

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29

This is the final peer-reviewed accepted manuscript of:  
**Infectious bursal disease virus in free-living wild birds: a systematic review and meta-analysis of its sero-viroprevalence on a global scale**  
Giulia Graziosi, Elena Catelli, Angela Fanelli, Caterina Lupini  
The final published version is available online at: <https://doi.org/10.1111/tbed.14433>

**Rights / License:**

The terms and conditions for the reuse of this version of the manuscript are specified in the publishing policy. For all terms of use and more information see the publisher's website.

*This item was downloaded from IRIS Università di Bologna (<https://cris.unibo.it/>)*  
**When citing, please refer to the published version.**

# Infectious bursal disease virus in free-living wild birds: a systematic review and meta-analysis of its sero-viroprevalence on a global scale

Giulia Graziosi<sup>1</sup>, Elena Catelli<sup>1</sup>, Angela Fanelli<sup>2</sup>, Caterina Lupini<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>) Department of Veterinary Medical Sciences, University of Bologna, Ozzano dell'Emilia (BO) Italy; [elena.catelli@unibo.it](mailto:elena.catelli@unibo.it) (E.C.); [caterina.lupini@unibo.it](mailto:caterina.lupini@unibo.it) (C.L.)

<sup>2</sup>) Department of Veterinary Medicine, University of Bari, Valenzano (BA), Italy; [angela.fanelli@uniba.it](mailto:angela.fanelli@uniba.it) (A.F.)

Correspondence: Giulia Graziosi, Department of Veterinary Medical Sciences, University of Bologna, Ozzano dell'Emilia (BO), Italy. E-mail: [giulia.graziosi2@unibo.it](mailto:giulia.graziosi2@unibo.it) (G.G)

**KEYWORDS:** Meta-analysis; wild birds; *Infectious bursal disease virus*; systematic review; seroprevalence; viroprevalence

## SUMMARY

Infectious bursal disease virus (IBDV) is an economically important pathogen for poultry, whereas knowledge of its occurrence in non-poultry hosts is limited. The objective of this systematic review and meta-analysis is to summarize the up-to-date knowledge about the sero-viroprevalence of IBDV in wild birds on a global scale. A computerized literature research was performed on PubMed, Scopus, CAB Direct and Web of Science to find relevant publications, along with the screening of reference lists. Journal articles, book chapters, scientific correspondences, conference proceedings and short communications on IBDV virological and/or serological surveys in free-living wild birds published between 1970 and 2021 were considered as eligible. Among 184 studies found, 36 original contributions met the pre-established criteria. A random-effect model was applied to calculate pooled seroprevalence estimates with 95% confidence intervals, whereas the paucity of virological studies (n = 6) only allowed a qualitative description of the data. The pooled seroprevalence was estimated to be 6% (95% C.I.: 3%-9%) and a high heterogeneity was detected ( $I^2=96\%$ ). Sub-group analyses were not performed due to the scarcity of available information about hypothetical moderators. With respect to virological studies, IBDV was detected in *Anseriformes*, *Columbiformes*, *Galliformes*, *Passeriformes* and *Pelecaniformes* and different strains related to poultry infection were isolated. Our estimates of serological data showed a moderate exposure of wild birds to IBDV. The susceptibility of different species to IBDV infection underlines their potential role in its epidemiology at least as carriers or spreaders. Indeed, the isolation of IBDV in healthy wild birds with a migratory attitude might contribute to a long-distance spread of the virus and to strain diversity. Whilst a wild reservoir host could not be clearly identified, we believe our work provides useful insights for conducting future surveys which are needed to broaden our knowledge of IBDV occurrence in wild birds.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Infectious bursal disease (IBD) or Gumboro disease (GD) is an economically impacting disease of the global poultry industry caused by Infectious bursal disease virus (IBDV), a highly contagious bi-segmented double stranded RNA virus. IBDV belongs to the genus *Avibirnavirus* within the family *Birnaviridae* (Lefkowitz et al., 2018) and two serotypes can be identified by cross-neutralization assays, namely serotype 1 and serotype 2. Serotype 1 includes pathogenic strains for chickens and serotype 2 includes non-pathogenic strains which naturally occurs in turkeys (McNulty et al., 1979; McFerran et al., 1980) and are also detected in other avian species (Candelora et al., 2010; Gough et al., 2002). IBDV transmission commonly happens through the fecal-oral route (Benton et al., 1967).

1 Being a non-enveloped RNA virus, IBDV is also extremely resistant in the environment and has the  
2 potential to be spread by different fomites (Crespo et al., 2016) and mechanical vectors (Howie &  
3 Thorsen, 1981; McAllister et al., 1995; Pagès-Manté et al., 2004; Park et al., 2010).  
4 Regardless of the pathogenicity of the strain, IBDV infection damages the bursa of Fabricius and  
5 causes an immunosuppression which is more severe the younger the animals affected (Lupini et al.,  
6 2020; Rautenschlein et al., 2003; Silveira et al., 2019; Sharma et al., 2000). IBDV-related  
7 immunodeficiency indeed leads a flock to higher susceptibility to secondary bacterial infections and  
8 decreases the efficiency of vaccination programs routinely applied (Aricibasi et al., 2010). Because  
9 of viral evolution through mutation (Aliyu et al., 2021), reassortment (Jackwood et al., 2016) and  
10 recombination (Jackwood, 2012; He et al., 2009), diverse IBDV genotypes are detected and classified  
11 in numerous genogroups (Michel & Jackwood, 2017; Islam et al., 2021). Infections with antigenically  
12 different strains can significantly impact the poultry production system due to the potential limited  
13 efficacy of implemented vaccination plans. Furthermore, the origin of newly emergent IBDV strains  
14 can be unobvious and epidemiological surveys can lead to inconclusive epidemiological links (Felice  
15 et al., 2017; Lupini et al., 2016; Thai et al., 2021).  
16 Despite an increasing awareness of the role of wildlife in poultry pathogens' ecology, little is known  
17 about the role played by wild birds in the IBDV epidemiology. Since 1980, scientific papers have  
18 demonstrated that other avian species apart from chicken (*Gallus gallus*) and turkey (*Meleagris*  
19 *gallopavo*) are susceptible to IBDV (Gough et al., 1998; McFerran et al., 1980; Wang et al., 1997;  
20 Zhou et al., 1998). It has therefore been hypothesized that wild birds could be epidemiologically  
21 relevant to the genetic evolution of circulating IBDV strains (Hon et al., 2006; Tammiranta et al.,  
22 2018; Yamaguchi et al., 1997) or could act as spreaders between infected farms (Gilchrist, 2005).  
23 Wild birds can exhibit extremely heterogeneous patterns of movement according to species and  
24 populations. Given their ability to fly over long distances, wild migratory birds interconnect different  
25 parts of the globe and can deliver pathogens from one country to another (Jourdain et al., 2007). In  
26 addition to natural habitats, some species are well adapted to human-driven environments and can act  
27 as bridges between pristine ecosystems and anthropogenic ones (Patankar et al., 2021; Wille et al.,  
28 2020).  
29 Considering the continuous detection of diverse strains of IBDV, disentangling the potential role of  
30 wild birds in the epidemiology of this pathogen is pivotal. In this study we summarize the up-to-date  
31 evidence of IBDV sero-virological prevalence in wild birds on a global scale conducting a systematic  
32 review and meta-analysis. To the best of our knowledge, this is the first review that focuses on IBDV  
33 in wild species rather than in poultry (Alkie & Rautenschlein, 2016; Dey et al., 2019; Berg, 2000;  
34 Mahgoub et al., 2012).

35

## 36 **2. MATERIALS AND METHODS**

37

38 A systematic review and meta-analysis were performed to estimate the seroprevalence of the IBDV  
39 in free-living wild birds. Given the small number of studies using molecular or virological methods  
40 to define the viral prevalence, it was determined that these could not be considered together. Thus,  
41 the analysis was limited to a systematic review and the studies' characteristics were displayed in a  
42 descriptive table.

43 Our work followed the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses  
44 Protocols (PRISMA-P) (Moher et al., 2015) and the PRISMA 2020 Statement (Page et al., 2020)  
45 (Supporting information 1).

46

### 47 **2.1 Information sources and search strategy**

48

49 Four databases were accessed from 01/10/2020 to 24/04/2021. These included: PubMed  
50 (<https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/>), Scopus (<https://www.scopus.com/>), CAB Direct  
51 (<https://www.cabdirect.org>) and Web of Science (<https://apps.webofknowledge.com/>). The reference

1 lists of eligible studies were also screened to find other relevant contributions by hand (Higgins et al.,  
2 2021).

3 The search strategy used for each database is reported in Table 1. Boolean operators ‘OR’ and ‘AND’  
4 were used in all the computerized databases and MeSH Terms related to IBDV were used in PubMed.  
5 Eligible studies were merged and managed in a Microsoft Excel 2021 sheet (Version 16.49).

6

## 7 **2.2 Selection process**

8

9 Literature searches and the screening process of the papers were independently performed by two  
10 reviewers (G.G. and A.F.). Eligible studies were selected by applying pre-established inclusion  
11 criteria to title and abstract of each work (Table 2). Portuguese and Chinese manuscripts were  
12 screened after translation into English through Google Translate (<https://translate.google.com>). After  
13 removing duplicate papers, the reasons for exclusion of any other study were recorded. If  
14 disagreements occurred, a third experienced author in the avian pathology field was consulted (E.C.).

15

## 16 **2.3 Data collection process**

17

18 Data extraction from each eligible study was performed by two independent reviewers (G.G. and  
19 A.F.) and the quality of the data was double checked by a third author (C.L.). Whenever two different  
20 diagnostic methods were applied, only the outcomes from the test used as confirmatory were  
21 considered. If prevalence data retrieved from original articles was expressed as percentage, raw  
22 numbers were obtained converting the percentages to the closest integers.

23 Two data extraction sheets were created, one for the seroprevalence surveys and another for viral  
24 prevalence ones. The first was filled with the following information: title, first author last name, year  
25 of publication, country, language, sampling period, host identification (order, family and species),  
26 age classes and sex, sample type, total number of animals tested, total number of positive cases,  
27 serological method, serological cut-off used to define a sample as positive, specificity and sensitivity  
28 of the method applied and serotype characterization (serotype 1 or serotype 2). The second with: title,  
29 first author last name, year of publication, country, language, sampling period, host identification  
30 (order, family and species), age classes and sex, sample type, total number of animals tested, total  
31 number of positive cases, molecular method, viral isolation method, specificity and sensitivity of the  
32 methods applied and GenBank accession number (<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/>).

