

1 **Wildlife tuberculosis in South African conservation areas:**  
2 **implications and challenges**

3

4

5

6 A.L. Michel<sup>1</sup>, R.G. Bengis<sup>2</sup>, D.F. Keet<sup>2</sup>, M. Hofmeyer<sup>3</sup>, L.M. de Klerk<sup>3</sup>, P.C. Cross<sup>4</sup>,

7 A.E. Jolles<sup>5</sup>, D. Cooper<sup>6</sup>, I.J. Whyte<sup>3</sup> and P. Buss<sup>3</sup> and J. Godfroid<sup>7</sup>

8

9

10 <sup>1</sup> Department of Bacteriology, ARC-Onderstepoort Veterinary Institute, Private Bag  
11 x05, Onderstepoort 0110, South Africa

12 <sup>2</sup> Directorate Veterinary Services, Skukuza, P.O. Box 138, South Africa

13 <sup>3</sup> South African National Parks, Skukuza, P.O. Box 402, South Africa

14 <sup>4</sup> U.S. Geological Survey, Northern Rocky Mountain Science Center, 229 AJM  
15 Johnson Hall, Bozeman MT 59717

16 <sup>5</sup> Department of Ecology & Evolutionary Biology, Princeton University, USA

17 <sup>6</sup> Chief Veterinarian, Ezemvelo KwaZulu/Natal Wildlife - KZN Wildlife. Private Bag  
18 x01, St Lucia, 3936

19 <sup>7</sup> Department of Veterinary Tropical Diseases, Faculty of Veterinary Science,  
20 University of Pretoria. Private Bag X04, Onderstepoort 0110, South Africa

21

22

23 Corresponding author: [Michela@arc.agric.za](mailto:Michela@arc.agric.za)

24

Tel: +27 12 5299384; fax: +27 12 5299127

1 **Abstract**

2 Tuberculosis, caused by *Mycobacterium bovis*, was first diagnosed in African buffalo  
3 in South Africa's Kruger National Park in 1990. Over the past 15 years the disease has  
4 spread northwards leaving only the most northern buffalo herds unaffected. Evidence  
5 suggests that ten other small and large mammalian species, including large predators,  
6 are spill-over hosts. Wildlife tuberculosis has also been diagnosed in several adjacent  
7 private game reserves and the Hluhluwe-Imfolozi Park, the third largest game reserve  
8 in South Africa.

9

10 The tuberculosis epidemic has a number of implications, for which the full effect of  
11 some might only be seen in the long term. Potential negative long-term effects on the  
12 population dynamics of certain social animal species and the direct threat for the  
13 survival of endangered species pose particular problems for wildlife conservationists.  
14 On the other hand, the risk of spillover infection to neighboring communal cattle raises  
15 concerns about human health at the wildlife-livestock-human interface, not only along  
16 KNP's western boundary, but also with regards to the joint development of the Greater  
17 Limpopo Transfrontier Conservation Area (GLTFCA) with Zimbabwe and  
18 Mozambique. From an economic point of view, wildlife tuberculosis has resulted in  
19 national and international trade restrictions for affected species . The lack of diagnostic  
20 tools for most species and the absence of an effective vaccine make it currently  
21 impossible to contain and control this disease within an infected free-ranging  
22 ecosystem. Veterinary researchers and policy-makers have recognized the need to  
23 intensify research on this disease and the need to develop tools for controlling this  
24 disease, initially targeting buffalo and lion.

1

## 2 **1. Introduction**

3

4 A number of reports of tuberculosis, caused by *Mycobacterium bovis*, in free-ranging  
5 African wildlife during the 20<sup>th</sup> century illustrate the susceptibility of a wide range of  
6 free-ranging mammals to this disease which has been primarily recognized as a disease  
7 of livestock (Thorburn et al. 1940, Francis, 1957, Guilbride, 1963, Gallagher et al.  
8 1972). Some affected species including African buffalo in the Queen Elizabeth  
9 National Park in Uganda and Lechwe in Zambia's Kafue National Park proved to act  
10 as maintenance host for *M. bovis* (Woodford, 1972, Krauss et al. 1984)

11 In 1880, Hutcheon made the first reference of bovine tuberculosis, which is caused by  
12 infection with *Mycobacterium bovis*, in cattle in South Africa. It is most likely that the  
13 disease was introduced by imported European cattle breeds mainly during the 18<sup>th</sup> and  
14 19<sup>th</sup> centuries. A potential link between tuberculosis in livestock and game was first  
15 suggested by Paine and Martinaglia in 1929 when they reported bovine tuberculosis in  
16 kudu and small ungulates in the Eastern Cape Province of South Africa. Subsequently,  
17 the increasing economic importance of tuberculosis as a disease of cattle led to the  
18 implementation of a national bovine tuberculosis control and eradication scheme in  
19 South Africa in 1969 (Huchzermeyer et al. 1994). Retrospective outbreak  
20 investigations suggested that the disease was transmitted to KNP buffalo from  
21 domestic cattle in the southeast corner of KNP between 1950 and 1960 (Kloeck,  
22 1998). The Crocodile River formed a natural barrier between KNP and the farmland to  
23 the south, but sightings of buffalo and cattle grazing in close proximity of one another  
24 were not uncommon. The presence of the disease was, however, only discovered in

1 1990. In 1992, BTB prevalence was estimated to be 0%, 4.4% and 27.1% in the north,  
2 central and south zones, respectively. Spread of infection to lion, cheetah, kudu,  
3 leopard and chacma baboon became evident by 1995 (Keet et al. 1996, Keet et al.  
4 2000). By 1998 BTB prevalence had increased significantly to 16% and 38.2% in the  
5 central and south zones, due to increases in both the average herd prevalence and the  
6 total number of herds infected with BTB (Rodwell et al., 2000). In the Hluhluwe-  
7 Imfolozi-Park (HiP), BTB was first diagnosed in buffalo in 1986 and spillover to lion,  
8 chacma baboon, bushpig and greater kudu was later documented. BTB herd prevalence  
9 in HiP varies from <10% to > 40% (Jolles, 2004). In Table 1 all free-ranging species  
10 diagnosed with BTB in HiP, KNPas well as adjacent reserves and farms are listed.

