Serological and molecular prevalences and phylogenetic analysis of *Coxiella burnetii* in dogs in Al-Qadisiyah and Baghdad Provinces, Iraq

Hadaf Mahdi Kadhim¹, Mithal K. A. Al-Hassani¹, Ahlam Ali Soghi Al-Galebi¹, and Israa M. Essa²

 Department of Biology, College of Education, University of Al-Qadisiyah, Al-Diwaniyah, Iraq; 2. Department of Public Health, College of Veterinary Medicine, University of Basrah, Basra, Iraq.
Corresponding author: Israa M. Essa, e-mail: israa.essa@uobasrah.edu.iq
Co-authors: HMK: hadaf.mahdi@qu.edu.iq, MKAA: mithal.al-hassani@qu.edu.iq, AASA: ahlam.ali@qu.edu.iq
Received: 22-08-2024, Accepted: 15-10-2024, Published online: 22-11-2024

doi: www.doi.org/10.14202/vetworld.2024.2603-2611 **How to cite this article:** Kadhim HM, Al-Hassani MKA, Al-Galebi AAS, and Essa IM (2024) Serological and molecular prevalences and phylogenetic analysis of *Coxiella burnetii* in dogs in Al-Qadisiyah and Baghdad Provinces, Iraq. *Veterinary World*, 17(11): 2603–2611.

Abstract

Background and Aim: *Coxiella burnetii* is a highly contagious zoonotic bacterial micro-organism. This study aimed to estimate the prevalence of *C. burnetii* in dogs using serological and molecular methods. Furthermore, a sequencing analysis of *C. burnetii* dog isolates was conducted.

Materials and Methods: A total of 172 dogs, including 93 pet dogs, 21 police dogs, 38 guardian dogs, and 20 stray dogs, were selected. Venous blood was drained from the dogs and examined serologically by indirect enzyme-linked immunosorbent assay (ELISA) and molecularly by polymerase chain reaction (PCR) for *C. burnetii*. A sequencing analysis of *C. burnetii* dog isolates was conducted.

Results: The overall prevalence of *C. burnetii* was 16.86%, accounting for 55% in stray dogs, 9.68% in pet dogs, 19.05% in police dogs, and 13.16% in guardian dogs. Strong positive sera were observed in stray dogs (4.84 ± 0.29), whereas weak sera were observed in pet dogs (3.22 ± 0.18). PCR analysis revealed 6.4% positive dogs, accounting for 1.08%, 4.76%, 2.63%, and 40% in pet, police, guardian, and stray dogs, respectively. Phylogenetic tree analysis of local *C. burnetii* isolates revealed a total rate of similarity and mutations/changes between 95.47% and 100% and 0.059%, respectively. Subsequently, the local isolates were significantly similar to Chinese hedgehog, Iraqi camel, and Colombian human *C. burnetii* National Center for Biotechnology Information-GenBank isolates.

Conclusion: This is the first study on prevalence of *C. burnetii* in dogs in Iraq. To prevent transmission of *C. burnetii* to humans, the role of dogs or other domestic and wild animals as sources of infection must be investigated extensively. In addition, the prevalence of *C. burnetii* in other Iraqi regions should be surveyed using the most sensitive and specific diagnostic assays, such as ELISA and PCR.

Keywords: canine zoonotic diseases, Coxiellosis, polymerase chain reaction, Q-fever, sequencing analysis.

Introduction

Coxiella burnetii is an obligate intracellular, pleomorphic, Gram-negative, spore-forming, coccobacillary bacterium that belongs to the *Coxiellaceae* family, the *Legionella* order, and the *Gammaproteobacteria* phylum [1, 2]. This bacterium was first observed and isolated in Australia and the USA from 1920 to 1935. Although the morphological characteristics of *C. burnetii* are similar to those of *Rickettsia*, it exhibits some physiological and genetic variations [3–6]. This bacterium can also affect domestic and wild animals and humans, causing a disease known as Q fever or coxiellosis, which is endemic to several countries worldwide [7]. After infection, a large amount of *Coxiella* is excreted *via* milk, urine, feces, placenta, aborted fetuses, or reproductive tissues and then

Copyright: Kadhim, *et al.* Open Access. This article is distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided you give appropriate credit to the original author(s) and the source, provide a link to the Creative Commons license, and indicate if changes were made. The Creative Commons Public Domain Dedication waiver (http://creativecommons.org/ publicdomain/zero/1.0/) applies to the data made available in this article, unless otherwise stated.

transmitted directly or indirectly to other animals or humans [8]. The inhalation of airborne materials, especially after animal birth, is a common cause of human infection [9]. In addition to mice and birds, more than 40 species of ticks have been found to play a role in the transmission of infection from animal to animal and from animal to human [7, 10]. Like intracellular micro-organisms, the acute phase produces antibodies that are provided by cellular response; in the chronic phase, high antibodies lead to the formation of immune complexes [6, 11, 12].

In dogs, *C. burnetii* infection is primarily characterized by the lack of symptoms or the presence of non-specific clinical symptoms, including depression, lethargy, seizures, and fever until the disease has progressed, thereby causing reproductive problems, such as stillbirth and deformities [13, 14]. Despite the development of a simple and reliable medium for screening *C. burnetii*, this bacterium remains an infectious organism [11, 15, 16]. Thus, enzymelinked immunosorbent assay (ELISA), a sensitive, specific, ready-to-use, and commercially available diagnostic method, can be used to identify specific antibodies [17]. However, the correlation between

Veterinary World, EISSN: 2231-0916

seropositivity to *C. burnetii* and bacterial shedding and clinical diseases in dogs remains unclear, and whether an increase in seroprevalence increases the risk of infection in dog owners remains unknown [18]. In recent decades, polymerase chain reaction (PCR), a safe, highly sensitive, specific, and easy-to-perform laboratory diagnostic tool, has been primarily used to identify the acute phase of *C. burnetii* infection [19, 20]. However, the combination of PCR and serology is recommended for the definitive diagnosis of early and late stages of *C. burnetii* infection [21].

No studies have been conducted in Iraq to identify *C. burnetii* in dogs; therefore, this study aimed to estimate the prevalence of *C. burnetii* in dogs serologically by ELISA and molecularly by PCR. Furthermore, a sequencing analysis of *C. burnetii* dog isolates was conducted.

