

1 **Seroprevalence of Foot and Mouth Disease Virus Infection in some Wildlife and Cattle**  
2 **in Bauchi State, Nigeria.**

3 Atuman Y.J<sup>1</sup>, Kudi C.A<sup>2</sup>, Abdu P.A<sup>2</sup>, Okubanjo O.O<sup>3</sup>, Abubakar. A<sup>4</sup> , Ularamu  
4 H.G<sup>5</sup>, Wungak Y<sup>5</sup>

5  
6 1. *National Veterinary Research Institute Vom Outstation Laboratory Bauchi,*  
7 *Bauchi State, Nigeria*

8 2. *Department of Veterinary Medicine, Faculty of Veterinary Medicine, Ahmadu*  
9 *Bello University Zaria, Nigeria*

10 3. *Department of Veterinary Parasitology and Entomology, Ahmadu Bello*  
11 *University, Zaria, Nigeria*

12 4. *Force Animal Branch Department, Nigeria Police Force Headquarters Abuja,*  
13 *Nigeria*

14 5. *Viral Reseach Division, National Veterinary Research Institute Vom Plateau*  
15 *State, Nigeria*

16

17 **Abstract**

18 **Background**

19 Foot and mouth disease (FMD) is one of the most economically important transboundary  
20 animal diseases with devastating consequence on livestock production and wildlife  
21 conservation. The objectives of the study were: to determine the seroprevalence of FMDV in  
22 wildlife and cattle and identify circulating FMDV serotypes in wildlife and identify potential  
23 risk factors that will contribute to transmission of the disease at the wildlife-livestock  
24 interface in Yankari Game Reserve and Sumu Wildlife Park in Bauchi State, Nigeria.

25 **Methods**

26 Blood samples were collected between 2013 to 2015 from some wildlife and cattle  
27 respectively within and around Yankari Game Reserve (YGR) and Sumu Wildlife Park  
28 (SWP) in Bauchi State, Nigeria. The Wild animals were immobilized for blood collection  
29 using a combination of Etorphine Hydrochloride (M99® Krüger-Med South Africa ) at 0.5-2  
30 mg/kg and Azaperone (Stresnil®, Janssen Pharmaceuticals (Pty.) Ltd., South Africa) at 0.1  
31 mg/kg using a Dan- Inject® rifle (Dan-Inject APS, Sallerup Skovvej, Denmark) fitted with 3  
32 ml dart syringe and for reversal, Naltrexone (Trexonil® Kruger-Med South Africa) at 1.5 mg  
33 IM was used, cattle were restrained by the owners for blood collection. Harvested Sera from  
34 blood were screened for presence of Antibodies against FMDV using prioCHECK® 3 ABC  
35 NSP ELISA kit and positive samples from wildlife were serotyped using Solid-Phase  
36 Competitive ELISA, (IZSLER Brescia-Italy). Data obtained were analysed using Graphpad  
37 Prism version 7.

38 **Results**

39 The results showed that 197 (65.7%) of the 300 serum samples from cattle and 13 (24.5%) of  
40 the 53 serum samples from wildlife tested positive for antibodies to the highly conserved

41 non-structural 3-ABC protein of FMDV and statistically significant ( $P < 0.05$ ). Classification  
42 of cattle into breed and sex showed that detectable antibodies to FMDV were higher ( $P$   
43  $< 0.05$ ) in White Fulani 157 (72.8%) than red Bororo 23 (39.7%) and Sokoto Gudali 17  
44 (33.3%) breeds of cattle whereas in females detectable FMDV antibodies were higher ( $P$   
45  $< 0.05$ ) 150 (72.8%) than in males 47 (50.0%). In the wildlife species, antibodies to FMDV  
46 were detected in waterbuck 2 (28.6%), elephant 1 (25.0%), wildebeest 4 (33.3%) and eland 6  
47 (25.0%). Four serotypes of FMDV: O, A, SAT-1 and SAT-2 were detected from the 3-ABC  
48 positive reactors in waterbuck, elephant, wildebeest and eland. Contact of wildlife and cattle  
49 during utilization of the rich resources in the conservation areas is a potential risk factor for  
50 the spread of FMDV in the study area.

## 51 **Conclusions**

52 Presence of FMDV antibodies in cattle and some wildlife were observed and serotypes of  
53 FMDV: O, A, SAT-1 and SAT-2 were detected from the 3-ABC positive reactors in some of  
54 the wildlife. The study highlights the need for active surveillance of FMDV in wildlife and  
55 pastoral cattle within and around wildlife conservation areas in Nigeria. FMD surveillance  
56 system, control and prevention program that targets wildlife and livestock at the wildlife-  
57 livestock interface level will be beneficial to the livestock industry and wildlife conservation  
58 goals in Bauchi State, Nigeria.

