

## THE USE OF ELISA FOR DIAGNOSIS AND EPIDEMIOLOGY OF BRUCELLA INFECTION IN SOME FARM ANIMALS IN ASSIUT GOVERNORATE

NOHA H.M. ORABY\*\*; ASMAA A.A. HUSSIEN K.\*; ISMAIL, A.A. \*; ELIAS A.H.\*\*  
and ABDEL-KADER, H.A.\*\*

\* Animal Hygiene & Zoonoses Dept., Faculty of Vet. Med., Assiut-71526, Egypt.

\*\* Animal Health Research Institute, Assiut , Egypt.

Received: 9. 6. 2007.

Accepted: 19. 6. 2007

### SUMMARY

The prevalence of brucella infection among different species of farm animals in Assiut Governorate was estimated by using Rose Bengal plate test (RBPT), Buffered acidified plate antigen test (BAPAT), Tube agglutination test (TAT), Rivanol test (Riv.T.) and Enzyme linked immunosorbent assay (ELISA). A total number of 197 cattle blood samples were examined serologically. Brucellosis incidence all over Assiut Governorate was 3.6 %. On the other hand, slaughter houses revealed the highest infection rate (7.1 %) followed by private flocks (1.6 %). While governmental farms did not record any infection rates in this study. A significant correlation between sexually

mature animals and the rate of infection was observed. The incidence of brucellosis among cattle was varied according to sex from 0.00 % in males to 6 % in females. Seroprevalence of brucella infection among 129 sheep blood samples was 11.6 % all over the governorate. A highest attack rate (50 %) was observed among the age group 2.3-2.6 years. The incidence of brucella infection was 12.2 % in ewes while no positive cases were recorded in rams. The serological examination of 32 buffaloes' sera did not detect any positive reactors. The role of these animals in transmitting infection to humans was discussed. The public health hazard from detecting brucella antibodies in 7.3 % of the composite milk from 41 dairy cows was also clarified.

## INTRODUCTION

Brucellosis is the most important zoonosis in terms of human suffering and is a true zoonosis in that almost all human cases are acquired from animals, in particular goats and sheep. Furthermore, it is considered as the main zoonotic disease especially in the Eastern Mediterranean Region. In Egypt, brucellosis is still remaining one of the major disease problems that affect animal industry as well as animal health inspite of the intensive governmental effort to minimize risk of infection. AOAD (1995) estimated that annual economic losses due to brucellosis were about 60 million Egyptian pounds yearly. Some investigations were carried out in Assiut Governorate to determine the prevalence of brucella infection among some farm animals. Zaghoul and Kamel, (1985) determined an infection rate in 2.7 % of examined cattle. While, Gaddalla (1991) was able to detect brucella infection in 1.7 % of cattle. Abdel-Hafeez et al. (1995) isolated *Brucella melitensis* biovar 3 from 3 Frisian cows by bacteriological examination of retropharyngeal, suprapupular and supramammary lymph nodes. Moreover, Abdel-Hafeez (1996) determined brucella infection in 0.29 % out of 8774 cattle Sedeek (1999) recorded a brucella seroprevalence of 0.58 % among cattle by using Riv.T. Two years later, Abdel-Hafeez et al. (2001) estimated brucella incidence in 0.53% out of 17456 examined cattle.

On the other hand, Gaddalla (1991) estimated an incidence of 0.84 % brucella infection among sheep in Assiut Governorate. While, Ali (1997) recorded an incidence of 1.6 %, 1.6 %, 1.33 %, and 1.4% brucella infection among 21776 examined sheep during the period from January to December 1995 by using BAPAT, RBPT, TAT, and Riv.T respectively. Sedeek (1999) recorded brucella infection in 1.15 %, 1.15 %, 0.85 %, and 1.1 % of 8457 sheep by using BAPAT, RBPT, TAT, and Riv.T respectively. Furthermore, Abdel-Hafeez et al. (2001) estimated an incidence of 1.35 % among 32939 examined sheep.

The incidence of brucellosis among buffaloes was recorded by many authors as El-Olemy (1974); Nashed (1977); Zaghoul and Kamel (1985); Abdel-Wahab (1985) and Abdel-Hafeez et al. (2001) who reported an incidence of 0.27 %, 0.22 %, 1.44 %, 1.8 % and 0.26 % respectively.

This study attempts to investigate the seroprevalence of brucellosis among some farm animals in Assiut Governorate and throw a spot light on the epidemiology of the disease as well as the evaluation of the used serological tests in comparison with ELISA.

