



BOVINE CORONAVIRUS ELISA KIT

BIO K 344/2

Diagnosis test for bovines

Diarrhoea is a major cause of mortality in young cattle under six weeks.

Bovine neonatal gastroenteritis is a multifactorial disease. It can be caused by viruses : coronavirus or rotavirus, by bacteria : *Salmonella* or *E.coli* F5 (K99), or by protozoa such as *Cryptosporidium*.

Coronavirus and rotavirus are often associated with episodes of neonatal diarrhoea.

The diagnosis of the aetiological agent of diarrhoea can be performed by laboratory technics only, because the clinical signs do not enable one to differentiate between the different microorganisms. It is possible to identify these agents by means of different techniques including culture, staining, electron microscopy and floating techniques. However, these techniques are labor-intensive, unpractical and time consuming. These conventional techniques can be replaced by ELISA because of its simplicity, and limited laboratory equipment requirements.

The sensitivity and specificity of the ELISA technique for the detection of these pathogens are at least as good as those of the more conventional techniques; the results are very similar. The ELISA technique is rapid and reliable and is particularly suited to the analysis of important numbers of samples.

Reliable Results

The use of monoclonal antibody as conjugate and capture antibody ensures excellent specificity and very reliable results.

Ease-of-Use


Minimal hands-on-time
Room temperature incubation
Results available in 140 minutes. All reagents are ready to use.

Flexibility

Results can be read visually or spectrophotometrically.

EIA Procedure

- 1- Microplate coated with monoclonal antibody
- 2- Add samples and positive control.
Incubate 1 hour at 21°C +/- 3°C
Wash
- 3- Add conjugate.
Incubate 1 hour at 21°C +/- 3°C .
Wash
- 4- Add chromogen (TMB)
Wait 10 minutes.





Example of results

Electron microscopy

ELISA BIO K 344

	+	-	
+	21	4	25
-	4	35	36
	22	39	61

Specificity: 90 %
Sensitivity: 95 %

RT-PCR

ELISA BIO K 344

	+	-	
+	14	1	15
-	4	77	81
	18	78	96

Specificity: 98.7 %
Sensitivity: 77.8 %

Days after birth

Calf 1

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
Corona											+	+	+	+		
Rota											+	+	+	+	+	
Crypto					+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+		
Diarrhoea								+				+	+	+	+	

Detectability

The kit gives a positive signal with a minimum of 100,000 TCID₅₀/ml






Composition of the kit

BIO-X ELISA CORONAVIRUS KIT ANTIGENIC : BIO K 344/2

	BIO K 344/2
Microplates	2
Washing solution	1 X 100 ml (20 X)
Dilution buffer	1 X 50 ml (5 X)
Conjugate	1 X 25 ml (1 X)
Control antigen	1 X 4 ml (1 X)
Single component TMB	1 X 25 ml (1 X)
Stopping solution	1 X 15 ml (1 X)

Stability : One year between +2°C and +8°C.



Bibliography

Evaluation of a Bovine Concentrated Lactoserum for Preventing Neonatal Diarrhoea in Belgian Blue Calves

S. Vandeputte, J. Detilleux, S. Carel, B. Bradfer, H. Guyot and F. Rollin

The Open Veterinary Science Journal, 2010, 4, 36-40





DETECTION OF ENTEROPATHOGENS INVOLVED IN CALF NEONATAL DIARRHOEA: VALIDATION OF ELISAs AND LATERAL FLOW IMMUNOASSAYS AS COMPARED WITH REFERENCE METHODS

C. van Maanen¹, M.H. Mars¹, A.M. van der Meulen¹, H. v.d. Sande, H.A. Blok² and C.B.E.M. Reusken²

¹Dutch Animal Health Services (GD), Deventer, the Netherlands

²Center for Infectious Disease Control, Institute for Public Health and the Environment (rivm), Bilthoven, the Netherlands

Key words: Calves; neonatal diarrhoea; diagnosis; enteropathogens; ELISA; lateral flow immunoassay; PCR

1. Introduction and Objectives

Several pathogens play a role in calf neonatal diarrhoea. The major enteropathogens involved are *Escherichia coli* F57/K99 (*E. coli*), *Cryptosporidium parvum*, bovine enteric coronavirus, bovine rotavirus and bovine viral diarrhoea virus. In our laboratory different methods – e.g. selective culture for *E. coli* F57/K99, microscopic examination of faecal smears for *Cryptosporidium parvum*, a commercially available latex agglutination test for bovine rotavirus, and a commercially available antigen-detection-ELISA for BVDV are routinely used for detection of these agents. For bovine enteric coronavirus no routine diagnostic method was implemented until now.