59

## 60 **Author summary**

61 Foot and mouth disease (FMD) is an important trans-boundary viral disease of both domestic  
62 and wild cloven hoofed animals characterized by high morbidity with devastating  
63 consequence on the livestock worldwide. Despite the endemic nature of FMD in Nigeria,  
64 little is known about the epidemiology of the disease at the wildlife-livestock interface level.  
65 To address this gap, blood samples were collected between 2013 to 2015 from some wildlife  
66 and cattle respectively within and around Yankari Game Reserve (YGR) and Sumu Wildlife  
67 Park (SWP) in Bauchi State, Nigeria. Wild animals were immobilized using a combination of  
68 Etorphine Hydrochloride (M99® Krüger-Med South Africa ) at 0.5-2 mg/kg and Azaperone  
69 (Stresnil®, Janssen Pharmaceuticals (Pty.) Ltd., South Africa) at 0.1 mg/kg using a Dan-  
70 Inject® rifle (Dan-Inject APS, Sellerup Skovvej, Denmark) fitted with 3 ml dart syringe and  
71 for reversal, Naltrexone (Trexonil® Kruger-Med South Africa) at 1.5 mg IM was used, cattle  
72 were restrained by the owners for blood collection. Harvested Sera from blood were screened  
73 for presence of Antibodies against FMDV using prioCHECK® 3 ABC NSP ELISA kit and  
74 positive samples were serotyped using Solid-Phase Competitive ELISA, (IZSLER Brescia-  
75 Italy). Out of the 300 and 53 sera collected from cattle and wildlife 197 (65.7%) and 13  
76 (24.5%) ( $P < 0.05$ ) respectively tested positive for antibodies to the highly conserved non-  
77 structural 3-ABC protein of FMDV by the FMDV-NS blocking ELISA. Classification of  
78 cattle into breed and sex showed that detectable antibodies to FMDV were higher ( $P < 0.05$ )  
79 in White Fulani 157 (72.8%) than red Bororo 23 (39.7%) and Sokoto Gudali 17 (33.3%)  
80 breeds of cattle whereas in females detectable FMDV antibodies were higher ( $P < 0.05$ ) 150  
81 (72.8%) than in males 47 (50.0%). In the wildlife species, antibodies to FMDV were detected  
82 in waterbuck 2 (28.6%), elephant 1 (25.0%), wildebeest 4 (33.3%) and eland 6 (25.0%). Four  
83 serotypes of FMDV: O, A, SAT-1 and SAT-2 were detected from the 3-ABC positive  
84 reactors in waterbuck, elephant, wildebeest and elands. The results showed presence of

85 antibodies to FMDV in some wildlife and cattle and suggest that wildlife could equally play  
86 an important role in the overall epidemiology of FMD in Nigeria. FMD surveillance system,  
87 control and prevention program should be intensified in the study area.  
88

89 **Key words: Bauchi State, Cattle, Foot and mouth disease virus, Nigeria, Serotypes,**  
90 **Wildlife**

91

92

### 93 **Introduction**

94 Foot and mouth disease (FMD) is one of the most economically important transboundary  
95 animal disease in the world caused by Foot and mouth disease virus (FMDV) a member of  
96 the genus *Aphthovirus* belonging to the *Picornaviridae* family (1). FMDV is a small non-  
97 enveloped virus and has a genome of 8.5 kb which encodes for structural proteins (VP1, VP2,  
98 VP3 and VP4) as well as non-structural proteins (NSPs) (2, 3). A structural protein produces  
99 antibodies to FMDV in vaccinated animals, whereas infected animals produce antibodies to  
100 both the structural and non-structural proteins (3) and assays to demonstrate antibodies  
101 against non-structural proteins have potential to differentiate infected from vaccinated  
102 animals (4,5,6,7). Seven immunologically different serotypes of the FMDV are known: O,  
103 A, C, Asia-1, South-African Territories (SAT) -1, -2 and -3, which comprise more than 65  
104 subtypes (8).

105

106 The transmission of FMDV in sub-Saharan Africa is mainly driven by two epidemiological  
107 cycles: one in which wildlife plays a significant role in maintaining and spreading the disease  
108 to other susceptible wild and/or domestic ruminants (9,10). Whilst with the second cycle the  
109 virus is solely transmitted within domestic populations and hence is independent of wildlife  
110 (11). The disease is endemic in some parts of Europe, Africa, Middle East and Asia and has  
111 contributed to significant declines in wildlife and livestock populations in those regions (12,  
112 13, 14, and 15). The first reported case of FMD outbreak in Nigeria was in 1924, which was

113 attributed to type O virus (16). Subsequently, other serotypes (A, SAT 1 and SAT 2) were  
114 reported (17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22) and recently SAT 3 serotype (23).

115

116 In spite of the annual FMD burden in Nigeria, sero-epidemiology and sero-typing studies for  
117 FMD infections are inadequate. The current trend of FMD occurrence in Nigeria showed that  
118 there are regular outbreaks, poor control measures and lack of enforcement of legislation  
119 guiding disease reporting to veterinary authority (24, 25). The presence of antibodies to  
120 FMDV in several wildlife species have been documented in studies conducted in different  
121 countries of Africa mainly eastern and southern regions (26, 27, 28). There has been limited  
122 monitoring of infectious diseases like FMD in wildlife in Nigeria. Domestic livestock  
123 sometimes do share the same range with wildlife in YGR and SWP in Bauchi State, Nigeria  
124 (29) and there is concern that wildlife may form a reservoir for FMDV. Consequently, there  
125 is need to understand the potential role of wildlife as reservoir of FMDV to aid in the design  
126 and implementation of the disease management programs. The aim of the study was to  
127 determine the seroprevalence of FMDV in wildlife and cattle and identify circulating FMDV  
128 serotypes in wildlife in YGR and SWP in Bauchi State, Nigeria.

129

## 130 **Materials and methods**

### 131 **The study area**

132 The study locations were Yankari Game Reserve (YGR) and Sumu Wildlife Park (SWP) in  
133 Bauchi State, Nigeria with human settlements surrounding them. YGR covers an area of  
134 about 2,244 square kilometres, it is an important refuge for over 50 species of mammals and  
135 over 350 species of birds and is one of the few remaining areas where wild animals are  
136 protected in their natural habitat in Nigeria (30, 31). SWP covers about 40 square kilometer  
137 area and harbours species of wildlife including impala (*Aepyceros melampus*), springbok

138 (*Antidorcas marsupialis*), oryx (*Orynx gazelle*), eland (*Taurotragus oryx*), zebra (*Equus*  
139 *quagga crawshayi*) kudu (*Tragelaphus strepsiceros*), blue wildebeest (*Connochaetes*  
140 *taurinus*), and giraffe (*Giraffa camelopardalis*) and is located about 60 km north of Bauchi  
141 the State capital (29).