## MATERIALS and METHODS

The present study was carried out during the period between May, 2003 to June, 2004 in the Department of Animal Hygiene and Zoonoses,

Faculty of Vet. Med., Assiut University; Department of Microbiology and Immunology. Faculty of Med., Assiut University and Assiut Regional Lab. (Animal Health Research Institute).

#### **Source of specimens**

A total of 465 animals of different species including cattle (197), sheep (129), and buffaloes (32) were selected for this study. The examined cattle were collected from two governmental farms in Assiut Governorate including Monshaat Khashaaba (27), Military farm (25), Private flocks (61), and Slaughterhouses (84). Sheep were randomly collected from private flocks as well as buffaloes samples were collected from slaughterhouses in Assiut Governorate.

#### **2-Collection of samples**

##### **A) Blood samples**

10 ml of blood were obtained from each examined animals by using a vacutainer tubes. Samples were kept overnight at 4°C to allow the separation of serum then centrifuged at 3000 r.p.m for 10 minutes. The collected sera were coded and kept at - 20°C up to the time of the test.

##### **B) Milk samples:**

Milk samples were obtained from 41 dairy

cows. Milk serum was obtained according to (Morgan et al., 1978). The clear supernatant was transferred into Eppendorf tube, labeled and preserved at - 20°C up to the time of testing.

#### **Serological examination of collected samples:**

All sera were subjected to Rose-Bengal plate test (RBPT) according to Morgan et al. (1969), Buffered acidified plate antigen test (BAPAT) as Alton et al. (1988), tube agglutination test (TAT) according to Alton et al. (1975), Rivanol test (Riv.T) as Alton et al. (1988) and Enzyme linked immunosorbent assay (ELISA) according to Ariaza et al. (1992) and Baldi et al. (1996). The used antigens were obtained from the Veterinary Sera and Vaccine Research Institute (VSVRI), Abasia, Cairo, 11517, Egypt. The ELISA kits [Brucella ELISA IgG (Vircell No. G1003)] were obtained from Vircell Company, Web site.

#### **RESULTS**

The obtained results were illustrated in Table (1) to Table (9).

| Locality   | RBPT |    | BAPAT |    | TAT |    | HVT |    | ELISA |    |
|------------|------|----|-------|----|-----|----|-----|----|-------|----|
|            | No.  | %  | No.   | %  | No. | %  | No. | %  | No.   | %  |
| Government | 0    | 0  | 0     | 0  | 0   | 0  | 0   | 0  | 0     | 0  |
| Private    | 6    | 71 | 6     | 71 | 5   | 6  | 6   | 71 | 6     | 71 |
| Private    | 1    | 14 | 1     | 14 | 1   | 14 | 1   | 14 | 1     | 14 |
| Total      | 6    | 71 | 6     | 71 | 5   | 6  | 6   | 71 | 6     | 71 |

Table (2): Ecological distribution of brucella seropositive reactors among cattle in Assam Governorate.

| No. of herd samples | RBPT |    | BAPAT |      | TAT |     | HVT |     | ELISA |      |
|---------------------|------|----|-------|------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-------|------|
|                     | No.  | %  | No.   | %    | No. | %   | No. | %   | No.   | %    |
| +ve                 | 7    | 36 | 190   | 96.4 | 6   | 3   | 1   | 0.5 | 191   | 96.4 |
|                     | 7    | 36 | 190   | 96.4 | 6   | 3   | 1   | 0.5 | 191   | 96.4 |
| -ve                 | 12   | 56 | 3     | 1.5  | 1   | 0.5 | 1   | 0.5 | 3     | 1.5  |
|                     | 12   | 56 | 3     | 1.5  | 1   | 0.5 | 1   | 0.5 | 3     | 1.5  |
| Total               | 19   | 88 | 193   | 94.9 | 13  | 6.5 | 2   | 1.0 | 194   | 93.9 |
|                     | 19   | 88 | 193   | 94.9 | 13  | 6.5 | 2   | 1.0 | 194   | 93.9 |

Table (1): Seroprevalence of Brucellosis among cattle in Assam Governorate.

| Sex    | No. of tested samples | Positive cases |     |       |     |     |     |        |     |       |     |
|--------|-----------------------|----------------|-----|-------|-----|-----|-----|--------|-----|-------|-----|
|        |                       | RBPT           |     | BAPAT |     | TAT |     | Riv.T. |     | ELISA |     |
|        | No.                   | %              | No. | %     | No. | %   | No. | %      | No. | %     |     |
| Female | 117                   | 7              | 6   | 7     | 6   | 5.1 | 7   | 6      | 7   | 6     |     |
| Male   | 80                    | 0              | 0   | 0     | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0      | 0   | 0     |     |
| Total  | 197                   | 7              | 3.6 | 7     | 3.6 | 6   | 3   | 7      | 3.6 | 7     | 3.6 |