33

## 34 **2.4 Study risk of bias assessment**

35

36 Despite the availability of different tools to evaluate the publication bias, the authors could not find  
37 a suitable one to the given dataset (Hunter et al., 2014). Considering the heterogenous study designs,  
38 diversity of species tested, different sample sizes and zero positive cases reported in some original  
39 papers it was decided to include all the eligible full texts retrieved. A comment section was added to  
40 the data extraction sheets to report anything that could affect the interpretation of the results (Fanelli  
41 et al. 2020). Moreover, outliers were identified through leave-one-out analysis and excluded from the  
42 meta-analysis (Viechtbauer & Cheung, 2010).

43

## 44 **2.5 Summary outcomes**

45

46 The principal summary outcome was the overall seroprevalence of IBDV in free-living wild birds  
47 without restriction to any geographical area. As mentioned before, data from virological studies were  
48 not pooled due to the paucity of original articles available and virological prevalence was therefore  
49 calculated for each individual study.

50

## 51 **2.6 Synthesis methods**

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50

### **2.6.1 Statistical synthesis methods**

All statistical calculations were performed on R software version 3.5.2 (R Core Team, 2018). Visual representation of search results was realized with the *wordcloud* package. The *meta* version 4.18-2 and *metaphor* version 2.4.0 packages were used to perform the meta-analysis of serologic data as described in the comprehensive tutorial of Wang (2018). Briefly, the observed proportions were transformed using the double arcsine method to normalize the data (Freeman & Tukey, 1950; Miller, 1978). For reporting, the pooled transformed proportions and its 95% confidence interval (C.I.) was converted back to the observed proportions. The between-study variance was estimated through the random effects method using the restricted maximum-likelihood estimator (REML). The heterogeneity between studies was quantified using the inconsistency index ( $I^2$ ) and interpreted as small, medium or high according to <25%, 25-50% and >75% values respectively (Higgins & Thompson, 2002). After visual inspection of the pooled seroprevalence forest plot, outliers were identified performing leave-one-out analysis and therefore removed. Considering the virological prevalence, the *prevalence* package version 0.4.0 was applied to calculate this estimate and its 95% C.I. using the “exact” method.

### **2.6.2 Other analyses**

Countries were grouped into sub-regions according to the standards of the Statistics Division of the United Nations Secretariat (<https://unstats.un.org/unsd/methodology/m49/>). Eventual inconsistencies in the taxonomic nomenclature used by the Authors were harmonized according to current nomenclature following the latest Avibase version (Lepage & Warnier, 2014). The taxonomic order of the hosts, the age classes and the geographical area of the studies were hypothesized as possible moderators. However, we decided not to perform sub-group analyses because of the scarcity of data available and heterologous age attribution techniques. Moreover, the studies were not pooled according to serological methods given the lack of any information about the sensitivity and specificity of the different tests applied.

With respect to virological studies, sequence analysis of IBDV Viral Protein 2 from wild birds was performed. Reference strains reported in Aliyu et al. (2021) were obtained from NCBI GenBank and used to represent IBDV genogroups (Michel & Jackwood, 2017). Sequences were aligned by MUSCLE algorithm. Best partition scheme, substitution models and maximum likelihood phylogenetic reconstruction were performed on the IQ-TREE web server using 1000 ultrafast bootstrap replicates (Trifinopoulos et al. 2016).

## **3. RESULTS**

### **3.1 Search summary**

A total of 165 articles were identified through the computerized literature research on PubMed, CAB Direct, Scopus and Web of Science. After duplicates removal ( $n = 67$ ), 98 articles were assessed for eligibility through the screening of titles and abstracts. Eventually, 23 studies met the pre-established criteria and were full-text accessed. Of these, one article out of 23 was afterwards excluded due to lack of necessary information on the species tested (Pawar et al., 2009). 22 eligible studies were therefore obtained from literature research on selected databases.

Another 19 articles were added after reference lists reading. Two of these studies were excluded due to unsuccessful retrieval of the full texts (Oña et al., 2000; Edgar & Cho, 1965). Three more studies were rejected after full text reading: 1) Wang et al. (1997) and 2) Zhou et al. (1998) surveyed the same population that was raised and held in captivity, 3) Candelora et al. (2008) presented the

1 preliminary results of Candelora et al. (2010), only the latter was therefore considered. As result, 14  
2 studies retrieved through reference lists reading were considered eligible.

3 To conclude, 36 original articles about virological and serological surveys of IBDV in wild birds  
4 were included in the systematic review here presented (Figure 1). After full-text retrieval, articles  
5 applying direct (n = 3) or indirect (n = 30) diagnostic methods were sorted into two different Microsoft  
6 Excel sheets as previously described. Watts et al. (2009), Vargas-Castillo et al. (2019) and Kasanga  
7 et al. (2008) which applied both serological and virological diagnostic methods were included in both  
8 databases.

### 10 3.2 Study characteristics

11  
12 We identified 36 eligible articles on IBDV surveys in free-living wild birds published between 1978  
13 and 2020 and covering 22 countries (Figure 2). An overview of the scientific publications is provided  
14 in Table 3 and Table 4, respectively for the use of indirect or direct methods for IBDV diagnosis.

15 Regarding serological surveys, the studies retrieved (n = 33) were published between 1978 and 2020  
16 and covered 20 countries of the world. A total amount of 7556 sera of free-living wild birds were  
17 examined and 1112 resulted positive. The serological methods applied included the enzyme-linked  
18 immunosorbent assay (ELISA) performed with both in-house and commercial kits, the viral  
19 neutralization test (VNT) and the agar gel immunodiffusion assay (AGID). None of the studies  
20 reported the sensitivity and specificity of the methods with regards to the species tested. The most  
21 common technique was the VNT (n = 13) whose details on strains and cell cultures applied are listed  
22 in Table 5, followed by the ELISA (n = 10). Four studies (Campbell, 2001; Grimaldi et al., 2018;  
23 Nunes et al., 2012; Wilcox et al., 1983) used two different serological tests in parallel or subsequently.  
24 Only eight out of 33 studies distinguished the IBDV serotype as serotype 1 or 2 for the positive cases  
25 (Candelora et al., 2010; Gauthier-Clerc et al., 2002; Hollmén et al., 2000; Kasanga et al., 2008; Miller  
26 et al., 2008; Ogawa et al., 1998; Watts et al., 2009; Wilcox et al., 1983). Regarding the host, a total  
27 of 17 orders of birds were sampled (Table 1A, Supporting information 2). Most studies concerned  
28 *Sphenisciformes* (12/33 papers), *Passeriformes* (10/33), *Columbiformes* (9/33), and *Charadriiformes*  
29 (7/33) (Figure 3). *Sphenisciformes* (n = 4050 birds), *Galliformes* (n = 753 birds) and *Anseriformes* (n  
30 = 459 birds) were the groups most frequently sampled. The highest rate of positive cases per order  
31 was retrieved for *Falconiformes* (33.3%), *Anseriformes* (32.9%); *Gruiformes* (32.7%),  
32 *Sphenisciformes* (16.8%), *Accipitriformes* (12.9%) and *Charadriiformes* (11.1%).

33 After statistical analyses, the following studies were identified as outliers and therefore removed from  
34 the summary of results: Dwight et al. (2018), Hollmén et al. (2000) and Miller & Shellam (2007)  
35 (Supporting information 3).

36 The six molecular/virological studies retrieved were published between 2009 and 2020 and covered  
37 6 countries (Figure 2). Bursa of Fabricius (n = 3), cloacal swabs (n = 2) and cecal tonsils (n = 1) were  
38 sampled for attempting IBDV diagnosis. The total number of animals sampled were 244 of which 10  
39 resulted positives in four different studies (Curland et al., 2018; Jeon et al., 2008; Kasanga et al.,  
40 2008; Naggar et al., 2020). The results from Watts et al. (2009) were not included in the count of the  
41 positive cases due to a hypothetical positive control contamination of the reverse-transcriptase PCR  
42 (RT-PCR) as assessed by the Authors of the paper. Regarding the technique applied, the RT-PCR or  
43 RT nested PCR assays were used as a screening method in all the studies. Primers and genes amplified  
44 are listed in Table 6. Naggar et al. (2020) and Jeon et al. (2008) both attempted viral isolation *via*  
45 chorioallantonic membrane (CAM) inoculation of embryonated specific pathogen free (SPF) chicken  
46 eggs. Whereas the CAM harvested material in Naggar et al. (2020) was confirmed of IBDV isolation  
47 through a Real-Time quantitative RT-PCR (qRT-PCR), Jeon et al. (2008) used both RT-PCR and  
48 AGP (agar gel immunoprecipitation test) for confirmation. Strains isolated by Jeon et al. (2008) and  
49 Naggar et al. (2020) and detected by Kasanga et al. (2008) were sequenced in Viral Protein 2 (VP2)  
50 gene, whereas Curland et al. (2018) did not further characterized the IBDV positive RT-PCR  
51 products. With respect to the host, eight different orders of birds were investigated and the

1 *Columbiformes* and *Galliformes* were surveyed in 3 out of 6 papers (Table 2A, Supporting  
2 information 2). The most frequently sampled groups were *Anseriformes* (n = 92 birds), *Passeriformes*  
3 (n = 43 birds) and *Galliformes* (n = 37 birds). The highest rate of positive cases per order was retrieved  
4 for *Pelecaniformes* (33.3%) and *Anseriformes* (5.4%).

### 5 6 **3.3 Results of individual serological and virological studies**

7  
8 Effect estimates and confidence intervals for each seroprevalence study are reported in the forest plot  
9 in Figure 4. The results from individual studies on serological and molecular/virological prevalence  
10 are shown in Table 3 and Table 4, respectively.

### 11 12 **3.4 Risk of bias in serological and virological studies**

13  
14 No relevant risk of bias were identified by reviewers.

### 15 16 **3.5 Pooled seroprevalence of serological studies**

17  
18 The pooled seroprevalence of IBDV in free-living wild birds was 6% (C.I. 95%: 3-9%). The  $I^2$   
19 statistic showed high heterogeneity ( $I^2 = 96\%$ ,  $p < 0.01$ ).

### 20 21 **3.6 Phylogenetic analysis**

22  
23 Phylogenetic reconstruction was performed using VP2 sequences from wild bird strains by applying  
24 a TIM2+F+G4 substitution model to the first codon position and a TIM2e+G4 substitution model to  
25 the second and third codon positions, as implemented on the IQ-TREE web server. As represented in  
26 Figure 6, IBDV strains detected in wild birds clustered with IBDV genogroup 1 and genogroup 3  
27 strains.