#### 142 **Serum sample collection**

143 Field sampling was conducted between February 2013 to December 2015 and blood samples  
144 were collected from 300 cattle, and 53 wildlife including four elephant (*Loxodonta Africana*),  
145 eleven waterbuck (*Kobus ellipsiprymus*), one Hartbeest (*Alcelaphus buselaphus caama*) from  
146 YGR and twenty four eland (*Taurotragus oryx*), twelve blue wildebeest (*Connochaetes*  
147 *taurinus*) and one kudu (*Tragelaphus strepsiceros*) from SWP following chemical  
148 immobilization using Etorphine hydrochloride ( M99® Krüger-Med South Africa ) at 0.5-2  
149 mg/kg and Azaperone (Stresnil®, Janssen Pharmaceuticals (Pty.) Ltd., South Africa) at  
150 0.1mg/kg delivered intramuscularly (IM) using a Dan- Inject® rifle (Dan-Inject APS,  
151 Sellerup Skovvej, Denmark) fitted with 3ml dart syringe and barbed needles and for reversal  
152 Naltrexone (Trexonil® Kruger-Med South Africa) at 1.5mg IM was used. The serum samples  
153 were harvested from the blood into cryovials after spinning for 10 min at 1200 g and were  
154 divided into aliquots, labelled and kept at -20 °C until used.

155 .

#### 156 **Detection of antibodies against FMDV non-structural proteins (NSPs) by ELISA**

157 The ELISA was performed according to the manufacturer's instructions (PRIOCHECK®  
158 FMD-3ABC NS protein ELISA) for detection of antibodies to the non-structural polypeptide  
159 3 ABC of FMDV in serum which detects infected animals regardless of their vaccination  
160 status and the FMDV serotype that caused the infection (32). Briefly, 80 µl of the ELISA  
161 buffer and 20 µl of the test sera were added to the 3ABC-antigen coated test plates. Negative,  
162 weak positive and strong positive control sera were added to designated wells on each test

163 plate, gently shaken and incubated overnight (18 h) at 22°C. The plates were then emptied  
164 and washed six times with 200 µl of wash solution and 100 µl of diluted conjugate was added  
165 to all wells. The test plates were sealed and incubated for one hour at 22°C. The plates were  
166 then washed six times with 200 µl of wash solution and 100 µl of the chromogen (tetra-  
167 methyl benzidine) substrate was dispensed to all wells of the plates and incubated for 20 min  
168 at 22°C following which 100 µl of stop solution was added to all the wells and mixed gently.  
169 Readings were taken on a spectrophotometer Multiskan® ELISA reader (Thermo Scientific,  
170 USA) at 450 nm and the OD 450 values of all samples was expressed as Percentage  
171 Inhibition (PI) relative to the OD 450 max using the following formula  $PI = 100 - [OD\ 450$   
172  $test\ sample/OD450\ max] \times 100$ . Samples with  $PI \geq 50\%$  were considered positive for FMD  
173 antibody while those with  $PI < 50\%$  were declared negative for FMD antibody. Since the 3-  
174 ABC ELISA for FMD was = 100% specific and > 99% sensitive, the percentage prevalence  
175 was taken as true prevalence.

176

### 177 **Detection of FMDV specific antibodies using solid-phase competitive enzyme linked** 178 **immunosorbent assay**

179 The 3ABC ELISA positive serum samples were analyzed for FMDV-specific antibodies using  
180 a Solid-Phase Competitive ELISA (SPCE) as previously described for serotypes O, A, SAT  
181 1 and SAT 2 (32, 33). The assays were performed using antibodies FMDV ELISA kits for  
182 serotypes O, A, SAT 1 and SAT 2 produced by IZSLER Biotechnology Laboratory (Italy).  
183 Briefly, 96 wells pre-coated with FMDV antigens captured by FMD serotypes O, A, SAT 1  
184 and SAT 2 specific MAb flat-bottomed plates were used. Four dilutions of sera at 1/10, 1/30,  
185 1/90 and 1/270 were made. Without washing, the conjugate (Horse-radish peroxidase) was  
186 added and incubated at room temperature for 1 h. The plate was washed and the  
187 substrate/chromogen solution (tetra-methyl-benzidine) was added and kept in the dark for 20

188 min. The reaction was stopped by the addition of a stop solution and the plates were read on a  
189 MultiSkan® spectrophotometer ELISA plate reader (Thermo Scientific, USA) at 450 nm  
190 wavelength. Serum end-point titre was expressed as the highest dilution producing 50%  
191 inhibition, with serum having end point titre  $\geq 50\%$  being classified as positive for the  
192 specific FMD antibody.

193 Data obtained were analysed using Graphpad Prism version 7. Results were summarized in  
194 tables and expressed as percentages and levels of association between positivity and sex,  
195 breed, age and animal species were derived using Chi-square. Values of  $P \leq 0.05$  were  
196 regarded as statistically significantly different.

197

198

199

200

201

202

203

204

205

206

207

208

209

210

211 **Results**

212 Overall seroprevalence of FMDV in wildlife was 24.53% (Table 1). Detectable antibodies to  
213 FMDV were observed in waterbuck 2 (28.6%), elephant 1 (25.00 %), wildebeest 4 (33.3%)  
214 and eland 6 (25.0 %).

215 **Table 1: Seroprevalence of foot and mouth disease virus in wildlife from Yankari game**  
216 **reserve and Sumu wildlife park in Bauchi State, Nigeria.**

217

Wildlife	No. sampled (%)	No. +ve (%)	X <sup>2</sup>	P value	Odds ratio	CI at 95%
Yankari park						
Waterbuck	11 (10.4)	2 (18.2)	1.395	0.943	0.373	0.899-0.327
Elephant	4 (3.8)	1 (25.0)				
Hartbeest	1(0.9)	0 (0.0)				
Sumu park						
Eland	24 (22.6)	6 (25.0)				
Wildebeest	12 (11.3)	4 (33.3)				
Kudu	1 (0.9)	0 (0.0)				
Overall	53 (100)	13 (24.5)				

218

219

220 Comparison of the overall seroprevalences of FMDV at the wildlife-cattle interface (Table 2)  
221 showed that detectable antibodies to FMDV were significantly higher ( $P < 0.05$ ) in cattle 197  
222 (65.67%) than in wildlife 13 (24%).

