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ABSTRACT

A survey was conducted using standard parasitological procedures to determine the ecology of ticks on the cattle within the main campus of the University of Abuja, Nigeria. The tick species identified were Amblyomma variegatum, Amblyomma hebraeum, Ornithodorus moubata complex, Hyalomma truncatum, Hyalomma rufipes, Rhipicephalus decoloratus, Phlpicephalus appendiculatus, and Boophilus microplus. Of the 100 cattle examined, 47(47%) of the tick examined was found on the male cow and 53(53%) were found on the female cow. In addition, 23(23%) of the observed tick are found on the leg, 20(20%) are found in the anus, 20(20%) are found on the udder, 14(14%) are found on the back while 23(23%) of the ticks are found in the ear. 31(31%) of the observed ticks were found on the bunaj specie, 24(24%) of the ticks on the Gudali, 24(24%) of the observed ticks on the Rahaji specie and 21(21%) on the wadara specie. Amblyomma hebraeum, Ornithodorus moubata Complex and Rhipicephalus decoloratus were found more dominantly on Bunaj breed (42.9%, 55.6% and 42.9% respectively), Amblyomma variegatum and Phlpicephalus appendiculatus was observed to be more dominant on Rahaji breed (infesting 33.3% and 66.7% respectively), Boophilus microplus and Hyalomma rufipes were found dominant on wadara (30% and 50% respectively). There is need to help establish baseline information on
ticks ecology and occurrence in the study area which would consequently lead to increased public awareness especially to the herdsmen and in avoiding tick borne diseases, also to help in vector control formulation and to prevent the herdsmen of suffering from low productivity due to the presence of ticks, thereby leading to various weaknesses, diseases and sometimes death of the cattle. Owing to this, this study did not only identify the tick species infesting cattle but also examined the host-parasite ecology of ticks on cattle within the main campus of the University of Abuja, Nigeria.
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1. INTRODUCTION

Beef cattle in the tropics are exposed to varying levels of challenge from endo and ecto-parasites to other environmental stressors. Among ectoparasites, ticks have been recognized as the most notorious world threat to cattle due to severe irritation and allergy [1]. Ticks are blood sucking ecto-parasites that live by feeding on the blood of different companion animals, wildlife and livestock species. (Ixodidae) is a three-host tick with three active life stages, larva, nymph and adult [2]. The immature stages are found on hosts of all sizes while adult stages tend to be the only stage found on larger hosts [3]. Ticks are ranked as the most economically important ectoparasites of livestock in the tropics, including Sub-Saharan Africa (SSA) [4]. Their veterinary importance is related to their blood-feeding, from which both their direct and indirect pathogenicity originates [5]. In dairy cattle, tick pervasion alone can cause pallor, stress, decrease in weight gain and milk yields, devaluation of conceal worth, excessive touchiness and poison levels, driving likewise to auxiliary diseases. In Nigeria, 90% of the dairy cattle populace is held under the customary peaceful farming of Fulani herdsmen; for the most part amassed in the focal northern piece of the country [6]. Under the Fulanis’ management, cattle are extensively grazed in pastures and forest, and exposed to infestation by the three tick genera present in Nigeria (i.e., Amblyomma, Hyalomma, and Rhipicephalus spp). Usually low in the dry season, tick loads on cattle tend to increase after the first scattered rains, reaching the highest abundance one month after the heavy rains (i.e., from July to September), when all tick species are required to be available [7].

Ticks on cattle are seen as a peril by the Fulani pastoralists, who traditionally control them by manual removal three times a week during the wet season (i.e., April to October) and twice a week during the dry season (i.e., November to March). Neither dip tanks nor acaricides have ever been used in this part of the country [8]. Information on tick dispersion is a fundamental essential for contriving any successful control of these arthropods and the contaminations they communicate [9]. The effect of ticks and tickborne illnesses on the individual and public economy warrants use of proper tick control methodologies [10]. Therefore, this study examines possible eradicating techniques of ticks on cattle and examined the host-parasite ecology of ticks on cattle within the main campus of the University of Abuja, Nigeria. within the main campus of the University of Abuja, Nigeria.