## 28 29 **4. DISCUSSION**

### 30 31 **4.1 Summary of evidence**

32  
33 To the best of our knowledge this is the first systematic review and meta-analysis of the sero-  
34 viro-prevalence of IBDV in wild birds on a global scale. Considering the persistence of serum  
35 antibodies over time and the ease of revealing both past and current infection, the majority of relevant  
36 papers retrieved from literature concerned serological surveys rather than virological ones.

37 With respect to seroprevalence, the results showed that wild birds from different taxonomic groups  
38 were exposed to IBDV with an overall pooled prevalence estimate of 6% (95% C.I.: 3-9%). The meta-  
39 analysis also highlighted a high degree of heterogeneity ( $I^2 = 96\%$ ,  $p < 0.01$ ) thus our estimate is  
40 important to be considered together with its 95% C.I. Hollmén et al. (2000), Dwight et al. (2018),  
41 and Miller & Shellam (2007) were identified as outliers. Although these studies reported the highest  
42 percentages of wild birds with antibody titers against IBDV (69.2%, 69.7% and 63.6% respectively),  
43 none of the positive cases were epidemiologically linked to outbreaks in poultry. Hollmén et al.  
44 (2000) found a high seroprevalence of IBDV in spectacled eiders (*Somateria fischeri*) living in remote  
45 areas of western Alaska, speculating that they might act as carrier hosts of IBDV. Dwight et al. (2018)  
46 carried out a sero-survey on wild and pen-reared pheasants (*Phasianus colchicus*). High  
47 seroprevalence found in both populations was interpreted by the Authors as a potential false positivity  
48 due to unvalidated diagnostic test applied or as a potential unexploited epidemiological role of  
49 pheasants in the ecology of IBDV. Miller & Shellam (2007) detected IBDV antibodies in adults and  
50 1 year-old king penguins (*Aptenodytes patagonicus*) and adult royal penguins (*Eudyptes schlegeli*)  
51 on a sub-Antarctic island, thus implying an endemic circulation of IBDV in these populations.

1 Despite the rigorous statistical methods applied, our findings need to be cautiously interpreted.  
2 Several variables could have been hypothetically considered as moderators (e.g. geographic areas,  
3 host characteristics, diagnostic methods), however we could not perform any sub-group analyses due  
4 to the scarcity of available data. This can be considered a limit of the review hereby presented. With  
5 regards to the spatial distribution of data, we included 33 eligible studies from 11 different world sub-  
6 regions. More than one sero-survey per area were retrieved only for South America, Western Africa,  
7 Eastern Asia and Antarctica therefore we were not able to pool the data according to this factor.  
8 Concerning the avian host characteristics, free-living wild birds can be frequently found around rural  
9 and commercial poultry farms (Burns et al., 2012). Moreover, some species could be considered as  
10 more exposed to possible IBDV infection due to their ecology and feeding habits. Higher taxonomic  
11 categories could have been considered as a possible grouping factor to investigate the heterogenous  
12 results generated from the diversity of species tested. Unfortunately, several orders of birds were  
13 underrepresented or included exclusively in one survey. Still, we hereby discuss relevant findings for  
14 guiding future surveys. *Sphenisciformes* was the most studied order (12/33 papers) due to the  
15 increasing attention of men-driven threats to the Antarctic ecosystem. IBDV seropositivity was  
16 frequently observed in wild penguins (16.8%), possibly implying an endemic circulation (Miller &  
17 Shellam, 2010; Watts et al., 2009) or a diagnostic cross-reactivity with closely related viruses  
18 (Gauthier-Clerc et al., 2002; Gilbert et al., 2013; Grimaldi et al., 2018). Currently available data  
19 though is not sufficient for considering these birds as a possible natural IBDV reservoir.  
20 *Falconiformes* and *Anseriformes* appear to be the orders with the highest rates of seropositive animals  
21 (33.3% and 32.9%, respectively), however: 1) in *Falconiformes* only 3 animals were sampled; 2) the  
22 major contribution to positive cases in *Anseriformes* (127 cases over 151 total positives) arose from  
23 spectacled eiders tested solely by Hollmén et al. (2000). *Gruiformes* also showed an high rate of  
24 seropositive animals (32.7%), although this order was investigated in just two out of the 33 sero-  
25 surveys retrieved (Candelora et al., 2010; Assam et al., 2014). Candelora et al. (2010) found IBDV  
26 antibodies against serotype 2 in sandhill cranes (*Grus canadensis*) in Florida, USA. The Authors  
27 hypothesized that these infected cranes could interact with the endangered whooping cranes (*Grus*  
28 *americana*) living in the same habitat and be a potential carrier of infection for the latter, with  
29 unknown consequences for the species' conservation. A 12.9% overall seropositivity was found in  
30 *Accipitriformes*, with positive cases originated from only one (Höfle et al., 2001) of the two studies  
31 where representatives of this order were included (Assam et al., 2014). This *taxon* comprises diurnal  
32 predators with feeding behaviors that might expose them to IBDV spillover from poultry farms with  
33 low biosecurity levels, however current data is insufficient to drive any conclusion. Lastly,  
34 *Charadriiformes* showed an 11.1% overall seropositive IBDV rate. This order includes aquatic birds  
35 as gulls, terns, plovers and other shorebirds which are often gregarious and migrants. Hollmén et al.  
36 (2000) hypothesized that herring gulls (*Larus argentatus*) might be IBDV carriers due to their  
37 exposure to poultry waste and their opportunistic feeding behaviors. The trophic plasticity of *Lariidae*  
38 species might indeed be a factor to be taken into account when arranging epidemiological surveys in  
39 wild birds. Furthermore, skuas (*Stercorariidae*) might migrate and introduce pathogens in Antarctica  
40 by stealing food resources from other birds and scavenging around fishing boats (Miller et al., 2008;  
41 Nunes et al., 2012).

42 Another possible source of the heterogeneity observed in our meta-analysis could be found in the age  
43 or sex of the tested birds. Demographic data is indeed believed to be an important tool for comparing  
44 the outcomes from different studies. Unfortunately, we could not investigate age or sex related  
45 patterns of seroprevalence since many studies lacked information or applied incomparable criteria of  
46 age classification.

47 Also, the use of different serological methods with different performances could have affected the  
48 obtained results. None of the studies reported about the sensitivity and the specificity of the test used  
49 with regards to the species. ELISA is frequently chosen for conducting sero-epidemiological surveys  
50 and is considered as a sensitive and rapid diagnostic tool, however the commercial kits validated for  
51 poultry could yield false-positives when applied to non-poultry hosts (Karesh et al., 1999; Nunes et



1 al., 2012; Parsons et al., 2016; Smith et al., 2008; Travis et al., 2006b; Uhart et al., 2020). The virus  
2 neutralization test is recognized as a very sensitive and very specific serological test and has the  
3 advantage of being possibly used with the sera of any species (Phalen, 2002). VNT can also  
4 differentiate antibodies from exposure to IBDV serotype 1 or 2. The latter is considered apathogenic  
5 for fowl, however high titers against IBDV serotype 2 had been associated with high mortality and  
6 morbidity events in captive-reared whooping cranes (*G. americana*) during a reintroduction program  
7 in Florida, USA (Spalding et al., 2008). Only few studies distinguished between IBDV serotypes  
8 (8/33 articles), still this differentiation is advised to give a more exhaustive epidemiological picture.  
9 Grimaldi et al. (2018) and Nunes et al. (2012) combined two different serologic methods (an in-house  
10 competitive ELISA and the VNT and a commercial ELISA kit and the AGID, respectively) to confirm  
11 the positivity observed with the ELISA test and overcome methodological limitations.

12 With respect to viro-prevalence studies, we could not perform a meta-analysis due to the limited  
13 number of relevant articles retrieved (n = 6). Virus detection proves active viral shedding and allows  
14 further characterization of the isolated strains, we therefore consider it relevant to review the available  
15 data even if scarce. As reported by Naggar et al. (2020), the isolation of IBDVs in alive wild birds  
16 with a migratory attitude highlights the chance of a long-distance spread of the virus. It is also relevant  
17 to notice that these positive individuals did not show any sign of disease. IBDV strains were also  
18 detected in a black-billed magpie (*Pica hudsonia*) (Jeon et al., 2008), a wild pigeon (*Columba livia*)  
19 (Kasanga et al., 2008) and a wild pheasant (*P. colchicus*) (Curland et al., 2018) which are common  
20 species around poultry farms. According to sequence analyses, wild bird isolates of IBDVs are closely  
21 related to IBDV genogroup 3 strains (Jeon et al., 2008; Kasanga et al., 2008; Naggar et al., 2020) or  
22 IBDV genogroup 1 strains (Naggar et al., 2020), suggesting epidemiological links between domestic  
23 chicken and wild birds. Unique aminoacidic residues found in the VP2 hypervariable region (HVR)  
24 of some isolates also indicates that IBDV can undergo mutational changes in the wild hosts (Kasanga  
25 et al., 2008, Naggar et al., 2020). Furthermore, wild birds might harbor strains that could eventually  
26 reassort with poultry ones leading to the emergence of novel IBDV outbreaks in the future.

## 27 28 **4.2 Limitations**

29  
30 Among the constrains identified regarding the systematic review presented, we acknowledge the  
31 scarcity of publications on IBDV in free-living wild birds in comparison with the abundance of  
32 studies available for poultry. We also imply the existence of possible research which may not be  
33 accessible through the search strategy here adopted. With respect to the statistical analysis, the  
34 scarcity of relevant articles about IBDV virological prevalence prevented us from pooling the data  
35 and performing a meta-analysis. Furthermore, we did not apply any test neither to assess nor to  
36 quantify the publication bias because of the absence of specific tools applicable to our research  
37 question (Fanelli et al., 2021).

## 38 39 40 **5. CONCLUSION**

41  
42 Considering the continuous evolution of IBDV strains and their spatial distribution over time, we feel  
43 that the role of free-living wild birds has implications that remain unexplored. Our systematic review  
44 and meta-analysis provide an up-to-date synthesis of the available literature related to IBDV sero-  
45 viro-prevalence in wild hosts. Whereas it is not possible to currently identify any wild bird species as  
46 a reservoir of IBDV, it is still important to assess the role that free-living birds could have in the  
47 epidemiology of this virus considering their movements and aggregation patterns. An effective  
48 screening strategy should combine, whenever possible, serological and virological methods of  
49 diagnosis to increase the significance of the outcomes. Increasing attention has been placed on  
50 synanthropic wildlife as bridge hosts, potentially vehiculating viruses from natural maintenance hosts  
51 to poultry, between different poultry farms (Shriner et al., 2016) or from poultry to other wild birds.