223

224

225

226

227

228

229

230



231 **Table 2: Seroprevalence of foot and mouth disease at the wildlife-cattle interface in**  
 232 **Yankari game reserve and Sumu wildlife park in Bauchi State, Nigeria.**

Specie	No. sampled	No. +Ve (%)	X <sup>2</sup>	P value	Odds ratio	CI at 95%
Wildlife	53	13 (24.53)	31.63	0.000	0.1699	0.087 - 0.332
Cattle	300	197 (65.67)				
Overall	353	210 (59.49)				

233

234

235

236 Antibodies to FMDV were significantly higher in female cattle than males (P <0.05) with  
 237 Bunaji breed of cattle having high risk factor (odds ratio >5) of exposure to FMDV than the  
 238 other breeds of cattle examined (Table 3).

239 **Table 3: Seroprevalence of foot and mouth disease virus in cattle around Yankari game**  
 240 **reserve and Sumu Wildlife Park in Bauchi State, Nigeria**

Variables	No. sampled (%)	No +Ve (%)	X <sup>2</sup>	P value	Odds ratio	CI at 95%
<b>Breed</b>						
Red Bororo	58 (19.3)	23 (39.7)	64.2	0.000		
Sokoto gudali	51 (17.0)	17 (33.3)			0.544	0.241 - 1.225
White Fulani	191 (63.7)	157 (82.2)			5.019	2.550 -9.878
Overall	300 (100)	197 (65.7)				
<b>Sex</b>						
Male	94 (31.3)	47 (50.0)	14.9	0.000	0.373	0.225 -0.620
Female	206 (68.7)	150 (72.8)				
Overall	300 (100.0)	197 (65.7)				

241

242 The detectable antibodies to FMD serotype were for serotypes O, A, SAT 1 and SAT 2 in  
 243 waterbuck, wildebeest and eland whereas antibodies to serotypes A and SAT 2 were detected  
 244 in elephant. Each of the serotypes A and SAT 1 were shown to have highest reactors of 10  
 245 (18.87%) whereas serotype O had the least reactors of 7 (13.21%) (Table 4)

246 **Table 4: Foot and mouth disease virus serotypes detected in wildlife in Yankari game**  
 247 **reserve and Sumu Wildlife Park in Bauchi State, Nigeria.**  
 248

Wildlife	No. tested (%)	Foot and mouth disease virus serotypes			
		O No. positive (%)	A	SAT 1	SAT 2
Waterbuck	11 (10.4)	2 (18.18)	2 (18.18)	3 (27.27)	1 (9.09)
Elephant	4 (3.8)	0	1 (25.0)	0	1 (25.0)
Hartbeest	1 (0.9)	0	0	0	0
Eland	24 (22.6)	3 (12.5)	6 (25.0)	4 (16.67)	4 (16.67)
Wildebeest	12 (11.3)	2 (16.67)	1 (8.33)	3 (25.0)	2 (16.67)
Kudu	1(0.9)	0	0	0	0
Overall	53 (100)	7 (13.21)	10 (18.87)	10 (18.87)	8 (15.09)

249

## 250 Discussion

251 The results of this study have shown that antibodies to FMDV were present in cattle (65.7%)  
 252 and wildlife (24.5%). This is consistent with results of previous survey for FMDV antibodies  
 253 in Nigeria in which a seroprevalence of 75.11% was reported in a study conducted in cattle in  
 254 Kwara State (34). Also, seroprevalences of 64.3% and 70.98% respectively were reported in  
 255 studies carried out in Plateau State (35, 36), and 64.7% in a study conducted at the Border  
 256 States in Nigeria (21, 37). The similarities of findings of the present study with previous  
 257 studies have shown that FMD is still an enzootic disease in Nigeria and this could be  
 258 attributed to the lack of FMD vaccination campaigns in Nigeria (21, 37). There is unrestricted

259 herds mobility, continuous contact and intermingling of different cattle herds at water points,  
260 communal grazing areas and porous borders.

261 The higher FMDV seroprevalence in female cattle during this study was consistent with the  
262 findings of other investigators (34, 37) who reported a risk difference in association with sex  
263 during FMDV studies in Kwara and Plateau States, Nigeria, respectively. Similarly, high  
264 incidence of FMDV in females in Northwest Ethiopia was reported (38). However, most of  
265 the cattle sampled during the study were females as opposed to males. The significant  
266 association of seroprevalence with sex could be attributed to the preference for females to  
267 males by the nomads for reproductive purposes and milk production and therefore females  
268 are kept for longer period thereby having higher risk of exposure than males (8, 34, 37).  
269 Significant association in seropositivity was observed in Bunaji breed of cattle, this could be  
270 due to small number of other breeds (Sokoto gudali and Red bororo) sampled. However, all  
271 the breeds of cattle are equally at risk.

272

273 Results from the study have shown that antibodies to FMDV were present in elands,  
274 wildebeests, waterbucks and elephants. This finding being the first of its kind in the study  
275 area reveals that FMD could be a problem in wildlife in Nigeria. This is not surprising as  
276 FMD is endemic in Nigerian livestock (18, 20, 39, 23). Presence of wildlife population along  
277 the national park in Borgu Niger State Nigeria where cloven hoofed species come in contact  
278 with live stock was shown to be the probable exposure factor that contributed to high FMD  
279 sero-positivity in livestock observed in the area (37). The results from this study corroborate  
280 with other studies in South Africa, Zimbabwe, Zambia, Botswana, Namibia, India, Chad and  
281 Iran that demonstrated FMDV antibodies in wildlife (40, 10, 41, 42, 43, 28, 11, 44, 45). High  
282 FMDV prevalence in waterbuck observed in this study reflects their ecology and living  
283 ecosystem which is consistent with other findings in East Africa and Zimbabwe (41, 27, 46).

