Ticks (Acari: Ixodidae) of livestock and their seasonal activities, northwest of Iran
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ABSTRACT

Objective: To identify the ticks (Acari: Ixodidae) of livestock and their seasonal activities, in northwest of Iran, including the combination of two of the geographical regions of Iran (Caspian and mountain plateau) where the majority of the domestic ruminants in Iran exist.

Methods: Fifteen villages of Meshkin–Shahr County were selected randomly from different areas of the county. The animal dwellings were visited and the whole body of sheep, cows, goats and dogs were examined for their probable infestation. Samples were identified at the level of species according to the standard morphological key.

Results: In this study 1208 specimen were collected and totally nine species (Dermacentor marginatus, Dermacentor nivus, Haemaphysalis erinacei, Haemaphysalis punctata, Hyalomma anatolicum, Hyalomma asiaticum, Hyalomma marginatum, Rhipicephalus bursa and Rhipicephalus sanguineus) were identified in this study. Also 569 host including 40 cows, 450 sheep, 70 goats and 9 dogs were examined for infestation and among them 255 were infested which showed a 44% of infestation among examined livestock. The infestation rate among sheep (46%) was higher than other hosts. The infestation rates among the rest of hosts were as: cows (40%), goat (37%) and dogs (33%).

Conclusions: The results of this study and other studies of the region showed the probability of the establishment and development of the burden of several tick–borne diseases.

1. Introduction

Ticks as the obligate hematophagous arthropods transmit wide range of pathogens by parasitizing different groups of vertebrates across the world[1]. Tick–borne pathogens in addition to animals encompass the human and lead to over 100000 of clinical cases in the world annually[2].

In several notable tick–borne diseases which affect the human, the livestock play an important role. In addition to the study of the ticks and their distribution, based on the nature of these diseases, the pattern of their host should be determined[1]. In tick–borne diseases, the infectivity of the reservoir hosts which are susceptible to the infection, the tick infestation rate, and the host density are the most effective elements which determine the epidemiology of these diseases[3,4].

Several studies have been conducted in order to determine the tick fauna in different regions of Iran, their seasonal activity, host distribution, infestation rates and their infection with pathogens[5–20].

Because of the natural condition and the environment, keeping livestock, animal husbandry and related industries are the main jobs of the majority of the people of some areas like north and northwestern parts of Iran. On the other hand because of the importance of livestock in several tick–borne diseases, the identification of the ticks and their host in these regions is of considerable importance[18]. Some studies focused on the ticks of west and western–north of Iran. For instance, West–Azarbaijan Province and Ardabil Province[18].
Ardabil Province has been located between two different climates, wet-forest climate (Caspian sea region, Guilan Province) and subtropical–mountainous areas (Azarbaijan region). Also its common borders with a foreign country (the republic of Azarbaijan), the wide exchange of the people between this region and neighbors, the movement of livestock within this Province and between different study to re-determine the situation of ticks, their hosts and neighboring people between this region and neighbors, the movement north by Germi County, to the east by the republic of Azarbaijan, to the south by the Ardabil County, and to the west by East Azerbaijan Province (Figure 1). The main city of Ardabil Province is Ardabil. Meshkin-Shahr county is located in the northwest of Iran and its main city is Meshkin-Shahr. Meshkin–Shahr county is located in its central part of the Province and is bordered to the north by Germi County, to the east by the republic of Azarbaijan, to the south by the Ardabil County, and to the west by East Azerbaijan Province (Figure 1). The main city of the Meshkin–shahr County is Meshkin–Shahr. The county is divided into four districts: Arshaq District, the Central District, Meshkin–e Sharqi District, and Moradlu District. The county has three cities: Meshkin–Shahr, Razi, and Lahrud[21].

Figure 1. The map of Iran and the location of Ardabil Province.

2. Materials and methods

2.1. Study area

Ardabil Province is located in the northwest of Iran and its main city is Ardabil. Meshkin–Shahr county is located in its central part of the Province and is bordered to the north by Germi County, to the east by the republic of Azarbaijan, to the south by the Ardabil County, and to the west by East Azerbaijan Province (Figure 1). The main city of the Meshkin–shahr County is Meshkin–Shahr. The county is divided into four districts: Arshaq District, the Central District, Meshkin–e Sharqi District, and Moradlu District. The county has three cities: Meshkin–Shahr, Razi, and Lahrud[21].

