

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.

**Epidemiological studies of parasitism in  
sheep and reproduction in horses**

A thesis presented  
in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of  
Master of Veterinary Studies (Epidemiology)  
at  
Massey University

Chiara Macchi

1997

## Abstract

Anthelmintic resistance is a well-recognised problem for control of nematodes in sheep in most countries of the world. The climatic conditions in New Zealand are particularly favourable to the survival and development of gastrointestinal nematodes. As a consequence, gastrointestinal parasitism is a major impediment to profitable sheep raising in New Zealand.

A random postal survey of 300 sheep farmers in the southern North Island region of Manawatu was conducted with the purpose of examining current farming and drenching practices and investigating possible risk factors in the development of anthelmintic resistance. The results of this study, reported in Chapter 2, revealed a high degree of awareness and concern about the problem of resistance, but also a lack of understanding on how grazing management strategies should be combined in order to achieve integrated control over gastrointestinal nematodes while minimising the use of anthelmintic drugs. Only 31% of respondents had performed at least one drench test on their property. Among testing farms, prevalence of resistance approached 70% and involved benzimidazole products in all but one case.

Subsequently, a trial was undertaken to investigate the economic consequences of anthelmintic resistance in growing lambs on commercial farms (Chapters 3 and 4). Five farms with a history of resistance to benzimidazole drenches were selected. The effects of three treatment strategies (partially ineffective, effective and suppressive) on nematode egg counts, bodyweight gains and susceptibility to diarrhoea were compared between groups of ewe lambs. Suppressively treated lambs performed significantly better than effectively treated lambs, which in turn performed better than ineffectively treated lambs. However, a partial budgeting analysis carried out by means of a stochastic simulation model (Chapter 4) indicated that effective treatment yielded the highest net returns. The model also showed that the range of possible outcomes oscillated substantially around the mean, reflecting the degree of uncertainty about the outcome on any single farm due to variation between farms.

Chapter 5 describes a study which was carried out with the objective of evaluating two management strategies for breeding mares after foaling. Mares were examined on day 7-9 postpartum by palpation and ultrasound. Group 1 mares were bred at foal heat provided that they met predetermined criteria and Group 2 mares were treated with a PGF<sub>2α</sub> analogue. Pregnancy rates, pregnancy loss rates and time from foaling to conception in the two groups were compared. Pregnancy rate at first served oestrus was 58.3% and 71.4% for Group 1 and 2 respectively. However, the statistical power of the study as determined by power analysis, was insufficient for the observed differences to reach statistical significance.

## Acknowledgements

When I came to New Zealand in February 1995, I was a newly graduated veterinarian who knew little about anthelmintic resistance in sheep and pregnancy diagnosis in mares, nothing about epidemiology and even less about computers: let alone statistics! During these two years, many people have worked hard in order to teach me something on all these subjects. Thanks to their patience and understanding I am now able to appreciate the difference between an equine embryo, a *Nematodirus* egg and a computer virus, as well as have a better idea of the risk factors associated with each of them.

I am very grateful to my chief supervisor, Prof. Roger Morris, for his invaluable help, support and counsel throughout the study period.

To Dr. Bill Pomroy, my most sincere thanks for all the time and patience he kindly devoted to me, both during the studies and the writing of my thesis, and for sharing with me his knowledge, passion and ideas on anthelmintic resistance.

I thank Dr. Dave West for his enthusiasm and constant availability, as well as for the helpful suggestions he has kindly provided.

Dr. Nigel Perkins has been an excellent teacher and a cheerful ever-smiling workmate: working with him has been a real pleasure.

I also wish to thank Dr. Dirk Pfeiffer, who achieved the difficult task of transmitting his own passion for data analysis and computers, as well as infusing me with optimism when I most needed it.

I am grateful to all the students and staff who offered me both practical and psychological help throughout this time.

I also wish to thank my parents, who allowed me to undertake these studies and, though far away, were always there when I needed help or understanding.

Finally, I would like to thank my fiancé, Serafino, for being so close to me every moment of these two years, even when whole continents kept us apart.

## Table of contents

<b>ABSTRACT .....</b>	<b>i</b>
<b>ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....</b>	<b>iii</b>
<b>TABLE OF CONTENTS .....</b>	<b>iv</b>
<b>LIST OF TABLES .....</b>	<b>viii</b>
<b>LIST OF FIGURES .....</b>	<b>ix</b>
<b>CHAPTER 1 A REVIEW OF THE EPIDEMIOLOGY AND CONTROL OF ANTHELMINTIC RESISTANCE IN GASTROINTESTINAL NEMATODES OF SHEEP .....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>Epidemiology of gastrointestinal parasitism of sheep in New Zealand .....</b>	<b>2</b>
General strongylid life cycle .....	2
Environmental factors .....	6
The role of the host .....	7
Effects of parasitism on sheep health and production .....	9
Economic consequences of parasitism .....	11
<b>Control of gastrointestinal parasitism .....</b>	<b>12</b>
Anthelmintic drugs .....	12
Management strategies .....	13
<i>Pasture spelling</i> .....	14
<i>Strategic decontamination of pastures</i> .....	14
<i>Stocking rates</i> .....	15
<i>Pasture composition</i> .....	15
Genetic selection .....	16
Vaccination .....	18
Biological methods .....	18
Control of dagginess .....	19
<b>Anthelmintic drugs .....</b>	<b>20</b>
Benzimidazoles .....	20
Levamisole/Morantel .....	21
Macrocyclic lactones .....	22
<b>Anthelmintic resistance .....</b>	<b>25</b>
Definition of resistance .....	25
History of drench resistance and current trends .....	27
Causes of resistance .....	30
<i>Genetics</i> .....	30