284 The study hitherto provided a picture of FMDV distribution in wildlife in Bauchi State,  
285 Nigeria which was observed to be largely understudied (44).

286

287 The study confirms the presence of antibody to FMDV serotype O, A, SAT 1 and SAT 2 in  
288 wildlife a finding probably first of its kind in Nigeria. Reported outbreaks affecting livestock  
289 of West Africa since 2000 were caused by FMDV types O, A, and SAT 2 (44). Similarly,  
290 FMDV serotypes O, A, and SAT 2 were the cause of most reported outbreaks in domestic  
291 livestock in Nigeria from 2010 to 2016 (39, 34, 22). The result here showed that FMDV  
292 serotypes observed in wildlife were equally previously observed in domestic livestock. The  
293 possible source of FMDV serotypes infection for the wildlife could be from infected  
294 livestock interacting with wildlife in the same environment. Transmission of FMDV between  
295 wildlife and livestock, even in isolated areas, may be due to windborne infection or via  
296 fomites (47, 48). Wildlife species often congregate at the natural 'salt lick' point in YGR (31)  
297 similarly artificial salt lick points are also available in SWP. Therefore, dissemination of the  
298 FMDV during wildlife activities at the salt-lick points is possible. Previous studies have  
299 shown that FMDV can easily be disseminated in the soil and can persist in that environment  
300 for a long period (28) .

301

302 The presence of FMDV antibodies in wildlife and cattle in this study might be driven by  
303 direct contact at wildlife-livestock interface through sharing of water and pasture resources  
304 observed to be a common activity in YGR and SWP in Bauchi State, Nigeria (31, 29). During  
305 dry season wildlife and livestock in the study area do closely congregate at feed and water  
306 points thus increasing the transmission likelihood of water-related infections like FMD (41,  
307 13, 44). Studies conducted in Ethiopia and Zimbabwe found significant association between  
308 cattle exposed to FMDV and their contact history with wildlife (50, 48, 11). It is unfortunate

309 that due to the endemic nature of FMD in Nigeria that outbreaks are not being investigated to  
310 determine the primary source and hence the disease have continued to be a scourge to live  
311 stock production in the Country.

312

### 313 **Conclusion**

314 According to the results presented, presence of FMDV antibodies in cattle and some wildlife  
315 were observed with four serotypes of FMDV: O, A, SAT-1 and SAT-2 detected from the 3-  
316 ABC positive reactors in some wildlife. This might have been driven by direct contact at  
317 wildlife-cattle interface through sharing of water and pasture resources observed to be a  
318 common activity in YGR and SWP in Bauchi State, Nigeria. The study highlights the need  
319 for intensification of FMD surveillance system, control and prevention program among  
320 wildlife and livestock within and around wildlife conservation areas in Nigeria.

321

322

323

### 324 **Acknowledgements**

325 We would like to thank the wildlife capture team and game rangers from Yankari Game  
326 Reserve and Sumu Wildlife Park in Bauchi State, Nigeria for their cooperation and support  
327 during samples collection.

### 328 **Conflict of interest**

329 The authors have declared that there is no conflict of interest

### 330 **References**

331 Abegunde, A.A., Ezeokoli, C.D., Umoh, J.U. and Addo, P.B (1988). Relationship between  
332 recent FMD virus isolates from Nigeria and standard vaccine virus strain from the  
333 African region. In: *Viral Diseases of Animals in Africa*. Williams, O. and Masiga, W.  
334 N. (eds). OAU/STRC, Lagos, Nigeria.

