

Milk yield and lactation stage are associated with positive results to ELISA for *Mycobacterium avium* subsp. *paratuberculosis* in dairy cows from Northern Antioquia, Colombia: a preliminary study

Nathalia M. Correa-Valencia¹ · Nicolás F. Ramírez¹ · Martha Olivera² · Jorge Arturo Fernández-Silva^{1,3}

Received: 17 November 2015 / Accepted: 2 May 2016
© Springer Science+Business Media Dordrecht 2016

Abstract Paratuberculosis is a slow-developing infectious disease characterized by chronic granulomatous enterocolitis. This disease has a variable incubation period from 6 months to over 15 years and is caused by *Mycobacterium avium* subsp. *paratuberculosis* (MAP). Some studies have been conducted in cattle during the last decades in Colombia. However, those studies were designed using relatively small populations and were not aimed to establish prevalence. This study aimed to determine the MAP seroprevalence in selected dairy herds and to explore risk factors associated with the serology results. Serum samples and related data were collected from 696 randomly selected bovines in 28 dairy herds located in 12 different districts in one of the main dairy municipalities in Colombia (San Pedro de los Milagros). The samples were analyzed using a commercial ELISA kit. The information on risk factors was analyzed using a logistic regression. The apparent seroprevalence was 3.6 % (1/28) at the herd level and 2 % (14/696) at the animal level. The number of days in milk production between 100 and 200 days and over 200 days and the daily milk production between 20 and 40 L/cow and over 40 L/cow were associated with MAP seropositivity with odds ratios of 4.42, 3.45, 2.53, and 20.38, respectively. This study

demonstrates the MAP seroprevalence in dairy herds from Antioquia and the possible relationship between MAP seropositivity, milk yield, and lactation stage.

Keywords Dairy cattle · Johne's disease · Milk production · *Mycobacterium avium* subsp. *paratuberculosis* · Seroprevalence · Risk factors

Introduction

Paratuberculosis (PTB), also known as Johne's disease (JD), is a severe slow-developing and incurable granulomatous enteritis (Clarke 1997). This disease affects cattle and other domestic and wild ruminants (Nielsen and Toft 2009; Sweeney et al. 2012). *Mycobacterium avium* subsp. *paratuberculosis* (MAP) is the causal agent of PTB. It is a Gram-positive, facultative anaerobic, mycobactin-dependant, slow-growing, and acid-fast bacillus (AFB) that may cause a persistent infection in a host tissue's intestinal macrophages and lead to immune and inflammatory reactions (Sweeney 1996). MAP can resist environmental and chemical changes and persists in spoils, stream water, and manure slurry storages for up to a year (Sweeney 1996). MAP has been associated with the human chronic enteritis known as Crohn's disease (Sweeney et al. 2012; Atreya et al. 2014; Liverani et al. 2014).

MAP infections produce important economic losses related to cattle production in infected herds (Marce et al. 2009; Nielsen and Toft 2009). Economic losses due to reduced milk production, increased cow replacement, lower cull-cow revenue, and greater cow mortality are higher in PTB-infected herds compared to PTB-negative herds (Johnson et al. 2001; Kudahl et al. 2004; Weber 2006; Beaudeau et al. 2007; Gonda et al. 2007; Nielsen and Toft 2009; Richardson and More

✉ Jorge Arturo Fernández-Silva
jorge.fernandez@udea.edu.co

¹ Grupo Centauro, Facultad de Ciencias Agrarias, Universidad de Antioquia, Medellín, Colombia

² Grupo Biogénesis, Facultad de Ciencias Agrarias, Universidad de Antioquia, Medellín, Colombia

³ Epidemiología y Salud Pública Veterinaria, Centauro, Escuela de Medicina Veterinaria, Facultad de Ciencias Agrarias, Universidad de Antioquia UdeA, Calle 70 No. 52-21, Medellín, Colombia

2009; McAloon et al. 2016). There are reports of infections with MAP and clinical cases of JD from all countries that have ruminant populations (Marce et al. 2009; Nielsen and Toft 2009; Juste and Pérez 2011). It is thought that this disease has a global distribution (Manning and Collins 2010). Therefore, PTB belongs to the List of Diseases of the World Organization for Animal Health (OIE) because of its international distribution and zoonotic potential, leading to not only public and animal health risks but also commercial restrictions (Anonymous 2000, 2015).

Parturition, lactation, or other stresses may provoke clinical stages of this disease (Clarke 1997; Fecteau and Whitlock 2010). The main transmission route at an individual level in natural conditions is the oral-fecal route, especially at early stages of life in animals. However, intrauterine and transmammary routes have also been considered (Lambeth et al. 2004; Whittington and Windsor 2009).

MAP infections occur in young animals, and it is generally assumed that some age resistance takes place. Animals from 0 to 6 months of age are thought to be the most susceptible to MAP infections (McGregor et al. 2012; Mortier et al. 2013). Consequently, the major sources of MAP infection are infected animals (Manning and Collins 2001) and the contamination of the udder of the calf's dam, the pasture, the feedstuff, or the implements with feces. These are described as the principal factors to avoid when the control of the disease in the herd is desired (Sweeney 1996; O'Brien et al. 2006). For an antemortem diagnosis of PTB in cattle, several tests are available and recommended. These include tests to detect antibodies against MAP, the direct detection of MAP genes, bacterial cultures of fecal samples (individual, pooled, and environmental), and tests to detect MAP in tissue samples (Collins et al. 2005). The sensitivity and specificity of tests for the antemortem diagnosis of PTB vary significantly depending on the MAP infection or clinical stage (Nielsen and Toft 2008a). Therefore, it is considered that none of the diagnostic tests are capable of detecting all subclinically infected animals (Chacon et al. 2004; Lavers et al. 2013). In any case, sampling all adult cattle in every herd, environmental sampling, serial testing, and the use of two to three diagnostic tests has been recommended for herd screening and to increase the accuracy of MAP diagnosis (Collins et al. 2005; Stevenson 2010; Serraino et al. 2014).