Table (3): Seroprevalence of Brucellosis among cattle according to sex.

| Age           | No. of tested samples | Positive cases |      |   |       |   |      |     |      |   |        |   |      |       |
|---------------|-----------------------|----------------|------|---|-------|---|------|-----|------|---|--------|---|------|-------|
|               |                       | RBPT           |      |   | BAPAT |   |      | TAT |      |   | Riv.T. |   |      | ELISA |
|               | No.                   | %              | No.  | % | No.   | % | No.  | %   | No.  | % | No.    | % | No.  | %     |
| 1-2 years     | 51                    | 0              | 0    | 0 | 0     | 0 | 0    | 0   | 0    | 0 | 0      | 0 | 0    | 0     |
| 2-3 years     | 36                    | 0              | 0    | 0 | 0     | 0 | 0    | 0   | 0    | 0 | 0      | 0 | 0    | 0     |
| 3-4 years     | 29                    | 1              | 3.4  | 1 | 3.4   | 1 | 3.4  | 1   | 3.4  | 1 | 3.4    | 1 | 3.4  | 0     |
| 4-5 years     | 19                    | 2              | 10.5 | 2 | 10.5  | 1 | 5.3  | 2   | 10.5 | 2 | 10.5   | 1 | 5.3  | 2     |
| 5-6 years     | 28                    | 3              | 10.7 | 3 | 10.7  | 3 | 10.7 | 3   | 10.7 | 3 | 10.7   | 3 | 10.7 | 3     |
| 6-7 years     | 29                    | 1              | 3.4  | 1 | 3.4   | 1 | 3.4  | 1   | 3.4  | 1 | 3.4    | 1 | 3.4  | 1     |
| Above 7 years | 5                     | 0              | 0    | 0 | 0     | 0 | 0    | 0   | 0    | 0 | 0      | 0 | 0    | 0     |
| Total         | 197                   | 7              | 3.6  | 7 | 3.6   | 6 | 3    | 7   | 3.6  | 7 | 3.6    | 7 | 3.6  | 7     |

Table (4): Age distribution of Brucellosis among cattle.

Table (5): Results of different serological tests on blood and milk sera of the examined dairy cattle.

| Number of tested blood & milk samples | Blood serum    |      |       |      |     |     |        |      |       |      | Milk Serum     |     |        |     |      |     |         |     |        |     |
|---------------------------------------|----------------|------|-------|------|-----|-----|--------|------|-------|------|----------------|-----|--------|-----|------|-----|---------|-----|--------|-----|
|                                       | Positive cases |      |       |      |     |     |        |      |       |      | Positive cases |     |        |     |      |     |         |     |        |     |
|                                       | RBPT           |      | BAPAT |      | TAT |     | Riv.T. |      | ELISA |      | WRBPT          |     | WBAPAT |     | WTAT |     | WRiv.T. |     | WELISA |     |
|                                       | No.            | %    | No.   | %    | No. | %   | No.    | %    | No.   | %    | No.            | %   | No.    | %   | No.  | %   | No.     | %   | No.    | %   |
| 41                                    | 5              | 12.2 | 5     | 12.2 | 4   | 9.8 | 5      | 12.2 | 5     | 12.2 | 1              | 2.4 | 1      | 2.4 | 1    | 2.4 | 2       | 4.9 | 3      | 7.3 |

Table (6): Seroprevalence of Brucellosis among sheep in Assiut Governorate.

| Number of tested blood samples | RBPT       |      |            |      | BAPAT     |      |            |      | TAT        |     |            |     | Riv.T.     |      |            |      | ELISA      |      |            |      |            |      |
|--------------------------------|------------|------|------------|------|-----------|------|------------|------|------------|-----|------------|-----|------------|------|------------|------|------------|------|------------|------|------------|------|
|                                | + ve cases |      | - ve cases |      | +ve cases |      | - ve cases |      | + ve cases |     | ± ve cases |     | - ve cases |      | + ve cases |      | - ve cases |      | + ve cases |      | - ve cases |      |
|                                | No.        | %    | No.        | %    | No.       | %    | No.        | %    | No.        | %   | No.        | %   | No.        | %    | No.        | %    | No.        | %    | No.        | %    | No.        | %    |
| 129                            | 16         | 12.4 | 113        | 87.6 | 16        | 12.4 | 113        | 87.6 | 10         | 7.8 | 5          | 3.9 | 114        | 88.4 | 16         | 12.4 | 113        | 87.6 | 15         | 11.6 | 114        | 88.4 |