11

12 Table 1.

13

## 14 **2. Area descriptions**

15

### 16 *Kruger National Park*

17 Kruger National Park with an area of 19,485 km<sup>2</sup> is South Africa's largest wildlife  
18 refuge and a critical biodiversity resource. The Park's game population supports 147  
19 mammal species, incl. approximately 27 000 African buffalo and 1700 lions.  
20 Bordering on Zimbabwe to the north and Mozambique to the east the KNP stretches  
21 320 km from north to south and 65 km from east to west. More recently several private  
22 game reserves, situated on the western border, have been incorporated to form the  
23 Greater Kruger National Park Complex (GKNPC).

24

1

## 2 *Hluhluwe-Imfolozi Park*

3 The Hluhluwe-Imfolozi Park (HiP) is situated in the province of Kwazulu/Natal and is  
4 South Africa's third largest game reserve. It covers an area of almost 100 000 ha. HiP  
5 has a buffalo population of approximately 3000 and is entirely surrounded by  
6 communal farm land.

7

8

### 9 **3. Implications of BTB**

10

#### 11 *Effect on wildlife populations*

12 African buffalo can act as maintenance host of *M. bovis* and propagate BTB in large  
13 ecosystems in the absence of cattle (de Vos et al. 2001). Their social behaviour  
14 provides favourable conditions for aerosol transmission of *M. bovis* to members of the  
15 same herd. Buffalo herds in the Kruger National Park range in size from 50 to 1000  
16 individuals with an average of roughly 250. In addition, males frequently disperse  
17 between herds via bachelor groups, while females and juveniles move to different  
18 herds via splinter groups (Halley et al. 2002, Cross et al. 2005). Recent studies  
19 showed that these events may occur more frequently than previously thought,  
20 promoting the spatial spread of *M. bovis* (Cross et al. 2004, Cross et al. 2005). Cross  
21 et al. (2005) described how drought conditions may favor spatial spread of the disease  
22 by prompting herds to explore new areas and mix with previously unassociated herds.  
23 In HiP, buffalo bulls spent only a limited period, generally not exceeding 3 – 4

1 months, with breeding herds, but their *M. bovis* infection rates were higher than those  
2 of cows (Jolles, 2004).

3 On examination of mortality rates and calf:cow ratios in both infected and non-infected  
4 buffalo in HiP, Jolles (in press) found that mortalities due to clinically advanced BTB  
5 occurred at an annual rate of 11%. Over time this is expected to shift the age  
6 distribution towards younger animals. On the other hand, BTB was found to reduce  
7 pregnancy rates in infected females which has an opposite effect on age distribution.  
8 As a result, BTB may have no overall affect upon the age structure of the buffalo  
9 population. Due to the chronic nature of BTB and the long lifespan of African buffalo,  
10 it is not surprising that results from studies conducted earlier in the epidemic may  
11 differ from those conducted later, and some effects may only be detectable later in the  
12 epidemic. Results from a cross-sectional survey in 1998 by Rodwell et al. (2001)  
13 suggested that BTB may have no effect on buffalo fecundity, while data from HiP  
14 (Jolles, 2004) and a later study of known individuals from 2001-2005 suggest  
15 otherwise (Cross, unpublished data).

16 Caron et al. (2003) found a compelling correlation between increasing BTB herd  
17 prevalence in buffalo and a decrease in overall body condition. The association was  
18 even stronger during the dry season when herds of higher prevalence lost condition  
19 faster than herds of low BTB prevalence. Weak, old and debilitated prey animals are  
20 more vulnerable to predation by lions and other large predators (Mills et al. 1995,  
21 Funston 1998). Hence buffalo worst affected by the disease are the most likely  
22 targeted during lion predation because they are easiest to kill (Caron et al. 2003).

23

1 Since buffalo are considered to be one of four preferential prey species of lions (Mills  
2 1995), the frequent exposure of lions to large amounts of infectious buffalo tissue led  
3 to a spatial spread of BTB within lion prides in areas where the BTB prevalence is  
4 high in buffalo (Keet, unpublished data). It is thus difficult to determine at present  
5 whether lions are a maintenance or spillover host. Although infection occurs  
6 predominantly via the oral route, sociality and intra-species aggression between lions  
7 are specific behaviour patterns that may facilitate and predispose to aerosol and  
8 percutaneous transmission. The role of these horizontal and possibly of vertical  
9 transmission in perpetuating the infection cannot be excluded sufficiently. In a study  
10 comparing identified lion prides in the high buffalo TB prevalence zone, with a similar  
11 cohort in the low TB buffalo prevalence zone, disease effect parameters determined  
12 for buffalo were found to be true for infected lions. These include disease mortality,  
13 correlations between age and BTB infection as well as between BTB infection and  
14 body condition. Further and probably even more importantly, BTB was found to be  
15 driving social changes within prides which contributed to lower lion survival and  
16 breeding success (Keet, unpublished data). A faster territorial male coalition turnover  
17 was seen with consequent infanticide. The eviction of entire male and female prides  
18 from territories was also documented. This is in total contradiction with lion behaviour  
19 patterns described from elsewhere in Kruger and the rest of Africa. An abnormal sex  
20 ratio was seen – 2 males for every female (adults). It should be 1 male for every 2  
21 females. The infected sub-population was significantly younger than the non-infected  
22 sub-population. The non-infected subpopulation lived significantly longer than the  
23 infected subpopulation, especially males. Cub survival was higher in the non-infected

1 sub-population but birth rate was higher in the infected sub-population (Keet,  
2 unpublished data).