2. MATERIALS AND METHODS

2.1 Study Area

This study was carried out at the University of Abuja permanent site FCT Abuja. The University of Abuja Main Campus is located along the Nnamdi Azikiwe Airport road, Abuja. Latitude 9°32’N and Longitude 50°10'E with a land mass of about 11,800 hectares in Gwagwalada Area Council of Abuja. The main campus is characterized with a temperature range of 30°C to 35°C.

The government region is found only north of the juncture of the Niger River and Benue River. It is lined by provinces of Niger toward the West and North, Kaduna toward the Upper east, Nasarawa toward the East and South, and Kogi toward the southwest (Government Capital Domain 2015). Lying between scope 8.25 and 9.20 north of the equator and 7.39 east of Greenwich Meridian, Abuja is geologically situated at the centre of the country.

2.2 Population of the Study

A total of 100 cows comprising Bunaji, Gudali, Rahaji and Wadara breeds were randomly selected from the different Fulani settlement of the University of Abuja permanent site. This was
carried out within the period of September-October 2019.

2.3 Samples Collection

This research employed random sampling to select a representatives unit of 5% of the total population area estimated to be one hundred (100). Ticks were gathered from various parts of the body including the leg, anus, udder, back, and ear by utilizing forceps and hand gloves. At the point when required, little hairbrush dunked in ethanol was utilized for the assortment of the ticks. The place of connection was spread with ethanol. Satisfactory safeguards were taken to protect the mouthparts and a few limbs of the ticks during assortment to help in the identification. The ticks gathered were placed into clean, appropriately marked and well-plug glass vials containing 70% liquor and 5% formalin for safeguarding. The vials were promptly transported to the biological science laboratory, University of Abuja for further identification.

2.4 Method of Identification

Ticks were collected, identified and sorted out according to the parts of the body they were found. Ticks gathered were inspected under low power and afterward high power magnification of the microscope. The morphology of the ticks was analyzed in the laboratory using the compound microscope. Identification of the various types of the ticks was aided by the anatomical and morphological characteristics.
2.5 Data Analysis

The data collected was presented through percentages (%), this helps to assign and give percentage height to each alternative in order to make a good comparative analysis and to determine the statistical significance and association between the disease and other independent variables. All statistical analyses for the present study were assessed using Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) evaluation.

3. RESULTS

From the above result in Table 1, 47(47%) of the tick examined was found on the male cow and 53(53%) are found on the female cow. 23(23%) of the observed tick are found on the leg, 20(20%) are found in the anus, 20(20%) are found on the udder, 14(14%) are found on the back and 23(23%) of the ticks are found in the ear. 31(31%) of the observed ticks were found on the bunaj specie, 24(24%) of the ticks on the Gudali, 24(24%) of the observed ticks on the Rahaji breed and 21(21%) on the wadara specie. Whereas 7(7%) of the ticks found are Amblyomma hebraeum, 15(15%) are Amblyomma variegatum, and 40(40%) are found to be Boophylus microplus, 4(4%) are Hyalomma rufipes, also, 12(12%) are Hyalomma truncatum, 6(6%) are Phipicephalus appendiculatus, 9(9%) are Rhipicephalus dicoloratus and 7(7%) were found to be Ornithodorus moubata Complex.

Table 2 above shows the distribution of the species across the breed with Amblyomma hebraeum, Ornithodorus moubata Complex and Rhipicephalus dicoloratus found more dominantly on Bunaj breed (42.9% 55.6% and 42.9% respectively), Amblyomma variegatum and Phipicephalus appendiculatus was observed to be more dominant on Rahaji Breed (infesting 33.3% and 66.7% respectively). Boophylus microplus and Hyalomma rufipe were found dominant on wadara (30% and 50% respectively).