Materials and Methods

Ethical approval and Informed consent

This study was approved by the Scientific Committee of the Department of Biology (College of Education, University of Al-Qadisiyah, Approval No. 121/CVM-UQ/18-10-2023). Blood samples were collected after verbal consent from all animal owners.

Study period and location

This study was conducted from November 2023 to February 2024 among various regions in Al-Qadisiyah and Baghdad Provinces (Iraq), and the samples were tested at the Microbiology Laboratory in the College of Veterinary Medicine (University of Al-Qadisiyah).

Samples

Samples were collected using convenience sampling. A total of 172 dogs, including 93 pets, 21 police dogs, 38 guardians, and 20 strays, were selected. Under aseptic conditions, approximately 4 mL of venous blood was collected from the cephalic or saphenous veins of each study dog and then transferred into two labeled tubes: 2.5 mL of the collected venous blood was placed in an ethylenediaminetetraacetic acid -anticoagulant tube (Falcon, Jordan) and frozen at -20° C until molecular examination and 1.5 mL of the collected blood was placed in a free-anticoagulant glass-gel tube. After centrifugation (2800 × g for 5 min), the obtained sera were placed in labeled 1.5-mL Eppendorf tubes (Abdos, India) and frozen at -20° C until tested serologically.

Serological analysis

The kit contents were prepared, and the sera were thawed in accordance with the manufacturer's instructions for the indirect canine anti-Q-fever antibody ELISA kit (Biotangusa, USA). Then, the positive and negative solutions and the serum samples were diluted and processed. In addition, the optical density (OD) was measured at 450 nm using an automatic ELISA microplate reader (Bio Tek, USA). Positive anti-Q-Ab samples were identified after determining the P/N value (OD $_{\text{samples}}$ /OD $_{\text{negative control}}$) at ≥ 2.1 , whereas samples with a P/N value of <2.1 were considered negative.

Molecular testing

In the present study, a Presto Mini gDNA Bacteria kit (Geneaid, Taiwan) was used to extract DNA from whole blood samples from the study dogs. After estimating the concentration and purity of DNA using a nanodrop spectrophotometer (Thermo Scientific, UK), a GoTag Green Master Mix kit (Promega, Korea) was used to prepare the Master Mix tubes by targeting the 16S rRNA gene ([F: 5'-AGT ACG GCC GCA AGG TTA AA-3'] and R: [5'-CTC CAA TCC GGA CTA CGA GC-3']) at a final volume of 20 µL [22]. Using a thermal cycler (Bio-Rad, USA), PCR was performed as follows: 1 cycle for initial denaturation $(95^{\circ}C/5 \text{ min})$; 30 cycles for denaturation $(95^{\circ}C/40 \text{ s})$, annealing (56°C/40 s), and extension (72°C/40 s); and 1 cycle for final extension (72°C/7 min). The electrophoresis of PCR products in agarose gel (1.5%) stained with ethidium bromide was performed at 100 V and 80 A for 1 h. Based on the standardized band sizes of a ladder marker, the product size of positive samples was identified at approximately 425 bp under an ultra-violet illuminator (Clinx Science, China).

Sequencing analysis

Positive PCR samples (n = 11) were sequenced using the modified Sanger method (Macrogen Company, Korea), and the received data of local C. burnetii strains were subjected to multiple sequence alignment analysis and phylogenetic tree analysis using MEGA 11 software (Pennsylvania State University, USA) to investigate their identity for National Center for Biotechnology Information Search (NCBI)-Basic Local Alignment Too C. burnetii isolates. Furthermore, the local C. burnetii strains were submitted to the NCBI database under the following GenBank IDs: PQ097649.1, PQ097650.1, PQ097651.1, PQ097652.1, PQ097653.1, PQ097654.1, PO097655.1, PO097656.1, PO097657.1, PO097658.1, and PO097659.1.

Statistical analysis

All obtained results were documented in Microsoft Excel 2010 (Microsoft Office, Washington, USA) and statistically analyzed using Student's unpaired t-test and one-way analysis of variance in GraphPad Prism software version 9.4.1 (GraphPad Software Inc, USA). Differences between the compared values were considered significant at p < 0.05 (*), p < 0.01 (**), p < 0.001 (***), and p < 0.0001 (****) [23]. Values are represented as either mean \pm standard error or percentage (%).

Results

The overall *C. burnetii* serological prevalence was 16.86% (n = 29) among the 172 dogs tested. In addition, the prevalence of *C. burnetii* infection among the study dogs was significantly different (p \leq 0.009), accounting for 55% (n = 11) in 20 stray dogs, 9.68% (n = 9) in 93 pet dogs, 19.05% (n = 4) in 21 police dogs, and 13.16% (n = 5) in 38 guardian dogs (Figure-1). Significantly, the antibody concentration was higher in stray dogs (4.87 \pm 0.29) and lower in pet dogs (3.22 \pm 0.18) compared with guardian (3.8 \pm 0.13) and police dogs (3.93 \pm 0.2) (Figure-2).

Based on the PCR test results, among 172 dogs, 6.4% (n = 11) were positive for *C. burnetii*, including 1.08% (n = 1) from 93 pet dogs, 4.76% (n = 1) from 21 police dogs, 2.63% (n = 1) from 38 guardian dogs, and 40% (n = 8) from 20 stray dogs (Figure-3).

The results of the present study indicated that the serological and molecular prevalence rates of *C. burnetii* in dogs were 16.86% and 6.4%, respectively (Figure-4).

Sequencing data of all positive PCR products of *C. burnetii* (11) were subjected to multiple sequence alignment analysis using MEGA 11 software (Figure-5) and the NCBI viewer to detect nucleotide similarity (*) and mutation/changes between local *C. burnetii* isolates and NCBI-GenBank *C. burnetii* isolates/strains (Figures-6 and 7).

Comparative identification of the genetic variation between local *C. burnetii* isolates and NCBI-GenBank *C. burnetii* isolates/strains revealed that



Figure-1: Seropositive results of enzyme-linked immunosorbent assay in study dogs (n = 172).