3 Research conducted in South Africa and elsewhere shows that infected buffalo serve as  
4 source of direct infection to large predators and scavenging omnivores. A less obvious  
5 link in the transmission between the maintenance and spillover host not living in the  
6 same habitat, has been demonstrated in greater kudu (Michel, 2002). The *M. bovis*  
7 genotype commonly found in KNP buffalo has been isolated from kudu, suggesting  
8 either faecal-oral transmission as discussed by previous authors (Thorburn & Thomas,  
9 1940), or alternatively, infection could have been carried over by ingestion of  
10 contaminated browse or water. More often an *M. bovis* strain genetically unrelated to  
11 the one characterized in buffalo, was associated exclusively with tuberculosis in KNP  
12 kudu, strongly indicating the maintenance host potential of this species. Cooper  
13 (unpublished data) concluded that a resident population of greater kudu were the most  
14 likely source of BTB infection in previously disease-free buffalo one year after they  
15 had been introduced into a Kwazulu/Natal game reserve.

16  
17 The source of re-current infections in solitary predators such as cheetah and leopard  
18 has been only partially understood. We have numerous observations where cheetahs  
19 and leopards were scavenging and it has been confirmed that they were infected with  
20 the same *M. bovis* genotype as buffalo (Michel, unpublished data). A possibility  
21 remains that they contract BTB from a currently undiagnosed infection in a smaller  
22 antelope species. Other carnivores such as hyaenas, as well as certain omnivores  
23 (baboons, warthogs & honey badgers) are considered to contract *M. bovis* through  
24 scavenging on BTB infected carcasses (Bengis, unpublished data). Greater kudu



1 appear to be the only species which show distinct clinical signs of BTB caused by  
2 bilateral abscessation of parotid lymph nodes, frequently accompanied by formation of  
3 draining fistulae (Keet et al. 2001).

4

5 With the exception of greater kudu none of the infected species known to date has  
6 shown maintenance host potential. However, as BTB prevalence continues to increase  
7 there is also a greater risk of spillover to new vulnerable and rare species.

8

9

#### 10 *The wildlife-livestock-human interface*

11 The farmland on the 390 km long western border of GKNPC is largely under  
12 communal land use. The livelihood of rural communities relies to a large extent on  
13 livestock farming. A game deterrent fence separates the two landscapes but despite  
14 great efforts and costs for its maintenance this man made barrier cannot guarantee the  
15 absolute separation of livestock from infected wildlife populations. Elephant activities  
16 or natural disasters such as the water floods experienced early in the year 2000, can  
17 cause damage to the fence allowing buffalo to mingle with domestic cattle. On the  
18 other hand, fences cannot prevent the movement of wild animals in all cases, e.g.  
19 greater kudu and warthogs. Once contact between infected wild animals with livestock  
20 is established, the potential of *M. bovis* transmission to cattle exists, as demonstrated in  
21 New Zealand and Great Britain and North America (Cheeseman et al 1998, Morris &  
22 Pfeiffer 1994).

23

1 To date no evidence of BTB outbreaks in communal cattle herds has been  
2 demonstrated despite intensified monitoring of cattle health at the interface (du Plessis,  
3 pers. comm.). However, unlike in commercial productions, communal livestock and  
4 their products are largely excluded from veterinary and veterinary public health control  
5 measures (Michel et al. 2004). BTB infection of communal cattle could be detrimental  
6 to the livelihood of small scale farmers. The objectives of livestock keeping in rural  
7 areas of sub-Saharan Africa, over and above that of food production, also include the  
8 generation of traditional wealth, social status and marriage dowries. As a result of this  
9 value system life expectancy of livestock is generally higher than on commercial  
10 farms, and livestock are moved in exchange of goods or services and owners often live  
11 in close proximity with their animals. BTB as a chronic and progressive disease  
12 manifests itself more often in older animals, under nutritional or productive stress.  
13 Taking this into account, people who are frequently exposed to either livestock  
14 infected with BTB or infected products such as unpasteurised milk, should be  
15 considered at risk of contracting zoonotic tuberculosis. This risk increases  
16 considerably in individuals with an immuno-suppression induced by HIV infection, as  
17 documented previously (Raviglione et al. 1995). A report published in South Africa in  
18 2001 stated the overall HIV prevalence in this country at between 15% (total  
19 prevalence) and 30% (age group 30 – 34 years) (Dorrington et al. 2001). At the end of  
20 2003 an estimated 5.3 million South Africans were living with HIV. As a result of the  
21 HIV epidemic the crude incidence rate of TB has not only increased drastically (Cosivi  
22 et al. 1998) but 50% or more of new cases of tuberculosis in South Africa can be  
23 ascribed to HIV (Maartens, 2001). In Hlabisa Hospital, situated in rural Kwazulu/Natal  
24 close to the HiP, the number of African HIV-positive patients with tuberculosis

1 increased from six in 1989 to 451 as early as in 1993 (Walker et al. 2003). Although  
2 the role of zoonotic tuberculosis in humans has not been investigated in South Africa,  
3 the wildlife-livestock-human interface as a risk factor should not be underestimated.

4

5

#### 6 *Implications on conservation and trade*

7 The diagnosis of BTB in a game species has severe implications on the national and  
8 international trade in wildlife due to movement restrictions and results in revenue  
9 losses for both KNP and HiP. It may be argued that BTB has partially turned the KNP  
10 into a conservation island not only jeopardizing conservation efforts in endangered  
11 species but also prohibiting the free exchange of genetic resources between  
12 conservation areas.

13

14

#### 15 *Greater Limpopo Transfrontier Conservation Area (GLTFCA)*

16 In December 2002 an international treaty to establish the Greater Limpopo  
17 Transfrontier National Park (GLTNP) was signed, bringing the parks of Gaza in  
18 Mozambique, Kruger National Park in South Africa and Gonarezhou in Zimbabwe  
19 together under a joint management. The three countries also reached agreement on  
20 creating a transfrontier conservation area (TFCA) that encompasses the GLTNP and  
21 the intervening matrix of conservancies and wildlife ranches on freehold land, together  
22 with the communal farming areas. Covering an area of approximately 100 000 km<sup>2</sup> the  
23 GLTFCA will be the second transfrontier park in southern Africa and one of the  
24 biggest conservation areas in the world. The longer term plans for this vast area

1 currently focus on the development of wildlife based tourism with freedom of  
2 movement for wildlife and tourists across international borders. Interactions between  
3 wildlife, livestock and humans living in the conservation area can be expected to  
4 increase drastically. The management of wildlife and livestock diseases such as BTB  
5 within the individual parks and the envisaged larger landscape has remained  
6 unresolved and presents a new challenge on approaches to disease control with an  
7 impact on existing disease control policies. Currently efforts are undertaken to gain  
8 information on geographical distribution and prevalence rates of BTB in domestic and  
9 wild species in the countries concerned. The need for an integrated, inter-disciplinary  
10 approach on animal health issues incl. BTB has been identified in a framework  
11 document by the Southern Africa AHEAD-GLTFCA Working Group (Osofsky et al.  
12 2003).