<i>Frequency of treatment</i> .....	31
<i>Underdosing</i> .....	32
<i>Timing of treatment</i> .....	33
<b>Diagnosis of anthelmintic resistance</b> .....	<b>34</b>
In vitro assays .....	36
<i>Egg hatch assay</i> .....	36
<i>Microagar larval development test</i> .....	36
<i>Polymerase chain reaction</i> .....	37
<i>Larval paralysis</i> .....	37
Controlled test.....	37
Faecal egg count reduction test (FECRT).....	37
<i>Statistical issues in analysing egg counts</i> .....	39
<i>Limitations of the FECRT</i> .....	40
<b>Prevention of drench resistance</b> .....	<b>42</b>
Minimal drenching.....	42
Quarantine drenching.....	44
Effective dosage.....	44
Narrow-spectrum drenches .....	44
Alternation of action families .....	45
Combination drenches .....	46
Controlled-release capsules (CRC).....	47
Grazing management .....	47
Vaccination .....	48
Breeding sheep for resistance .....	49
Biological control.....	49
Susceptible strains.....	49
Education .....	50
<b>Reversion of resistant strains to susceptibility and control of anthelmintic resistance</b> .....	<b>50</b>
<b>References</b> .....	<b>52</b>
<b>CHAPTER 2 CURRENT FARMING AND DRENCHING PROCEDURES IN NEW ZEALAND: RESULTS FROM A POSTAL QUESTIONNAIRE</b> .....	<b>65</b>
<b>Abstract</b> .....	<b>66</b>
<b>Introduction</b> .....	<b>67</b>
<b>Materials and methods</b> .....	<b>68</b>
Selection of farms and questionnaire design.....	68
Statistical analyses .....	68
<b>Results</b> .....	<b>70</b>

Details of farm and livestock numbers .....	70
Management of lambs .....	75
Drenching policy and procedures .....	78
The farmers' opinion.....	84
Further investigation into statistical relationships.....	85
<b>Discussion .....</b>	<b>88</b>
<b>References.....</b>	<b>92</b>
<b>CHAPTER 3 AN EVALUATION OF THE EFFECTS OF ANTHELMINTIC RESISTANCE ON THE PRODUCTIVITY OF LAMBS .....</b>	<b>95</b>
<b>Abstract.....</b>	<b>96</b>
<b>Introduction.....</b>	<b>97</b>
<b>Materials and methods .....</b>	<b>98</b>
Study design and selection of farms .....	98
Experimental units and treatment protocol .....	99
Measurements .....	101
<i>Weights and dag scores</i> .....	<i>101</i>
<i>Nematode egg counts and larval differentiation</i> .....	<i>101</i>
Statistical analyses .....	101
<b>Results.....</b>	<b>102</b>
Body weights .....	102
Dag scores .....	108
Parasitology.....	109
<i>Parasite burdens</i> .....	<i>109</i>
<i>Prevalence of nematode genera</i> .....	<i>114</i>
<b>Discussion .....</b>	<b>118</b>
<b>Acknowledgements .....</b>	<b>122</b>
<b>References.....</b>	<b>123</b>
<b>CHAPTER 4 EVALUATION OF ANTHELMINTIC STRATEGIES: A STOCHASTIC PARTIAL BUDGETING ANALYSIS.....</b>	<b>125</b>
<b>Abstract.....</b>	<b>126</b>
<b>Introduction.....</b>	<b>127</b>
<b>Materials and methods .....</b>	<b>128</b>

Costs.....	129
<i>Anthelmintics</i> .....	129
<i>Labour costs</i> .....	129
<i>Mustering, drenching, crutching and capsule administration</i> .....	129
<i>Dagginess</i> .....	130
Returns .....	131
<i>Carcass Price</i> .....	131
<i>Carcass yield</i> .....	131
<b>Results</b> .....	<b>134</b>
Returns minus costs .....	134
Margins over Group 1 .....	137
Margins over Group 2.....	138
<b>Discussion</b> .....	<b>140</b>
<b>References</b> .....	<b>142</b>
<b>CHAPTER 5 STUDIES ON FOAL HEAT BREEDING IN THE MARE</b> .....	<b>143</b>
<b>Abstract</b> .....	<b>144</b>
<b>Introduction</b> .....	<b>145</b>
<b>Materials and methods</b> .....	<b>150</b>
<b>Results</b> .....	<b>154</b>
<b>Discussion</b> .....	<b>159</b>
<b>Acknowledgements</b> .....	<b>160</b>
<b>References</b> .....	<b>161</b>