1 To better interpret the epidemiological links existing among different IBDV host species, it is crucial  
2 to perform a genetic characterization of the isolates. We also consider of main importance collecting  
3 exhaustive information on the individuals tested, such as species, sex and age classes according to  
4 international standards. Whenever positive results are presented, a thorough examination of the host  
5 ecology may help for further epidemiological considerations. Due to men-driven environmental  
6 changes, pathogens' ecology at the wildlife-domestic interface is evolving fast. Further research is  
7 necessary to better understand the role that wild birds might play in the eco-epidemiology of this virus  
8 and in driving changes in the way IBDV impacts poultry production.

9  
10 **AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS:** Conceptualization, C.L. and E.C.; acquisition of data, G.G. and  
11 A.F.; statistical analysis, G.G.; interpretation of data, G.G. and C.L.; writing—original draft  
12 preparation, G.G.; writing—review and editing, G.G., E.C. and C.L.; supervision, E.C., C.L. and A.F.  
13 All authors have read and agreed to the published version of the manuscript.

14  
15 **ACKNOWLEDGMENTS:** This research did not receive any specific grant or funding from agencies  
16 in the public, commercial or not-for-profit sectors.

17  
18 **CONFLICT OF INTERESTS STATEMENT:** The authors declare that they have no competing  
19 interests.

20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51

## REFERENCES

Adamu, H. U., Balami, A. G., & Abdu, P. A. (2017). Avian influenza, Gumboro and Newcastle disease antibodies and antigens in apparently healthy wild birds in Kano Metropolis, Nigeria. *Nigerian Veterinary Journal*, *38*, 69-77.

Aliyu, H. B., Hair-Bejo, M., Omar, A. R., & Ideris, A. (2021). Genetic diversity of recent Infectious Bursal Disease Viruses isolated from vaccinated poultry flocks in Malaysia. *Frontiers in Veterinary Science*, *8*, 643976. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fvets.2021.64396>

Alkie, T. N., & Rautenschlein, S. (2016). Infectious bursal disease virus in poultry: current status and future prospects. *Veterinary Medicine (Auckland, New Zealand)*, *7*, 9-18. <https://doi.org/10.2147/VMRR.S68905>

Aricibasi, M., Jung, A., Heller, E. D., & Rautenschlein, S. (2010). Differences in genetic background influence the induction of innate and acquired immune responses in chickens depending on the virulence of the infecting infectious bursal disease virus (IBDV) strain. *Veterinary Immunology and Immunopathology*, *35*, 79-92. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.vetimm.2009.11.005>

Assam, A., Abdu, P. A., Ademola, A. O., Augustine, E., & Lawal, S. (2014). Avian influenza, Newcastle and Gumboro disease antibodies and antigens in apparently healthy wild birds in Kaduna state, Nigeria. *Bulletin of Animal Health and Production in Africa*, *62*.

Benton, W. J., Cover, M. S., & Rosenberger, J. K. (1967). Studies on the transmission of the infectious bursal agent (IBA) of chickens. *Avian Diseases*, *11*, 430–438.

Berg, T. P. (2000) Acute infectious bursal disease in poultry: a review. *Avian Pathology*, *29*, 175-194. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03079450050045431>

Burns, T. E., Ribble, C., Stephen, C., Kelton, D., Toews, L., Osterhold, J., & Wheeler, H. (2012). Use of observed wild bird activity on poultry farms and a literature review to target species as high priority for avian influenza testing in 2 regions of Canada. *The Canadian veterinary journal*, *53*, 158–166.

Campbell, G. (2001). Investigation into evidence of exposure to infectious bursal disease virus and infectious anaemia virus in wild birds in Ireland. In E. F. Kaleta, H. R. Ursula, & H. Lange-Herbs (Eds.), *Proceedings of the II International Symposium on Infectious Bursal Disease and Chicken Infectious Anaemia* (pp. 230–235). Gießen, Germany: Justus-Liebig University.

Candelora, K. L., Spalding, M. G., Nesbitt, S. A., Sellers, H. S., Olson, J., Perrin, L., & Parker, J. (2008). Infectious bursal disease in wild populations of turkeys and sandhill cranes: preliminary findings. In M. J. Folk, & S. A. Nesbitt (Eds.), *Proceedings of the Tenth North American Crane Workshop* (pp. 171-172). Zacatecas, Mexico: North American Crane Working Group.

Candelora, K. L., Spalding, M. G., & Sellers, H. S. (2010). Survey for antibodies to infectious bursal disease virus serotype 2 in wild turkeys and Sandhill Cranes of Florida, USA. *Journal of Wildlife Diseases*, *46*, 742-52. <https://doi.org/10.7589/0090-3558-46.3.742>

Crespo, R., Badcoe, L., Williams, C., & Bary, A. (2016). Inactivation of Infectious Bursal Disease Virus Through Composting of Litter from Poultry Houses. *Avian Diseases*, *60*, 506-510. <https://doi.org/10.1637/11341-120615-ResNote>

- 1  
2 Curland, N., Gethöffer, F., van Neer, A., Ziegler, L., Heffels-Redmann, U., Lierz, M., Baumgärtner,  
3 W., Wohlsein, P., Völker, I., Lapp, S., Bello, A., Pfankuche, V. M., Braune, S., Runge, M., Moss, A.,  
4 Rautenschlein, S., Jung, A., Teske, L., Strube, C., Schulz, J., Bodewes, R., Osterhaus, A. D. M. E.,  
5 & Siebert, U. (2018). Investigation into diseases in free-ranging ring-necked pheasants (*Phasianus*  
6 *colchicus*) in northwestern Germany during population decline with special reference to infectious  
7 pathogens. *European Journal of Wildlife Research*, 64. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10344-018-1173-2>  
8
- 9 De Wit, J. J., Heijmans, J. F., Mekkes, D. R., & Van Loon, A. A. (2001). Validation of five  
10 commercially available ELISAs for the detection of antibodies against infectious bursal disease virus  
11 (serotype 1). *Avian pathology*, 30, 543–549. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03079450120078743>  
12
- 13 Deem, S. L., Noss, A. J., Cuéllar, R. L., & Karesh, W. B. (2005). Health evaluation of free-ranging  
14 and captive blue-fronted Amazon parrots (*Amazona aestiva*) in the Gran chaco, Bolivia. *Journal of*  
15 *Zoo and Wildlife Medicine*, 36, 598–605.  
16
- 17 Dey, S., Pathak, D. C., Ramamurthy, N., Maity, H. K., & Chellappa, M. M. (2019). Infectious bursal  
18 disease virus in chickens: prevalence, impact, and management strategies. *Veterinary medicine*  
19 (*Auckland, New Zealand*), 10, 85–97. <https://doi.org/10.2147/VMRR.S185159>  
20
- 21 Dwight, I. A., Coates, P. S., Stoute, S. T., Senties-Cue, C. G., Gharpure, R. V., & Pitesky, M. E.  
22 (2018). Serologic Surveillance of Wild and Pen-reared Ring-necked Pheasants (*Phasianus colchicus*)  
23 as a method of understanding disease reservoirs. *Journal of Wildlife Diseases*, 54, 414–418.  
24 <https://doi.org/10.7589/2017-08-191>  
25
- 26 Edgar, S. A., & Cho, Y. (1965). Avian nephrosis (Gumboro disease) and its control by immunization.  
27 *Poultry Science*, 44, 1366.  
28
- 29 Ezeifeke, G. O., Dowoh, S. K., & Umoh, J. U. (1992). Involvement of wild and domestic birds in the  
30 epidemiology of Newcastle disease and Infectious bursal disease in Zaria, Nigeria. *Bulletin of Animal*  
31 *Health and Production in Africa*, 40(2), 125-127.  
32
- 33 Fagbohun, O. A., Owoade, A. A., Oluwayelu, D. O., & Olayemi, F. O. (2000). Serological survey of  
34 infectious bursal diseases virus antibodies in cattle egrets, pigeons and Nigerian laughing doves.  
35 *African Journal of Biomedical Research*, 3.  
36
- 37 Fanelli, A., Battisti, E., Zanet, S., Trisciuglio, A., & Ferroglio, E. (2021). A systematic review and  
38 meta-analysis of *Toxoplasma gondii* in roe deer (*Capreolus capreolus*) and red deer (*Cervus elaphus*)  
39 in Europe. *Zoonoses and Public Health*, 68, 182–193. <https://doi.org/10.1111/zph.12780>  
40
- 41 Felice, V., Franzo, G., Catelli, E., Di Francesco, A., Bonci, M., Cecchinato, M., Mescolini, G.,  
42 Giovanardi, D., Pesente, P., & Lupini, C. (2017). Genome sequence analysis of a distinctive Italian  
43 infectious bursal disease virus. *Poultry Science*, 96, 4370-4377. <https://doi.org/10.3382/ps/pex278>.  
44
- 45 Freeman, M., & Tukey, J. (1950). Transformations related to the angular and the square root. *The*  
46 *Annals of Mathematical Statistics*, 21, 607-611. <https://doi.org/10.1214/aoms/1177729756>  
47
- 48 Gardner, H., Kerry, K., Riddle, M., Brouwer, S., & Gleeson, L. (1997). Poultry virus infection in  
49 Antarctic penguins. *Nature*, 387, 245. <https://doi.org/10.1038/387245a0>  
50

