

Investigating zoonotic diseases at the wildlife livestock interface in the Okavango Delta and Chobe National Park.

Jori, F; Munstermann, S; Mokopasetso, M; Etter, E; Mhongovoyo, J; Nkgowe, C: Michel, A and Newmann, S.H.

11<sup>th</sup> AHEAD-GLTFCA Working Group Meeting 2<sup>nd</sup> to 4<sup>th</sup> March, 2011, Mopani Camp, Kruger National Park



## Introduction

- Bacterial zoonoses like BTB, Brucellosis have been reported in several protected areas in Southern Africa (GLTFCA, Hluhluwe-iMfolozi, Kafue Basin,..)
- In addition, Rift Valley Fever (RVF) is re-emerging in Southern Africa and the role of wildlife as a reservoir of this disease hasn't been sufficiently studied.
- Very limited information on the presence or absence of these pathogens exists in the WLHI from protected areas in Northern Botswana.



- To generate baseline data on the presence or circulation of selected zoonotic disease such as
  - BTB
  - Brucellosis (Brucella abortus)
  - RVF virus
  - at the WLI of the Chobe National Park and the Okavango Delta.
- Identify potential risks for human communities in that interface.
- Identify potential epidemiological roles for wildlife (buffalo) concerning those diseases.
  - Potential reservoirs
  - Spread to other areas and species



















	Details of the buffalo samples October 2010				
Location	Herd ID	Sample size	Size of the herd	Type of herd	
Kabulebule	CH1	14	250	Mixed	
Kabulebule	CH2	11	Megaherd*	Mixed	
Ihaha	СНЗ	7	40	Mixed	
Serondela	CH4	21	300	Mixed	
Simwanza	СН5	8	30	Mixed	
Simwanza	СН6	6	25	Bachelor	
Ngoma	СН7	22	Megaherd*	Mixed	
Moremi	NH1	10	150	Mixed	
Moremi	NH2	2	5	Bachelor	
Moremi	NH3	17	Megaherd*	Mixed	
Moremi	NH4	11	50	Mixed	
Khurunxaragha	NH5	10	250	Mixed	
Khurunxaragha	NH6	13	350	Mixed	
Khurunxaragha	NH7	7	150	Mixed	
Khurunxaragha	NH8	10	150	Mixed	

7

# Details of the cattle samples

Median Herd size: 38 IQR [21;81] Kraaling at night: 94.8% Deworming: 15% Origin of cattle: heritage 84.4%; outside 13.5% Water sharing with wildlife: 77.3%



	Samp	oles a	nd analysis • Brucellosis :
Diseases	Cattle	Buffalo	<ul> <li>Screening with Rose Bengal test</li> </ul>
Bovine Tuberculosis	500	131	<ul> <li>Positive animals re- tested with SAT and</li> </ul>
Brucellosis (RBT, SAT, CFT)	500	167	Bovine Tuberculosis
Rift Valley Fever (IgM& IgG)	500	168	<ul><li>Gamma interferon test</li><li>RVF</li></ul>
			<ul> <li>Indirect ELISA to detect</li> <li>IgG and</li> <li>IgM, respectively.</li> </ul>

Resu	lts:	Bruce	llosis	in	buffalo
ILC JU	103.	Diace	10515		Sanaio

ID	RBT	SAT	CFT
NH1011	Positive	Negative	Negative
NH2002	Positive	Negative	Negative
NH3005	Positive	Negative	Negative
NH3009	Positive	Positive	Positive
NH4002	Positive	Positive	Positive
NH4006	Positive	Positive	Negative
NH4007	Positive	Positive	Positive
NH5003	Negative	Negative	Positive
NH5004	Positive	Positive	Positive
NH6003	Positive	Positive	Negative
NH6007	Positive	Positive	Negative
NH8005	Positive	Negative	Positive
CH1006	Positive	Positive	Negative
CH1009	Positive	Positive	Negative
CH5003	Positive	Positive	Positive
CH7010	Positive	Positive	Negative
CH7013	Positive	Negative	Negative
	,		
	Late infection (IgG	)	
	Early infection (IgN	Л)	
	No infection		

Prevalence: 8% (13/167)

