

Copyright is owned by the Author of the thesis. Permission is given for a copy to be downloaded by an individual for the purpose of research and private study only. The thesis may not be reproduced elsewhere without the permission of the Author.

# **Epidemiology and production effects of leptospirosis in New Zealand sheep**

A thesis presented in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

In

Veterinary Sciences

at Massey University, Manawatu,  
New Zealand

**Emilie Vallée**

**2016**

Institute of Veterinary Animal  
and Biomedical Sciences  
Massey University  
Palmerston North  
New Zealand

February 2016

## Abstract

Leptospirosis causes clinical disease in sheep and is an important occupational disease in New Zealand. Contact with sheep has been shown to be a significant risk factor for human infection, particularly in meat workers. Up to 97% of New Zealand sheep flocks are seropositive to *Leptospira borgpetersenii* serovar Hardjo (Hardjo) and/or *Leptospira interrogans* serovar Pomona (Pomona), yet vaccination is rare.

The work presented in this thesis investigates the epidemiology and effects on sheep growth and reproduction of Hardjo and Pomona, as well as the effectiveness and the effects on sheep production of a commercial bivalent Hardjo and Pomona vaccine.

A split-herd vaccination trial involved a bivalent Hardjo and Pomona vaccination programme for one third of 2260 ewe lambs on 8 farms starting at one month of age. Repeated blood samples were taken over one (6 farms, mated as hoggets) or two (2 farms, mated as 2-tooths) years for microscopic agglutination testing to assess exposure to Hardjo and Pomona in the unvaccinated group. Weight and pregnancy, docking and weaning data were recorded and compared between vaccinated and unvaccinated, as well as between seropositive and seronegative within the unvaccinated group. Urine samples were collected from a random subsample of both vaccinated and unvaccinated sheep on each farm one to two years after the beginning of the study and the samples were analysed by real-time PCR.

The Hardjo exposure pattern was consistent across seven out of eight farms, with exposure occurring at around 10-15 months. On one farm Hardjo exposure started before weaning. Three farms became positive for Pomona at around 8-15 months. The description of the serological patterns identified a period at risk for sheep exposure to leptospirosis, and also possibly at risk for humans handling sheep.

The overall vaccine effectiveness was 86.3% [63.6-94.8], with the lowest farm level effectiveness 76% [29-92], in spite of a vaccination schedule differing from the manufacturer's recommendations on some farms. Vaccination timing seemed to be crucial in achieving optimum reduction in shedding in urine of vaccinated sheep. These results can be used to inform vaccination best practice guidelines and recommendations.

Comparison of growth performance between sheep seropositive for Hardjo and/or Pomona and seronegative did not allow for definitive conclusions as the results varied between farms and periods in magnitude and direction of difference. The results showed a significant effect of recent Hardjo infection in hoggets on reducing lamb survival from docking to weaning. No other statistically significant difference in reproductive rates was observed for either serovar. No difference in growth or reproduction was observed

between vaccinated and unvaccinated sheep. Hence, vaccination appears unlikely to be cost-effective on most New Zealand sheep farms where exposure patterns would be similar to those observed in this study. However, more data is needed to understand the variability in the results observed between the different study farms. This conclusion also does not account for the possible cost of human infection. Furthermore, the Pomona exposure was possibly not high enough to identify any production effect associated with this serovar, so more data on the effects of Pomona would be needed for robust conclusions.

This likely absence of production effects contrasts with what has been observed in New Zealand farmed deer, where vaccination was shown to improve growth rates and weaning rates.

## Acknowledgements

*All praise and thanks to the Lord of all mankind*

I would like to start by expressing all my gratitude to Pr Peter Wilson, my main supervisor, for his support, patience, advice, encouragement, and especially for guiding me towards a real scientific approach. I also thank my co-supervisors, Pr Cord Heuer, Dr Julie Collins-Emerson and Dr Jackie Benschop, for your immense support, both academically and personally. I learnt so much, about leptospirosis, about epidemiology, and about myself, thanks to you all!

Very special thanks go to the farmers, farm workers, spouses... who, for 3 years, contributed to the data used for this work: James, Forbes, Duncan, Angus, Arthur, Kit, Mark, Scott, Simon, Nikki, Robbie, John, Charles, Tony, Lynda, Alf and many more... This was a huge work that could not have been conducted without passionate and generous people like them. This appreciation extends to their veterinarians, particularly Noel McGirr and Ian Page, North Canterbury veterinary clinics, for their help in finding candidate farms and collecting the data.

I am also immensely grateful to Neville Haack, for all these hours, days, nights, weeks, weekends, on the farm or in the lab, collecting or analysing samples. We collected around 17,000 blood samples, analysed twice each... This was huge, huge work, and my gratitude is in proportion.