Figure-2: Concentration of antibody values in the seropositive study dogs (n = 172).

the total similarity ranged from 95.47% to 100%, whereas the total mutation rate/change was 0.059%. Subsequently, the following local isolates showed significant identity with different NCBI-GenBank isolates/strains: IRAQ1 isolate (PQ097649.1) from the Chinese hedgehog isolate (MN263246.1); IRAQ2-IRAQ6 (PQ097650.1, PQ097651.1, PQ097652.1, PQ097653.1, and PQ097654.1) from the Iraqi camel isolate (MN900579.1); and IRAQ7-IRAQ11 (PQ097655.1, PQ097656.1, PQ097657.1, PQ097658.1, and PQ097659.1) from the Colombian human isolate (MN540441.1) (Table-1 and Figure-8).

Discussion

In the present study, the overall prevalence of *C. burnetii* was 16.86%, accounting for 55% in stray dogs, 9.68% in pet dogs, 19.05% in police dogs, and 13.16% in guardian dogs. However, the mechanism by which dogs can maintain, transmit, and spread *C. burnetii* infection remains unclear, and differences in serological prevalence might occur throughout particular times and geographic regions. Previously, the serological prevalence of *coxiellosis* was 14.3% in stray dogs in India [24], 66.1% in stray dogs in the USA [25], 0.9% in household dogs in Italy [26],



Figure-3: Polymerase chain reaction results in the study dogs (n = 172).



Figure-4: Enzyme-linked immunosorbent and polymerase chain reaction assay results.

Species/Abbry	* * *	* *	* 1	* *	* *	* 1	* * :	* *	* 1	* *	* *	* *	* :	* *	* *	* *	* 1	* *	* *	* *	* *	* *	* *	* *
1. Coxiella burnetii isolate IRAQ1/Irag (PQ097649.1)	сст	GΑ	С	GG	G G	GO	: c (G	C A	C	ΑA	GC	G	T	GG	A G	C A	Т	GT	GG	ТТ	AA	AT	тс
2. Coxiella burnetii isolate IRAQ2/Irag (PQ097650.1)	сст	GA	c	GG	G G	GO	. c (G	C A	A C	AA	GC	G	ЭТ	GG	A G	C A	Т	GT	GG	тт	AA	AT	тс
3. Coxiella burnetii isolate IRAQ3/Irag (PO097651.1)	GA	c	GG	G G	GO	: c (G	C A	A C	AA	GC	G	T C	GG	A G	C A	Т	GT	GG	тт	AA	AT	тс	
4. Coxiella burnetii isolate IRAQ4/Irag (PQ097652.1)	GA	c	GG	G G	GO	: c (G	C A	A C	AA	GC	G	T	GG	AG	C A	Т	GT	GG	тт	AA	AT	тс	
5 Coxiella burnetii isolate IRAQ5/Iraq (PQ097653.1)	G A	c	G	G G	G		G	C 4	L C	ΔΔ	GC	G	т	GG	A G	C 4	Ť	GT	GG	тт		AT	тс	
6. Coxiella burnetii isolate IRAQ6/Iraq (PQ097654.1)	сст	GA	c	G	6 6	GO		G	C A	LC.		GO	G	т	G G	AG	C 4	Ť	GT	GG	τT		AT	тс
7. Coxiella burnetii isolate IRAO7/Irag (PO097655.1)	сст	G A	c	G	6 6	G		G	C 4		ΔΔ	GC	G	т	G G	A G	C 4	Ť	GT	GG	τT		AT	тс
8. Coxiella burnetii isolate IRAO8/Irao (PO097656.1)	сст	G A	c	3 6	0 0 0 0				c z			60	G	т	0.0	A G	c z	÷	GT	66	τī		AT	тс
9. Coviella burnetii isolate IRAQ9/rag (PO097657.1)		GA		20	0 0 0 0				č /				G	Ť	0.0		č /	÷	GT	66	÷ ÷			TC
10. Coviella burnetii isolate IDAO10/rag (PO097658.1)					0 0 0 0					č	22		G	- T				÷	GT	66	÷÷			TC
11. Coxiella burnetii isolate IRAQ11/iraq (PQ097659.1)		G A		30	0 0 0 0				c 2		22	60	G	T	0.0		c /	÷	GT	66	÷÷			TC
Species/Abbry			-				• •								-									
1. Coxiella burnetii isolate IRAQ1/iraq (PQ09/649.1)		00	1	GA		GG	GG				AC		GC	GG	TG	GA	G		TG	TO	GI			TC
2. Coxiella burnetii isolate IRAQ2/Iraq (PQ097650.1)		00	1			66	66				AC			66	TO	GA			TO	TO		122		TC
4. Coxiella burnetii isolate IRAQ3/Iraq (P0097651.1)		00	+			66	66					22		66	TG	GA			TG	TG	G T	+22		TC
5. Coxiella burnetii isolate IRA05/Iraq (P0097653.1)		00	÷			6 6	6 6					22		6 6	TG			1	TG	TG	G T	+27		TC
6 Coxiella burnetii isolate IRAQ6/Iraq (P0097654.1)		0.0	÷			00	0.0				Ac	22	60	00	TG	GA			TG	TG	сτ	TA A		тс
7 Coxiella burnetii isolate IRA07/Iraq (P0097655.1)		C C	T d	GA	C G	GG	GG	0.0	2 0	GC	AC		GC	GG	TG	GA	G		TG	TG	GT	TAA		тс
8. Coxiella burnetii isolate IRAQ8/Iraq (PQ097656.1)		сс	т	GA	C G	GG	GG	c c	: c	GC	AC	AA	GC	GG	TG	GA	G		TG	TGO	GТ	TAA	AT	тс
9. Coxiella burnetii isolate IRAQ9/Iraq (PQ097657.1)		сс	т	GA	CG	GG	GG	c c	c	GC	AC	AA	GC	GG	TG	GA	G	A	TG	TGO	GT	TAA	AT	тс
10. Coxiella burnetii isolate IRAQ10/Iraq (PQ097658.1)		сс	т	GA	C G	GG	GG	c c	c	GC	AC	A A	GC	G G	A G	GA	G	A	ΤG	TGO	GТ	TAA		тс
11. Coxiella burnetii isolate IRAQ11/Iraq (PQ097659.1)		сс	т	GA	c G	GG	GG	сс	c	G C	AC	A A	GC	G G	TG	G A	G	A	тG	TGO	GT	TAA		тс
12. Coxiella burnetii isolate C7/China (MN263246.1)		сс	т	GA	c g	G G	GG	сс	c	G C	AC	A	G C	G G	ΤG	G A	G	A	тG	TGO	GТ	TAA		тс
13. Coxiella burnetii isolate Hyalomma asiaticum/China (MN880	312.1)	сс	т	GA	C G	G G	GG	сс	c c	G C	AC	A	GC	G G	ΤG	G A	G	: A	ΤG	TGO	GT	TAA		тс
14. Coxiella burnetii CB_30/Indonesia (LC464975.1)		сс	т	GA	C G	G G	GG	сс	c	G C	AC	A A	GC	G G	ΤG	G A	G	A S	ΤG	TGO	G T	T A A		тс
15. Coxiella burnetii isolate Bulg-Lume2/Russia (MG722701.1)		сс	т	GA	C G	G G	GG	сс	c c	G C	AC	A A	GC	G G	ΤG	G A	G	: A	ΤG	TGO	GT	T A A		тс
16. Coxiella burnetii isolate Baiyin-tick-12/China (PP930514.1)		СС	т	G A	C G	G G	G G	сс	c c	G C	AC	A A	GC	A G	ΤG	G A	G	A	ΤG	TG	G T	TAA		тс
17. Coxiella burnetii strain KZQ3/Korea (KY498541.1)		сс	т	G A	C G	G G	G G	сс	c c	G C	AC	A A	GC	G G	ΤG	G A	G	A S	ΤG	TGO	G T	T A A	A T	ТС
18. Coxiella burnetii isolate PRS 88 J/Indonesia (OR491253.1)		СС	Т	G A	C G	G G	GG	СС	: C	GC	AC	A A	GC	G G	ΤG	G A	G	A	ΤG	TGO	GT	TAA	A T	ТС
19. Coxiella burnetii isolate 614/Russia (OQ225486.1)		сс	т	G A	C G	G G	GG	СС	c c	GC	AC	A A	GC	G G	ΤG	G A	G	A	ΤG	TGO	GT	TAA	A T	ТС
20. Coxiella burnetii isolate kR-K92/Russia (JX154095.1)	сс	Т	GA	C G	G G	GG	сс	c c	GC	AC	A A	GC	G G	ΤG	G A	G	A S	ΤG	TG	GT	TAA		TC	
21. Coxiella burnetii isolate z24/ltaly (MW262812.1)	сс	Т	G A	C G	GG	GG	сc	c c	GC	AC	AA	GC	G G	ΤG	G A	G	A	ΤG	TGO	GT	TAA		ТС	
22. Coxiella burnetii strain At12/Brazil (JQ740886.1)	сс	Т	G A	C G	GG	GG	сc	C C	GC	AC	A A	GC	A G	ΤG	G A	G	C A	ΤG	TGO	GT	TAA		ТС	
23. Coxiella burnetii strain ATCC VR-615/USA (NR_104916.1)	сс	Т	G A	G	GG	GG	c c	C C	GC	AC	AA	GC	G G	ΤG	G A	G	A	ΤG	TGO	GT	TAA		тс	
24. Coxiella burnetii strain Ammassalik/Denmark (FJ787329.1)	сс	Т	GA	G	GG	GG	C C	C C	GC	AC	AA	GC	GG	TG	GA	G	A	ΤG	TGO	GT	TAA		тс	
25. Coxiella burnetii strain VR145/Korea (AY342037.1)				GA	GG	GG	GG	C C	C	GC	AC	AA	GC	GG	TG	GA	GO	A	TG	TGO	GT	TAA	AT	TC
26. Coxiella burnetii isolate IRAQ/Camel-No.1/Iraq (MN900579.1)				GA	GG	GG	GG	CC	C	GC	AC	A A	GC	GG	IG	GA	GO	A	TG	TGO	GT		AT	1 C
27. Coxiella burnetii isolate B10/China (MN263245.1)	CC		GA	GG	GG	GG	CC	C	GC	AC		GC	GG	T G	GA	G	A	TG	TGO	GT			I C	
28. Coxiella burnetii isolate Bulg-Dermret/Russia (MG722703.1)	CC		GA	GG	GG	GG	00			AC		GC	AG	TG	GA	GO	A	TG	TGO	GT			
29. Coxiella burnetii isolate txP-LO201/Russia (MG640364.1)		CC	1 (SA	G	GG	GG	CC		GC	AC	AA	GC	GG	I G	GA	G	- A	IG	I G (GI	I A A	AA	

