

Contents lists available at ScienceDirect

Asian Pacific Journal of Tropical Disease

journal homepage: www.elsevier.com/locate/apjtd



Original article

doi: 10.1016/S2222-1808(15)60995-1

©2016 by the Asian Pacific Journal of Tropical Disease. All rights reserved.

Detection of *Toxoplasma gondii* infection and associated risk factors among pregnant women in Makkah Al Mukarramah, Saudi Arabia

Khalil Mohamed^{1*}, Adil Bahathiq², Narjes Degnah³, Suzan Basuni⁴, Al Bagir Mahdi⁵, Ali Al Malki³, Ahmad Babalghith⁶

- Department of Epidemiology, Faculty of Public Health & Health Informatics, Umm Al Qura University, Makkah Al Mukarramah, Saudi Arabia
- ² Department of Physiology, Faculty of Medicine, Umm Al Qura University, Makkah Al Mukarramah, Saudi Arabia
- ³ Department of Laboratory, Maternal and Child Hospital, Makkah Al Mukarramah, Saudi Arabia
- ⁴ Department of Psychiatric, Faculty of Education, Umm Al Qura University, Makkah Al Mukarramah, Saudi Arabia
- ⁵ Department of Obstetrics & Gynecology, Faculty of Medicine, Umm Al Qura University, Makkah Al Mukarramah, Saudi Arabia
- ⁶ Department of Medical Genetics, Faculty of Medicine, Umm Al Qura University, Makkah Al Mukarramah, Saudi Arabia

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:
Received 25 Dec 2015
Received in revised form 5 Jan, 2nd revised form 6 Jan 2016
Accepted 19 Jan 2016
Available online 22 Jan 2016

Keywords: Toxoplasma gondii Prevalence Pregnant women Makkah Al Mukarramah Saudi Arabia

ABSTRACT

Objective: To determine the prevalence of *Toxoplasma gondii* (*T. gondii*) in pregnant women in Saudi Arabia and detect the risk factors associated with infection.

Methods: Data were collected using questionnaires after the participants signed the consent form. ELISA techniques were used to detect both immunoglobulin G (IgG) and immunoglobulin M (IgM) antibodies against *T. gondii* for all samples from the participants.

Results: About 326 samples were examined by ELISA to detect IgG and IgM. Seroprevalence of IgG was 21.2% (69) while seroprevalence of IgM was 1.2% (4). The majority of pregnant women [168 (52.0%)] were in the third trimester. The history of abortion occurred in 95 (29.1%) for the first or second time while 31 (9.5%) had abortion three times and more. The study found relationship between previous infection with *T. gondii* and the height of pregnant women. The women with height less than 150 cm were more affected than others (P < 0.02). Association was observed between eating undercooked meat and infection with *T. gondii* (P = 0.008).

Conclusions: Infection with *T. gondii* was found among Saudi women. High proportions of women (78.8%) are exposed to primary infection which can lead to abortion. Therefore, it is recommended that educational program to raise awareness to prevent the infection should be commenced without delay.

1. Introduction

Toxoplasma gondii (T. gondii) is an obligate intracellular protozoan parasite causing toxoplasmosis, which is one of the most predominant chronic infections affecting one third of the human

*Corresponding author: Khalil Mohamed, Department of Epidemiology, Faculty of Public Health & Health Informatics, Umm AL Qura University, Makkah Al Mukarramah, Saudi Arabia.

Tel: +966542864897

E-mails: kmismail@uqu.edu.sa, khali72@gmail.com

The study protocol was performed according to the Helsinki declaration and approved by Bioethics Committee in the Faculty of Public Health and Health Informatics, Umm Al Qura University. Informed written consent was obtained from the participants.

The journal implements double-blind peer review practiced by specially invited international editorial board members.

Foundation Project: Supported by Institute of Scientific Research and Revival of Islamic Heritage at Umm Al-Qura University (project # 43309004).

around the world[1-3]. It is documented as a Category B important pathogen by National Institutes of Health[4]. In pregnancy, particularly primary infection with *T. gondii* has been associated with miscarriage, hydrocephalus, cerebral calcification and chorioretinitis in the newborn[5]. Humans can acquire infection via ingestion of raw or undercooked meat containing cysts of *T. gondii* or by consumption of contaminated food or water with oocysts of *T. gondii* or via contaminated soil. Infection can also occur from infected mother to the fetus via placenta[6-10].

The importance of toxoplasmosis in pregnant women comes from the high prevalence of *T. gondii* infection and its severe consequences to the fetus and infant[10,11], and prevention from infection of the fetus and complications by antibiotic treatment has not been very effective[12].

Diagnosis of *T. gondii* infections during pregnancy is mostly done by detecting immunoglobulin M (IgM) and immunoglobulin

G (IgG) antibodies by using serological methods such as latex agglutination test, ELISA, and indirect immunofluorescence antibodies test[13-16].

T. gondii infection is widespread and the seropositivity varies from less than 10% to over 90%[17,18]. In Saudi Arabia several studies were published recently regarding the prevalence of toxoplasmosis in pregnant women. The overall prevalence of the disease in pregnant women in Jazan Province was 24.1%[19], and in the south western it was 38.8%[20]. In Riyadh, the capital of Saudi Arabia, retrospective study was carried out in pregnant women at King Khalid University Hospital, and the prevalence of 38% was found[21]. In pregnant women in Makkah Al Mukarramah, two studies were conducted using ELISA in 2008 and 2006 with the prevalence of 35.6% and 29.4%, respectively[22,23].

The current study was conducted to determine the prevalence of toxoplasmosis in pregnant women in Makkah Al Mukarramah and to study the risk factors that increase the infection with *T. gondii*.

2. Materials and methods

2.1. Area and study design

Cross-sectional study for toxoplasmosis in pregnant women was performed. The sample size was calculated as 326 samples according to prevalence obtained in 2006 in Makkah Al Mukarramah[23]. The study was conducted during April to August 2014 in Maternal and Child Hospital after approved by scientific committee of the hospital. The target group of this study was Saudi pregnant women who live in Makkah or the surrounding and regularly visited the hospital for follow up.