Several people also deserve to be acknowledged here, for their input, advice or teaching: Dr Anne Ridler, for bringing her knowledge on sheep and beef cattle farming, Pr Mark Stevenson, Dr Naomi Cogger, Dr Chris Jewell and Pr Ian Dohoo for all the epidemiological knowledge I gained and sometimes applied during these years, the people and staff in the "EpiLab and the EpiCentre, John Moffat from MSD Animal Health for his trust and useful feedbacks, and A Pr Geoff Jones for the last minute emailed questions always quickly and nicely answered.

This work was funded by the Sustainable Farming Fund of the NZ Ministry of Primary Industry, Rural Women, Beef+Lamb NZ, Federated Farmers, Alma Baker, Agmardt, the New Zealand Veterinary Association, MSD Animal Health, Virbac, Zoetis, and Massey University Graduate Research School.

Friends make you laugh a little louder, smile a little brighter and live a little better, and I was blessed to be surrounded by such wonderful persons, in IVABS and EpiCentre: Masako, Dani, Kandarp, Felipe, Jose, Sara, Doris, Rebecca, Kat, Asmad, Ali, Alfredo, Tessa, Shirli, Fang (thanks for all the time spent teaching me lab techniques

too), Juan, Nelly, Arata, Aaron, Alicia, Chris, Milan, Lesley, Anou, Cristobal, Krano, Melvin, Rima, Ray, Ben and many more. Some came to the farm with me, along with too many others to list them here, including visiting students from France and Netherlands, and I'm really grateful for this precious help.

Palmy became my home, and some people contributed to it: my sisters and brothers from the Massey Muslim Society and the Manawatu Muslim Association, especially (but not only) Rana & Hazim, Norzam and Nazmeen & Imtiyaz. Thanks to you all I always had a family to rely on here. Jazakum Allah kheir.

Last but not least, I would like to thank my parents, for always having faith in me and supporting all my choices, and my husband Ahmed for, simply, everything. For being here, especially at my worst, for believing in me more than I do, for showing me how to get the best out of myself, for your prayers and your love, and for everything I cannot list here.

*“I asked Allah for strength and Allah gave me difficulties to make me strong. I asked Allah for wisdom and Allah gave me problems to solve. I asked Allah for courage and Allah gave me obstacles to overcome. I asked Allah for love and Allah gave me troubled people to help. I asked Allah for favors and Allah gave me opportunities. Maybe I received nothing I wanted, but I received everything I needed – Alhamdulillah.” – Anonymous*

## List of Publications

**Vallée E, Heuer C, Collins-Emerson JM, Benschop J, Wilson PR.** Serological patterns, antibody half-life and shedding in urine of *Leptospira* spp. in naturally exposed sheep. *New Zealand Veterinary Journal* 63, 301-312, 2015

**Ridler AL, Vallée E, Corner RA, Kenyon PR, Heuer C.** Factors associated with fetal losses in ewe lambs on a New Zealand sheep farm. *New Zealand Veterinary Journal*, 63, 330-334, 2015

**Vallée E, Heuer C, Collins-Emerson J, Benschop J, Wilson P.** Update on research into the effects of *Leptospira* serovars Hardjo and Pomona on sheep and beef cattle growth and reproduction. *Proceedings of the Society of Sheep and Beef Cattle Veterinarians of the New Zealand Veterinary Association, Annual Seminar 2014*, 29-34, 2014

**Vallée E.** Does leptospirosis reduce animal production in New Zealand? *Vetscript* 26(11), 17, 2013

**Vallée E, Heuer C, Collins-Emerson J, Benschop J, Wilson P.** Growth and reproductive losses in sheep and cattle due to leptospirosis. *Proceedings of the Food Safety, Animal Welfare & Biosecurity, Epidemiology & Animal Health Management, and Industry branches of the NZVA 2013*, 195-199, 2013

**Heuer C, Wilson PR, Benschop J, Collins-Emerson J, Dreyfus A, Sanhueza J, Vallee E.** Leptospirosis update – 2013. *Proceedings of the Food Safety, Animal Welfare & Biosecurity, Epidemiology & Animal Health Management, and Industry branches of the NZVA 2013*, 135-139, 2013

## List of Presentation and Posters

### Oral presentations (\* speaker)

**Vallée E\*, Heuer C, Collins-Emerson J, Benschop J, Wilson P.** A method to visualise natural infection patterns of *Leptospira* serovars Hardjo and Pomona micro-agglutination test titres in sheep and cattle on New Zealand farms. *14th International Symposium on Veterinary Epidemiology and Economics*, Merida, Mexico, 2015