Figure-5: Multiple sequence alignment analysis of the local study *Coxiella burnetii* isolates and National Center for Biotechnology Information GenBank *C. burnetii* isolates/strains using MEGA 11 software.

Table-1: Homology sequence analysis identity between the local Coxiella burnetii strains and the NCBI-GenBank C. burnetii isolates/strains.

Lo	cal strains	1	Identity (%)		
Name	Accession No.	Accession No.	Country	Host	
IRAQ1	PQ097649.1	MN263246.1	China	Hedgehog	95.47
IRAQ2	PQ097650.1	MN900579.1	Iraq	Camel	98.03
IRAQ3	PQ097651.1	MN900579.1	Iraq	Camel	98.03
IRAQ4	PQ097652.1	MN900579.1	Iraq	Camel	98.87
IRAQ5	PQ097653.1	MN900579.1	Iraq	Camel	98.87
IRAQ6	PQ097654.1	MN900579.1	Iraq	Camel	98.87
IRAQ7	PQ097655.1	MN540441.1	Colombia	Human	100
IRAQ8	PQ097656.1	MN540441.1	Colombia	Human	99.43
IRAQ9	PQ097657.1	MN540441.1	Colombia	Human	99.45
IRAQ10	PQ097658.1	MN540441.1	Colombia	Human	99.46
IRAQ11	PQ097659.1	MN540441.1	Colombia	Human	99.45

15.0% in stray dogs in Japan [27], and 11.8% in stray dogs of Croatia [28]. In a study conducted on military army dogs, the seropositivity rates were 5.2% in French Guyana, 8.3% in Ivory Coast, 9.8% in Southern France, and 11.6% in Senegal [29]. In pet dogs, *C. burnetii* was identified in 1.9%, 2.3%, 3%, 6.5%, and 21.8% of shelters, breeding, households, aboriginal, and owned dogs, respectively [30, 31].



Figure-6: Multiple sequence alignment analysis of *Coxiella burnetii* isolates and the National Center for Biotechnology Information -GenBank *C. burnetii* isolates/strains.