- 335 Alexandersen, S., Zhang, Z. and Donaldson, A. I. (2002). Aspects of the persistence of foot-  
336 and-mouth disease virus in animals—the carrier problem. *Microbes and Infection*,  
337 4(10): 1099-1110.
- 338 Atuman, Y. J., Adawa, D.A.Y., Audu, S., Paul, M. P. and Bankole, O. A. (2014). Potential  
339 risks for rabies spill-over from apparently healthy dogs to wildlife in Bauchi State,  
340 Nigeria. *Journal of Veterinary Advances*, 4(4): 493-498.
- 341 Bastos, A., Boshoff, C.I., Keet, D.F., Bangis, R.G. and Thomson, G.R. (2000). Natural  
342 transmission of foot-and-mouth disease virus between African buffalo  
343 (*Synceruscaffer*) and impala (*Aepycerosmelampus*) in the Kruger National Park, South  
344 Africa. *Epidemiol Infect*, 124:591.
- 345 Berger, H.G., Straub, O.C., Ahi, R., Tesar, M. and Marquardt, O. (1990). Identification of  
346 foot-and-mouth disease virus replication in vaccinated cattle by antibodies to non-  
347 structural virus protein. *Vaccine*, 8: 213-216.
- 348 Bengis, R., Kock, R. and Fischer, J. (2002). Infectious animal diseases: the wildlife-livestock  
349 interface. *Revue Scientifique et Technique-Office International des Epizooties*, 21(1):  
350 53-66.
- 351 Bengis, R.G., Leighton, F.A., Fischer, J.R., Artois, M., Morner, T. Tate, C.M. (2004). The  
352 role of wildlife in emerging and re-emerging zoonoses. *Revue Scientifique et*  
353 *Technique-Office International des Epizooties*, 23(2):497-511.
- 354 Bolortsetseg, S., Enkhtuvshin, S., Nyamsuren, D., Weisman, W., Fine, A. and Yang, A.  
355 (2012). Serosurveillance for foot-and-mouth disease in Mongolian gazelles (*Procapra*  
356 *gutturosa*) and livestock on the Eastern Steppe of Mongolia. *Journal of Wildlife*  
357 *Diseases*. 48(1):33-38.
- 358 Bronsvoort, B., Parida, S., Handel, I., McFarland, S., Fleming, L., Hamblin, P. and Kock, R.  
359 (2008). Serological survey for foot-and-mouth disease virus in wildlife in eastern  
360 Africa and estimation of test parameters of a nonstructural protein enzyme-linked  
361 immunosorbent assay for buffalo. *Clinical and Vaccine Immunology*, 15(6): 1003-  
362 1011.
- 363 Brown, C. C. and Slenning, B. D. (1996). Impact and risk of foreign animal diseases. *Journal*  
364 *of the American Veterinary Medical Association*, 208 (7): 1038-1040.
- 365 Chénard, G., Miedema, K., Moonen, P., Schrijver, R. S. and Dekker, A. (2003). A solid-phase  
366 blocking ELISA for detection of type O foot-and-mouth disease virus antibodies  
367 suitable for mass serology. *Journal of Virological Methods*, 107(1): 89-98.
- 368 Chukwuedo, A. and Nimzing, L. (2012). Field investigation of Foot and Mouth Disease  
369 (FMD) virus infection in cattle in the northern states of Nigeria. *Nigerian Journal of*  
370 *Biotechnology*, 24: 22-31.
- 371 Clavijo, A., Wright, P. and Kitching, P. (2004). Developments in diagnostic techniques for  
372 differentiating infection from vaccination in foot-and mouth disease. *Veterinary*  
373 *Journal*, 167: 9-22.
- 374 Daszak, P., Cunningham, A. A. and Hyatt, A. D. (2000). Emerging infectious diseases of  
375 wildlife--threats to biodiversity and human health. *Science*, 287(5452): 443-451.
- 376 Dawe, P., Flanagan, F., Madekurozwa, R., Sorensen, K., Anderson, E., Foggin, C. and  
377 Knowles, N. (1994). Natural transmission of foot-and-mouth disease virus from

- 378 African buffalo (*Syncerus caffer*) to cattle in a wildlife area of Zimbabwe. *The*  
379 *Veterinary Record*, 134(10): 230-232.
- 380 De-Diego, M., Brocchi, E., Mackay, D. and De Simone, F. (1997). The nonstructural  
381 polyprotein 3ABC of foot-and-mouth disease as a diagnostic antigen in ELISA to  
382 differentiate infected from vaccinated cattle. *Archives of Virology*, 142: 2021-2033.
- 383 Di Nardo, A., Libeau, G., Chardonnet, B., Chardonnet, P., Kock, R.A., Parekh, K.,  
384 Hamblin, P., Li, Y., Parida, S. and Sumption, J.K. (2015). Serological profile of  
385 foot-and-mouth disease in wildlife populations of West and Central Africa with  
386 special reference to *Syncerus caffer* subspecies. *Veterinary Research*, 46(1): 77-93.
- 387 Durojaiye, A. (1981). Incidence of FMD in Oyo State of Nigeria, 1967- 1981. *Nigeria*  
388 *Veterinary Journal*. 10: 7-13.
- 389 Ehizibolo, D.O., Ajogi, I., Umoh, J.U., Kazeem, H.M., Ehizibolo, P.O., Perez, A.M. and  
390 Metwally, S. (2010). Serological survey of Foot and Mouth Disease (FMD) 3d Non-  
391 structural Proteins using virus-infection associated (VIA) Antigen assay in livestock  
392 animals from Plateau State, Nigeria. In: Book of Abstract 47th Annual Congress of  
393 the Nigerian Veterinary Medical Association, Benue, P 75.
- 394 Ehizibolo, D.O., Haegeman, A., De Vleeschauwer, AR., Umoh, J.U., Kazeem, H.M.,  
395 Okolocha, E.C., Van Borm, S. and De Clercq, K. (2017). Detection and molecular  
396 characterization of foot and mouth disease viruses from outbreaks in some states of  
397 northern Nigeria 2013-2015. *Transboundary and Emerging Diseases*, 64(6): 1979-  
398 1990
- 399 Esterhuysen, J.J., Thomson, G.R., Flammand, J.R. and Bengis, R.G. (1985). Buffalo in the  
400 Natal game parks show no serological evidence of infection with Foot and mouth  
401 disease virus, *Onderstepoort Journal of Veterinary Research*, 52 (2): 63-66
- 402 Fry, E.E., Stuart, D.I. and Rowlands, D.J. 2005. The structure of foot-and-mouth disease  
403 virus. *Current Topics in Microbiology and Immunology*, 288:71-101.  
404
- 405 Hemmatzadeh, F., Boardman, W., Alinejad, A., Hematzade, A. and Moghadam, M.K. (2016).  
406 Molecular and Serological Survey of Selected Viruses in Free- Ranging Wild  
407 Ruminants in Iran. *PLoS ONE*, 11(12):1-14.  
408
- 409 Lazarus, D.D., Schielen, W.J.G., Wungak, Y.S., Kwange, D.Y. Fasina, F.O. (2012). Sero-  
410 epidemiology of foot-and-mouth disease in some Border States of Nigeria. *African*  
411 *Journal of Microbiology Research*, 6(8): 1756-1761.
- 412 Lazarus, D.D., Wungak, Y.S., Adah, M.I., Ibu, J.O., Abenga, N., Ekong, P.S. and Ularamu,  
413 H.G. (2015). Serological response of commercial dairy cattle to inactivated foot-and-  
414 mouth disease vaccine (Type-O and A) in Nigeria. *Asian Journal of Medicine and*  
415 *Biological Research*, 1:163-168.
- 416 Libeau, J. (1960). Foot-and-mouth disease in Africa south of the Sahara the present situation.  
417 *Bulletin of Epizootic Diseases in Africa*, 8: 90-104.
- 418 Longjam, N., Deb, R., Sarmah, A., Tayo, T., Awachat, V. and Saxena, V. (2011). A brief  
419 review on diagnosis of foot-and-mouth disease of livestock: conventional to molecular  
420 tools. *Veterinary Medicine International*, 12: 123-129.
- 421