**Vallée E\*, Heuer C, Collins-Emerson J, Benschop J, Wilson P.** The effect of *Leptospira* serovars Hardjo and Pomona on sheep growth and reproduction, and cost effectiveness of vaccination. *14th International Symposium on Veterinary Epidemiology and Economics*, Merida, Mexico, 2015

**Sanhueza J\*, Heuer C, Vallée E, Wilson P, Benschop J, Collins-Emerson J.** Population impact of leptospirosis on public health and livestock production. *14th International Symposium on Veterinary Epidemiology and Economics*, Merida, Mexico, 2015

**Heuer C\*, Sanhueza J, Vallée E, Wilson P, Collins-Emerson JM.** Hardjo vs pomona two pathogens with different ecological risk. *9<sup>th</sup> scientific meeting of the International Leptospirosis Society*. Semarang, Indonesia, 2015

**Heuer C\*, Sanhueza J, Vallée E, Wilson P, Benschop J, Collins-Emerson JM.** Can vaccination of animals protect humans against Leptospirosis?. *9<sup>th</sup> scientific meeting of the International Leptospirosis Society*, Semarang, Indonesia, 2015

**Heuer C\*, Sanhueza J, Collins-Emerson JM, Benschop J, Vallée E, Wilson P.** Estimating the economic impact of leptospirosis on public health and livestock farming in New Zealand. *2<sup>nd</sup> ELS meeting on leptospirosis and other rodent borne haemorrhagic fevers*. Amsterdam, 2015

**Vallée E\*, Heuer C, Collins-Emerson J, Benschop J, Wilson P.** Update on research into the effects of *Leptospira* serovars Hardjo and Pomona on sheep and beef cattle growth and reproduction. *Society of Sheep and Beef Cattle Veterinarians of the New Zealand Veterinary Association, Annual Seminar 2014*, Hamilton, New Zealand, 2014

**Vallée E\*, Heuer C, Collins-Emerson J, Benschop J, Wilson P.** Subclinical effects of leptospira borgpetersenii serovar hardjo on New Zealand sheep production. , 8th Scientific Meeting of International Leptospirosis Society, Fukuoka, Japan, 2013

**Vallée E\*, Heuer C, Collins-Emerson J, Benschop J, Wilson P.** Growth and reproduction losses in sheep and beef cattle due to leptospirosis. *Combined NZVA Conference of the Food Safety, Animal Welfare & Biosecurity, Epidemiology & Animal Health Management, and Industry branches of the NZVA 2013*, Palmerston North, New Zealand, 2013

**Sanhueza J, Vallée E, Dreyfus A, Fang F, Ridler A, Benschop J, Collins-Emerson J, Wilson P, Heuer C\*.** Leptospirosis in New Zealand sheep: Recent knowledge advance. *8<sup>th</sup> International Sheep Veterinary Congress: Connecting Sheep and Science*, Rotorua, New Zealand, 2013

**Vallée E\*, Heuer C, Collins-Emerson J, Benschop J, Wilson P.** Effect of leptospirosis on sheep production. *8<sup>th</sup> International Sheep Veterinary Congress: Connecting Sheep and Science*. Rotorua, New Zealand, 2013

### **Posters**

**Vallée E\*, Heuer C, Collins-Emerson J, Benschop J, Wilson P.** Effects of leptospirosis on sheep and beef cattle growth and reproduction: Preliminary results. *First Infectious Disease Research Centre (IDReC) Science Symposium*, Palmerston North, New Zealand, 2012

# Table of Contents

|  |              |
|--|--------------|
| <b>Abstract.....</b>   | <b>iii</b>   |
| <b>Acknowledgements.....</b>   | <b>v</b>     |
| <b>List of Publications.....</b>   | <b>vii</b>   |
| <b>List of Presentation and Posters .....</b>                              | <b>viii</b>  |
| <b>Table of Contents .....</b>   | <b>x</b>     |
| <b>List of Figures.....</b>  | <b>xvi</b>   |
| <b>List of Tables .....</b>  | <b>xviii</b> |
| <b>Appendices.....</b>   | <b>xxi</b>   |
| <b>Chapter 1. Introduction.....</b>  | <b>1</b>     |
| <b>1.1. Etiologic agent: <i>Leptospira</i> species.....</b>                | <b>1</b>     |
| 1.1.1. Characteristics.....  | 1            |
| 1.1.2. Classification.....   | 1            |
| <b>1.2. Epidemiology and ecology .....</b>                                 | <b>2</b>     |
| <b>1.3. <i>Leptospira</i> and leptospirosis in pastoral livestock.....</b> | <b>4</b>     |
| 1.3.1. Situation in New Zealand.....                                       | 4            |
| 1.3.2. Risk factors for seropositivity .....                               | 7            |
| 1.3.2.1. Contact with other species .....                                  | 7            |
| 1.3.2.2. Environmental factors .....                                       | 8            |
| 1.3.2.3. Management factors .....  | 8            |
| 1.3.3. Clinical signs and lesions .....                                    | 9            |
| 1.3.4. Subclinical effects .....   | 10           |
| 1.3.5. Pathogenesis.....   | 10           |
| 1.3.6. Immunity.....   | 10           |
| 1.3.7. Diagnosis.....  | 11           |
| 1.3.7.1. Detection of <i>Leptospira</i> .....                              | 11           |
| 1.3.7.2. Serological diagnosis .....                                       | 12           |
| 1.3.7.3. Molecular diagnosis .....   | 13           |
| 1.3.8. Treatment .....   | 14           |
| 1.3.9. Prevention and vaccination .....                                    | 15           |
| <b>1.4. Leptospirosis as a zoonosis.....</b>                               | <b>16</b>    |
| <b>1.5. Aims of this thesis.....</b>                                       | <b>17</b>    |
| <b>1.6. References .....</b>   | <b>18</b>    |