The objectives of this study were to evaluate two commercially available antigen-detection-ELISA kits and two lateral flow immunoassay tests (on site tests) for the detection of four of the above-mentioned pathogens.

2. Materials and Methods

2.1 Samples At necropsy rectal contents were sampled from calves between 0 and 6 weeks of age with diarrhoea (n=216). Samples were investigated by routine procedures and then stored at -20 °C to enable batchwise testing.

2.2 ELISAs Samples were tested in two different ELISA kits according to the instructions of the manufacturers. Samples positive for bovine coronavirus in one or both ELISAs were tested by a coronavirus-specific PCR for confirmation.

2.2 Lateral flow immunoassay tests. A subset of 100 samples with a more or less equal distribution of positive results for the four pathogens of interest, were tested by two lateral flow strip tests (C and D). Tests A and C were produced by the same manufacturer. All samples of this subset were also tested for bovine coronavirus by PCR.

3. Results

Agreement is presented in table 1. For *E. coli* F57/K99, the number of positives in the reference test and other tests was comparable. For rotavirus and cryptosporidium, slightly more samples were positive in ELISAs and slightly less samples were positive in fast tests than in the reference tests. Agreement between ELISA results was also good, and correlation coefficients between ELISA results were high for the four enteropathogens evaluated.

Table 1. Level of agreement between different tests for four pathogens associated with neonatal diarrhoea in calves, displayed as κ -values (Kappa)

		Reference method			
		<i>E. coli</i> K99	bovine rotavirus	bovine coronavirus	<i>Cryptosporidium parvum</i>
BIO K 348	ELISA kit A	0.93	0.80	0.55	0.81
	ELISA kit B	0.96	0.72	0.54	0.70
BIO K 156	Fast test kit C	0.89	0.91	0.37	0.85
	Fast test kit D	0.91	0.72	0.05	0.73

For coronavirus all positive samples in ELISA kit A were confirmed by PCR, whereas ELISA kit B scored some false positives. In the comparative study on a subset of 100 samples PCR scored 26 samples positive for coronavirus, of which 12 and 14 samples scored positive in ELISA kits A and B, respectively. Fast test C was as sensitive as ELISA kit A, but scored an additional 14 samples positive, discrepant, however, from the additional PCR positives. Fast test D only scored 1 sample positive.

Fig. 1 shows the numbers of samples for each pathogen detected by ELISA kit A (four pathogens) or routine methods for BVDV and *Salmonella typhimurium/dublin*. Fig. 2 demonstrates detection of more than one pathogen in 25 % of the samples.

Fig. 1 Frequency distribution of defined enteropathogens in faecal samples of young calves with diarrhoea





Fig. 2 Simultaneous detection of enteropathogens in faecal samples of young calves with diarrhoea



Discussion and Conclusions

Hardly any literature is available concerning diagnostic performance of commercially available ELISA kits and lateral flow kits for detection of the major enteropathogens involved in calf neonatal diarrhoea (2, 3). All kits showed satisfactory diagnostic performance for detection of *E. coli* K99, bovine rotavirus and *Cryptosporidium parvum*, with kits A and C showing the highest kappa-values. For detection of bovine coronavirus, kit D failed almost completely, whereas kappa-values of the other kits were rather poor. The reference test, however, was PCR. Considering the relative low detection limits of PCRs in general, the clinical significance of these PCR results remain to be seen (1). Also the significance of – frequently occurring – combinations of enteropathogens in calf neonatal diarrhoea may cause a headache for the veterinary practitioner.

5. References

1. Kapil, S., Trent, A.M. and Goyal, S.M., 1990. Excretion and persistence of bovine coronavirus in neonatal calves. *Arch. Virol.*, 115 (1-2): 127-132
2. Khattar, S. and Pandey, R., 1990. A comparison of four methods for detecting rotavirus in faeces of bovine calves. *J. Diarrhoeal Dis. Res.*, 8 (1-2): 31-33.
3. Trotz-Williams, L.G., Martin, S.W., Martin, D., Duffield, T., et al., 2005. Multiattribute evaluation of two simple tests for the detection of *Cryptosporidium parvum* in calf faeces. *Vet. Parasitol.*