



Document heading doi: 10.1016/j.apjr.2015.07.011

Serological profile of offspring on an intensive pig farm affected by Porcine reproductive and respiratory syndrome

Silva J^{1*}, Rocha D², Cunha I², Rui Sales L², Neto F¹, Fontes MC¹, Simões J¹¹Department of Veterinary Science. University of Trás-os-Montes e Alto Douro. 5000–811 Vila Real, Portugal²AGRUPALTO – Agrupamento de Produtores Agro-Pecuários, SA. Estrada Nacional 10 – Apartado 37 – Porto Alto. 2136–901 Samora Correia, Portugal

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:

Received 2 April 2015

Received in revised form 10 July 2015

Accepted 15 July 2015

Available online 20 December 2015

Keywords:

Animal sentinels

ELISA

Epidemiology

PCR

Porcine reproductive and respiratory syndrome

ABSTRACT

Objective: To evaluate/predict the offspring serum profile of antibodies against Porcine reproductive and respiratory syndrome virus (PRRSV) in an affected intensive herd, whereas sows are vaccinated, and determine the better sample time using pigs as sentinels. **Methods:** Serum samples were collected from a total of 66 offspring pigs from a PRRSV endemic herd, whereas only sows were vaccinated. Six animals per grouped age were randomly selected with 0 (at perinatal time), 1, 2, 3, 6, 9, 12, 15, 18, 21 and 24 weeks of age. Individual and three pooled samples were tested by ELISA and PCR, respectively. **Results:** The proportion of seropositive animals was 75.0% (18/24), 33.3% (6/18) and 95.8% (23/24) at farrowing (0 to 3 weeks), nursery (6 to 12 weeks) and growing/finishing (15 to 24 weeks) phases, respectively. It was 46 times more likely ($P < 0.01$) to observe seropositive pigs on the growing/finishing than on nursery phase. European PRRSV strain was detected on serum of 6, 9 and 15-weeks old pigs. Polynomial fit degree 4 regression between sample-to-positive (S/P) ratios and age of pigs ($r = 0.78$; $R^2 = 0.60$; $P < 0.001$) estimated a quickly decrease of maternal antibodies, above 0.4 S/P value (cut off), until the 6th week following by a progressive increment of humoral immunity until 21st week of age, when it declines. **Conclusions:** The results indicate that the piglets can present viremia early at nursery, and the 18th – 21st weeks are the best time to sample offspring pigs, as sentinel, from PRRSV contaminated intensive herds.

1. Introduction

Porcine reproductive and respiratory syndrome (PRRS) is a swine disease which appeared simultaneously in Europe (early 1990s) and North America (late 1980s)[1,2] and continues to be one of the major diseases that affect the swine industry worldwide, being responsible for losses of \$664 million annually in U.S.A national breeding and growing pig herds[3,4].

PRRS is caused by a virus (PRRSV), which belongs to the family *Arteriviridae*, genus *Arterivirus*[5]. Generally, PRRSV is divided into two major genotypes, the type I (European) and type II (North

American), which are antigenically, genetically and clinically different[1,6,7].

PRRS is characterized by respiratory problems, like cough and dyspnea, in growing and finishing pigs and reproductive failure in sows, with late term abortion, stillbirth and increased preweaning mortality[8]. The diagnosis is obtained by virus isolation or by the identification of antibodies, antigens or nucleic acid in infected samples. However, there are limitations on the PRRS diagnosis. Serological tests for PRRSV normally detect serum antibody response after 14–21 days post-infection, and do not allow the distinction between infected and vaccinated animals[9]. Virus isolation and identification has also limits due the wide diversity of PRRSV strains, being selective between cell cultures[8,10].

The PRRS surveillance in swine populations is not easy to be done. Several studies evaluated the use of oral fluids as samples for diagnostics of swine diseases, including PRRS[11–13] for easier and less cost effective sample collection. However, there is only few

*Corresponding author: Silva J, Department of Veterinary Science. University of Trás-os-Montes e Alto Douro. 5000–811 Vila Real, Portugal.