Table (7): Seroprevalence of Brucellosis among sheep according to sex.

| Sex    | No. of tested samples | Positive cases |      |       |      |     |     |        |      |       |      |  |  |
|--------|-----------------------|----------------|------|-------|------|-----|-----|--------|------|-------|------|--|--|
|        |                       | RBPT           |      | BAPAT |      | TAT |     | Riv.T. |      | ELISA |      |  |  |
|        |                       | No.            | %    | No.   | %    | No. | %   | No.    | %    | No.   | %    |  |  |
| Female | 123                   | 16             | 13   | 16    | 13   | 10  | 8.1 | 16     | 13   | 15    | 12.2 |  |  |
| Male   | 6                     | 0              | 0    | 0     | 0    | 0   | 0   | 0      | 0    | 0     | 0    |  |  |
| Total  | 129                   | 16             | 12.4 | 16    | 12.4 | 10  | 7.8 | 16     | 12.4 | 15    | 11.6 |  |  |

Table (8): Age distribution of Brucellosis among sheep.

| Age             | No. of tested samples | Positive cases |      |       |      |     |      |        |      |       |      |  |  |
|-----------------|-----------------------|----------------|------|-------|------|-----|------|--------|------|-------|------|--|--|
|                 |                       | RBPT           |      | BAPAT |      | TAT |      | Riv.T. |      | ELISA |      |  |  |
|                 |                       | No.            | %    | No.   | %    | No. | %    | No.    | %    | No.   | %    |  |  |
| Up to 1 year    | 10                    | 0              | 0    | 0     | 0    | 0   | 0    | 0      | 0    | 0     | 0    |  |  |
| 1.3 - 1.6 years | 2                     | 0              | 0    | 0     | 0    | 0   | 0    | 0      | 0    | 0     | 0    |  |  |
| 1.9 - 2 years   | 16                    | 6              | 37.5 | 6     | 37.5 | 3   | 18.8 | 6      | 37.5 | 6     | 37.5 |  |  |
| 2.3 - 2.6 years | 10                    | 5              | 50   | 5     | 50   | 4   | 40   | 5      | 50   | 5     | 50   |  |  |
| 2.9 - 3 years   | 35                    | 3              | 8.6  | 3     | 8.6  | 2   | 5.7  | 3      | 8.6  | 2     | 5.7  |  |  |
| Above 3 years   | 56                    | 2              | 3.6  | 2     | 3.6  | 1   | 1.8  | 2      | 3.6  | 2     | 3.6  |  |  |
| Total           | 129                   | 16             | 12.4 | 16    | 12.4 | 10  | 7.8  | 16     | 12.4 | 15    | 11.6 |  |  |

Table (9): Summarized table showing brucella positive reactors among some farm animals in Assiut Governorate by using different serological tests.

| Species   | Total No. | Positive cases |      |       |      |     |     |       |      |       |      |  |  |
|-----------|-----------|----------------|------|-------|------|-----|-----|-------|------|-------|------|--|--|
|           |           | RBPT           |      | BAPAT |      | TAT |     | Riv.T |      | ELISA |      |  |  |
|           |           | No.            | %    | No.   | %    | No. | %   | No.   | %    | No.   | %    |  |  |
| Cattle    | 197       | 7              | 3.6  | 7     | 3.6  | 6   | 3   | 7     | 3.6  | 7     | 3.6  |  |  |
| Buffaloes | 32        | 0              | 0    | 0     | 0    | 0   | 0   | 0     | 0    | 0     | 0    |  |  |
| Sheep     | 129       | 16             | 12.4 | 16    | 12.4 | 10  | 7.8 | 16    | 12.4 | 15    | 11.6 |  |  |

- RBPT: Rose Bengal plate test.
- BAPAT: Buffered acidified plate antigen test.
- TAT: Tube agglutination test.
- Riv.T.: Rivanol test.
- ELISA: Enzyme linked immunosorbent assay.



## DISCUSSION

Brucellosis is still a major disease problem facing the veterinary and medical professions and still imposes serious public health problems in many countries around the world, particularly in the Middle East, Latin America, and the Arabian Gulf as well as economic losses (Abdel-Hafeez et al., 1995 and Saleh et al., 2003).

