



## Field Evaluation of Immunogenicity of Five Commercial Vaccines Against Newcastle Disease in Poultry Farms in Ibadan, Nigeria

OLUGASA, B. O.<sup>1</sup>, EMIKPE, B. O.<sup>2</sup>, OLUWAYELU, D. O.<sup>3</sup>, CADMUS, S. I. B.<sup>1</sup>, AYINMODE, A. B.<sup>3</sup> and OLUWOLE, O. E.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Department of Veterinary Public Health and Preventive Medicine, <sup>2</sup>Department of Veterinary Pathology, <sup>3</sup>Department of Veterinary Microbiology and Parasitology, Faculty of Veterinary Medicine, University of Ibadan, Ibadan, Nigeria

### ABSTRACT

This study was conducted to evaluate immunogenicity of five commonly used vaccines for prevention of Newcastle disease (ND) in Ibadan, the capital city of Oyo State Nigeria. Two hundred and twenty (220) blood samples were collected from apparently healthy vaccinated chicken in 8 poultry farms in suburbs of the city. An average of 27 samples was collected from each farm. Blood samples were collected from a total of 72 breeders, 88 layers and 60 pullets. Sera were tested using hemagglutination inhibition (HI) technique to determine antibody levels against ND after vaccination with a commercial ND vaccine. Geometric mean titre (GMT) of antibodies against ND were calculated among flocks. The results indicated significant ( $p < 0.05$ ) difference between the vaccines used. Highest level of immunity was conferred by an imported LaSota vaccine (VAC 2), while lowest immunity was conferred by another imported LaSota vaccine (VAC 1). The present findings indicate that some imported ND vaccines may effectively serve as alternative to the locally produced vaccines. Routine sero-monitoring of poultry response to ND vaccination is advocated to enable farmers monitor immune profile of their flocks. This facility could be part of the services in State Veterinary Laboratories in Nigeria.

**KEY WORDS:** Hemagglutination-inhibition test,

Newcastle disease, seromonitoring, vaccine efficacy.

### INTRODUCTION

Newcastle disease (ND) also called Avian Distemper or Velogenic Viscerotropic Newcastle Disease (VVND) is an acute infectious and highly contagious disease (Ohore *et al.*, 2002) with the potential of causing 100% morbidity and mortality in unvaccinated poultry (Chakrabarti *et al.*, 2006). The disease has both epizootic and enzootic patterns in different flocks or population but, it is an epizootic in intensive poultry and is responsible for most economic losses associated with poultry production (Awan *et al.*, 1994). The occurrence of highly virulent NDV infections are recognized as a notifiable disease reportable to the Office of International Epizootics (Agbede *et al.*, 1992) and is one of the main sanitary barriers for the free trade of poultry and poultry products (OIE, 1996, Chitate and Gutal, 2011). It is of great economic importance causing devastating losses among both intensive, extensive poultry birds and traditional village poultry that provides lifeline to many poor people across the developing world (Anon, 2010).

Newcastle disease had been present in

Nigeria since 1951, and ever since, it's still occasionally occurs in epidemic proportions. A seasonal variation has been observed in the incidence of the disease in the country with more outbreaks occurring in the dry season between October and March (Onunkwo and Momoh, 1981, El-Yuguda *et al.* 2004). Apart from pathogenic Avian Influenza, ND is a most dreaded disease of poultry industry in Nigeria (Echeonwu and Iroegbu, 1993).

In the control of this disease bio-security and hygiene measures are very essential in the prevention of the introduction or the spread of the disease. Such measures include: quarantine (Alexander 2001; Alexander *et al.*, 2004; Anon, 2010), restriction of movements, isolation of sick birds, vaccination (Anon, 2010), destruction of birds infected with ND, resting the contaminated environment, proper litter disposal, destruction of pests, use of disinfectants for cleaning all surfaces, equipment and vehicles, use of bird-proofed houses, food stores and water tanks, provision of clean clothing and cleansing facilities for employees, maintenance of all-in, all-out philosophy of flock management, keeping pet birds out of the farm, education of farmers, well-manned poultry extension service (Alexander *et al.*, 2004, Anon, 2010).