2.2. Ethical approval

The study protocol was performed according to the Helsinki declaration and approved by Bioethics Committee in the Faculty of Public Health and Health Informatics, Umm Al Qura University. Approval also was given for the study from the administration of the hospital before starting.

2.3. Data collection

Consent form was filled by each individual and signed to agree to participate in the study. Data were collected using a questionnaire. There were questions concerning socio-demographic data including age, education, occupation, residency, and related risk factors including source of drinking water, obstetrical history and type of meat, egg and milk the participants eat also, kitchen hygiene, whether they own cats, history of cleaning cat area or feeding raw meat scraps, eating out, and soil exposure were also explored. Some questions regarding the knowledge of the disease and past history of illness before marriage were also included in the questionnaire.

2.4. Samples collection

The blood samples were collected in the laboratory section

in Maternal and Child Hospital by using 5 mL syringe into heparinized tubes. Plasma was separated by centrifugation of the blood at $5\,000$ r/min for 10 min. Plasma was kept in different labeled cryo tubes at $-80\,^{\circ}\text{C}$ till used.

2.5. Laboratory work

The ELISA was performed to detect IgG and IgM antibodies against T. gondii using plasma samples according to manufacturer instruction (Toxo IgG® and IgM®, Human, Germany). Mean absorbance value of positive and negative controls and cut-off were calculated. Cut-off was calculated using the following formula: Cut-off value = mean of negative control + $0.2 \times \text{mean}$ of positive control.

2.6. Data analysis

SPSS version 20.0 (SPSS Inc. Chicago, IL. USA) was used to calculate the descriptive statistics to obtain specified statistics on the categorical (frequency or percentage) and numerical (mean and median) variables. The package was also used to calculate the prevalence of the disease. *Chi*-square test was used for ordinal variables to find the significant association between the infection and risk factors. Statistically *P*-value less than 0.05 was considered as significant.

3. Results

3.1. Seroprevalence of T. gondii

Out of 326 samples examined by ELISA, seroprevalence of IgG was 21.2% (69); also IgM was tested in all the samples using ELISA IgM and seroprevalence was 1.2% (4). Combined IgG and IgM positivity was found in one case (0.3%) (Table 1).

Table 1
Seroprevalence of IgG and IgM in pregnant women in Makkah Al Mukarramah.

Sero reaction	n	%
IgG positive	69	21.2
IgG positive and IgM positive	1	0.3
IgG positive and IgM negative	68	20.9
IgG negative and IgM positive	3	0.9
IgG negative and IgM negative	254	77.9

3.2. Socio-demographic profile

A total of 326 pregnant women were enrolled in this study with mean age of (30.19 ± 6.02) years; the age range of pregnant women participated in the current study was 16–40 years. Most of pregnant women participated in this study reside in urban area (86%). Approximately 206 (86.9%) belong to Arab and more than half of them [180 (55.6%)] have been married for over five years, and 117 (36.1%) attended higher education and 263 (80.7%) were housewives. Majority of pregnant women in this study have blood grouping type O positive [123 (48.4%)] while 287 (88.0%) of them has height more than 150 cm, and more than 226 (69.5%) of them has weight more than 60 kg as shown in Table 2.

3.3. Obstetrical features

In the duration of the study most pregnant women participated were grand multigravid [169 (62.6%)]; moreover, the majority of pregnant women were in the third trimester [168 (52.0%)]. The history of abortion occurred in 95 (29.1%) for the first or second time while 31 (9.5%) had aborted three times and more. Out of 325 participants, 12 (3.7%) had stillbirth (Table 2).

 Table 2

 Socio-demographic profile and obstetric history of participants.

Socio-demographic profil	e and history	N	%
Age groups (years) $(n =$	16–20	17	5.5
311)	21–25	64	20.5
	26-30	100	32.2
	31–35	72	23.2
	36-40	58	18.6
Residency $(n = 307)$	Urban	264	86.0
	Rural	43	14.0
Race $(n = 237)$	Arab	206	86.9
	Asian	19	8.0
	African	12	5.1
Years of marriage (years)	< 1	48	14.8
(n = 324)	1–5	96	29.6
	> 5	180	55.6
Education $(n = 324)$	Illiterate	18	5.6
	Primary and intermediate	95	29.3
	Secondary	94	29.0
	University	117	36.1
Occupation $(n = 326)$	Housewife	263	80.7
	Employee	45	13.8
	Student	18	5.5
Blood grouping $(n = 254)$	O+	123	48.4
	0-	18	7.1
	A+	62	24.4
	A-	8	3.1
	B+	38	15.0
	B-	4	1.6
	AB+	1	0.4
Height (cm) $(n = 326)$	121-150	39	12.0
	> 150	287	88.0
Weight (kg) $(n = 325)$	< 50	28	8.6
	51-60	71	21.9
	> 60	226	69.5
Gravidity ($n = 270$)	Primigravid	40	14.8
	Multigravid	61	22.6
	Grand multigravid	169	62.6
Trimester ($n = 323$)	1st Trimester	70	21.7
	2nd Trimester	85	26.3
	3rd Trimester	168	52.0
Abortion ($n = 326$)	0	200	61.4
	1-2	95	29.1
	> 3	31	9.5
Past occurrence of	Yes	12	3.7
stillbirth ($n = 325$)	No	313	96.3

3.4. Behavioral characteristics

To determinate the exposure of participants to risk factors associated with infection with *T. gondii*, pregnant women were asked about the source of drinking water that was usually used,

and most of them [136 (43.9%)] used health water for drinking. For drinking milk, majority of pregnant women used processed milk [260 (85.0%)]. Approximately 313 (97.2%) of target group in this study were consuming chicken meat and 293 (91.0%) were consuming sheep meat, while 62 (19.3%) consuming goat meat and only 11 (3.4%) consuming beef, but 130 (40.4%) consuming camel meat. On the other hand, the majority of women who participated in the current study handled meat [300 (93.5%)] and about 297 (92.5%) washed hands after handling meat, while 302 (94.1%) reported washing kitchen utensils (Table 3).

