

Research Article

# Factors Associated with the Prevalence of Bovine Tuberculosis in the Kafue Basin of Zambia

Kalenga Mwelaisha<sup>1,\*</sup> , Rosemary Ndonyo Likwa<sup>1</sup> , Humphrey Simukoko<sup>2</sup> 

<sup>1</sup>Department of Population Studies and Global Health, School of Public Health, University of Zambia, Ridgeway Campus, Lusaka, Zambia

<sup>2</sup>Department of Biomedical Sciences, School of Veterinary Medicine, University of Zambia, Main Campus, Lusaka, Zambia

## Abstract

Worldwide, bovine tuberculosis is most common in agricultural regions of Central and South America, Sub-Saharan Africa and South-Western Asia. Bovine tuberculosis was reported to be endemic in the Zambian traditional cattle sector with a high herd prevalence of 49.8% recorded from areas within, and adjacent to the Kafue Basin as far back as 1995. An analytical cross sectional study design was applied to a sample size of 384 selected cattle owners in the Kafue Basin. A semi-structured questionnaire was administered to the cattle owners who were randomly selected. The data was analyzed using STATA Version 15 Software. The results from the study showed that 54% of the cattle owners experienced bovine tuberculosis among their cattle while 46% did not experience bovine tuberculosis. The prevalence of bovine tuberculosis in cattle was higher among the male cattle owners (76%) compared to female cattle owners (24%). There was a significant relationship of p value < 0.029 between level of knowledge of cattle owners and the prevalence of bovine tuberculosis. Unemployed cattle owners had higher odds of experiencing bovine tuberculosis among their cattle (OR 3.488; 95% CI 1.341-9.067) and the relationship was statistically significant at p value < 0.010. There was equally a significant relationship of p value < 0.042 between vaccination status of animals and the occurrence of bovine tuberculosis. The study showed that the majority of cattle owners lacked awareness and had a lower level of understanding of the disease and its public health significance. Therefore, the implications of the study suggest the creation of disease control programs that will ensure regular herd testing for bovine tuberculosis, routine vaccinations of animals, deliberate quarantine of infected animals as well as community health education about transmission, control and prevention of the disease.

## Keywords

Bovine Tuberculosis, Cattle Owners, Awareness, Vaccination, Transmission, Level of Knowledge, Kafue Basin

## 1. Introduction

Bovine tuberculosis is a chronic bacterial disease of animals caused by members of the *Mycobacterium Tuberculosis Complex*. It is a major infectious disease among cattle and also affects other domesticated animals and certain wildlife

populations [1]. The disease is contagious and can be transmitted directly by contact with infected domestic and wild animals or indirectly by ingestion of contaminated material [2, 3]. In Zambia, bovine tuberculosis was reported in cattle as far

\*Corresponding author: [mwelaishakalenga@gmail.com](mailto:mwelaishakalenga@gmail.com) (Kalenga Mwelaisha)

**Received:** 15 March 2024; **Accepted:** 29 March 2024; **Published:** 17 April 2024



Copyright: © The Author(s), 2024. Published by Science Publishing Group. This is an **Open Access** article, distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>), which permits unrestricted use, distribution and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

back as 1995. The abattoir compilation done by the Veterinary Department in the same report indicated that 1.6% of cattle slaughtered at an abattoir in Lusaka had tuberculous lesions; 2% at an abattoir in Livingstone; 5.2% in Mazabuka and 16.8% of slaughtered animals from Namwala [4-6].