95% CI [4.3-13.3]

#### Apparent prevalence in buffalo and cattle (Percentage and 95% CI)

Disease	Cattle	Buffalo	Buffalo	
	Ngamiland	Ngamiland	Both areas	
Brucellosis	2/500 1.4%	9/80 11.3%	13/167 8%	
	[0.2-5.0]	[5.6-21.3]	[4.3-13.3]	

#### Apparent prevalence in buffalo and cattle (Percentage and 95% CI)

Disease	Cattle	Buffalo	Buffalo
	Ngamiland	Ngamiland	Both areas
Brucellosis	2/500 1.4%	9/80 11.3%	13/167 8%
	[0.2-5.0]	[5.6-21.3]	[4.3-13.3]
Bovine	3/449 0.7%	2/73 2.7%	2/135 1.4%
Tuberculosis	[0.2-2.1]	[0.3- 9.5]	[0.2-5.2]

#### Apparent prevalence in buffalo and cattle (Percentage and 95% CI)

Disease	Cattle	Buffalo	Buffalo
	Ngamiland	Ngamiland	Both areas
Brucellosis	2/500 1.4%	9/80 11.3%	13/167 8%
	[0.2-5.0]	[5.6-21.3]	[4.3-13.3]
Bovine	3/449 0.7%	2/73 2.7%	2/135 1.4%
Tuberculosis	[0.2-2.1]	[0.3- 9.5]	[0.2- 5.2]
RVF (IgM)	10/500 2% [0.9 - 10.5 ]	0/80	0/179
RVF (IgG)	78/500 17.5%	5/80 6.3%	32/172 18.6%
	[14.3-21.2]	[2.2-14.3]	[13.1-25.2]

# Comparison of buffalo prevalence in both study areas

Disease	Chobe	Ngamiland	P value *
Brucellosis	5.3% (5/94)	11.3% (9/80)	0,19
Bovine tuberculosis	0 (0/62)	2.7% (2/73)	0,19
RVF	24.5% (23/94)	6.3% (5/80)	0,001

\* T test for inequality of population means



# **RVF** in northern Botswana

• Antibody activity and human clinical cases in Chobe (Tessier et al., 1987).

Short Report	Table- teated b sens in	Prevalence n r indirect im Chobs (Bots)	f antibodies to Rift V munofluorescent assay muna)	Valley ferer vicus de la haman and asimi
Viral haemorrhagic fever survey in Chobe (Bots- wanz)	Your	Survey	Village or place of origin	Na. positiva/ total (%)
S. F. TESSIER <sup>1</sup> *, P. E. ROLLIN <sup>2</sup> AND P. SUREAU <sup>2</sup> <i>IP.O. Box 3, Kasane, Botroana;</i> <sup>2</sup> Laboratoire de Fièrrer Hèmorragiques Virales, Institut Patteur, Paris, France Viral infeccions with possible important haemor-	1984	Humann	Mabele Parakarungu Kachikau Pandamatenga Kanane	7/12 (38-3%) 6/14 (42-8%) 1/16 (6-2%) 0/8 0/2
chagic complications in southern Africa include Cri- mean-Congo virus (SWANAPORT, et al., 1983), Mar- tone and Congo virus (SWANAPORT,		Cattle	Mabele Parakarangu	0/13 0/10
(RVF) viruses (GEAR of al., 1973), and this virus view		Wadlife	Whole Chobe	6.9

- First report in cattle and wildlife in both areas.
- No clinical symptoms detected in cattle despite high levels of IgG and 2% presented IgM antibodies.



## **Bovine Tuberculosis**

- The apparent prevalence of BTB reactors among cattle and buffaloes was below 1.5%.
- Considering Sp of IFNg assay below 98.5% (Michel et al., 2011), one could consider that this falls within the range of expected false positive reactors.
- However, very low infection rates cannot be ruled out.
   Positive animals showed high reactivity
  - Similar prevalence levels were found in BTB surveys in buffaloes in the northern Kruger National Park (Grobler et al., 2002).
- A final conclusion is not possible since the true infection status of the reactor animals could not be confirmed by post-mortem examination nor isolation of *M. bovis.*





