# **BACTERIAL EMPIRE**



# **REGULAR ARTICLE**

# MOLECULAR DIAGNOSIS OF RICKETTSIAE INFECTING CAMELS AND IXODID TICKS IN EGYPT

Hend H.A.M. Abdullah<sup>1</sup>, Amal El-Molla<sup>2</sup>, Fayez A. Salib<sup>2</sup>, Alaa A. Ghazy<sup>1\*</sup>, Nesreen A.T. Allam<sup>1</sup>, Yasser M. Sanad<sup>1,3</sup> & Sobhy Abdel-Shafy<sup>1</sup>

#### Address (es): Anjana Thuduhenge Dona

<sup>1</sup>Department of Parasitology and Animal Diseases, Veterinary Research Division, National Research Centre, Elbehouth Street, Postal Code: 12622, Dokki, Giza, Egypt. <sup>2</sup>Department of Infectious Diseases, Faculty of Veterinary Medicine, Cairo University, Giza, Egypt.

<sup>3</sup>Department of Agriculture, School of Agriculture, Fisheries and Human Sciences, University of Arkansas, Pine Bluff, AR, USA.

\*Corresponding author: aaghazy7@hotmail.com

## ABSTRACT

Rickettsioses including their pathogens, vectors, and hosts have an epidemiological importance and zoonotic importance. The objective of the present article was to define the prevalence and genotypic properties of *Rickettsia* in camels and their ticks in Egypt. Sixty one blood samples and 99 adult ticks were taken from camel hosts from Cairo, Giza and Sinai, during a period extending from 2013 to 2014. Based on the morphological identification of both male and female tick specimens, 91.9 % of the collected ticks were *Hyalomma dromedarii*. The prevalence of *Rickettsia* in camels using Gimenez staining technique and PCR was 0 and 41 %, respectively. The rickettsiae infection in ticks recorded 10.1 and 1.01 %, by Gimenez stain and PCR, respectively. Further, the phylogenetic analysis was conducted based on the sequences of *OmpA* and *gltA*genes and three intergenic spacers (*mppA*, *dksA* and *rpmE*) of *Rickettsia* species. The phylogenetic analyses revealed a novel strain of *Rickettsia* africae in *Hyalomma marginatum* that was collected from camel in Sinai province. In addition, the phylogenetic analysis based on Clustal omega suggested that *Rickettsia* sequences which detected in camels were *R. africae*. Moreover, the highest Rickettsiai infection rate was recorded in age groups of 17 to 19 years (80.0 %), Abady camel breeds (56.8 %) and ticks-infested camels (42.8 %). Concerning hematological changes, macrocytic anemia and leucopenia were recorded in camels with rickettsioses. The molecular characterization of *Rickettsia* detected in camels and their tick vectors will help in a better understanding of the epidemiological approach of rickettsioses in Egypt.

Keywords: Camels, Hyalomma species, rickettsioses, Multi-genes typing

#### INTRODUCTION

Rickettsioses are considered emerging and re-emerging zoonotic vector-borne diseases (Parola and Raoult, 2001; Dantas-Torres *et al.*, 2012; Kernif *et al.*, 2012b; Parola *et al.*, 2013). Rickettsioses in general have high morbidity and low mortality except some *Rickettsia* spp. such as *Rickettsia rickettsia*, which showed high mortality in both dogs and human (Raoult and Roux, 1997; Parola *et al.*, 2005; 2013).

The order Rickettsiales are simply known obligatory intracellular gram negative bacilli, cocci or thread-like bacteria that retained basic fuchsin when stained by Gimenez stain (Gimenez, 1964; Fournier and Raoult, 2007; Kang *et al.*, 2014). The taxonomy of Rickettsiae has undergone extensive reorganization (Raoult and Roux, 1997; Hechemy *et al.*, 2003). The order Rickettsiales includes Anaplasmataceae and Rickettsiaceae families. The 16S rRNA, *gltA*, *ompA*, *ompB*, and *sac 4* genes were suggested for rickettsial taxonomy (Dumler *et al.*, 2001; Fournier *et al.*, 2003). The rickettsiae are divided into four groups; Spotted Fever (SFG), Typhus (TG), *R. belli* and *R. candensis* group (Fournier an ARoult, 2007; Merhej and Raoult, 2011).

Ticks are considered secondary to mosquitoes in their ability to transmit diseases (Hillyard, 1996). They are the main vectors and reservoirs of *Rickettsia* spp.; especially SFG Rickettsiae that were transmitted transstadially through the developmental stages and transovarial (Raoult and Roux, 1997; Anderson and Magnorelli, 2008; Socolovschi *et al.*, 2009b). Ixodid ticks (hard ticks) transmit the microorganisms to vertebrates through tick bites via their salivary secretions, or through feces and blood transfusion (Socolovschi *et al.*, 2009b).

In Egypt, *Hyalomma* species are the most dominant ticks on camels, especially *H. dromedarii*, *H. marginatum*, *H. excavatum*, and *H. impeltatum* (Abdel-Shafy, 2000; El-Kammah *et al.*, 2001; Abdel-Shafy *et al.*, 2012).

Tick-borne rickettsioses have been diagnosed serologically in animals and human (Botros et al., 1989; Soliman et al., 1989; Corwin et al., 1992; 1993; Reynolds, 2004). In previous studies, SFG were detected in *Rhipicephalus* sanguineus and Hyalomma spp. from Sinai (Lange et al., 1992; Loftis et al., 2006ab). Socolovschi and his colleagues detected *R. sibirica mongolitimonae* in a traveler returned from Egypt to France (Socolovschi et al., 2010). Moreover, *R. africae* was recorded for the first time in Hyalomma spp. in Egypt by Abdel-Shafy et al. (2012). In addition, *R. aeschlimannii* alsohas been reported in Hyalomma spp. by Loftis et al. (2006ab) and Abdel-Shafy et al. (2012).

The diagnosis of rickettsioses is still considered a challengedue to the non-specific clinical signs, laboratory abnormalities and/or subclinical infection

(Gasser et al., 2001; Parola et al., 2005; 2013). Molecular techniques were applied targeting accurate and rapid detection and identification of *Rickettsia* spp. PCR followed by sequencing improved the sensitivity of diagnosis and specificity of taxonomy (Parola et al., 2013; Guillemi et al., 2015). Primers amplifying the *OmpA* and gltA genes were less conserved genes, so it had a higher discriminating power between genomes of SPG *Rickettsia* spp. (Roux et al., 1997; Fournier et al., 1998). Moreover, intergenic spacers (*mppA*, dksA and *rpmE*) were more variable than genes and conserved spacers (Fournier et al., 2004). Therefore, they had highly variable sequences.

Few previous studies aimed to detect rickettsioses in camel ticks. However, to the best of our knowledge, this is the first study to detect camels' rickettsioses in Egypt. Camels have been used in meat and milk production, security purposes in desert and border areas, also in racing as a traditional sport. Therefore, the objectives of this study were the determination of the prevalence of tick-borne rickettsioses in camels and their ixodid tick vectors at different provinces in Egypt, in addition the molecular characterization of novel genotypes of *Rickettsia* compared to the previously published genotypes. The genotypic relationship between these *Rickettsia* species and previously recorded worldwide is targeted by *OmpA*, *gltA*, *mpA*, *dksA* and *rpmE* sequences alignment with GenBank related records.

#### MATERIALS AND METHODS

#### Sampling sites and collections (Animals and Ticks)

Sixty one camels were examined for the presence of ticks at Cairo, Giza and Sinai from Mar. 2013 - Oct. 2014. AnEDTA-whole blood (5 ml each) was collected from jugular vein of each animal. The blood samples were used for hematological studies, preparing blood smears for Gimenez staining techniques (Gimenez, 1964). An amount of blood per animal was stored at -20 °C for molecular studies. Other blood samples were collected without anticoagulants for serum separation. Sera were used for further biochemical parameters investigations. The animals were checked for tick infestations through their whole body (Abdullah *et al.*, 2016b). Ninety nine adult ticks were collected from animals. Ticks were transferred to the lab for further processing.

## **Ticks Identification**

Ticks were identified according to the taxonomic keys of Hoogstraal and Kaiser (1958), and Estrada-Peña *et al.* (2004). Further, hemolymph staining technique was performed for all collected ticks according to Gimenez (1964). Then, the ticks were stored at -20 °C until DNA was extracted for molecular studies.

#### **DNA** extraction

The DNA was extracted from blood samples using GF-1 Tissue Blood Combi DNA Extraction Kit (SNF, Vivantis, Malaysia) according to the manufacturer's instructions. The DNA of adult ticks was extracted after dividing the tick body

 Table 1 Primers utilized in amplification and sequencing of genes

**DNA Marker** 5'- Primers Sequences-3' **Amplified Fragments** References OmpA gene 190.70-F 5'-ATGGCGAATATTTCTCCAAAA-3' 590-634 bp Fournier et al. (1998) 5'-GTTCCGTTAATGGCAGCATCT-3' 190.701-R gltA gene CS2d-F 5'-ATGACCAATGAAAATAATAAT-3' 852-1265 bp Roux et al. (1997) 5'-CTTATACTCTCTATGTACA-3' Mediannikov et al. (2004) CSEnd-R **Intergenic spacers:** 5'-GCAATTATCGGTCCGAATG-3 mppA-purC-F 155-197 bp 5'-TTTCATTTATTTGTCTCAAAATTCA-3' mppA-purC-R dksA-xerC-F 5'-TCCCATAGGTAATTTAGGTGTTTC-3' 164-292 bp Fournier et al. (2004) dksA-xerC-R 5'-TACTACCGCATATCCAATTAAAAA-3' rmpE-tRNA-F 5'-TCAGGTTATGAGCCTGACGA-3' 297-417 bp rmpE-tRNA-R 5'-TTCCGGAAATGTAGTAAATCAATC-3'

#### PCR amplification of target sequences

The PCR amplifications were performed in a PTC- $100^{TM}$  thermal cycler according the protocol described by **Abdel-Shafy** *et al.* (2012) and **Abdullah** *et al.* (2016a). PCR products were electrophoresed in 1.5 % agarose gels. The gels were stained with ethidium bromide. A 100 bp ladder was used with each gel. The Gel photos were analyzed by Lab Image software (BioRad).