Worldwide, bovine tuberculosis is most common in agricultural regions of Central and South America, Sub-Saharan Africa and South-Western Asia [3]. Bovine tuberculosis is more common in developing countries and countries that do not have veterinary public health programs that routinely vaccinate animals against the disease [5]. In Africa a high prevalence of bovine tuberculosis was reported in buffaloes, deer and domesticated cattle [7-9]. Bovine tuberculosis has been reported to be endemic in the Zambian traditional cattle sector with a high herd prevalence of 49.8% recorded in the Kafue Basin [1]. Studies on the epidemiology of bovine tuberculosis in Zambia have indicated that the disease is not homogeneously distributed, however, high prevalence rates were recorded within and around the Kafue Basin, an area with extensive overlap in terms of grazing land from wild and domestic animals [10-12]. Zambia recorded 9 outbreaks and 265 suspected cases of bovine tuberculosis between January 2016 and January of 2019. During this period, 1 outbreak occurred in Bweengwa, 4 outbreaks in Namwala, 2 in Mumbwa, and 2 in Nega-Nega. All these outbreaks were in areas within and around the Kafue Basin [6, 13].

Given this background and gaps in literature on the factors associated with bovine tuberculosis, WHO and other stakeholder's (Health and Agriculture) recommend the need to document associated links of *M. Bovis* infections in cattle in Zambia [8]. Furthermore, the findings of the study will add to the existing knowledge on bovine tuberculosis and other zoonotic disease outbreak prevention. The study findings will be used for effective planning and designing interventions to address challenges arising with bovine tuberculosis surveillance and prevention as well as help to have more specific solutions towards the challenges faced by cattle owners in tackling zoonotic diseases.

## 2. Methodology

The study was conducted in the Kafue Basin. The Kafue Basin stretches from as far as Namwala District in the Southern Province and the areas within and around the Basin

include Kafue, Nega-Nega, Chikankata, Lochinvar National Park, Bweengwa and some parts of Mumbwa [19]. An analytical cross-sectional study across selected cattle owners of the Kafue Basin was conducted to collect and analyze relevant information associated with bovine tuberculosis. According to the 2010 Zambia Census of Population and Housing, the Kafue Basin had a total population of 619,000 of which 308,939 were males and 310,061 were females. The household sitting within the Kafue Basin was 67, 431 representing 17% of all the households in Zambia [11, 12].

Data was collected using an interviewer-administered questionnaire. The questionnaire had both open and closed ended questions. Two (2) research assistants were recruited and trained to assist in data collection. The data was analyzed using STATA Version 15 Software. Categorical variables were summarized as counts and percentages or proportions, while continuous variables were summarized using the mean and standard deviations. Chi-square test was used to determine the associations between the dependent variable and the various categorical variables after the assumptions of the chi-square tests were met. Statistical significance level was set at  $p < 0.05$  and 95% confidence interval.

Ethical approval to undertake this study was obtained from the University of Zambia Biomedical Research Ethics Committee (UNZABREC) with approval number 2989-2022. In addition, approval to conduct the study in the Kafue Basin was obtained from the District Livestock Offices in Namwala District, Chikankata District, Nega-Nega District and Kafue District. Authorization was also sought from the National Health Research Authority (NHRA).

## 3. Results

### 3.1. Prevalence of Bovine Tuberculosis

Table 1 shows the distribution of the prevalence of bovine tuberculosis in the Kafue Basin of Zambia. The findings show that 54% of the cattle owners had experienced bovine tuberculosis in their animals compared with 46% who had not experienced the disease. This demonstrates that there is a high prevalence of bovine tuberculosis in the Kafue Basin settlement area.

**Table 1.** Prevalence of bovine tuberculosis in the Kafue Basin.

| Experienced BTB | Frequency | Percentage (%) |
|-----------------|-----------|----------------|
| Yes             | 207       | 53.91          |
| No              | 177       | 46.09          |
| Total           | 384       | 100            |

\*\*\*Key: BTB=Bovine Tuberculosis

### 3.2. Demographic and Socio-Economic Characteristics of Cattle Owners

The results in table 2 show that the majority (38.02%) of cattle owners were in the age-group of 25 to 29 years with a mean age of 30 years. The findings have shown that most of the cattle owners are young people in the Zambian Kafue Basin. The gender distribution shows a higher proportion of cattle owners being males with 75.78% than females with a lower proportion of 24.22% to indicate a gender inequality in

cattle farming between rural men and women. The majority (41.67%) of the cattle owners had attained primary school education while 39.06% represented those that did not attain any level of education. This however, shows that most of the cattle owners in the Kafue Basin are not necessarily influenced by their level of education. The results further show that the majority (67.79%) of the cattle owners are unemployed compared to those that are in formal employment (32.41%). Therefore, unemployment predisposes rural young people to the desirable preference of cattle farming.