Tel.: +351259350666

Fax: +351259350480

E-mail: jorgeeduardosilva@gmail.com

information about the quantity of virus-specific antibodies in oral fluids of infected pigs[14] and the development of oral fluid-based assays and the PRRS evaluation of their results has only started recently[15]. So, at present time, blood samples collection remains a precious tool for PRRS surveillance and virus circulation, even if clinical form rate decrease. Nevertheless, the offspring evaluation of serum profiles on affected herds, whereas vaccinated sows, was not sufficiently reported.

The main objectives of the present study were to evaluate the offspring serum profile of antibodies against PRRSV in an affected intensive herd in Portugal and determine the better sample time using pigs as sentinels.

2. Material and methods

2.1. Animals and general features of the herd

The herd is located in the Center region of Portugal, at latitude 39.649478 and longitude -8.307067. The herd structure is constituted by three buildings: two 'grow-finishing' buildings and one with the gestation room, the farrowing rooms and the nurseries. It is operated as a closed herd which comprises approximately 480 sows, 1 500 weaned piglets and 2 000 growing-finishing pigs. The gilt reposition has external origin. The commercial pigs were based on Large white (X Landrace) X Pietrain breeds.

The herd management was based in weekly artificial insemination of approximately 25 sows. At the farrowing rooms, piglets are weaned with 4 weeks of age, being transferred to the nursery. Around 10 to 12 weeks of age, piglets are again transferred to the 'grow-finishing' building.

The PRRSV vaccine used in the prophylactic plan was Porcilis® PRRS (Intervet International BV, Boxmeer, Netherlands), a European live attenuated PRRS virus strain DV, administered every 4 month to sows on the multiplication unit building. The primovaccination of all gilts was performed on the quarantine facilities. The vaccination plan also included the Aujeszky's disease virus and Circovirus. The offspring pigs were only vaccinated against Circovirus. The farm used this vaccination plan at least during the last 3 years.

The PRRS was previously (last 3 years) diagnosed on the herd by ELISA and PCR techniques, similar to the reported on the present paper. Reproductive and respiratory symptoms were also present. The farm simultaneously monitored serum antibodies profiles concerning Circovirus (PCV K2- IgM and IgG), Actinobacillus pleuropneumoniae (APP ApxII/TBp 2), Influenza and Aujeszky disease virus (ADV gB and ADV gE) from sentinels on each production cycle, i.e. the same 4 to 6 pigs were periodically prospecting at different times.

2.2. Sample collections

Blood samples were collected, on November 2014, from a total of 66 offspring pigs of different ages and all rooms/pens were considered. Six animals per grouped age were randomly selected with 0 (at perinatal time), 1, 2, 3, 6, 9, 12, 15, 18, 21 and 24 weeks of age. Blood was collected by vena caval puncture. After collection, tubes were refrigerated at 4°C and sent to laboratory. The serum was removed from whole blood by centrifugation and stored at -20°C until use.

2.3. Enzyme-linked immunosorbent assay of PRRSV specific antibody

The samples were analyzed individually, according to the manufacturer instructions, by the enzyme-linked immunosorbent assay (ELISA) with a commercial kit – IDEXX PRRS X3 (IDEXX Laboratory Inc., Liebefeld-Bern, Switzerland), which detects both strains – type I (European) and type II (North American).

The cut off of sample-to-positive ratios (S/P values), i.e., the threshold level for positive samples, was 0.4.

2.4. Quantification of PRRSV by real-time RT-PCR and amplicon analysis

Due to economic reasons, RT-PCR was performed using a pooling strategy. Serum of three samples from pigs with the same age was previously mixed (total of 22 pools) and submitted to analysis.

Viral RNA was isolated using the BioSprint® 96 One-For-All Vet Kit (Qiagen S.A., Hilden, Germany).