#### Sequencing of PCR products

The PCR products were purified by ExoSAP-IT PCR Product Cleanup Kit according to manufacturer's recommendation. Sequencing reactions were performed in an MJ Research PTC-225 Peltier Thermal Cycler using an ABI PRISM®BigDye<sup>™</sup> Terminator Cycle Sequencing Kits with AmpliTaq® DNA polymerase (FS enzyme; Applied Biosystems), following the protocols supplied by the manufacturer. The sequencing was performed in Macrogen Center, Seoul, South Korea. Each sequencing reaction was repeated at least three times.

#### Data submission in GenBank

The sequences of *OmpA*, *gltA* and intergenic spacers were aligned, assembled and corrected using ChromasPro 1.49 beta (Technelysium Pty. Ltd., Tewantin, QLD, Australia), then the corrected *Rickettsia* sequences were submitted in GenBank (http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/genbank/) to record each sequence with accession number.

#### Phylogenetic relationship and Multigene typing

Amplified sequences of each fragment were aligned using Blastn program of NCBI (http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/BLAST/) for sequence homology searches against *Rickettsia* spp. GenBank database. Multiple sequences alignments for evolutionary relationships between new Egyptian records and other reference isolates were inferred using the ClustalW 1.8<sup>®</sup> program (**Dessen** *et al.*, **1990**) after modification of sequences length by BioEdit sequence alignment editor (v. 7.0.9.0). In addition, the percent of the identity matrix were constructed by using Clustal omega (http://www.ebi.ac.uk/Tools/msa/clustalo/). Using the MEGA4 software, two phylogenetic trees were constructed with the neighbor joining method (NJ) (Saitou and Nei, 1987; Tamura *et al.*, 2007), and the unweighted pair group method with arithmetic mean (UPGMA) (**Dawyndt** *et al.*, 2006). The

into quarters. The DNA was extracted by high salt concentration protocol (**Zilberman** *et al.*, **2006**). The purity and concentration of DNA were measured by nanodrop 2000c (Thermo Scientific) and stored at -20°C.

#### **Primers Design**

The primers of *OmpA* and *gltA* genes were designed according to **Fournier** *et al.* (1998), **Roux** *et al.* (1997) and **Mediannikov** *et al.* (2004) (Table 1). *Rickettsia* positive sample further characterized using primers targeting intergenic spacers (*mppA*, *dksA* and *rpmE*) (Fournier et al. 2004) (Table 1).

evolutionary distances were calculated by the maximum composite likelihood method (**Tamura** *et al.*, **2004**). Percentage of replicate trees in which the associated taxa clustered together in the bootstrap test (500 replicates) is shown next to the branches (**Felsenstein**, **1985**, **2004**).

#### Hematological and Biochemical profiles

Haematological parameters including total erythrocytic count (RBCs), total leucocytic count (WBCs), differential leucocytic count (DLC), haemoglobin (Hb) and packed cell volume (PCV) were done as described by **Schalm** *et al.* (1986). All biochemical prameters were determined spectrophotometerically. Serum total protein (Biuret method) was determined according to **Gornal** *et al.* (1949). Serum albumin was determined according to **Doumas** *et al.* (1971). Serum globulin was determined by subtraction of serum albumin from serum total protein according to **Doumas** *et al.* (1971). A/G ratio was estimated by dividing the albumin content on globulin value. Serum AST and ALT were determined according to **Belfield and Goldberg (1971)**. Serum Urea was determined according to **Fawcett and Soctt (1960)**. Serum Creatinine was determined according to **Schirmeister (1964)**.

#### Statistical analysis

Statistical analysis for hematological and biochemical parameters was performed using Student's *t* test (SPSS 14.0 for Windows Evaluation Version). Probability values (P-value) < 0.05 were considered of statistical significant and < 0.001 were considered of high statistical significant.

#### RESULTS

During sampling, the main clinical signs were observed in the 61 tested camels ranged between apparently healthy (n = 49) to number of camels with fever (n = 9), anorexia (n = 6), Lethargy (n = 5), anemia (n = 8), enlargement of superficial lymph nodes (n = 2), and emaciation (n = 2). In addition, the five tick species found in Cairo, Giza, and Sinai were identified into *Hyalomma* species. Where, the camel tick *H. dromedarii* was the most dominant that recorded 91.9 % (Table 2). *H. marginatum, H. impeltatum, H. excavatum* and *H. rufipes* recorded low infestation (Table 2).

			No. of positives with <i>Rickettsia</i> spp.						
Camels and	Prevalence of Gimenez staining		PCR using						
Ticks species	INO.	Tick species (%)	techn	ique	OmpA&gltA genes				
			No.	%	No.	%			
Camels	61	_	0	0	25	41			
Hayalommaspp.	99	100	10/99	10.1	1/99	1.01			
H. dromedarii	91/99	91.9	8/91	8.79	0	0			
H. marginatum	5/99	5.05	1/5	20	1/5	20			
H. excavatum	1/99	1.01	0	0	0	0			
H. impeltatum	1/99	1.01	1/1	100	0	0			
H. rufipes	1/99	1.01	0	0	0	0			

Table 2 The prevalence of Rickettsia spp. in camels and their tick by Gimenez stain and PCR

# Prevalence of tick-borne rickettsioses in camels and their tick vectors

The prevalence of Rickettsiaspp. in camels and their tick species using Gimenez staining technique was 0 % and 10.1 %, respectively (Table 2). Moreover, all blood camels' specimens and their ticks were screened by PCR amplifying fragments of OmpA and gltA genes with the products sizes 500 to 600 bp and 1000 to 1200 bp, respectively (Fig.1). For more discrimination, the Rickettsia positive samples were further screened by intergenic spacers amplification (mppA, dksA and rpmE), where the obtained fragment sizes were 146, 229 and 344 bp, respectively. The total of 25/61 camel samples (4 OmpA and 23 gltA) and 1/99 ticks' samples (H. marginatum from Sinai province) were confirmed positive. Therefore, the prevalence of rickettsioses using PCR was 41.0 % in camels and 1.01 % in their tick species (Table 2).



Fig 1 Molecular identification of Rickettsia spp. by PCR products detected in camels and Hyalomma species in 1.5 % agarose gels stained with ethidium bromide. In all figures, lane M: 100 bp DNA ladder and lane N: Control negative. (a) Lane P presents600 bp amplicon of OmpA Rickettsia positive tick sample and lanes 1 to4 present 600 bp amplicon of OmpA Rickettsia positive samples of camels. (b) Lane P presents1200 bp amplicon of gltA Rickettsia positive tick sample and lanes 1 to 5 present 1000 bp amplicon of OmpA Rickettsia positive samples of camels. (c) Lane P presents 146 bp amplicon of mppA Rickettsia positive tick sample. (d) Lane P presents 229 bp amplicon of dksA Rickettsia positive tick sample. (e) Lane P presents 344 bp amplicon of rpmE Rickettsia positive tick sample.

#### Sequences Analyses and Genbank Accession Numbers

The obtained Egyptian Rickettsia sequences of OmpA and gltA genes and intergenic spacers (mppA, dksA and rpmE) from H. marginatum tick were submitted in GenBank and registered with accession numbers KX819299, KX819298, KX819297, KX819295 and KX819296, respectively. The identities of obtained Rickettsia sequences were ranged from 97-100 % in comparison to Rickettsia strains recorded in Genbank (Table 3 and 4). The present results revealed that the Egyptian new isolates were similar to R. africae (KX819299, KX819298, KX819297, KX819295 and KX819296) and closely matching to the reference counterparts previously recorded in Saini-Egypt (HQ335132.1, HQ335126.1, HQ335143.1, HQ335138.1 and HQ335144.1), respectively (Table 3). Moreover, the partial sequence of OmpA gene of Rickettsia amplified from camel (no. 61) showed 48.68 % similarity with R. africae accession no. U83436.2 (Table 3).