**Table 2.** Demographic and socio-economic characteristics of cattle owners.

| Variable           | Frequency | Percentage (%) |
|--------------------|-----------|----------------|
| Age                |           |                |
| 20-24              | 64        | 17.45          |
| 25-29              | 146       | 38.02          |
| 30-34              | 76        | 19.79          |
| 35-39              | 38        | 9.9            |
| 40+                | 57        | 14.84          |
| Total              | 385       | 100            |
| Sex                |           |                |
| Male               | 291       | 75.78          |
| Female             | 93        | 24.22          |
| Total              | 384       | 100            |
| Education Status   |           |                |
| No education       | 150       | 39.06          |
| Primary            | 160       | 41.67          |
| Secondary          | 69        | 17.97          |
| College/University | 5         | 1.3            |
| Total              | 384       | 100            |
| Employment Status  |           |                |
| Unemployed         | 268       | 67.79          |
| Employed           | 116       | 32.41          |
| Total              | 384       | 100            |

**Table 3.** Level of knowledge and the prevalence of bovine tuberculosis.

| Variable         | Namwala (%) | Kafue (%) | Chikankata (%) | Nega-Nega (%) | Total (%) | P Value |
|------------------|-------------|-----------|----------------|---------------|-----------|---------|
| Knowledge of BTB |             |           |                |               |           |         |
| Heard of BTB     | 149 (55)    | 67 (25)   | 42 (15)        | 14 (5)        | 272 (71)  |         |
| Not heard of BTB | 51 (45)     | 30 (27)   | 22 (20)        | 9 (8)         | 112 (29)  | 0.043*  |

| Variable               | Namwala (%) | Kafue (%) | Chikankata (%) | Nega-Nega (%) | Total (%) | P Value |
|------------------------|-------------|-----------|----------------|---------------|-----------|---------|
| Total                  | 200 (52)    | 97 (25)   | 64 (17)        | 23 (6)        | 384 (100) |         |
| Source of information  |             |           |                |               |           |         |
| Veterinary Doctor      | 92 (71)     | 16 (12)   | 15 (12)        | 7 (5)         | 130 (130) |         |
| Fellow cattle owner    | 61 (47)     | 44 (34)   | 21 (16)        | 4 (3)         | 130 (34)  |         |
| TV                     | 18 (36)     | 15 (30)   | 11 (22)        | 6 (12)        | 50 (13)   |         |
| Radio                  | 17 (42)     | 12 (29)   | 9 (22)         | 3 (7)         | 41 (11)   | 0.033*  |
| Newspaper              | 12 (36)     | 10 (30)   | 8 (24)         | 3 (10)        | 33 (8)    |         |
| Total                  | 200 (52)    | 97 (25)   | 64 (17)        | 23 (6)        | 384 (100) |         |
| Cattle infected by BTB |             |           |                |               |           |         |
| Yes                    | 112 (51)    | 52 (23)   | 39 (18)        | 15 (8)        | 218 (57)  |         |
| No                     | 88 (53)     | 45 (27)   | 25 (15)        | 8 (5)         | 166 (43)  | 0.123   |
| Total                  | 200 (52)    | 97 (25)   | 64 (17)        | 23 (6)        | 384 (100) |         |
| Action taken           |             |           |                |               |           |         |
| Kill the cattle        | 105 (54)    | 48 (24)   | 32 (16)        | 11 (6)        | 196 (51)  |         |
| Call the vet           | 48 (46)     | 29 (28)   | 19 (18)        | 8 (8)         | 104 (27)  |         |
| Separate from others   | 47 (56)     | 20 (24)   | 13 (15)        | 4 (5)         | 84 (22)   | 0.045*  |
| Total                  | 200 (52)    | 97 (25)   | 64 (17)        | 23 (6)        | 384 (100) |         |