Different individual and herd-level factors related to within-herd contact have been shown to influence the PTB infection status in dairy cattle (Johnson-Ifearulundu and Kaneene 1998, 1999; Hacker et al. 2004; Dieguez et al. 2008). Some of those risk factors include "not cleaning maternity pens after each use" (Johnson-Ifearulundu and Kaneene 1998; Tiwari et al. 2009), "more than one cow in a maternity pen" (Wells and Wagner 2000; Tiwari et al. 2009), "presence and percentage of cows born at other dairies" (Wells and Wagner 2000; Chia et al. 2002; Tiwari et al. 2009),

"contamination of udders of peri-parturient cows with manure" (Ansari-Lari et al. 2009), "winter group-housing for pre-weaned calves" (Wells and Wagner 2000; Tiwari et al. 2009; Ridge et al. 2010; Pithua et al. 2013), "animals fed colostrum from multiple cows" (Nielsen and Toft 2008b), "Bovine Viral Diarrhea Virus (BVDV)-seropositive herds" and "BVDV vaccination not done properly in calves" (Tiwari et al. 2009), "housing replacement calves with adult cattle before they were 6 months old" (Collins et al. 1994; Dieguez et al. 2008), "suckling from foster cows" (Nielsen and Toft 2008b), "feeding milk with antibiotics" (Ridge et al. 2010), "exposure of calves 0 weeks to adults feces," "young stock contact with adult feces from same equipment used for cleaning," and "feces spread on forage fed to any age group" (Goodger et al. 1996; Obasanjo et al. 1997), and "cows with more than 4 parturitions" (Jakobsen et al. 2000).

In South America and the Caribbean, few studies have reported consistent seroprevalence. Animal and herd-level prevalence of PTB from this region range from 2.7 to 72 % and from 18.7 to 100 %, respectively (Fernández-Silva et al. 2014). In Colombia, PTB was first reported in cattle in 1924, probably from imported animals (Vega-Morales 1947). After this, PTB research in cattle has been sporadic and has mainly focused on clinical, histopathological, serologic, microbiological, and/or molecular diagnosis (Vega-Morales 1947; Isaza-Triviño 1978; Góngora and Perea 1984; Mancipe et al. 2009; Ramírez-Vásquez et al. 2001; Zapata et al. 2010; Fernández-Silva et al. 2011a, b; Ramírez-Vásquez et al. 2011, 2013; Ramírez-García and Maldonado-Estrada 2013), treatment (Huber-Luna 1954), prevalence (Patiño-Murillo and Estrada-Arbeláez 1999; Fernández-Silva et al. 2011a), and molecular characterization (Fernández-Silva et al. 2011b). These studies were very useful in confirming the presence of MAP in local cattle. However, the studies were performed in a relatively small dairy cattle population.

Despite these investigative efforts, no official control or eradication program for PTB has been carried out in Colombia. Its control is considered a farmer's responsibility. The main objective of the current study was to determine the seroprevalence of MAP and explore the main risk factors associated with enzyme-linked immunoassay (ELISA)-positive results in cows of dairy herds of one municipality of the Northern Region of Antioquia, Colombia.

Materials and methods

Ethical considerations

This research was approved by the Ethics Committee for Animal Experimentation of the Universidad of Antioquia, Colombia (Act number 88, from March 27, 2014).

166	Study design		
167	Twelve districts (out of 37) of a municipality located in the		
168	Northern Region of Antioquia, Colombia, that contribute		
169	70 % of the municipality's cattle population were included		
170	in the study. Proportional allocation design of the herds to be		
171	sampled in each of the selected districts as well as an adjust-		
172	ment by cluster was considered.		
173	A sample of 28 dairy herds inside the selected districts		
174	without a previous PTB diagnosis and/or without known his-		
175	tory of PTB was selected, according to its specific weight in		
176	the dairy population of the municipality. Accounting for a loss		
177	of 28 % and an average adult population (≥ 2 years of age) per		
178	herd estimated to be 23, 696 animals were randomly sampled.		
179	According to the study design, 29 animals per herd were test-		
180	ed by ELISA. In the study region, dairy production is the main		
181	economic activity. Dairy production takes place in all places		
182	within the region, and Holstein is the predominant dairy cattle		
183	breed. In all the cases, the herds had to fulfill the following		
184	conditions to be enrolled in the study: security during sam-		
185	pling visits, geographical accessibility, and willingness of herd		
186	owner to participate in the study, allow sampling of all the		
187	necessary animals, and provide information regarding animal		
188	features and herd management practices. In addition, herds		
189	had to have the minimum facilities for the personnel to carry		
190	out the procedures safely on animals. All herds accomplishing		
191	these inclusion criteria were included in the random selection		
192	process.		
193	Serum samples and information		
194	All the herds were visited and tested once from May to		
195	July 2014. In each herd, information and whole blood		
196	samples were taken from each animal over 2 years of		
197	age. The sample collection was conducted according to		
198	standard methods to avoid unnecessary pain or stress to		
199	animals. Blood samples were taken from the coccygeal or		
200	jugular vein, collected in red-top plastic Vacutainer®		
201	tubes and transported in a refrigerated cage until their		
202	arrival at the laboratory, where they were centrifuged at		
203	1008 RCF for 5 min to obtain the serum for the ELISA		
204	test. The obtained serum was frozen for 30 to 45 days at		
205	-20 °C. After this time, frozen samples were thawed at		
206	room temperature before being tested by ELISA. In each		
207	herd, the information on individual animal features, herd		
208	characteristics, and herd management practices were col-		
209	lected through questionnaires administered directly to		
210	herd owners or managers on every visit and by direct		
211	observation of the individual and herd characteristics, as		
212	well as management practices (questionnaires available		
213	upon request). The questionnaires were administered by		
214	one of the authors to ensure that recording was clear,		
215	complete, and consistent.		
		ELISA	216
		A serum ELISA was performed using a preabsorbed serum	217
		ELISA Parachek®2 (Prionics AG, Switzerland) following the	218
		manufacturer's instructions. This test included a preabsorption	219
		step with <i>Mycobacterium phlei</i> to reduce cross-reactions. A	220
		herd was considered ELISA-positive if the herd had at least	221
		two serum ELISA-positive animals. This avoided the risk of	222
		confirming a herd as positive based on one single false-	223
		positive result by the test, as it is defined by the manufacturer	224
		of the diagnostic test used. An animal was considered ELISA-	225
		positive if serum sample was above or equal to the cutoff of	226
		15 % positivity (%P), as it is defined by the manufacturer of	227
		the diagnostic test used.	228
		Statistical analysis	229
		All the information generated during the study was entered	230
		into Excel worksheets (Microsoft Corp., Redmond, WA,	231
		USA) and then exported to Stata 12.0 (StataCorp, 2011,	232
		Texas, USA) for statistical analysis. The data were examined	233
		for biologically implausible entries (those unlikely to be true).	234
		Any erroneous data (those incorrect, detected during the	235
		editing process of the database) were removed or corrected.	236
		Descriptive statistics were computed for all the variables of	237
		interest. Observations were stratified by district and sampling	238
		weights were computed based on the specific weight of the	239
		district on the reference population. Variables were checked	240
		for more than 30 % missing values, a case in which they	241
		should have been deleted from the analysis. None of the var-	242
		iables showed more than 30 % missing values. Pearson and	243
		Spearman correlation analyses were used for continuous and	244
		categorical variables, respectively. A complex design analysis	245
		was conducted according to a cluster effect and the stratified	246
		nature of the study using the Survey command. Unconditional	247
		associations between each risk factor and the outcome of in-	248
		terest—ELISA-positive—were computed. Associations with	249
		$p \leq 0.25$ were retained for consideration in a multivariable	250
		model. A complete multivariable logistic regression model	251
		was constructed considering a significance level of $p < 0.05$.	252
		The potential confounding effect of parturition was evaluated	253
		by refitting the final model with parturition omitted to see if	254
		the coefficients for other predictors changed substantially. The	255
		results from the final models are presented as odds ratios (OR)	256
		with 95 % CIs. The model fit was assessed using a Hosmer-	257
		Lemeshow goodness-of-fit test.	258
		Case definition	259
		The case definition for a MAP-infected herd was the one with	260
		at least two seropositive animals determined by serum ELISA.	261
		The case definition for a MAP-infected animal was seroposi-	262
		tivity of an individual serum ELISA.	263