Table 3	GenBank	accession	numbers	of Egy	ntian <sup>†</sup>	Rickettsial	amplified	from	camels a	and their	tick	vectors
	O ULID CHILL	accession.		01 257	percent .	I CIVILUCCOICCI	ampinea		ettitero t	and the the		

		221	1						
Companyon trimo	Animals and Ti	cks	Egyptian Rickettsial	GenBank	GenBank Similarity with recorded <i>Rickettsia</i> species in Gen				
Sequence type	Species	Sex	isolates	No.	Identity (%)	Covering (%)	Reference strains of Rickettsia spp.		
OmpA				KX819299	100	99	HQ335132.1		
gltA				KX819298	100	94	HQ335126.1		
mppA	H. marginatum	ď	Rickettsia africae	KX819297	97	99	HQ335143.1		
dksA				KX819295	99	99	HQ335138.1		
rpmE				KX819296	99	100	HQ335144.1		
OmpA	Camel (no. 61)	ď	Rickettsia spp.	-	48.68	_	U83436.2		

HQ335132.1 = Rickettsia africae strain EgyRickHmm-Qalet El-Nakhl-2 outer membrane protein A (OmpA) gene, partial cds.

HQ335126.1 = Rickettsia africae strain EgyRickHd-Qalet El-Nakhl citrate synthase (gltA) gene, partial cds.

HQ335143.1 = Rickettsia africae isolate EgyRickHmm-Qalet El-Nakhl-11 mppA-purC intergenic spacer, partial sequence.

HQ335138.1 = Rickettsia africae isolate EgyRickHimp-El-Arish-4 dksA-xerC intergenic spacer, partial sequence. HQ335144.1 = Rickettsia africae strain EgyRickHimp-El-Arish-6 RpmE (rpmE) gene, partial sequence; rpmE-trnM intergenic spacer, complete sequence; and tRNA-Met (trnM) gene, partial sequence.

U83436.2 = Rickettsia africaestrain ESF 2500-1 cell surface antigen rOmpA (scaO) gene, partial cds.

# Phylogenetic Relationships and Multi-genes Typing

The percent identity matrix of Egyptian Rickettsial sequences was constructed based on Clustal omega multiple alignments (Table 4), and the phylogenetic analyses of two genes and three intergenic spacers for each *Rickettsia* amplicon using two methods UPGMA (not shown) and NJ by MEGA4 using *Rickettsia felis* as outgroup (Fig.2). The NJ phylogenetic trees indicated that *R. africae* 

strains of *H. marginatum* were grouped together with other *R. africae* recorded in GenBank (Table 4 and Fig.2). The *dksA* and *rpmE* were fallen in a separate clade in the NJ trees (Fig.2 d, e) indicated a novel strain of *R. africae* within *H. marginatum* picked from camel from Sinai province. In addition, the similarity percent of the Egyptian *Rickettsia* camel *OmpA* amplicons was 48.68 in comparison to *R. africae* GenBank record U83436.2 (Table 4).

**Table 4** Identity matrix generated with the nucleotide sequences obtained from the different *Rickettsia* spp. Isolates from *H. marginatumOmpA*(a), *gltA*(b), *mppA*(c), *dksA*(d) and *rpmE* (e) and camel 61 *OmpA* gene (f).

a) OmpA														
1. KF791242	100.00	98 26	98 00	98.64	98 60	98 50	97.28	97 97	08.13	08 3	0 083	0 0	8 4 5	
2. KT3/5080	98.26	100.00	99.09	98.04	98.00	90.39	97.20 97.64	98.07	90.13	20.3 QQ 1	0 90.5 8 0.8 /	5 90 8 09	8.65	
2. IN 1343900 3. DO007082	98.20	99.83	100.00	98 87	98.90	98.06	97.04	98.52 98.66	90.52	20.4 08 2	0 90.4 7 0.8.2	0 90 7 09	8.05 8.48	
4. U83436 2	98.69	98.99	98.82	100.00	100.00	99.90	97.47	98.00	99.15	90.3	2 98.5	2 90	9.40	
5: GU247115	98.60	98.98	98.81	100.00	100.00	99.48	97.84	98.91	99.00	99.1	7 99.1	7 90	9.32	
6: GO853063	98.59	99.13	98.96	99.48	99.48	100.00	97.57	99.17	98.79	98.9	6 98.9	6 90	9.13	
7: EU715288	97.28	97.64	97.47	97.79	97.84	97.57	100.00	98.44	97.32	2 97.4	8 96.6	9 9	7.47	
8. KX819299	97.92	98.92	98.66	98.96	98 91	99.17	98 44	100.00	100.00	0 992	2 99.2	2 95	8 93	
0. HO225122	09.12	08.22	09.15	00.05	00.00	08 70	07.22	100.00	100.00	0 00.5	2 09.0		0.22	
9: HQ555152	98.15	98.32	98.15	99.05	99.00	98.79	97.52	100.00	100.00	0 99.5	3 98.9 00 00.2	0 95 7 0	9.33	
10: ПQ555151 11: UO225126	98.30	96.46	96.52	99.21	99.17	98.90	97.40	99.22	99.33	100.	00 99.5	/ 9 00 00	0.49	
12: 10601730	98.30	90.40	90.32	90.30	99.17	90.90	90.09	99.22	90.90	2 00 /	0 001	00 93 0 10	9.49	
(h)altA	70.45	70.05	70.40	77.55	11.52	<i>))</i> .15	77.47	70.75	77.55	, ,,,,	/ //.+		00.00	
(b)guA														
1: AV7/3327 100.00	98.78 9	8 67 98 / 3	98.80	98.76 98.78	98.94	98 75	98.64 98.94	5 08.85	98.72	00 03 00	03 99.11	98.87	99.03	
2: U59729 98.78	100.00 9	8.86 99.03	99.11	99.03 99.03	99.20	99.13	99.06 99.3	5 99.29	99.19	99.43 99.	43 99.51	99.51	99.43	
3: U59719 98.62 4: HQ335153 98.43	98.86 1 99.03 9	00.00 99.35 9a.35 100.00	99.27 99.36	98.67 98.70 98.94 98.87	98.85 99.12	98.75 99.04	98.73 99.03 98.98 99.19	3 98.94 99.21	98.86 9 98.96 9	99.11 99. 99.27 99.	11 99.19 27 99.35	99.19 99.30	99.11 99.27	
5: DQ365804 98.80	99.11 9	9.27 99.36	100.00	99.12 98.95	99.30	99.23	99.07 99.2	7 99.38	99.12 9	99.35 99.	35 99.43	99.44	99.35	
7: U59733 98.78	99.03 9 99.03 9	8.70 98.87	98.95	99.47 100.0	0 99.82	99.23	99.29 99.20 99.07 99.19	99.20	99.29 9	99.29 99. 99.43 99.	47 99.50 43 99.51	99.50	99.47 99.43	
8: HM050288 98.94	99.20 9	8.85 99.12	99.30	99.65 99.82	100.00	99.42	99.47 99.3	3 99.38 00.32	99.47 9	99.47 99.	65 99.74	99.74	99.65	
9. KA819298 98.75 10: HQ335126 98.64	99.15 9 99.06 9	8.73 99.04 8.73 98.98	99.23 99.07	99.52 99.23 99.29 99.07	99.42 99.47	100.00	100.00 99.3	99.33 99.38	99.42 9 99.41 0	99.32 99.	02 99.71 49 99.58	99.71 99.58	99.62 99.49	
11: U59730 98.95	99.35 9	9.03 99.19	99.27	99.20 99.19	99.38	99.33	99.24 100.0	00 100.00	99.35	99.59 99.	59 99.68	99.68	99.59	
12: HM050292 98.85 13: HM050296 98.72	99.29 9 99.19 9	8.94 99.21 8.86 98.96	99.38 99.12	99.20 99.21 99.29 99.19	99.38 99.47	99.33 99.42	99.38 100.0 99.41 99.3	0 100.00 5 99.38	99.38 9 100.00 9	99.56 99. 99.43 99.	00 99.65 59 99.68	99.65 99.68	99.65 99.76	
14: U59728 99.03	99.43 9	9.11 99.27	99.35	99.29 99.43	99.47	99.42	99.32 99.59	99.56	99.43 1	100.00 99.	68 99.76	99.76	99.68	
16: KU310587 99.11	99.43 9 99.51 9	9.19 99.35	99.33 99.43	99.47 99.43	99.03	99.02	99.49 99.59 99.58 99.68	99.50 99.65	99.59 9	99.08 100 99.76 99.	92 99.92 92 100.00	100.00	99.84 99.92	
17: KM288711 98.82	99.51 9	9.19 99.30	99.44	99.56 99.51	99.74	99.71	99.58 99.68	99.65	99.68	99.76 99.	92 0	100.00	99.92	
18: DQ097081 99.03	99.43 9	9.11 99.27	99.35	99.47 99.43	99.65	99.62	99.49 99.59	99.56	99.76 9	99.68 99.	84 99.92	99.92	100.00	
(c) mppA														
1 1/1/010207	100.00	40.20	16.04	49.20	40.20	17 (0)	40.15	40.00	40.00	40.07				
1: KX819297	100.00	48.39	46.24	48.39	48.39	47.62	48.15	48.89	48.89	49.07				
2: EF140692	48.39	100.00	96.08	97.39	97.39	97.26	97.39	98.04	98.04	97.83				
3: DQ008285	46.24	96.08	100.00	98.69	97.39	97.26	97.39	98.04	98.04	97.83				
4: DQ008283	48.39	97.39	98.69	100.00	98.69	98.63	98.69	99.35	99.35	99.28				
5: DQ008299	48.39	97.39	97.39	98.69	100.00	98.63	98.69	99.35	99.35	99.28				
6: AY345087	47.62	97.26	97.26	98.63	98.63	100.00	98.75	99.38	99.38	99.34				
7: HQ335142	48.15	97.39	97.39	98.69	98.69	98.75	100.00	98.98	99.49	99.35				
8: KC8/0931	48.89	98.04	98.04	99.35	99.35	99.38	98.98	100.00	100.00	100.00				
0.110225141	40.00	08.04	08.04	00.25	00.25	00.20	00.40	100.00	100.00	100.00				
9: HQ335141	48.89	98.04	98.04	99.35	99.35	99.38	99.49	100.00	100.00	100.00				
10: HQ335143	49.07	97.83	97.83	99.28	99.28	99.34	99.35	100.00	100.00	100.00				
(d)dksA														
1: KX819295	100.00	59.88	55.45	55.84	51.11	59.15	53.33	54.55	56.57	55.56	56.00			
2: AY820021	59.88	100.00	87.11	92.94	88.72	93.97	92.64	84.06	87.5	88.72	94.67			
3. HO335138	55 / 5	87.11	100.00	100.00	03.83	02.80	96.51	97 77	03 30	03 75	08 31			
4. HO335140	55.45	97.04	100.00	100.00	96.00	98 27	96 51	97.18	97 7/	98 31	98 31			
5. HO335140	51 11	88 77	93.83	96.00	100.00	93.43	95.93	94 25	90.27	90.71	97 75			
6. AY428741	59.15	93 97	92.89	98.27	93 43	100.00	98 21	89.62	92.36	92.6	100.00			
7. EF215902	53 33	92 64	96 51	96.51	95.93	98 21	100.00	97.09	97.67	98.26	98.26			
8. AY820036	54 55	84.06	97 77	97.18	94 25	89.62	97.09	100.00	90.42	90.83	98.88			
9: AY820034	56.57	87 50	93.30	97.74	90.27	92.36	97.67	90.42	100.00	97.05	99.44			
10: AY820026	55 56	88 72	93.75	98.31	90.71	92.60	98.26	90.83	97.05	100.00	100.00			
11: KR492916	56.00	94.67	98.31	98.31	97.75	100	98.26	98.88	99.44	100.00	100.00			
(e) <i>rnmE</i>	2 0.00				0									
(-, <b>.p</b>	1													
1: KX819296	100.00	45.45	45.45	45.00	46.10	46.53	46.53	45.45	47.16	48.50	43.56	45.82		
2: DO008250	45.45	100.00	97	97.00	97	97.00	97.00	97.5	88.00	87.00	91.48	92.23		
3: DO008248	45.45	97.00	100.00	99	99.00	99	99.00	99.50	89.00	88.00	92.61	93.26		
4: KF539830	45.00	97.00	99.00	100.00	98.65	98.65	98.65	99.50	91.25	90.88	92.61	93.77		
5: KC870937	46.10	97	99	98.65	100	98.82	98.81	99.5	92.28	91.94	92.61	93.77		
6: HQ335144	46.53	97.00	99.00	98.65	98.82	100.00	100.00	99.50	92.42	92.08	92.61	93.77		
7: HQ335145	46.53	97.00	99	98.65	98.81	100.00	100.00	99.50	92.40	92.08	92.61	93.77		
		200	~ ~								/			

