Impact of three inactivated bovine viral diarrhoea virus vaccines on bulk milk p80 (NS3) ELISA test results in dairy herds
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A B S T R A C T

Bovine viral diarrhoea virus (BVDV) is endemic in many countries and vaccines are used as a component of control and eradication strategies. Surveillance programmes to detect exposure to BVDV often incorporate the use of bulk milk (BM) testing for antibodies against BVDV p80 (NS3), but vaccination can interfere with these results. The aim of this study was to evaluate whether BVDV vaccines would confound BM testing for specific antibodies in a nationally representative group of commercial dairy farms in the Republic of Ireland. A total of 256 commercial dairy herds were included in the statistical analysis. Quarterly BM or serum samples from selected weanling heifers (unvaccinated homeborn youngstock) were assessed by ELISA for antibodies against the BVDV p80 subunit and whole virus. Wilcoxon rank-sum and receiver operating characteristic (ROC) analyses were used to examine differences among groups vaccinated with one of three commercially available inactivated BVDV vaccines. Two of the three vaccines showed evidence of interference with ELISA testing of BM samples. ROC analysis highlighted that one vaccine did not reduce the discriminatory power of the BVDV p80 ELISA for identification of herds with evidence of recent BVDV circulation, when compared with unvaccinated herds; thus, administration of this vaccine would allow uncomplicated interpretation of BM ELISA test results in vaccinated seropositive herds. Seasonal differences in BM antibody results were identified, suggesting that the latter half of lactation is the most suitable time for sampling dairy herds containing predominantly spring calving cows. The results of the present study are likely to prove useful in countries allowing vaccination during or following BVDV eradication, where BM testing is required as part of the surveillance strategy.

© 2015 The Authors. Published by Elsevier Ltd. This is an open access article under the CC BY-NC-ND license (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/).

Introduction

Bovine viral diarrhoea virus (BVDV) is endemic in many countries (Lindberg and Houe, 2005). Control of BVDV involves removing persistently infected (PI) animals from the herd, ensuring biosecurity and vaccination of susceptible animals (Moennig et al., 2005). Several countries, including Ireland1, have initiated eradication programmes (Ridpath, 2012; Stähli and Alenius, 2012) and many of these countries are close to or have achieved BVDV-free status (Bitsch et al., 2000; Valle et al., 2005; Presi et al., 2011).

Detection of BVDV-specific antibodies in bulk milk (BM) samples is routinely used to determine herd health status, prior to introduction of BVDV control measures and for surveillance purposes following implementation of a control programme (Houe et al., 2006). BM analysis is often combined with selective (spot) testing of young stock for serum antibodies against BVDV, to determine whether there is evidence of recent virus circulation (RVC) in a herd, since BM results often reflect historical rather than current antibody responses (Mars and Van Maanen, 2005; Laureyns et al., 2010).

Use of a BVDV vaccine is a confounding factor when interpreting test results for immunoassays designed to detect antibodies against BVDV, since it can be difficult to differentiate vaccinated from infected animals (DIVA). This issue has led some Scandinavian countries to prohibit the use of BVDV vaccines during, and subsequent to, BVDV eradication (Greiser-Wilke et al., 2003; Barrett et al., 2011). However, vaccination is often a feature of BVDV control and eradication strategies in high seroprevalence countries, such as Ireland (Makoschey et al., 2007; Barrett et al., 2011), thereby restricting the usefulness of BM testing as a surveillance tool.

Previous studies have examined the impact of vaccination against BVDV on antibody testing under controlled conditions (Graham et al., 2003; Makoschey et al., 2007; Raue et al., 2011). Small scale field studies have been conducted on a single Dutch farm (Kuijk et al., 2000; Makoschey et al., 2007; Barrett et al., 2011).