Table 3
Behavioral characteristics of pregnant women in Makkah Al Mukarramah

Behavioral characteristics	of pregnant women in Makkah	Al Mukarr	amah.
Variable		N	%
Source of drinking water	Desalination water	87	28.1
(n = 310)	Health water	136	43.9
	Zamzam	10	3.2
	Desalination water & health water	34	11.0
	Desalination water & zamzam	18	5.8
	Health water & zamzam	19	6.1
	All water type	6	1.9
Type of milk consuming	Processed milk	260	85.0
(n = 306)	Natural milk	3	0.9
	Processed milk & natural milk	43	14.1
Consuming chicken meat	Yes	313	97.2
(n = 322)	No	9	2.8
Consuming sheep meat	Yes	293	91.0
(n = 322)	No	29	9.0
Consuming goat meat	Yes	62	19.3
(n = 322)	No	260	80.7
Consuming beef meat	Yes	11	3.4
(n = 322)	No	311	96.6
Consuming camel meat	Yes	130	40.4
(n = 322)	No	192	59.6
Handling meat $(n = 321)$	Yes	300	93.5
	No	21	6.5
Washing hands after	Yes	297	92.5
handling meat $(n = 321)$	No	24	7.5
Washing kitchen utensils	Yes	302	94.1
(n = 321)	No	19	5.9
Frequency of eating meat	Daily	242	75.6
(n = 320)	Weekly	78	24.4
Eating meat in restaurant	Yes	311	97.8
(n = 318)	No	7	2.2
Frequency of eating meat in	Regularly	89	28.4
restaurant $(n = 313)$	Often	171	54.6
	Rarely	53	17.0
Meat prefer $(n = 321)$	Partially cooked	57	17.8
. ,	Thoroughly cooked	264	82.2
Eating egg $(n = 320)$	Raw	1	0.3
8 88 (/	Partially cooked	11	3.4
	Thoroughly cooked	308	96.3
Contact with cat $(n = 326)$	Yes	53	16.3
	No	273	83.7
Keep indoor cat $(n = 326)$	Yes	65	19.9
	No	261	80.1
Cleaning cat area $(n = 326)$	Yes	24	7.4
crouning out area (* 520)	No	302	92.6
Feeding cat raw meat scraps	Yes	15	4.6
(n = 326)	No	311	95.4
Contact with soil $(n = 326)$	Yes	31	9.5
(** 220)	No	295	90.5
Eating soil $(n = 326)$	Yes	14	4.3
	No	312	95.7
Cleaning house and dust	Yes	166	50.9
(n = 326)	No	160	49.1
Working in the garden	Yes	29	8.9
working in the garden $(n = 326)$	No	297	91.1
· -==/	110	291	71.1

3.5. Knowledge of T. gondii infection and detection before marriage

According to Table 4, about 40 (12.4%) of infected women have previous knowledge of *T. gondii* while only 14 (4.3%) checked infection with *T. gondii* before getting married.

Table 4
Knowledge of *T. gondii* infection and detection before getting marriage.

Variable		No. of infected	%
Know of T. gondii	Yes	40	12.4
(n = 323)	No	283	87.6
Check before getting	Yes	14	4.3
married $(n = 323)$	No	309	95.7

3.6. Risk factors associated with seropositivity

The current study showed no significant difference between previous infection and age (P > 0.11). Pregnant women in rural or urban area in Makkah can get the infection (P > 0.4). No relationship between race and previous infection with T. gondii (P > 0.4) was found. Pregnant women who married recently or long time ago can either get or not the infection with T. gondii; no significant different was observed (P > 0.15). Relationship between education and previous infection was not observed in this study (P > 0.2). Also, there was no association between the infection and the occupation of the pregnant women participated in this study (P > 0.07). Also, no association was found between blood group of pregnant women who participated in the current study and the previous infection (P > 0.15). The study found relationship between previous infection with T. gondii and the height of pregnant women. The women with height less than 150 cm were more affected than others (P < 0.02). In the same time no relationship was found between weight and the previous infection (P > 0.6).

Association between gravidity and infection was not seen in this study (P > 0.2). Also, the relationship between the stage of pregnancy and the infection was not recorded (P > 0.5). Association between the history of abortion and infection with T. *gondii* was not detected in the present study (P > 0.2). Also, no association between infection and stillbirth was observed in this study (P > 0.5) (Table 5).

Table 5Analyses of factors associated with IgG/ IgM seroprevalence of *T. gondii* among pregnant women.

** * * * * *			n 1			n 1
Variable	Ig	G	P-value	IgM		P-value
	seropositivity		_	seropositivity		
	Yes	No		Yes	No	
Age groups (years) 16-20	1	16	0.113	1	16	0.278
21-25	13	51		0	64	
26-30	16	84		2	98	
31-35	15	57		0	72	
36-40	18	40		1	57	
(continued on the right column)						

Table 5 (continued)