264 **Pretest of the methodology**

265 All testing procedures and questionnaires were pretested on a
 266 small scale to evaluate their effectiveness in order to accom-
 267 plish the objectives of the study.

268 **Results**

269 **Descriptive statistics**

270 The study population was mainly composed of Holstein
 271 (77.6 %) cows (99.6 %), older than 3 years of age (74.9 %),
 272 in lactation (83.3 %), with more than 200 days in milk
 273 (57.1 %) and less than three parities (67 %) (Table 1). The
 274 individual daily milk production was predominately 20–40 L/

cow (45.8 %), and the percentage of animals not born in the
 herd was 69.7 % (Table 1).

The herd-level characteristics of less than 50 ha (66.2 %),
 ≥30 and ≤60 cows in milk (45.8 %), and a daily milk produc-
 tion between ≥500 and ≤1400 l (46.2 %) were the most com-
 mon findings regarding farm size, herd size, and herd daily
 milk production, respectively (Table 2). The presence of other
 ruminants (i.e., goats, sheep, and/or buffalo), manure spread-
 ing on pastures as a method of fertilization, and cows staying
 with their calf after calving was reported in 17.9, 67.9, and
 85.7 % of the herds, respectively. The percentage of herds
 certified in good farming practices (buenas prácticas
 ganaderas, BPG) and percentage of tuberculosis- and
 brucellosis-free herds were 25 and 75 %, respectively
 (Table 2). The descriptive analysis of the quantitative vari-
 ables is summarized in Table 3.

t1.1 **Table 1** Animal-level predictors
 t1.2 in bovines from dairy herds of
 t1.3 San Pedro de los Milagros,
 Antioquia, Colombia

Variable	Description	Unit/category	Observations	Distribution (%)	
Breed	According to herd registers	Holstein	540	77.6	
		Jersey	120	17.2	t1.4
		Other ^a	36	5.2	t1.5
		Total	696		t1.6
Sex	According to herd registers	Female	693	99.6	
		Male	3	0.4	t1.8
		Total	696		t1.9
Age	According to herd registers	2–3 years old	175	25.1	
		>3 years old	521	74.9	t1.11
		Total	696		
Milk production state	According to herd registers	Heifer	68	10.5	
		Milking cow	538	83.3	t1.13
		Dry cow	40	6.2	t1.14
		Total	646		t1.15
Days in milk	Days that had passed from the first day the cow started producing milk to the moment of the testing	<100	158	22.7	
		≥100–≤200	140	20.1	t1.17
		>200	397	57.1	t1.18
		Total	695		t1.19
Parity	Times the cow had gave birth during its life to the moment of the testing	<3	376	67	
		≥3–≤8	188	32.4	t1.21
		>8	132	0.6	t1.22
		Total	696		t1.23
Individual daily milk production	Total milk obtained during the previous day to the moment of testing	<20	125	53.1	
		≥20–≤40	312	45.8	t1.25
		>40	92	1.1	t1.26
		Total	529		t1.27
Born in the herd	The cow had been born in the herd or was purchased from another farm	Yes	451	30.3	
		No	196	69.7	t1.29
		Total	647		t1.30

^a Other breeds included Guernsey, Ayrshire, Swedish Red, Swiss Brown, Jersey, and several crossbreeds of Holstein with Jersey, Ayrshire, Angus, Blanco Orejinegro, Brahman, and Gir

Trop Anim Health Prod

t2.1 **Table 2** Herd-level predictors in dairy herds of San Pedro de los Milagros, Antioquia, Colombia

t2.2	Variable	Description	Unit/category	Observations	Distribution (%)	
t2.3	Farm size	Part of the herd dedicated to farming in hectares (Has)	<50	19	66.2	
			≥50–≤99	6	23.7	t2.4
			≥100	3	10.1	t2.5
			Total	28		t2.6
t2.7	Herd size	Number of cows in milk	<30	6	25	
			≥30–≤60	11	45.8	t2.8
			≥60	7	29.2	t2.9
			Total	24		t2.10
t2.11	Herd daily milk production	Total milk (in liters) obtained during a day in each herd considered in the screening, in average, to the moment of the testing	<500	7	26.9	
			≥500–≤1400	12	46.2	t2.12
			>1400	7	26.9	t2.13
			Total	26		t2.14
t2.15	Presence of other ruminants	Coexistence with goats, sheep, and/or buffaloes in the same installations	Yes	5	17.9	
			No	23	82.1	t2.16
			Total	28		t2.17
t2.18	Manure spreading	Use of cow manure as a fertilizer in the pastures	Yes	19	67.9	
			No	9	32.1	t2.19
			Total	27		t2.20
t2.21	Cow stays with the dam after calving	After parturition the cow stays with the mother in direct contact	Yes	23	85.7	
			No	5	14.3	t2.22
			Total	28		t2.23
t2.24	BPG ^a certification	Herd certified by the Instituto Colombiano Agropecuario (ICA) as a BPG practican	Yes	8	25	
			No	20	75	t2.25
			Total	28		t2.26
t2.27	Tuberculosis-free certification	Herd certified by Instituto Colombiano Agropecuario (ICA) as tuberculosis-free	Yes	20	75	
			No	8	25	t2.28
			Total	28		t2.29
t2.30	Brucellosis-free certification	Herd certified by Instituto Colombiano Agropecuario (ICA) as brucellosis-free	Yes	21	75	
			No	7	25	t2.31
			Total	28		t2.32

^aBuenas Prácticas Ganaderas (Good Farming Practices)