Hend H.A.M. Abdullah et al., in Bacterial Empire

8: AY8365	521	45.45	97.5	9	9.50	99.50	99.50	) 9	9.5	99.50	100.	3 00	39.5	88.5	93.18	9	3.78					
9: HQ3351	165	47.16	88.00	) 8	9	91.25	92.28	3 9	2.42	92.40	89.5	0 1	00.00	99.03	88.39	9	5.56					
10: HQ335	5164	48.5	87.00	) 8	8.00	90.88	91.94	4 9	2.08	92.08	88.5	0 9	99.03	100.00	87.95	9	5.54					
11: DO008	3256	43.56	91.48	3 9	2.61	92.61	92.61	1 9	2.61	92.61	93.1	8 8	38.39	87.95	100.00	) 9	0.18					
12: DO440	)626	45.82	92.23	3 9	3.26	93.77	93.77	7 9	3.77	93.77	93.7	8 9	95.56	95.54	90.18	1	00.00					
(f) Camel 61	1																					
1: Camal 61	100.00	48.24	49.19	49.19	49.19	49.24	49.24	18 24	49.19	48.24	17 97	48.02	48.02	18 68	48.50	18 24	48.02	17 55	47.48	17.64	17.64	47.80
1. Camer 01	48.24	48.54	40.10	40.10	40.10	40.54	40.34	40.54	40.10	40.54	47.07	48.05	40.05	48.08	40.00	40.54	48.05	47.55	47.40	47.04	47.04	47.80
2: U83442.1	48.54	97.51	97.51	97.45	90.88	97.16	97.01	97.05	97.05	96.98	90.85	97.20	97.04	97.17	97.05	97.11	96.04	96.48	96.70	90.95	96.95	90.80
4· U83451 1	48.18	97.51	98.33	100.00	97.83	98.17	97.96	97.93	97.99	97.93	97.80	98.24	98.59	97.96	97.86	98.05	96.04	96.32	96.54	96.86	96.86	96.89
5: U83455.1	48.18	96.88	97.89	97.83	100.00	99.46	98.33	98.43	98.43	98.43	98.33	98.65	98.65	98.68	98.58	98.77	95.71	96.00	96.13	96.47	96.47	96.35
6: U83439.1	48.34	97.16	98.20	98.17	99.46	100.00	98.61	98.71	98.71	98.71	98.61	98.93	98.93	98,96	98.86	98.99	96.08	96.27	96.46	96.81	96.81	96.68
7: U83453.1	48.34	97.01	97.98	97.96	98.33	98.61	100.00	99.84	99.84	99.78	98.62	99.06	98.68	98.62	98.49	98.55	95.78	96.20	96.20	96.51	96.51	96.48
8: U83448.1	48.34	97.05	98.02	97.93	98.43	98.71	99.84	100.00	99.94	99.87	98.71	99.15	98.77	98.71	98.59	98.65	95.82	96.23	96.23	96.54	96.54	96.51
9: U83443.1	48.18	97.05	98.02	97.99	98.43	98.71	99.84	99.94	100.00	99.87	98.71	99.15	98.77	98.71	98.59	98.65	95.82	96.23	96.23	96.54	96.54	96.51
10: U83440.1	48.34	96.98	98.02	97.93	98.43	98.71	99.78	99.87	99.87	100.00	98.71	99.15	98.77	98.71	98.59	98.65	95.82	96.23	96.23	96.54	96.54	96.51
11: U83441.1	47.87	96.83	97.86	97.83	98.33	98.61	98.62	98.71	98.71	98.71	100.00	99.37	98.62	98.62	98.43	98.43	95.69	96.10	96.32	96.57	96.57	96.48
12: U83437.1	48.03	97.20	98.24	98.21	98.65	98.93	99.06	99.15	99.15	99.15	99.37	100.00	98.99	98.87	98.74	98.81	96.01	96.51	96.61	96.92	96.92	96.83
13: U83454.1	48.03	97.64	98.68	98.59	98.65	98.93	98.68	98.77	98.77	98.77	98.62	98.99	100.00	98.81	98.74	98.84	96.32	96.67	96.95	97.20	97.20	97.17
14: U83436.2	48.68	97.17	98.11	97.96	98.68	98.96	98.62	98.71	98.71	98.71	98.62	98.87	98.81	100.00	99.12	98.99	95.82	96.35	96.42	96.67	96.67	96.64
15: U83452.1	48.50	97.05	97.92	97.86	98.58	98.86	98.49	98.59	98.59	98.59	98.43	98.74	98.74	99.12	100.00	98.99	95.75	96.17	96.20	96.51	96.51	96.48
16: U83449.1	48.34	97.11	98.11	98.05	98.77	98.99	98.55	98.65	98.65	98.65	98.43	98.81	98.84	98.99	98.99	100.00	95.85	96.23	96.35	96.73	96.73	96.64
17: U83447.1	48.03	96.04	96.25	96.04	95.71	96.08	95.78	95.82	95.82	95.82	95.69	96.01	96.32	95.82	95.75	95.85	100.00	96.04	96.35	96.73	96.73	96.54
18: U83446.1	47.55	96.48	96.66	96.32	96.00	96.27	96.20	96.23	96.23	96.23	96.10	96.51	96.67	96.35	96.17	96.23	96.04	100.00	97.36	97.61	97.61	97.68
19: U83438.1	47.48	96.70	96.85	96.54	96.13	96.46	96.20	96.23	96.23	96.23	96.32	96.61	96.95	96.42	96.20	96.35	96.35	97.36	100.00	99.22	99.22	98.93
20: U83445.1	47.64	96.95	97.10	96.86	96.47	96.81	96.51	96.54	96.54	96.54	96.57	96.92	97.20	96.67	96.51	96.73	96.73	97.61	99.22	100.00	100.00	99.25
21: U83444.1	47.64	96.95	97.10	96.86	96.47	96.81	96.51	96.54	96.54	96.54	96.57	96.92	97.20	96.67	96.51	96.73	96.73	97.61	99.22	100.00	100.00	99.25
22: U83450.1	47.80	96.86	97.07	96.89	96.35	96.68	96.48	96.51	96.51	96.51	96.48	96.83	97.17	96.64	96.48	96.64	96.54	97.68	98.93	99.25	99.25	100.00





AY820036.1 Rickettsia japonica YH

H0335140.1 Rickettsia africae isolate Eq

KR492916.1 Rickettsia africae clone Amba

AY428741.2 Rickettsia conorii strain URR

AY820026.1 Rickettsia conorii subsp. isr

HQ335138.1 Rickettsia africae isolate Eg

HQ335139.1 Rickettsia africae isolate Eg

AY820034.1 Rickettsia slovaca strain Pot

AY820021.1 Rickettsia montanensis strain

DQ648584.1 Rickettsia felis strain 26457

- KX819295 Rickettsia africa 🚄

EF215902.1 Rickettsia rickettsii isolate





Fig 2 Phylogenetic trees of *R. africae* detected in the present study based on the sequences of two genes (*OmpA* and *gltA*) and the three intergenic spacers (*mppA*, *dksA* and *rpmE*). All sequences were aligned and Neighbor-joining trees were constructed; (a)*OmpA*, (b)*gltA*, (c)*mppA*, (d)*dksA*and(e) *rpmE*.