Variable Variable Variable Seropositivity Variable Seropositivity Variable	Table 5 (cd	эпппиеа)		<u> </u>	n 1			p. 1
Resident	Variable				P-value	_		P-value
Resident Rural Urban (Nama) 54 (Nama) 210 (Nama) 0.44 (Nama) 260 (Nama) 0.417 (Nama) Race Arah Arah 49 (157) (Nama) 0 (13) (Nama) 0 (13) (Nama) 0 (13) (Nama) 0 (13) (Nama) 0 (12) (Nama)								
Race Rural 10 33 0.42 1 205 0.927 Ashan 49 157 0.442 1 205 0.927 Ashan 5 14 0 19 0 12 Years of 1 6 42 0.159 2 46 0.129 Marrian 1-5 18 78 1 195 0 10 10 10 10 0 10 10 0 10 0 10 0 10 0 10 0 10 0 10 0 10 0 10 0 10 0 10 0 11 14	Resident	Urban			0.404			0.417
Race Arab Arab Asian 55 1.4 0 19 Arican 5 1.4 0 19 Years of African 1 1 0 12 Years of Security (cars) 5 44 136 1 179 Education (cycars) 5 44 136 0 18 0.390 Education (primary kintermediate (a) 21 74 1 94 0.390 Education (primary kintermediate (a) 21 74 1 94 0.300 Education (primary kintermediate (a) 21 74 1 94 0.33 1.14 94 Cocupation (primary kintermediate (a) 21 17 107 0.154 2 121 0.608 Branch (primary kintermediate (a) 13 40 0.077 3 260 0.83 1 170 0 8 1 0 0 1 1 0 0 1 1 1 0 0 1	Resident				0.404	-		0.417
African	Race				0.442			0.927
Years of smarriage 1-5 (years) > 5 44 (a) 13 (b) 13 (b) 13 (b) 13 (b) 14 (b) 15 (c) 14 (b) 15 (b) 14 (b) 15		Asian	5	14		0	19	
Marriage 1-5 (years) 5 44 136		African	1	11		0	12	
(years) > 5 44 136 1 179 Education Primary & intermediate Pri	Years of	< 1	6	42	0.159	2	46	0.129
Education Illiterate 3 15 0.208 0 18 0.390	U	1-5	18	78		1	95	
Primary & intermediate 21	(years)	> 5	44	136		1	179	
Secondary 23	Education	Illiterate	3	15	0.208	0	18	0.390
Occupation Housewife 59 204 0.077 3 260 0.738		Primary & intermediate	21	74		1	94	
Occupation Employee Employee Employee Suddent 59 204 0.077 3 260 0.738 Employee Suddent 10 35 1 44 44 44 44 44 44 44 44 60 18 0 18 0 18 0 18 0 18 0 18 1 17 0.608 17 17 107 0.154 2 121 0.608 0 38 48 4 2 3 0.825 4 283 4 283 0.825 4 283 0.825 4 283 0.825 4 283 0.825 4 28		•						
Employee 10 35		-						
Student O	Occupation				0.077			0.738
Blood O+ 17 107 0.154 2 121 0.608 grouping O- 5 13 1 17 17 17 17 17 17						-		
grouping O- 5 13 1 17 A+ 13 49 0 62 B- 1 7 0 8 B- 0 4 0 4 B- 0 4 0 4 B- 0 4 0 4 AB+ 1 0 0 1 Height 120 14 25 0.018 0 39 0.458 (cm) > 150 55 233 0.672 0 28 0.825 Weight (kg) < 50	DI I				0.454			0.600
A+					0.154			0.608
A-	grouping	_						
B+								
B-			-				_	
AB+								
Height		_					-	
(cm) > 150 55 232 4 283 Weight (kg) < 50	Height				0.018			0.458
Weight (kg) < 50	_				0.010			0.450
Sile					0.672			0.825
Section	moight (lig)				0.072			0.020
Gravidity Gravidity Multigravid Multigravid Grand multigravid Grand multigravid Hill Grand						-		
Multigravid 14	Gravidity				0.289			0.335
Grand multigravid			14	47		0	61	
2nd Trimester 20 65 0 85 3rd Trimester 32 136 3 165 Abortion 0 46 154 0.294 4 196 0.279 1-2 15 80 0 95 > 3 8 23 0 31 Past Yes 2 10 0.649 1 12 0.140 occurrence of stillbirth No 67 246 3 309 Source of drinking Health water 26 110 2 134 water Zamzam 4 6 0 10 Desalination water & 6 28 0 34 health water Desalination water & 5 13 0 18 Zamzam Health water & 3 16 0 19 Zamzam All water type 1 5 0 6 Type Processed milk 54 204 0.638 2 258 0.622 of milk Natural milk 0 3 0 3 Consuming Processed milk & 10 33 1 42 Consuming Yes 66 247 0.377 4 309 0.733 chicken No 3 6 0 9 Consuming Yes 62 231 0.709 4 289 0.527 sheep meat No 60 200 4 256 Consuming Yes 3 8 0.631 0 11 0.705 beef meat No 66 245 4 307 Consuming Yes 23 107 0.179 3 127 0.156 camel meat No 46 146 1 191 Handling Yes 61 239 0.055 3 297 0.133 meat No 8 13 1 20		· ·	40	129		2	268	
Abortion 0 46 154 0.294 4 196 0.279 1-2 15 80	Trimester	1st trimester	17	53	0.568	1	69	0.473
Abortion 0		2nd Trimester	20	65		0	85	
1-2		3rd Trimester	32	136		3	165	
Past Yes 2 10 0.649 1 12 0.140	Abortion	0	46	154	0.294	4	196	0.279
Past occurrence of stillbirth Yes 2 10 0.649 1 12 0.140 Source of stillbirth Desalination water 21 66 0.672 1 86 0.975 drinking water Desalination water 26 110 2 134 134 142 134 142 134 142 134 142 134 142 134 134 142 134 134 134 134 134 134 134 134 134 134 134 134		1–2	15	80		0	95	
occurrence of stillbirth No 67 246 3 309 Source of drinking Mater Desalination water 21 66 0.672 1 86 0.975 drinking Water Health water 26 110 2 134 134 2 134 134 134 134 134 134 134 134 134 134 134 134 134 134 13		> 3	8	23		0	31	
of stillbirth No 210 3 30 Source of drinking Desalination water 21 66 0.672 1 86 0.975 drinking Health water 26 110 2 134 134 134 134 134 134 144		Yes	2	10	0.649	1	12	0.140
Source of drinking		No	67	246		3	309	
drinking water Health water 26 110 2 134 water Zamzam 4 6 0 10 Desalination water & health water 6 28 0 34 health water 5 13 0 18 Zamzam Health water & 3 16 0 19 Zamzam All water type 1 5 0 6 Type Processed milk 54 204 0.638 2 258 0.622 of milk Natural milk 0 3 0 3 0 3 consuming Processed milk & 10 33 1 42 142 142 142 142 142 142 142 142 144		Deceliantian vuoten	21	66	0.672	1	96	0.075