In addition to bio-security measures, vaccination is an important effort towards the control of ND (Alexander 2001). The use of viable non-pathogenic isolates of Newcastle disease virus to immunize poultry against pathogenic strains of the virus has been a common practice since the B1 strain was first described in 1948. Numerous ND virus with different levels of pathogenicity have been used to achieve desired immunologic response (Beard *et al.*, 1992), using different vaccination regimes (Emikpe *et al.* 2007).

The different types of vaccines commonly used include live, killed and inactivated vaccines. Vaccines containing inactivated ND virus in oil emulsion adjuvant do induce long term protection against viscerotropic velogenic ND so also live vaccines such as LaSota strains, Hitchner B1 and Komarov have gained acceptance by poultry producers in several countries (Nishizawa *et al.*, 2007). Thermostable Newcastle disease vaccines, given to village flocks had substantially protected the flock against ND (Alexander 2001; Anon, 2010). Despite rigorous vaccination programs, outbreak of ND are often reported in vaccinated as well as unvaccinated flocks. Outbreaks in vaccinated flocks are thought to be due to faulty administration (including administration by quacks), handling of the vaccines due to transport difficulties, high ambient temperatures, lack of refrigeration (Mgomezulu *et al.*, 2009), low immunogenicity of the vaccine, non-relatedness to the field strain, poor management of flocks or the presence of inter-current disease. In Nigeria, where there is little information as to the efficacy of most commonly employed ND vaccination regimes, farmers tend to repeat vaccination at relatively short intervals due to uncertainty of protective immune profile. The need to evaluate the field situation as regards the effectiveness of some available ND vaccines in the market is expedient. The aim of this study is to compare post-vaccination serum antibody level of different ND vaccines.

## **MATERIALS AND METHODS**

### **Study areas**

This study was conducted between April and June, 2011. Study areas were farms in suburbs of Ibadan, capital city of Oyo State (Latitude 7° 23' N and Longitude 3° 56' E). The main hub of the poultry industry in Nigeria is located within the south-western

states of the country (Oyo, Osun, Ogun and Lagos). Ibadan is a major central city in the south-western hub. Thus, the city is important in the national production and distribution of most poultry commodities, ranging from chicks to point-of-lay pullets, spent layers, commercial broilers and poultry inputs such as drugs, vaccines and feed ingredients. The city has 11 local government areas (LGAs). Five of these are in the main city and 6 are in the suburbs. Most poultry production activities take place in the suburb LGAs of Akinyele, Ido, Oluyole, Ona Ara, Egbeda and Lagelu (OLUWOLE et al., 2012).

### **Sampling of poultry farms**

Only poultry farms within the suburb LGAs of Akinyele, Ido, Oluyole, Ona Ara, Egbeda and Lagelu were included in this study. This purposive selection was used to focus the study on areas within Ibadan that were well known for large number of poultry farms. There were an estimated 320 poultry farms within the 6 LGAs combined. Most of these poultry farms were not registered with Oyo State Branch of Poultry Farmers Association of Nigeria. The poultry farms in the catchment area were stratified into commercial and breeder stock categories. Stratified simple random sampling method was used to select the farms surveyed in each category (stratum). Thus, only one or two farms were targeted from each LGA for blood collection in flock. Flocks A and B were from two farms in Lagelu LGA, flock H was from a farm in Egbeda LGA, Flock F was from a farm in Ido LGA, flocks C and D are from two farms in Oluyole LGA while flock G was from a farm in Onaara LGA and flock E was from a farm in Akinyele LGA (Table I).