In the vicinity of a 2015 human Q-fever outbreak in New South Wales (Australia), Ma *et al.* [18] recorded a 26.1% serological prevalence of the bacterium in 330 dogs, indicating the role of environments in sharing infections between dogs and humans. In Portugal, Anastácio *et al.* [32] detected different positive infections in dogs in two periods (12.6% in 2012 and 1.7% in 2021), indicating the role of the sampling scheme in reducing positivity. In Brazil, 30% of police K-9 dogs were positive for anti-*C. burnetii* antibodies, indicating that working dogs can rest at a police

battalion kennel and share operational incursions at a work location [33]. In Iraq, several stray dogs are found in rural areas; therefore, the apparent seropositivity of *C. burnetii* infection in stray dogs may be due to the environment and increasing direct contact with potential infectious sources. Other environmental factors include proximity to livestock transport routes and major interstate sources. Dust from trucks on animal transportation may also play a role in transmitting infections.

Higher anti-C. burnetii antibody concentrations in stray dogs are expected as most animals remain

NCBI Multiple	Sequer	ce Alianme	nt Viewer Ver	sion 1 25 2										
Sequence ID	Sequen	Start	Alignment	51011 1.2.5.2									End	Ornanism
Dequence iD		Otan	152	160	170	180	1	90 20	0	210	220	230 235	Liiu	organian
P0097649 1	(1)	3	CTCTCCT	CACATCZ	TCCCTC		ACCACCCC		TTACTTCC				384	Coviella humetii
FQ097049.1	(+)) 3		GAGAIGI		AGNECCCGNA	ACGAGCGC	NA-18S ribosomal RNA	TTAGT FGC	CAGCGAGACA	A G I C G G G A	ACCC PRANGE	3 304	Coxiella burrietii
MN121702.1	(+)) 1											382	Coxiella burnetii
MN121700.1	(+)) 6											387	Coxiella burnetii
MN473206.1	(+)	2			- A - D -								366	Coxiella burnetii
HG825990.3	(+)	166,506						••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••				· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	166,877	Coxiella burnetii Cb175
MN263246.1 MN880312.1	(+)	916						• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •					1,288	Coxiella burnetii
MN396576.1	(+)	82						• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •					454	uncultured Coxiella sp.
MN396574.1	(+)) 82			The second se			G					454	uncultured Coxiella sp.
LC464974.1	(+)	798						· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·					1,170	Coxiella burnetii
LC464973.1	(+)	798						· · · · · • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •				- R B - 100	1,170	Coxiella burnetii
CP040059.1 CP035112.1	(+)	440.524						G					440.896	Coxiella burnetii
CP032542.1	(-)	93,465						••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••				· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	93,093	Coxiella burnetii
MG722701.1	(+)) 26			T			G					398	Coxiella burnetii
PP930514.1	(+)	90						••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••					462	Coxiella burnetii
PP930513.1	(+)	90			· · · · · T ·			· · · · · · G · · ·					462	Coxiella burnetii
CP014561.1	(+)	231,672						· · · · · G · G G · · ·					232,044	Coxiella burnetii
CP014559.1	(+)	231,672						••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••					232,044	Coxiella burnetii
CP014557.1 CP014555.1	(+)	159.254			T T			• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •		· · · · · · · · · · · ·			160,710	Coxiella burnetii
CP014553.1	(+)	159,714						••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••				· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	160,086	Coxiella burnetii
CP014551.1 CP014836.1	(+)	78 703						G					160,536	Coxiella burnetii
CP014549.1	(-)	81,783						••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••					81,411	Coxiella burnetii
CP014548.1	(-)	84,219						· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		• • • • • • • • • • •		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	83,847	Coxiella burnetii
CP018005.1	(+)	166,494											166,864	Coxiella burnetii
KY498541.1	(+)	49			• • • • • • T •			• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •				· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	421	Coxiella burnetii
KX825917.1	(+)) 49						G					421	Coxiella burnetii
LT009434.1	(+)	775						· · · · · • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •					1,147	uncultured Coxiella sp.
CP018150.1	(+)	338,222			<u>. T</u> .			••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••				- B	338,594	Coxiella burnetii 'MSU
OR857391.1	(+)	760						.					1,132	uncultured Coxiella sp.
OR857386.1	(+)	760						••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••					1,132	uncultured Coxiella sp.
OR857385.1 OR857383.1	(+)	758						G					1,130	uncultured Coxiella sp.
OR857380.1	(+)	759						••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••				· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	1,131	uncultured Coxiella sp.
OR857377.1 OR491253.1	(+)) 757						G					1,129	uncultured Coxiella sp. Coxiella burnetii
CP013667.1	(-)	93,458						· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·					93,086	Coxiella burnetii
KT894209.1	(+)	918			T			· · · · · • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •					1,290	uncultured Coxiella sp.
OQ225486.1 OQ225485.1	(+)	915						G G G G G G G G G G G G G G G G G G G					1,055	Coxiella burnetii
OQ225484.1	(+)	915			.			• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •					1,287	Coxiella burnetii
OQ152502.1 OQ152501.1	(+)	915			<u>.</u> T								1,287	Coxiella burnetii
OQ152500.1	(+)	907						••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••					1,279	Coxiella burnetii
OQ152499.1	(+)	907			· · · · · T ·			· · · · · · G · · ·					1,279	Coxiella burnetii
OQ152497.1	(+)	907						.					1,279	Coxiella burnetii
AP019759.1	(+)	166,494						••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••				· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	166,866	Coxiella burnetii
CP107268.1	(-)	163,204			T			• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •					1,744,	Coxiella burnetii
CP107247.1	(+)	163,268			• • • • • • • •			••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••				· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	163,640	Coxiella burnetii
OP411004.1 CP103428.1	(+)	920						G					1,292	uncultured Coxiella sp. Coxiella burnetii
CP103431.1	(+)	166,615						• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •					166,987	Coxiella burnetii
CP103435.1	(+)	166,499			T			· · · · · · G · · ·					166,871	Coxiella burnetii
CP103430.1	(+)	166,576						.					166,948	Coxiella burnetii
CP103426.1	(+)	166,560						• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •				· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	166,932	Coxiella burnetii
CP007555.1	(+)	336,324						G					336,696	Coxiella burnetii str. N
MW450598.1	(+)	805			• • • • • • T •			••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••				· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	1,177	uncultured Coxiella sp.
MW450480.1 MW450479 1	(+)	870						G					1,242	uncultured Coxiella sp. uncultured Coxiella sp.
LK937696.1	(+)	166,531						••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••					166,903	Coxiella burnetii Z3055
JX154095.1 MW262812.1	(+)	19						G					384	Coxiella burnetii
JQ740886.1	(+)	879						.	-				1,251	Coxiella burnetii
NR_104916.1	(+)	892		10. N N.				· · · · • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •					1,264	Coxiella burnetii
FJ787329.1	(+)	891			T			G					1,290	Coxiella burnetii
CP001020.1	(+)	338,225			. T			••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••					338,597	Coxiella burnetii CbuK
CP000890.1 CP000733.1	(+)	240,478			T			G					240,850	Coxiella burnetii RSA 331 Coxiella burnetii Duraway
AY342037.1	(+)	916						· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·					1,288	Coxiella burnetii
Y11500.1	(+)	886						· · · · · · G · · ·					1,258	Coxiella burnetii
D89792.1	(+)	915											1,286	Coxiella burnetii
MN900579.1	(+)	1			• • A • • • •								352	Coxiella burnetii
MN396575.1	(+)) 19											454	uncultured Coxiella sp
MN263245.1	(+)	916			· · · · • • • • • •			· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·					1,288	Coxiella burnetii
MG722703.1 MG722702.1	(+)	26						G					398	Coxiella burnetii
MG722699.1	(+)	26			T								398	Coxiella burnetii
MG640364.1	(+)	26			T			••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••					398	Coxiella burnetii
MG640362.1	(+)	20	8 8 8					G G G					398	Coxiella burnetii
CP014565.1	(-)	1,717,			• • • • • • T •			· · · · · · · G · · ·					1,716,	Coxiella burnetii
CP103429.1 CP103433.1	(+)	166.621						G					166,963	Coxiella burnetii
CP103425.1	(-)	1,756,			.			••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••					1,756,	Coxiella burnetii
CP103427.1	(+)	166.605			· · · · · T ·			• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •				·	166.977	Coxiella burnetii