1 See: www.animalhealthireland.ie (accessed 23 October 2014).
2008), on two (Álvarez et al., 2012) and three (González et al., 2014) Spanish dairy farms, and on 34 UK farms, the majority of which used a vaccine that is no longer commercially available (Booth et al., 2013). These studies investigated whether the use of a p80 (NS3) subunit ELISA has the potential to allow differentiation between infected animals and those receiving inactivated BVDV vaccines. Such differentiation might be possible, since administration of an inactivated form of the virus should lead to limited exposure of the immune system to the p80 non-structural protein, which is produced predominantly during viral replication (Graham et al., 2003; González et al., 2014). Although some of the inactivated BVDV vaccines evaluated seemed to generate an antibody response that was not detected with the p80 ELISA, more recent studies have suggested that DIVA is not straightforward (Raue et al., 2011; González et al., 2014), but might be possible at the herd level, with the use of BM samples rather than individual sera (Álvarez et al., 2012).

The aim of the present study was to undertake a large scale, farm-based study of the impact of BVDV vaccination on BM testing in a high seroprevalence region. A commercially available BVDV p80 ELISA was evaluated for use in BM testing in a nationally representative group of dairy farms in the Republic of Ireland, where three different commercial BVDV vaccines were being administered.

Materials and methods

Study population and sample collection

A detailed description of the sample population used in the present study has been provided by O’Doherty et al. (2013). Stratified proportional sampling, based on herd size and geographical location, was used to randomly select and invite farmers on 500 Herdplus farms from the Irish Cattle Breeding Federation (ICBF) database2 to participate in the study without incentives. A total of 312 commercial dairy farms were subsequently recruited.

BM samples were submitted from each herd on four occasions (March, June, August and November) in 2009. Farms were visited from October 2009 to January 2010 to sample weaning heifers (unvaccinated) and farms on 500 Herdplus farms from the Irish Cattle Breeding Federation (ICBF) database2 to participate in the study without incentives. A total of 312 commercial dairy farms were subsequently recruited.

BM samples were obtained from blood samples (20 mL) at 3 days (±24 hours) after the birth of the heifer. Blood samples were obtained by coccygeal venepuncture from 20% of the weaning group, with a minimum of five heifers sampled per farm. Serum samples were obtained following centrifugation of clotted blood samples for testing by ELISA. Where possible, only BM samples that were positive for p80 antibodies were used for statistical analyses.

The vaccination status of each herd was determined by questionnaire. Herds for which BM were not available (n = 3), which did not return the vaccination questionnaire (n = 4), which did not supply a vaccine brand name (n = 19), which recorded positive BM samples (n = 22) or for which BM samples were not included in the final model. All second level interactions were also examined.

Sample analysis

BM samples at each time point were analysed at an accredited laboratory (National Milk Laboratories) using a BVDV p80 blocking ELISA (Institut Pourquier), demonstrating a sensitivity (Se) of 95.0% and specificity (Sp) of 97.7% for BM (Beaudeau et al., 2001). Heifer serum samples were also tested using this assay (Se 97.6%, Sp 97.3%). On the basis of optical density at 450 nm (OD450), results are reported as % inhibition, i.e. 1 – (OD450 of the analysed sample/mean OD450 of the negative control) × 100, with cut-off values for positivity of ≥55% and ≥60% inhibition applied for BM and serum, respectively.

BM samples submitted in March and August were also tested in an approved laboratory (Efer Diagnostics) using an indirect BVDV ELISA against whole virus antigen (IDEXX Laboratories; Se 96.3%, Sp 99.5%) (Hashemi Tabar et al., 2011). Results are reported as S/P values, i.e. (OD450 of sample – OD450 of negative control)/mean OD450 of positive control – OD450 of negative control), with the positive cut-off value for BM samples set at 0.2.

Herd classification

Herd samples were included in the final model. All second level interactions were also examined.

Herd classification

Herd samples were included in the final model. All second level interactions were also examined.