### **Poultry management and types of vaccines used**

Management systems were uniformly

battery cage for layer birds and deep litter for breeders. Pullets were on deep litter system. Ages of birds varied from 4 months in pullets and average of 10 months in layers to 24 months in breeders. The five vaccines investigated are identified as VAC1 to VAC5. VAC1 is an imported, live freeze-dried vaccine brand of La Sota indicated for the immunization of fowls against ND by administration in the drinking water, by spray or by eye-drop or nasal instillation. The farms investigated used the oral method of administration. VAC2 is an imported, live freeze-dried vaccine, a second brand of LaSota (B) (Table I). VAC3 is imported attenuated live-vaccine, a brand of Komarov prescribed as safe when given to birds not less than six weeks of age. Each dose of 0.5 ml VAC3 was inoculated intramuscularly (I/M). VAC4 is the third brand of imported LaSota (C). VAC5 is local brand of Komarov ND vaccine.

### **Route of blood collection**

Blood samples were obtained through wing veno-puncture. About 1.5 - 2.0 ml of blood was aseptically collection from each bird and delivered into 5ml plain sample bottle. Blood was allowed to clot and serum was separated and stored at -4°C in eppendorff tube until tested. Blood samples were collected from a total of 220 apparently healthy birds. On the average, 27 samples were collected from each farm. The sample size comprised 72 breeders 88 layers and 60 pullets.

### **Haemagglutination Inhibition (HI) Test**

Haemagglutination Inhibition (HI) test was performed according to the method described by Thayer and Beard (1988). The HI titre was the reciprocal of the highest dilution of serum which completely inhibits haemagglutination (Alexander *et al.*, 2004). HI test is based on the principle

that the haemagglutinin on the viral envelope can bring about agglutination of chicken red blood cells (RBC) and this can be inhibited by specific antibodies to ND virus antigen. HI remains a sensitive and specific test, and comparable to Enzyme Linked Immunosorbent Assay that is also commonly used (Alexander *et al.*, 2004). The Geometric Mean Titres (GMT) of the flocks was determined and vaccines used for the flocks were compared using student T-test statistics.

varied with some vaccines yielding exceptionally higher antibody titre than

## **RESULTS**

Sera from different farms gave varied antibody titres on HI test. Flock E gave highest antibody titre (3.0) followed by flock C (2.7). Flocks C, D and E however gave the highest level of immunity (100%) followed by flock G (78%) (Table II). Flock A had the least mean antibody titre (0.24) and the lowest level of immunity (0%). Flock E had the highest modal antibody titre (3.0).

The interval between the date of last ND vaccination and the time of blood sample collection was however not the same for all the samples. For flock E, both the antibody titre, the modal antibody titre and percentage immunity (2.71, 3.01 and 100% respectively) were still high in spite of the fact that the flocks had the longest time interval between the last vaccination and date of sample collection (Table I). The GMT of the flocks was also compared based on the vaccine brand used since different brands of ND vaccines were used to prevent the disease in the different flocks.

## **DISCUSSION**

This investigation showed that all the vaccines commonly used for the control of ND in Nigerian poultry are immunogenic (Emikpe *et al.*, 2007), however the titre



**Table I:**  
**Number of birds sampled, their age groups, management systems and post-vaccination interval before assessment of ND antibodies among poultry farms in Ibadan, Nigeria**

| Farm Identification and location      | A           | B            | C             | D             | E            | F            | G                | H           |
|---------------------------------------|-------------|--------------|---------------|---------------|--------------|--------------|------------------|-------------|
|                                       | Lagelu      | Lagelu       | Oluyole       | Oluyole       | Akinyele     | Ido          | Onaara           | Egbeda      |
| Vaccine Used                          | VAC 1       | VAC 1        | VAC 2         | VAC 2         | VAC 2        | VAC3         | VAC4             | VAC 5       |
| Flock Type                            | Pullets     | Layers       | Layer Breeder | Layer Breeder | Layers       | Layers       | Broiler Breeders | Pullets     |
| Management System                     | Deep Litter | Battery Cage | Deep Litter   | Deep Litter   | Battery Cage | Battery Cage | Deep Litter      | Deep Litter |
| Vaccination Date(2011)                | May 30      | March 5      | June 15       | June 15       | March 29     | May 27       | June 02          | June 20     |
| Sample Collection Date(2011)          | July 11     | July 11      | July 13       | July 13       | July 21      | July 12      | July 13          | July 11     |
| Time Interval (Days)                  | 42          | 128          | 29            | 29            | 114          | 49           | 42               | 21          |
| Bird Age at sample collection (Weeks) | 13          | 68           | 75            | 75            | 42           | 36           | 39               | 14          |
| Number of Samples                     | 30          | 27           | 24            | 24            | 26           | 27           | 24               | 30          |