13

14

#### 15 **4. Progress**

16

##### 17 *Surveillance and monitoring*

18 In the absence of a management strategy policy for BTB in KNP buffalo, resources  
19 have been focussed on surveillance projects to determine the distribution and rate of  
20 spread of the disease. A progressive northward spread of BTB as well as an increase in  
21 disease prevalence have been documented. A monitoring project in buffalo in a  
22 dedicated study area in the medium prevalence zone revealed that the BTB prevalence  
23 increased in this sub-population from 13% in 2001 to 25% in 2003. For minimal  
24 invasiveness as well as ethical and ecological considerations both surveys in the low

1 prevalence north zone were based on live sampling making use of the modified gamma  
2 interferon assay as described by Grobler et al. (2002). In 2000 the infection had spread  
3 to an additional three herds. By 2003 a total of ten out of 29 buffalo herds in the  
4 northern region of KNP had a culture confirmed positive BTB status. Up to date the  
5 status of two further herds has remained suspect after positive IFNg test results for one  
6 buffalo in either herd could not be confirmed (Hofmeyr, unpublished data). In 2004 the  
7 most northern case of BTB in buffalo was diagnosed approximately 40 km south of the  
8 Limpopo River, which forms the border between South Africa and Zimbabwe  
9 (Hofmeyr, unpublished data).

10

11 In Kwazulu/Natal a control programme for managing BTB in HiP was initiated in  
12 1999 which is currently still ongoing. The programme is aimed at reducing buffalo  
13 herd prevalence below 10%, as well as reducing the risk of spillover into key species  
14 and to domestic livestock in areas surrounding the park. It is based on limited  
15 intervention in the form of mass capture of buffalo followed by tuberculin testing and  
16 removal of positive animals which appears to help reduce the prevalence of infection  
17 in individual herds (Cooper, unpublished data). To date a total of more than 3200 tests  
18 have been performed on buffalo. The programme was successful in reducing the  
19 prevalence

20 in some buffalo herds from previously 10 – 20% to below 10%, and in high  
21 prevalence herds from approximately 55% in 2000/2001 to an estimated 20 – 30%.  
22 (Jolles & Cooper, unpublished data).

23

1 Laboratory diagnosis of suspect cases of BTB in wildlife is essential for confirmation  
2 of BTB infection and in combination with molecular characterization of *M. bovis*  
3 provides a powerful tool to assist in studying spatial, temporal and inter-species  
4 transmission of *M. bovis*. Restriction fragment length polymorphism has been used to  
5 track transmission from cattle to KNP buffalo, from buffalo to lion and other spillover  
6 species (Michel 2002, van Helden, pers. comm.) At present, results from the genetic  
7 analysis of *M. bovis* isolates from most of the infected species support the hypothesis  
8 that the BTB epidemic originated from a point source and subsequently spread through  
9 the park. In contrast, at least two epidemiologically unrelated *M. bovis* strains were  
10 found to circulate in HiP buffalo. The BTB epidemics in KNP and HiP were shown to  
11 be epidemiologically unrelated. Genotyping of *M. bovis* will become instrumental in the  
12 BTB control of the future transfrontier conservation area with Zimbabwe and  
13 Mozambique.

14

15

16 *Control:*

17 Once BTB has established itself in a native, free-ranging maintenance host, eradication  
18 of the disease becomes highly unlikely. The choice of suitable control measures  
19 depends on the primary objectives for the particular ecosystem. KNP has an obligation  
20 to protect the species that host the pathogen. Although there is presently no evidence  
21 of a population level decline in the buffalo due to BTB (Whyte, 1998) various  
22 implications have to be considered which include the preservation of protected species,  
23 the minimization of risk of transmission to domestic cattle and a potentially  
24 devastating impact on population dynamics in other maintenance and spillover species.

1 Vaccination is undisputedly the control measure of choice in achieving these  
2 objectives, but in the absence of an effective vaccine alternative strategies have to be  
3 decided upon. Currently BTB is managed in KNP with minimal interference, meaning  
4 that no active control efforts have been implemented , but surveillance, monitoring and  
5 research activities are conducted to investigate the major epidemiological determinants  
6 (de Lisle, Mackintosh, Bengis 2001). This strategy is likely to change following the  
7 recent classification of BTB as an alien species in the KNP ecosystem (SANPark,  
8 unpublished information). The broad objective of the policy on alien species is to  
9 minimize the impact on, and maintain the integrity of indigenous biodiversity.  
10 Thresholds for potential concerns (TPCs) e.g. influence of the disease on biodiversity,  
11 the spatial and temporal impact of BTB on population dynamics, the animal and public  
12 health implications at the interface, etc. have been determined for BTB in buffalo and  
13 TPCs for other species, especially lions, are expected to be included over time. A  
14 monitoring programme has been proposed to determine whether and to which extend  
15 the thresholds have been reached or exceeded. This monitoring programme is linked  
16 to objectives of the Southern Africa Working Group of *AHEAD* (Animal Health for the  
17 Environment and Development) ([www.wcs-ahead.org](http://www.wcs-ahead.org)) and the veterinary research  
18 objectives of the Peace Parks Foundation, both of which are concerned with the socio-  
19 political and socio-economic aspects of this and other livestock diseases and the  
20 impact they may have at the wildlife-livestock-human interface in the Greater  
21 Limpopo Transfrontier Conservation Area (GTFCA).