|   |           |
|---|-----------|
| <b>Chapter 2. A review of the effects of <i>Leptospira</i> spp. infection on farmed ruminants production .....</b>                          | <b>29</b> |
| <b>2.1. Introduction .....</b>  | <b>30</b> |
| <b>2.2. Reproduction .....</b>  | <b>31</b> |
| 2.2.1. Conception and establishment of pregnancy.....   | 31        |
| 2.2.1.1. Dairy cattle .....   | 31        |
| 2.2.1.2. Beef cattle.....   | 32        |
| 2.2.1.3. Small ruminants and deer.....  | 33        |
| 2.2.1.4. Pathogenesis of early reproductive effects.....  | 33        |
| 2.2.2. Fetal leptospirosis and its effects: abortion and stillbirth.....  | 34        |
| 2.2.2.1. Fetal leptospirosis in cattle.....   | 34        |
| 2.2.2.2. Fetal leptospirosis in small ruminants and other species .....   | 38        |
| 2.2.2.3. Relative importance of <i>Leptospira</i> as a cause of abortion .....  | 39        |
| 2.2.3. Clinical disease and mortality between birth and weaning.....  | 40        |
| <b>2.3. Clinical disease and mortality in adults .....</b>  | <b>41</b> |
| <b>2.4. Milk production.....</b>  | <b>42</b> |
| <b>2.5. Growth and live weight.....</b>   | <b>43</b> |
| 2.5.1. Weight at birth.....   | 43        |
| 2.5.2. Growth of young and weight of adults.....  | 43        |
| <b>2.6. Effectiveness of vaccination in preventing or reducing production losses .....</b>  | <b>46</b> |
| 2.6.1. Vaccination to prevent production losses .....   | 46        |
| 2.6.2. Vaccination in response to production losses .....   | 51        |
| <b>2.7. Conclusion.....</b>   | <b>52</b> |
| <b>2.8. References .....</b>  | <b>53</b> |
| <b>Chapter 3. Serological patterns, antibody half-life and shedding in urine of <i>Leptospira</i> spp. in naturally exposed sheep .....</b> | <b>61</b> |
| <b>3.1. Abstract.....</b>   | <b>62</b> |
| 3.1.1. Aims .....   | 62        |
| 3.1.2. Methods.....   | 62        |
| 3.1.3. Results .....  | 62        |
| 3.1.4. Conclusions .....  | 62        |
| <b>3.2. Key words .....</b>   | <b>63</b> |
| <b>3.3. Abbreviations .....</b>   | <b>63</b> |