- 422 Mazengia, H., Taye, M., Negussie, H., Alemu, S. and Tassew, A. (2010). Incidence of foot  
423 and mouth disease and its effect on milk yield in dairy cattle at Andassa dairy farm,  
424 Northwest Ethiopia. *Agriculture and Biology Journal of America*, 1 (5): 969-973.
- 425 Miguel, E., Grosbois, V., Caron, A., Boulinier, T., Fritz, H., Cornélis, D. and de Garine-  
426 Wichatitsky, M. (2013). Contacts and foot and mouth disease transmission from wild  
427 to domestic bovines in Africa. *Ecosphere*, 4(4): 1-32.
- 428 Molla, B., Ayelet, G., Asfaw, Y., Jibril, Y., Ganga, G. and Gelaye, E. (2010).  
429 Epidemiological study on foot-and-mouth disease in cattle: seroprevalence and risk  
430 factor assessment in South Omo zone, south-western Ethiopia. *Transboundary and*  
431 *Emerging Diseases*, 57: 340–347
- 432 Nawathe, D.R and Goni, M. (1976). Foot-and-Mouth disease in Nigeria. *Bulletin of Animal*  
433 *Health and Production in Africa*. 24:1-4.
- 434 Odunlami, S. S. and Lake, B. (2003). An assessment of the ecotourism potential of Yankari  
435 national park, Nigeria. *Eco Club. Communication E paper Series NR*, 7.
- 436 Olabode, O., Kazeem, H., Raji, M. and Ibrahim, N. (2013). Seroprevalence of foot and mouth  
437 disease virus antibodies in trade cattle (*Bos indicus*) in Kwara state of Nigeria.  
438 *Veterinary World*, 6(10) :1-9.
- 439 Omondi, P., Mayienda, R., Mshelbwala, J. and Massalatchi, M. (2006). *Total aerial count of*  
440 *elephants, buffaloes, roan antelope and other wildlife species in Yankari ecosystem,*  
441 *Nigeria*. Technical report for CITES MIKE Programme, pp. 78-102.
- 442 Owolodun, B. (1971). Foot-and-mouth disease and virus types distribution in Nigeria.  
443 *Bulletin of Epizootic Diseases of Africa*, 12: 1-9.
- 444 Pedersen, A.B., Jones, K.E., Nunn, C.L. and Altizer, S (2007). Infectious diseases and  
445 extinction risk in wild mammals. *Conservation Biology*, 21(5): 1269-1279.
- 446 Rodriguez, A., Dopazo, J., Saiz, J.C. and Sobrino, F. (1994). Immunogenicity of non-  
447 structural protein of foot-and-mouth disease virus; differences between infected and  
448 vaccinated swine. *Archive of Virology*, 136:123-131.
- 449 Smith, M.J., Telfer, S., Kallio, E.R., Burthe, S., Cook, A.R. and Lambin, X. (2009). Host-  
450 pathogen time series data in wildlife support a transmission function between density  
451 and frequency dependence. *Proceedings of National Academy of Science U S A*,  
452 106(19): 7905-7909
- 453 Sutmoller, P., Thomson, G. R., Hargreaves, S. K., Foggin, C. M. and Anderson, E. C. (2000).  
454 The foot-and-mouth disease risk posed by African buffalo within wildlife  
455 conservancies to the cattle industry of Zimbabwe. *Preventive Veterinary Medicine*, 44  
456 (1): 43-60.
- 457 Thomson, G., Vosloo, W. and Bastos, A. (2003). Foot and mouth disease in wildlife. *Virus*  
458 *Research*, 91(1): 145-161.
- 459 Ularamu, H. G., Ibu J.O., Abenga, J. N., Lazarus, D. D., Wungak, Y. S., Chuckwuedu, A. A.,  
460 Pam, B. L. and Adah, I. A. (2017). Improving laboratory capacity for foot and mouth  
461 disease diagnosis and control for sustainable livestock production in Nigeria. *Vom*  
462 *Journal of Veterinary Science*, 12: 1-10.
- 463