22

23 Vaccination remains the ultimate control measure for BTB in wildlife reservoirs.  
24 Despite the close relatedness between domestic cattle and African buffalo it is

1 mandatory that the effectiveness of potential vaccine candidates can be demonstrated  
2 in buffalo. To determine adequate infectious challenge doses an infection model was  
3 developed in which a local *M. bovis* strain was used for intra-tonsillar infection of  
4 buffalo. Lesions induced were comparable in size, number and distribution to those  
5 found in naturally infected buffalo (de Klerk, unpublished data). The evaluation of  
6 BCG as a vaccine in African buffalo has recently commenced. Despite the fact that  
7 initial experiments did not yield statistically significant differences in the number of  
8 lesioned buffaloes between the groups of vaccinated and control animals, they have  
9 provided us with crucial insight instrumental to the design of subsequent trials.

10

11 For monitoring and control purposes availability of reliable diagnostic tests for  
12 affected species are essential. Despite its many limitations in wildlife, the intradermal  
13 tuberculin test is currently used to diagnose BTB in buffalo and lions (Jolles et al. in  
14 press, Keet, unpublished data). Following a slight modification the bovine gamma  
15 interferon assay has proved to be a valuable alternative to the tuberculin test (Grobler  
16 et al. 2002). A project has recently been initiated to explore the potential of this  
17 technique for BTB testing in rhinoceros and elephants (Morar, 2003). For many other  
18 animal species, however, there are no ante mortem tests available to date and the  
19 diagnosis of *M. bovis* infection relies on culture and histopathology.

20

21

## 22 **5. Discussion**

23



1 Bovine tuberculosis (BTB) is most well known as pathogen of livestock and the role of  
2 wildlife reservoirs in its eradication has been recognized (Bengis et al. 1999, Schmitt,  
3 2002). Countries' approaches to address and resolve this problem are largely  
4 determined by economic and socio-political driving forces. In the case of New  
5 Zealand, where the wildlife reservoir is considered an alien species, culling as a  
6 management option for BTB does not warrant ecological or ethical concerns. In  
7 contrast, wildlife tuberculosis in South and Southern Africa may, in the medium to  
8 long term, threaten the viability of indigenous, protected and even endangered species  
9 in ecosystems such as the KNP and HiP. Although direct effects of BTB are difficult  
10 to detect and appear to be developing slowly at the species population level, research  
11 conducted in buffalo and lion has revealed distinct adverse effects of BTB on  
12 individual and sub-population level which cannot be ignored. Organisations with the  
13 responsibility to maintain biodiversity in these ecosystems have the obligation to  
14 protect species, regardless of or despite the fact that they may be hosts of BTB.  
15 Wildlife-based tourism and trade are important economic lifelines for South Africa and  
16 can be adversely affected by BTB. At the same time governments have an obligation  
17 to protect human health at the interface of humans, domestic livestock and wildlife.  
18 The significance of zoonotic tuberculosis in humans in Southern Africa is currently  
19 unknown. In the light of the current HIV/AIDS burden, however, zoonotic tuberculosis  
20 should be considered a health risk factor in immuno-compromised people, since  
21 human tuberculosis is not only the commonest cause of HIV-related deaths but HIV  
22 infection is driving the tuberculosis epidemic in sub-Saharan Africa.

1 Whatever the current limitations are in terms of resources, effective BTB control  
2 measures, scientific information, research tools, etc., the development of the Greater  
3 Limpopo Transfrontier Conservation area (GLTFCA) requires an understanding of the  
4 complex systems influencing both human livelihoods and wildlife health across  
5 international borders.

6

7

## 8 **6. Further challenges**

9 The pioneer work of Anderson and May paved the way for the study of wildlife  
10 disease ecology. They pointed out that the parasite-host relationship was not simply  
11 the impact a parasite had on an individual, but formed an integral part of those  
12 interactions at the population level and at the same time a dynamic process where  
13 parasites were flowing from one host to the next. The rate at which this took place was  
14 determined by host behaviour and abundance (May & Anderson, 1978). Nowadays,  
15 numerous workers apply these ideas to explore the impact of diseases in naturally  
16 fluctuating wildlife populations, particularly in the context of conservation biology.  
17 Therefore, a major challenge is to link our understanding of individual level of  
18 infections to how disease flows through susceptible host populations and may possibly  
19 influence host dynamics.

20 Due to its importance and its sustainability in the population, BTB in buffalo  
21 highlights some of the challenges posed by BTB in wildlife to ecologists and  
22 veterinarians.

23 In order to understand the epidemiology of BTB in the buffalo population, a  
24 fundamental parameter is the  $R_0$  ('R nought'), the basic reproductive number that

1 defines a threshold ( $R_0 > 1$ ) for a pathogen to invade a population or the number of  
2 new infections arising from an infected individual. Obviously this parameter is linked  
3 to the density of the population allowing contact between susceptible and infected  
4 members (Hudson et al., 2002). In the buffalo population, the natural unit would be  
5 either a herd, or the number of individuals living in a defined geographical area.

6

7 Contradicting the often-presented hypothesis that *M. tuberculosis* evolved from *M.*  
8 *bovis*, recent work suggests that the common ancestor of the tubercle bacilli resembled  
9 *M. tuberculosis* and could well already have been a human pathogen (Brosch et al.,  
10 2002). Domestication of bovidae, in turn, allowed the adaptation of *M. bovis* to cattle.  
11 This study re-enforces the hypothesis of a recent introduction of *M. bovis* in buffalo  
12 related to the introduction of BTB infected cattle in Africa some 200 years ago and  
13 subsequent contact with naïve buffalo, 40 years ago (Bengis, 1999). As a consequence  
14 there has been no co-evolution between *M. bovis* and its new host and thus there are  
15 numerous unknowns in the short natural history of BTB in buffalo. Therefore, the  
16 pathobiology of the infection in buffalo has to be studied in details, particularly  
17 immune responses, in order to ascertain that assumptions we make, based on our  
18 knowledge of the infection in cattle, are valid for buffalo, too. Critical questions like  
19 transmission of the infection, induced pathology and conditions prevailing for overt  
20 disease (and hence shedding and infectivity) in buffalo have to be addressed. This can  
21 only be achieved by identifying the host immune responses that are likely to protect  
22 the host or conversely that are likely to promote invasion of the buffalo population by  
23 the newly introduced pathogen. Ecological immunology opens new avenues of  
24 research for invasion biology (Lee & Klasing, 2004): how do buffalo cope with the