(d)

### Epidemiological Profile on rickettsioses in the studied camels

The 61 camels investigated during the present study were divided into groups according to age, breeds and tick infestation at time of examination. The results revealed the highest prevalence of rickettsioses among aged, Abady breeds and ticks-infested camels (Tables 5 and 6).

**Table 5** The prevalence of rickettsioses among camels screened by PCR with regards to age groups.

Age Groups (Years)	Total No. of Tested Camels by PCR	No. of Positive Camels by PCR	The prevalence rate (%)
< 11	16/61	4/16	25.0
11 – 13	16/61	3/16	18.7
13 - 15	6/61	2/6	33.3
15 - 17	11/61	8/11	72.7
17 - 19	5/61	4/5	80.0
> 19	7/61	4/7	57.1
Total	61	25/61	41.0

 Table 6 The prevalence of rickettsioses among camels screened by PCR with regards to Breed, and Ticks Infestation.

	Bı	reeds	Tick Infestation			
Parameters	Abady Beshary		Ticks infested camels	Ticks free camels		
No. of tested camels by						
PCR	37/61	24/61	14/61	47/61		
No. of positive camels	21/37	4/24	6/14	19/47		
by PCR						
The prevalence rate (%)	56.8	16.7	42.8	40.4		

#### Hematological and biochemical changes in camels with rickettsioses

The hematological and biochemical tests were applied on 61 camels of which 25 were proved *Rickettsia* infected camels by PCR and 36 were *Rickettsia* free camels. Macrocytic anemia and leucopenia were recorded in the *Rickettsia* positive camels (Table 7), while there were no significant differences in the biochemical changes between *Rickettsia* positive and negative camels (Table 8).

**Table 7** Hematological parameters of Rickettsial infected camels compared withRickettsial free camels (Mean  $\pm$  SD).

Hamatalagiaal	Animal Groups						
Parameters	Rickettsial Free Camels	Rickettsial Diseased Camels					
RBCs (×10 <sup>6)</sup>	5.02±0.15	5.95±0.23**					
Hb (g/dl)	13.92±0.58	19.13±1.05**					
PCV (%)	40.75±1.85	55.00±3.16**					
MCV (fl)	80.75±1.68	90.56±2.35*					
MCH (pg)	27.72±0.54	31.62±0.75**					
MCVC (g/dl)	34.46±0.40	33.78±1.31					
Platelets (×10 <sup>3</sup> )	95.16±2.06	96.66±2.59					
WBCs (×10 <sup>3</sup> )	11.48±0.31	9.15±0.51**					
Neutrophils (%)	81.75±0.65	83.20±0.59					
Lymphocytes (%)	11.77±0.43	11.20±0.56					
Monocytes (%)	5.02±0.32	4.04±0.29					
Eosinophils (%)	1.55±0.11	1.54±0.14					

\* = significant at P< 0.05 \*\* = highly significant at P< 0.01

Table 8 Biochemical p	parameters of	Rickettsial	infected	camels	compared	with
Rickettsial free camels	(Mean ± Stan	dard Deviati	ion; SD).			

	Animal Groups						
<b>Biochemical Parameters</b>	Rickettsial Free	Rickettsial Diseased					
	Camels	Camels					
Total Protein (g/dl)	7.70±0.79	7.58±0.17					
Albumin (g/dl)	2.37±0.34	2.43±0.22					
Globulin (g/dl)	5.16±0.39	5.05±0.27					
Albumin/Globulin Ratio	$0.54{\pm}0.08$	0.61±0.11					

GOT (AST; IU/L)	58.40±6.59	53.30±4.95
GPT (ALT; IU/L)	47.54±5.63	35.70±2.88
ALP (IU/L)	55.97±4.73	55.61±3.98
Creatinine (mg/dl)	2.47±0.16	2.42±0.06
Urea (mg/dl)	72.37±4.80	45.57±2.86

#### DISCUSSION

Globalization, international trade, urbanization, climate change, travel and animals' mobility are factors that led to rapid extension of the zoogeographical range of many tick species, subsequently, tick-borne diseases (Shaw *et al.*, 2003; Harrus and Baneth, 2005). Therefore, researches on ricketsiae are exceeded because of their public health implication, zoonotic importance and worldwide distribution (Parola and Raoult, 2001; Dantas-Torres *et al.*, 2012; Kernif *et al.*, 2012b; Parola *et al.*, 2013).

In Egypt, few studies have been undertaken on the epidemiology of rickettsioses infection in camels as reservoirs of *Rickettsia* spp. The main objective of this study is to evaluate the clinical, hematological, and biochemical profiles of camel rickettsioses and their molecular diagnostic investigations to confirm the previously detected and/or novel genotypes of *Rickettsia* in Egypt.

The main clinical signs observed in the 61 studied camels were similar to those mentioned by **Wernery** *et al.* (2001) who reported some clinical characteristic of rickettsiosis as lethargy, emaciation, recumbency and enlarged edematous lymph nodes that agreed with the findings of the present study. Concerning the apparently healthy camels, the results agreed with other reportsstated thatno statistically significant differences were found between clinically healthy and sick animals (Kelly *et al.*, 1992; Solano-Gallego *et al.*, 2006; Ortuno *et al.*, 2009; Riveros-Pinilla *et al.*, 2015).

In the present study, it was found that *H. dromedarii* was the most abundant tick species on camels, while other *Hyalomma* spp recorded very low infestation rate in agreement with previous findings recorded by Abdel-Shafy (2000); Diab et al. (2001); El-Kammah et al. (2001); Abdel-Shafy et al. (2012); Abdullah et al. (2016a).

Gimenez staining technique of camels'blood and tick hemolymph staining revealed that the prevalence of *Rickettsia* spp. was 0 % and 10.1 %, respectively (Table 2). The negative results of Gimenez staining technique in camel blood films may return to the low numbers of rickettsiae circulating in the blood and had probably cleared from blood (**Breitschwerdt** *et al.*, **1990**; **Parola** *et al.*, **2005**). While, hemolymph staining was successful as a field test for detection of *Rickettsia* in ticks which kept ticks undamaged, so that the infected ticks can be used in other purposes (**Gimenez**, **1964**). However, the susceptibility of the Gimenez stain to other bacterial agents than *Rickettsia* justified the magnified prevalence percentage of infection in ticks by staining technique and needed to be confirmed by PCR; the more specific technique (**Parola** *et al.*, **2013**; **Guillemi et al.**, **2015**).

Here, PCR technique was carried out on 61 camels' blood samples and their ticks using OmpA and gltA genes; SFP specific primers (Parola et al., 2013; Guillemi et al., 2015). The results revealed that twenty-five camels, from Cairo, Giza and Sinai provinces and one tick (H. marginatum) from Sinai province, were positive for Rickettsia spp. infection. The samples from positive animals and ticks were additionally screened by intergenic spacers (mppA, dksA and rpmE) amplification and sequencing. The prevalence of Rickettsia spp. in camels was 41.0 % and 1.01 % in Hyalomma spp. (Table 2). In the previous studies, Rickettsia spp. were identified in camel blood film stain from Dubai (Wernery et al., 2001) and 18.8% of camel blood samples by PCR from Nigeria (Kamani et al., 2015). On the other hand, Mentaberre et al. (2013) reported that 83 % of camels were found infected with Rickettsia spp. serologically by ELISA. However, the detection of SFG Rickettsia spp. in the present study indicated the importance role of camels in the persistence of Rickettsia in the nature than previously thought (Wernery and Kaaden, 2002; Kamani et al., 2015). Furthermore, our results of Rickettsia positive ticks were similar to those were previously reported by Niebylski et al. (1999), Levin et al. (2009) and Socolovschi et al. (2009a) that the naturally infection rate of ticks with rickettsiae almost is < 1% because of the lethal effects of Rickettsia. In the previous studies carried out in Egypt, SFG were detected in Rh. sanguineus and Hyalomma species at Sinai by immunostaining and PCR (Lange et al., 1992) while Loftis et al. (2006a, b) detected R. aeschlimannii in Hyalomma spp. by PCR. Moreover, Abdel-Shafy et al. (2012) were the first to report R. africae in H. dromedarii, H. impeltatum and H. marginatum, and R. aeschlimannii in H. impeltatum and H. marginatum collected from camels in Sinai.

