

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23

**Molecular Identification and Characterization of Rickettsia spp. and other  
Tick-borne Pathogens in Cattle from Birjand, Iran**

Pejman Taji<sup>1</sup>, Saloomeh Shirali <sup>1,2\*</sup>, Rahmat Solgi<sup>3</sup> , Mehdi Sakha<sup>4</sup>

1. Department of Veterinary Pathobiology, SR.C, Islamic Azad University, Tehran, Iran

2. Department of Biotechnology, Ahv.C Islamic Azad University, Ahvaz, Iran

3. Department of Parasitology and mycology, Infectious Diseases Research  
Center,

Hamadan University of Medical Sciences, Hamadan, Iran.

4. Department of Clinical Science, SR.C., Islamic/Azad University, Tehran, Iran.

\* Corresponding authors: Saloomeh.shirali@iau.ac.ir

24 **Abstract:**

25 **Introduction**

26 Tick-borne pathogens (TBPs) pose significant threats to both animal and human  
27 health worldwide. Among these pathogens, *Babesia*, *Theileria*, and *Rickettsia*  
28 species are of particular concern because of their prevalence in cattle and their  
29 potential zoonotic impact.

30 **Objective**

31 The objective of this study was to investigate the prevalence of major tick-borne  
32 pathogens in cattle and their associated tick species collected from different  
33 geographical locations in eastern Iran using molecular approaches.

34 **Materials and Methods**

35 This cross-sectional study was conducted from January to June 2024. Blood  
36 samples were collected from 100 heads of cattle, and ticks were simultaneously  
37 removed from the animals in the study areas. A total of 95 ticks were  
38 morphologically identified, including *Hyalomma marginatum* (42%, n = 40),  
39 *Dermacentor marginatus* (36.8%, n = 35), and *Rhipicephalus sanguineus* (21%, n  
40 = 20). Both cattle blood samples and tick specimens were screened for tick-borne  
41 pathogens using molecular techniques.

42 **Results**

43 The most frequently detected pathogen in cattle blood samples was *Rickettsia* spp.,  
44 identified in 5% (n = 5) of the samples, followed by *Theileria annulata* detected in  
45 4%. Overall, 7.3% (7/95) of the tick DNA pools tested positive for protozoan  
46 pathogens. Sequencing analysis revealed infection of ticks with *Rickettsia conorii*  
47 (3%), *Babesia bovis* (3%), and *Theileria annulata* (1%).

48 **Conclusion**

49 The results of this study demonstrate the presence of multiple tick-borne  
50 pathogens in cattle and their associated tick species in eastern Iran. These findings  
51 emphasize the need for continuous surveillance and the implementation of

52 appropriate control measures to reduce the risk of tick-borne diseases in animal  
53 populations and potentially in humans

54 **Keywords:** Cattle, Polymerase chain reaction, Tick-borne pathogens, Iran

## 55 **1. Introduction**

56 The blood-feeding behavior of many arthropods, especially ticks and fleas, allows  
57 them to act as important vectors for a wide range of viral, bacterial, and protozoan  
58 pathogens that affect both animal and human health [1]. Some microorganisms can  
59 survive within ticks throughout their developmental stages through transstadial  
60 transmission, which supports their continued presence in tick populations [2].

61 Tick-borne diseases are a major concern for public and veterinary health worldwide.  
62 Among the different tick genera involved in pathogen transmission, Rhipicephalus  
63 species are particularly important due to their broad geographic distribution and  
64 their ability to carry several infectious agents. In Iran, cattle are commonly infested  
65 with Rhipicephalus ticks, which may contribute to the transmission of pathogens of  
66 veterinary relevance as well as those with zoonotic potential [3].

67 Recent studies have indicated that ticks can transmit a variety of microorganisms,  
68 including Ehrlichia, Anaplasma, hemotropic Mycoplasma, Babesia, and Theileria  
69 species [4]. Infected animals may develop clinical outcomes ranging from  
70 subclinical infection to severe or fatal disease. The use of molecular diagnostic  
71 methods has greatly improved the detection of tick-borne pathogens. Traditional  
72 diagnostic techniques, such as microscopic examination and serological tests, often  
73 show limited sensitivity and specificity, particularly when pathogen levels are low  
74 or when mixed infections are present [5]. In comparison, molecular methods such  
75 as polymerase chain reaction (PCR) and quantitative PCR (qPCR) provide more  
76 reliable detection and allow accurate identification of closely related pathogens [5].  
77 However, information on the prevalence and diversity of tick-borne pathogens in  
78 cattle and their associated ticks in Iran is still limited [6]. Therefore, the present  
79 study aimed to investigate the occurrence of major tick-borne pathogens in cattle  
80 and their associated ticks in Iran using molecular methods.

## 81 **2. Materials and methods:**

### 82 2.1. Study area

83 The study was conducted from January to June 2024 in different locations in eastern  
84 Iran. The research was carried out at the Islamic Azad University, Science and  
85 Research Branch, Iran. The cattle included in the study had no history of deworming  
86 or treatment with ectoparasiticides.