From the above result, Hyalomma rufipe and Phipicephalus appendiculatus are found more dominant on the leg (infesting 100% and 100% respectively), Rhipicephalus dicoloratus is found to be dominant in the anus region having 100% of the observed ticks, Amblyomma hebraeum is found to be dominant in the udder region also having prevalence of 100% of the observed ticks, Amblyomma variegatum is also found to be dominant on the back region having also 53.3% prevalence rate of the observed ticks, Ornithodorus moubata Complex is found to be dominant in the udder region also having 100% of the observed ticks and Boophylus microplus is equally distributed around the leg and ears of the observed cows.

4. DISCUSSION

This examination was carried out in the late wet season, when the overall moistness just as vegetation cover is at its pinnacle. This research aimed to evaluate the ecology of ticks on cattle within the main campus of the University of Abuja. An average of 100 cattle were randomly selected and examined, the greater number of adults as opposed to younger cows sampled, reflects the age composition of Fulani herds, with at least 65% of cattle being adult.
### Table 1. Frequency distribution of variables

|       | Frequency | Percent | P-Value |
|-------|-----------|---------|---------|
| **Sex** |           |         |         |
| Male   | 27        | 47.0    | .000    |
| Female | 33        | 53.0    |         |
| **Total** | 60       | 100.0   |         |
| **Leg** |           |         |         |
| Anus   | 20        | 20.0    |         |
| Udder  | 20        | 20.0    |         |
| Back   | 14        | 14.0    |         |
| Ear    | 23        | 23.0    | .000    |
| **Total** | 100      | 100.0   |         |
| **Breed** |          |         |         |
| Bunaj  | 31        | 31.0    |         |
| Gudali | 24        | 24.0    |         |
| Rahaji | 24        | 24.0    |         |
| Wadara | 21        | 21.0    | .000    |
| **Total** | 100      | 100.0   |         |
| **Species** |      |         |         |
| *Amblyomma hebraeum* | 7 | 7.0 |         |
| *Amblyomma variegatum* | 15 | 15.0 |         |
| *Boophylus microplus* | 40 | 40.0 |         |
| *Hyalomma rufipe* | 4 | 4.0 |         |
| *Hyalomma truncatum* | 12 | 12.0 |         |
| *Phipicephalus appendiculatus* | 6 | 6.0 |         |
| *Rhipicephalus dicoloratus* | 9 | 9.0 |         |
| *Ornithodorus moubata Complex* | 7 | 7.0 | .000 |
| **Total** | 100 | 100 |         |