Figure-7: Color coded of the local study *Coxiella burnetii* isolates and National Center for Biotechnology Information -GenBank *C. burnetii* isolates/strains using the National Center for Biotechnology Information viewer showing nucleotide similarity (*) and mutations.

free, thereby increasing the chance of frequent exposure to ticks and micro-organisms through contact with wildlife and domestic animals.

The molecular PCR results revealed that 6.4% of the study dogs were positive for *C. burnetii*, accounting for 1.08% in pet dogs, 4.76% in police dogs, 2.63% in guardian dogs, and 40% in stray dogs. Globally, several studies have shown that serological tests cannot always diagnose *C. burnetii* in animals due to the absence of specific anti-*C. burnetii*

antibodies at the early stage of infection [34, 35]. Comparatively, molecular examination of whole blood samples revealed a lack of Q-fever in 10% of Zambian stray dogs [36], 2.7% in different dog breeds of the Campania region in southern Italy [37], 10% in pound dogs of Algeria [35], and 11% in Iran [38]. Recently, the absence of *C. burnetii* DNA in dogs' blood samples was attributed to bacterial shedding by dogs and cats, even in pet animals that have a higher rate of exposure to infection and breed frequently [18, 32].



Figure-8: Phylogenetic tree analysis of local *Coxiella burnetii* strains and the National Center for Biotechnology Information-GenBank *C. burnetii* isolates/strains.

According to Angelakis and Raoult [39], diseased dogs might serve as a potential source of infection to other animals during delivery and to their owners by inhaling air. Small and large ruminants, including goats, sheep, cattle, and camels, can shed large numbers of organisms during abortions and normal parturition. Moreover, considerable environmental stability can allow the persistence of *C. burnetii* in soil for a long period [22, 40].

The present study showed that 16.86% and 6.4% of the study dogs were positive for *C. burnetii* based on the ELISA and PCR results, respectively. In southern Italy, 5.97% and 2.7% of dogs were found to be

positive for *C. burnetii* based on the results of ELISA and PCR, respectively [37]. Other studies demonstrated high levels of positive anti-*C. burnetii* antibodies in other domestic animals compared with the findings of molecular assays [3, 40-43]. Gangoliya *et al.* [41] detected that the overall serological and molecular positivity rates of Q-fever in sheep were 38.2% and 7.3%, respectively, whereas such rates were 23.7% and 0% in goats, respectively. ELISA and PCR showed that the positivity rates of Q-fever in one-humped camels were 19.8% and 4.4%, respectively [42]. An epidemiological study revealed that *C. burnetii* antibodies and DNA in cattle were 37% and 9%, respectively [43]. Ghaoui *et al.* [35] also mentioned that the laboratory detection of *C. burnetii* must be based on the interpretation of the serological response and presence of the pathogen. Furthermore, PCR can identify infected animals when positive sero-logical findings are found in a herd.

Targeting the *16S rRNA* gene, phylogenetic analysis revealed that local *C. burnetii* isolates are significantly similar to Chinese hedgehog, Iraqi camel, and Colombian human isolates. Based on these data, different *C. burnetii* strains could infect dogs in Iraq, with the possible transmission of *C. burnetii* infection from different animals to humans and vice versa. Chitanga *et al.* [36] assumed that *C. burnetii* has a sylvatic and domestic transmission cycle in which livestock plays an important link between the two cycles.

Conclusion

The overall prevalence of C. burnetii in dogs was high, particularly in stray dogs that showed an exceptional increase in infection rates compared with pet and police dogs, indicating that stray dogs in Iraq are frequently exposed to sources of infection over time. In addition, local C. burnetii isolates are considered the first Iraqi dog isolates submitted to the NCBI-GenBank, in which the results demonstrated an association between C. burnetii isolates and different strains, indicating that 16S rRNA sequencing can be used as a simple, unambiguous, transferrable genotyping approach to differentiate C. burnetii strains. The role of dogs or other domestic and wild animals as sources of infection must be widely initiated to prevent the transmission of C. burnetii infection from micro-organisms to humans. In addition, the prevalence of bacteria in other Iraqi regions should be surveyed using the most sensitive and specific diagnostic assays, such as ELISA and PCR.

