Current Situation with Avian Mycoplasmosis Prevention and Control

S. H. Kleven
University of Georgia
Department of Avian Medicine
Athens, Georgia 30602-4875

Efforts in the United States to control *Mycoplasma gallisepticum* (MG) began in the 1960's, primarily as a response to high condemnations from airsacculitis after the initiation of USDA post mortem inspection of poultry. Somewhat later, *M. synoviae* (MS) and *M. meleagridis* (MM) were added to the program. Since then, significant progress has been made in controlling Mycoplasma infections in turkey and chicken breeding stocks. Voluntary MG control programs in the U. S. are administered under the National Poultry Improvement Plan; testing provisions and protocols are provided in their official publication (1). The majority of poultry production in the U. S. is mycoplasma-free; however, MG and MS infection are common in commercial egg production flocks. Unfortunately, in spite of increased efforts at control, outbreaks continue to occur.

There have been changes which have resulted in an evolving situation in MG control, both in the United States and world-wide. These include changes in the poultry industry itself, improved detection methods, better understanding of the agent and its pathogenesis, and improved control methods.

Changes in the of the Poultry Industry Which Affect Mycoplasma Control

In most modern poultry producing areas of the world, the emphasis on the control of Mycoplasma infections has been centered around maintenance of Mycoplasma-free breeding stock and keeping parent and production flocks free of infection by utilizing single-age, all-in all-out farms with good biosecurity. In many parts of the world, this has been very successful, and the majority of broiler, turkey and egg production is free of infection. In contrast, areas with less-developed poultry industries tend to have high levels of contamination with MG and MS; this poses special problems for companies attempting to institute modern production methods.

With the rapid growth of poultry production world-wide, there has been concentration of large numbers of birds into small areas, leading to increased risk of exposure to pathogenic Mycoplasmas. In some areas, poultry production is so concentrated that from an epidemiological point of view, it is almost like a very large multi-age farm. Also, general improvements in disease control have sometimes resulted in decreased efforts in biosecurity, thus enhancing the possibilities for the spread of Mycoplasma infections (15).

There has been a tendency to drift away from all-in all-out production and to concentrate production on multi-age sites. This has been especially true for commercial egg production – the majority of egg production in the U.S. is now on multi-age sites, and this trend is developing around the world. Such multi-age production sites are mostly MS-positive, and many are also MG positive (29), even though grandparent and parent stocks are generally MG and MS-free.

In many locations, multi-age management of broiler breeders or broilers may occur. In turkey production, multi-stage production farms, on which 2 or even 3 different ages are maintained, are becoming quite common.

Therefore, in spite of sometimes heroic efforts at biosecurity and improved understanding of the survival of Mycoplasmas outside the host, Mycoplasma outbreaks continue to occur.

Improvements in Detection Methods

The basis for control programs has centered around serological methods such as agglutination and hemagglutination-inhibition, with reactors often confirmed by isolation of the organism. More recently, commercial ELISA kits have become available (IDEXX Laboratories, Westbrook, Maine, USA; Kirkegaard and Perry Laboratories, Gaithersburg, Maryland, USA) and are becoming widely used. Such kits have excellent sensitivity and specificity, but non-specific reactions may still occur. Potential improvements in ELISA specificity may result from the utilization of highly purified antigens, or the use of a blocking ELISA utilizing a specific monoclonal antibody.

MG strains of low virulence typically produce a poor antibody response, and isolation from clinical specimens may be difficult (36). This may be especially true if the antigenic makeup of the MG strain involved is not a good match with the strains used to produce test antigens. Variability in strains and clinical responses have also been noted for MS. We have encountered situations where flocks have exhibited a low-level serological response with a low percentage of PCR reactions. Such flocks have been culture negative. It has been possible to transfer such reactivity by placing SPF chickens in contact with the principals. These observations suggest that there may be atypical strains which have been undetectable with traditional diagnostic methods.

Polymerase chain reaction represents a rapid and sensitive alternative to traditional culture methods, which require specialized media and reagents and are time consuming. At least one company (IDEXX Laboratories, Westbrook, Maine, USA) produces commercial PCR kits, which are being widely used. A PCR procedure developed by Dr. Lauerman at Auburn University (20) is also in wide use.