Results

The distribution of study herds across region, herd size, calving season and type of enterprise is shown in Appendix: Supplementary Table S1. Herd BM, RVC and vaccination status are shown in Appendix: Supplementary Table S2. In the Pourquier p80 ELISA, ≥55% inhibition results were recorded in BM from 94/118 (79.7%) unvaccinated herds, indicating a high prevalence of seroconversion against the BVDV p80 antigen from natural viral infection. Of the vaccinated herds suitable for statistical analysis (n = 149), 68/149 (45.6%) used Bovivac (49.5% used PregSure BVD 37/149 (24.8%) used Bovilis BVD. The most common time of year to vaccinate against BVDV was January to April, when 153/190 (80.5%) of herds were vaccinated. A total of 2171 serum samples from weanlings (mean age 291 days, range 109–549 days) were analysed, with 543/2171 (25.0%) testing seropositive for BVDV. At least one seropositive weanling ≥270 days of age was identified in 87/258 (33.9%) study herds.

Quarterly median BVDV p80 ELISA BM results for vaccinated and unvaccinated herds across vaccine brand over time are shown in Fig. 1. Corresponding Wilcoxon rank-sum z and P values are shown in Table 1. Using the Pourquier p80 ELISA, there were significant increases in median percentage BM ELISA inhibition values over the entire lactation in NRV herds vaccinated with Bovivac (10.8–24.1%; P < 0.01) or PregSure BVD (14.0–26.4%; P < 0.01), but not in NRV herds vaccinated with Bovilis BVD (6.1–10.3%; P = 0.05–0.01) or Bovivac (4.7–9.4%; P = 0.05–0.01) vaccines.
herds vaccinated with Bovilis BVD (0.46–10.9%; P values 0.14–0.55 at different sampling dates), compared to unvaccinated NRVC herds (Fig. 1A; Table 1).

NRVC herds vaccinated with Bovilis BVD had significantly lower median BM ELISA percentage inhibition values at each sampling time point than unvaccinated RVC herds (March: P = 0.02; June: P = 0.009; August: P = 0.003; November: P = 0.002), while NRVC herds vaccinated with Bovidec recorded no significant difference (March: P = 0.7; June: P = 0.15; August: P = 0.8; November: P = 0.8). PregSure BVD vaccinated NRVC herds recorded elevated % inhibition values compared to unvaccinated RVC herds in March (P = 0.035), June (P = 0.001) and August (P = 0.008), with no significant difference (P = 0.16) recorded in November (Table 1). There was no significant difference in ELISA values in herds with evidence of RVC, regardless of vaccination status or vaccine brand administered (Fig. 1B; Table 1).

There was a significant increase (P < 0.01) in whole virus antigen ELISA values in BM from NRVC herds vaccinated with any of the three BVDV vaccine brands in comparison with NRVC unvaccinated herds; animals vaccinated with the PregSure BVD vaccine had the highest values (Fig. 2; Table 1). Power calculations relating to the most pertinent between-group comparisons are outlined in Appendix: Supplementary Tables S3 and S4. With the exception of the March comparison between Bovilis BVD NRVC and unvaccinated RVC herds, sample sizes were of sufficient power (>0.8) to detect reported between-group differences.

ROC analysis of BM and spot test results on serum samples from weanling heifers in unvaccinated herds yielded an AUC of 0.78. Bovilis BVD vaccinated herds recorded similar powers of discrimination between RVC and NRVC herds, yielding an AUC of 0.77 (P = 0.91; Fig 3A; Table 2). Herds vaccinated with Bovidec or PregSure BVD yielded AUC values of 0.50 and 0.55, respectively, indicating that RVC and NRVC herds could not be distinguished using these vaccines (Figs. 3B, C; Table 2). A p80 ELISA percentage inhibition positive cut-off value for BM samples between 83.3% (Se 71.4%, Sp 72.6%) and 86.5% (Se 65.3%, Sp 81.0%) correctly classified >70% of unvaccinated and Bovilis BVD vaccinated herds (n = 144).