- 464 Ularamu, H.G., Ibu, J.O., Wood, B.A., Abenga, J.N., Lazarus, D.D., Wungak, Y.S.,  
 465 Knowles, N.J., Wadsworth, J., Mioulet, V., King, D.P., Shamaki, D. and M. I. Adah,  
 466 M.I. (2017). Characterization of Foot-and-Mouth Disease Viruses Collected in Nigeria  
 467 Between 2007 and 2014: Evidence for Epidemiological Links Between West and East  
 468 Africa. *Transboundary and Emerging Diseases*, 64(6): 1867-1876.
- 469
- 470 Vandebussche, F., Mathijs, E., Ularamu, H.G., Ehizibolo, D.O., Haegeman, A., Lefebvre,  
 471 D., De Vleeschauwer, A.R., Van Borm, S. and De Clercq, K. (2018). Complete  
 472 genome sequences of five foot-and-mouth disease viruses of serotype A isolated from  
 473 cattle in Nigeria between 2013 and 2015. *Genome Announcements*, 6:e00039-18
- 474
- 475
- 476 Vosloo, W., De Klerk, L.M., Boshoff, C., Botha, B., Dwarka, R., Keet, D. and Haydon, D.  
 477 (2007). Characterisation of a SAT-1 outbreak of foot-and-mouth disease in captive  
 478 African buffalo (*Syncerus caffer*): clinical symptoms, genetic characterisation and  
 479 phylogenetic comparison of outbreak isolates. *Veterinary Microbiology*, 120(3): 226-  
 480 240.
- 481 Vosloo, W., Thompson, P., Botha, B., Bengis, R. and Thomson, G. (2009). Longitudinal  
 482 study to investigate the role of Impala (*Aepyceros melampus*) in foot-and-mouth  
 483 disease maintenance in the Kruger National Park, South Africa. *Transboundary and*  
 484 *Emerging Diseases*, 56(1-2): 18-30.
- 485 Weaver, G. V., Domenech, J., Thiermann, A. R. and Karesh, W. B. (2013). Foot and mouth  
 486 disease: a look from the wild side. *Journal of Wildlife Diseases*, 49(4): 759-785.
- 487 Williams, E., Yuill, T., Artois, M., Fischer, J. and Haigh, S. (2002). Emerging infectious  
 488 diseases in wildlife. *Revue Scientifique et Technique-Office International des*  
 489 *Epizooties*, 21(1): 139-158.
- 490 Wungak, Y. S., Olabisi, I. O., Olugasa, B. O., Lazarus, D. D. and Ularamu, H. G. (2015).  
 491 Seroprevalence of foot and mouth disease (FMD) among sedentary cattle in northern  
 492 Plateau, Nigeria. *Asian Journal of Medical and Biological Research*, 1(2): 169-174.
- 493 Wungak, Y., Olugasa, B., Ishola, O., Lazarus, D. and Ularamu, G. (2016). Foot-and-mouth  
 494 disease (FMD) prevalence and exposure factors associated with seropositivity of cattle  
 495 in north-central, Nigeria. *African Journal of Biotechnology*, 15(24): 1224-1232.
- 496 Yousef, M.R., Mazloun, K.S. and Al-Nakhli, H.M. (2012). Serological evidence of natural  
 497 exposure of camels (*camelus dromedaries*) to foot-and-mouth disease virus. *Vet.*  
 498 *World*, 5(4):197-200

499

500

501

502 **Table 1: Seroprevalence of foot and mouth disease virus in cattle around Yankari game**  
 503 **reserve and Sumu Wildlife Park in Bauchi State, Nigeria**

Variables	No. sampled (%)	No +Ve (%)	X <sup>2</sup>	P value	Odds ratio	CI at 95%
-----------	-----------------	------------	----------------	---------	------------	-----------

Breed

---

Red Bororo	58 (19.3)	23 (39.7)	64.2	0.000		
Sokoto gudali	51 (17.0)	17 (33.3)			0.544	0.241 - 1.225
White Fulani	191 (63.7)	157 (82.2)			5.019	2.550 -9.878
Overall	300 (100)	197 (65.7)				
Sex						
Male	94 (31.3)	47 (50.0)	14.9	0.000	0.373	0.225 -0.620
Female	206 (68.7)	150 (72.8)				
Overall	300 (100.0)	197 (65.7)				

---

504

505

506

507

508

509

510

511

512

513

514

515

516

517

518

519

520

521

522

523

524

525

526

527

528

529

530

531

532

533

534

535

536

537  
538  
539  
540  
541  
542  
543  
544  
545  
546  
547  
548  
549  
550  
551  
552  
553  
554  
555  
556  
557  
558  
559  
560  
561  
562  
563  
564  
565  
566  
567  
568  
569

**Table 2: Seroprevalence of foot and mouth disease virus in wildlife from Yankari game reserve and Sumu wildlife park in Bauchi State, Nigeria.**

Wildlife	No. sampled (%)	No. +ve (%)	X <sup>2</sup>	P value	Odds ratio	CI at 95%
Yankari park						
Waterbuck	11 (10.4)	2 (18.2)	1.395	0.943	0.373	0.899-0.327
Elephant	4 (3.8)	1 (25.0)				
Hartbeest	1(0.9)	0 (0.0)				
Sumu park						
Eland	24 (22.6)	6 (25.0)				
Wildebeest	12 (11.3)	4 (33.3)				

Kudu	1 (0.9)	0 (0.0)
Overall	53 (100)	13 (24.5)

570 **Table 3: Seroprevalence of foot and mouth disease at the wildlife-cattle interface in**  
 571 **Yankari game reserve and Sumu wildlife park in Bauchi State, Nigeria.**

Specie	No. sampled	No. +Ve (%)	X <sup>2</sup>	P value	Odds ratio	CI at 95%
Wildlife	53	13 (24.53)	31.63	0.000	0.1699	0.087 - 0.332
Cattle	300	197 (65.67)				
Overall	353	210 (59.49)				

572

573

574

575

576

577

578

579

580 **Table 4: Foot and mouth disease virus serotypes detected in wildlife in Yankari game**  
 581 **reserve and Sumu Wildlife Park in Bauchi State, Nigeria.**

582

Wildlife	No. tested (%)	Foot and mouth disease virus serotypes			
		O	A	SAT 1	SAT 2
		No. positive (%)			
Waterbuck	11 (10.4)	2 (18.18)	2 (18.18)	3 (27.27)	1 (9.09)
Elephant	4 (3.8)	0	1 (25.0)	0	1 (25.0)
Hartbeest	1 (0.9)	0	0	0	0
Eland	24 (22.6)	3 (12.5)	6 (25.0)	4 (16.67)	4 (16.67)
Wildebeest	12 (11.3)	2 (16.67)	1 (8.33)	3 (25.0)	2 (16.67)
Kudu	1(0.9)	0	0	0	0

---

Overall	53 (100)	7 (13.21)	10 (18.87)	10 (18.87)	8 (15.09)
---------	----------	-----------	------------	------------	-----------

---

583

584