The prevalence of brucellosis in serologically examined 197 cattle in Assiut Governorate (Table 1) was 3.6 %, 3.6 %, 3 %, 3.6 % and 3.6 % by using RBPT, BAPAT, TAT, Riv.T. and ELISA respectively. These findings were considered higher than those previously recorded by Kaldas, 1990 (0.97 %); Abdel-Hafeez, 1996 (0.3 %) and Abdel-Hafeez et al., 2001 (0.53 %). On the contrary, they are lower than those reported by Hamdy, 1992 (7.5 %); Ibrahim et al., 2002 (29.17 %) ; Ahmed et al, 2002 (26.4 %) and Shalaby et al., 2003 (7.85 %). That difference can be an expected matter due to several factors such as difference in localities, hygienic and control measures adopted, as well as eradication programs in such countries.

The illustrated results in (Table 2) clarify a great variation in the ecological distribution of brucellosis in Assiut Governorate. Maximal infection rate was observed in the slaughterhouses (7.1 %), which may be attributed to the fact that all positive cases for brucella infection are sent to the

abattoir as a rule of eradication program (Montasser, 1999 and Montasser et al., 2002). On the other hand, frequent mixing and close contact of animals from different sources in markets, the availability of such herds to be transmitted from infected to a new free area as well as the absence of periodical examination play a significant role in persistence of brucella infection among small private herds amounting to 1.6 % in our study. On the contradictory side, governmental farms did not record any infection rate with brucellosis as they practise to calf hood vaccination with S19 and RB51 vaccines and periodical examination.

The incidence of brucellosis among cattle is variable according to sex from 0.00 % in males to 6 % in females (Table 3). It is difficult to reach any satisfactory conclusion regarding relative sex susceptibility because males and females are kept under such different conditions (Stableforth, 1959).i.e., females in dairy herds appear to be more susceptible than males that are often kept for meat production.

Regarding to the distribution of brucellosis among cattle (Table 4), it is evident that the highest antibody prevalence (10.7 %) was estimated among the age group 5-6 years. This finding supports the view of Shakya et al. (1995); Meyer (1990) and Amin et al. (2004) who reported that brucellosis is the disease of sexually mature animals.

Table (5) elucidates that, 5 (12.2 %) out of 41 examined lactating cows were brucella positive serologically. 3 (7.3 %) of these cases showed brucella agglutinins in their milk by using ELISA test. Shifting to the results of whey agglutination tests, it is clear that the overall results revealed low incidence of brucellosis ranging from 1 (2.4 %) by WRBPT, WBAPAT and WTAT to 2 (4.9 %) by using WRiv.T. This low sensitivity of whey tests may be due to defatting process which may deprive milk whey from some immunoglobulins that present on the surface of fat globules (Sutra et al., 1986). The removal of the solid parts by rennin, change in the pH and the change in molecular weight of the immunoglobulins could be additional factors that led to the low sensitivity of the whey agglutination tests (Sutra et al. 1986) and Hamdy, 1992). WELISA (whey enzyme linked immunosorbent assay) shows a good relative sensitivity and specificity in comparison with the other used agglutination tests and this accord with the results achieved by Nazem et al. (1998) who recommended the use of WELISA as a good substitute to the milk ELISA.

Seroprevalence rates of brucellosis among 129 examined sheep were 12.4 %, 12.4 %, 7.8 %, 12.4 % and 11.6 % by using RBPT, BAPAT, TAT, Riv.T. and ELISA respectively (Table, 6). A lower prevalence was obtained by Bassiony and Ibrahim, (1997) (1.99%); Ali, (1997) (1.4%); Sedeek, (1999) (1.1 %); Abdel-Hafeez et al., 2001 (1.35%) and Shalaby et al. (2003) (8.06%).

While, a higher percentage was detected by Shalaby, (1986) (42.75 %) and El-Bauomy, 1989 (15.03 %).

Such variations may be attributed to various factors including the environmental conditions controlling the different areas from which animals were imported. The extent of population movement and the evolutionary changes in the animals' husbandry are considered the main factors which affect the rate of exposure (Shahat, 2000).

The results shown in (Table 7) indicated that the incidence of brucella infection was (12.2 %) in ewes while no positive cases were recorded in rams. These findings nearly coincide with those obtained by Abdel-Ghani et al. (1983) and Mahmoudi et al. (1992). The high incidence of brucellosis among ewes may be attributed to various factors including the virulence of infecting strain, the size of infecting inoculum, pregnancy, sexual and immune status of the host (FAO / WHO, 1986).

Regarding to the susceptible age to contract the disease among sheep, illustrated results in Table (8) elucidate that a higher infection rate (50 %) was observed among the age group 2.3- 2.6 years. Susceptibility to infection in small ruminants increases after sexual maturity especially with pregnancy. Young animal may be infected but do not show any clinical signs and generally show a weak and transit serological response (Scientific

Committee in Animal Health and Animal Welfare, 2001).

