

Application of an indirect MilA ELISA for the detection of *Mycoplasma bovis* antibodies in bovine milk

Abd Al-Bar AL-FARHA^{1,2,*}, Nadeeka WAWEGAMA³, Farhid HEMMATZADEH²,
Simon FIRESTONE³, Jamie MOFFAT⁴, Gholam Ali KOJOURI⁵, Ania AHANI AZARI²,
Reza AMANOLLAHI², Andrew HOARE⁶, Kiro PETROVSKI^{2,7}

¹Department of Animal Production, Technical Agricultural College, Northern Technical University, Mosul, Iraq

²Australian Centre for Antimicrobial Resistance Ecology, School of Animal and Veterinary Sciences,
The University of Adelaide, South Australia, Australia

³Asia-Pacific Centre for Animal Health, Faculty of Veterinary Science, The University of Melbourne, Parkville, Victoria, Australia

⁴Antimicrobial Resistance and Infectious Disease (AMRID) Research Laboratory,

School of Veterinary and Life Sciences, Murdoch University, Western Australia, Australia

⁵Department of Clinical Sciences, Faculty of Veterinary Medicine, Shahrekord University, Iran

⁶South East Vets, Mount Gambier, South Australia, Australia

⁷Davies Research Centre, School of Animal and Veterinary Sciences, The University of Adelaide, South Australia, Australia

Received: 24.11.2018 • Accepted/Published Online: 03.03.2020 • Final Version: 00.00.2020

Abstract: The objective of this study was to detect *Mycoplasma bovis* specific antibodies using a recently reported MilA ELISA with the aim to detect *M. bovis* antibodies in milk. An indirect ELISA, based on a recombinant fragment of the *Mycoplasma* immunogenic lipase A (MilA) protein, was conducted on 291 milk samples for the detection of *M. bovis* antibodies. Samples were also tested with conventional *Mycoplasma* culture and *M. bovis* PCR. Samples were collected from individual cows from 2 commercial dairy herds in South Australia. Of 291 samples tested, 68 (23.4%) were detected positive for *M. bovis* antibodies, 150 (51.5%) were positive for *M. bovis* in PCR and 166 (57.0%) in bacterial culture. These results indicate that MilA indirect ELISA can be utilized for the detection of *M. bovis* antibodies in milk.

Key words: *Mycoplasma*, antibodies, mastitis, ELISA, PCR, MilA

Mycoplasma bovis is increasingly raising concerns in the dairy industry as a mastitis associated pathogen. It can cause significant economic losses as a result of a decrease in milk production, an increase in somatic cell counts (SCC), decreasing product value, the cost of associated treatments [1], and implementation of eradication strategies [2]. As a result, early and accurate detection of *M. bovis* in milk has attracted the attention of recent research, to better improve the strategic control of the disease [3]. Cattle subclinically infected with *M. bovis*, otherwise known as “carrier cows,” pose significant challenges, particularly if introduced to an uninfected herd as newly purchased stock [4,5]. Among these challenges, for instance, is the recognition of carrier cows at the time of sampling.

The difficulties in detection of *M. bovis* from milk samples via culture or Polymerase Chain Reaction (PCR) is commonly attributed to the intermittent shedding of the pathogen in milk [6], or the inability of current diagnostic

tests to identify the pathogen during the convalescent phase of the disease. Hence, identifying a diagnostic test capable of accurately detecting *M. bovis* in milk samples from carrier cows is necessary.

Indeed, some immunogenic proteins from *M. bovis* have been evaluated previously for their capacity in detection of *M. bovis* antibodies [7,8]. Other commercial ELISA kits have been used for *M. bovis* antibodies screening at bulk tank milk levels in Danish and Australian dairy herds [5,9,10]. However, the recombinant *Mycoplasma* immunogenic lipase (MilA) Immunoglobulin G (IgG) indirect ELISA has not been evaluated in milk. It has been developed and evaluated in experimentally infected calves with *M. bovis* using serum [11]. MilA has shown greater sensitivity and comparable specificity to other commercial ELISA kits (BIO K302 and BIO K260 from BioX Diagnostics (Belgium)). Therefore, it has been recommended for serological screening for *M. bovis* in

* Correspondence: dr.abdalbar@ntu.edu.iq

cattle [11,12]. As a result, this study aimed to detect *M. bovis* antibodies with the MilA ELISAs in milk samples and compare these results to the presence or absence of *M. bovis* in the samples, as determined by conventional bacterial culture and PCR methodologies.