- 1 Gauthier-Clerc, M., Eterradossi, N., Toquin, D., Guittet, M., Kuntz, G., & Le Maho, Y.  
2 (2002). Serological survey of the king penguin, *Aptenodytes patagonicus*, in Crozet Archipelago for  
3 antibodies to infectious bursal disease, influenza A and Newcastle disease viruses. *Polar*  
4 *Biology*, 25, 316–319. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00300-001-0346-7>  
5
- 6 Gilbert, A. T., Fooks, A. R., Hayman, D. T., Horton, D. L., Müller, T., Plowright, R., Peel, A. J.,  
7 Bowen, R., Wood, J. L., Mills, J., Cunningham, A. A., & Rupprecht, C. E. (2013). Deciphering  
8 serology to understand the ecology of infectious diseases in wildlife. *Ecohealth*, 10(3), 298-313.  
9 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10393-013-0856-0>  
10
- 11 Gilchrist, P. (2005). Involvement of free-flying wild birds in the spread of the viruses of avian  
12 influenza, Newcastle disease and infectious bursal disease from poultry products to commercial  
13 poultry. *World's Poultry Science Journal*, 61(2), 198-214. <https://doi.org/10.1079/WPS200451>  
14
- 15 Gough, R. E., Drury, S. E., Cox, W. J., Johnson, C. T., & Courtenay, A. E. (1998). Isolation and  
16 identification of birnaviruses from ostriches (*Struthio camelus*). *Veterinary Records*, 142(5), 115-  
17 116. <https://doi.org/10.1136/vr.142.5.115>  
18
- 19 Gough, R. E., Drury, S. E., Welchman, D. de B., Chitty, J. R., & Summerhays, G. E. (2002). Isolation  
20 of birnavirus and reovirus-like agents from penguins in the United Kingdom. *Veterinary Records*,  
21 151(14), 422-424. <https://doi.org/10.1136/vr.151.14.422>  
22
- 23 Grimaldi, W., Ainley, D. G., & Massaro, M. (2018). Multi-year serological evaluation of three viral  
24 agents in the Adélie Penguin (*Pygoscelis adeliae*) on Ross Island, Antarctica. *Polar Biology*, 41.  
25 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00300-018-2342-1>  
26
- 27 Gu, F., Li, S., Ye, X., & Liu, R. (1998) Serological investigation and artificial infection of guinea-  
28 fowls and pheasants with infectious bursal disease. *Chinese Journal of Veterinary Science and*  
29 *Technology*, 28(1), 22-23.  
30
- 31 He, C. Q., Ma, L. Y., Wang, D., Li, G. R., & Ding, N. Z. (2009). Homologous recombination is  
32 apparent in infectious bursal disease virus. *Virology*, 384(1), 51-58.  
33 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.virol.2008.11.009>  
34
- 35 Higgins, J. P. T., & Thompson, S. G. (2002). Quantifying heterogeneity in a meta-analysis. *Statistics*  
36 *in Medicine*, 21, 1539-1558. <https://doi.org/10.1002/sim.1186>  
37
- 38 Higgins, J. P. T., Thomas, J., Chandler, J., Cumpston, M., Li, T., Page, M. J., & Welch, V. A. (2021).  
39 Cochrane handbook for systematic reviews of interventions version 6.2 (updated February 2021). The  
40 Cochrane Collaboration, 2011.  
41
- 42 Höfle, U., Blanco, J. M., & Kaleta, E. F. (2001). Neutralizing antibodies against infectious bursal  
43 disease virus in sera of free-living and captive birds of prey from central Spain (preliminary results).  
44 In E. F. Kaleta, H. R. Ursula, & H. Lange-Herbs (Eds.), *Proceedings of the II International*  
45 *Symposium on Infectious Bursal Disease and Chicken Infectious Anaemia* (pp. 247–251). Gießen,  
46 Germany: Justus-Liebig University.  
47
- 48 Hollmén, T., Franson, J. C., Docherty, D. E., Kilpi, M., Hario, M., Creekmore, L. H., & Petersen, M.  
49 R. (2000). Infectious Bursal Disease Virus antibodies in Eider Ducks and Herring Gulls. *The Condor*,  
50 102, 688–691. <https://doi.org/10.1093/condor/102.3.688>  
51

- 1 Hon, C. C., Lam, T. Y., Drummond, A., Rambaut, A., Lee, Y. F., Yip, C. W., Zeng, F., Lam, P. Y.,  
2 Ng, P. T., & Leung, F. C. (2006). Phylogenetic analysis reveals a correlation between the expansion  
3 of very virulent infectious bursal disease virus and reassortment of its genome segment B. *Journal of*  
4 *Virology*, *80*, 8503-8509. <https://doi.org/10.1128/JVI.00585-06>  
5
- 6 Howie, R. I., & Thorsen, J. (1981). Identification of a strain of infectious bursal disease virus isolated  
7 from mosquitoes. *Canadian Journal of Comparative Medicine*, *45*, 315-320.  
8
- 9 Hunter, J. P., Saratzis, A., Sutton, A. J., Boucher, R. H., Sayers, R. D., & Bown, M. J. (2014). In  
10 meta-analyses of proportion studies, funnel plots were found to be an inaccurate method of assessing  
11 publication bias. *Journal of Clinical Epidemiology*, *67*, 897-903.  
12 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclinepi.2014.03.003>  
13
- 14 Iman, M. E., Faki, A. E., AlHassan, A. M., Selma, O. A., Egbal, S. A., Rahim, J. I., & Esmat, E.  
15 (2013). Microbiological and serological studies of some poultry pathogens in wild birds in Sudan.  
16 *Bulletin of Animal Health and Production in Africa*, *61*.  
17
- 18 Islam, M. R., Nooruzzaman, M., Rahman, T., Mumu, T. T., Rahman, M. M., Chowdhury, E. H.,  
19 Eterradosi, N., & Müller, H. A. (2021). Unified genotypic classification of infectious bursal disease  
20 virus based on both genome segments. *Avian Pathology*, *50*, 190-206.  
21 <https://doi.org/10.1080/03079457.2021.1873245>  
22
- 23 Jackwood, D. J. (2012). Molecular epidemiologic evidence of homologous recombination in  
24 infectious bursal disease viruses. *Avian Diseases*, *56*(3), 574-577. [https://doi.org/10.1637/10053-](https://doi.org/10.1637/10053-010912-ResNote.1)  
25 [010912-ResNote.1](https://doi.org/10.1637/10053-010912-ResNote.1)  
26
- 27 Jackwood, D. J., Stoute, S. T., & Crossley, B. M. (2016). Pathogenicity of genome reassortant  
28 Infectious Bursal Disease Viruses in chickens and turkeys. *Avian Diseases*, *60*, 765-772.  
29 <https://doi.org/10.1637/11409-031116-Reg>  
30
- 31 Jeon, W. J., Lee, E. K., Joh, S. J., Kwon, J. H., Yang, C. B., Yoon, Y. S., & Choi, K. S. (2008). Very  
32 virulent infectious bursal disease virus isolated from wild birds in Korea: epidemiological  
33 implications. *Virus Research*, *137*(1), 153-156. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.virusres.2008.06.013>  
34
- 35 Jourdain, E., Gauthier-Clerc, M., Bicout, D. J., & Sabatier, P. (2007). Bird migration routes and risk  
36 for pathogen dispersion into western Mediterranean wetlands. *Emerging infectious diseases*, *13*, 365-  
37 372. <https://doi.org/10.3201/eid1303.060301>  
38
- 39 Karesh, W. B., Uhart, M. M., Frere, E., Gandini, P., Braselton, W. E., Puche, H., & Cook, R. A.  
40 (1999). Health evaluation of free-ranging rockhopper penguins (*Eudyptes chrysocomes*) in Argentina.  
41 *Journal of Zoo and Wildlife Medicine*, *30*(1), 25-31.  
42
- 43 Kasanga, C. J., Yamaguchi, T., Wambura, P. N., Munang'andu, H. M., Ohya, K., & Fukushi, H.  
44 (2008). Detection of infectious bursal disease virus (IBDV) genome in free-living pigeon and guinea  
45 fowl in Africa suggests involvement of wild birds in the epidemiology of IBDV. *Virus genes*, *36*,  
46 521-529. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11262-008-0219-z>  
47
- 48 Lefkowitz, E. J., Dempsey, D. M., Hendrickson, R. C., Orton, R. J., Siddell, S. G., & Smith, D. B.  
49 (2018). Virus taxonomy: the database of the International Committee on Taxonomy of Viruses  
50 (ICTV). *Nucleic Acids Research*, *46*. <https://doi.org/10.1093/nar/gkx932>  
51

- 1 Leite, A. T. M., Fischer, G., Hübner, S. de O., Lima, M. de., & Vargas, G. D. (2020). Investigation  
2 of impact viruses in poultry health of wild birds near a free range poultry farm in Pelotas, RS. *Science  
3 and Animal Health*, 8, 73-87. <https://doi.org/10.15210/sah.v8i1.17601>  
4
- 5 Lepage, D., & Warnier, J. (2014). The Peters' Checklist of the Birds of the World (1931-1987)  
6 Database. Retrieved from <https://avibase.bsc-eoc.org/peterschecklist.jsp>  
7
- 8 Lupini, C., Giovanardi, D., Pesente, P., Bonci, M., Felice, V., Rossi, G., Morandini, E., Cecchinato,  
9 M., & Catelli, E. (2016). A molecular epidemiology study based on VP2 gene sequences reveals that  
10 a new genotype of infectious bursal disease virus is dominantly prevalent in Italy. *Avian  
11 Pathology*, 45, 458–464. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03079457.2016.1165792>  
12
- 13 Lupini, C., Felice, V., Silveira, F., Mescolini, G., Berto, G., Listorti, V., Cecchinato, M., & Catelli,  
14 E. (2020). Comparative in vivo pathogenicity study of an ITA genotype isolate (G6) of infectious  
15 bursal disease virus. *Transboundary and Emerging Diseases*, 67, 1025–1031.  
16 <https://doi.org/10.1111/tbed.13421>  
17
- 18 Mahgoub, H. A., Bailey, M., & Kaiser, P. (2012). An overview of infectious bursal disease. *Archives  
19 of Virology*, 157, 2047-57. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00705-012-1377-9>  
20
- 21 McAllister, J. C., Steelman, C. D., Newberry, L. A., & Skeeles, J. K. (1995). Isolation of infectious  
22 bursal disease virus from the lesser mealworm, *Alphitobius diaperinus*. *Poultry Science*, 74(1), 45-  
23 49. <https://doi.org/10.3382/ps.0740045>  
24
- 25 McFerran, J. B., McNulty, M. S., McKillop, E. R., Connor, T. J., McCracken, R. M., Collins, D. S.  
26 & Allan, G. M. (1980). Isolation and serological studies with infectious bursal disease viruses from  
27 fowl, turkeys and ducks: demonstration of a second serotype. *Avian Pathology*, 9, 395–404.  
28 <https://doi.org/10.1080/03079458008418423>  
29
- 30 McNulty, M. S., Allan, G. M., & McFerran, J. B. (1979). Isolation of infectious bursal disease virus  
31 from turkeys. *Avian Pathology*, 8, 205–212. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03079457908418346>  
32
- 33 Michel, L. O., & Jackwood, D. J. (2017). Classification of infectious bursal disease virus into  
34 genogroups. *Archives of Virology*, 162, 3661-3670. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00705-017-3500-4>  
35
- 36 Miller, G. D., & Shellam, G. R. (2007, September). *Disease status of penguins on Macquarie Island*.  
37 Poster presented at the 6th international penguin conference, Hobart.  
38
- 39 Miller, G. D., Watts, J., & Shellam, G. (2008). Viral antibodies in south polar skuas around Davis  
40 Station, Antarctica. *Antarctic Science*, 20, 455-461. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0954102008001259>  
41
- 42 Miller, G. D., & Shellam, G. R. (2010, August-September). *Seasonal prevalence of viral antibodies  
43 in emperor penguins at Auster Colony, Antarctica*. Poster presented at the 7th international penguin  
44 conference, Boston.  
45
- 46 Miller, J. J. (1978). The Inverse of the Freeman – Tukey Double Arcsine Transformation. *The  
47 American Statistician*, 32, 138. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00031305.1978.10479283>  
48
- 49 Moher, D., Shamseer, L., Clarke, M., Ghersi, D., Liberati, A., Petticrew, M., Shekelle, P., & Stewart,  
50 L.A. (2015). Preferred reporting items for systematic review and meta-analysis protocols (PRISMA-  
51 P) 2015 statement. *Systematic Reviews*, 4. <https://doi.org/10.1186/2046-4053-4-1>

