

# 1 **Cryptosporidiosis in neonatal ruminants in South Africa: a review**

2 **M.C. Marufu**

3  
4 Department of Veterinary Tropical Diseases, Faculty of Veterinary Science, University of  
5 Pretoria, Private Bag X4, Onderstepoort 0110, Pretoria, South Africa.

6 Telephone: +27 12 529 8227; Fax: +27 12 539 8315; Email: [chris.marufu@up.ac.za](mailto:chris.marufu@up.ac.za)

## 7 8 **Summary**

9 Protozoan parasites of the species *Cryptosporidium* are leading causes of diarrhoea in  
10 ruminants and humans and as such cryptosporidiosis is an important and emerging protozoal  
11 disease of public health significance. In South Africa, the organism has gained importance by  
12 causing large outbreaks in neonatal ruminants in different farming systems. The prevalence of  
13 cryptosporidiosis and risk factors associated with transmission of the disease among neonatal  
14 ruminants in South Africa are not understood and warrant investigation. The genetic  
15 characterisation of *Cryptosporidium* isolates in neonatal ruminant systems also requires  
16 elucidation.

17  
18 **Key words:** *Cryptosporidium parvum*; neonatal diarrhea; small ruminants; oocysts

## 19 20 **1. Introduction**

21 Organisms of the genus *Cryptosporidium*, first described by Tyzzer in the early 1900s in mice  
22 (Tyzzer, 1907; 1912), were only recognised to be of veterinary importance in the mid-1950s  
23 through a *C. meleagridis* outbreak in turkeys (Slavin 1955). Since then, *C. parvum* has gained  
24 prominence as a leading cause of diarrhoea in neonatal ruminants and humans, worldwide. In  
25 South Africa specifically, the organism has gained importance in the country by causing large  
26 outbreaks in neonatal ruminants in different farming systems. The organism has been ranked  
27 as the fifth most important food-borne parasite globally by the World Health Organization  
28 (Odeniran & Ademola, 2019). It is against this background that the current literature review  
29 discusses cryptosporidiosis in ruminants and proposes to investigate its prevalence, distribution  
30 and associated risk factors.

## 31 32 **2. Current knowledge on *Cryptosporidium***

33 The protozoan parasite *Cryptosporidium* belongs to the family *Cryptosporidiidae*, suborder  
34 *Eimeriina*, order *Eucoccidiida*, subclass *Coccidia*, class *Sporozoa*, phylum Apicomplexa  
35 (Carmena, 2010). This parasite affects a large variety of hosts globally, including humans  
36 (Robertson, 2014). Ruminants are susceptible to and also considered sources of infection  
37 particularly of *C. parvum* and *C. ubiquitum*, which have been reported to have public health  
38 significance (Xiao, 2010). Infection with *Cryptosporidium* species results in gastroenteritis that  
39 manifests as diarrhoea of varying severity depending on the host's immunity (Mahfouz et al.,  
40 2014). In adult ruminants and immunocompetent hosts, the diarrhoea is mild and self-limiting,  
41 whereas severe, chronic and life-threatening diarrhoea often occurs in neonatal ruminants and  
42 immunocompromised hosts (Samra et al., 2016). The disease has a negative impact on animal  
43 production, causing severe economic losses associated with decreased growth rate and  
44 mortality particularly in infected neonatal ruminants (Santin, 2020).

45  
46 In young animals, children and immunocompromised people (such as human  
47 immunodeficiency virus (HIV) patients), the disease causes chronic diarrhoea and can often be  
48 fatal (Chalmar & Davies, 2010). With the high prevalence rate of HIV in South Africa, the  
49 contact between susceptible humans and infected animals particularly in ruminant farming  
50 communities can be an important transmission mode and source of infection for humans. No

51 drug or drug combination effectively treats cryptosporidiosis in humans and animals (Chako et  
52 al., 2010). Nitazoxanide has been shown to be partially effective against cryptosporidiosis in  
53 humans, but it is largely ineffective in immunocompromised patients, who remain vulnerable  
54 to infection (Abubakar et al., 2007). In animals, halofuginone can be used for the treatment of  
55 cryptosporidial diarrhoea in calves, and has been recently registered for use in food animals in  
56 South Africa (MSD, 2020). Its efficacy in reducing oocyst shedding, however, has not been  
57 clearly demonstrated (Chako et al., 2010). The prevention of cryptosporidiosis should therefore  
58 be the mainstay of control of the parasite, guided by sound epidemiological data.