Examination of the effect of seasonality on ELISA test results in unvaccinated herds showed significantly increased ELISA % inhibition
values in the latter half of the year, regardless of infection status. Seasonality of test results in vaccinated herds was more variable (see Appendix: Supplementary Table S5).

A number of associations were highlighted between explanatory variables and the use of each vaccine brand (Table 3). An interaction between explanatory variables, region and RVC highlighted that, compared to herds vaccinated with Bovilis BVD, herds vaccinated with Bovidec were more likely to record positive weanlings in a high dairy density region than a low density region ($P = 0.03$). In addition, relative to herds vaccinated with Bovilis BVD, mixed enterprise herds were less likely to use PregSure BVD than herds managing dairy stock only (relative ratio, RR $= 0.26$; $P < 0.01$).

### Discussion

Vaccination has a role to play in the control of BVDV infection, once PI animals have been identified and removed from the herd (Makoschey et al., 2007; Ståhl and Alenius, 2012). Although the immunological protection offered by BVDV vaccines is limited when naïve cattle are exposed to PI animals shedding large amounts of virus (Ståhl and Alenius, 2012), vaccination can be a valuable tool in protection against clinical disease. However, the use of vaccines can compromise surveillance strategies based on the use of serological assays to determine if there has been exposure to BVDV in herds. In the present study, an inactivated vaccine was identified that could be used alongside a BVDV subunit ELISA to DIVA.

In the present study, a relatively large proportion of spring calving herds were recruited. Such herds have a relatively stable composition over a lactation period and animals are vaccinated at a similar time of the year. These factors potentially reduce the fluctuations...
in BM test results reported by Booth et al. (2013), thereby allowing more definitive conclusions to be drawn. The high BVDV seroprevalences reported in Irish dairy herds in the current study (80%) and by Cowley et al. (2012) (98%) should minimise differences in BVDV status between vaccinated and unvaccinated groups, thereby allowing meaningful comparisons across study groups. A potential weakness of the present study is that only vaccines administered in 2009 were recorded and the impact of prior vaccine use on results cannot be assessed.

In an ideal situation, vaccines should be an integral component of a BVDV eradication and surveillance programme, provided vaccination has minimal interference with BM antibody testing. Certain conditions should be met, before a particular vaccine would be considered to be suitable for use in BVDV control programmes. The median percentage inhibition value of unvaccinated NRVC herds should not differ from that of vaccinated NRVC herds using the p80 ELISA, i.e. administration of the vaccine should not result in significantly increased levels of p80 antibodies. The median percentage inhibition value of unvaccinated RVC herds should be significantly greater than that of vaccinated NRVC herds using the p80 ELISA, i.e. it should be possible to distinguish vaccinated herds from those with evidence of recent viral transmission and infection. The median S/P value (whole virus ELISA) of a vaccinated group should not be significantly lower than that of other vaccine groups examined, i.e. the vaccine should be administered correctly and should induce a BVDV antibody response. Finally, ROC analysis of BM and spot testing of vaccinated herds should not be significantly different from unvaccinated herds, i.e. AUC values in vaccinated and unvaccinated herds should indicate comparable power (AUC > 0.5; P > 0.05) in distinguishing RVC from NRVC herds.

Under field conditions in a high seroprevalence region, Bovilis BVD was the only one of three vaccines that satisfied the stated criteria, when used in conjunction with the Pourquier p80 ELISA. Bovilis BVD vaccinated herds did not differ significantly from unvaccinated herds in the parameters included in the statistical analysis. Additionally, ROC analysis of unvaccinated and Bovilis BVD vaccinated herds yielded a similar BM positive cut-off value for detecting RVC herds to that suggested by Thobokwe et al. (2004) (80% inhibition) in a study in New Zealand dairy herds, in a production system similar to that in Ireland.