\*\*\*Key: %=Percentage, \*=statistically significant p value at 5%

### 3.3. Level of Knowledge and the Prevalence of Bovine Tuberculosis

Table 3 shows the results from a cross tabulation between level of knowledge and the prevalence of bovine tuberculosis across the four districts. The results showed that the variables knowledge of BTB ( $p < 0.043$ ), source of information ( $p < 0.033$ ) and action taken ( $p < 0.045$ ) were all statistically significant at 0.05 significance level with the prevalence of bovine tuberculosis. However, the variable cattle infected by BTB ( $p > 0.123$ ) was not statistically significant at 0.05 significance level with the prevalence of bovine tuberculosis.

### 3.4. Environmental Features and Behavioral Practices

Cattle owners that reported veterinary clinic not available

had higher odds of experiencing bovine tuberculosis among their cattle (OR 0.237; 95% CI 1.124-2.523) and the relationship was statistically significant at  $p < 0.023$ . Similarly, cattle owners that did not vaccinate their animals had higher odds of experiencing bovine tuberculosis among their cattle (OR 2.513; 95% CI 1.231-5.130) and the relationship was statistically significant at  $p < 0.011$ . Cattle owners who vaccinated their animals twice a year had lower odds of experiencing bovine tuberculosis among their cattle (OR 0.149; 95% CI 0.553-0.390) but the relationship was not statistically significant at  $p > 0.409$ . On the other hand, cattle owners that reported not enough shelter for their cattle had higher odds of experiencing bovine tuberculosis among their cattle (OR 1.402; 95% CI 0.201-2.805) and the relationship was statistically significant at  $p < 0.010$ .

**Table 4.** Bivariate analysis showing environmental features and behavioral practices associated with the prevalence of bovine tuberculosis.

| Variable                    | Unadjusted Odds Ratio (95% CI) | P Value | Adjusted Odds Ratio (95% CI) | P Value |
|-----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|------------------------------|---------|
| Veterinary clinic available |                                |         |                              |         |
| Yes                         | 1                              |         |                              |         |
| No                          | 0.735 (0.303-1.782)            | 0.047   | 0.237 (1.124-2.523)          | 0.023*  |
| Distance to the clinic      |                                |         |                              |         |
| Less than 1km               | 1                              |         | 1                            |         |
| Between 1km – 5km           | 1.042 (0.365-2.977)            | 0.271   | 0.775 (0.334-1.803)          | 0.141   |
| Beyond 5km                  | 1.052 (0.426-2.602)            | 0.012   | 0.934 (0.436-1.999)          | 0.020*  |
| Other                       | 7.957 (0.864-73.216)           | 0.067   | 3.565 (0.609-20.869)         | 0.019*  |
| Vaccination of animals      |                                |         |                              |         |
| Yes                         | 1                              |         | 1                            |         |
| No                          | 3.891 (1.580-9.581)            | 0.042   | 2.513 (1.231-5.130)          | 0.011*  |
| Frequency of vaccinations   |                                |         |                              |         |
| Once a year                 | 1                              |         | 1                            |         |
| Twice a year                | 1.830 (0.673-4.975)            | 0.236   | 0.149 (0.553-0.390)          | 0.409   |
| Beyond 2 years              | 2.683 (0.883-8.154)            | 0.022   | 2.093 (0.877-4.994)          | 0.016*  |
| Enough shelter for animals  |                                |         |                              |         |
| Yes                         | 1                              |         | 1                            |         |
| No                          | 0.274 (0.110-0.687)            | 0.033   | 1.402 (0.201-2.805)          | 0.010*  |
| Enough grazing land         |                                |         |                              |         |
| Yes                         | 1                              |         |                              |         |
| No                          | 0.965 (0.396-2.348)            | 0.031   | 1.381 (0.302-2.912)          | 0.023*  |
| Contact with wild animals   |                                |         |                              |         |
| Yes                         | 1                              |         |                              |         |
| No                          | 0.766 (0.268-2.195)            | 0.157   |                              |         |