|   |            |
|---|------------|
| <b>3.4. Introduction</b> .....  | <b>63</b>  |
| 3.4.1. Study design.....  | 64         |
| <b>3.5. Material and methods</b> .....  | <b>64</b>  |
| 3.5.1. Farms and animals .....  | 65         |
| 3.5.2. Blood and urine collection .....   | 66         |
| 3.5.3. Microscopic agglutination test.....  | 68         |
| 3.5.4. Real-time PCR .....  | 68         |
| 3.5.5. Statistical analysis .....   | 69         |
| 3.5.5.1. Log titre and geometric mean titre .....   | 69         |
| 3.5.5.2. Seroprevalence .....   | 69         |
| 3.5.5.3. Titre pattern with age .....   | 69         |
| 3.5.5.4. Titre decay and antibody half-life.....  | 70         |
| 3.5.5.5. Leptospiral shedding in urine.....   | 71         |
| 3.5.5.6. Animals lost to follow-up .....  | 71         |
| 3.5.5.7. Statistical packages .....   | 71         |
| 3.5.6. Animal Ethics.....   | 71         |
| <b>3.6. Results</b> .....   | <b>71</b>  |
| 3.6.1. Descriptive analysis: seroprevalence and GMT.....  | 71         |
| 3.6.2. Titre pattern with age .....   | 75         |
| 3.6.3. Titre decay and antibody half-life .....   | 80         |
| 3.6.4. Shedding in urine .....  | 81         |
| 1.1.1. Animals lost to follow-up .....  | 82         |
| <b>3.7. Discussion</b> .....  | <b>84</b>  |
| <b>3.8. Acknowledgements</b> .....  | <b>92</b>  |
| <b>3.9. References</b> .....  | <b>93</b>  |
| <b>Chapter 4. Effectiveness of a commercial leptospiral vaccine on urinary<br/>shedding in naturally exposed sheep in New Zealand</b> ..... | <b>97</b>  |
| <b>4.1. Abstract</b> .....  | <b>98</b>  |
| <b>4.2. Keywords</b> .....  | <b>98</b>  |
| <b>4.3. Abbreviations</b> .....   | <b>98</b>  |
| <b>4.4. Introduction</b> .....  | <b>99</b>  |
| <b>4.5. Materials and methods</b> .....   | <b>100</b> |
| 4.5.1. Animals .....  | 100        |
| 4.5.2. Vaccine and vaccination protocol .....   | 100        |

|                   |   |            |
|-------------------|---|------------|
| 4.5.3.            | Blood and urine sampling .....  | 103        |
| 4.5.4.            | Laboratory analysis .....   | 103        |
| 4.5.4.1.          | Microscopic Agglutination Test (MAT) .....  | 103        |
| 4.5.4.2.          | DNA extraction and PCR.....   | 104        |
| 4.5.5.            | Statistical analysis .....  | 104        |
| 4.5.5.1.          | Definition of flock exposure .....  | 104        |
| 4.5.5.2.          | Shedding and vaccine effectiveness calculations.....  | 105        |
| 4.5.6.            | Animal ethics .....   | 105        |
| <b>4.6.</b>       | <b>Results .....</b>  | <b>105</b> |
| <b>4.7.</b>       | <b>Discussion.....</b>  | <b>108</b> |
| <b>4.8.</b>       | <b>Conclusion.....</b>  | <b>111</b> |
| <b>4.9.</b>       | <b>Contributions of the authors .....</b>   | <b>111</b> |
| <b>4.10.</b>      | <b>Conflicts of interest .....</b>  | <b>112</b> |
| <b>4.11.</b>      | <b>Acknowledgements.....</b>  | <b>112</b> |
| <b>4.12.</b>      | <b>References .....</b>   | <b>112</b> |
| <b>Chapter 5.</b> | <b>Effects of natural infection by <i>L. borgpetersenii</i> serovar Hardjo type Hardjo-bovis and <i>L. interrogans</i> serovar Pomona and leptospiral vaccination on sheep growth .....</b> | <b>117</b> |
| <b>5.1.</b>       | <b>Abstract.....</b>  | <b>118</b> |
| <b>5.2.</b>       | <b>Keywords .....</b>   | <b>118</b> |
| <b>5.3.</b>       | <b>Introduction.....</b>  | <b>118</b> |
| <b>5.4.</b>       | <b>Materials and methods .....</b>  | <b>120</b> |
| 5.4.1.            | Study design, farms and animals.....  | 120        |
| 5.4.2.            | Microscopic agglutination test .....  | 125        |
| 5.4.3.            | Statistical analysis .....  | 125        |
| 5.4.4.            | Animal ethics .....   | 126        |
| <b>5.5.</b>       | <b>Results .....</b>  | <b>126</b> |
| 5.5.1.            | Effect of vaccination status on live weight .....   | 128        |
| 5.5.2.            | Effect of serological status on live weight .....   | 128        |
| 5.5.3.            | Sensitivity analysis for titre cut-point .....  | 128        |
| <b>5.6.</b>       | <b>Discussion.....</b>  | <b>132</b> |
| <b>5.7.</b>       | <b>Conclusion.....</b>  | <b>135</b> |
| <b>5.8.</b>       | <b>Conflict of interest.....</b>  | <b>136</b> |
| <b>5.9.</b>       | <b>Acknowledgements.....</b>  | <b>136</b> |