Sequencing and phylogenetic analyses were performed on *OmpA* and *gltA* genes and intergenic spacers (*mppA*, *dksA* and *rpmE*) amplified from camels and *Hyalomma* spp. The present results revealed that the Egyptian obtained *R*.

africae records; KX819299, KX819298, KX819297, KX819295 and KX819296, were highly similar to the reference counterparts; HQ335132.1, HQ335126.1, HQ335143.1, HQ335138.1 and HQ335144.1, which were obtained previously from Sinai province in Egypt (Abdel-Shafy et al., 2012). Nonetheless, the topology inferred from non-coding intergenic spacers, illustrates a relationship between Egyptian isolates and other Rickettsia spp. The presence of obtained strains in a separate clade in the NJ trees of dksA and rpmE sequences (Fig.2d, e) were in accordance to the fact that non-coding intergenic spacers are able to identify a single Rickettsia spp. (Fournier et al., 2004). Therefore, the present results suggested the novelty of the obtained strain of R. africae in H. marginatum collected from camels in Sinai province. These results were in agreement with Abdel-Shafy et al. (2012) who were the first to identify R. africae in H. dromedarii, H. impeltatum and H. marginatum from Sinai province. Moreover, R. africae was detected in H. dromedarii on camels from Algeria (Kernif et al., 2012a), while in Israel it was detected in H. dromrdarii, H. impeltatum, H. excavatum and H. turanicum (Kleinerman et al., 2013). Although, R. africae in South Africa was associated only with Amblyomma spp. (Parola and Raoult, 2001; Parola et al., 2005). The present study confirmed that Hyalomma spp. have a potential role as a vector for R. africae (ATBF) in North Africa (Abdel-Shafy et al., 2012; Kernif et al., 2012a).

Regarding the phylogenetic analyses of camels Rickettsia spp., which were positive by OmpA amplification, the similarity percent to other reference Rickettsia strains published by Fournier et al. (1998) was 48.68 % with R. africae isolate U83436.2 (Table 4). The results revealed that the Rickettsia spp. detected in camel (no. 61) from Sinai province was closely matching to R. africae. Furthermore, the present Egyptian isolates were clustered in a separate clade with higher similarity to the reference counterparts (HQ335132.1, HQ335136.1 and HQ335131.1) which were obtained previously from Sinai province in Egypt, as well (Abdel-Shafy et al., 2012) (Fig.3). These results suggested that the presence of R. africae strain in camel. Accordingly, this is the first molecular detection of Rickettsia DNA in camels in Egypt. In addition, Hyalomma spp. are the main camel ticks in Egypt and North Africa (Abdel-Shafy, 2000; Diab et al., 2001; El-Kammah et al., 2001; Abdel-Shafy et al., 2012). The present study confirmed that Hyalomma spp. have a potential role as a vector for R. africae in camels. Moreover, the detection of R. africae in H. marginatum and in its camel from Sinai province indicated that R. africae can act as an emerging pathogen in Sinai province.

Concerning the ageand breed susceptibility, the highest infection rate of rickettsioses was recorded in age groups of 17 to 19 years and Abady camel breed, respectively as shown in tables (5 and 6). Though there were limited data on age or breed susceptibility in camels, other studies were applied on dogs and horses concluded the absence of statistical association between infection rate with *Rickettsia* spp. and age, sex and breed **Riveros-Pinilla** et al. (2015). Concurrently, Cunha et al. (2014) observed that older animals were more reactive with *Rickettsia* than younger animals, which may be due to the prolonged and/or repetitive exposure of older animals to ticks infected with *Rickettsia* spp. and/or senile lower immunity. Hence, the present study revealed a significant difference among age groups.

The infection rate with rickettsioses was relatively higher in ticks-infested camels (42.8 %) than in ticks-free camels (40.4 %), as shown in table (6). The present results indicated that camels infested by ticks were at high risk to be positive for *Rickettsia* spp. because *Hyalomma* spp. were reported as the principle vector of rickettsioses in Egypt. However, some camels infested by ticks were negative for rickettsioses in the present study, this may be attributed to the fact that attached ticks were free from *Rickettsia* spp. or were infected with *Rickettsia* but they recently attached to these camels and yet to transmit the infection to their hosts. Furthermore, the ticks-free camels (at the time of examination) which were proved positive for *Rickettsia*, might be infested various acaricide treatments.

Moreover, hematological and biochemical profiles in studied camels were recorded as shown in tables (7 and 8). The presented results revealed that macrocytic anemia and leucopenia were recorded in *Rickettsia* positive camels. The leucopenia recorded in this study may be attributed to the decrease in monocytes and lymphocytes. While, no significant differences were reported in biochemical changes between *Rickettsia* positive and negative camels. However, the available data on hematological and biochemical parameters in camels are limited, previous experimental studies were applied on dogs recorded anemia and early leukopenia during the course of disease followed by progressive leukocytosis and severe thrombocytopenia (Gasser *et al.*, 2001; Elchos and Goddard, 2003; Parola *et al.*, 2005; 2013). Similarly, Scorpio *et al.* (2008) reported no specific hematologic or biochemical differences between seronegative and seropositive dogs.



**Fig 3** Cladogram of current molecular epidemiological status of the Egyptian *Rickettsia* spp. isolates that compare the ones obtained during the present study from Camels and its tick (*H. marginatum*; red arrows), with other *Rickettsia* spp. records of local (green arrows) and international isolates within Genbank database dependent on alignment of *OmpA* genes sequences constructed by the Clustal omega multiple alignments software utilizing NJ equation.

#### CONCLUSION

A novel strain of *R. africae* was detected in *H. marginatum* picked from camel from Sinai province that was dissimilar from previous Egyptian isolates by molecular characterization. This is the first detection of Rickettsia DNA in camels by PCR in Egypt with the prevalence rate 41.0 %. Moreover, the detection of R. africa in H. marginatum and its camel from Sinai indicated that R. Africa act as an emerging pathogen in Sinai province. Rickettsioses has tobe included during examination of imported animals as exotic diseases as well as the differential diagnosis of non-specific febrile illness of camels. Further, the detection of tick-borne Rickettsia in camels and their ticks not only indicates that camels' populations in Egypt are at risk, but also presents possible zoonotic implications in human populations since Hyalomma spp. were known to be aggressive to bite human, which likely can facilitate the transmission of Rickettsia to human. In conclusion, our data indicates that camels may play a role in persistence of Rickettsia in Egypt. Thus, further investigations are warranted to better understand the epidemiological dynamics of Rickettsia; survival within vector populations, host species, and the horizontal transmission between vector and host species.

Acknowledgment: This study is part of Ph.D. thesis entitled "Some epidemiological studies and molecular characterization of Rickettsiae infecting some animals in Egypt" by Hend H. A. M. Abdullah, which is supported by National Research Centre, and project number 50/4/10, National Research Centre, Ministry of higher Education and Scientific Research, Egypt.

#### REFERENCES

ABDEL-SHAFY, S. 2000. Microbiological and control studies on ticks infesting farm animals and poultry. *PhD Thesis, Faculty of Agriculture, Cairo University*. ABDEL-SHAFY, S., ALLAM, A.T.N., MEDIANNIKOV, O. PAROLA, P., RAOULT, D. 2012. Molecular Detection of Spotted Fever Group Rickettsiae Associated with Ixodid Ticks in Egypt. *Vector Borne and Zoonotic Diseases*, 12, 1-14. https://doi.org/10.1089/vbz.2010.0241

Abdullah, H.A.M.H., El-Molla, A., Salib, A.F., Allam, A.T., Ghazy, A.A., Abdel-Shafy, S. 2016a. Morphological and molecular identification of the brown dog tick *Rhipicephalus sanguineus* and the camel tick *Hyalomma dromedarii* (Acari: Ixodidae) vectors of rickettsioses in Egypt. *Veterinary World*, 9, 1087-1101. <u>10.14202/vetworld.2016.1087-1101</u>

ABDULLAH, S., HELPS, C., TASKER, S., NEWBURY, H., WALL, R. 2016b. Ticks infesting domestic dogs in the UK: a large-scale surveillance programme. *Parasites and Vectors* 9, 391. 10.1186/s13071-016-1673-4

ANDERSON, J.F., MAGNORELLI, L.A. 2008. Biology of Ticks. Infectious Disease Clinics of North America, 22, 195-215.

https://doi.org/10.1016/j.idc.2007.12.006

BELFIELD, A., GOLDBERG, D.M. 1971. Revised assay for serum phenyl phosphatase activity using 4-amino-antipyrine. *Enzyme*, 12, 561-573. https://doi.org/10.1159/000459586

BOTROS, B.A., SOLIMAN, A.K., DARWISH, M., EL SAID, S., MORRILL, J.C., KSIAZEK, T.G. 1989. Seroprevalence of murine typhus and fievre boutonneuse in certain human populations in Egypt. *The Journal of Tropical Medicine and Hygiene*, 92, 373-378.

BREITSCHWERDT, E.B., LEVY, G.M., DAVIDSON, G.M., WALKER, H.D., BURGDORFER, W., CURTIS, C.B., BABINEAU, A.C. 1990. Kinetics of IgM and IgG responses to experimental and naturally acquired *Rickettsia rickettsii* infection in dogs. *American Journal of Veterinary Research*, 51, 1312-1316.