The RNA viral amplification was developed using the QuantiTect™ SYBR® Green RT-PCR kit (Qiagen S.A., Hilden, Germany). Real-time PCRs were run on the thermocyclers Rotor Gene Q (Qiagen S.A., Hilden, Germany).

All these steps were performed following the manufacturer's instructions manual.

The genotyping was obtained by sequencing the fragment ORF7, which encode the nucleocapsid protein, using Sanger method. The sequences were then analysed by BLAST (available at <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/>), comparing to the European, American and Chinese reference strains, allowing to assign which of three strains is closer.

2.5. Statistical analysis

The odds ratio according nursery and 'growing/finishing' phases was calculated using univariate logistic regression. Wald test was considered.

Polynomial fit degree 4 regressions between S/P values and age of pigs were used for model prediction assessment. The JMP® 7[16] software statistical package was used.

3. Results

The proportion of seropositive animals at farrowing (weeks 0, 1, 2 and 3), nursery (weeks 6, 9 and 12) and “growing/finishing” phases (weeks 15, 18, 21 and 24) were 75.0% (18/24), 33.3% (6/18) and 95.8% (23/24), respectively.

It was 46 more likely to observe seropositive pigs on the growing/finishing phase than on nursery phase (95% interval of confidence of odds ratios from 5.0 to 427.4; $P < 0.01$).

A correlation $r = 0.78$ ($P < 0.001$) between S/P values and the pig age, considering all positive and negative animals to PRRSV antibodies, was observed (Figure 1). This correlation remained significant ($r = 0.69$; $P < 0.001$) even if only positive pigs to S/P values were considered (Figure 2).

A positive field sample (pool) from 6-weeks old pigs was closer to European Lelystad AY588319.1 [M96262.2 (gi 51094507)] strain. The nucleotide sequence of the amplified fragment was:

```
CCAGTTGCTGGGTGCAATGATAAAGTCCCAGCGCCAGCA
ACCTAGGGGAGGACAGGCAAAAAAAAAAGAAAGCCTGAGAA
GCCACATTTTCCCCTAGCTGCTGAAGATGACATTCGGCACC
ACCTCACCAGACCGAACGTTCCCTCTGCTTGAATCGATC
CAGACGGCTTTTAACCAAGGCGCAGGAAGTGCCTCGCTTT
CATCCAGCGGGAAGGTCAGTTTTTCAGGTTGAGTTCATGCT
GCCGTTGCT.
```

Two other positive pools to referenced European PRRSV strain were also observed in pigs at 9- and 15-weeks old in nursery and “grow-finisher” rooms, respectively.




Figure 1. Prediction of S/P values according pig aging considering all positive and negative animals to PRRSV antibodies. R.D.S.: Residual standard deviation.




Figure 2. Prediction of S/P values according pig age considering positive animals to PRRSV antibodies. R.D.S.: Residual standard deviation.

4. Discussion

Porcine reproductive and respiratory syndrome is a disease which is continuously evolving, generating new strains and expanding its diversity. However, modern swine industry is also a major concern because is responsible for virus distribution nationwide and even worldwide[17]. To face this problem, it is important to create new control measures and new methods of surveillance.

According to Albina *et al* [18], the maternal antibodies for PRRSV provided by colostrum were present in the serum until the third week of age, just before weaning. However, Chung *et al* [19] showed that maternal antibodies remained relatively high until the age of 4 weeks and reached its lowest level at the age of 6 weeks. In our study, the estimated S/P values reached the threshold level (0.4) for positive samples during the 5th week, indicating the maternal antibodies disappearance.

When the antibodies decreased, weaned piglets may become infected with the PRRSV[20]. This aspect was well evidenced in our study by the PRRSV detection on serum from 6-weeks old pigs.