### Table 2. Species * Breed crosstabulation

| Species                  | Breeds     | Total |
|--------------------------|------------|-------|
| *Amblyomma hebraeum*     |            | 7     |
| Count                    | 3          | 2     |
| % within Species         | 42.9%      | 28.6% |
| % within Breeds          | 9.7%       | 8.3%  |
| Amblyomma variegatum     |            | 15    |
| Count                    | 4          | 4     |
| % within Species         | 26.7%      | 26.7% |
| % within Breeds          | 12.9%      | 16.7% |
| Boophylus microplus      |            | 40    |
| Count                    | 11         | 9     |
| % within Species         | 27.5%      | 22.5% |
| % within Breeds          | 35.5%      | 37.5% |
| Hyalomma rufipe          |            | 4     |
| Count                    | 1          | 0     |
| % within Species         | 25.0%      | 0.0%  |
| % within Breeds          | 3.2%       | 0.0%  |
| Hyalomma truncatum       |            | 12    |
| Count                    | 4          | 4     |
| % within Species         | 33.3%      | 33.3% |
| % within Breeds          | 12.9%      | 16.7% |
| Phipicephalus            |            | 6     |
| Count                    | 0          | 2     |
| % within Species         | 33.3%      | 16.7% |
| % within Breeds          | 12.9%      | 8.3%  |
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| Species                  | Breeds | Total |
|--------------------------|--------|-------|
|                          | Bunaj  | Gudali| Rahaji| Wadara| |
| Amblyomma hebraeum       |        |       |       |       | 7.0% |
| Count                    | 0      | 0     | 7     | 0     | 7     |
| % within Species         | 0.0%   | 0.0%  | 35.0% | 0.0%  | 100.0%|
| % within Breed           | 0.0%   | 0.0%  | 100.0%| 0.0%  | 100.0%|
| Amblyomma variegatum     |        |       |       |       | 15.0%|
| Count                    | 3      | 0     | 0     | 4     | 15    |
| % within Species         | 13.0%  | 0.0%  | 20.0% | 57.1% | 100.0%|
| % within Breed           | 20.0%  | 0.0%  | 26.0% | 53.3% | 100.0%|
| Boophylus microphylus    |        |       |       |       | 100.0%|
| Count                    | 10     | 5     | 9     | 6     | 40    |
| % within Species         | 43.5%  | 25.0% | 45.0% | 42.9% | 43.5% |
| % within Breed           | 25.0%  | 12.5% | 22.5% | 15.0% | 25.5% |
| Hyalomma rufipes         |        |       |       |       | 100.0%|
| Count                    | 4      | 0     | 0     | 0     | 4     |
| % within Species         | 17.4%  | 0.0%  | 0.0%  | 0.0%  | 4.0%  |
| % within Breed           | 100.0% | 0.0%  | 0.0%  | 0.0%  | 100.0%|
| Hyalomma truncatatum     |        |       |       |       | 12.0%|
| Count                    | 0      | 6     | 0     | 0     | 6     |
| % within Species         | 0.0%   | 30.0% | 0.0%  | 0.0%  | 26.1% |
| % within Breed           | 0.0%   | 50.0% | 0.0%  | 0.0%  | 50.0% |
| Rhipicephalus appendiculatus | |       |       |       | 6.0%  |
| Count                    | 6      | 0     | 0     | 0     | 6     |
| % within Species         | 26.1%  | 0.0%  | 0.0%  | 0.0%  | 6.0%  |
| % within Breed           | 100.0% | 0.0%  | 0.0%  | 0.0%  | 100.0%|
| Rhipicephalus dicoloratus |        |       |       |       | 9.0%  |
| Count                    | 0      | 9     | 0     | 0     | 9     |
| % within Species         | 0.0%   | 45.0% | 0.0%  | 0.0%  | 9.0%  |

Table 3. Distribution of the species around some selected body parts location
The results of this study reveal presence of *Amblyomma variegatum*, *Hyalomma sripipe*, *Rhipicephalus appendiculatus*, *Ornithodoros moubata* and *Boophilus microplus* pervading cows is in accordance with reports by [11] who identified these ticks in addition to *Demacentor variabilis*. Comparative perceptions were accounted for from different pieces of the world [12].

The predominance of these ticks chiefly belonging to the family *Ixodidae* (hard ticks) in University of Abuja permanent site could be as a result of the high temperature usually experienced. This high temperature makes it unfavorable for the survival of soft ticks [11].