291 **ELISA** 2 %. Eight of the seropositive animals were from one herd 294
of the 28 included in the study. This herd was the only positive 295
292 Fourteen of 696 of the animals had a positive ELISA test, herd according to the case definition, resulting in a herd-level 296
293 which resulted in an animal-level apparent prevalence of apparent prevalence of 3.6 %. 297

t3.1 **Table 3** Descriptive summary of
t3.2 quantitative variables in dairy
herds of San Pedro de los

t3.3	Variable	Observations	Mean ± SD	Minimum	Maximum
t3.3	Farm size (in Has)	28	50.87 ± 47.22	5	180
t3.4	Herd size	24	63.66 ± 61.27	11	332
t3.5	Herd daily milk production (L/day) ^a	26	1350 ± 1534	220	8132
t3.6	Days in milk	532	199.67 ± 140.32	1	785
t3.7	Parity	562	3.06 ± 2.00	0	12
t3.8	Individual milk production (L/day) ^b	529	20.42 ± 7.39	2	51

^aMilk produced per herd/day

^bMilk produced per cow/day

298 **Risk factors analysis**

299 The two cow-level factors “days in milk” and “individual
300 daily milk production” showed strong associations with the
301 presence of ELISA-positive results (Table 4). Biologically
302 plausible interactions of predictor variables were assessed
303 and find to be nonsignificant. The Hosmer-Lemeshow
304 goodness-of-fit test suggested that the model fits the data
305 ($p > 0.97$). The OR for seropositivity was increased with the
306 number of days in milk and individual daily milk production
307 ($p < 0.01$). The number of days in milk had a similar OR pat-
308 tern for the 100- to 200-day interval (OR = 4.42) as for
309 >200 days (OR = 3.45).

310 **Discussion**

311 The present study was designed to identify the prevalence and
312 explore the risk factors associated with seropositive results
313 detected using an ELISA in one of the main dairy production
314 areas of Colombia.

315 The current herd and animal-level prevalence is unknown
316 in many countries. However, according to several authors, the
317 prevalence of infection is increasing in some countries that do
318 not have mandatory control programs (Salem et al. 2013;
319 Fernández-Silva et al. 2014). Colombia lacks a mandatory
320 program. However, no trend can be established with the cur-
321 rently available data. The animal- and herd-level prevalence
322 estimated in the present study is lower than the prevalence
323 found in cattle by other authors in European, Asian, North
324 American, Latin American, and Caribbean countries (Clarke
325 1997; Nielsen and Toft 2009; Manning and Collins 2010;
326 Fernández-Silva et al. 2014). Nonetheless, Fernández-Silva
327 et al. (2014) reported studies in Latin American and
328 Caribbean countries with an overall prevalence of 16.9
329 (13.2–20.5) and 75.8 % (50.1–101.5) in cattle, at the animal

and herd levels, respectively, revealing the extreme limits that
can be found in the PTB prevalence reports.

332 On a national scale, our results are similar to those obtained
333 in a previous seroprevalence study in Normando cattle using
334 an ELISA in the Colombian departments of Caldas and
335 Tolima (animal-level 1.69 %; 3/177; Patiño-Murillo and
336 Estrada-Arbeláez 1999). However, they contrast with MAP-
337 detection results obtained in the department of Antioquia in
338 which ELISA-positive results were found for 10.1 (31/307)
339 and 70 % (10/14) at the animal and herd-level, respectively
340 (Fernández-Silva et al. 2011a). It should be mentioned that in
341 this previous study, serum from asymptomatic cows was ana-
342 lyzed by an unabsorbed ELISA test, which could affect the
343 specificity of the findings, leading to false-positive results. On
344 the other hand, in their study, herds were selected attempting a
345 representation of all productive districts of the municipality
346 (not a random sampling), and of these 14 herds, one herd
347 had presented sporadic clinical cases compatible with
348 paratuberculosis confirmed by PCR and histopathology
349 (Zapata et al. 2010). These factors could have increased the
350 prevalence reported. Our study attempts to, and finally, report
351 a seroprevalence at the animal- and herd-level in a higher
352 population of the department of Antioquia compared to pre-
353 vious studies carried out in the country and region. Those
354 previous studies did not attempt to report prevalence in their
355 study design and used diagnostic tests with different
356 characteristics.

357 Although the results obtained (2 and 3.6 %, animal and
358 herd-level, respectively) refer to the apparent MAP prevalence
359 in the population being studied, no attempt to calculate the
360 true prevalence was carried out due to a lack of information
361 on the sensitivity and specificity of the test used, which should
362 had been previously estimated in the same population for an
363 accurate determination (Nielsen and Toft 2009). In any case,
364 the low prevalence obtained could also be explained by the
365 test’s characteristics that are mainly related to its sensitivity as
366 a response to the silent and long-lasting behavior of the dis-
367 ease, than to failures of the test itself (Sweeney 1996; Collins
368 et al. 2005; Mon et al. 2012; Sorge et al. 2012). According to
369 Lavers et al. (2015), the sensitivity of serum and milk ELISA
370 is approximately 25.6–45.3 % and its specificity of 97.6–
371 98.9 %, which can lead to a misclassification of the cows
372 and reporting infected cows as negative (Nielsen et al.
373 2002). On the other hand, the low prevalence obtained could
374 be related to sample handling. In the present study, the serum
375 samples were frozen for 30 to 45 days at -20°C , which could
376 have led to lower scores for the MAP ELISA, as previously
377 reported by Alinovi et al. (2009).

378 The risk factors identified in this study (number of days in
379 milk and individual daily milk production) are supported by
380 the current data that parturition, stage of lactation, and meta-
381 bolic stress, induced by milk production, can act as triggers
382 and lead to seroconversion or progression from stage II to

t4.1 **Table 4** Final logistic regression model assessing the effect of selected herd and cow variables on the probability for animals to be serum-ELISA-positive to MAP in San Pedro de los Milagros, Antioquia, Colombia ($n = 532$ observations)

t4.2	Variable	Odds ratio	SEM	p value*	95 % CI
t4.3	Days in milk				
t4.4	<100	Referent			
t4.5	$\geq 100 - \leq 200$	4.42	0.86	0.00	2.89–6.76
t4.6	>200	3.45	0.92	0.00	1.93–6.17
t4.7	Individual daily milk production				
t4.8	<20	Referent			
t4.9	$\geq 20 - \leq 40$	2.53	0.75	0.00	1.32–4.85
t4.10	>40	20.38	5.54	0.00	11.26–36.88

*Significant results ($p < 0.05$)

stage III of the disease (Clarke 1997; Nielsen et al. 2002; Fecteau and Whitlock 2010). Nielsen et al. (2002) reported that in serum ELISAs, the OR of being positive is highest at the end of lactation (>203 days; OR = 5.22), possibly indicating that cows with low antibody concentrations are infected but with a cell-mediated immune response, undetectable by ELISA. This statement is hypothetical and would have to be supported by a longitudinal study with repeated samplings on the same population to understand the serological patterns.