\*\*\*%=Percentage, CI=Confidence Interval, \*=Significant at 5% level

## 4. Discussion

The study shows that some demographic and socio-economic characteristics were statistically significant in association with the prevalence of bovine tuberculosis at bivariate level. Cattle owners who had attained college or university education and those in formal employment had lower chances of experiencing bovine tuberculosis among their animals. This can be compared to a study conducted in South West Ethiopia which showed that the level of education and income of cattle owners determined the ability to acquire vaccines and proper spaced shelter for their animals in order to prevent overcrowding which could prevent trans-

mission of the disease from infected cattle to other cattle in the herd [16, 23, 24]. Also, the level of education of cattle owners would help to determine how informed they are about the prevention and curing of bovine tuberculosis as well as decision making regarding the transmission and infection of the disease among their animals [20, 27]. Therefore, from the findings of this study, it is evident enough to argue that employment status and education level of cattle owners do influence the prevalence of bovine tuberculosis in cattle and that it is important to adopt strategies that support preventive measures of the disease.

The study indicates that cattle owners who had not heard of bovine tuberculosis had higher chances of experiencing bovine tuberculosis among their cattle. Reference could be made to a study conducted in the tropical farming regions of

Ethiopia which attributes this to the knowledge gaps regarding the prevalence of bovine tuberculosis due to scarcity of information surrounding bovine tuberculosis infection, treatment, care, and prevention as well as control measures [18, 22]. Literature from data sources on the epidemiology of bovine tuberculosis revealed that more than 60% of the community members in the Kafue Basin were aware of bovine tuberculosis disease. However, 38% of the community members in the Kafue Basin were not aware of bovine tuberculosis, and as to whether the disease was zoonotic or not, clinical signs and symptoms and also how it could be transmitted from one animal to another [14, 23].

The study further showed that action taken when cattle owners' experienced bovine tuberculosis also had an influence on the prevalence of bovine tuberculosis. Cattle owners that practiced the action of separating the animals that had contracted the disease from the healthy ones had lesser chances of experiencing bovine tuberculosis among their cattle hence, one of the best methods to prevent the spread of bovine tuberculosis from one animal to another [15]. According to the National Control and Eradication Programs based on test and slaughter of infected animals have been successfully implemented in many countries, as the preferred approach to managing bovine tuberculosis [5, 24]. However, this approach remains impractical in some heavily infected countries because it would necessitate slaughtering large numbers of cattle, and this may not be feasible due to human resource or financial limitations within the animal health programs or for cultural reasons [21].

The findings further showed that environmental characteristics and behavioural practices of the cattle owners influenced the prevalence of bovine tuberculosis among the animals. The findings showed that cattle owners who are in settlements without a veterinary clinic and/or have to move more than 5km to access veterinary services had higher odds of experiencing bovine tuberculosis among their cattle. Equally, cattle owners who did not vaccinate their animals and those with inadequate shelter had higher odds of experiencing bovine tuberculosis. However, the major factors among which contribute to the acquisition of the infection in both urban and rural populations of Africa are family ownerships of cattle, previous livestock ownership and sharing of houses with animals [17, 28]. All these causalities and/or habits are the daily practices most notably of rural communities in Africa. In rural areas of Ethiopia, most people do have extremely close attachments with cattle (such as sharing shelter) that intensifies the transmission and spread of bovine tuberculosis [29]. Still, cattle from different villages and families can be kept together in one large herd especially during transhumance and those which become permanently resident in the interface areas away from the villages more for security reasons [26].

Studies in agricultural regions of Southern Namibia in more or less similar ecosystems have also indicated that the type of cattle management becomes a significant risk factor

for bovine tuberculosis transmission given the type of existing risk factors in that particular ecosystem [25]. This becomes more elaborate when the likelihood of cattle movement in that enterprise is high, an important point for consideration in the Kafue Basin given the high interaction patterns between different cattle herds and wild animal populations [30].