A total of 291 milk samples were collected aseptically from individual cow once from 2 commercial dairy farms in South Australia. Of these, 251 were collected from Farm 1, a 2500-cow dairy located in the south east region of South Australia and were previously used in another study [13]. The remaining 40 samples were collected from Farm 2, a 400-cow dairy located in the mid-north region of South Australia. Both farms had a history of repeated mastitis treatment failure and high SCC, however no clinical signs of *M. bovis* diseases were observed at the time of sampling for any of the sampled cows. The problem of high SCC has been historic on both farms, *M. bovis* has previously been detected on Farm 1 (using a commercial laboratory for testing of milk for presence of *M. bovis*) but there was no previous detection of *M. bovis* on Farm 2.

All 291 samples were analyzed by MilA ELISA, bacterial culture and PCR. The MilA ELISA was conducted to test for *M. bovis* antibodies in milk following the procedure described previously [12]. The ELISA cutoff value was calculated using Bayesian latent class modelling in multiple populations [11] and was estimated at 140 antibody units (AU) (therefore all tests above this value were considered as positive). All samples were also subjected to purified glutathione-S-transferase (GST) ELISA.

For bacterial culture analysis, an aliquot of each milk sample (250 μ L) was added to a Mycoplasma broth (Oxoid, Australia) and left for 5 days before plating on Mycoplasma media (Oxoid, Australia). Plates were incubated for 15 days at 37° C using 10% CO₂ jars. The plates were then examined for colonies using a stereomicroscope (Olympus SZ30, Australia). Samples were considered positive when at least a single Mycoplasma colony was detected [14]. To confirm isolation of Mycoplasma, 3–5 selected colonies from each plate were subcultured into the enriched Mycoplasma broth and inoculated under the same conditions and checked for color change of broth and typical Mycoplasma colonies on agar. As soon as the phenol red indicator changed to yellow, subcultures into fresh broth and onto agar were carried out.

DNA extraction was performed directly on 250 μ L from each milk sample (Qiagene, Germany), and a DNA concentration measurement was performed using Nanodrop 1000c (ThermoFisher Scientific Inc., Waltham, MA, USA). HRM-real time PCR was conducted on each of these samples according to [15] using *M. bovis* specific primers targeting 16S rRNA, including primer forward: 5'-CCAGCTCACCCCTTATACATGAGCGC-3' and primer reverse:

5'-TGACTCACCAATTAGACCGACTATTTTCACC-3' [16]. Following recommendation by Behera et al. [17], the gene copy number cutoff value detected by our qPCR was estimated at 30 copies.

Results of the ELISA indicated that 68/291 samples (23.4%) were positive for *M. bovis* antibodies (\geq 140 AU). By farm, 63/251 (25.1%) and 5/40 (12.5%) samples were positive from Farms 1 and 2, respectively. In comparison, a total of 166/291 samples (57.0%) were positive for Mycoplasma like colonies by conventional culture. By farm, 144/251 (57.4%) and 22/40 (55.0%) samples were positive from Farms 1 and 2, respectively. Finally, 150/291 (51.5%) samples were positive for *M. bovis* by PCR, all of which were from Farm 1 (Table).

Another previously described ELISA, designed with similar conditions using GST protein as coating antigen, was also carried out to ensure the signals in MilA ELISA were due to the *M. bovis* antigen and not the result of the GST fusion antigen. All samples tested in the MilA ELISA negative to GST protein (data not shown).

A total of 24/68 (35.3%) and 23/68 (33.8%) samples were positive by indirect ELISA and negative on bacterial culture and PCR, respectively (Table). This may have occurred due to several reasons. Firstly, indirect ELISAs not only detect animals undergoing current infections but also those which have undergone past exposure to the pathogen; and secondly, the sensitivity of the indirect ELISA to detect antibodies during the convalescent phase of the disease when the cow has seroconverted and cleared the organism.