Our study reported similar results of odds over 3.45 for cows over 200 days in milk, indicating that the probability of being ELISA-positive is different across lactation progression and is higher in the middle of the lactation. From a diagnostic point of view, it is important to recognize the differences in ELISA-positive animals in different stages of lactation and different production levels, as these findings can help establish risk assessment-based control programs and guide owners to recognize the distinctive clinical signs of PTB at an early stage.

Some variables that we hypothesized to be important risks and were previously identified by other studies for seropositivity were not significant in the logistic regression analysis, including parity ($p=0.160$), physiological state ($p=0.57$), cow staying with the calf after calving ($p=0.55$), presence of other ruminants ($p=0.62$), and manure spreading as a fertilizer in the pastures ($p=0.57$; Goodger et al. 1996; Cetinkaya et al. 1997; Obasanjo et al. 1997; Jakobsen et al. 2000; Fredriksen et al. 2004; Dieguez et al. 2008; Nielsen and Toft 2008b; Ansari-Lari et al. 2009; Doré et al. 2012; Nielsen and Toft 2012).

Although previous studies have reported that the highest probability of a positive-ELISA is observed in older cows (parity ≥ 3 ; Sherman 1985; Jakobsen et al. 2000), a large herd (Braun et al. 1990; Ott et al. 1999; Jakobsen et al. 2000; Muskens et al. 2003; Hirst et al. 2004), and Jersey cows compared to larger breeds (including Holstein-Friesian; Jakobsen et al. 2000; Jørgensen 1972; McNab et al. 1991; Cetinkaya et al. 1997), no relationship between breed, parity, and herd size was found in our study. However, the role of parity as a confounder was investigated by the fitting models considering MAP ELISA-positive results, with and without parity included. No confounding effect of parity was observed.

The practice of leaving a cow with her calf after birth was also representative of the herds of the study and has been reported as a risk factor, increasing the within-herd transmission of PTB by Goodger et al. (1996), Obasanjo et al. (1997), and Ansari-Lari et al. (2009). Concerning the presence of other ruminants, Whittington et al. (2001) reported cases of bovine PTB due to S (sheep) strain that were confirmed in Australia, demonstrating the transmission opportunity between species. Manure spreading as a risk factor has been previously described (Goodger et al. 1996; Obasanjo et al. 1997), because of the potential exposure to younger and susceptible cattle.

BPG certification includes management practices which can be considered PTB-related, such as grazing strategies (i.e., rotational, rational, intelligent, stripped-rotational, altering, and extensive), fertilization strategies (i.e., organic and inorganic), other animal species in the farm (e.g., pigs, rabbits, goats, horses, buffaloes, and poultry), enteric disease cases in the last semester and their diagnosis, and tuberculosis and brucellosis sanitation status (ICA 2007).

This study had several limitations. The design chosen for this study was not optimal for the evaluation of herd-level paratuberculosis risk factors. The study would have had much more power to evaluate herd-level effects if a cross-sectional study involving many more herds had been used. However, financial resources were limited to include more herds, but authors believe that herds included in this study were good examples of the specialized dairy herds in the region in an exploratory manner.

The Survey command in Stata version 12.0 (StataCorp 2011) was used in the data analysis for several reasons. First, the variance linearization procedure used allows for the simultaneous evaluation of both cow-level and herd level risk factors, with appropriate standard error estimates. Second, it allows for the incorporation of sampling weights into all analyses to correctly account for the probability of a herd being sampled within a district.

Conclusion

In conclusion, we detected an apparent seroprevalence of 3.6 % at the herd-level and 2 % at the animal-level. The risk factors associated with MAP seropositivity were ≥ 100 days in milk and an individual daily milk production over 20 L/cow.

The information in this study indicates the importance of implementing protective management practices related to our results. Thus, it will be necessary to design risk-based programs in each country that are adapted to its specific conditions. Follow-up studies on herds with PTB over a long time period to investigate if the change of individual management practices leads to changes in PTB prevalence on these farms should be performed.

Acknowledgments This research was funded by Vecol and Universidad de Antioquia (Colombia). The authors thank Estrategia de sostenibilidad CODI 2013–2014, Universidad de Antioquia (Centauro), and Estrategia de sostenibilidad CODI 2014–2015, Universidad de Antioquia (Biogénesis). Special regards to all technical and laboratory team who supported all testing and diagnostic procedures, and to farmers for allowing animal testing and information collecting.

Compliance with ethical standards

Conflicts of interest The authors declare that they have no conflict of interest.