2.2. Tick collection

A total of 15 villages of Meshkin–Shahr County were selected randomly from different areas of the county. As the

more than 60% of the Meshkin–Shahr county is mountainous and the rest categorized as plateau then 9/15 of villages selected from mountainous and 6/15 of them were selected from plateau region. The sample collections were conducted from May 2012 to May 2013.

The animal dwellings were visited and the whole body of sheep, cows, goats and dogs were examined for their probable infestation. The collected samples were counted and transferred to the laboratory in labeled glass vials. Samples were identified at the level of species according to the standard morphological key[22,23].

3. Results

In this study 1208 specimen was collected among 4 genera (Hyalomma, Rhipicephalus, Dermacentor and Haemaphysalis). Analyzing the species composition showed that the most diversity has been observed among the genus Hyalomma by 3 species. Two species have been identified from the other three genera (Rhipicephalus, Dermacentor and Haemaphysalis).

Totally, nine species (Dermacentor marginatus (D. marginatus), Dermacentor niveus (D. niveus), Haemaphysalis erinacei (H. erinacei), Haemaphysalis punctata (H. punctata), Hyalomma anatolicum (H. anatolicum), Hyalomma asiaticum (H. asiaticum), Hyalomma marginatum (H. marginatum), Rhipicephalus bursa (R. bursa) and Rhipicephalus sanguineous (R. sanguineous)) were identified in this study.

Among them D. marginatus (by 77.4%), R. bursa (by 14.4%) were the most abundant species respectively whereas H. erinacei (0.16%) was the rarest species (Table 1).

Table 1
The prevalence of Ixodidae tick species according to different seasons, Meshkin–Shahr, Ardabil Province, 2012.

| Species          | Spring | Summer | Autumn | Winter | Total |
|------------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|-------|
|                  | n (%)  | n (%)  | n (%)  | n (%)  | n (%) |
| D. marginatus    | 188    | 15.56  | 434    | 35.90  | 314   | 25.90 |
|                  | 0      | 0.00   | 4      | 0.32   | 0     | 0.00  |
|                  | 0      | 0.00   | 2      | 0.16   | 0     | 0.00  |
|                  | 0      | 0.00   | 0      | 0.00   | 18    | 1.49  |
|                  | 14     | 1.10   | 2      | 0.16   | 0     | 0.00  |
|                  | 6      | 0.40   | 4      | 0.32   | 0     | 0.00  |
|                  | 27     | 2.23   | 12     | 0.99   | 0     | 0.00  |
|                  | 161    | 13.30  | 2      | 0.16   | 11    | 0.91  |
|                  | 1      | 0.08   | 8      | 0.65   | 6     | 0.50  |
|                  | 397    | 32.86  | 466    | 35.90  | 345   | 28.50 |
|                  | 0      | 0.00   | 0      | 0.00   | 9     | 0.74  |
|                  | 1208   | 100.00 | 1000   | 85.90  | 936   | 77.40 |

The results also showed that more than (38.5%) of specimen have been collected in summer, (32.86%) in spring, (28.5%) in autumn and (0%) in winter. The details of collected species, their number and percentage according to the different seasons have been presented in Table 1.

In this study totally 569 host including 40 cows, 450 sheep, 70 goats and 9 dogs were examined for infestation and among them 255 were infested which showed a 44% of infestation among examined livestock. The infestation rate among sheep
(46%) was higher than other hosts. The infestation rates among the rest of hosts were as: cows (40%), goat (37%) and dogs (33%). The details of infestation of different hosts by different ticks species have been presented in Table 2.

**Table 2**
The prevalence of ixodidae tick species among different hosts, Meshkin-Shahr, Ardabil Province, 2012.

| Species       | Cow (40/16) | Sheep (490/216) | Dog (9/3) | Goat (70/26) | Total |
|---------------|-------------|-----------------|-----------|--------------|-------|
| D. marginatus | 75          | 699             | 14        | 148          | 936   |
| D. nivosus    | 0           | 1               | 2         | 1            | 4     |
| H. erinacei   | 0           | 2               | 0         | 0            | 2     |
| H. punctata   | 10          | 16              | 0         | 2            | 18    |
| H. anatolicum | 4           | 9               | 0         | 3            | 16    |
| H. asiaticum  | 7           | 0               | 2         | 1            | 10    |
| H. marginatum | 16          | 23              | 0         | 3            | 39    |
| R. bursa      | 12          | 130             | 0         | 32           | 174   |
| R. sanguineus | 0           | 1               | 6         | 2            | 9     |
| **Total**     | 114         | 881             | 24        | 189          | 1208  |

The analyzing of results according to the topographical preference of collection sites showed that more than half of the specimens have been collected from mountainous areas (722 specimens, 59.7%). In comparison 486 specimens have been collected from plateau region (Table 3).