Another reason for positive ELISA detection versus negative culture and PCR can be explained by the intermittent shedding of the pathogen through milk [18]. Moreover, in advanced stages of *M. bovis* infection, the impermeability of mammary gland epithelium to the antibodies detected by ELISA could be another reason for the discrepancies between detection of antigen and antibody [19]. In this study, PCR had higher rate of positive samples than ELISA. This is not an unusual detection. ELISA detects antibodies and PCR detect the antigen. One possible explanation for the high discrepancy may be the incubation or prodromal period of the majority of sampled cows when antibodies are not present yet, but cows are shedding the antigen found by the PCR. Impermeable mammary gland may result in prevention of seroconversion that may have resulted in the low prevalence of antibodies in milk. After recovery, the persistence of the antibodies to *M. bovis* in the mammary gland may be short, resulting in a transient detection of antibodies in milk only. Not all media are suitable for testing of antibodies by ELISA. Milk may be unsuitable media, and this needs further research. It is also possible that the cutoff used in the MilA ELISA was too high for bovine milk, as the cutoff used in this study

Table. Count of *Mycoplasma bovis* samples per outcome of indirect ELISA (140AU) versus both culture and qPCR results of 291 samples collected aseptically from 2 farms in South Australia.

ELISA results (no.)	Bacterial culture results (no.)							PCR results (no.)						
	Positive			Negative			Total	Positive			Negative			Total
	Farm 1	Farm 2	Total	Farm 1	Farm 2	Total		Farm 1	Farm 2	Total	Farm 1	Farm 2	Total	
Positive	43	1	44	20	4	24	68	45	0	45	18	5	23	68
Negative	101	21	122	87	14	101	223	105	0	105	83	35	118	223
Total	144	22	166	107	18	125	291	150	0	150	101	40	141	291

had not been the same as one used previously on bovine serum samples [11]. Testing the sensitivity and specificity at different ELISA cutoffs indicated that the cutoff value for ELISA at 140 was the recommended threshold; however, it did give a low sensitivity (30.0%) but relatively good specificity (83.7%). It should be noted that the PCR was probably not the appropriate 'gold standard' test for testing the prevalence of *M. bovis* in milk and this should be an area of a future research.

This is the first study where the MilA ELISA has been used to detect *M. bovis* specific antibodies in bovine milk. The results indicate that this ELISA could be utilized for improving biosecurity on dairy farms, not for detecting positive cows (low sensitivity) but for confirming positive cows as they were likely true positive (high specificity). The application of the MilA ELISA to detect antibodies in milk may need further validation compared to commercial

ELISA kits approved for use on milk. The cutoff value for the MilA ELISA may need to be reevaluated for bovine milk and this would require further studies on farms with known *M. bovis* outbreaks. Indeed, it would be more beneficial to repeatedly test cows with known timing of infection (e.g., by challenge model) and estimate the timing of appearance and waning of the antibodies in bovine milk.

Acknowledgments

The authors would like to express their special thanks to the farmer and farm staff for their cooperation and interest in the study. Abd Al-Bar Al-Farha was partially funded by the Higher Committee for Education Development in Iraq in the form of a scholarship. All field and laboratory procedures were financially supported by the University of Adelaide.

References

1. Timonen AA, Katholm J, Petersen A, Motus K, Kalmus P. Within herd prevalence of intramammary infection caused by *Mycoplasma bovis* and associations between cow udder health, milk yield, and composition. *Journal of Dairy Science* 2017; 100: 6554-6561. doi: 10.3168/jds.2016-12267
2. Nicholas RA, Fox LK, Lysnyansky I. *Mycoplasma mastitis* in cattle: To cull or not to cull. *Veterinary Journal* 2016; 216: 142-147. doi: 10.1016/j.tvjl.2016.08.001
3. Parker AM, House JK, Hazelton MS, Bosward KL, Sheehy PA. Comparison of culture and a multiplex probe PCR for identifying *Mycoplasma* species in bovine milk, semen and swab samples. *PLOS One* 2017; 12: e0173422. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0173422
4. Hazelton MS, Sheehy PA, Bosward KL, Parker AM, Morton J et al. Shedding of *Mycoplasma bovis* and antibody responses in cows recently diagnosed with clinical infection. *Journal of Dairy Science* 2017; 101: 584-589. doi: 10.3168/jds.2017-13512
5. Parker AM, House JK, Hazelton MS, Bosward KL, Morton J et al. Bulk tank milk antibody ELISA as a biosecurity tool for detecting dairy herds with past exposure to *Mycoplasma bovis*. *Journal of Dairy Science* 2017; 100: 8296-8309. doi:10.3168/jds.2016-12468
6. Biddle MK, Fox LK, Hancock DD. Patterns of mycoplasma shedding in the milk of dairy cows with intramammary mycoplasma infection. *Journal of the American Veterinary Medical Association* 2003; 223: 1163-1166. doi:10.2460/javma.2003.223.1163
7. Sun Z, Fu P, Wei K, Zhang H, Zhang Y et al. Identification of novel immunogenic proteins from *Mycoplasma bovis* and establishment of an indirect ELISA based on recombinant E1 beta subunit of the pyruvate dehydrogenase complex. *PLoS One* 2014; 9: e88328. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0088328
8. Byrne WJ, Ball HJ, Brice N, McCormack R, Baker SE. et al. Application of an indirect ELISA to milk samples to identify cows with *Mycoplasma bovis* mastitis. *Veterinary Record* 2000; 146: 368-369. doi: 10.1136/vr.146.13.368