486
487

References

- Alinovi, C.A., Ward, M.P., Lin, T.L. and Wu, C.C., 2009. Sample handling substantially affects Johne's ELISA, Preventive Veterinary Medicine, 90, 278–283.
- Anonymous, 2000. Possible links between Crohn's disease and paratuberculosis. Report of the Scientific Committee on Animal Health and Animal Welfare. European Commission, Brussels. http://www.johnes.org/handouts/files/out38_en.pdf Accessed March 5th, 2016.
- Anonymous, 2015. Terrestrial Animal Health Code. 2015. <http://www.oie.int/es/sanidad-animal-en-el-mundo/oie-listed-diseases-2015/>. Accessed 20 March 2014.
- Ansari-Lari, M., Haghkhal, M., Bahramy, A., Novin Baهران, A.M., 2009. Risk factors for Mycobacterium avium subspecies paratuberculosis in Fars province (Southern Iran) dairy herds. Tropical Animal Health and Production, 41, 553–557.
- Atreya, R., Bülte, M., Gerlach, G.F., Goethe, R., Homef, M.W., Köhler, H., Meens, J., Möbius, P., Roeb, E., Weiss, S., 2014. Facts, myths and hypotheses on the zoonotic nature of Mycobacterium avium subspecies paratuberculosis. International Journal of Medical Microbiology, 304(7), 858–867.
- Beauveau, F., Belliard, M., Joly, A., Seegers, H., 2007. Reduction in milk yield associated with Mycobacterium avium subspecies paratuberculosis (Map) infection in dairy cows. Veterinary Research, 38(4):625–34.
- Braun, R.K., Buergelt, C.D., Littell, R.C., Linda, S.B., Simpson, J.R., 1990. Use of an enzyme-linked immunosorbent assay to estimate prevalence of paratuberculosis in cattle of Florida. Journal of the American Veterinary Medical Association, 196(8), 1251–1254.
- Cetinkaya, B., Erdogan, H.M., Morgan, K.L., 1997. Relationships between the presence of Johne's disease and farm and management factors in dairy cattle in England. Preventive Veterinary Medicine, 32, 253–266.
- Chia, J., VanLeeuwenb, J.A., Weersinka, A., Keefe, G.P., 2002. Management factors related to seroprevalences to bovine viral diarrhoea virus, bovine-leukosis virus, Mycobacterium avium subspecies paratuberculosis, and Neospora caninum in dairy herds in the Canadian Maritimes. Preventive Veterinary Medicine, 55, 57–68.
- Clarke, C.J., 1997. The pathology and pathogenesis of paratuberculosis in ruminants and other species, Journal Comparative Pathology, 116, 217–261.
- Collins, M.T., Sockett, D.C., Goodger, W.J., Conrad, T.A., Thomas, C.B., Carr, D.J., 1994. Herd prevalence and geographic distribution of, and risk factors for, bovine paratuberculosis in Wisconsin. Journal of the American Veterinary Medical Association, 204(4), 636–641.
- Collins, M.T., Gardner, I.A., Garry, F.B., Roussel, A.J., Wells, S.J., 2005. Consensus recommendations on diagnostic testing for the detection of paratuberculosis in cattle in the United States. Journal of the American Veterinary Medical Association, 229 (12):1912–9.
- Dieguez, F.J., Arnaiz, I., Sanjuan, M.L., Vilar, M.J., Yus, E., 2008. Management practices associated with Mycobacterium avium subspecies paratuberculosis infection and the effects of the infection on dairy herds. Veterinary Record, 162, 614–617.
- Doré, E., Paré, J., Côté, G., Buczinski, S., Labrecque, O., Roy, J.P., Fecteau, G., 2012. Risk factors associated with transmission of Mycobacterium avium subsp. paratuberculosis to calves within dairy herd: a systematic review. Journal of Veterinary Internal Medicine, 26(1), 32–45.
- Fecteau, M.E., Whitlock, R.H., 2010. Paratuberculosis in cattle. In: Behr MA, Collins DM (ed.), Paratuberculosis: Organism, Disease, Control. CAB International, Oxfordshire, England, 144–156.
- Fernández-Silva, J.A., Abdulmawjood, A., Bülte, M., 2011b. Diagnosis and molecular characterization of Mycobacterium avium subsp. paratuberculosis from dairy cows in Colombia. Veterinary Medicine International, 2011;2011:352561.
- Fernández-Silva, J.A., Abdulmawjood, A., Akineden, O., Bülte, M., 2011a. Serological and molecular detection of Mycobacterium avium subsp. paratuberculosis in cattle of dairy herds in Colombia. Tropical Animal Health and Production, 43, 1501–1507.
- Fernández-Silva, J.A., Correa-Valencia, N.M., Ramírez-Vásquez, N., 2014. Systematic review of the prevalence of paratuberculosis in cattle, sheep, and goats in Latin America and the Caribbean. Tropical Animal Health and Production, 46(8), 1321–1340.
- Fredriksen, B., Djonne, B., Sigurdardóttir, O., Tharaldsen, J., Nyberg, O., Jarp, J., 2004. Factors affecting the herd level of antibodies against Mycobacterium avium subspecies paratuberculosis in dairy cattle. Veterinary Record, 154, 522–526.
- Gonda, M.G., Chang, Y.M., Shook, G.E., Collins, M.T., Kirkpatrick, B.W., 2007. Effect of Mycobacterium paratuberculosis infection on production, reproduction, and health traits in US Holsteins. Preventive Veterinary Medicine, 80(2–3):103–19.
- Góngora, O.A., Perea, J., 1984. Evaluación de tres métodos diagnósticos en paratuberculosis bovina. Bogotá, Cundinamarca, Universidad Nacional de Colombia, diss.
- Goodger, W.J., Collins, M.T., Nordlund, K.V., Eisele, C., Pelletier, J., Thomas, C.B., Sockett, D.C., 1996. Epidemiologic study of on-farm management practices associated with prevalence of Mycobacterium paratuberculosis infections in dairy cattle. Journal of the American Veterinary Medical Association, 208, 1877–1881.
- Hacker, U., Huttner, K., Konow, M., 2004. Investigation of serological prevalence and risk factors of paratuberculosis in dairy farms in the state of Mecklenburg-Westpommern, Germany. Berliner und Münchener tierärztliche Wochenschrift, 117, 140–144.
- Hirst, H.L., Garry, F.B., Morley, P.S., Salman, M.D., Dinsmore, R.P., Wagner, B.A., McSweeney, K.D., Goodell, G.M., 2004. Seroprevalence of Mycobacterium avium subsp paratuberculosis infection among dairy cows in Colorado and herd-level risk factors for seropositivity. Journal of the American Veterinary Medical Association, 225(1), 97–101.
- Huber-Luna, G., 1954. La administración de la isonicotimilhidrazina de cortisona en la paratuberculosis bovina (Enfermedad de Johne). Bogotá, Cundinamarca, Universidad Nacional de Colombia, diss.
- Instituto Colombiano Agropecuario (ICA), 2007. Resolución 0002341 de 2007. from <http://www.ica.gov.co/getattachment/0b5de556-cb4a-43a8-a27a-cd9a2064b1ab/2341.aspx>. Accessed 13 December 2014.
- Isaza-Triviño, P.F., 1978. Diagnóstico de paratuberculosis en bovinos por los métodos de baciloscopia, fijación de complemento e inmunofluorescencia. Bogotá, Cundinamarca, Universidad Nacional de Colombia, diss.
- Jakobsen, M.B., Alban, L., Nielsen, S.S., 2000. A cross-sectional study of paratuberculosis in 1155 Danish dairy cows. Preventive Veterinary Medicine, 46, 15–27.
- Johnson, Y.J., Kaneene, J.B., Gardiner, J.C., Lloyd, J.W., Sprecher, D.J., Coe, P.H., 2001. The effect of subclinical Mycobacterium paratuberculosis infection on milk production in Michigan dairy cows. Journal of Dairy Science, 84(10):2188–94.
- Johnson-Ifearulundu, Y.J., Kaneene, J.B., 1998. Management related risk factors for M. paratuberculosis infection in Michigan, USA, dairy herds. Preventive Veterinary Medicine, 37, 41–54.
- Johnson-Ifearulundu, Y., Kaneene, J.B., 1999. Distribution and environmental risk factors for paratuberculosis in dairy cattle herds in Michigan. American Journal of Veterinary Research, 60(5), 589–596.
- Jørgensen, J.B., 1972. Undersøgelser over forekomst af paratuberkulose hos kvæg i Danmark (Investigations on the occurrence of paratuberculosis in cattle in Denmark). Nordisk Veterinær Medicin, 24, 297–308.
- Juste, R.A., Pérez, V., 2011. Control of paratuberculosis in sheep and goats. Veterinary Clinics of North America: Food Animal Practice, 27, 127–138.