|   |            |
|---|------------|
| 5.10. References .....  | 136        |
| <b>Chapter 6. Effects of natural infection by <i>L. borgpetersenii</i> serovar Hardjo type Hardjo-bovis, <i>L. interrogans</i> serovar Pomona and leptospiral vaccination on sheep reproduction .....</b> | <b>139</b> |
| 6.1. Abstract.....  | 140        |
| 6.2. Keywords .....   | 141        |
| 6.3. Introduction.....  | 141        |
| 6.4. Material and methods.....  | 142        |
| 6.4.1. Study design, farms and animals.....   | 142        |
| 6.4.2. Reproduction data collection and outcome definitions.....  | 143        |
| 6.4.3. Microscopic agglutination test.....  | 146        |
| 6.4.4. Statistical analysis .....   | 146        |
| 6.4.4.1. Inference of missing breeding weights .....  | 146        |
| 6.4.4.2. Effects on reproduction.....   | 147        |
| 6.4.4.3. Effects of vaccination on cumulated loss to follow-up.....   | 147        |
| 6.5. Results .....  | 148        |
| 6.5.1. Reproductive rates.....  | 148        |
| 6.5.2. Relationship between vaccination and reproduction .....  | 148        |
| 6.5.3. Relationship between Hardjo serology and reproduction .....  | 149        |
| 6.5.4. Relationship between Pomona serology and reproduction.....   | 151        |
| 6.5.5. Relationship between dual Hardjo-Pomona serology and reproduction<br>.....   | 151        |
| 6.5.6. Relationship between vaccination and loss to follow-up.....  | 155        |
| 6.6. Discussion.....  | 156        |
| 6.7. Conclusion.....  | 158        |
| 6.8. Conflict of interest.....  | 158        |
| 6.9. Acknowledgements.....  | 158        |
| 6.10. References .....  | 159        |
| <b>Chapter 7. General discussion.....</b>   | <b>163</b> |
| 7.1. Introduction.....  | 163        |
| 7.1.1. Aims of this chapter .....   | 163        |
| 7.1.2. Aims of the thesis.....  | 163        |
| 7.2. Critical analysis and interpretation of findings, relevance and<br>comparison with current knowledge .....   | 164        |

|                 |   |            |
|-----------------|---|------------|
| 7.2.1.          | Summary of findings.....  | 164        |
| 7.2.2.          | The notion of reservoir species status: is the sheep a reservoir for Hardjo in New Zealand? .....   | 165        |
| 7.2.3.          | Between-farm variability of the Pomona status in New Zealand .....  | 166        |
| 7.2.4.          | Maternal antibodies in sheep.....   | 167        |
| 7.2.5.          | Cost effectiveness of vaccination in sheep.....   | 168        |
| <b>7.3.</b>     | <b>Chosen methodology and effect on conclusions.....</b>  | <b>169</b> |
| 7.3.1.          | Selection bias and marginal effects.....  | 169        |
| 7.3.2.          | Split-herd trial: comparison of design with a similar work in deer.....   | 171        |
| 7.3.3.          | Reduction of type I and type II errors .....  | 173        |
| 7.3.3.1.        | Multiple comparison adjustments to reduce type I error .....  | 173        |
| 7.3.3.2.        | Multiple imputation to reduce type II error in observational studies .....  | 173        |
| <b>7.4.</b>     | <b>Conclusions and suggestions for future work.....</b>   | <b>174</b> |
| <b>7.5.</b>     | <b>References .....</b>   | <b>175</b> |
| <b>Appendix</b> | <b>.....</b>  | <b>179</b> |
|                 | <b>Appendix 1: Link to online repository containing the raw data used for this thesis .....</b>   | <b>180</b> |
|                 | <b>Appendix 2: Published article: Serological patterns, antibody half-life and shedding in urine of <i>Leptospira</i> spp. in naturally exposed sheep .....</b> | <b>181</b> |
|                 | <b>Appendix 3: Published article: Factors associated with fetal losses in ewe lambs on a New Zealand sheep farm .....</b>                                       | <b>195</b> |

## List of Figures

### Chapter 3

- Figure 3-1: Location of the eight study farms A to H ..... 655
- Figure 3-2: Predicted mean log titre for *Leptospira borgpetersenii* serovar Hardjo as a function of sheep age on eight different farms (A–H), with Loess smoothing and bootstrap 95% CI around predicted values. .... 766
- Figure 3-3: Predicted mean log titre for *Leptospira borgpetersenii* serovar Hardjo including all farms as a function of sheep age, with Loess smoothing and bootstrap 95% CI around predicted values ..... 777
- Figure 3-4: Predicted mean log titre for *Leptospira interrogans* serovar Pomona as a function of sheep age on eight different farms (A–H), with Loess smoothing and bootstrap 95% CI around predicted values ..... 788
- Figure 3-5: Predicted mean log titre for *Leptospira interrogans* serovar Pomona including all farms as a function of sheep age, with Loess smoothing and bootstrap 95% CI around predicted values ..... 799
- Figure 3-6: Predicted linear regressions of log titre for *Leptospira borgpetersenii* serovar Hardjo (plain line with peak at 3,072 and dot-dash line with peak at 768) and *L. interrogans* serovar Pomona (dashed line with peak at 3,072 and dotted line with peak at 768), as a function of time in months after a peak in naturally infected sheep. The blue dots are the observed Hardjo titres and the red dots the observed Pomona titres. .. 80