Such improvements in serological methods and rapid detection by PCR have done much to facilitate the rapid and accurate diagnosis of MG infection.

Variability Among and Within Strains of *M. gallisepticum* and *M. synoviae*

MG and MS strains are known to vary in pathogenicity and antigenicity (16, 18). Variability in pathogenicity among strains of MG has been recognized for some time (36). Significant antigenic variability among MG strains also exists (18), which could affect the sensitivity of serological tests, depending on the strain infecting the flock and the strain used to prepare antigen. There are also significant differences in virulence among strains of MS. Recently, a strain of MS was encountered in turkeys which did not induce an antibody response even though birds were culture positive in the upper respiratory tract (19). House finches (*Carpadacus mexicanus*) with conjunctivitis caused by MG has been shown to be widespread in the U.S. (22, 23, 27). This strain has been shown to spread poorly to chickens and to be relatively avirulent in chickens (31). A house finch-like strain of MG has also been isolated from turkeys with atypically mild clinical disease (9).

Restriction Length Polymorphism (RFLP) of whole-cell DNA has been shown to be useful for differentiating MG strains (18). However, the RFLP procedure is time-consuming and laborious, making identification of specific strains a tedious procedure. More recently, Random Amplified Polymorphic DNA (RAPD) has been developed for identifying specific strains (5, 8, 10). This procedure is very simple and rapid, and has provided a routine procedure for the rapid identification of MG strains. This has proven to be very useful for epidemiological studies and for identification of specific MG strains in field outbreaks. More recently, we have utilized a PCR for the PvpA (25), mgc1 (gapA) (11, 14) and lipoprotein (30) genes, followed by RFLP or sequencing of the PCR product to identify specific MG strains. We are currently evaluating this method under field conditions utilizing primers for the mgc2 gene (13). Using this method we have been able to more closely pinpoint the identity of field and vaccine strains.

Studies utilizing Western blots and monoclonal antibodies have shown a high degree of variability in expression of surface antigens among strains of MG; many of these proteins are variably expressed (2, 3, 28). This has led to a large effort in characterizing the variable expression of surface antigens have shown that phase variation also occurs in vivo. Similar variability of surface antigen expression has now also been shown to occur among strains of MS. For example, clones of MS which are hemagglutinin negative are less virulent than clones which are hemagglutinin positive. The significance of such variability in the expression of surface antigens is not well understood; however, it seems logical that it would play a role in pathogenesis, serological responses, and evasion of the immune system of the host.

***M. gallisepticum* Vaccination**

With the advent of multi-age commercial layer complexes, control by vaccination became desirable.

The first commercially available MG vaccines were oil-emulsion bacterins (12). Bacterins protect well against airsacculitis and egg production losses, but provide little protection against colonization by field strains of MG, thus providing little value in eradication programs. Major disadvantages of bacterins are the need for 2 doses for optimal protection and the cost of administration.

Live MG vaccines include F strain (4, 26), which has been available for some time through several manufacturers, strain 6/85 from Intervet America, Millsboro, Delaware (6, 7), and strain ts-11, developed and widely used in Australia and licensed in the U.S. by Merial Select, Gainesville, Georgia (34, 35).

F strain exhibits low moderate virulence in chickens (it is virulent for turkeys), colonizes the upper respiratory tract efficiently, spreads relatively slowly from flock to flock, and offers protection against losses in egg production. It provides excellent protection against colonization by challenge strains, and displaces the wild-type field strains present in multi-age commercial egg operations. Unfortunately, F strain has been implicated in field infections in commercial turkeys (21).

Strains 6/85 and ts-11 offer some advantages over F strain. They both offer protection against challenge, but are avirulent and have very limited potential to spread from bird to bird (24), thus presenting less risk to neighboring poultry flocks. F strain has better ability to displace challenge strains in pen trial studies than does 6/85 or ts-11 (17), but field experience in a commercial layer operation suggests that strain ts-11 may be able to displace F strain in multi-age commercial layers . After ts-11 vaccination was discontinued, the flock has remained MG-free (33). Similar data with the 6/85 strain is not available, but there are complexes which have used 6/85 which now are seronegative, suggesting that displacement of wild type strains is also possible with 6/85. We have seen situations in commercial layers where the 6/85 or ts-11 strains did not hold up against field challenge. If the wild-type strains are highly virulent, it may be necessary to vaccinate with F strain for 1 or more production cycles to displace the wild type strain on that farm. It that point it may be possible to switch over to either 6/85 or ts-11, or it may seem reasonable to continue with F strain..