59

60 Very few prevalence studies have been conducted on *Cryptosporidium* in livestock in South  
61 Africa (Samra et al., 2013, Samra et al., 2016, Samie et al., 2017). In the earlier studies by  
62 Samra and colleagues (2013; 2016) in Mpumalanga Province, focus was given to cattle and  
63 wildlife and not to sheep and goats. The study by Samie and colleagues (2017) in Limpopo  
64 Province, focused on cattle, chicken and goats, but only included four sheep. From these  
65 studies, it has been observed that the prevalence of cryptosporidiosis varies with geographic  
66 location and species, and has been shown to be high, particularly in goats in Limpopo Province  
67 (Samie et al., 2017), and low in cattle in Mpumalanga Province (Samra et al., 2016). The  
68 development of molecular methods to diagnose cryptosporidiosis has led to a more in-depth  
69 understanding of the genetic diversity of *Cryptosporidium*, which plays an important role in  
70 the diverse clinical presentations of cryptosporidiosis (Santin, 2013). Application of these  
71 molecular methods in prevalence studies in South Africa has been limited and molecular  
72 genotyping of *Cryptosporidium* infections remains a challenge.

73

### 74 **3. Importance to relevant industry**

75 In South Africa, prevalence data on *Cryptosporidium* in ruminant livestock still remains scant  
76 despite the importance of ruminants as a source of protein. The prevalence of *Cryptosporidium*  
77 spp. has been determined mostly in cattle (Samra et al., 2013, Samra et al., 2016, Samie et al.,  
78 2017), and few studies have focused on sheep and goats (Samie et al. 2017), which are often  
79 farmed simultaneously with cattle and can be important sources of infection for humans.  
80 Microscopy and serodiagnostic tools have been used in these studies and yet these techniques  
81 lack sensitivity and specificity. The prevalence of *Cryptosporidium* infection and the various  
82 species of cryptosporidiosis responsible for infection in cattle, sheep and goats in South Africa  
83 therefore remains largely unknown. An increase in reports of clinical outbreaks and the  
84 zoonotic potential of these outbreaks of cryptosporidiosis in neonatal ruminants in South Africa  
85 make it imperative to conduct a more detailed and widespread study of the epidemiology of  
86 *Cryptosporidium* infection with the aim of understanding the prevalence. It is essential to  
87 employ molecular tools which have greater sensitivity and specificity to enable detection of  
88 the important *Cryptosporidium* species that affect ruminants.

89

90 Genetic characterisation of *Cryptosporidium* in ruminants in South Africa is still lacking and  
91 molecular studies have not been conducted. Genetic characterisation of the species of  
92 *Cryptosporidium* affecting different ruminant species in South Africa will be important in  
93 understanding species diversity of the pathogen and host species specificity in ruminants as  
94 well as determine the zoonotic importance of the *Cryptosporidium* spp. The risk factors  
95 associated with cryptosporidiosis are largely unknown in neonatal ruminant species in the  
96 country. A study of the risk factors associated with cryptosporidiosis in neonatal ruminants in  
97 South Africa is required as this will enable formulation of strategies to counter these risks and  
98 reduce the disease burden in ruminants, and lessen risk of human infections.

### 99 **4. Knowledge gaps that need to be addressed**

100 *Cryptosporidium andersoni* and *C. bovis* were reported to occur in calves 3-12 months of age  
101 at a wildlife-livestock-human interface in South Africa (Samra et al., 2013). Another study by  
102 Samra et al. (2016) however, only detected *C. parvum* and *C. bovis* in calves less than four  
103 months old in the same study area. The inclusion of juvenile cattle in the earlier study may  
104 explain the presence of *C. andersoni*, which was not detected in the latter study involving  
105 calves less than four months old, since this *Cryptosporidium* species has been shown to affect  
106 juvenile and adult cattle (Santin, 2020). Samie et al. (2017) observed *C. parvum* in calves and  
107 adult cattle and *C. andersoni* in cows in Limpopo Province. Interestingly, age related  
108 distribution of *Cryptosporidium* species in cattle has been reported to be not fully consistent  
109 (Diaz et al., 2021). More work is required on the prevalence of *Cryptosporidium* species in  
110 cattle of different age groups in South Africa as this will allow determination of those age  
111 classes posing a higher risk to public and animal health. The use of molecular methods to  
112 identify and sequence the *Cryptosporidium* species affecting different age groups of cattle will  
113 be a requisite. Studies on the effects of age-related differences in *Cryptosporidium* species  
114 should be conducted in different cattle production systems occurring in South Africa.