water Zamzam 4 6 0 10 Desalination water & health water 6 28 0 34 Desalination water & 5 last camzam 1 0 18 Health water & 2amzam 3 16 0 19 All water type 1 5 0 6 Type Processed milk 54 204 0.638 2 258 0.622 of milk Natural milk 0 3 0 3 0 3 consuming Processed milk & 10 33 1 42 142 <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>0.672</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>0.973</td>					0.672			0.973
Desalination water & 6 28 0 34								
health water Desalination water & 5 13 0 18 Zamzam Health water & 3 16 0 19 Zamzam All water type 1 5 0 6 Type Processed milk 54 204 0.638 2 258 0.622 of milk Natural milk 0 3 0 3 0 3 0 0.600								
Consuming Yes Consuming Yes Yes			U	20		U	34	
Health water & Zamzam		Desalination water &	5	13		0	18	
Zamzam		Zamzam						
All water type			3	16		0	19	
Type of milk of milk consuming Processed milk & natural milk 54 204 0.638 2 258 0.622 Of milk consuming of milk consuming Processed milk & natural milk 10 33 1 42 Consuming Yes 66 247 0.377 4 309 0.733 Consuming Yes 62 231 0.709 4 289 0.527 Sheep meat No 7 22 0 29 Consuming Yes 9 53 0.14 0 62 0.326 goat meat No 60 200 4 256 Consuming Yes 3 8 0.631 0 11 0.705 beef meat No 66 245 4 307 0.156 Consuming Yes 23 107 0.179 3 127 0.156 camel meat No 46 146 1 191 Handling Meat No 8 13 1 20								
of milk consuming Natural milk processed milk & natural milk 0 3 0 3 Consuming chicken meat Yes 66 247 0.377 4 309 0.733 Consuming chicken meat No 3 6 0 9 Consuming Yes 62 231 0.709 4 289 0.527 Sheep meat No 7 22 0 29 0.326 Consuming Yes 9 53 0.14 0 62 0.326 Goat meat No 60 200 4 256 Consuming Yes 3 8 0.631 0 11 0.705 beef meat No 66 245 4 307 0.156 Consuming Yes 23 107 0.179 3 127 0.156 camel meat No 46 146 1 191 Handling Yes 61 239 0.055 3 297 0.133 meat No 8 <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td>								
consuming Processed milk & natural milk 10 33 1 42 Consuming Yes 66 247 0.377 4 309 0.733 chicken No 3 6 0 9 meat 0 9 0.527 Sheep meat No 7 22 0 29 Consuming Yes 9 53 0.14 0 62 0.326 goat meat No 60 200 4 256 4 307 0.705 beef meat No 66 245 4 307 0.156	J 1				0.638			0.622
Consuming Yes 66 247 0.377 4 309 0.733 chicken No 3 6 0 9 meat Consuming Yes 62 231 0.709 4 289 0.527 sheep meat No 7 22 0 29 Consuming Yes 9 53 0.14 0 62 0.326 goat meat No 60 200 4 256 Consuming Yes 3 8 0.631 0 11 0.705 beef meat No 66 245 4 307 Consuming Yes 23 107 0.179 3 127 0.156 camel meat No 46 146 1 191 Handling Yes 61 239 0.055 3 297 0.133 meat No 8 13 1 20								
Consuming Yes chicken No meat 66 September 1 247 September 2 0.377 September 2 4 309 September 3 0.733 September 3 0 9 September 3 0.709 September 3 4 289 September 3 0.527 September 3 0.709 September 3 4 289 September 3 0.527 September 3 0.14 September 3 0.62 September 3 0.326 September 3 0.14 September 3 0.62 September 3 0.061 September 3 0.061 September 3 0.061 September 3 0.0705 September 3	Consuming		10	33		1	42	
chicken meat No meat 3 6 0 9 Consuming Yes sheep meat No 62 231 0.709 4 289 0.527 Sheep meat No 7 22 0 29 Consuming Yes 9 53 0.14 0 62 0.326 goat meat No 60 200 4 256 Consuming Yes 3 8 0.631 0 11 0.705 beef meat No 66 245 4 307 Consuming Yes 23 107 0.179 3 127 0.156 camel meat No 46 146 1 191 Handling Yes 61 239 0.055 3 297 0.133 meat No 8 13 1 20	Consumin		66	247	0.277	4	300	0.732
meat Consuming Yes 62 231 0.709 4 289 0.527 sheep meat No 7 22 0 29 Consuming Yes 9 53 0.14 0 62 0.326 goat meat No 60 200 4 256 Consuming Yes 3 8 0.631 0 11 0.705 beef meat No 66 245 4 307 0.156 camel meat No 46 146 1 191 Handling Yes 61 239 0.055 3 297 0.133 meat No 8 13 1 20	_				0.577		- 07	0.755
sheep meat No 7 22 0 29 Consuming Yes goat meat No 9 53 0.14 0 62 0.326 Consuming Yes Seef meat No 3 8 0.631 0 11 0.705 beef meat No 66 245 4 307 Consuming Yes 23 107 0.179 3 127 0.156 camel meat No 46 146 1 191 Handling Yes Seef No 61 239 0.055 3 297 0.133 meat No 8 13 1 20		110	3	0		U	9	
Consuming Yes goat meat No 9 53 0.14 0 62 0.326 Consuming Yes beef meat No 3 8 0.631 0 11 0.705 Consuming Yes beef meat No 66 245 4 307 Consuming Yes camel meat No 46 146 1 191 Handling Yes No 61 239 0.055 3 297 0.133 meat No 8 13 1 20	Consuming	Yes	62	231	0.709	4	289	0.527
goat meat No 60 200 4 256 Consuming Yes 3 8 0.631 0 11 0.705 beef meat No 66 245 4 307 Consuming Yes 23 107 0.179 3 127 0.156 camel meat No 46 146 1 191 Handling Yes 61 239 0.055 3 297 0.133 meat No 8 13 1 20			7	22		0	29	
Consuming Yes 3 8 0.631 0 11 0.705 beef meat No 66 245 4 307 Consuming Yes 23 107 0.179 3 127 0.156 camel meat No 46 146 1 191 Handling Yes 61 239 0.055 3 297 0.133 meat No 8 13 1 20	Consuming	Yes	9	53	0.14	0	62	0.326
beef meat No 66 245 4 307 Consuming Yes camel meat No 23 107 0.179 3 127 0.156 Handling Yes meat No 61 239 0.055 3 297 0.133	goat meat	No	60	200		4	256	
Consuming Yes camel meat No 23 107 0.179 3 127 0.156 Handling Yes meat No 61 239 0.055 3 297 0.133	_	Yes	3	8	0.631	0	11	0.705
camel meat No 46 146 1 191 Handling Yes 61 239 0.055 3 297 0.133 meat No 8 13 1 20	beef meat	No	66	245		4	307	
Handling Meat Yes No 61 239 0.055 3 297 0.133 3 297 0.133			23	107	0.179	3	127	0.156
meat No 8 13 1 20	camel meat	No		146			191	
110	_				0.055	_		0.133
(continued on next page)	meat	No	8	13				
					(continu	ed on ne	ext page)