One major concern about live MG vaccines is safety. There have been numerous instances of clinical respiratory disease caused by “escaped” F strain vaccine in turkeys; this strain should probably not be used if there is potential danger of spread to turkeys, even though it is the most efficacious strain in chickens. We are unaware of any instance of “escaped” F strain infecting chickens. There have been several instances of isolation of 6/85-like MG strains from turkeys showing clinical disease. In some cases there was a history of vaccination of nearby chickens or turkeys. Recently, there has been detection of 6/85-like isolates of MG in unvaccinated commercial layers housed near 6/85-vaccinated birds (32).The ts-11 strain has been detected on at least two occasions in unvaccinated chicken flocks. In both instances there is a history of possible use of contaminated vaccination equipment and in one of the instances, subsequent spread to neighboring broiler breeders. We also know that ts-11 can spread from vaccinated spike males to unvaccinated breeder females. These experiences suggest that even though the newer vaccines are very safe, they do have the potential for spread, and their safety should be very carefully before a decision is made to vaccinate. An important rule for consideration in the use of these vaccines, is that high titered vaccine should be used and administered properly in order to give the vaccine strain little opportunity to spread from bird to bird. Table 1 summarizes the author’s experience with the characteristics of the various vaccine strains.

MG vaccines have had less use in turkeys. The F strain is too pathogenic for consideration in turkeys, but 6/85 or ts-11 strains may have potential use under very limited circumstances. In one vaccination trial conducted by us, administration of 6/85 or ts-11 did not result in respiratory signs or lesions in turkeys. There was little or no measurable resistance against airsacculitis after heavy aerosol challenge, but there was some protection detected against lesions in the upper respiratory tract. The ts-11 strain appears to have limited ability to infect turkeys.

Field experiences utilizing live vaccines have been very favorable in commercial layers, and field experiences in multi-age broiler breeders has also been favorable. These experiences suggest that live vaccines may be viable tools for the eradication of MG infection on multi-age commercial poultry farms.

There has been relatively little work on MS vaccines. There has been one MS bacterin licensed in the U.S., but it apparently has had little field use. A temperature sensitive MS strain has been licensed for use in Australia, and is widely used there. It has been licensed in Mexico and some other countries, but is not available in the U.S.

References

1. Anonymous, *National Poultry Improvement Plan and Auxiliary Provision.* Vol. APHIS-91-55-054. 2000, Washington, DC: USDA.

2. Avakian, A. P., and S. H. Kleven. The humoral immune response of chickens to Mycoplasma gallisepticum and Mycoplasma synoviae studied by immunoblotting. Vet. Microbiol. 24:155-170. 1990.

3. Boguslavsky, S., D. Menaker, I. Lysnyansky, T. Liu, S. Levisohn, R. Rosengarten, M. Garcia, and D. Yogev. Molecular characterization of the Mycoplasma gallisepticum pvpA gene which encodes a putative variable cytadhesin protein. Infect Immun. 68:3956-3964. 2000.

4. Carpenter, T. E., E. T. Mallinson, K. F. Miller, R. F. Gentry, and L. D. Schwartz. Vaccination with F-strain Mycoplasma gallisepticum to reduce production losses in layer chickens. Avian Dis. 25:404-409. 1981.

5. Charlton, B. R., A. A. Bickford, R. L. Walker, and R. Yamamoto. Complementary randomly amplified polymorphic DNA (RAPD) analysis patterns and primer sets to differentiate Mycoplasma gallisepticum strains. J. Vet. Diag. Invest. 11:158-161. 1999.

6. Evans, R. D., and Y. S. Hafez. Evaluation of a Mycoplasma gallisepticum strain exhibiting reduced virulence for prevention and control of poultry mycoplasmosis. Avian Dis. 36:197-201. 1992.