In contrast, Bovidec and PregSure BVD appear to elicit BVDV p80-specific antibody responses, limiting their usefulness in surveillance programmes, where a large proportion of seropositive herds are present. It should be noted that the antibody response to Bovilis BVD may be transient (Alvarez et al., 2012); furthermore, all farmers in the current study administered a single annual booster dose to their herds, contrasting with the three dose regime outlined by Alvarez et al. (2012). Further research is required to better characterise the serological response to inactivated BVD vaccines immediately post-vaccination and how this might affect BM testing.

Inappropriate vaccine use or vaccine failure could have influenced the study outcome. However, it is considered to be unlikely that this would be biased towards any particular vaccine brand. The BM antibody test results against whole BVDV were not significantly different between Bovidec and Bovilis BVD vaccines, suggesting that the differences observed in the Pourquier p80 ELISA were specific to the vaccine brand. The elevated antibody reactivity against whole BVDV observed with the PregSure BVD vaccine is possibly due to increased immunogenicity associated with the specific adjuvant used in this vaccine (Demasius et al., 2013). The PregSure BVD vaccine has recently been withdrawn, due to links with neonatal pancytopenia in calves (Deutskens et al., 2011; Euler et al., 2013). Seasonal variation in BM test results was evaluated, since it has been reported that BVDV antibody levels in milk are inversely related to the amount of milk produced (Niskanen et al., 1989). The majority of herds in the present study calved in the spring, with peak lactation occurring 9 weeks post-calving (Quinn et al., 2005); a significant increase in antibody values was recorded in unvaccinated herds in the latter half of the year, as anticipated. This indicates that autumn might be a more suitable period for sampling unvaccinated herds, to avoid false negative results. Although significant differences between sampling times were also recorded in vaccinated herds, none were of a magnitude to warrant suggesting an optimal time of year for BM sampling in vaccinated herds. The variation in individual animal responses to vaccination, as outlined in previous studies (Raue et al., 2011), highlights the usefulness of herd level BM testing, which avoids issues with sampling at different times post-vaccination.

Further research is required into farm level risk factors, which might account for the increased likelihood of seropositive weanlings on farms using Bovidec compared to Bovilis BVD. It is possible that Bovilis BVD performs better in reducing the levels of new/recent infection in dairy systems or, alternatively, that farmers experiencing issues with active BVDV infection are more likely to select Bovidec. Similarly, herds vaccinated with PregSure BVD tended to be more likely to record a positive mean annual BM p80 test result, which again may indicate increased use of this vaccine in herds experiencing problems with BVDV, rather than inferior vaccine efficacy. The significantly elevated values recorded in PregSure BVD vaccinated herds for both BVDV p80 and whole virus antigen ELISAs may be the main contributing factor. These findings should be investigated further to allow evidence-based recommendations with regard to BVDV vaccine use.

Conclusions

Administration of Bovilis BVD results in minimal interference with BM testing for antibodies against BVDV using the Pourquier p80 ELISA. Therefore, use of this vaccine is compatible with BVDV eradication and surveillance programmes.

Conflict of interest statement

None of the authors of this paper has a financial or personal relationship with other people or organisations that could inappropriately influence or bias the content of the paper.

Acknowledgements

This study is an output from an Irish Dairy Levy funded project. The authors wish to thank Noel Byrne, Eugene O’Doherty and Yris Bloemhoff for their assistance in sample collection and recording of survey data. Assistance in identifying study farmers was gratefully received from the Irish Cattle Breeding Federation and the cooperation of study farmers is gratefully acknowledged.

Appendix: Supplementary material

Supplementary data to this article can be found online at doi:10.1016/j.tvjl.2015.03.025.

References

Beaudeau, F., Bello, C., Seevers, H., Assié, S., Pourquier, P., Joly, A., 2001. Informative value of an indirect enzyme-linked immunosorbent assay (ELISA) for the


Demasius, W., Weiskard, R., Hadlich, F., Müller, K.E., Kühn, C., 2013. Monitoring the immune response to vaccination with an inactivated vaccine associated to bovine neonatal pancytopenia by deep sequencing transcriptome analysis in cattle. BMC Veterinary Research 44, 93.