**Table II:**  
**Brands of Newcastle disease vaccine and post vaccination haemagglutination inhibition antibody levels among chicken from eight poultry farms in Ibadan, Nigeria**

| Flock Identification      | A                       | B                       | C                            | D                           | E                           | F                    | G                     | H                  |
|---------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|------------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|----------------------|-----------------------|--------------------|
| Mean Antibody Titre       | 1:2.5                   | 1:210.9                 | 1:552                        | 1:348                       | 1:535                       | 1:243                | 1:224                 | 1:86.7             |
| GMT (±SD)                 | 0.24(0.19)              | 0.89(1.33)              | 2.65 <sup>ab</sup><br>(0.31) | 2.50 <sup>a</sup><br>(0.26) | 2.71 <sup>b</sup><br>(0.35) | 2.22 (0.403)         | 2.15 (0.315)          | 1.38<br>(0.84)     |
| Mode (log <sub>2</sub> )  | 0                       | 0                       | 2.7                          | 2.4                         | 3.01                        | 2.4                  | 2.1                   | 1.5                |
| Percentage Inhibition (%) | 0                       | 32                      | 100                          | 100                         | 100                         | 72                   | 78                    | 19                 |
| Vaccine Used              | VAC 1 imported LaSota A | VAC 1 imported LaSota A | VAC 2 imported LaSota B      | VAC 2 imported LaSota B     | VAC 2 imported LaSota B     | VAC3imported Komarov | VAC4imported LaSota C | VAC 5local Komarov |

GMT with superscripts are significant in value (P<0.05)

**REFERENCE**

ADU, F.D., OYEJIDE, O. and IKEDA, B.O. (1985). Characterization of Nigerian strains of Newcastle

- Disease Virus. *Avian Diseases* 29. 3:829-831.
- ALEXANDER, D.J. (2001). Newcastle disease – The Gordon Memorial Lecture. *British Poultry Science*, **42**: 5-22
- ALEXANDER, D.J., BELL, J.G. and ALDERS, R.G. (2004). FAO Technology Review: Newcastle Disease. Retrieved August 1, 2011 <http://fao.org/docrep/005/ac802e04.htm>.
- ANON (2010). Exotic Newcastle Disease. Retrieved August 1, 2011, from <http://www.cidrap.umn.edu/cidrap/content/biotechnology/ag-biotech/animdisease/exnewcastle.html#top>.
- AWAN, M. A., OTTE, M. J. and JAMES, A. D. (1994). The epidemiology of Newcastle disease in rural poultry: *Avian Pathology* 23. 3:405-423.
- BEARD, C.W., VILLEGAS, P. and GLISSON, J.R. (1992). Comparative Efficacy of the B-1 and VG/GA Vaccine Strains against Velogenic Viscerotropic Newcastle Disease Virus in Chickens. *Avian Diseases* 37:222-225.
- CHAKRABARTI, S., KING, D.J., CARDONA, C., AFONSO, C.L., SWAYNE, D.E. and GERRY, A.C. (2006). Potential role of flies in the persistence and dispersal of exotic Newcastle disease virus in Southern California. *Livestock Insect Worker's Conference Annual Meeting*. p. 34.
- CHITATE, F. and GUTAL, M. (2011). Country Report: Zimbabwe. Retrieved August 9, 2011, from <http://aciarc.gov.au/files/node/2131/pr103chapter12zimbabwe.pdf>. 09/08 2011.
- ECHEONWU GON and IROEGBU AC (1993). Recovery of velogenic Newcastle disease virus from dead and healthy free-roaming birds in Nigeria. *Avian Pathology*, 22: 383-387.
- EL-YUGUDA., DOKAS and BABA (2004). The effects of Newcastle Disease and Infectious Bursal Disease Vaccines, Climate and other Factors on the Village Chicken Population in North-Eastern Nigeria. WFL Publisher, *Science & Technology*. Retrieved January 14, 2008, from <http://www.isfae.org/scientificjournal/2005/issue/abstracts/abstract11.php>.
- EMIKPE, B.O., AKPAVIE, S.O and ADENE, D.F. (2001). Influence of parenteral route on oral route of local IBD vaccine administration on the responses of broiler chicks. *Revue d'Elevage et de Medecine Veterinaire des Pays Tropicaux* **54** (3-4): 213-216
- EMIKPE B.O, AKPAVIE S.O, ADENE D.F, (2003). Immune response of broiler chicks to local IBD Vaccine using different routes of administration. *African Journal of Clinical and Experimental Microbiology* **3**(2): 95-97.
- EMIKPE, B.O., OLADELE, O.A., IKUBOR, A.O. and OCKIYA, M.A. (2007). The laboratory assessment of common Newcastle vaccination regimes in use in Nigerian Poultry. *Journal of Animal and Veterinary Advances*. **6**: 971-974.
- MGOMEZULU, R.A., ALDERS, R.G., CHIKUNGWA, P.B., YOUNG, M.P., LIPITA, W.G. and WANDA, G.W. (2009). Trials with a thermotolerant I-2 Newcastle disease vaccine in confined Australorp chickens and scavenging village chickens in Malawi. Retrieved August 9, 2011, from <http://aciarc.gov.au/files/node/111>