The serological examination of 32 buffaloes' sera did not detect any positive reactors (Table 9). This obtained result upholds that buffaloes are somewhat resistant to the infection (Sadek, 2004). Regarding the results of RBPT and BAPAT (Table 4), it is evident that RBPT and BAPAT detected a higher number of positive reactors among animals compared with TAT. It may be due to the superior sensitivities of these tests which can detect low titers missed by TAT (Davis, 1971; El-Bauomy, 1989; Montasser, 1995 and Shalaby et al., 2003). Moreover, the acidic pH (3.65 in RBPT and 4.0 in BAPAT) of the antigens used in these tests inhibits to a certain extent the activity of non-specific immunoglobulins and enhances agglutination of IgG1 immunoglobulin (FAO / WHO, 1986; Huber, 1989; Alton et al., 1988; Barton, 1994 and Abdel-kader, 1996). The results of Riv.T. are similar to those obtained by RBPT and BAPAT. This confirms that most of the positive reactor animals were in the chronic stage in which IgG1 antibodies are evident. Whereas, Riv.T. is specific for detection of these antibodies after precipitation of IgM and reducing reactivity of IgG2 through the action of Rivanol solution (Mikolon, et al., 1998).

From obtained results in Table (4), it is obvious that Rivanol test is a useful and reliable test in detecting brucellosis without serious number of false positive. It is a highly specific and an

official diagnostic test as it detects mainly the presence of IgG through the precipitation of IgM (Hamdy, 1992).

The lower sensitivity of TAT may be attributed to certain limitation of this test especially in the early incubative and in the later chronic stages of the disease (Morgan, 1967; Nicolletti, 1969; Davis, 1971 and Mylrea & Fraser, 1976). Furthermore, this agglutination test failed to detect IgG1 antibodies, since these antibodies can not agglutinate antigen at pH value near neutrality and when in excess these antibodies are liable to block the agglutination activity of other isotypes resulting in false negative reactions (Farina, 1985 and Ahmed et al., 2002).

The used indirect ELISA kits are standardized to provide 98 % sensitivity and 100 % specificity (Vircell Kit, No. G1003). Meanwhile, it requires only a small amount of serum. ELISA reagents are stable and have a long shelf-life. Furthermore, the optical density of ELISA is measured photometrically and consequently, this eliminates the reader error (Ahmed et al., 2002). From the previously discussed results, it is clear that ELISA provides a rapid, simple, accurate diagnostic assay for brucellosis. This assay will also enable us to assess diagnosis accurately and reduce the eradication time.

Anyhow, the need of a regular investigation must be stressed in order to determine the extent of

brucella infection among farm animals. Control of brucellosis in Egypt should be implanted through organizing a national control programs for combating brucellosis in various domestic animal species all over Egypt or through bilateral projects with some agencies or international organizations aiming to minimize the infection rate among animals and to control the human infection against brucellosis.

Abdel-Wahab, E.M. (1985): Incidence of brucella positive slaughtered animals. M.V.Cs. Thesis, Cairo Univ. Ahmed, T.M.; Bassiony, M.M. and Ibrahim, I.G.A. (2002): Field evaluation of complement fixation test and enzyme immunoassay for detection of brucellosis in Bull. J. Egypt. Vet. Med. Assoc., 62 (1): 119-125. Ali, M.M. (1997): Serodiagnostic study of sheep brucellosis in Assiut Governorate. Assiut Vet. Med. J. 36 (72): 167-174.

Alton, G.G.; Jones, L.M. and Pietez, D.E. (1975): Laboratory Technique in Brucellosis. 2nd ed. FAO / WHO. Geneva.

## REFERENCES

Abdel-Ghani, M.; Osman, K. and Nada, S.M. (1983): Evaluation of serodagnostic methods for brucellosis among goats in Egypt. Int. J. Zoon., 10: 132-137.

Abdel-Hafeez, M.M. (1996): A serological study on brucellosis infection among cattle in Assiut Governorate. Assiut Vet. Med. J., 36 (71): 1-8.

Abdel-Hafeez, M.M.; Abdel-kadder, H.A.; Bastawros, A.F.; El-Ballal, S.S. and Hamdy, M.E.R. (1995): Bacteriological and pathological studies on brucella melitensis infection in a dairy farm. 3rd Sci.cong., Egyptian society of cattle disease, 3-5 Dec. 1995, Assiut, Egypt: 266-270.

Abdel-Hafeez, M.M.; Abdel-Kader, H.A.; Bastawros, A.F.; Ali, M.M. and Sedik, S.R. (2001): Zoonotic importance of brucellosis among farm animals and veterinary field employees at Assiut Governorate. Assiut Vet. Med. J., 44 (88): 119-134.