### Chapter 5

- Figure 5-1: Predicted weights (kg) of ewes (Farms A-H), adjusted for farm and enrolment weight (lamb docking on all farms but H, lamb weaning on farm H), according to weighing episode (2: lamb weaning, 3: hogget breeding, 4: hogget scanning, 5: hogget docking, 6: hogget weaning, 7: 2-tooth breeding, 8; 2-tooth scanning), and stratified by status (green vaccinated, orange non-vaccinated with Hardjo titre only  $\geq 48$ , purple non-vaccinated with Pomona titre only  $\geq 48$ , red non-vaccinated with both Hardjo and Pomona titres  $\geq 48$ , blue non-vaccinated with Hardjo and Pomona titres  $< 48$ ).... 1277

### Chapter 6

- Figure 6-1: Odds ratios (with 95% confidence intervals) of the effect of vaccination on the presence of a live lamb at different reproduction events (scan: at pregnancy scanning, dock: from scanning to tail-docking, wean: from tail-docking to weaning) for both age groups ( $\square$ : hoggets,  $\blacksquare$ : 2-tooth). Odds ratios are adjusted for breeding weight..... 1488

- Figure 6-2: Log-transformed odds-ratios adjusted for breeding weight of the effect of Hardjo serostatus of control ewes compared with seronegative ewes using different cut-offs ( $\square$ : 48,  $\blacksquare$ : 96,  $\circ$ : 192,  $\bullet$ : 384,  $\triangle$ : 768,  $\blacktriangle$ : 1536) on having a live lamb for each reproduction outcome (scan: from breeding to scanning, dock: from scanning to tail-

|  |      |
|--|------|
| docking, wean: from tail-docking to weaning) for both age groups (Hog: hoggets, 2T: 2-tooth), with 95% confidence intervals. ....  | 1522 |
| Figure 6-3: Log-transformed odds-ratios adjusted for breeding weight of the effect of Pomona serostatus of control ewes compared with seronegative ewes using different cut-offs (□: 48, ■: 96, ○: 192, ●: 384, △: 768, ▲: 1536) on having a live lamb for each reproduction outcome (scan: from breeding to scanning, dock: from scanning to tail-docking, wean: from tail-docking to weaning) for both age groups (Hog: hoggets, 2T: 2-tooth), with 95% confidence intervals .....                       | 1533 |
| Figure 6-4: Log-transformed odds-ratios adjusted for breeding weight for the effect of dual seropositivity Hardjo-Pomona of control ewes compared to seronegative ewes using different cut-offs (□: 48, ■: 96, ○: 192, ●: 384, △: 768) on having a live lamb for each reproduction outcome (scan: from breeding to scanning, dock: from scanning to tail-docking, wean: from tail-docking to weaning) on study farms, for both age groups (Hog: hoggets, 2T: 2-tooth), with 95% confidence intervals. .... | 1544 |
| Figure 6-5: Odds-ratio adjusted for breeding weight of the effect of vaccination on loss to follow-up from hoggets breeding to hoggets weaning and to 2-tooth scanning on the different study farms (□: A, ■: B, ○: C, ●: D, △: E, ▲: G, +: H) with 95% confidence intervals .....   | 1555 |

# List of Tables

## Chapter 1

Table 1-1: Serovars and serogroups isolated from animals in New Zealand and traditionally recognized reservoir species (Hathaway and Marshall 1980; Levett 2001; Marshall and Manktelow 2002) ..... 2

Table 1-2: Summary of published cross-sectional studies of leptospirosis seroprevalence in New Zealand livestock since 2007, including origin and age of the animals, serovars tested, MAT cut-off used, number of animals tested, observed animal-level seroprevalence, number of farms tested and farm-level seroprevalence. .... 5

Table 1-3: Major clinical signs and associated serovar in cattle, sheep and deer ... 9

## Chapter 2

Table 2-1: Summary of cattle studies with a comparative, observational, prospective design done on-farm providing quantification of the production effect of exposure to *Leptospira* showing type, sample size, serovars tested and seroprevalence, timing of measurement of exposure, method and time of measurement of the production effect and observed effect of exposure on production ..... 45