Pigs infected with PRRSV produce an immune response, which is easily detected by the presence of specific IgM or IgG from 7 and 14 days after infection, respectively[21]. In Brown *et al*[22] observations, pigs experimentally infected with PRRSV were 0%, 76.6% and 100% seropositive to Idexx ELISA test by 7, 14 and 21 days after infection, respectively. The maximum S/P value was observed by these researchers 8 weeks after the infection, decreasing in the following weeks. In our case, piglets were infected at the nursery time, around the 6 to 9 weeks of age, such as determined by RT-PCR test. In the following weeks of age, and despite PRRSV circulation on grower/finishing building (positive pool at 15-week old), seroconversion was observed being incremented during the grower phase, as shown in figure 1. A similar increment also occurs when only positive pigs to ELISA test were considered. The maximum S/P values were observed at age of 21 weeks, decreasing rapidly until the age of 24 weeks, similarly to the described in induced[22,23] or natural[24] PRRSV infections. These circumstances might indicate that pigs with 18 to 21 weeks are the best option to use as sentinels for a PRRSV-infected herd, even if sows are vaccinated. In fact, in the present study, not only a prediction of S/P value increment was observed in grower/finishing phase until 21 weeks, but pigs sampled at this time were 46 times more likely to become PRRSV seropositive than piglets at nursery, although the 95% confidence interval odds ratio was large.

Our study illustrates a curve of seropositives of the different ages when the samples are collected simultaneously in an infected herd and consequently pigs can be infected by PRRSV at different times. However, the relative low values of regression coefficients

observed between S/P values and age for all ($R^2=0.60$) or only positive ($R^2=0.47$) animals may indicate that the animal age is not the only important factor affecting the seroconversion, even the virus circulated on farm like the suggested by PCR positive results on pigs with different ages. Probably, individual immunomodulation competence status and potential interaction with other microorganisms (for example *Actinobacillus pleuropneumoniae*[25] or Circovirus-2[26] IgM/IgG ratio, according to ELISA track records of the farm) also can affect pigs. Our results also suggest that biosecurity measures applied on the herd were insufficient. To control PRRS, many management techniques can be used, including sow stabilization, all in/all out systems, medicated early weaning, segregated early weaning, unidirectional nursery depopulation and vaccination even with incomplete success. In infected herds, like the herd in the present study, herd closure should be implemented in order to stop introducing of new strains and to reduce the number of susceptible subpopulations. Gilt acclimatization is also effective with a planned exposure to the field PRRSV, being an inexpensive and effective tool to minimize adverse effects in pregnant sows in endemic herds[1].

Modified live vaccines have been widely used and showed some efficacy in reducing clinical disease and severity of symptoms, as well as the duration of viremia and virus shedding. Previous reports have shown a wide range of protection from 50% to 85%, conferring some immunity[27–29]. However, those vaccines have their limitation when facing with genetically distinct PRRSV strains[1].

In extreme cases, depopulation/repopulation of the herd can be considered, but this method is highly costly.

In conclusion, in a real context of farms contaminated by European PRRSV strain, the antibodies against PRRSV originated from passive immunity seems to quickly disappear until the end of the first month of live and piglets were able to seroconvert antibodies at nursery time. The seroconversion is incremented during the grower phase and the week 18 seems to be the best time to harvest samples in endemic farms. In the present study, the maximum S/P values were observed on week 21 and quickly decreased until week 24. The use of live attenuated vaccines on sows is not sufficient to avoid PRRSV viremia on piglets at nursery time.

Conflict of interest statement

All authors, including the AGRUPALTO employees, declare that they have no conflict of interest in order to provoke any bias on the present study.

Acknowledgements

This manuscript is prepared from MSc. thesis of first author at University of Trás-os-Montes e Alto Douro. We are grateful to AGRUPALTO producers association for support. We also thanks to Francisco Fagundes from MSD - Merck Sharp & Dohme, Lda, Paço de Arcos, Portugal and to María Luisa Martínez Sanz from LABOPAT, Segovia, Spain for their technical/laboratorial support.