Abdel-Kader, H.A. (1996): Serological study on caprine brucellosis in Assiut Governorate. Assiut.Vet. Med. J., 36 (71): 9-16.

Alton, G.G.; Jones, L.M.; Angus, R.D and Verger, J.M. (1988): Technique for the brucellosis laboratory. Institute National de la Recherche Agronomique, Paris.

Amin, K.M.R.; Rahman, M.B.; Kabir, S.M.L.; Sarker, S.K. and Akand, M.S.I. (2004): Serological epidemiology of brucellosis in Cattle of Mymensingh districts of Bangladesh. Journal of Animal & Veterinary Advances, 3(11): 776-780.

AOAD (1995): Arab organization for agriculture development report. December, 1995, Khartoum, Sudan: 414-474.

Ariza, J.; Pellicer, T.; Pallares, R.; Foz, A. and Gudiol, F. (1992): Specific antibody profile in human brucellosis. Clin.Inf.Dis., 14: 131-140.

Baldi, P.C.; Miguel, S.E.; Fossati, C.A. and Wallach, J.C. (1996): Serological follow-up of human brucellosis by meaning of IgG antibodies to lipopolysaccharide and cytoplasmic proteins of Brucella species. Clin.Inf.Dis., 22: 446-455.

- arton, C.E. (1994): Immunology and serology of bovine brucellosis. Brucellosis Epidemiology Course Cairo, Egypt, 25-30 June, 1994.
- Bassiony, M.M. and Ibrahim, I.G.A. (1997): Bacteriological and immunological profiles of brucellosis in sheep and goats. Assiut Vet. Med. Journal .36 (72): 255-261.
- Davis, G. (1971): The Rose Bengal Test. Vet. Rec.88: 447-449.
- El-Bauomy, E.E. (1989): Some studies on brucellosis in sheep and goats M.V.Sc. Thesis. , Cairo Uni.
- El-Olemy, G.M. (1974): Incidence of brucellosis among sheep and goats with regard to human infection in El-Menoufia governorate, Egypt. PH. D. Vet. Thesis. , Cairo Uni.
- FAO/ WHO (1986): Joint FAO/ WHO Expert Committee on Brucellosis. Six Report. World Health Organization. Technical Report Series 740. World Health Organization, Geneva, Switzerland.
- Farina, R. (1985): Current Serological methods in *B. melitensis* cited in: *B. melitensis* by J.M. Verger and M. Plomet INRA, Nouzilly, France.
- Gadalla, Z.B. (1991): Epidemiological studies in Upper Egypt with special references of its prevalence among different species of animals. M.V.Sc. Thesis, Faculty of Veterinary Medicine, Assiut Uni.
- Hamdy, M.E. (1992): Epidemiological studies on Brucella melitensis in dairy animals and man. PH.D. Thesis. Faculty of veterinary medicine, Cairo University.
- Huber, J.D. (1989): Principles of immunology and serology. Brucellosis seminar, February, 1989, Cairo, Egypt.
- Ibrahim, A.K.; Ibrahim, I.G.A.; Ghoneim, M.A. and Awad, W.S. (2002): Evaluation of polymerase chain reaction (PCR) and conventional brucellosis diagnostic techniques in milk samples from different animal species. J. Egypt. Vet. Med. Assoc., 62 (2): 119-131.
- Kaldas, Y.T. (1990): Some brucella serological tests in El-Minia Governorate (Egypt) in farm animals. I-analytical study. 4<sup>th</sup> Sci.Cong., 18-20 November, Faculty of Vet. Med., Assiut Univ., pp. 18-20.
- Masoumi J.P.; Sheikh, M.A.; Ahmed, R.; Nacem, M.; Ahmed, M and Hussain, I. (1992): Seroprevalence of brucellosis in sheep, goats and man in Lahour area. Indian J. Dairy Sci., 45 (6): 298-299.
- Meyer,T.N. (1990): Review of Veterinary Microbiology. (Edt. Biberstein, E.L and Zec; Y.C.) Blackwell Scientific Publication Oxford, pp. 250.
- Mikolon, B.A.; Gardner, A.I.; Hietala, K.S.; De Anda, H.J.; Pestana, C.E; Hennager, G.S. and Edmondson, J.A. (1998): Evaluation of North America antibody detection tests for diagnosis of brucellosis in goats. J. Clinical microbiology, 36 (6): 1716-1722.
- Montasser, A.M. (1995): Morphological and immunological studies on animal naturally and experimentally infected by brucella. PH.D. Vet. Thesis, Cairo Uni.
- Montasser, A.M. (1999): Some epidemiological studies on ovine and caprine brucellosis in Egypt. 5th Sci. Cong., Egyptian Society of cattle disease, 28-30 November, Assiut, Egypt, pp. 99-106.
- Montasser, A.M.; Hamoda, F.K. and Talaat, A.S.H. (2002): Some epidemiological and diagnostic studies on brucellosis among ruminates in Kafer-El-Shiekh Governorate. J. Egypt. Vet. Med. Assoc., 62 (6a): 25-38.
- Morgan, W.J.B. (1967): The serological diagnosis of bovine brucellosis. Vet. Rec., 80 (21): 612-621.
- Morgan, W.J.B.; Mackinnon, D.J.; Lawson, J.R. and Culen, G.A. (1969): The Rose Bengal plate test in the