7. Evans, R. D., Y. S. Hafez, and C. S. Schreurs. Demonstration of the genetic stability of a Mycoplasma gallisepticum strain following in vivo passage. Avian Dis. 36:554-560. 1992.

8. Fan, H. H., S. H. Kleven, and M. W. Jackwood. Application of polymerase chain reaction with arbitrary primers to strain identification of Mycoplasma gallisepticum. Avian Dis. 39:729-735. 1995.

9. Ferguson, N. M., D. Hermes, V. A. Leiting, and S. H. Kleven. The characterization of a naturally occurring Infection of a Mycoplasma gallisepticum house finch-like strain in turkey breeders. Avian Dis. 523-530. 2003.

10. Geary, S. J., M. H. Forsyth, S. A. Saoud, G. Wang, D. E. Berg, and C. M. Berg. Mycoplasma gallisepticum strain differentiation by arbitrary primer PCR (RAPD) fingerprinting. Molec. Cell. Probes. 8:311-316. 1994.

11. Goh, M. S., T. S. Gorton, M. H. Forsyth, K. E. Troy, and S. J. Geary. Molecular and biochemical analysis of a 105 kDa Mycoplasma gallisepticum cytadhesin (GapA). Microbiol. 144:2971-2978. 1998.

12. Hildebrand, D. G., D. E. Page, and J. R. Berg. Mycoplasma gallisepticum (MG) — laboratory and field studies evaluating the safety and efficacy of an inactivated MG bacterin. Avian Dis. 27:792-802. 1983.

13. Hnatow, L. L., C. L. Keeler, Jr., L. L. Tessmer, K. Czymmek, and J. E. Dohms. Characterization of MGC2, a Mycoplasma gallisepticum cytadhesin with homology to the Mycoplasma pneumoniae 30-kilodalton protein P30 and Mycoplasma genitalium P32. Infect. Immun. 66:3436-3442. 1998.

14. Keeler Jr., C. L., L. L. Hnatow, P. L. Whetzel, and J. E. Dohms. Cloning and characterization of a putative cytadhesin gene (mgc1) from Mycoplasma gallisepticum. Infect. Immun. 64:1541-1547. 1996.

15. Kleven, S. H. Changing expectations in the control of Mycoplasma gallisepticum. Acta Vet. Hung. 45:299-305. 1997.

16. Kleven, S. H., O. J. Fletcher, and R. B. Davis. Variation of pathogenicity of isolates of Mycoplasma synoviae with respect to development of airsacculitis and synovitis in broilers. Am J Vet Res. 163:1196-1196. 1973.

17. Kleven, S. H., M. I. Khan, and R. Yamamoto. Fingerprinting of Mycoplasma gallisepticum strains isolated from multiple-age layers vaccinated with live F strain. Avian Dis. 34:984-990. 1990.

18. Kleven, S. H., C. J. Morrow, and K. G. Whithear. Comparison of Mycoplasma gallisepticum strains by hemagglutination-inhibition and restriction endonuclease analysis. Avian Dis. 32:731-741. 1988.

19. Kleven, S. H., G. N. Rowland, and M. C. Kumar. Poor serological response to upper respiratory infection with Mycoplasma synoviae in turkeys. Avian Dis. 45:719-723. 2001.

20. Lauerman, L. H. Mycoplasma PCR Assays. In: Nucleic Amplification Assays for Diagnosis of Animal Diseases, ed. L. H. Lauerman, eds. American Association of Veterinary Laboratory Diagnosticians, Auburn, AL. pp. 41-52. 1998.

21. Ley, D. H., A. P. Avakian, and J. E. Berkhoff. Clinical Mycoplasma gallisepticum infection in multiplier breeder and meat turkeys caused by F Strain: Identification by sodium dodecyl sulfate-polyacrylamide gel electrophoresis, restriction endonuclease analysis, and the polymerase chain reaction. Avian Dis. 37:854-862. 1993.

22. Ley, D. H., J. E. Berkhoff, and S. Levisohn. Molecular epidemiological investigations of Mycoplasma gallisepticum conjunctivitis in songbirds by random amplified polymorphic DNA analysis. Emerging Inf. Dis. 3:375-380. 1997.