CORWIN, A., HABIB, M., OLSON, J., SCOTT, D., KSIAZEK, T., WATTS, M.D. 1992. The prevalence of arboviral, rickettsial, and Hantaanlike viral antibody among school children in the Nile river delta of Egypt. *Transactions of the Royal Society of Tropical Medicine and Hygiene*, 86, 677-679.

CORWIN, A., HABIB, M., WATTS, D., DARWISH, M, OLSON, J., BOTROS, B., HIBBS, R., KLEINOSKY, M., LEE, H.W., SHOPE, R., KILPATRICK, M. 1993. Community-based prevalence profile of arboviral, rickettsial, and Hantaanlike viral antibody in the Nile River Delta of Egypt. *The American Journal of Tropical Medicine and Hygiene*, 48, 776-783.

CUNHA, C.N., LEMOS, R.S.E., ROZENTAL, T., TEIXEIRA, C.R., CORDEIRO, D.M., LISBOA, S.R., FAVACHO, R.A., BARREIRA, D.J., REZENDE, J., FONSECA, H.A. 2014. Rickettsiae of the Spotted Fever group in dogs, horses and ticks: an epidemiological study in an endemic region of the State of Rio de Janeiro, Brazil. *Revista brasileira de medicina veterinaria*, 36, 294-300.

DANTAS-TORRES, F., CHOMEL, B.B., OTRANTO, D. 2012. Ticks and tickborne diseases: one Health perspective. Trends in Parasitology, 28, 437-446. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pt.2012.07.003

DAWYNDT, P., DEMEYER, H., DE BAETS, B. 2006. UPGMA clustering revisited: A weight-driven approach to transitive approximation. *International Journal of Approximate Reasoning*, 42, 174-191. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijar.2005.11.001

DESSEN, P., FONDRAT, C., VALENCIEN, C., BISANCE, A. 1990. A French service for access to biomolecular databases. *Bioinformatics*, 6, 355-356. https://doi.org/10.1093/bioinformatics/6.4.355

DIAB, F.M., EL, KADY, G.A., SHOUKRY, A. 2001. Bionomics of ticks collected from Sinai Peninsula: 2 – abundance, attachment sites, and density estimators of ticks infesting Arabian camels. *Journal of the Egyptian Society of Parasitology*, 31, 479-489.

DOUMAS, B.T., WATSON, W.A., BIGGS, H.G. 1971 Albumin standards and the measurement of serum albumin with bromcresol green. *Clinica Chimica Acta*, 31, 87-96.

DUMLER, J.S., BARBET, F.A., BEKKER, P.J.C., DASCH, A.G., PALMER, H.G., RAY, C.S., RIKIHISA, Y., RURANGIRWA, R.F. 2001. Reorganization of genera in the family's Rickettsiaceae and Anaplasmataceae in the order Rickettsiales: unification of some species of *Ehrlichia* with *Anaplasma*, *Cowdria* with *Ehrlichia* and *Ehrlichia* with *Neorickettsia*, descriptions of six new species combinations and designation of *Ehrlichia equi* and 'HGE agent' as subjective synonyms of *Ehrlichia phagocytophila*. *International Journal of Systematic and Evolutionary Microbiology*, 51, 2145-2165. <u>10.1099/00207713-51-6-2145</u>

ELCHOS, BN., GODDARD, J. 2003. Implications of presumptive fatal Rocky Mountain spotted fever in two dogs and their owner. *Journal of the American Veterinary* <u>Medical</u> Association, 223, 1450-1452. https://doi.org/10.2460/javma.2003.223.1450

EL-KAMMAH, K.M., OYOUN, L.M., EL KADY, G.A., ABDEL-SHAFY, S. 2001. Investigation of blood parasites in livestock infested with argasid and ixodid ticks in Egypt. *Journal of the Egyptian Society of Parasitology*, 31, 365-371.

ESTRADA-PENA, A., BOUATTOUR, A., CAMICAS, J.L., WALKER, A.R. 2004. Ticks of domestic animals in the Mediterranean region: a guide to identification of species. Zaragoza: University of Zaragoza.

FAWCETT, J.K., SOCTT, J.E. 1960. A rapid and precise method for the determination of Urea. *Journal of Clinical Pathology*, 13, 156-159.

FELSENSTEIN, J. 1985. Confidence limits on phylogenies: An approach using the bootstrap. *Evolution* 39, 783-791.

FELSENSTEIN, J. 2004. Inferring Phylogenies. 1. Sunderland, MA: Sinauer Associates Inc. American Journal of Human Genetics, 74(5): 1074.

FOURNIER, P.E., DUMLER, J.S., GREUB, G., ZHANG, J., WU, Y., RAOULT, D. 2003. Gene sequence-based criteria for identification of new rickettsia isolates and description of *Rickettsia heilongjiangensis* sp. nov. *Journal of Clinical Microbiology*, 41, 5456-5465. <u>doi:10.1128/JCM.41.12.5456-5465.2003</u>

FOURNIER, P.E., RAOULT, D. 2007. Identification of rickettsial isolates at the species level using multi-spacer typing. *BMC Microbiology*, 7, 72. https://doi.org/10.1186/1471-2180-7-72

FOURNIER, P.E., ROUX, V., RAOULT, D. 1998. Phylogenetic analysis of spotted fever group rickettsiae by study of the outer surface protein rOmpA. *International journal of systematic bacteriology*, 48, 839-849.

FOURNIER, P.E., ZHU, Y., OGATA, H., RAOULT, D. 2004. Use of highly variable intergenic spacer sequences for multispacer typing of *Rickettsia conorii* strains. *Journal of Clinical Microbiology*, 42, 5757-5766. DOI: 10.1128/JCM.42.12.5757-5766.2004

GASSER, A.M., BIRKENHEUER, A.J., BREITSCHWERDT, E.B. 2001. Canine Rocky Mountain spotted fever: a retrospective study of 30 cases. Journal of the American Animal Hospital Association, 37, 41-48. https://doi.org/10.5326/15473317-37-1-41

GIMENEZ, D.F. 1964. Staining Rickettsiae in Yolk Sac Cultures. *Stain Technology*, 39, 135-140.

GORNAL, A.C., BARDAWILL, C.J., DAVID, M.M. 1949. Determination of serum proteins by means of the biuret reaction. *The Journal of biological chemistry*, 177, 751-766.

GUILLEMI, C.E., TOMASSONE, L., FARBER, D.M. 2015. Tick-borne Rickettsiales: Molecular for the study of an emergent group of pathogens. *Journal of Microbiological Methods*, 119, 87-97. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.mimet.2015.10.009

HARRUS, S., BANETH, G. 2005. Drivers for the emergence and re-emergence of vector-borne protozoal and bacterial diseases. *International Journal for* 

Parasitology, 35, 1309-1318. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijpara.2005.06.005

HECHEMY, K.E., AVSIC-ZUPANC, T., CHILDS, E.J., RAOULTD, A.D. 2003. Rickettsiology: present and future directions—preface. Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences. 990: XVII-XVXX. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1749-6632.2003.tb07330.x

HILLYARD, P.D. 1996. Diseases carried by ticks in NW Europe: their medical and veterinary importance: In: BARNES, R.S.K., COLES, J.H., eds, Ticks of North-West Europe. Ynopses of British Fauna (New Series). FSC Publications. 22-23

HOOGSTRAAL, H., KAISER, M.N. 1958. The ticks (Ixodoidea) of Egypt: a brief review and keys. *Journal of the Egyptian Public Health Association*, 33, 51-85.

KAMANI, J., BANETH, G., APANASKEVICH, D.A., MUMCUOGLU, K.Y., HARRUS, S. 2015. Molecular detection of *Rickettsia aeschlimannii* in *Hyalomma* spp. ticks from camels (*Camelus dromedarius*) in Nigeria, West Africa. *Medical and Veterinary Entomology*, 29, 205-209.

KANG, Y.J., DIAO, X.N., ZHA, G.Y., CHEN, M.H., XIONG, Y., SHI, M., FU, W.M., GUO, Y.J., PAN, B., CHEN, X.P., HOLMES, E.C., GILLESPIE, J.J., DUMLER, S.J., ZHANG, Y.Z. 2014. Extensive diversity of Rickettsiales bacteria in two species of ticks from China and the evolution of the Rickettsiales. *BMC Evolutionary Biology*, 14, 167. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12862-014-0167-2 KELLY, P.J., MATTHEWMAN, A.L., MASON, R.P., COURTNEY, S., KATSANDE, C., RUKWAVA, J. 1992. Experimental infection of dogs with a Zimbabwean strain of *Rickettsia conorii*. *The Journal of Tropical Medicine and* 

Hygiene, 95, 322-326.