1 shift from native, co-adapted pathogens to a preponderance of a novel challenge and  
2 how does this affect the potential of *M. bovis* to become invasive? Based on the  
3 temporal distribution pattern following the entry of BTB into KNP it was suggested in  
4 2000 that it could take another 30 years for the infection to reach the northern most  
5 point of KNP, but that due to a higher buffalo density the spread might occur faster (de  
6 Vos et al. 2001). In 2004 BTB was diagnosed in buffalo just 40 km from the northern  
7 boundary of KNP. Such a phenomenon cannot be easily explained by transposing our  
8 knowledge of the epidemiology of BTB in cattle to buffalo. Indeed, most (if not all)  
9 our recent knowledge of the epidemiology of BTB in cattle has been acquired in the  
10 context of control or eradication programs (Phillips et al., 2003). The epidemiology of  
11 BTB in buffalo is in essence different: there has been no co-evolution between the host  
12 and the newly introduced pathogen and no such control programs exist. Hence  
13 infection and disease are allowed to progress. Recent data suggest that BTB has  
14 invaded a vast proportion of the KNP buffalo population.

15 It is generally accepted that tuberculosis in humans results from a single infection with  
16 a single *M. tuberculosis* strain. Such infections are thought to confer protective  
17 immunity against exogenous re-infection. These assumptions were recently  
18 challenged. Indeed, a South African study published in 2004, showed that patients with  
19 active tuberculosis often have different strains in the same sputum specimen. These  
20 results suggest that multiple infections are frequent, implying high re-infection rates  
21 and the absence of efficient protective immunity conferred by the initial infection  
22 (Warren et al., 2004). What is the potential role of multiple infections in BTB,  
23 particularly in buffalo in KNP where no control program exists and where the infection  
24 pressure is high? Is overt disease (and as a consequence, the shedding of *M. bovis*) a

1 result of progressive disease following infection acquired early in life, possibly after  
2 reactivation, or could it be due to multiple infections? Is a shift of dominance of a Th1  
3 towards a Th2 immune response associated with the progression of the disease as  
4 recently suggested for cattle (Welsh et al., 2005)? Answers to these questions are  
5 critical in order to better understand the epidemiology of BTB in buffalo.

6

## 7 **Acknowledgements**

8 The authors are grateful to the South African Veterinary Foundation for funding of  
9 fundamental studies on BTB in lions, to the US NSF-NIH Ecology of Infectious  
10 Disease Grant for studies on the ecology of BTB in buffalo. We are grateful for  
11 financial assistance provided by the Smithsonian Institution for vaccine trials in  
12 buffalo and from the National Geographic society, the Theresa Heinz Foundation, the  
13 Mellon Foundation and the Wildlife Conservation Society in support of research  
14 related to BTB buffalo in HiP.

15

16

17

18

## 19 **Literature**

20 Anderson, R.M., May, R.M. 1978. Regulation and stability of host-parasite population  
21 interactions. I. Regulatory processes. *J. Anim. Ecol.*, 47: 219-247.

22

23 Bengis, R.G., Kriek, N.P.J., Keet, D. F., Raath, J.P., de Vos, V., Huchzermeyer, H.,

1 1996. An outbreak of tuberculosis in a free-living African buffalo (*Syncerus caffer*  
2 SPARRMAN) population in the Kruger National Park: a preliminary report.  
3 Onderstepoort J. Vet. Res., 63, 15-18.  
4  
5 Bengis, R.G. 1999. Tuberculosis in free-ranging mammals. In: Fowler M.E. and Miller  
6 R.E. (Eds.), Zoo and wild animal medicine. W.B. Saunders Company, Philadelphia,  
7 Pennsylvania.  
8  
9 Brosch, R., Gordon, S.V., Marmiesse, M., Brodin, P., Buchrieser, C., Eiglmeier, K.,  
10 Garnier, T., Gutierrez, C., Hewinson, G., Kremer, K., Parsons, L.M., Pym, A.S.,  
11 Samper, S., van Soolingen, D., Cole, S.T. 2002. A new evolutionary scenario for the  
12 *Mycobacterium tuberculosis complex*. Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA., 99: 3684-3689.  
13  
14 Caron, A., Cross, P.C., du Toit, J.T. 2003. Ecological implications of bovine  
15 tuberculosis in African buffalo herds. Ecological Applications, 13: 1338-1345.  
16  
17 Cheeseman C.L. , J.W. Wilesmith, F.A. Stuart. 1989. Tuberculosis: the disease and  
18 its epidemiology in the badger – a review. Epidemiol. Infect., 103: 113-125.  
19  
20 Cosivi, O., Grange J.M., Daborn, C.J., Raviglione, M.C., Fujikura, T., Cousins, D.,  
21 Robinson, R.A, Huchzermeyer, H.F.A.K., de Kantor, I. & Meslin, F.X. 1998. Zoonotic  
22 Tuberculosis due to *Mycobacterium bovis* in Developing Countries. Emerg. Infect.  
23 Dis., 4: 59-70.  
24