Table 5 (continued)

Variable		IgG seropositivity		P-value	P-value IgM seropositivity		P-value
		Yes				<u>-</u>	
Wline bende	Yes	res 62	No 235	0.342	Yes 3	No 294	0.180
Washing hands after handling	Yes No	7		0.342	-		0.180
meat		•	17		1	23	
Washing kitchen	Yes	64	238	0.598	3	299	0.104
utensils	No	5	14		1	18	
Frequency of	Daily	53	189	0.795	3	239	0.977
eating meat	Weekly	16	62		1	77	
Eating meat in	Yes	66	245	0.170	3	308	0.086
restaurant	No	3	4		1	6	
Frequency of	Regularly	15	74	0.270	2	87	0.313
eating meat in	Often	36	135		1	170	
restaurant	Rarely	15	38		0	53	
Meat prefer	Partially cooked	5	52	0.008	1	56	0.544
	Thoroughly	64	200		3	261	
Eating egg	Raw	0	1	0.837	0	1	0.924
	Partially cooked	2	9		0	11	
	Thoroughly	67	241		4	304	
Contact with cat	Yes	11	42	0.87	0	53	0.490
	No	58	215		4	269	
Keep indoor cat	Yes	14	51	0.527	0	65	0.409
	No	55	206		4	257	
Cleaning cat area	Yes	6	18	0.608	0	24	0.571
	No	63	239		4	298	
Feeding cat raw	Yes	4	11	0.531	0	15	0.828
meat scraps	No	65	246		4	307	
Contact with soil	Yes	8	23	0.506	1	30	0.331
	No	61	246		3	292	
Eating soil	Yes	4	10	0.505	0	14	0.670
Ü	No	65	247		4	308	
Cleaning house	Yes	32	134	0.395	1	165	0.589
and dust	No	37	123		3	157	
Working in the	Yes	9	20	0.231	1	28	0.312
garden	No	60	237		3	294	

Regarding to the uses of drinking water and the infection with T. gondii in the present study, no significant association were detected (P>0.6), and the same results were found between types of milk used and infection (P>0.6). Types of meat consumed including beef, chicken, sheep, goat and camel meat had no association in causing the infection. Handling meat had no association with infection by T. gondii in the current study (P>0.09). Washing hands after handling meat and washing kitchen utensils were not significantly associated with infection (P>0.3; P>0.5).

Relationship between eating meat or eating meat in the restaurant or frequency of eating meat in the restaurant and infection was not found in this study (P > 0.7; P > 0.1; P > 0.2). Association was observed between eating undercooked meat and infection with T. gondii (P = 0.008). The relation between eating raw or undercooked egg and infection was not detected in this study (P > 0.8).

The association between contacting cat, keeping indoor cat, cleaning the area of cat or feeding cat raw meat scraps and infection was not observed in this study (P > 0.8; P > 0.5; P > 0.6; P > 0.5, respectively) (Table 5).

In addition, no relationship between direct contact with soil, cleaning dust, working in the garden or eating soil and the infection with T. gondii was detected (P > 0.5; P > 0.5; P > 0.3; P > 0.5, respectively). (Table 5).

4. Discussion

The results obtained from this study were based on serological methods, ELISA for IgG and IgM. Detection of IgG in blood samples was for previous infection and IgM for recent infection in pregnant women. Prevalence of previous T. gondii infection among pregnant women in Makkah City in the current study was 21.2% which is similar to previous studies done in the same area and same target group. In 2002, Ghazi et al. recorded 35.6% IgG seropositivity by using ELISA[22], and in 2006 in the same target group the prevalence was 29.4% by using ELISA for IgG[23]. According to the prevalence obtained in the three studies, we observed that the prevalence of T. gondii among pregnant women in Makkah City was reduced. This reduction may be attributed to climate changes, enhancement in hygienic conditions, changes in feeding habits or good knowledge about avoiding the infection with T. gondii. The observation confirmed by seropositivity of IgM for detection of recent infection was done in the same group and area in 2006 (5.6%)[23], but in the current study, the prevalence of recent infection was 1.2%.

Comparing the results obtained in the current study with previous studies done in the different areas in Saudi Arabia in the same target group, we found that the prevalence was contrasting. In the pregnant women in Al Ahsa, prevalence was 51.4% using ELISA for IgG and 8.8% using ELISA for IgM[24]. While prevalence was 41% in pregnant Saudi women in Aseer region by using PCR[25]. Another study done in Saudi pregnant women in Hail using ELISA showed prevalence of 28.9% and 2.8% for IgG and IgM, respectively[26]. Also, study done in Hail in pregnant women in 2014 revealed prevalence of 8.57% for IgG[27]. Recently, a study was done in women in Najran using ELISA, the results showed 29.2% for IgG and 3.1% for IgM[28]. In South Western Saudi Arabia, another study done in pregnant women using ELISA showed prevalence of 38.8% for IgG and 6.2% for IgM[20]. Similar study done in Jazan using same techniques displayed prevalence of 20% for IgG and 6.2% for IgM[19]. The results obtained in the current study and previous ones done in Saudi Arabia were similar and the variation may be due to the difference of climate and geographical area, as the infection with T. gondii spread in hotter and wetter area. The results were also similar to that obtained in other countries such as Qatar[29] and Iraq[30], but different from results recorded in pregnant women in Colombia[31], France[32], and Ethiopia[33]; the variation may be due to the difference in climate or life style.

In previous study done in pregnant women in Makkah in 2006, about 10% of participants had the knowledge of toxoplasmosis and none of participants was previously tested for *Toxoplasma* infection. In current study the proportion was increased to more than 12% for women who have the knowledge of toxoplasmosis and more than 4% were tested for *Toxoplasma* infection before getting married[23].