115  
116 Cryptosporidiosis has major negative impacts to the cattle industry through calve mortalities,  
117 diagnosis and treatment costs, and extra husbandry costs for calves to reach market weight  
118 (Olson et al., 2004). *Cryptosporidium* infections have been reported to negatively impact  
119 cattle production, causing a reduction in milk yield in dairy cattle, as well as weight loss in  
120 beef and feedlot animals (Anderson, 1998; Esteban & Anderson, 1995; Ralston et al., 2010;  
121 Ralston et al., 2003; Shivley et al., 2018). In South Africa, there is a dearth of studies that  
122 have determined the factors associated with oocyst shedding and impact of cryptosporidiosis  
123 in different cattle production systems. The factors associated with oocyst shedding in the  
124 different cattle production systems in South Africa thus merit investigation. It is also essential  
125 to determine the impact of cryptosporidiosis on the different cattle production systems in the  
126 country.

127  
128 Infected neonatal calves are considered a high risk and dangerous source of infection as they  
129 can shed up to 107 oocysts per gram of faeces (de Graaf et al., 1999; Garro et al., 2016).  
130 Seasonal variation in the prevalence of cryptosporidiosis in cattle has been observed  
131 (Brankston et al., 2018; Szonyi et al., 2010), though there were differences in the season when  
132 the organism is most likely to occur. Poor hygiene, communal housing, overcrowded  
133 conditions and soiling of the dam's udder by faeces all increase the risk of infection of calves  
134 (de Graaf et al., 1999). However, shedding of oocysts in faeces was not demonstrated in pre-  
135 weaned calves of native cattle breeds (Maikai et al., 2011), suggesting a reduced importance in  
136 the transmission of cryptosporidiosis from native breeds to other livestock and humans.

137  
138 The risk factors associated with cryptosporidiosis in cattle in South Africa have not been fully  
139 elucidated and thus need to be investigated. Management practices, seasonal trends, and the  
140 presence of oocyst shedding calves, all warrant investigation as they could potentially influence  
141 the prevalence of cryptosporidiosis in cattle in the country. There is a need to further investigate  
142 the breed effect on shedding of *Cryptosporidium* oocysts, and comparisons of exotic,  
143 composite and indigenous cattle breeds will be important in this regard. Since differences in  
144 regional and managemental factors have been observed, there is thus a need to perform regional  
145 risk factor surveys to identify the most decisive variables in a particular cattle population (Diaz  
146 et al., 2021).

147  
148 In sheep, the most commonly detected *Cryptosporidium* species are *C. ubiquitum*, *C. xiaoi* and  
149 *C. parvum* (Bordes et al., 2020). The distribution of *Cryptosporidium* species in sheep is not

150 clearly associated with age unlike in cattle (Santin, 2020). It has, however, been reported that  
151 *C. parvum* or *C. xiaoi* are the predominant species in lambs younger than 1 month old, while  
152 *C. ubiquitum* was reported to be most common species in older animals (Guo et al., 2021;  
153 Mueller-Doblies et al., 2008; Wang et al., 2009; Ye et al., 2013). Other studies have however,  
154 found *C. ubiquitum* to be similarly distributed in lambs and adults (Santín et al., 2007; Wang  
155 et al., 2009). There are also geographic differences in the distribution of the three dominant  
156 species in sheep (Ryan et al., 2014); *C. parvum* is the dominant species in Europe, *C. xiaoi* is  
157 dominant in Australia, whereas *C. ubiquitum* appears to dominate in the Americas and Asia  
158 (Ye et al. 2013). Other species isolated in sheep worldwide have been reviewed by Hatam-  
159 Nahavandi et al. (2019) and include *C. hominis*, *C. andersoni*, *C. bovis*, *C. fayeri*, *C. scrofarum*,  
160 *C. suis* and *C. bovis*.