1 Cross, P.C., Lloyd-Smith, J.O., & Getz, W.M. 2005. Disentangling association  
2 patterns in fission-fusion societies using African buffalo as an example. *Animal*  
3 *Behaviour*, 69: 499-506.  
4  
5 Cross, P.C., Lloyd-Smith, J.O., Bowers, J.A., Hay, C.T. Hofmeyr, M. Getz, W.M.  
6 2004. Integrating association data and disease dynamics in a social ungulate: bovine  
7 tuberculosis in African buffalo in the Kruger National Park. *Ann. Zool. Fennici*, 41:  
8 879-892.  
9  
10 Cross, P.C., Lloyd-Smith, J.O., Johnson, P.L.F., Getz, W.M. 2005. Duelling timescales  
11 of host movement and disease recovery determine invasion of disease in structured  
12 populations. *Ecology Letters*, 8: 587-595.  
13  
14 de Lisle, G.W. , Mackintosh, C.G., Bengis, R.G. 2001 . *Mycobacterium bovis* in free  
15 living and captive wildlife, including farmed deer. In: *Mycobacterial infections in*  
16 *domestic and wild animals. Rev. sci. tech. Off.int.Epiz.*, 20: 86-111.  
17  
18 Dorrington, R., Bourne D., Bradshaw, D., Laubscher, R. & Timaeus, I.M. 2001. The  
19 impact of HIV/AIDS on adult mortality in South Africa. Technical Report of the  
20 Burden of Disease Research Unit of the Medical Research Council, South Africa.  
21  
22 Francis, J. 1957. *Tuberculosis in animal sand man*. Cassell and Company Limited,  
23 London, pp. 3-10, 70-82.  
24

- 1 Funston, P. 1998. Predator-prey relationships between lions and large ungulates in the  
2 Kruger National Park. PhD tesis, University of Pretoria, South Africa.  
3
- 4 Gallagher, J., MacAdam, I., Sawyer, J. & van Lavieren, L.P. 1972. Pulmonary  
5 tuberculosis in free living leche antelope in Zambia. Tropical Animal Health and  
6 Production, 4: 204-213.  
7
- 8 Grobler, D.G., Michel A.L., de Klerk, L.-M. & Bengis, R.G. 2002. The gamma  
9 interferon test: its usefulness in a bovine tuberculosis survey in African buffaloes  
10 (*Syncerus caffer*) in the Kruger National Park. Onderstepoort J. Vet. Res., 69: 221-227.  
11
- 12 Guilbride, P.D.L., Rollison, D.H.L., Mcanulty, E.G., Alley, J.G. & Wells, E.A. 1963.  
13 Tuberculosis in free living African (Cape) buffalo (*Syncerus caffer* Sparrman). J.  
14 Comp. Path. Ther., 73:337-348.  
15
- 16 Halley, D.J., Vandewalle, M.E.J. & Taolo, C. 2002. Herd-switching and long-distance  
17 dispersal in female African buffalo (*Syncerus caffer*). African Journal of Ecology,  
18 40, (1): 97-99.  
19
- 20 Hudson, P.J., Rizzoli, A., Grenfell, B.T., Heesterbeek, H., Dobson, A.P. 2002. The  
21 Ecology of Wildlife Diseases. Oxford University Press. ISBN 0 19 850620 1.  
22
- 23 Huchzermeyer, H.F.A.K., Brueckner, G.K., van Heerden, A., Kleeberg, H.H., van  
24 Rensburg, I.B.J., Koen, P. and Loveday R.K. (1994) Tuberculosis In: Infectious



1 Diseases of Livestock. Coetzer, J.A.W., Thomson, G.R. and Tustin, R.C. (Eds) pp.  
2 1425 – 14445.

3

4 Hutcheon, D. 1880. Tering: consumption, tables mesenterica. Annual Report, Colonial  
5 Veterinary Surgeon, Cape of Good Hope.

6

7 Jolles, 2004. Disease ecology of bovine tuberculosis in African buffalo. PhD thesis,  
8 Princeton University.

9

10 Jolles, A.E., Cooper, D., Levin, S.A. 2005. Hidden effects of chronic tuberculosis in  
11 African Buffalo. Ecology.-in press

12

13 Keet, D.F., Kriek, N.P.J., Penrith, M.-L., Michel, A. & Huchzermeyer, H. 1996.  
14 Tuberculosis in buffaloes (*Syncerus caffer*) in the Kruger National Park: Spread of the  
15 disease to other species. Onderstepoort J. Vet. Res., 63: 239-244.

16

17 Keet, D.F., Kriek, N.P.J., Bengis, R.G., Grobler, D.G., Michel A.L. 2000. The rise and  
18 fall of tuberculosis in a free-ranging chacma baboon troop in the Kruger National Park.  
19 Onderstepoort. J. Vet. Res., 67: 115-122.

20

21 Keet, D.F., Kriek, N.P.J., Bengis R.G & Michel, A.. 2001. Tuberculosis in kudu  
22 (*Tragelaphus strepsiceros*) in the Kruger National Park Onderstepoort J. Vet. Res., 68,  
23 (3): 225-230.

24

1 Kloeck, P.E. 1998. Tuberculosis of domestic animals in areas surrounding the Kruger  
2 National Park. In Proceedings of “The challenges of managing tuberculosis in wildlife  
3 in Southern Africa, Zunkel, (Ed.), 30-31 July 1998, Nelspruit, South Africa.

4

5 Krauss, H., Roetcher, D., Weiss, R., Danner, K & Hubschle, O.J.B. 1984. Wildtiere als  
6 Infektionsquelle fuer Nutztiere: Untersuchungen in Zambia. Beitrage der Klinischen  
7 Veterinaermedizin zur Verbesserung der tierischen Erzeugung in den Tropen, Band 10,  
8 Justus-Liebig-Universitaet, Giessen.

9

10 Lee, K.A., Klasing, K.C. 2004. A role for immunology in invasion biology. Trends  
11 Ecol. Evol., 19: Doi: 10.1016/j.tree.2004.07.012.

12

13 Maartens, G. 2001. HIV and tuberculosis. Joint Congress: HIV Clinicians, Infectious  
14 Diseases, Infection Control, Travel Medicine, Sexually Transmitted Diseases Societies  
15 and Veterinary and Human Public Health, 2-6 December 2001, Stellenbosch, South  
16 Africa

17

18 Michel, A.L. 2002. The epidemiology of *M. bovis* infection in South African  
19 wildlife. Abstracts of the Veterinary European Network on Mycobacterium  
20 (VENOM) Symposium: “DNA Fingerprinting of Bovine TB strains” , Belfast,  
21 Northern Ireland, October 24-26, 2002.

22

23 Michel, A.L., Meyer, S., McCrindle, C.M., Veary, C.M. 2004. Community based  
24 veterinary public health systems, current situation, future trends and recommendations.