- 1  
2 Naggar, R. F. E., Rohaim, M. A., & Munir, M. (2020). Potential reverse spillover of infectious bursal  
3 disease virus at the interface of commercial poultry and wild birds. *Virus Genes*, *56*, 705-711.  
4 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11262-020-01793-x>  
5
- 6 Nawathe, D. R., Onunkwo, O., & Smith, I. M. (1978). Serological evidence of infection with the virus  
7 of infectious bursal disease in wild and domestic birds in Nigeria. *The Veterinary record*, *102*, 444.  
8 <https://doi.org/10.1136/vr.102.20.444>  
9
- 10 Nunes, C. F., Fonseca, F., Leite, A. T. M., da Silva Filho, R. P., Fonseca Finger, P., Castro, C. C.,  
11 Fischer, G., D'avila Vargas, G., & de Oliveira, H. S. (2012). Investigation on Newcastle Disease  
12 Virus (NDV), Infectious Bursal Disease Virus (IBDV) and Avian Poxvirus (APV) in magellanic  
13 penguins in Southern region of Brazil. *Brazilian Archives of Biology and Technology*, *55*.  
14 <https://doi.org/10.1590/S1516-89132012000400008>  
15
- 16 Oña, A., Martinez, J., Berg, T. P., Casal, I., Negro, J. J., & Rodriguez, J. F. (2000). Epidemiological  
17 survey of infectious bursal disease virus in wild birds. In *Proceedings of the 4<sup>th</sup> Meeting of the*  
18 *European Wildlife Disease Association*, (p 39). Zaragoza, Spain: European Wildlife Disease  
19 Association.  
20
- 21 Ogawa, M., Wakuda, T., Yamaguchi, T., Murata, K., Setiyono, A., Fukushi, H., & Hirai, K. (1998).  
22 Seroprevalence of infectious bursal disease virus in free-living wild birds in Japan. *Journal of*  
23 *Veterinary Medicine Sciences*, *60*, 1277-1279. <https://doi.org/10.1292/jvms.60.1277>  
24
- 25 Orakpoghenor, O., Oladele, S., & Abdu, P. (2020). Detection of infectious bursal disease virus  
26 antibodies in free-living wild birds in Zaria, Nigeria. *Poultry Science*, *99*, 1975-1977.  
27
- 28 Page, M. J., McKenzie, J. E., Bossuyt, P. M., Boutron, I., Hoffmann, T. C., Mulrow, C. D., Shamseer,  
29 L., Tetzlaff, J. M., Akl, E. A., Brennan, S. E., Chou, R., Glanville, J., Grimshaw, J. M., Hróbjartsson,  
30 A., Lalu, M. M., Li, T., Loder, E. W., Mayo-Wilson, E., McDonald, S., McGuinness, L. A., Stewart,  
31 L. A., Thomas, J., Tricco, A. C., Welch, V. A., Whiting, P., & Moher, D. (2021). The PRISMA 2020  
32 statement: an updated guideline for reporting systematic reviews. *British Medical Journal*, *372*.  
33 <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.n71>  
34
- 35 Pagès-Manté, A., Torrents, D., Maldonado, J., & Saubi, N. (2004). Dogs as potential carriers of  
36 infectious bursal disease virus. *Avian Pathology*, *33*, 205-209.  
37 <https://doi.org/10.1080/0307945042000195821>  
38
- 39 Patankar, S., Jambhekar, R., Suryawanshi, K. R., & Nagendra, H. (2021). Which Traits Influence  
40 Bird Survival in the City? A Review. *Land*, *10*(2), 92. <https://doi.org/10.3390/land10020092>  
41
- 42 Park, M. J., Park, J. H., & Kwon, H. M. (2010). Mice as potential carriers of infectious bursal disease  
43 virus in chickens. *Veterinary Journal*, *183*, 352-354. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tvjl.2008.12.005>  
44
- 45 Parsons, N. J., Gous, T. A., Schaefer, A. M., & Vanstreels, R. E. (2016). Health evaluation of African  
46 penguins (*Spheniscus demersus*) in southern Africa. *The Onderstepoort Journal of Veterinary*  
47 *Research*, *83*. <https://doi.org/10.4102/ojvr.v83i1.1147>  
48
- 49 Pawar, S., Pande, S., Jamgaonkar, A., Koratkar, S., Pal, B., Raut, S., Nanaware, S., Ray, K.,  
50 Chackrabarti, A., Kode, S., Thite, V., Khude, M., Randive, S., Basu, A., Pawashe, A., Ponkshe,  
51 Pandit, P., & Deshpande, P. (2009). Avian influenza surveillance in wild migratory, resident,



1 domestic birds and in poultry in Maharashtra and Manipur, India, during avian migratory season  
2 2006–07. *Current Science*, 97, 550-554.

3

4 Phalen, D. N. (2002). Virus neutralization assays used in exotic bird medicine. *Seminars in Avian  
5 and Exotic Pet Medicine*, 11(1), 19-24.

6

7 R Core Team. (2018). *A Language and Environment for Statistical Computing*. R Foundation for  
8 *Statistical Computing* (version 3.5.2) [Computer software]. Retrieved from [https://www.r-  
9 project.org/](https://www.r-project.org/)

10

11 Rautenschlein, S., von Samson-Himmelstjerna, G., & Haase, C. (2007). A comparison of immune  
12 responses to infection with virulent (IBDV) between specific-pathogen-free chickens infected at 12  
13 and 28 days of age. *Veterinary Immunology and Immunopathology*, 115, 251–260.  
14 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.vetimm.2006.11.002>

15

16 Sharma, J. M., Kim, I. J., Rautenschlein, S., & Yeh, H. Y. (2000). Infectious bursal disease virus of  
17 chickens: pathogenesis and immunosuppression. *Developmental and Comparative Immunology*, 24,  
18 223-235. [https://doi.org/10.1016/s0145-305x\(99\)00074-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/s0145-305x(99)00074-9)

19

20 Shriner, S., Root, J., Lutman, M., Kloft, J. M., VanDalen, K. K., Sullivan, H. J., White, T. S.,  
21 Milleson, M. P., Hairston, J. L., Chandler, S. C., Wolf, P. C., Turnage, T. C., McCluskey, B. J.,  
22 Vincent, A. L., Torchetti, M. K., Gidlewski, T., & DeLiberto, T. (2016). Surveillance for highly  
23 pathogenic H5 avian influenza virus in synanthropic wildlife associated with poultry farms during an  
24 acute outbreak. *Scientific Reports*, 6. <https://doi.org/10.1038/srep36237>

25

26 Silveira, F., Felice, V., Franzo, G., Mescolini, G., Catelli, E., Cecchinato, M., Berto, G., Listorti, V.,  
27 & Lupini, C. (2019). Inoculation of specific pathogen-free chickens with an of the ITA genotype (G6)  
28 leads to a high and persistent viral load in lymphoid tissues and to a delayed antiviral response.  
29 *Veterinary Microbiology*, 235, 136–142. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.vetmic.2019.06.014>

30

31 Smith, K. M., Karesh, W. B., Majluf, P., Paredes, R., Zavalaga, C., Reul, A. H., Stetter, M., Braselton,  
32 W. E., Puche, H., & Cook, R. A. (2008). Health evaluation of free-ranging Humboldt penguins  
33 (*Spheniscus humboldti*) in Peru. *Avian Diseases*, 52(1), 130-135. [https://doi.org/10.1637/8265-  
34 071007-Reg](https://doi.org/10.1637/8265-071007-Reg)

35

36 Spalding, M. G., Sellers, H. S., Hartup, B. K., & Olsen, G. H. (2008). A wasting syndrome in released  
37 Whooping Cranes in Florida associated with infectious bursal disease titers. In: M. J. Folk, & S. A.  
38 Nesbitt (Eds.), *Proceedings of the Tenth North American Crane Workshop* (p. 202). Zacatecas,  
39 Mexico: North American Crane Working Group.