Although the seroconversion was increased among 36-40 age

group, this finding was not significant in the current study but matching with the theory which says that people living longer has chance to expose to more causing agent. This result was different from that obtained by other researchers in the same target groups with different locations in Saudi Arabia[20,23,26,27], but similar to study done in Ethiopia[34], Cameroon[35], and Thailand[36].

Location, race and marital status of pregnant women had no significant association with infection in this study, but the study suggested that people can get the infection in any places and the infection varies even in one location in same area. Women from any race acquire the infection equally. Women with long-time marriage are prone to acquire infection more times than single women because they may be more responsible for cooking and cleaning the house.

In the current study, the significant relationship between seropositivity and education was not found; the infection actually increased with high level of education and uneducated women were less infected. This finding may be due to the lifestyle which depends on hygienic practice regardless of level of education. This finding contrasts with finding in Hail region[27], but matches with finding in the same area of this study[23].

The majority of women who participated in the current study were housewives; few of them were working or students. The relationship between infection and occupation was not observed. This observation confirmed the hygienic lifestyle of participants.

The association between pregnant women and height was found significant in this study. Women higher in heights were more suspected to acquire the infection, as found in Iran[37]. This finding needs to be confirmed in separate study.

The relationship between obstetric history and seropositivity was not observed in this study. These results are in agreement with previous study done in Makkah[23] and in south western region[20].

Part of risk factors surveyed such as drinking water and type of milk or meat consumed, has no role in transmission of toxoplasmosis in this study; this finding matches with other previous study done in the same target group and same area. This may be attributed to religious beliefs and culture habits[23].

Handling meat, washing hands after handling meat, and washing kitchen utensils have no effect on transmission of the disease to the target group because there was no statistical significance found.

Other risk factors regarding eating meat in restaurant or frequency of eating meat in restaurant did not show any significant relationship with seroprevalence in the current study. According to the result obtained in this study, eating partially cooked meat or undercooked meat was highly associated with seroprevalence of toxoplasmosis in the current study, and may be the only source of infection to pregnant women participated in the study. Raw meat was not consumed in the target area of study due to their culture, but partially cooked meat was consumed. This result was well documented in different parts of the world[6,38-41].

Some of the risk factors such as the ownership of cat, feeding or contacting with cat, contacting with soil, cleaning the dust, eating soil, and working in the garden have shown no significant association with toxoplasmosis. The absence of this significant association may be due to the weather conditions in Makkah.

According to our finding, the infection can be eradicated by using educational programme with emphasis on the role of undercooked meat in transmission of the disease particularly in pregnant women.

In conclusion, the study tried to explore the situation of the disease in Makkah, the source of infection and the risk factors which contributed to increase in the infection. The situation has been compared with previous study done in the same area and similar target group ten years ago. The current study found that the spread of disease reduced and the main source of infection has been determined. The authors believe that educational programme should target this source of infection.

Conflict of interest statement

We declare that we have no conflict of interest.

Acknowledgments

The authors would like to thank Institute of Scientific Research and Revival of Islamic Heritage at Umm Al-Qura University (project # 43309004) for the financial support.

References

- [1] Sonar SS, Brahmbhatt MN. Toxoplasmosis: an important protozoan zoonosis. *Vet World* 2010; **3**(9): 436-9.
- [2] Tekkesin N. Diagnosis of toxoplasmosis in pregnancy: a review. Telangana: Herbert Publications Pvt. Ltd.; 2012. [Online] Available from: http://www.hoajonline.com/journals/pdf/2050-0874-1-9.pdf [Accessed on 18th December, 2015]
- [3] Robert-Gangneuxa F, Dardé ML. Epidemiology of and diagnostic strategies for toxoplasmosis. *Clin Microbiol Rev* 2012; **25**(2): 264-96.
- [4] Weiss LM, Dubey JP. Toxoplasmosis: a history of clinical observations. Int J Parasitol 2009; 39: 895-901.
- [5] Flatt A, Shetty N. Seroprevalence and risk factors for toxoplasmosis among antenatal women in London: a re-examination of risk in an ethnically diverse population. Eur J Public Health 2013; 23(4): 648-52.
- [6] Montoya JG, Liesenfeld O. Toxoplasmosis. Lancet 2004; 363: 1965-76.
- [7] Dubey JP, Jones JL. *Toxoplasma gondii* infection in humans and animals in the United States. *Int J Parasitol* 2008; **38**(11): 1257-78.
- [8] Dubey JP. Toxoplasmosis of animals and humans. 2nd ed. Beltsville: CRC Press; 2010, p. 200-11.
- [9] Torgerson PR, Macpherson CN. The socioeconomic burden of parasitic zoonoses: global trends. *Vet Parasitol* 2011; **182**: 79-95.
- [10] Alvarados-Esquivel C, Estrada-Martinez S, Liesenfeld O. *Toxoplasma gondii* infection in workers occupationally exposed to unwashed raw fruits and vegetables: a case control seroprevalence study. *Parasit Vectors* 2011; 4: 235.

