315.  
486 <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0199315>
- 487 17. Lita E, Nasinyama G, Ochi E, James B, Erume J. Sero-prevalence and Risk Factors  
488 Associated with Bovine Brucellosis in Central Equatoria State, South Sudan. Scholars  
489 Journals of Agriculture and Veterinary Science. 2016; 3(7): 454-462. Available from:

- 490 <https://pdfs.semanticscholar.org/f23c/44b4a99f036fb6f2a84902efb33787ef6eca.pdf>
- 491 18. Lado D, Maina N, Lado M, Abade A, Amwayi S, Omolo J, and Oundo J. Brucellosis in  
492 Terekeka County, Central Equatoria State. East African Medical Journal. 2012; 89(1):28–  
493 33.
- 494 19. McDermott JJ, Deng KA, Jayatileka TN & El Jack MA. 1987. A Cross-sectional Cattle  
495 Disease study in Kongor Rural council, South Sudan. II. Brucellosis in Cows: Association  
496 Factors, Impact on production and disease control considerations. Prev Vet Med. 1987; 5:  
497 125 - 132
- 498 20. Megersa B, Biffa D, Niguse F, Rufael T, Asmare K, Skjerve E. Cattle brucellosis in  
499 traditional livestock husbandry practice in Southern and Eastern Ethiopia , and its  
500 zoonotic implication. AVS. 2011; 1–8. <http://www.actavetscand.com/content/53/1/24>
- 501 21. Preena P, Darshana W U, Naveen KV, Shefeena S, Ganesan PI, Balakrishnan S, Ronald  
502 BSM. Cross-species transmission of *Brucella abortus* in an aborted sow. JEZS 2020;  
503 8(3):1793–17955.
- 504 22. Thrusfield M. Veterinary epidemiology. Third Edition. Blackwell Science. pp626.
- 505 23. Alton GG, Johns LM, Angus, Pietz, DE. Laboratory techniques in brucellosis. 2<sup>nd</sup> Edition.  
506 Published under auspices of Food and Agriculture (FAO) (FAO) and World Health  
507 Organization (WHO) of the United Nations. Vol. 91, Harefuah. 1976.
- 508 24. Assenga JA, Matemba LE, Muller SK, Malakalinga JJ, Kazwala RR. Epidemiology of  
509 Brucella infection in the human, livestock and wildlife interface in the Katavi-Rukwa  
510 ecosystem, Tanzania. BMC Vet Res. 2015; 11:189. Available from:  
511 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1186/s12917-015-0504-8>
- 512 25. Ntirandekura JB, Matemba LE, Kimera SI, Muma JB, Karimuribo ED. Brucellosis and its

- 513 associated risk factors to humans and domestic ruminants in Kagera Ecosystem, Tanzania.  
514 Afri Health Sci. 2021; 21(2). 523-530 <https://dx.doi.org/10.4314/ahs.v21i2.6>
- 515 26. Majalija S, Luyombo P, Tumwine G. Sero-prevalence and associated risk factors of  
516 Brucellosis among Malaria negative febrile out-patients in Wakiso district, Central  
517 Uganda. BMC Res Notes. 2018; 1–6. Available from: [https://doi.org/10.1186/s13104-018-](https://doi.org/10.1186/s13104-018-3907-3)  
518 3907-3
- 519 27. Kadi A. Seroprevalence of *Brucella* infection in sheep and goat in two Woreda , in Arsi  
520 Zone, Oromia, Ethiopia. Int. J. Vet. Res. 2022; 8(3):113–117. DOI:  
521 <https://dx.doi.org/10.17352/ijvsr.000123>
- 522 28. Hussen AM, Alemu F, Hussen AH, Mohamed AH, Gebremeskel HF. Herd and animal  
523 level seroprevalence and associated risk factors of small ruminant brucellosis in the  
524 Korahey zone, Somali regional state , eastern. Front. Vet Sci. 2023; 10:1236494 doi:  
525 10.3389/fvets.2023.1236494
- 526 29. Teshome D, Sori T, Banti T, Knife G, Wieland B, Alemayeh G. Prevalence and risk  
527 factors of *Brucella* spp. in goats in Borana pastoral area, Southern Oromia, Ethiopia.  
528 Small Rumin Res. 2022; 206:106594.  
529 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.smallrumres.2021.106594>[https://doi.org/10.1016/j.smallrumres.2](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.smallrumres.2021.106594)  
530 021.106594
- 531 30. Rostami S, Rashidian E, Jaydari A, Rahimi H. Investigation of the Proportion of *Brucella*  
532 *abortus* and *Brucella melitensis* in Sheep and Goat Milk. Hindawi Veterinary Medicine  
533 International. Volume 2023; Article ID 6751152, <https://doi.org/10.1155/2023/6751152>.
- 534 31. Bertu WJ, Ducrotoy MJ, Muñoz PM, Mick V, Zúñiga-ripa A, Bryssinckx W, Kwaga JKP,  
535 Kabir J, Welburn SC, Moriyon I, Ocholi RA. Phenotypic and genotypic characterization