## List of Tables

### CHAPTER 1

Table I. Gastrointestinal nematodes recorded in New Zealand sheep .....	3
Table II. The free-living and parasitic stages of the life cycle of <i>O. circumcincta</i> .....	5
Table III. <i>In vivo</i> and <i>in vitro</i> bioassays (BA), biochemical assays (BC), and genetic assays (G) used in the detection of anthelmintic resistance.....	35

### CHAPTER 2

Table I. General farm information .....	72
Table II. Purchase of animals between 1 July 1994 and 30 June 1995.....	74
Table III. Results of univariate analyses showing the variables significantly associated with completion of a drench test on the farm (variable <i>TEST</i> ).....	86
Table IV. Final logistic regression model for the dependent variable <i>TEST</i> .....	87

### CHAPTER 3

Table I. Detection of anthelmintic resistance on the trial farms. ....	99
Table II. Treatment schedule .....	100
Table III. Results of the repeated measures ANOVA model for the dependent variable <i>weight gain</i> .....	106
Table IV. Weight gains for each treatment group.....	107
Table V. Results of the repeated measures ANOVA model for the dependent variable <i>epg</i> (log <i>epg</i> +1).....	114
Table VI. Results of FECRT and larval differentiation for lambs from Group 1 .....	115
Table VII. Number of sheep excreting <i>Nematodirus</i> spp. eggs .....	116

### CHAPTER 4

Table I. Input variables for @RISK model. <i>Anthelmintics, labour costs, labour time</i> .....	130
Table II. Input variables for @RISK model. <i>Dagginess</i> .....	131
Table III. Input variables for @RISK model. <i>Meat Price and Carcass yield</i> .....	131
Table IV. Spreadsheet showing input variables <i>costs</i> .....	132
Table V. Spreadsheet showing input variables <i>returns</i> .....	133

### CHAPTER 5

Table I. Parameters assessed by palpation per rectum and ultrasound .....	150
Table II. Comparison of pregnancy rates. Results of $\chi^2$ analyses.....	156
Table III. Results of power analysis on comparison of pregnancy rates between treatment groups. ....	158

## List of Figures

### CHAPTER 2

Figure 1. Main breed of ewes and rams kept on the farm.....	70
Figure 2. Frequency of weaning lambs on to a paddock not grazed by lambing ewes since 1 June 1994 (n=172).....	75
Figure 3. Association between grazing management of lambs and time spent on <i>clean</i> pasture.....	76
Figure 4. Percentage of occasions in which farmers attempted to create safe pastures for lambs by grazing animals of a different species or spelling paddocks (n=157).....	77
Figure 5. Association between weaning on to clean pasture and frequency of use of animals of a different species or spelling pastures (n=156).....	78
Figure 6. Drenching frequency for three categories of sheep (number of drenches administered between 1 July 1994 and 30 June 1995).....	79
Figure 7. Products used on lambs between July 1994 and June 1995 (n=148).....	81
Figure 8. Association between use of clean pastures after weaning and after drenching lambs (n=162).....	82

### CHAPTER 3

Figure 1. Distribution of live weights of lambs at the beginning (white bars) and at the end (striped bars) of the trial.....	104
Figure 2. Mean change in live weights of lambs for each treatment group on individual farms.....	105
Figure 3. Mean weight change for each treatment group on subsequent visits,.....	106
Figure 4. Distribution of lambs from each treatment group according to dag score at subsequent visits.....	110
Figure 5. Mean change in Strongylid faecal egg counts excluding <i>Nematodirus</i> spp. Arrows indicate the change in treatment.....	111
Figure 6. Farm 1. Mean change in Strongylid faecal egg counts.....	112
Figure 7. Farm 2. Mean change in Strongylid faecal egg counts.....	112
Figure 8. Farm 3. Mean change in Strongylid faecal egg counts.....	113
Figure 9. Farm 4. Mean change in Strongylid faecal egg counts.....	113
Figure 10. Farm 5. Mean change in Strongylid faecal egg counts.....	114
Figure 11. Prevalence of <i>Nematodirus</i> spp.....	118

### CHAPTER 4

Figure 1. Input variables for economic analysis.....	128
Figure 2. Returns minus costs for Group 1.....	134
Figure 3. Returns minus costs for Group 2.....	135
Figure 4. Returns minus costs for Group 3.....	135
Figure 5. Tornado graph showing the results of the sensitivity analysis for Group 1.....	136
Figure 6. Comparison of <i>returns minus costs</i> for three treatment groups.....	136

Figure 7. Margins over Group 1 for Group 2.....	137
Figure 8. Margins over Group 1 for Group 3.....	137
Figure 9. Comparison of <i>margin over Group 1</i> for Groups 1 and 2. ....	138
Figure 10. Margins over Group 2 for Group 3.....	138

## **CHAPTER 5**

Figure 1. Age of mares by treatment group .....	154
Figure 2. Distribution of foaling dates by treatment group.....	155
Figure 3. Kaplan-Meier survival function. Days from foaling to conception.....	157