Authors' Contributions

HMK: Molecular examination of whole blood samples by PCR. MKAA: Serological examination of sera by ELISA. AASA: Collection of blood samples, preparation of sera, and statistical analysis. IME: NCBI submission and phylogenetic analysis of *C. burnetii* isolates. All authors have read and approved the final manuscript.

Acknowledgments

The authors thank all veterinarians who contributed to blood sample collection. The authors did not receive any funds for this study.

Competing interests

The authors declare that they have no competing interests.

Publisher's Note

Veterinary World remains neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published institutional affiliation.

References

- 1. Celebi, B. and Baş, B. (2019) First isolation of *Coxiella burnetii* in Turkey from a patient with endocarditis; antigen production and phase change study. *Microbiol. Bult.*, 53(3): 274–284.
- Parija, S.C. (2023) *Rickettsia, Orientia, Ehrlichia*, and *Coxiella*. In: Textbook of Microbiology and Immunology. Springer Nature Singapore, Singapore, p641–652.
- 3. Gharban, H.A. and Yousif, A.A. (2021) First isolation and molecular phylogenetic analysis of *Coxiella burnetii* in lactating cows, Iraq. *Bul. J. Vet. Med.*, 24(4): 508–519.
- Valiakos, G., Gouvias, I., Lysitsas, M., Bouzalas, I., Tampach, S., Malissiova, E. and Billinis, C. (2024) Exposure of dairy cows to *Coxiella burnetii* in Greece: Surveillance results and association of bacterial presence with environmental variables. *Microbiol. Res.*, 15(2): 655–666.
- Dresler, J., Klimentova, J., Pajer, P., Salovska, B., Fucikova, A.M., Chmel, M. and Mertens-Scholz, K. (2019) Quantitative proteome profiling of *Coxiella burnetii* reveals major metabolic and stress differences under axenic and cell culture cultivation. *Front. Microbiol.*, 10: 2022.
- Sireci, G., Badami, G.D., Di Liberto, D., Blanda, V., Grippi, F., Di Paola, L. and Torina, A. (2021) Recent advances on the innate immune response to *Coxiella burnetii*. *Front. Cell. Infect. Microbiol.*, 11: 754455.
- Celina, S.S. and Cerný, J. (2022) *Coxiella burnetii* in ticks, livestock, pets and wildlife: A mini-review. *Front. Vet. Sci.*, 9: 1068129.
- Contreras, V., Gonzalez, M., Alvarez, J. and Mattar, S. (2018) *Coxiella burnetii* infection in sheep and goats: A public risk health, Colombia. *Infectio*, 22(4): 173–177.
- Abeykoon, A.H., Clark, N.J., Soares Magalhaes, R.J., Vincent, G.A., Stevenson, M.A., Firestone, S.M. and Wiethoelter, A.K. (2021) *Coxiella burnetii* in the environment: A systematic review and critical appraisal of sampling methods. *Zoonoses Public Health*, 68(3): 165–181.
- Yessinou, R.E., Katja, M.S., Heinrich, N. and Farougou, S. (2022) Prevalence of *Coxiella*-infections in ticks-review and meta-analysis. *Ticks Tick Borne Dis.*, 13(3): 101926.
- Eldin, C., Mélenotte, C., Mediannikov, O., Ghigo, E., Million, M., Edouard, S. and Raoult, D. (2017) From Q fever to *Coxiella burnetii* infection: A paradigm change. *Clin. Microbiol. Rev.*, 30(1): 115–190.
- Zarza, S.M., Mezouar, S. and Mege, J.L. (2021) From *Coxiella burnetii* infection to pregnancy complications: Key role of the immune response of placental cells. *Pathogens*, 10(5): 627.
- Stefanetti, V., Compagnone, A., Sordini, C., Passamonti, F., Rampacci, E., Moscati, L. and Marenzoni, M.L. (2018) Retrospective biomolecular investigation of *Coxiella burnetii* and *Leptospira* spp. DNA in cases of abortion, stillbirth and neonatal mortality in dogs and cats. *Top. Companion Anim. Med.*, 33(4): 122–125.
- Newton, P., Kuba, M., Padmanabhan, B., Latomanski, E.A. and Newton, H.J. (2019) *Coxiella burnetii*: Hiding in Plain Sight. Defense Against Biological Attacks. Vol. 2. Springer, Berlin, p213–238.
- Wurtz, N., Papa, A., Hukic, M., Di Caro, A., Leparc-Goffart, I., Leroy, E. and Raoult, D. (2016) Survey of laboratory-acquired infections around the world in biosafety level 3 and 4 laboratories. *Eur. J. Clin. Microbiol. Infect. Dis.*, 35(8): 1247–1258.
- Xi, Y., Ren, Y., Shang, X., Lu, S., Luo, S., Fan, H. and Song, L. (2023) *Coxiella burnetii* from cell and axenic cultures has similar viability but varied vitality as measured by using a methylcellulose semi-solid medium. *Res. Square*, 2023: 1–9.
- Ledda, S., Santucciu, C., Chisu, V. and Masala, G. (2020) Validation of a novel commercial ELISA test for the detection of antibodies against *Coxiella burnetii*. *Pathogens*, 9(12): 1075.
- 18. Ma,G.C., Norris, J.M., Mathews, K.O., Chandra, S., Šlapeta, J.,

Bosward, K.L. and Ward, M.P. (2020) New insights on the epidemiology of *Coxiella burnetii* in pet dogs and cats from New South Wales, Australia. *Acta Trop.*, 205: 105416.