40

41 Tammiranta, N., Ek-Kommonen, C., Rossow, L., & Huovilainen, A. (2018). Circulation of very  
42 virulent avian infectious bursal disease virus in Finland. *Avian Pathology*, 47, 520-525.  
43 <https://doi.org/10.1080/03079457.2018.1503642>

44

45 Thai, T. N., Jang, I., Kim, H. A., Kim, H. S., Kwon, Y. K., & Kim, H. R. (2021). Characterization of  
46 antigenic variant infectious bursal disease virus strains identified in South Korea. *Avian  
47 Pathology*, 50, 174–181. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03079457.2020.1869698>

48

49 Travis, E. K., Vargas, F. H., Merkel, J., Gottdenker, N., Miller, R. E., & Parker, P. G. (2006a).  
50 Hematology, plasma chemistry, and serology of the flightless cormorant (*Phalacrocorax harrisi*) in

- 1 the Galapagos Islands, Ecuador. *Journal of Wildlife Diseases*, 42, 133-141.  
2 <https://doi.org/10.7589/0090-3558-42.1.133>  
3
- 4 Travis, E. K., Vargas, F. H., Merkel, J., Gottdenker, N., Miller, R. E., & Parker, P. G. (2006b).  
5 Hematology, serum chemistry, and serology of Galápagos penguins (*Spheniscus mendiculus*) in the  
6 Galápagos Islands, Ecuador. *Journal of wildlife diseases*, 42, 625–632. <https://doi.org/10.7589/0090-3558-42.3.625>  
7  
8
- 9 Trifinopoulos, J., Nguyen, L. T., von Haeseler, A., & Minh, B. Q. (2016). W-IQ-TREE: a fast online  
10 phylogenetic tool for maximum likelihood analysis. *Nucleic acids research*, 44.  
11 <https://doi.org/10.1093/nar/gkw256>  
12
- 13 Uhart, M., Thijl Vanstreels, R. E., Gallo, L., Cook, R. A., & Karesh, W. B. (2020). Serological survey  
14 for select infectious agents in wild magellanic penguins (*Spheniscus magellanicus*) in Argentina,  
15 1994-2008. *Journal of Wildlife Diseases*, 56, 66-81. <https://doi.org/10.7589/2019-01-022>  
16
- 17 Vargas-Castillo, L., Soler-Tovar, D., Gómez, A. P., & Santander, A. F., Benavides, E., & Villamil  
18 Jiménez, L. C. (2019). Evaluation of viral agents in wild birds of the Middle-East of Colombia.  
19 *Ornitologia Colombiana*, 17.  
20
- 21 Viechtbauer, W., & Cheung M. W. L. (2010). Outlier and Influence Diagnostics for Meta-  
22 Analysis. *Research Synthesis Methods*, 1, 112–25. <https://doi.org/10.1002/jrsm.11>  
23
- 24 Wang, Y., Zhou, Z., Chunsheng, Z., Luo, H., Ding, C., & Fang, Y. (1997). Studies on the ecology of  
25 infectious bursal disease virus: Serological surveys of non-chicken avian species naturally infected  
26 with IBDV. *Chinese Journal of Veterinary Science and Technology*, 27, 15-16.  
27
- 28 Wang, N. (2018). How to conduct a meta-analysis of proportions in R: A Comprehensive Tutorial.  
29 <http://dx.doi.org/10.13140/RG.2.2.27199.00161>  
30
- 31 Watts, J. M., Miller, G. D., & Shellam, G. R. (2009). Infectious Bursal Disease Virus and Antarctic  
32 Birds. In K. R. Kerry, & M. Riddle (Eds), *Health of Antarctic Wildlife* (pp. 95-105). Berlin,  
33 Heidelberg: Springer. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-540-93923-8\\_5](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-540-93923-8_5)  
34
- 35 Wilcox, G. E., Flower, R. L., Baxendale, W., & Mackenzie, J. S. (1983). Serological survey of wild  
36 birds in Australia for the prevalence of antibodies to egg drop syndrome 1976 (EDS-76) and  
37 infectious bursal disease viruses. *Avian Pathology*, 12, 135-139.  
38 <https://doi.org/10.1080/03079458308436155>  
39
- 40 Wille, M., & Holmes, E. C. (2020). Wild birds as reservoirs for diverse and abundant gamma- and  
41 deltacoronaviruses. *FEMS Microbiol Reviews*, 44, 631-644. <https://doi.org/10.1093/femsre/fuaa026>  
42
- 43 Yamaguchi, T., Ogawa, M., Miyoshi, M., Inoshima, Y., Fukushi, H., & Hirai, K. (1997). Sequence  
44 and phylogenetic analyses of highly virulent infectious bursal disease virus. *Archives of Virology*,  
45 142, 1441-1458. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s007050050171>  
46
- 47 Zhou, Z., Wang, Y., Deng, X., Diao, Z., Gao, J., Shi, Z., Hanlu, S., & Fang, Y. (1998). Survey on the  
48 Ecology and Epidemiology of Infectious Bursal Disease Virus (IBDV). *Chinese Journal of*  
49 *Veterinary Science*, 18, 430-433.  
50  
51

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10

1 **TABLES**

2  
3  
4  
5

**Table 1.** Search lines used for the computerized literature research and number of studies retrieved from each database (PubMed, Scopus, CAB Direct, Web of Science) before duplicates removal.

<b>Database</b>	<b>Search line</b>	<b>No. of studies retrieved</b>
<b>PubMed</b>	(((((infectious bursal disease*[Title/Abstract]) OR "infectious bursal disease virus"[MeSH Terms]) OR "gumboro disease"[Title/Abstract]) OR "ibdv"[Title/Abstract]) OR "birnaviridae infections/veterinary"[MeSH Terms]) AND ((animal, wild[MeSH Terms]) OR "free living"[Title/Abstract]) AND (((“birds”[MeSH Terms]) OR bird*[Title/Abstract]) OR "wild birds"[Title/Abstract]))	14
<b>Scopus</b>	TITLE-ABS("infectious bursal disease virus") OR TITLE-ABS("infectious bursal disease") OR ("Gumboro") OR TITLE-ABS("IBDV") AND (TITLE-ABS("wild") OR TITLE-ABS(*free-living*)) AND TITLE-ABS(*bird*)	49
<b>CAB Direct</b>	(title:"infectious bursal disease virus") OR ab:"infectious bursal disease virus") OR title:"Gumboro disease") OR ab:"gumboro disease") OR title:"IBDV") OR ab:"IBDV")) AND ((title:"wild") OR ab:"wild")) OR (title:(free-living) OR ab:(free-living)) AND (title:"bird") OR ab:"bird))	42
<b>Web of Science</b>	ALL=(("infectious bursal disease" OR "infectious bursal disease virus" OR "avian infectious bursitis" OR "gumboro disease" OR "IBDV") AND (((wild) OR (free-living)) AND (bird*)))	60

6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26

1 **Table 2.** Inclusion criteria applied for screening titles and abstracts of the publications retrieved.

2

---

**All studies (journal articles, book chapter, scientific correspondence, conference proceedings and contributions, short communication) on natural infections of IBDV published after 1970**

---

**All languages**

---

**Full text access**

---

**Virological/molecular study (direct diagnostic methods)**

---

**Serological study (indirect diagnostic methods)**

---

**Samples: blood, tissue samples, swabs**

---

**Free-living wild birds: species of free-range wild birds not living in captivity when the study occurred, exception for wild birds admitted to rehabilitation center**

---

**Sample size > 10**

---

**Population not included in more than one study**

---

3

4

5

6

**Table 3.** Overview of the serological studies on IBDV in wild birds included in the qualitative synthesis of results and in the meta-analysis.

<b>Authors and publication year</b>	<b>Geographic area<sup>†</sup></b>	<b>Study period</b>	<b>Method</b>	<b>Host identification</b>	<b>Total no. birds (total cases)</b>	<b>Apparent prevalence (%)</b>	<b>Sero-type</b>
Leite et al., 2020	South America	n.r.	ELISA <sup>a</sup>	<i>Columbiformes, Passeriformes</i>	30(0)	0	n.a.
Uhart et al., 2020	South America	1994-2008	AGID	<i>Sphenisciformes</i>	337(0)	0	n.a.
Orakpoghenor et al., 2020	Western Africa	2017	ELISA <sup>b</sup>	<i>Columbiformes, Pelecaniformes, Passeriformes</i>	150(3)	2	n.a.
Vargas-Castillo et al., 2019	South America	2012-2013	ELISA <sup>a</sup>	<i>Apodiformes, Columbiformes, Passeriformes</i>	29(0)	0	n.a.
Dwight et al., 2018	Northern America	2014-2015	ELISA <sup>a</sup>	<i>Galliformes</i>	33(23)	69.7	n.a.
Grimaldi et al., 2018	Antarctica	2010-2013	ELISA and VNT	<i>Sphenisciformes</i>	424(10)	2.4	n.r.
Adamu et al., 2017	Western Africa	2014	ELISA <sup>a</sup>	<i>Columbiformes, Passeriformes, Pelecaniformes</i>	195(12)	6.2	n.a.
Parsons et al., 2016	Southern Africa	2007; 2009; 2010-2013	ELISA <sup>a</sup>	<i>Sphenisciformes</i>	443(12)	2.7	n.a.
Assam et al., 2014	Western Africa	2012	AGID	<i>Accipitriformes, Anseriformes, Charadriiformes, Ciconiiformes, Columbiformes, Falconiformes, Galliformes, Gruiformes, Passeriformes, Pelecaniformes, Piciformes</i>	95(0)	0	n.a.

**Table 3. Cont.**

Iman et al., 2013	Northern Africa	2011-2012	serum	AGID	<i>Anseriformes, Charadriiformes, Columbiformes, Coraciiformes, Gruiformes, Passeriformes, Pelecaniformes</i>	41(0)	0	n.a.
Nunes et al., 2012	South America	2012	serum	ELISA <sup>a</sup> and AGID	<i>Sphenisciformes</i>	89(42)	47.2	n.a.
Candelora et al., 2010	Northern America	2004-2007; 1992-1998	serum	VNT	<i>Galliformes, Gruiformes</i>	757(87)	11.5	2
Miller & Shellam, 2010	Antarctica	2008	serum	VNT	<i>Sphenisciformes</i>	560(187)	33.4	n.r.
Watts et al., 2009	Antarctica	1996-2002	serum	VNT	<i>Charadriiformes, Sphenisciformes</i>	1395(190)	13.6	1
Kasanga et al., 2008	Eastern Africa	2005	serum	VNT	<i>Columbiformes, Galliformes</i>	11(0)	0	1
Miller et al., 2008	Antarctica	1999	serum	VNT	<i>Charadriiformes</i>	118(20)	16.9	1
Smith et al., 2008	South America	1992-1994	serum	AGID	<i>Sphenisciformes</i>	20(0)	0	n.a.
Miller & Shellam, 2007	Antarctica	2006	serum	VNT	<i>Sphenisciformes</i>	313(214)	68.4	n.r.
Travis et al., 2006a	South America	2003	serum	AGID	<i>Suliformes</i>	68(0)	0	n.a.
Travis et al., 2006b	South America	2003-2004	serum	AGID	<i>Sphenisciformes</i>	75(0)	0	n.a.
Deem et al., 2005	South America	2000	serum	AGID	<i>Psittaciformes</i>	22(0)	0	n.a.
Gauthier-Clerc et al., 2002	Antarctica	1996-1997	serum	VNT	<i>Sphenisciformes</i>	302(14)	4.6	1; 2
Höfle et al., 2001	Southern Europe	n.r.	serum	VNT	<i>Accipitriformes, Falconiformes, Strigiformes</i>	37(4)	10.8	n.r.