## 5. Conclusion

Bovine tuberculosis is still one of the largely neglected zoonotic diseases in the world, particularly in developing countries. Thus, this zoonosis deserves further research and efforts to establish the real burden of the disease in animals. The study showed that bovine tuberculosis is highly prevalent in the Kafue Basin and the surrounding areas including the Lochinvar National Park. Associated risk factors contributed to the prevalence of the disease in cattle and its transmission. The study also showed that the respondents had a lower level of understanding of the zoonotic potential of bovine tuberculosis than human tuberculosis. This however, is a strong indication that the public health sector of the veterinary service of the country has work to be done about this and other zoonotic diseases and also, the need for further research to be done by other researchers on this zoonotic disease. Awareness rising about the disease, its transmission and zoonotic implication is of great importance for reduction and control measures.

## Abbreviations

WHO: World Health Organization  
UNZABREC: University of Zambia Biomedical Research Ethics Committee  
NHRA: National Health Research Authority  
BTB: Bovine Tuberculosis  
UNZA: University of Zambia  
ACEIDHA: Africa Centre of Excellence for Infectious Diseases of Humans and Animals

## Acknowledgments

This article is derived from Kalenga Mwelaisha's dissertation submitted to the University of Zambia (UNZA) for the award of a Master of Public Health Degree in Population Studies. Sincere gratitude to everyone who contributed to this paper and also, special thanks goes to the Africa Centre of Excellence for Infectious Diseases of Humans and Animals (ACEIDHA) Management for supporting this research paper.

## Author Contributions

**Kalenga Mwelaisha:** Conceptualization, Data curation,

Software, Formal Analysis, Supervision, Validation, Investigation, Writing - original draft, Methodology, Visualization, Project administration

**Rosemary Ndonyo Likwa:** Resources, Supervision, Funding acquisition, Investigation, Project administration, Writing - review & editing

**Humphrey Simukoko:** Supervision, Writing - review & editing

## Availability of Data & Complete Report

It can be accessed at the University of Zambia Archives.

## Conflicts of Interest

The authors declare no conflicts of interest.