1 In: FAO Expert Consultation on Community Based Veterinary Public Health Systems.  
2 [http://www.fao.org/ag/againfo/programmes/en/vph/events/expert\\_consult\\_report.pdf](http://www.fao.org/ag/againfo/programmes/en/vph/events/expert_consult_report.pdf).

3

4 Morris, R.S. & Pfeifer, D.U. 1994. The epidemiology of *Mycobacterium bovis*  
5 infections. Vet. Microbiol., 40: 153-177.

6

7 Mills, M.G. L. 1995. Notes on wild dog (*Lycaon pictus*) and lion (*Panthera leo*)  
8 population. Trends during a drought in the Kruger National Park. Koedoe, 38: 95-99.

9

10 Mills, M.G. L., Biggs, H. C. & Whyte, I. J. 1995. The relationship between rainfall,  
11 lion predation and population trends in African herbivores. Sixth International  
12 Theriological Congress, University of New South Wales in Sydney, Australia, 1995.  
13 Wildlife Research, 22: 75-88.

14

15 Morar, D. 2003. The development of an interferon-gamma (IFNg) assay for the  
16 diagnosis of tuberculosis in African elephants (*Loxodonta Africana*) and black  
17 rhinoceros (*Diceros bicornis*). MSc thesis. Dept. of Veterinary Tropical Diseases,  
18 Faculty of Veterinary Sciences, University of Pretoria

19

20 Osofsky, S. A., Cleaveland, S., Karesh, W. B., Kock, M. D., Nyhus, P. J., Starr, L.,  
21 and Yang A. (eds.) 2005- in press. Proc. Southern and East African Experts Panel on  
22 Designing Successful Conservation and Development Interventions at the  
23 Wildlife/Livestock Interface: Implications for Wildlife, Livestock, and Human Health.  
24 AHEAD (Animal Health for the Environment And Development) Forum.

1

2 Paine, R. and Martinaglia, G. 1929. Tuberculosis in wild buck living under natural  
3 conditions. J. Comp. Path. Ther. XLII, 1: 1-8.

4

5 Phillips, C.J., Foster, C.R., Morris, P.A., Teverson, R. 2003. The transmission of  
6 *Mycobacterium bovis* infection to cattle. Res. Vet. Sci., 74: 1-15.

7

8 Raviglione, M.C., Snider, D.E., Kochi, A. 1995. Global epidemiology of tuberculosis.  
9 J. Am. Med. Assoc., 273: 220-226.

10

11 Rodwell, T. C. 1999. The epidemiology of bovine tuberculosis in African buffaloes  
12 (*Syncerus caffer*). Ph.D. thesis, University of California, Davis

13

14 Rodwell, T.C., Kriek, N.P., Bengis, R.G., Whyte, I.J., Viljoen, P.C., De Vos, V., &  
15 Boyce, W.M. 2000. Prevalence of bovine tuberculosis in African buffalo at Kruger  
16 National Park. J. Wild. Dis., 37: 258-264.

17

18 Rodwell, T.C., Whyte, I.J., Boyce, W.M. 2001. Evaluation of population effects of  
19 bovine tuberculosis in free-ranging African buffalo (*Syncerus caffer*). J. Mammal., 82:  
20 231-238.

21

22 Schmitt, S.M., O'Brien, D.J., Bruning-Fann, C.S., Fitzgerald, S.D. 2002. Bovine  
23 tuberculosis in Michigan wildlife and livestock. Ann. N.Y. Acad. Sci., 969: 262-268.

24

1 Thorburn, J.A. & Thomas, A. D. 1940. Tuberculosis in Cape Kudu. J. S. Afr. Vet.  
2 Med. Ass., 11: 3-10.  
3  
4 Walker, A.R.P., Walker, B.F., Wadee, A.A. 2003. The HIV/AIDS infection – the  
5 public health burden particularly in Southern Africa. South. Afr. J. Epidemiol. Infect.,  
6 18: 26-28.  
7  
8 Warren, R.M., Victor, T.C., Streicher, E.M., Richardson, M., Beyers, N., van Pittius,  
9 N.C., van Helden, P.D. 2004. Patients with active tuberculosis often have different  
10 strains in the same sputum specimen. Am. J. Respir. Crit. Care Med., 169: 610-614.  
11  
12 Welsh, M.D., Cunningham, R.T., Corbett, D.M., Girvin, R.M., McNair, J., Skuce,  
13 R.A., Bryson, D.G., Pollock, J.M. 2005. Influence of pathological progression on the  
14 balance between cellular and humoral immune responses in bovine tuberculosis.  
15 Immunology, 114 :101-111.  
16  
17 Whyte, I.J. 1998. Effects of bovine tuberculosis on the dynamics of the buffalo  
18 population in Kruger National Park. Preliminary report. Scientific Report 07/1998.  
19 Kruger National Park, South Africa.  
20  
21 Woodford, M.H. 1972. Tuberculosis in the African buffalo (*Syncerus caffer*) in the  
22 Queen Elizabeth National Park, Uganda. Thesis presented to the Faculty of Veterinary  
23 Medicine of the University of Zurich for the Degree of Doctor of Veterinary Medicine.  
24 Zurich: Juris Druck + Verlag.

1 Table 1. Wildlife species in which *M. bovis* infection has been confirmed to date in

2 South Africa

3

4 

---

 African buffalo (*Syncerus caffer*)

5 Greater kudu (*Tragelaphus strepsiceros*)

6 Lion (*Panthera leo*)

7 Eland (*Taurotragus oryx*)

8 Warthog (*Phacochoerus aethiopicus*)

9 Bushpig (*Potamochoerus porcus*)

10 Large spotted genet (*Genetta tigrina*)

11 Leopard (*Panthera pardus*)

12 Spotted hyena (*Crocuta crocuta*)

13 Cheetah (*Acinonyx jubatus*)

14 Chacma baboon (*Papio ursinus*)

15 Impala (*Aepyceros melampus*)

16 Honey badger (*Mellivora capensis*)

17 

---

18

19