KERNIF, T., DJERBOUH, A., MEDIANNIKOV, O., AYACH, B., ROLAIN, J.M., RAOULT, D., PAROLA, P., BITAM, I. 2012a. *Rickettsia africae* in *Hyalomma dromedarii* ticks from sub-Saharan Algeria. *Ticks and Tick-borne Diseases*, 3, 377-379. <u>https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ttbdis.2012.10.013</u>

KERNIF, T., SOCOLOVSCHI, C., BITAM, I., RAOULT, D., PAROLA, P. 2012b. Vector-borne rickettsioses in North Africa. *Infectious Disease of North America*, 26, 455-478. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.idc.2012.03.007

KLEINERMAN, G., BANETH, G., MUMCUOGLU, K.Y., VAN STRATEN, M., BERLIN, D., APANASKEVICH, D.A., ABDEEN, Z., NASEREDDIN, A., HARRUS, S. 2013. Molecular detection of *Rickettsia africae*, *Rickettsia aeschlimannii* and *Rickettsia sibirica mongolitimonae* in camels and *Hyalomma* spp. ticks from Israel. *Vector-Borne and Zoonotic Diseases*, 13, 851-856. https://doi.org/10.1089/vbz.2013.1330

Lange JV, El Dessouky AG, Manor E (1992) Spotted fever rickettsiae in ticks from the northern Sinai Governate, Egypt. Am J Trop Med Hyg 46: 546-551

LEVIN, M.L., KILLMASTER, L., ÉREMEEVA, M.E., DASCH, G.A. 2009. Effects of *Rickettsia conorii* infection on the survival of *Rhipicephalus sanguineus* ticks. *Clinical Microbiology and Infection*, 15, 277-278. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1469-0691.2008.02234.x

LOFTIS, A.D., REEVES, W.K., SZUMLAS, D.E. 2006a. Surveillance of Egyptian fleas for agents of public health significance: *Anaplasma, Bartonella, Coxiella, Ehrlichia, Rickettsia*, and *Yersinia pestis. The American Journal of* 

TropicalMedicineandHygiene,75,41-48.https://doi.org/10.4269/ajtmh.2006.75.41\_

LOFTIS, A.D., REEVES, W.K., SZUMLAS, D.E. 2006b. Rickettsial agents in Egyptian ticks collected from domestic animals. *Experimental and Applied Acarology*, 40, 67-81.

MEDIANNIKOV, O.Y., SIDELNIKOV, Y., IVANOV, L. 2004. Acute tickborne rickettsiosis caused by *Rickettsia heilongjiangensis* in Russian Far East. *Emerging Infectious Diseases*, 10: 810-817. doi:10.3201/eid1005.030437

MENTABERRE, G., GUTIERREZ, C., RODRIGUEZ, F.N., JOSEPH, S., GONZALEZ-BARRIO, D., CABEZON, O., DE LA FUENTE, J., GORTAZAR, C., BOADELLA, M. 2013. A transversal study on antibodies against selected pathogens in dromedary camels in the Canary Islands, Spain. *Veterinary Microbiology*, 167, 468-473. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.vetmic.2013.07.029

MERHEJ, V., RAOULT, D. 2011. Rickettsial evolution in the light of comparative genomics. *Biological Reviews*, 86, 379-405. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1469-185X.2010.00151.x

NIEBYLSKI, M.L., PEACOCK, G.M., SCHWAN, G.T. 1999. Lethal effect of *Rickettsia rickettsii* on its tick vector (*Dermacentor andersoni*). Applied and *Environmental Microbiology*, 65, 773-778.

ORTUNO, A., PONS, I., NOGUERAS, M.M., CASTELLÀ, J., SEGURA, F. 2009. The dog as epidemiological marker of *Rickettsia conorii* infection. *Clinical Microbiology and Infection*, 15, 241-242. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1469-0691.2008.02158.x

PAROLA, P., PADDOCK, C.D., RAOULT, D. 2005. Tick-borne rickettsioses around the world: emerging diseases challenging old concepts. *Clinical Microbiology Reviews*, 18, 719-756. DOI:10.1128/CMR.18.4.719-756.2005

PAROLA, P., PADDOCK, D.C., SOCOLOVSCHI, C., LABRUNA, B.M., MEDIANNIKOV, O., KERNIF, T., ABDAD, Y.M., STENOS, J., BITAM, I., FOURNIER, P., RAOULT, D. 2013. Update on Tick-Borne rickettsioses around the World: A Geographic Approach. *Clinical Microbiology Reviews*, 26, 657-702. DOI:10.1128/CMR.00032-13

PAROLA, P., RAOULT, D. 2001. Ticks and tick-borne bacterial diseases in humans: an emerging infectious threat. *Clinical Infectious Diseases*, 32, 897-928. https://doi.org/10.1086/319347

RAOULT, D., ROUX, V. 1997. Rickettsioses as paradigms of new or emerging infectious diseases. *Clinical Microbiology Reviews*, 10, 694-719. DOI:10.1128/CMR.10.4.694

Regnery RL, Spruill CL, Plikaytis D (1991) Genotypic identification of rickettsiae and estimation of intraspecies sequence divergence for portions of two rickettsial genes. J Bacteriol 73: 1576-1589

REITMAN, A., FRANKEL, S. 1957 A colorimetric method for the determination of serum glutamic oxalacetic and glutamic pyruvic transaminases. *American Journal of Clinical Pathology*, 28, 56-63.

REYNOLDS, M.G. 2004. Serologic evidence for exposure to spotted fever and typhus group rickettsioses among persons with acute febrile illness in Egypt. Presented at the Fourth International Conference on Emerging Infectious Diseases. Atlanta.

RIVEROS-PINILLA, A.D., ACEVEDO, G.L., LONDONO, F.A., GONGORA, O.A. 2015. Antibodies against spotted fever group *Rickettsia* sp., in horses of the Colombian Orinoquia. *Revista MVZ. Cordoba*, 20, 5004-5013.

ROUX, V., RYDKINA, E., EREMEEVA, M., RAOULT, D. 1997. Citrate synthase gene comparison, a new tool for phylogenetic analysis, and its application for the rickettsiae. *International Journal of Systematic Bacteriology*, 47, 252-261.

SAITOU, N., NEI, M. 1987. The neighbor-joining method: a new method for sequences. *Journal of Molecular Biology*, 16, 111-120.

SCHALM, O.W., JAIN, N.C., CARROL, E.J. 1986. Veterinary Haematology. Textbook, 4th. Edition, Lea and Febiger, Philadelphia, USA.

SCHIRMEISTER, J. 1964. Determination of creatinine in serum. Dtsch Med Wschr, 89, 1940.

SCORPIO, G.D., WACHTMAN, M.L., TUNIN, S.R., BARAT, C.N., GARYU, W.J., DUMLER, S.J. 2008. Retrospective Clinical and Molecular Analysis of Conditioned Laboratory Dogs (*Canis familiaris*) with Serologic Reactions to *Ehrlichia canis, Borrelia burgdorferi*, and *Rickettsia rickettsii. Journal of the American Association for Laboratory Animal Science*, 47, 23-28.

SHAW, S.E., LERGA, A.I., WILLIAMS, S., BEUGNET, F., BIRTLES, R.J., DAY, M.J., KENNY, M.J. 2003. Review of exotic infectious diseases in small animals entering the United Kingdom from abroad diagnosed by PCR. *Veterinary Record*, 152, 176-177. http://dx.doi.org/10.1136/vr.152.6.176

SOCOLOVSCHI, C., BARBAROT, S., LEFEBVRE, M., PAROLA, P., RAOULT, D. 2010. *Rickettsia sibirica mongolitimonae* in traveler from Egypt. *Emerging Infectious Diseases*, 16, 1495-1496. doi: 10.3201/eid1609.100258

SOCOLOVSCHI, C., MATSUMOTO, K., BROUQUI, P., RAOULT, D., PAROLA, P. 2009a. Experimental infection of *Rhipicephalus sanguineus* with *Rickettsia conorii conorii. Clinical Microbiology and Infection*, 15, 324-325. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1469-0691.2008.02259.x

SOCOLOVSCHI, C., MEDIANNIKOV, O., RAOULT, D., PAROLA, P. 2009b. The relationship between spotted fever group Rickettsiae and ixodid ticks. *Veterinary Research*, 40, 34. https://doi.org/10.1051/vetres/2009017

SOLANO-GALLEGO, L., LLULL, J., OSSO, M., HEGARTY, B., BREITSCHWERDT, E. 2006. A serological study of exposure to arthropodborne pathogens in dogs from northeastern Spain. *Veterinary Research*, 37, 231-244.

https://doi.org/10.1051/vetres:2005054

SOLIMAN, A.K., BOTROS, B.A., KSIAZEK, T.G. 1989. Seroprevalence of *Rickettsia typhi* and *Rickettsia conorii* infection among rodents and dogs in Egypt. *The Journal of Tropical Medicine and Hygiene*, 92, 345-349.

TAMURA, K., DUDLEY, J., NEI, M., KUMAR, S. 2007. MEGA4: Molecular Evolutionary Genetics Analysis (MEGA) software version 4.0. *Molecular Biology and Evolution*, 24, 1596-1599. https://doi.org/10.1093/molbev/msm092

TAMURA, K., NEI, M., KUMAR, S. 2004. Prospects for inferring very large phylogenies by using the neighbor-joining method. *Proceeding of the national Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, 101: 11030-11035. https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.0404206101

WERNERY, U., KAADEN, O.R. 2002. Infectious Diseases of Camelids. Blackwell Science, Berlin.

WERNERY, U., MUSA, B., KINNE, J. 2001. Rickettsia-like disease in dromedaries. *Journal of Camel Practice and Research*, 8, 7-9.

ZILBERMAN, N., REIKHAV, S., HULATA, G., RON, M. 2006. Highthroughput Genomic DNA Extraction Protocol from Tilapia's Fine Tissue.

Aquaculture, 255, 597-599. DOI:10.1016/j.aquaculture.2005.11.042