- Hardi, F., Rauf, H., Mahmood, S., Ahmed, R., Ali, B. and Sheikh, M. (2020) Molecular detection and identification of *Coxiella burnetii* in aborted sheep and goats in Sulaimani Province, Kurdistan-Iraq. *Assiut Vet. Med. J.*, 66(164): 133–139.
- Khademi, P., Tukmechi, A., Sgroi, G., Ownagh, A., Enferadi, A., Khalili, M. and Mardani, K. (2024a) Molecular and genotyping techniques in diagnosis of *Coxiella burnetii*: An overview. *Infect. Genet. Evol.*, 123: 105655.
- 21. Sahu, R., Rawool, D.B., Vinod, V.K., Malik, S.V.S. and Barbuddhe, S.B. (2020) Current approaches for the detection of *Coxiella burnetii* infection in humans and animals. *J. Microbiol. Methods*, 179: 106087.
- 22. Gharban, H.A. and Yousif, A.A. (2020) Serological, clinical and hematological prevalence of *Coxiella burnetii* in adult cows, Iraq. *Biochem. Cell. Arch.*, 20(1): 67–74.
- Gharban, H.A. (2024) First genotyping confirmation of *Pichia kudriavzevii* in subclinically mastitic cows in Iraq. *Rev. Ciênc. Agrovet.*, 23(3): 529–536.
- Yadav, M.P. and Sethi, M.S. (1979) Sero-epidemiological studies on coxiellosis in animals and man in the state of Uttar Pradesh and Delhi (India). *Int. J. Zoonoses*, 6(2): 67–74.
- Willeberg, P., Ruppanner, R., Behymer, D.E., Haghighi, S., Kaneko, J.J. and Franti, C.E. (1980) Environmental exposure to *Coxiella burnetii*: A sero-epidemiologic survey among domestic animals. *Am. J. Epidemiol.*, 111(4): 437–443.
- Baldelli, R., Cimmino, C. and Pasquinelli, M. (1992) Dogtransmitted zoonoses: A serological survey in the province of Bologna. *Ann. Ist. Super. Sanita*, 28(4): 493–496.
- Htwe, K.K., Amano, K., Sugiyama, Y., Yagami, K., Minamoto, N., Hashimoto, A. and Hirai, K. (1992) Seroepidemiology of *Coxiella burnetii* in domestic and companion animals in Japan. *Vet. Rec.*, 131(21): 490–498.
- Punda-Polić, V., Poljak, S., Bubić, A., Bradarić, N. and Klismanić-Nuber, Z. (1995) Antibodies to spotted fever group rickettsiae and *Coxiella burnetii* among domestic animals in Southern Croatia. *Acta Microbiol. Immunol. Hung.*, 42(4): 339–344.
- 29. Boni, M., Davoust, B., Tissot-Dupont, H. and Raoult, D. (1998) Survey of seroprevalence of Q fever in dogs in the Southeast of France, French Guyana, Martinique, Senegal and the Ivory Coast. *Vet. Microbiol.*, 64(1): 1–5.
- Shapiro A.J., Norris J.M., Heller J., Brown G., Malik R. and Bosward K.L. (2016) Seroprevalence of *Coxiella burnetii* in Australian dogs. *Zoonoses Public Health*, 63(6): 458–466.
- Orr, B., Malik, R., Westman, M.E. and Norris, J.M. (2022) Seroprevalence of *Coxiella burnetii* in pig-hunting dogs from north Queensland, Australia. *Aust. Vet. J.*, 100(6): 230–235.
- 32. Anastácio, S., Anjos, S., Neves, S., Neves, T., Esteves, P.,

Craveiro, H. and Vilhena, H. (2022) *Coxiella burnetii* in Dogs and Cats from Portugal: Serological and molecular analysis. *Pathogens*, 11(12): 1525–1534.

- 33. De França, D.A., Da Silva, J.S., Rodrigues, N.J.L., Duré, A.I.D.L., Farinhas, J.H., Kmetiuk, L.B. and Biondo, A.W. (2024) Serosurvey of *Coxiella burnetii* in police officers and working dogs in Brazil: Case report and one health implications. *Trop. Med. Infect. Dis.*, 9(4): 78–85.
- Marenzoni, M.L., Stefanetti, V., Papa, P., Proietti, P.C., Bietta, A., Coletti, M. and Henning, K. (2013) Is the horse a reservoir or an indicator of *Coxiella burnetii* infection? Systematic review and biomolecular investigation. *Vet. Microbiol.*, 167(3–4): 662–669.
- 35. Ghaoui, H., Bitam, I., Zaidi, S., Achour, N., Zenia, S., Idres, T. and Fournier, P.E. (2024) Molecular detection and MST genotyping of *Coxiella burnetii* in ruminants and stray dogs and cats in Northern Algeria. *Comp. Immunol. Microbiol. Infect. Dis.*, 106: 102126.
- Chitanga, S., Simulundu, E., Simuunza, M.C., Changula, K., Qiu, Y., Kajihara, M. and Hang'ombe, B.M. (2018) First molecular detection and genetic characterization of *Coxiella burnetii* in Zambian dogs and rodents. *Parasit. Vectors*, 11(1): 40.
- Ferrara, G., Flores-Ramirez, G., Palkovicova, K., Ferrucci, F., Pagnini, U., Iovane, G. and Montagnaro, S. (2024) Serological and molecular survey of Q fever in the dog population of the Campania Region, Southern Italy. *Acta Trop.*, 257: 107299.
- Khademi, P., Tukmechi, A., Ownagh, A., Sgroi, G., Hadian, M. and Enferadi, A. (2024b) Epidemiological and molecular survey of *Coxiella burnetii* in domestic dog and cat populations, Iran. *Heliyon*, 2024: 1–17.
- Angelakis, E. and Raoult, D. (2010) Q fever. Vet. Microbiol., 140(3–4): 297–309.
- Gharban, H.A., Al-Abedi, G.J.K. and Al-Shaeli, S.J.J. (2022) Serological investigation of different abortion pathogens in one humped camels, Iraq. *Int. Cong. Appl. Sci.*, 10(1): 411–426.
- Gangoliya, S.R., Kumar, S., Alam, S.I., Sharma, H.K., Singh, M., Kotwal, S.K. and Kamboj, D.V. (2019) First molecular and serological evidence of *Coxiella burnetii* infection among sheep and goats of Jammu province of India. *Microb. Pathog.*, 130: 100–103.
- 42. Al-Graibawi, M.A., Yousif, A.A., Gharban, H.A. and Zinsstag, J. (2021) First serodetection and molecular phylogenetic documentation of *Coxiella burnetii* isolates from female camels in Wasit governorate, Iraq. *Iraqi J. Vet. Sci.*, 35(Suppl 1–3): 47–52.
- 43. Menadi, S.E., Chisu, V., Santucciu, C., Di Domenico, M., Curini, V. and Masala, G. (2022) Serological, molecular prevalence and genotyping of *Coxiella burnetii* in dairy cattle herds in Northeastern Algeria. *Vet. Sci.*, 9(2): 40.