## References

- [1] Alvarez L. G., Webb R. and Holmes M. A.: A novel field-based approach to validate the use of network models for disease spread between dairy herds. *Epidemiology and Infection*. 2011. 139-163.
- [2] CDC: *Mycobacterium bovis (Bovine Tuberculosis) in domestic animals*. U. S. Department of Agriculture-Bovine Tuberculosis fact sheet. 2019.
- [3] Lehman F. D.: *Critical Control Points in Beef Heifer Development* - College of Veterinary Medicine, Box 9825, Mississippi State. 2017. MS 3976.
- [4] WHO: *Bovine tuberculosis world organization for animal health*. 2018.
- [5] Cosivi O., Grange J. M. and Daborn C. J.: The zoonotic importance of mycobacterium bovis - *Tubercle and Lung Disease*. 2000. Vol. 77, no. 2, pp. 103-108.
- [6] Munyeme M., Muma J. B., Skjerve: Risk factors associated with bovine tuberculosis in traditional cattle of the livestock/wildlife interface areas in the Kafue basin of Zambia - *Preventive Veterinary Medicine*. 2005.
- [7] O'Reilly F. and Daborn D.: Wildlife tuberculosis in South African conservation areas: implications and challenges, *Veterinary Microbiology*. 2004. Vol. 112, no. 2-4, pp. 91-100.
- [8] Williamson D. and Payne G.: The role of wild animal populations in the epidemiology of tuberculosis in domestic animals: how to assess the risk - *Veterinary Microbiology*. 2003. Vol. 112, no. 2-4, pp. 303-312.
- [9] Bengis L. and Cooper R. J.: Zoonotic tuberculosis due to mycobacterium bovis in developing countries-*Emerging Infectious Diseases*. 2006. Vol. 4, no. 1, pp. 59-70.
- [10] Ameni G. and Kiros S.: Mycobacterium tuberculosis complex DNA from an extinct bison - *Clinical Infectious Diseases*. 2001. Vol. 33, no. 3, pp. 305-311, 2001.
- [11] Ministry of Health. *Ministry of Health Annual Report of 2019 – an analytical report on disease surveillance in Zambia*. 2019.
- [12] Zambia National Public Health Institute. *ZNPFI Annual Report of 2019 – a case study on the prevalence of bovine tuberculosis in Zambia*. 2019.
- [13] Olea-Poppelka G., Rothschild B. M. and Martin L. D.: Prevalence of bovine tuberculosis and animal level risk factors for indigenous cattle under different grazing strategies in the livestock/wildlife interface areas of Africa. 2004.
- [14] Ameni G. and Tibbo M.: Prevalence and risk factor assessment in cattle and cattle owners in Wuchale-Jida District. *Central Ethiopia. International Journal of Applied Research in Veterinary Medicine*. 2003. 1-17.
- [15] Roswurm H. and Ranney T. S.: Risk factors for herd-level bovine-tuberculosis seropositivity in transhumant cattle in Uganda - *Preventive Veterinary Medicine*. 2000. Vol. 80, no. 4, pp. 318-329.
- [16] Kazwala K. J.: A review of diseases of parasites of the Kafue lechwe (*Kobus lechwe kafuensis*). *J. Wildl. Dis*. 2001. 661- 667.
- [17] Faye N.: *Bovine Tuberculosis - an update*. Veterinary Epidemiology and Economics Research Unit, The University of Reading and UK. 2005. 132.
- [18] Kaneene S.: Detection and identification of multiple mycobacterial pathogens by DNA amplification in a single tube. 2002. *Genome Research* 1, 269-273.
- [19] Muma J. B., Samui K. L., Siamudaala V. M., Oloya J., Matop G., Omer M. K., Munyeme M., Mubita C. and Skjerve E.: Prevalence of antibodies to *Brucella* spp. and individual risk factors of infection in traditional cattle, goats and sheep reared in livestock-wildlife interface areas of Zambia. *Trop. Anim. Health Prod*. 2006. 38, 195-206.
- [20] Ayele D. G. Winkler B. and Mathews F.: Environmental risk factors associated with bovine tuberculosis among cattle in high-risk areas. 2004. <https://doi.org/10.1098/rsbl.2015.0536>
- [21] Macallan R. Martens G. and Hudson, C. P.: Diagnosing bovine tuberculosis: reducing the costs and diagnostic delays. *Int. J. Tuberc. Lung Dis*. 2000. 240-245.
- [22] Kasradze G.: Tuberculosis is a reemerging disease in animals and humans. 2015. *Vet Ital.*; 45: 35-181.
- [23] Munyua B.: Epidemiology of selected mycobacteria that infect humans and animals. *Rev Sci Tech off Inter des Epiz*. 2016. 20 (1): 105-112.
- [24] WHO: *Global animal tuberculosis report*. 2003. 1-14.
- [25] Fujikura T.: Zoonotic tuberculosis due to mycobacterium bovis in developing countries. *Emerging Infectious Diseases*. 2007. 4: 1-17.
- [26] Oloya J.: Risk factors for herd-level bovine-tuberculosis seropositivity in transhumant cattle in Uganda PMID: 17482694 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.preventmed.2007.03-04>

- [27] Enticotta G., Mayeb D., Christl D. and Donnelly A.: An assessment of risk compensation and spill over behavioral adaptations associated with the use of vaccines in animal disease management. 2020.
- [28] Zellweger J. P.: How can bovine tuberculosis among immigrant cattle be managed in Europe? Editorial. *The International Journal of Bovine Tuberculosis and Lung Disease*. 1999. 551-552.
- [29] Grange J. M. and Yates M. D.: Zoonotic Aspects of Mycobacterium Bovis Infection PMID. 2002. 8073621  
[https://doi.org/10.1016/0378-1135\(94\)90052-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/0378-1135(94)90052-3)
- [30] Sitima A. C.: Variability of Mycobacterium Bovis in Traditionally Processed Sour Milk and the Prevalence of Bovine Tuberculosis in Namwala District of Zambia- University of Zambia, Lusaka. 2002.