- diagnosis of brucellosis. *Vet. Rec.*, 85: 636-641.
- Morgan, W.J.B.; Mackinnon, D.J.; Gill, K.P.; Gower, S.G.M. and Norris, P.I.W. (1978): *Brucellosis Diagnosis Standard Laboratory Techniques*. Ministry of Agriculture, Fisheries and Food. 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. Central Veterinary Laboratory, New Haw, Weybridge, Surrey, England.
- Myfrea, P. J. and Fraser, G.C. (1976): The use of supplementary tests in the serological diagnosis of bovine brucellosis. *Aust. Vet. J.*, 52: 261-266.
- Nashed, S.M. (1977): *Brucellosis in upper Egypt (Assiut Governorate) in Cattle, Buffaloes, Sheep, Goats and its relation to public health*. Ph.D. Vet. Thesis, Cairo University.
- Nazem, A.M.; Abdel-El-Mogny, A.F.; Ahmed, A.A. and Farag, H.F. (1998): Screening and confirmatory methods for detection of brucellosis in milk of dairy cattle. 8th Sci. Cong., 15-17 November, Faculty of Vet. Med. Assiut Univ.
- Nicoletti, P.L. (1969): Future evaluation of serological procedure used to diagnose brucellosis. *Am. J. Vet. Res.*, 30: 1811-1815.
- Sadek, O.A. (2004): *Serological studies on milk for diagnosis of brucella infection in Assiut Governorate*. M.V.C. Thesis, Assiut Univ., Egypt.
- Saleh, Waffa, M.A.; Ghobashy, H.M.; El-Bauomy, E.M. and Shalaby, M.N.H. (2003): *Diagnosis of human brucellosis among animal farm workers and patients with fever with fever of unknown origin using both conventional and serological technique*. 7th Sci. Cong., Egyptian Society for Cattle Disease, 7-9 Dec., Assiut, Egypt. pp. 283-295.
- Scientific Committee in Animal Health and Animal Welfare (2001): *Brucellosis in sheep & goats (Br. melitensis)*. SANCO.C.2/AH/R23: 1-89.
- Sedcek, S.R. (1999): *Serological studies on brucella infection in cattle, sheep, and goats in Assiut governorate*. Assiut Vet. Med. J., 42 (83): 216-227.
- Shahat, A.A. (2000): *Brucellosis among slaughtered food animals in Saudi Arabia*. *J. Egypt. Vet. Med. Assoc.*, 60 (4): 91-95.
- Shakya, S.; Joshi, R.K. and Ali, S.L. (1995): *Seroepidemiological survey of bovine brucellosis in a village of Madhya Pradesh*. *Ind. Vet. J.*, 72:1327-1328.
- Shalaby, M.N. (1986): *A survey on brucellosis as a cause of reproductive disorders in farm animals in Egypt*. M.V.Sc. Thesis, Cairo Univ.
- Shalaby, M.N.H.; Ghobashy, H.M.; El-Bauomy, E.M. and Saleh, Waffa, M.A. (2003): *Prevalence of brucellosis among animal species in some Governorates in Egypt*. 7th Sci. Cong., Egyptian Society for Cattle Disease, 7-9 Dec., Assiut, Egypt. pp. 271-282.
- Stableforth, A.W. (1959): *Brucellosis. Infectious Diseases of Animals: Diseases due to Bacteria*, Vol.1, Eds, Stableforth, A.W.; Galloway, I.A. and Butterworths, London: 53-159.
- Sutra, L.; Caffin, J.P. and Dubary, G. (1986): *Role of milk immunoglobulin in brucella milk ring test*. *Vet. Micro.* 2: 359-360.
- Zaghloul, A.H. and Kamel, Y.Y. (1985): *Incidence of brucellosis among farm animals in Assiut Governorate*. *Assiut Vet. J.*, 14 (28): 117-122.