**Table 3. Cont.**

Campbell, 2001	Northern Europe	n.r.	serum	AGID and/or ELISA <sup>a</sup>	<i>Anseriformes, Columbiformes, Galliformes, Passeriformes</i>	41(10)	24.4	n.a.
Hollmén et al., 2000	Northern Europe; Northern America	1998	serum	VNT	<i>Anseriformes, Charadriiformes</i>	211(146)	69.2	1
Fagbohun et al., 2000	Western Africa	n.r.	serum	ELISA	<i>Columbiformes, Pelecaniformes</i>	75(14)	18.7	n.a.
Karesh et al., 1999	South America	1994	serum	AGID	<i>Sphenisciformes</i>	30(0)	0	n.a.
Ogawa et al., 1998	Eastern Asia	1989-1997	serum	VNT	<i>Anseriformes, Charadriiformes, Columbiformes, Falconiformes, Passeriformes, Pelecaniformes, Strigiformes</i>	739(51)	6.9	1; 2
Gu et al., 1998	Eastern Asia	n.r.	serum	AGID	<i>Galliformes</i>	70(14)	20	n.a.
Gardner et al., 1997	Antarctica	1991; 1995-1996	serum	VNT	<i>Sphenisciformes</i>	364(39)	10.7	n.r.
Ezeifeke et al., 1992	Western Africa	n.r.	serum	AGID	<i>Passeriformes, Piciformes</i>	35(0)	0	n.a.
Wilcox et al., 1983	Australia and New Zealand	1977-1979	serum	AGID and VNT	<i>Anseriformes, Charadriiformes, Procellariiformes</i>	397(14)	3.5	1; 2
Nawathe et al., 1978	Western Africa	1977	serum	AGID	<i>Passeriformes, Piciformes</i>	50(6)	12	n.r.

<sup>†</sup>Countries of origin of the studies were grouped into sub-regions as stated by the Statistics Division of the United Nations Secretariat (<https://unstats.un.org/unsd/methodology/m49/overview/>)

<sup>a</sup>ELISA kit: IDEXX IBD<sup>®</sup>, IDEXX Laboratories – specificity and sensitivity on chicken serum (%): 100 and 88, respectively. (De Wit et al., 2001)

<sup>b</sup>ELISA kit: IDEXX IBD-XR<sup>®</sup>, IDEXX Laboratories – specificity and sensitivity on chicken serum (%): 95.4 and 100, respectively (De Wit et al., 2001)

n.a.: not applicable; n.r.: not reported



**Table 4.** Overview of the molecular/virological studies on IBDV in wild birds included in the qualitative synthesis of results.

Authors and publication year	Geographic area	Study period	Sample type	Molecular method	Viral isolation	GenBank accession number	Host identification	Total no. birds (total cases)	Prevalence % (95% C.I.)
Naggar et al., 2020	Northern Africa	2019	cloacal swab	RT-PCR	CAMs (qRT-PCR <sup>‡</sup> )	MT304668 MT304669 MT304670	<i>Anseriformes</i> , <i>Pelecaniformes</i> , <i>Galliformes</i>	28(3)	10.7 (0%-20%)
Vargas-Castillo et al., 2019	South America	2012-2013	cloacal swab	RT-PCR	-	-	<i>Apodiformes</i> , <i>Columbiformes</i> , <i>Passeriformes</i>	48(0)	0
Curland et al., 2018	Western Europe	2011-2014	bursa of Fabricius	RT-PCR	-	-	<i>Galliformes</i>	27(1)	3.8 (0%-11%)
Watts et al., 2009	Antarctica	2000	bursa of Fabricius	RT nested PCR	CAMs	-	<i>Sphenisciformes</i>	23(3) <sup>†</sup>	0 <sup>†</sup>
Kasanga et al., 2008	Eastern Africa	2005	bursa of Fabricius	RT-PCR	-	AB306716	<i>Galliformes</i>	11(1)	9.1 (8%-27%)
Jeon et al., 2008	Eastern Asia	2006-2007	cecal tonsil	RT-PCR	CAMs (RT-PCR <sup>‡</sup> ; AGP <sup>‡</sup> )	EU493342 EU493343 EU493345 EU493344 EU493341	<i>Anseriformes</i> , <i>Charadriiformes</i> , <i>Columbiformes</i> , <i>Passeriformes</i>	107(5)	4.7 (0.7%-9%)

<sup>†</sup> Watts et al. (2009) reported 3 IBDV positive samples interpreted as a possible positive-control contamination after genetic characterization therefore the prevalence (%) was considered as 0.

<sup>‡</sup> Diagnostic tests used to confirm IBDV isolation with CAMs.

**Table 5.** IBDV strains and cell cultures used for virus neutralization test (VNT) as serological screening of IBDV in wild bird samples in the eligible studies which reported the information.

<b>Reference</b>	<b>IBDV strain (serotype)</b>	<b>Cell culture</b>
Grimaldi et al., 2018	GT101 strain (1)	Chicken embryo fibroblast (CEF)
Candelora et al., 2010	Ohio strain (2)	Chicken embryo fibroblast (CEF)
Watts et al., 2009	GT101 strain (1)	Chicken embryo fibroblast (CEF)
Kasanga et al., 2008	GBF-1E strain (1)	Chicken embryo fibroblast (CEF)
Miller et al., 2008	GT101 strain (1)	Chicken embryo fibroblast (CEF)
Gauthier-Clerc et al., 2002	CT strain (1); TY89 strain (2)	Chicken embryo fibroblast (CEF)
Höfle et al., 2001	D78 strain (1)	Chicken embryo liver (CEL)
Ogawa et al., 2008	GBF-1E strain (1); OH strain (2)	Chicken embryo fibroblast (CEF)
Wilcox et al. 1983	PBG98 strain (1); TY89 strain (2)	Chicken embryo fibroblast (CEF)

**Table 6.** Primers and genes amplified for molecular screening of IBDV in wild bird samples in the eligible studies considered.

<b>Reference</b>	<b>Gene(s) amplified</b>	<b>Primers 5'-3'</b>	<b>Location of 5' nucleotide</b>
Naggar et al., 2020	Viral Protein 2	Forward: GCCCAGAGTCTACACCAT Reverse: CCCGGATTATGTCTTTGA	717 1459
Vargas-Castillo et al., 2019	Viral Protein 3; Viral Protein 4	Forward: GTRACRATCACACTGTTCTCAGC Reverse: GATGTRAYTGGCTGGGTTATCTC	804 1050
Curland et al., 2018	Viral Protein 2	Forward: GCCCAGAGTCTACACCAT Reverse: CCCGGATTATGTCTTTGA	717 1459
Watts et al., 2009	Viral Protein 2	Outer set of primers: Forward: TCACCGTCCTCAGCTTA Reverse: TCAGGATTTGGGATCAGC Inner set of primers: Forward: GCCCAGAGTCTACACCATAACTGC Reverse: GCGACCGTAACGACAGATC	587 1212 717 1174
Kasanga et al., 2008	Viral Protein 2	Forward: CCAGAGTCTACACCATAA Reverse: CCTGTTGCCACTCTTTCGTA	719 1189
Jeon et al., 2008	Viral Protein 2	Forward: GCCCAGAGTCTACACCAT Reverse: CCCGGATTATGTCTTTGA	717 1459



## FIGURE LEGENDS


**Figure 1.** PRISMA flow chart of the systematic review method applied to the occurrence of IBDV in free-living wild birds on a global scale ([https://estech.shinyapps.io/prisma\\_flowdiagram/](https://estech.shinyapps.io/prisma_flowdiagram/)).

**Figure 2.** Global distribution of IBDV publications in free-living wild birds included in our study. Green = both direct and indirect diagnostic methods applied in the study; orange = direct diagnostic methods; blue = indirect diagnostic methods. Created with QGIS 3.6.0 (Development Team, 2017).


**Figure 3.** Word cloud showing the number of serological studies on IBDV according to different taxonomic orders of wild birds. Data are ordered from low to high, with light colors for lower number of studies on a specific order and darker color for higher values.

**Figure 4.** Forest plot of the random-effects meta-analysis of IBDV serological prevalence.  $I^2$  (inverse variance index),  $\tau^2$  = the between study variance,  $\chi^2$  and p-value of the Cochran's Q test for heterogeneity.

**Figure 5.** Phylogenetic tree of IBDV VP2 sequences of reference strains and wild bird strains retrieved from eligible virological studies (red square). IBDV strains are clustered into genogroups from G1 to G7 and into serotype 1 and serotype 2. Values for nodes with bootstrap  $>70$  are showed.



**Figure 1.** PRISMA flow chart of the systematic review method applied to the occurrence of IBDV in free-living wild birds on a global scale ([https://estech.shinyapps.io/prisma\\_flowdiagram/](https://estech.shinyapps.io/prisma_flowdiagram/)).




**Figure 2.** Global distribution of IBDV publications in free-living wild birds considered as “eligible” according to pre-established criteria applied as screening method of literature. Green = both direct and indirect diagnostic methods applied in the study; orange = direct diagnostic methods; blue = indirect diagnostic methods. Created with QGIS 3.6.0.




**Figure 3.** Word cloud showing the number of serological studies on IBDV according to different taxonomic orders of wild birds. Data are ordered from low to high, with light colors for lower number of studies on a specific order and darker color for higher values (*Sphenisciformes* n = 12 studies; *Columbiformes* n = 9 studies; *Passeriformes* n = 8 studies; *Charadriiformes* n = 7 studies; *Pelecaniformes*, *Galliformes* n = 6 studies each; *Anseriformes* n = 5 studies; *Accipitriformes*, *Falconiformes* n = 4 studies each; *Procellariiformes*, *Strigiformes* n = 3 studies each; *Gruiformes*, *Piciformes* n = 2 studies each. *Ciconiiformes*, *Psittaciformes* and *Suliformes* with n = 1 study each are not represented).





**Figure 4.** Forest plot of the random-effects meta-analysis of IBDV serological prevalence.  $I^2$  (inverse variance index),  $\tau^2$  = the between study variance,  $\chi^2$  and p-value of the Cochran's Q test for heterogeneity.



**Figure 5.** Phylogenetic tree of IBDV reference strains including wild birds sequences retrieved from eligible virological studies (red square). IBDV strains are grouped into genogroups from G1 to G7 and into serotype 1 and serotype 2. Only nodes with bootstrap values >70 are shown.

This item was downloaded from IRIS Università di Bologna (<https://cris.unibo.it/>)

**When citing, please refer to the published version.**