- 33/PR131%20part%202.pdf.
- NISHIZAWA, M., PAULILLO, AC., NAKAGHI, LSO., NUNES, AD., CAMPIONI, J.M. AND DORETTO, J.L. (2007). Newcastle disease in white Pekin ducks: response to experimental vaccination and challenge. *Rev. Bras. Cienc. Avic.* 9.
- OHORE, O.G., OZEGBE, P.C., EMIKPE, B.O., OKOJIE, V.E. (2002). Survey of antibodies to Newcastle disease virus in apparently healthy adult Nigerian indigenous chickens (*Gallus domesticus*) in Ibadan Using ELISA. *African Journal of Clinical & Experimental Microbiology* 3(1): 38-40.
- OIE. (1996). Manual for animal disease reporting to the Office International des Epizooties (OIE) Paris: World Organization for Animal Health.
- OLUGASA BO, ODENIYI AO, ADEOGUN AO and OA ADEOLA (2010). Antibody levels against rabies among occupationally exposed individuals in a Nigerian University. *Veterinaria Italiana* 46 (1):21-28
- OLUGASA BO, AIYEDUN JO and EMIKPE BO (2011). Prevalence of antibodies against rabies among confined, free-roaming and stray dogs in a transit city of Nigeria. *Veterinaria Italiana* 47(4) 453-460
- OLUWOLE JO, EMIKPE BO and OLUGASA BO (2012). Attitude of poultry farmers towards vaccination against Newcastle disease and avian influenza in Ibadan, Nigeria. *Sokoto Journal of Veterinary Sciences* 10 (1): 5-12.
- ONUNKWO, O. and MOMOH, MA. 1981. Characterization of a Newcastle disease virus isolated from a Parrot (*Psittacus erythracus*) in Nigeria. *Journal of Wildlife Diseases* 17(3): 463.
- ROY, P., VENUGOPALAN, A. T. and DHILLON, A. S. (2003). Efficacy of two commercial Newcastle disease virus lentogenic vaccines against virulent asiatic type Newcastle disease viruses. *Poultry Science Association, Inc.* 12:169-173.
- THAYER, S. G. and C. W. BEARD, (1998). Serologic procedures. In: *A Laboratory Manual for the Isolation and Identification of Avian Pathogens*. 4<sup>th</sup> Ed., American Association of Avian Pathologists, Philadelphia, USA, pp: 256- 258.