- 536 of *Brucella* strains isolated from autochthonous livestock reveals the dominance of *B.*  
537 *abortus* biovar 3a in Nigeria. *Vet Microbiol* [Internet]. 2015;180(1–2):103–108. Available  
538 from: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.vetmic.2015.08.014>
- 539 32. Scientific Committee on Animal Health and Animal Welfare. Brucellosis in sheep and  
540 goats. [sanco.c.2/AH/R23/2001](http://sanco.c.2/AH/R23/2001)
- 541 33. Bercovich Z. Maintenance of *Brucella Abortus* - free herds : A review with emphasis on  
542 the epidemiology and the problems in diagnosing brucellosis in areas of low prevalence.  
543 *Vet Quart.* 1998; 20:81-88. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01652176.1998.9694845>
- 544 34. Otto M Radostits, Clive C Gay, Kenneth W, Hinchcliff PDC. A textbook of the diseases  
545 of cattle, sheep, goats, pigs and horses. 10<sup>th</sup> ed. Saunders; 2006.
- 546 35. Wareth G, El-Diasty M, Melzer F, Schmoock G, Moustafa SA, El-Beskawy M, Khater  
547 DF, Hamdy MER, Zaki HM, Ferreira AC, Ekateriniadou LV, Boukouvala E, Abdel-Glil  
548 MY, Menshawy AMS, Sancho M P, Sakhria S, Pletz MW, Neubauer H. MLVA-16  
549 Genotyping of *Brucella abortus* and *Brucella melitensis* Isolates from Di ff erent Animal  
550 Species in Egypt : Geographical Relatedness and the Mediterranean Lineage. *Pathogens*  
551 2020; 9, 498; doi:10.3390/pathogens9060498
- 552 36. Rahman MS, Faruk MO, Her M, Kim JY, Kang SI, Jung SC. Prevalence of brucellosis in  
553 ruminants in Bangladesh. *Vet Med.* 2011; 56(8):379–85. [https://doi.org/10.17221/1555-](https://doi.org/10.17221/1555-VETMED)  
554 [VETMED](https://doi.org/10.17221/1555-VETMED)
- 555 37. Tulu D, Urge B, Bogale A, Aleme M, Temteme S. Herd and animal level seroprevalence  
556 and associated risk factors of bovine brucellosis in different agro-ecologies of southwest  
557 Ethiopia. *Heliyon.* 2023; 9(6):e16852. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2023.e16852>
- 558 38. Edao BM, Ameni G, Assefa Z, Berg S, Whatmore AM, Wood JLN. Brucellosis in

- 559 ruminants and pastoralists in Borena, Southern Ethiopia. *PLoS Negl Trop Dis.* 2020;  
560 14(7):1–17. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1371/journal.pntd.0008461>
- 561 39. Mengele IJ, Shirima GM, Bwatota SF, Motto SK, Mark B, Bronsvort DC,  
562 Komwihangilo DM, Lyatuu E, Cook EAJ and Hernandez-Castro LE. The Status and Risk  
563 Factors of Brucellosis in Smallholder Dairy Cattle in Selected Regions of Tanzania. *Vet.*  
564 *Sci.* 2023; 10,155. <https://doi.org/10.3390/vetsci10020155>
- 565 40. Sima DM, Ifa DA, Merga AL, Tola EH. Seroprevalence of Bovine Brucellosis and  
566 Associated Risk Factors in Western Ethiopia. *Dovepress* 2021; 317–24.
- 567 41. Warioba JP, Karimuribo ED, Komba EVG, Kabululu ML, Minga GA, Nonga HE.  
568 Occurrence and Risk Factors of Brucellosis in Commercial Cattle Farms from Selected  
569 Districts of the Eastern Coast Zone, Tanzania. *Hindawi.* 2023; ID4904931.  
570 <https://doi.org/10.1155/2023/4904931>
- 571