Females were found to have a somewhat higher tick prevalence over male cattle. This outcome is
in accordance with reports by [13,14] who reported that female cattle have more ticks than male cattle, because most of the female cattle are fundamentally bound for reproducing purposes and in this way is primarily infested by ticks from the male dairy cattle during mating. Infestation rate was higher in adult animals aged 3-7 years and mostly minimal in older animals aged >7 years. This is in concordance with the works of [13] which found that resistance in the animal was building up as the animals grew up and the animals became more resistant and adoptable than in younger stages irrespective of the farm species. It was also found that adult cattle were more susceptible to tick infestation than the calves and older animals. It is also reported that calves were 20 times more resistant to tick infestation than adult cattle. The result of this current research suggests that none of these breed (Bunaj, Gudali, Rahaji and Wadara) was totally impervious to tick pervasion as all the breed were pervaded at different levels. [15] reported that prevalence of ticks was significantly higher in local cattle (43.8%) than the crossbreed (24.1%) cattle. The distribution (%) of tick infestation in different body parts of cattle examined reveals that udder, anus, ears, back and leg were the most tick infested sites. This further affirms that tick like to connect and feed from certain regions of the cattle. This result is in concurrence with the work by (Opara et al. 2012) who found that ticks plaguing dairy cattle in this area like to append and benefit from the udder, butt, ears, back and leg. These finding could be ascribed to the way that the udder, butt, ears, back and leg are highly supplied with blood and ticks for the most part lean toward more slender and short air skin for invasion.

5. CONCLUSION

This investigation gives data on tick populaces affecting cattle within the main campus of the University of Abuja. The presence of Amblyomma variegatum, Hyalomma rufipes, Rhicepiphalus appendiculatus, Ornithodorus moubata and Boophilus microplus on the cattle within the main campus of the University of Abuja is of great veterinary importance as these species are involved in the transmission of anaplasmosis, Babesiosis, Cowdriosis and dermatophilosis (A. variegatum) and sweating sickness (H. rufipes). From the result, it can be predicted that Hard ticks (Ixodidae) are dominant and the female cattle are susceptible to the infestation of this ticks in the Fulani settlement of the university of Abuja, due to movement of grazing cattle and crossbreeding with other breeds within the campus and neighboring villages and also the climatic conditions of the study area.

6. RECOMMENDATION

This examination indicates that there was a high burden of ticks in the area. However, the consideration given to control the pervasion had not been adequate. Acaricide application is the main method of tick control in the region. Ticks ought to be managed at an economically acceptable level by a blend of strategies and the required information on the tick species pervasiveness and comprehension of their epidemiology. It is advisable that surveillance should be done by the parasitologist periodically to ascertain the level of infestation of ticks on the cattle within the main campus of the University of Abuja. The herdsmen should be taught the various methods of controlling tick infestation and eradicating tick borne disease, by setting up awareness and providing the herdsmen with the necessary chemicals and equipment to help avert tick infestations on their cattle.
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### APPENDIX

| Location | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|----------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Valid    | Leg       | 23      | 23.0          | 23.0               |
|          | Anus      | 20      | 20.0          | 43.0               |
|          | Udder     | 20      | 20.0          | 63.0               |
|          | Back      | 14      | 14.0          | 77.0               |
|          | Ear       | 23      | 23.0          | 100.0              |
|          | Total     | 100     | 100.0         | 100.0              |

| Breeds   | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|----------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Valid    | Bunaj     | 31      | 31.0          | 31.0               |
|          | Gudali    | 24      | 24.0          | 55.0               |
|          | Rahaji    | 24      | 24.0          | 79.0               |
|          | Wadara    | 21      | 21.0          | 100.0              |
|          | Total     | 100     | 100.0         | 100.0              |

| Species  | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|----------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Valid    | Amblyomma hebraeum | 7 | 7.0 | 7.0 | 7.0 |
|          | Amblyomma variegatum | 15 | 15.0 | 15.0 | 22.0 |
|          | Boophylus microplus | 40 | 40.0 | 40.0 | 62.0 |
|          | Hyalomma rufipes | 4 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 66.0 |
|          | Hyalomma truncatum | 12 | 12.0 | 12.0 | 78.0 |
|          | Phipicephalus appendiculatus | 6 | 6.0 | 6.0 | 84.0 |
|          | Rhipicephalus dicoloratus | 9 | 9.0 | 9.0 | 93.0 |
|          | Ornithodorus moubata | 7 | 7.0 | 7.0 | 100.0 |
|          | Complex    |          |               |                    |
|          | Total      | 100     | 100.0         | 100.0              |
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