**Table 3**
The prevalence of ixodidae tick species according to different topographic situation, Meshkin-Shahr, Ardabil Province, 2012.

| Species       | Mountain | Plateau |
|---------------|----------|---------|
|               | n        | %       | n        | %       |
| D. marginatus | 631      | 52.20   | 305      | 25.20   |
| D. nivosus    | 1        | 0.90    | 3        | 0.28    |
| H. erinacei   | 0        | 0.16    | 0        | 0.00    |
| H. punctata   | 7        | 0.57    | 11       | 0.91    |
| H. anatolicum | 12       | 0.90    | 4        | 0.33    |
| H. asiaticum  | 1        | 0.08    | 9        | 0.74    |
| H. marginatum | 12       | 0.90    | 27       | 2.23    |
| R. bursa      | 51       | 4.22    | 123      | 10.10   |
| R. sanguineus | 5        | 0.44    | 4        | 0.33    |
| **Total**     | 722      | 59.70   | 486      | 40.23   |

H. erinacei was collected only from mountainous area and H. anatolicum was the only species which its abundance was significantly higher in mountainous areas and other species like R. bursa, H. asiaticum, H. marginatum, and D. marginatus were caught more in plateau areas (Table 3).

**4. Discussion**

Different researchers divided Iran into four geographical regions according to different topographic, climatic, vegetation pattern and geographical properties[24]. This study was carried out in the combination of two of the mentioned geographical regions (Caspian and mountain plateau) where the majority of the domestic ruminants in Iran exist.

Notable part of tick–borne diseases is zoonoses and ruminants play important role in the cycle of these disease. The presence of several species of disease vectors were shown in this study. This becomes more important when the presence of some serious tick–borne disease like CCHF, Ehrlichiosis, Borreliosis and others in the region have been reported previously[18,25].

On the other hand, the pattern of animal husbandry in the region is based on seasonal movements of people and livestock within the region and between neighbors and this fact makes it more important to understand the seasonal activity of people, livestock and ticks.

Some species like H. anatolicum, H. marginatum, H. asiaticum and R. bursa, which have been identified in this study, were reported previously.

On the other hand, species like Haemaphysalis detritum, Haemaphysalis schulzii, Haemaphysalis dromedarii, Haemaphysalis aegyptium and Haemaphysalis inermis were not found in this study. Another study which focused on the ticks of north of Iran found R. bursa, D. marginatus, D. nivosus, Haemaphysalis detritum and Haemaphysalis choldokoesky from Ardabil Province[26]. Totally it seems that species like R. sanguineous, H. punctata and H. erinacei are new for the region. In this study, Dermacentor more frequently collected on domestic animas likewise earlier study conducted in northwest Iran that Hyalomma reported as most prevalent tick species[18,27].

As nomads of the region move their livestock to the mountainous areas during the late spring and whole summer and also most of the residents of mountainous areas are ranchers, then it could explain the higher rate of livestock infestation in mountainous areas also the higher abundance of infestation during spring and summer. As a result this should be carefully considered by the veterinary and health systems. They could emphasize on the mentioned areas for tick and tick–borne diseases control.

The seasonal activity of ticks in this region is properly compatible with the pattern of livestock husbandry and the movement of the livestock. Also sheep as the main livestock of the region showed higher infestation rate which shows that the relationships between ticks, their hosts, the socio–economic condition of the people and their animal husbandry pattern should be more studied and focused.

The studied region could be assumed as a representative for the western–north part of Iran according to the geographical, cultural and socio–economic properties. The results of this study and other studies of the region showed the probability of the establishment and development of the burden of several tick–borne diseases. Some of the tick–borne diseases have been studied but more studies are needed especially for determination more details of the relations between different cycles of the diseases.

Also even now the taxonomy of the ticks is problematic in some cases, using molecular approach in the field of ticks’ taxonomy and Epidemiology will be useful which will lead to better understanding the chain of diseases and the value of each of them.
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