References

- [1] Thanawongnuwech R, Suradhat S. Taming PRRSV: Revisiting the control strategies and vaccine design. *Virus Res* 2010; **154**: 133-140.
- [2] Wensvoort G, Terpstra C, Pol JM, ter Laak EA, Bloemraad M, de Kluyver EP, et al. Mystery swine disease in the Netherlands: the isolation of Lelystad virus. *Vet Quart* 1991; **13**: 121-130.
- [3] Darwich L, Gimeno M, Sibila M, Diaz I, de la Torre E, Dotti S, et al. Genetic and immunobiological diversities of porcine reproductive and respiratory syndrome genotype I strains. *Vet Microbiol* 2011; **150**: 49-62.
- [4] Holtkamp DJ, Kliebenstein JB, Zimmerman JJ, Neumann E, Rotto H, Yode T, et al. Economic analysis of PRRS virus elimination from a herd. *Animal Industry Report* 2012; AS 658, ASL R2678.[Online] Available at: http://lib.dr.iastate.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1716&context=ans_air [Accessed on 23th March, 2015]
- [5] Cavanagh D. Nidovirales: a new order comprising coronaviridae and arteriviridae. *Arch Virol* 1997; **142**: 629-633.
- [6] Murtaugh MP, Genzow M. Immunological solutions for treatment and prevention of porcine reproductive and respiratory syndrome (PRRS). *Vaccine* 2011; **29**: 8192-8204.
- [7] Gómez-Laguna J, Salguero FJ, Pallarés FJ, Fernández de Marco M, Barranco I, Cerón JJ, et al. Acute phase response in porcine reproductive and respiratory syndrome virus infection. *Comp Immunol Microb* 2010; **33**: e51-e58.
- [8] Rossow KD. Porcine reproductive and respiratory syndrome. *Vet Pathol* 1998; **35**: 1-20.
- [9] Batista L, Dee SA, Rossow KD, Polson DD, Xiao Z, Olin M, et al. Detection of porcine reproductive and respiratory syndrome virus in pigs with low positive or negative ELISA s/p ratios. *Vet Rec* 2004; **154**: 25-26.
- [10] Mengeling WL, Vorwald AC, Lager KM, Brockmeier SL. Diagnosis of porcine reproductive and respiratory syndrome using infected alveolar macrophages collected from live pigs. *Vet Microbiol* 1996; **49**: 105-115.
- [11] Kittawornrat A, Prickett J, Wang C, Olsen C, Irwin C, Panyasing Y, et al. Detection of Porcine reproductive and respiratory syndrome virus (PRRSV) antibodies in oral fluid specimens using a commercial PRRSV serum antibody enzyme-linked immunosorbent assay. *J Vet Diagn Invest* 2012; **24**: 262-269.