9. Arede M, Nielsen PK, Ahmed SS, Halasa T, Nilesen LR et al. A space-time analysis of *Mycoplasma bovis*: bulk tank milk antibody screening results from all Danish dairy herds in 2013-2014. *Acta Veterinaria Scandinavica* 2016; 58: 16. doi: 10.1186/s13028-016-0198-3
10. Nielsen, PK, Petersen MB, Nilesen LR., Halasa T, Toft N. Latent class analysis of bulk tank milk PCR and ELISA testing for herd level diagnosis of *Mycoplasma bovis*. *Preventive Veterinary Medicine* 2015; 121: 338-342. doi: 10.1016/j.prevetmed.2015.08.009
11. Wawegama NK, Markham PF, Kanci A, Schibrowski M, Oswin S et al. Evaluation of an IgG enzyme-linked immunosorbent assay as a serological assay for detection of *Mycoplasma bovis* infection in feedlot cattle. *Journal of Clinical Microbiology* 2016; 54: 1269-1275. doi: 10.1128/JCM.02492-15
12. Wawegama NK, Browning GF, Kanci A, Marendia MS, Markham PF. Development of a recombinant protein-based enzyme-linked immunosorbent assay for diagnosis of *Mycoplasma bovis* infection in cattle. *Clinical and Vaccine Immunology* 2014; 21: 196-202. doi: 10.1128/CVI.00670-13
13. Al-Farha A, Petrovski K., Jozani R, Hoare A, Hemmatzadeh F. Discrimination between some *Mycoplasma* spp. and *Acholeplasma laidlawii* in bovine milk using high resolution melting curve analysis. *BMC Research Notes* 2018; 11: 107. doi: 10.1186/s13104-018-3223-y
14. Markey B, Leonard F, Archambault M, Cullinane A, Maguire D. *Clinical Veterinary Microbiology*. 2nd edition, London, UK: Elsevier Health Sciences; 2013.
15. Al-Farha A, Hemmatzadeh F, Khazandi M, Hoare A, Petrovski K. Evaluation of effects of *Mycoplasma mastitis* on milk composition in dairy cattle from South Australia. *BMC Veterinary Research* 2017; 13: 351. doi: 10.1186/s12917-017-1274-2
16. Sachse K, Frey J. *PCR detection of microbial pathogens*. New Jersey, USA: Humana Press; 2003.
17. Behera S, Rana R, Gupta PK, Kumar D, Sonal et al. Development of real-time PCR assay for the detection of *Mycoplasma bovis*. *Tropical Animal Health and Production* 2018; 50: 875-882. doi: 10.1186/1471-2180-4-35
18. Maunsell FP, Woolums AR, Francoz D, Rosenbusch RF, Step DL et al. *Mycoplasma bovis* infections in cattle. *The Journal of Veterinary Internal Medicine*. 2011; 25: 772-83. doi: 10.1111/j.1939-1676.2011.0750.x.
19. Stelwagen K, Singh K. The role of tight junctions in mammary gland function. *Journal of Mammary Gland Biology and Neoplasia* 2014; 19: 131-138. doi: 10.1007/s10911-013-9309-1