161  
162 In goats, *C. ubiquitum*, *C. parvum* and *C. xiaoi* have been commonly reported to cause clinical  
163 disease or asymptomatic infection (Santin, 2020). Other species identified in goats albeit only  
164 sporadically have been reviewed, including *C. hominis*, *C. baileyi*, *C. andersoni*, and rat  
165 genotype II (Hatam-Nahavandi et al., 2019). In South Africa, there appears to be no studies  
166 reporting the predominant *Cryptosporidium* species in sheep and goats and therefore such  
167 studies are warranted. Moreover, there are no studies which have investigated age-related  
168 *Cryptosporidium* species infection in neonatal sheep and goats in South Africa and this  
169 warrants investigation.

170  
171 The transmission of *Cryptosporidium* occurs via the faecal-oral route with animals and people  
172 being infected from consuming oocyst-contaminated drinking water, feed or pastures (Innes et  
173 al., 2020). Contact with contaminated animals or people can be a route of infection (Dumaine  
174 et al., 2019). Water can harbour infective oocysts for long periods and is an important medium  
175 of transmission for *Cryptosporidium* species (Ojuromi & Ashafa, 2018). In countries like South  
176 Africa, the sharing of water bodies by humans and domesticated and wild animals, greatly  
177 increases the risk of surface water contamination by *Cryptosporidium* species shed from these  
178 sources (Aldeyarbi et al., 2016). Despite the many studies describing the transmission  
179 dynamics of *Cryptosporidium* in different parts of the world, in South Africa, however, these  
180 still remain relatively unexplored. It is important to identify all potential sources of infection  
181 in South Africa, as this may have a bearing on the prevention and control of cryptosporidiosis  
182 especially amongst communities involved in ruminant livestock production. In particular, the  
183 presence of *Cryptosporidium* species in dam water on ruminant livestock farms needs to be  
184 investigated as these have been shown to be a source of animal-animal transmission (Zahedi et  
185 al., 2020).

186  
187 **5. Accepted methodologies to be used**  
188 Procedures have been developed for the isolation and enrichment of *Cryptosporidium* genomic  
189 DNA directly from stool specimens (Guo et al., 2015; Li et al., 2014). This has been achieved  
190 by oocyst purification using a combination of sucrose flotation and immunomagnetic  
191 separation [IMS]. This was aided by removal of residual contaminants by hypochloride  
192 treatment of purified oocysts, DNA extraction and whole genome amplification (WGA) of the  
193 extracted DNA using commercial kits, and assessment of *Cryptosporidium* DNA quantity  
194 using qPCR analysis of WGA products (Guo et al., 2015). Comparative genomic analyses and  
195 genetic manipulation tools have been developed and are available for *Cryptosporidium* species  
196 (Fan et al. 2019; Vinayak 2020). Such tools have made it possible to characterise  
197 *Cryptosporidium* isolates and elucidation of the biological functions of candidate genes and  
198 proteins. These methodologies will improve understanding of the prevalence and transmission

199 of *Cryptosporidium* spp. in neonatal ruminants reared in various management systems and  
200 zoonotic transmission of *C. parvum* and *C. ubiquitum* in different geographic locations.