- [12]Langenhorst RJ, Lawson S, Kittawornrat A, Zimmerman JJ, Sun Z, Li Y, et al. Development of a fluorescent microsphere immunoassay for detection of antibodies against porcine reproductive and respiratory syndrome virus using oral fluid samples as an alternative to serum-based assays. *Clin Vaccine Immunol* 2012; **19**: 180-189.
- [13]Prickett JR, Kim W, Simer R, Yoon KJ, Zimmerman J. Oral-fluid samples for surveillance of commercial growing pigs for porcine reproductive and respiratory syndrome virus and porcine circovirus type 2 infections. *J Swine Health Prod* 2008; **16**: 86-91.
- [14]Decorte I, Breedam WV, Stede YV, Nauwynck HJ, Regge ND, Cay A. Detection of total and PRRSV-specific antibodies in oral fluids collected with different rope types from PRRSV-vaccinated and experimentally infected pigs. *BMC Vet Res* 2014; **10**: 134.
- [15]Chittick WA, Stensland WR, Prickett JR, Strait EL, Harmon K, Yoon K, et al. Comparison of RNA extraction and real-time reverse transcription polymerase chain reaction methods for the detection of Porcine reproductive and respiratory syndrome virus in porcine oral fluid specimens. *J Vet Diagn Invest* 2011; **23**: 248-253.
- [16]SAS Institute Inc. JMP user's guide. Version 7.0. Cary, NC, USA: SAS Institute Inc., 2007.
- [17]Shi M, Lam T, Hon C, Hui R, Faaberg K, Wennblom T, et al. Molecular epidemiology of PRRSV: A phylogenetic perspective. *Virus Res* 2010; **154**: 7-17.
- [18]Albina E, Madec F, Cariolet R, Torrison J. Immune response and persistence of the porcine reproductive and respiratory syndrome virus in infected pigs and farm units. *Vet Rec* 1994; **134**: 567-573.
- [19]Chung WB, Lin MW, Chang WF, Hsu M, Yang PC. Persistence of porcine reproductive and respiratory syndrome virus in intensive farrow-to-finish pig herds. *Can J Vet Res* 1997; **61**: 292-298.
- [20]Goyal SM. Porcine reproductive and respiratory syndrome. *J Vet Diagn Invest* 1993; **5**: 656–664.
- [21]Vezina SA, Loemba H, Fournier M, Dea S, Archambault D. Antibody production and blastogenic response in pigs experimentally infected with porcine reproductive and respiratory syndrome virus. *Can J Vet Res* 1996; **60**: 94-99.
- [22]Brown E, Lawson S, Welbon C, Gnanandarajah J, Li J, Murtaugh MP, et al. Antibody response to porcine reproductive and respiratory syndrome virus (PRRSV) nonstructural proteins and implications for diagnostic detection and differentiation of PRRSV type I and II. *Clin Vaccine Immunol* 2009; **16**: 628-635.
- [23]Han K, Seo HW, Park C, Oh Y, Kang I, Ham HJ, et al. Comparative Pathogenicity of three Korean and one Lelystad type I Porcine Reproductive and Respiratory Syndrome virus (Pan-European subtype 1) isolates in experimentally infected pigs. *J Comp Pathol* 2013; **149**: 331-340.
- [24]Sasaki K, Tsukahara T, Taira O, Tsuchiya K, Itoh M, Ushida K. Prevalence of Porcine reproductive and respiratory syndrome virus and porcine Circovirus type 2 in piglets after weaning on a commercial pig farm in Japan. *Anim Sci J* 2010; **81**: 135-141.
- [25]Lévesque C, Provost C, Labrie J, Hernandez Reyes Y, Burciaga Nava JA, et al. Actinobacillus pleuropneumoniae possesses an antiviral activity against porcine reproductive and respiratory syndrome virus. *PLoS One* 2014; **9**: e98434.
- [26]Fraile L, Calsamiglia M, Mateu E, Espinal A, Cuxart A, Seminati C, et al. Prevalence of infection with porcine circovirus-2 (PCV-2) and porcine reproductive and respiratory syndrome virus (PRRSV) in an integrated swine production system experiencing postweaning multisystemic wasting syndrome. *Can J Vet Res* 2009; **73**: 308-312.
- [27]Osorio FA, Zuckermann F, Wills R, Meier W, Cristian S, Galeota J, et al. PRRSV: Comparison of commercial vaccine in their ability to induce protection against current PRRSV strains of high virulence. *Proc. of the Allen D. Leman Swine Conference*. 1998; **25**: 176-182.
- [28]Scotti M, Prieto C, Simarro I, Castro JM. Reproductive performance of gilts following vaccination and subsequent heterologous challenge with European strains of porcine reproductive and respiratory syndrome virus. *Theriogenology* 2006; **66**: 1884-1893.
- [29]Martelli P, Gozio S, Ferrari L, Rosina S, Angelis ED, Quintavalla C, et al. Efficacy of a modified live porcine reproductive and respiratory syndrome virus (PRRSV) vaccine in pigs naturally exposed to a heterologous European (Italian cluster) field strain: Clinical protection and cell-mediated immunity. *Vaccine* 2009; **27**: 3788-3799.