Table 2-2: Summary of published studies of on-farm natural challenge vaccination trials in cattle and deer, with part of the herd vaccinated and with quantification of the effects of vaccination on production showing species and type, sample size, serovar(s) used in the vaccine, vaccination protocol, evidence of challenge in the control group, method and time of measurement of the production outcome, and observed effects, with p-value for the effect of vaccination on the production outcomes..... 48

## Chapter 3

Table 3-1: Description of the eight study farms ..... 677

Table 3-2: Date of blood sampling, approximate age, number of sheep sampled on eight farms and total number and proportion seropositive (microscopic agglutination test titre  $\geq 48$ ) for *Leptospira borgpetersenii* serovar Hardjo only, for *Leptospira interrogans* serovar Pomona only and both Hardjo and Pomona, geometric mean titre (GMT) for Hardjo and Pomona and p value of a t-test comparing Hardjo and Pomona GMT..... 733

Table 3-3: Linear regression coefficients and estimated half-life of MAT-titres for Hardjo and Pomona..... 81

Table 3-4: Number of sheep urine real-time PCR positive and seropositive for Hardjo and Pomona..... 83

Table 3-5: Coefficients of the mixed logistic regression with real-time PCR status of exposed sheep as the outcome, farm as a random effect and using 1:48 as a cut-off for seropositivity..... 84

Table 3-6: Significant or marginally non-significant ( $p < 0.1$ ) difference in Hardjo seroprevalence (titre  $\geq 48$ ) and GMT and Pomona GMT between animals subsequently

retained in the study (retained) and lost to follow-up (lost), and associated p-value for Fisher’s exact test or t-test ..... 84

**Chapter 4**

Table 4-1: Farm location, breed, median age and Hardjo and Pomona seroprevalence (MAT titre  $\geq 48$ ) of sheep at the first vaccination (“Leptavoid-2”, MSD Animal Health), and vaccination schedule..... 102

Table 4-2: Farm exposure, vaccination and sampling sequence, Hardjo and Pomona seroprevalence (titre  $\geq 48$ ) in the control group, number of sheep sampled, number of urine PCR positive for each treatment group, number MAT positive (titre  $\geq 48$ ) for Hardjo and Pomona in the vaccinated sampled animals at time of vaccination, number MAT positive (titre  $\geq 48$ ) for Hardjo and Pomona in the control sampled animals at time of urine sampling and vaccine efficacy (VE) stratified by farm ..... 107

**Chapter 5**

Table 5-1: Farm location, number and breed of ewes, date of weighing episodes, number of vaccinated and control sheep, Hardjo and Pomona seroprevalence (titre  $\geq 48$ ) and geometric mean titre (GMT, for animals with a titre  $\geq 24$ ) in unvaccinated controls at each sampling..... 122

Table 5-2: Predicted mean weight difference (kg) between non-vaccinated and vaccinated sheep (Vacc), and in the non-vaccinated group, between seropositive (H: Hardjo only, P: Pomona only, HP: Hardjo and Pomona) and seronegative sheep for different titre cut-points, with number of sheep seropositive at this cut-point (in brackets), by farm and by weighing episode (LW: lamb weaning, HB: hogget breeding, HS: hogget scanning, HD: hogget docking, HW: hogget weaning, TB: 2-tooth breeding, TS: 2-tooth scanning); significance level:  $^{\circ} < 0.1$ ,  $* < 0.05$ ,  $** < 0.01$ ,  $*** < 0.001$ . A negative weight difference indicates a higher mean weight in vaccinated than in control sheep, or a higher mean weight in seronegative than seropositive sheep. .... 129

**Chapter 6**

Table 6-1: Dates of vaccination and management events and number of animals positive ( $\geq 48$ ) for Hardjo (H) only, Pomona (P) only and both H/P in controls by farm; lambing occurred as hoggets on farms A, C, D, F, G and H and as 2-tooth on farms B and E..... 144

Table 6-2: Reproduction outcomes (number with positive outcome/number tested) for vaccinated sheep, and control sheep stratified by Hardjo (H) and Pomona (P) serostatus at the time of measurement of the outcome within each farm. Note: The number by serostatus does not always sum to total control due to some missing sheep, or sample mis-labelling. Lambing occurred as hoggets on farms A, C, D, F, G and H and as 2-tooth on farms B and E. .... 150

**Chapter 7**

Table 7-1 Differences in design between Subharat (2010) in red deer and the current work in sheep ..... 171

## Appendices

### Chapters 3 to 6

Appendix 1: Link to online repository containing the raw data used for this thesis. ...180

### Chapter 3

Appendix 2: Published article: Serological patterns, antibody half-life and shedding in urine of *Leptospira* spp. in naturally exposed sheep.....181

### Chapter 6

Appendix 3: Published article: Factors associated with fetal losses in ewe lambs on a New Zealand sheep farm.....195