201  
202

## 203 References

- 204 Abubakar, I., Aliyu, S. H., Arumugam, C., Usman, N. K., & Hunter, P. R. (2007). Treatment  
205 of cryptosporidiosis in immunocompromised individuals: systematic review and meta-  
206 analysis. *British Journal of Clinical Pharmacology*, 387-393.
- 207 Adams, R. B., Guerrant, R. L., Zu, S., Fang, G., & Roche, J. K. (1994). *Cryptosporidium*  
208 *parvum* infection of intestinal epithelium: morphologic and functional studies in an  
209 *in vitro* model. *Journal of Infectious Diseases*, 170-177.
- 210 Aldeyarbi, H. M., Abu El-Ezz, N. T., & Karanis, P. (2016). *Cryptosporidium* and  
211 cryptosporidiosis: the African perspective. *Environmental Science and Pollution*  
212 *Research volume*, 13811–13821.
- 213 Anderson, B. C. (1998). Cryptosporidiosis in bovine and human health. *Journal of Dairy*  
214 *Sciences*, 3036-3041.
- 215 Bouzid, M., Hunter, P. R., Chalmers, R. M., & Tyler, K. (2013). *Cryptosporidium*  
216 Pathogenicity and Virulence. *Clinical Microbiology Reviews*, 115-134.
- 217 Carmena, D. (2010). Waterborne transmission of *Cryptosporidium* and *Giardia*: detection,  
218 surveillance and implications for public health. *Current Research Technology and*  
219 *Education Topics in Applied Microbiology and Microbial Biotechnology*, 3-14.
- 220 Castro-Hermida, J. A., Gonzalez-Waletta, M., & Mezo, M. (2007). Natural infection by  
221 *Cryptosporidium parvum* and *Giardia duodenalis* in sheep and goats in Galicia (NW  
222 Spain). *Small Ruminant Research*, 96-100.
- 223 Chako, C. Z., Tyler, J. W., Schultz, L. G., Chiguma, L., & Beerntsen, B. T. (2010).  
224 Cryptosporidiosis in People: It's Not Just About the Cows. *Journal of Veterinary*  
225 *Internal Medicine*, 37-43.
- 226 Chalmar, R. M., & Davies, A. P. (2010). Minireview: clinical cryptosporidiosis. *Experimental*  
227 *Parasitology*, 138-146.
- 228 Diaz, P., Navarro, E., Remesar, S., Garcia-Dios, D., Martinez-Calaibuig, N., Prieto, A., . . .  
229 Morondo, P. (2021). The Age-Related *Cryptosporidium* Species Distribution in  
230 Asymptomatic Cattle from North-Western Spain. *Animals*, 256.
- 231 Dinler, C., & Ulutas, B. (2017). Cryptosporidiosis in Ruminants: Update and Current  
232 Therapeutic Approaches. *American Journal of Animal and Veterinary Sciences*, 96-  
233 103.
- 234 Dumaine, J. E., Tandel, J., & Striepen, B. (2019). *Cryptosporidium parvum*. *Trends in*  
235 *Parasitology*, 485-486.
- 236 Esteban, E., & Anderson, B. C. (1995). *Cryptosporidium* murlis: Prevalence, Persistency, and  
237 Detrimental Effect on Milk Production in a Drylot Dairy. *Journal of Dairy Science*,  
238 1068-1072.
- 239 Foster, D. M., & Smith, G. W. (2009). Pathophysiology of Diarrhea in Calves. *Veterinary*  
240 *Clinics of North America: Food Animal Practice*, 13-36.
- 241 Gunasekera, S., Zahedi, A., O'Dea, M., King, B., Monis, P., Thierry, B., . . . Ryan, U. (2020).  
242 Organoids and Bioengineered Intestinal Models: Potential Solutions to the  
243 *Cryptosporidium* Culturing Dilemma. *Microorganisms*, 715.
- 244 Hatam-Nahavandi, K., Ahmadpour, E., Carmena, D., Spotin, A., Bangoura, B., & Xiao, L.  
245 (2019). *Cryptosporidium* infections in terrestrial ungulates with focus on livestock: a  
246 systematic review and meta-analysis. *Parasites & Vectors*, 453.
- 247 Innes, E. A., Chalmers, R. M., Wells, B., & Pawlowic, M. C. (2020). A One Health Approach  
248 to Tackle Cryptosporidiosis. *Trends in Parasitology*, 36(3), 290-202.

