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Abstract

Sixty-nine years separated the first observation of *Cryptosporidium* by Tyzzer in 1907 from the realisation in 1976 that this enteric protozoan parasite was pathogenic. It is the third major cause of diarrhoeal disease worldwide causing a self-limiting infection in immuno-competent humans and young vertebrates. As yet there is no antimicrobial agent that combats *Cryptosporidium* so the organism poses a life threatening risk to the immuno-compromised e.g., AIDS patients, patients on immuno-suppressive drugs, chemotherapy or congenital immune deficiencies. By 2000 AD 152 species of mammals had been reported as being infected with *Cryptosporidium* plus 57 reptilian species and many birds and fish.

The advent of AIDS stimulated research into *Cryptosporidium* resulting in the large amount of information now becoming available, however little is known about the genetic characteristics, distribution and transmission cycles of *Cryptosporidium* species that cause human disease in New Zealand. To address these questions 1613 animal faecal samples and 423 human faecal specimens containing *Cryptosporidium* oocysts were collected from throughout New Zealand and examined by the polymerase chain reaction - restriction fragment length polymorphism technique (PCR-RFLP). Indeterminant results were resolved by DNA sequence analysis of the small subunit ribosomal DNA (rDNA).

Only 2.8% of the animal faecal specimens contained oocysts with the vast majority of these being *C. parvum* bovine genotype from calves.

Two regions supplied the majority of human isolates, one rural and one urban. Overall *C. hominis* accounted for 47% of all human isolates with the remaining 53% being *C. parvum* bovine genotype. A difference however, was observed between the *Cryptosporidium* species from rural and urban isolates with *C. hominis* dominant in the urban region while *C. parvum* bovine genotype was prevalent in rural New Zealand. A shift in transmission cycles was detected between seasons with an anthroponotic cycle in autumn and a zoonotic cycle in spring. A novel *Cryptosporidium*, that on DNA sequence analysis showed a close relationship with *C. canis*, was detected in two unrelated children from different regions, illustrating the genetic diversity within this genus.
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