- [11] Chaudhry SA, Gad N, Koren G. Toxoplasmosis and pregnancy. *Can Fam Physician* 2014; **60**: 334-6.
- [12] Montoya JG, Remington JS. Management of *Toxoplasma gondii* infection during pregnancy. *Clin Infect Dis* 2008; **47**: 554-66.
- [13] SYROCOT (Systematic Review on Congenital Toxoplasmosis) study group, Thiébau R, Leproust S, Chêne G, Gilbert R. Effectiveness of prenatal treatment for congenital toxoplasmosis: a meta-analysis of individual patients' data. *Lancet* 2007; 369(9556): 115-22.
- [14] Liesenfeld O, Wong SY JSR, editors. Cecil text book of medicine. 21st ed. Philadelphia: Saunders; 2000.
- [15] Liu Q, Wang ZD, Huang SY, Zhu XQ. Diagnosis of toxoplasmosis and typing of *Toxoplasma gondii*. *Parasit Vectors* 2015; **28**: 292.
- [16] Gibbs RS. The origins of stillbirth: infectious diseases. *Semin Perinatol* 2002; **26**(1): 75-8.
- [17] Pappas G, Roussos N, Falagas ME. Toxoplasmosis snapshots: global status of *Toxoplasma gondii* seroprevalence and implications for pregnancy and congenital toxoplasmosis. *Int J Parasitol* 2009; 39: 1385-94.
- [18] Torgerson PR, Mastroiacovo P. The global burden of congenital toxoplasmosis: a systematic review. *Bull World Heal Organ* 2013; 91: 501-8.
- [19] Aqeely H, El-Gayar EK, Khan DP, Najmi A, Alvi A, Bani I, et al. Seroepidemiology of *Toxoplasma gondii* amongst pregnant women in Jazan Province, Saudi Arabia. *J Trop Med* 2014; 2014: 913950.
- [20] Almushait MA, Bin Dajem SM, Elsherbiny NM, Eskandar MA, Al Azraqi TA, Makhlouf LM. Seroprevalence and risk factors of *Toxoplasma gondii* infection among pregnant women in south western, Saudi Arabia. *J Parasit Dis* 2014; 38(1): 4-10.
- [21] Almogren A. Antenatal screening for *Toxoplasma gondii* infection at a tertiary care hospital in Riyadh, Saudi Arabia. *Ann Saudi Med* 2011; 31(6): 569-72.
- [22] Ghazi HO, Telmesani AM, Mahomed MF. TORCH agents in pregnant Saudi women. *Med Princ Pract* 2002; **11**: 180-2.
- [23] Al-Harthi SA, Jamjoom MB, Ghazi HO. Seroprevalence of *Toxoplasma gondii* among pregnant women in Makkah, Saudi Arabia. *Umm Al-Qura Univ J Sci Med Eng* 2006; 18(2): 217-27.
- [24] Al-Mohammad HI, Amin TT, Balaha MH, Al-Moghannum MS. Toxoplasmosis among the pregnant women attending a Saudi maternity hospital: seroprevalence and possible risk factors. *Ann Trop Med Parasitol* 2010; 104(6): 493-504.
- [25] Bin Dajem SM, Almushaitb MA. Detection of *Toxoplasma gondii* DNA by PCR in blood samples collected from pregnant Saudi women from the Aseer region, Saudi Arabia. *Ann Saudi Med* 2012; 32(5): 507-12.
- [26] Al-Olayan EM, Metwally DM, Alabooshkh F. Sero-epidemiological studies of toxoplasmosis among pregnant women in Hail region Saudi Arabia. J Am Sci 2013; 9(12): 619-25.
- [27] Sarah YA, Uzma AK, Asmaa IE. Prevalence of seropositive toxoplasmosis in pregnant women in Hail region. Int J Health Sci Res

- 2014; **4**(10): 66-71.
- [28] El-Shahawy IS, Khalil MI, Bahnass MM. Seroprevalence of *Toxoplasma gondii* in women in Najran City, Saudi Arabia. *Saudi Med J* 2014; **35**(9): 1143-6.
- [29] Abu-Madi MA, Al-Molawi N, Behnke JM. Seroprevalence and epidemiological correlates of *Toxoplasma gondii* infections among patients referred for hospital-based serological testing in Doha, Qatar. *Parasit Vectors* 2008; 1: 39.
- [30] Obaid HM. Serological and microscopical detection of *Toxoplasma* gondii in Kirkuk city-Iraq. *Diyala J Pure Sci* 2014; **10**(4): 46-55.
- [31] Rosso F, Les JT, Agudelo A, Villalobos C, Chaves JA, Tunubala GA, et al. Prevalence of infection with *Toxoplasma gondii* among pregnant women in Cali, Colombia, South America. *Am J Trop Med Hyg* 2008; **78**(3): 504-8.
- [32] Berger F, Goulet V, Le Strat Y, Desenclos JC. Toxoplasmosis among pregnant women in France: risk factors and change of prevalence between 1995 and 2003. Rev Epidemiol Sante Publique 2009; 57(4): 241-8.
- [33] Agmas B, Tesfaye R, Koye DN. Seroprevalence of *Toxoplasma gondii* infection and associated risk factors among pregnant women in Debre Tabor, Northwest Ethiopia. *BMC Res Notes* 2015; 8: 107.
- [34] Shimelis T, Tebeje M, Tadesse E, Tegbaru B, Terefe A. Sero-prevalence of latent *Toxoplasma gondii* infection among HIV-infected and HIV-uninfected people in Addis Ababa, Ethiopia: a comparative cross-sectional study. *BMC Res Notes* 2009; 2: 213.
- [35] Njunda AL, Assob JCN, Nsagha DS, Kamga HLF, Nde PF, Yugah VC. Seroprevalence of *Toxoplasma gondii* infection among pregnant women in Cameroon. *J Public Health Afr* 2011; 2(2): 98-101.
- [36] Nissapatorn V, Suwanrath C, Sawangjaroen N, Ling LY, Chandeying V. Toxoplasmosis-serological evidence and associated risk factors among pregnant women in southern Thailand. Am J Trop Med Hyg 2011; 85(2): 243-7.
- [37] Shirbazou S, Abasian L, Talebi MF. Effects of *Toxoplasma gondii* infection on plasma testosterone and cortisol level and stress index on patients referred to Sina Hospital, Tehran. *Jundishapur J Microbiol* 2011; **4**(3): 167-73.
- [38] Ayi I, Edu SAA, Apea-Kubi KA, Boamah D, Bosompem KM, Edoh D. Sero-epidemiology of toxoplasmosis amongst pregnant women in the Greater Accra Region of Ghana. Ghana Med J 2009; 43(3): 107-14.
- [39] Jones JL, Dubey JP. Foodborne toxoplasmosis. *Clin Infect Dis* 2012; **55**: 845-51
- [40] Babaie J, Amiri S, Mostafavi E, Hassan N, Lotfi P, Rastaghi ARE, et al. Seroprevalence and risk factors for *Toxoplasma gondii* infection among pregnant women in Northeast Iran. *Clin Vaccine Immunol* 2013; 20(11): 1771-3.
- [41] Nassef NE, Abd El-Ghaffar MM, El-Nahas NS, Hassanain MEDA, El-Din SAS, Ammar AIM. Seroprevalence and genotyping of *Toxoplasma gondii* in Menoufia Governorate. *Menoufia Med J* 2015; 28: 617-26.