23. Ley, D. H., J. E. Berkhoff, and J. M. McLaren. Mycoplasma gallisepticum isolated from house finches (Carpodacus mexicanus) with conjunctivitis. Avian Dis. 40:480-483. 1996.

24. Ley, D. H., J. M. McLaren, A. M. Miles, H. J. Barnes, S. H. Miller, and G. Franz. Transmissibility of live Mycoplasma gallisepticum vaccine strains ts-11 and 6/85 from vaccinated layer pullets to sentinel poultry. Avian Dis. 41:187-194. 1997.

25. Liu, T., M. Garcia, S. Levisohn, D. Yogev, and S. H. Kleven. Molecular Variability of the Adhesin-Encoding Gene pvpA among Mycoplasma gallisepticum Strains and Its Application in Diagnosis. J. Clin. Microbiol. 39:1882-1888. 2001.

26. Luginbuhl, R. E., M. E. Tourtellotte, and M. N. Frazier. Mycoplasma gallisepticum - Control by immunization. Ann. N. Y. Acad. Sci. 143:234-238. 1967.

27. Luttrell, M. P., J. R. Fischer, D. E. Stallknecht, and S. H. Kleven. Field investigation of Mycoplasma gallisepticum infections in house finches (Carpodacus mexicanus) from Maryland and Georgia. Avian Dis. 40:335-341. 1996.

28. Markham, P. F., M. D. Glew, J. E. Sykes, T. R. Bowden, T. D. Pollocks, G. F. Browning, K. G. Whithear, and I. D. Walker. The organisation of the multigene family which encodes the major cell-surface protein, pMGA, of Mycoplasma gallisepticum. FEMS Microbiol. Lett. 352:347-352. 1994.

29. Mohammed, H. O., T. E. Carpenter, and R. Yamamoto. Evaluation of factors associated with infection of commercial layers with Mycoplasma gallisepticum and Mycoplasma synoviae. Avian Dis. 31:470-476. 1987.

30. Nascimento, E. R., R. Yamamoto, K. R. Herrick, and R. C. Tait. Polymerase chain reaction for detection of Mycoplasma gallisepticum. Avian Dis. 35:62-69. 1991.

31. O'Connor, R. J., K. S. Turner, J. E. Sander, S. H. Kleven, T. P. Brown, L. Gómez Jr., and J. L. Cline. Pathogenic effects on domestic poultry of a Mycoplasma gallisepticum strain isolated from a wild house finch. Avian Dis. 43:640-648. 1999.

32. Steinlage, S. J. T., N. Ferguson, J. E. Sander, M. García, S. Subramanian, V. A. Leiting, and S. H. Kleven. Isolation and characterization of a 6/85-like Mycoplasma gallisepticum from commercial laying hens. Avian Dis. 47:499-505. 2003.

33. Turner, K. S., and S. H. Kleven. Eradication of live F strain *Mycoplasma gallisepticum* vaccine using live ts-11 on a multiage commercial layer farm. Avian Dis. 42:404-407. 1998.

34. Whithear, K. G., Soeripto, K. E. Harrigan, and E. Ghiocas. Immunogenicity of a temperature sensitive mutant Mycoplasma gallisepticum vaccine. Aust. Vet. J. 67:168-174. 1990.

35. Whithear, K. G., Soeripto, K. E. Harrigan, and E. Ghiocas. Safety of temperature sensitive mutant Mycoplasma gallisepticum vaccine. Aust. Vet. J. 67:159-165. 1990.

36. Yoder Jr., H. W. A historical account of the diagnosis and characterization of strains of Mycoplasma gallisepticum of low virulence. Avian Dis. 30:510-518. 1986.

Table 1. Comparison of live MG vaccine strains.

	F Strain	6/85	ts-11
Form	Lyophilized	Lyophilized	Frozen
Route	Various	Spray	Eye Drop
Virulence	Moderate	None	None
Persistence	Excellent	???	Good
Antibody	Moderate	None	Slow
Transmission	Moderate	Poor	Poor
Displacement	Excellent	???	Good