- 616 Kudahl, A., Nielsen, S.S., Sørensen, J.T., 2004. Relationship between
617 antibodies against *Mycobacterium avium* subsp. paratuberculosis
618 in milk and shape of lactation curves. *Preventive Veterinary
619 Medicine*, 62(2):119–34.
- 620 Lambeth, C., Reddacliff, L.A., Windsor, P., Abbott, K.A., McGregor, H.,
621 Whittington, R.J., 2004. Intrauterine and transmammary transmis-
622 sion of *Mycobacterium avium* subsp paratuberculosis in sheep.
623 *Australian Veterinary Journal*, 82(8), 504–508.
- 624 Lavers, C.J., McKenna, S.L., Dohoo, I.R., Barkema, H.W., Keefe, G.P.,
625 2013. Evaluation of environmental fecal culture for *Mycobacterium
626 avium* subspecies paratuberculosis detection in dairy herds and as-
627 sociation with apparent within-herd prevalence. *Canadian
628 Veterinary Journal*, 54(11):1053–60.
- 629 Lavers, C.J., Dohoo, I.R., McKenna, S.L., Keefe, G.P., 2015. Sensitivity
630 and specificity of repeated test results from a commercial milk
631 enzyme-linked immunosorbent assay for detection of
632 *Mycobacterium avium* subspecies paratuberculosis in dairy cattle.
633 *Journal of the American Veterinary Medical Association*, 246(2),
634 236–244.
- 635 Liverani, E., Scaioli, E., Cardamone, C., Dal Monte, P., Belluzzi, A.,
636 2014. *Mycobacterium avium* subspecies paratuberculosis in the eti-
637 ology of Crohn's disease, cause or epiphenomenon? *World Journal
638 of Gastroenterology*, 20(36), 13060–13070.
- 639 Mancipe, L.F., Sanchez, C.J.L., Rodriguez, M., 2009. Paratuberculosis
640 study in a sheep flock of la Sabana de Bogotá by using three diag-
641 nostic techniques. *Revista de Medicina Veterinaria (UniSalle)*, 18,
642 33–51.
- 643 Manning, E.J., Collins, M.T., 2001. *Mycobacterium avium* subsp.
644 paratuberculosis: pathogen, pathogenesis and diagnosis. *Revue
645 scientifique et technique (International Office of Epizootics)*,
646 20(1), 133–50.
- 647 Manning, J.B., Collins, M.T., 2010. Epidemiology of paratuberculosis.
648 In: Behr MA, Collins DM (ed.), *Paratuberculosis: Organism,
649 Disease, Control*. CAB International, Oxfordshire, England, 22–27.
- 650 Marce, C., Beaudreau, F., Bareille, N., Seegers, H., Fourichon, C., 2009.
651 Higher non-return rate associated with *Mycobacterium avium* sub-
652 species paratuberculosis infection at early stage in Holstein dairy
653 cows. *Theriogenology*, 71(5), 807–816.
- 654 McAloon, C.G., Whyte, P., More, S.J., Green, M.J., O'Grady, L., Garcia,
655 A., Doherty, M.L., 2016. The effect of paratuberculosis on milk
656 yield-A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Journal of Dairy
657 Science*, 99(2):1449–60.
- 658 McGregor, H., Dhand, N.K., Dhungyel, O.P., Whittington, R.J., 2012.
659 Transmission of *Mycobacterium avium* subsp. paratuberculosis:
660 dose–response and age-based susceptibility in a sheep model.
661 *Preventive Veterinary Medicine*, 107(1–2), 76–84.
- 662 McNab, W.B., Meek, A.H., Duncan, J.R., Brooks, B.W., van Dreumel,
663 A.A., Martin, S.W., Nielsen, K.H., Sugden, E.A., Turcotte, C., 1991.
664 An evaluation of selected screening tests for bovine
665 paratuberculosis. *Canadian Journal of Veterinary Research*, 55,
666 252–259.
- 667 Mon, M.L., Viale, M., Baschetti, G., Alvarado Pinedo, F., Gioffre,
668 A., Traveria, G., Willemsen, P., Bakker, D., Romano, M.I.,
669 2012. Search for *Mycobacterium avium* subspecies
670 paratuberculosis antigens for the diagnosis of paratuberculosis.
671 *Veterinary Medicine International*, 860362.
- 672 Mortier, R.A., Barkema, H.W., Bystrom, J.M., Illanes, O., Orsel, K.,
673 Wolf, R., Atkins, G., De Buck, J., 2013. Evaluation of age-
674 dependent susceptibility in calves infected with two doses of
675 *Mycobacterium avium* subspecies paratuberculosis using pathology
676 and tissue culture. *Veterinary Research*, 44, 94.
- 677 Muskens, J., Elbers, A.R., van Weering, H.J., Noordhuizen, J.P., 2003.
678 Herd management practices associated with paratuberculosis sero-
679 prevalence in Dutch dairy herds. *Journal of Veterinary Medicine. B,
680 Infectious Diseases and Veterinary Public Health*, 50(8), 372–377.
- Nielsen, S.S., Toft N., 2008a. Ante-mortem diagnosis of paratuberculosis: 681
a review of accuracies of ELISA, interferon–gamma assay and fae- 682
cal culture techniques, *Veterinary Microbiology*, 129, 217–235. 683
- Nielsen, S.S., Toft N., 2008b. Colostrum and milk as risk factors for 684
infection with *Mycobacterium avium* subspecies paratuberculosis 685
in dairy cattle. *Journal of Dairy Science*, 91(12), 4610–4615. 686
- Nielsen, S.S., Toft N., 2009. A review of prevalences of paratuberculosis in 687
farmed animals in Europe. *Preventive Veterinary Medicine*, 88, 1–14. 688
- Nielsen, S.S., Toft N., 2012. Effect of days in milk and milk yield on 689
testing positive in milk antibody ELISA to *Mycobacterium avium* 690
subsp. paratuberculosis in dairy cattle. *Veterinary Immunology and* 691
Immunopathology, 149, 6–10. 692
- Nielsen, S.S., Enevoldsen, C., Gröhn, Y.T., 2002. The *Mycobacterium* 693
avium subsp. paratuberculosis ELISA response by parity and stage 694
of lactation. *Preventive Veterinary Medicine*, 54, 1–10. 695
- O'Brien, R., Mackintosh, C.G., Bakker, D., Kopecna, M., Pavlik, I., 696
Griffin, J.F.T., 2006. Immunological and molecular characterization 697
of susceptibility in relationship to bacterial strain differences in 698
Mycobacterium avium subsp. paratuberculosis infection in the red 699
deer (*Cervus elaphus*). *Infection and Immunity*, 74, 3530–3537. 700
- Obasango, I., Grohn, Y.T., Mohammed, H.O., 1997. Farm factors associ- 701
ated with the presence of *Mycobacterium paratuberculosis* infection 702
in dairy herds on the New York State paratuberculosis control pro- 703
gram. *Preventive Veterinary Medicine*, 32, 243–251. 704
- Ott, S.L., Wells, S.J. and Wagner, B.A., 1999. Herd–level economic 705
losses associated with Johne's disease on US dairy operations, 706
Preventive Veterinary Medicine, 40, 179–192. 707
- Patiño-Murillo, D.A., Estrada-Arbeláez, M., 1999. Determinación de la 708
prevalencia de paratuberculosis en tres hatos del Páramo de Letras. 709
Caldas, Manizales, Universidad de Caldas, Colombia, diss. 710
- Pithua, P., Espejo, L.A., Godden, S.M., Wells, S.J., 2013. Is an individual 711
calving pen better than a group calving pen for preventing transmis- 712
sion of *Mycobacterium avium* subsp paratuberculosis in calves? 713
Results from a field trial. *Research in Veterinary Science*, 95(2), 714
398–404. 715
- Ramírez-García, R., Maldonado-Estrada, J.G., 2013. Detection of mac- 716
rophages infected with *Mycobacterium avium* subsp. 717
paratuberculosis in a cow with clinical stage IV of Johne's disease. 718
A case report. *Revista Colombiana de Ciencias Pecuarias*, 26 (3), 719
219–225. 720
- Ramírez-Vásquez, N., Gaviria, G., Restrepo, L.F., Gómez, C., 2001. 721
Diagnóstico epidemiológico referente a varias patologías de bovinos 722
en tres haciendas de la Universidad de Antioquia. (Unpublished 723
document), 724
- Ramírez-Vásquez, N., Rodríguez, B., Fernández, S.J., 2011. Diagnóstico 725
clínico e histopatológico de paratuberculosis bovina en un hato 726
lechero en Colombia. *Rev MVZ Córdoba* 16: 2742–2753. 727
- Richardson, E. and More, S., 2009. Direct and indirect effects of Johne's 728
disease on farm and animal productivity in an Irish dairy herd. *Irish* 729
Veterinary Journal, 62(8):526–32. 730
- Ridge, S.E., Heuer, C., Cogger, N., Heck, A., Moor, S., Baker, I.M., 731
Vaughan, S., 2010. Herd management practices and the transmission 732
of Johne's disease within infected dairy herds in Victoria, Australia. 733
Preventive Veterinary Medicine, 95, 186–197. 734
- Salem, M., Heydel, C., El-Sayed, A., Ahmed, S.A., Zschöck, M., Baljer, 735
G., 2013. *Mycobacterium avium* subspecies paratuberculosis: an 736
insidious problem for the ruminant industry. *Tropical Animal* 737
Health and Production, 45, 351–366. 738
- Serraino, A., Arrigoni, N., Ostanello, F., Ricchi, M., Marchetti, G., 739
Bonilauri, P., Bonfante, E., Giacometti, F., 2014. A screening sam- 740
pling plan to detect *Mycobacterium avium* subspecies 741
paratuberculosis-positive dairy herds. *Journal of Dairy Science*, 742
97(6):3344–51. 743
- Sherman, D.M., 1985. Current concepts in Johne's disease. *Veterinary* 744
Medicine, 80, 7–84. 745