- 249 Mahfouz, M. E., Mira, N., & Amer, S. (2014). Prevalence and Genotyping of *Cryptosporidium*  
250 spp. in Farm Animals in Egypt. *The Journal of Veterinary Medical Science*, 1569-1575.
- 251 Ojuromi, O. T., & Ashafa, A. O. (2018). Cryptosporidiosis in Southern Africa: Review of  
252 prevalence and molecular epidemiology of a neglected disease. *Annals of Tropical*  
253 *Medicine and Public Health*, 11(4), 108-118.
- 254 Olson, M. E., O'Handley, R. M., Ralston, B. J., McAllister, T. A., & Thompson, R. A. (2004).  
255 Update on *Cryptosporidium* and *Giardia* infections in cattle. *Trends in Parasitology*,  
256 185-191.
- 257 Paraud, C., & Chartier, C. (2012). Cryptosporidiosis in small ruminants. *Small Ruminant*  
258 *Research*, 93-97.
- 259 Ralston, B. J., McAllister, T. A., & Olson, M. E. (2010). Prevalence and infection pattern of  
260 naturally acquired giardiasis and cryptosporidiosis in range beef calves and their dams.  
261 *Veterinary Parasitology*, 113-122.
- 262 Robertson, L. J. (2014). *Cryptosporidium* as a Foodborne Pathogen. *SpringerBriefs in Food,*  
263 *Health and Nutrition*, 1-95.
- 264 Ryan, U., Fayer, R., & Xiao, L. (2014). *Cryptosporidium* species in humans and  
265 animals: current understanding and research needs. *Parasitology*, 1667-1685.
- 266 Samie, A., Hlungwani, A. H., & Mbatia, P. A. (2017). Prevalence and risk factors of  
267 *Cryptosporidium* species among domestic animals in rural communities in Northern  
268 South Africa. *Tropical Biomedicine*, 636-647.
- 269 Samra, N. A., Jori, F., Caccio, S. M., Frean, J., Poonsamy, B., & Thompson, P. (2016).  
270 *Cryptosporidium* genotypes in children and calves living at the wildlife or livestock  
271 interface of the Kruger National Park, South Africa. *Onderstepoort Journal of*  
272 *Veterinary Research*, a1024.
- 273 Samra, N. A., Thompson, P. N., Jori, F., Frean, J., Poonsamy, B., du Plessis, D., . . . Xiao, L.  
274 (2013). Genetic Characterization of *Cryptosporidium* spp. in Diarrhoeic Children from  
275 Four Provinces in South Africa. *Zoonoses and Public Health*, 154-159.
- 276 Santin, M. (2020). *Cryptosporidium* and *Giardia* in Ruminants. *Veterinary Clinics: Food*  
277 *Animal Practice*, 223-238.
- 278 Smith, R. P., Clifton-Hadley, F. A., Cheney, T., & Giles, M. (2014). Prevalence and molecular  
279 typing of *Cryptosporidium* in dairy cattle in England and Wales and examination of  
280 potential on-farm transmission routes. *Veterinary Parasitology*, 111-119.
- 281 Thompson, S., Hamilton, C. A., Hope, J. C., Katzer, F., Mabbott, N. A., Morrison, L. J., &  
282 Innes, E. A. (2017). Bovine cryptosporidiosis: impact, host-parasite interaction and  
283 control strategies. *Veterinary Research*, 42.
- 284 Widmer, G., Klein, P., & Bonilla, R. (2007). Adaptation of *Cryptosporidium* oocysts to  
285 different excystation conditions. *Parasitology*, 1583-1588.
- 286 Wyatt, C. R., Riggs, M. W., & Fayer, R. (2010). Cryptosporidiosis in Neonatal Calves.  
287 *Veterinary Clinics of North America: Food Animal Practice*, 89-103.
- 288 Xiao, L. (2010). Molecular epidemiology of cryptosporidiosis: an update. *Experimental*  
289 *Parasitology*, 80-89.
- 290 Xiao, L., Herd, R. P., & McClure, K. E. (1994). Periparturient rise in the excretion of *Giardia*  
291 sp. cysts and *Cryptosporidium parvum* oocysts as a source of infection for lambs. *The*  
292 *Journal of parasitology*, 55-59.
- 293 Zahedi, A., Papparini, A., Jian, F., Robertson, I., & Ryan, U. (2016). Public health significance  
294 of zoonotic *Cryptosporidium* species in wildlife: Critical insights into better drinking  
295 water management. *International Journal of Parasitology. Parasites and Wildlife*, 88-  
296 109.

297 Zahedi, A., Ryan, U., Rawlings, V., Greay, T., Hancock, S., Bruce, M., & Jacobson, C. (2020).  
298 Cryptosporidium and Giardia in dam water on sheep farms – An important source of  
299 transmission? *Veterinary Parasitology*, 109281.  
300