- 746 Sorge, U.S., Lissemore, K., Godkin, A., Jansen, J., Hendrick, S., Wells,
747 S., Kelton, D.F., 2012. Risk factors for herds to test positive for
748 *Mycobacterium avium* ssp. paratuberculosis-antibodies with a com-
749 mercial milk enzyme-linked immunosorbent assay (ELISA) in
750 Ontario and Western Canada. *Canadian Veterinary Journal*, 53(9),
751 963–970.
- 752 Stevenson, K., 2010. Comparative differences between strains of
753 *Mycobacterium avium* subsp. paratuberculosis. In: Behr MA, Collins
754 DM, editors. *Paratuberculosis: Organism, disease, control*. First edition.
755 Cambridge, MA: Editorial Cabi International; p. 126–132.
- 756 Sweeney, R.W., 1996. Transmission of paratuberculosis. *Veterinary*
757 *Clinics of North America: Food Animal Practice*, 12, 305–312.
- 758 Sweeney, R.W., Collins, M.T., Koets, A.P., McGuirk, S.M., Roussel, A.J.,
759 2012. Paratuberculosis (Johne's disease) in cattle and other susceptible
760 species. *Journal of Veterinary Internal Medicine*, 26(6), 1239–1250.
- 761 Tiwari A, VanLeeuwen JA, Dohoo IR, Keefe GP, Haddad JP, Scott HM,
762 Whiting T (2009): Risk factors associated with *Mycobacterium*
763 *avium* subspecies paratuberculosis seropositivity in Canadian dairy
764 cows and herds. *Prev Vet Med* 88: 32–41.
- 765 Vega-Morales, A., 1947. Relación entre el diagnóstico de la
766 paratuberculosis bovina por el examen coprológico y de la prueba
767 alérgica de termorreacción con la tuberculina aviaria por vía
768 subcutánea. Bogotá, Colombia, Universidad Nacional de
769 Colombia, diss.
- 770 Weber, M.F., 2006. Risk management of paratuberculosis in dairy herds.
771 *Irish Veterinary Journal*, 9(10):555–61.
- 772 Wells, S.J., Wagner, B.A., 2000. Herd level risk factors for infection with
773 *Mycobacterium paratuberculosis* in US dairies and association be-
774 tween familiarity of the herd manager with the disease or prior di-
775 agnosis of the disease in that herd and use of preventive measures.
776 *Journal of the American Veterinary Medical Association*, 216,
777 1450–1457.
- 778 Whittington, R.J., Windsor, P.A., 2009. In utero infection of cattle with
779 *Mycobacterium avium* subsp. paratuberculosis: a critical review and
780 meta-analysis. *Veterinary Journal*, 179(1), 60–69.
- 781 Whittington, R.J., Taragel, C.A., Ottaway, S., Marsh, I., Seaman, J.,
782 Fridriksdottir, V., 2001. Molecular epidemiological confirmation
783 and circumstances of occurrence of sheep (S) strains of
784 *Mycobacterium avium* subsp. paratuberculosis in cases of
785 paratuberculosis in cattle in Australia and sheep and cattle in
786 Iceland. *Veterinary Microbiology*, 79(4), 311–322.
- 787 Zapata. M., Arroyave, O., Ramírez, R., Piedrahita, C., Rodas, J.D.,
788 Maldonado, J.G., 2010. Identification of *Mycobacterium avium*
789 subspecies paratuberculosis by PCR techniques and establishment
790 of control programs for bovine paratuberculosis in dairy herds.
791 *Revista Colombiana de Ciencias Pecuarias*, 23, 17–27.