### 87 **2.3. DNA extraction**

88 Genomic DNA was extracted from blood and tick samples using a Blood DNA  
89 Extraction Kit and the G-spin™ Genomic DNA Extraction Kit (iNtRON  
90 Biotechnology, South Korea), respectively, according to the manufacturer's  
91 instructions. The extracted DNA samples were stored at -20 °C until further  
92 analysis. A total of 95 tick specimens were selected for DNA extraction. To  
93 minimize the possibility of amplifying host blood DNA, visibly engorged ticks were  
94 excluded from molecular analysis.

95 Prior to DNA extraction, ticks were removed from ethanol and air-dried at room  
96 temperature. Each tick was then placed in a sterile Petri dish and bisected using a  
97 sterile blade. One half of each specimen was used for DNA extraction, while the  
98 remaining half was preserved for future analyses. Molecular identification and  
99 confirmation of tick species were performed by PCR amplification and sequencing  
100 following the methodology described by Latrofa et al. (2013) [9]. The quality and  
101 concentration of the extracted DNA were evaluated using agarose gel  
102 electrophoresis and a NanoDrop spectrophotometer.

### 103 **2.4. PCR amplification**

104 Polymerase chain reaction (PCR) was used to detect tick-borne pathogens (TBPs)  
105 in DNA samples obtained from cattle and ticks. Positive PCR products were  
106 subsequently subjected to DNA sequencing for accurate pathogen identification.

107 Primers targeting conserved genomic regions of *Rickettsia* spp. and  
108 *Babesia/Theileria* spp. were used in the assays. Details of the target genes, primer  
109 sequences, PCR conditions, and corresponding references are provided in Table 1.

110 Following amplification, PCR products were analyzed by agarose gel  
111 electrophoresis to confirm the presence of expected DNA fragments. A 1.5%  
112 agarose gel was prepared, and DNA bands were stained using ethidium bromide or

113 SYBR Safe. Five microliters of each PCR product were mixed with loading dye  
 114 and loaded into the gel wells. Electrophoresis was performed at 100 V for 30–  
 115 45 min, and the bands were visualized under ultraviolet light. The sizes of the  
 116 amplified products were determined by comparison with a DNA ladder to confirm  
 117 pathogen identity.

118 Primer sequences and PCR conditions used for tick species, *Rickettsia* spp.,  
 119 *Babesia*/*Theileria* spp. identification.

Assay	Targ et	Primer	size Referenc es
<b>Rickettsia spp.</b>	16S rRNA	<b>TAAGGAGGTAATCCAGCC</b> <b>CCTG GCTCAGAACGAA</b>	148 (23) 2
<b>Babesia spp.</b>	18S rRNA	<b>AATACCCAATCCTGACACAGGG</b> <b>TTAAATACGAATGCCCCCAAC</b>	408 (24)
<b>Theileria</b>	18S rRNA	<b>GAGGTAGTGACAAGAAATAA</b> <b>CAATA TCTTCGATCCCCTAACTTTC</b>	390 (25) 430
<b>Mitochondr ial 16S ribosomal DNA</b>	16S rDNA	<b>CTGCTCAATGATTTTTTAAATTGCT</b> <b>GTGG TTACGCTGTTATCCCTAGAG</b>	350 (24) 450

120  
 121  
 122

## 123 2.5. Sequencing

124 Following the successful amplification of target genes through PCR, the resulting  
 125 PCR products were purified using a commercial DNA purification kit (e.g., Qiagen  
 126 QIAquick PCR Purification Kit) to remove excess primers, nucleotides, and  
 127 enzymes. The purified DNA was then subjected to Sanger sequencing, which was  
 128 performed by a commercial sequencing facility. To confirm the identity of the  
 129 sequenced products, the obtained sequences were subjected to a Basic Local

130 Alignment Search Tool (BLAST) search against the National Center for  
131 Biotechnology Information (NCBI) database.

## 132 **2.6.Ethical Considerations**

133 All sampling procedures were conducted in accordance with ethical guidelines for  
134 animal research. Informed consent was obtained from wners prior to blood  
135 collection, and all efforts were made to minimize discomfort and stress to the  
136 animals during the sampling process.

## 137 **3- RESULT**

138 From the total 95 ticks collected, 40 (42 %) were morphologically identified as  
139 *Hyalomma marginatum*. and 35 (36.8%) as *Dermacentor marginatus*, and 20 (21%)  
140 *Rhipicephalus sanguines*. A total of two *H. marginatum*, five *D. marginatus*, and  
141 three *R. sanguines* were further studied on 16S rDNA mitochondrial genes for  
142 molecular identification. From the sequence analysis Table 2 of the 16S rDNA  
143 mitochondrial gene of the two *H. marginatum* ticks, both showed to be identical,  
144 sharing 99.5 identity with *H. marginatum* (PP937568.1) from Egypt. The 16S  
145 rDNA analysis of the *D. marginatus* ticks, showed that all five were identical,  
146 sharing 100 identity with an Kazakhstan *D. marginatus* (OR486023.1). Analysis  
147 for the 16S rDNA mitochondrial gene of three ticks also showed that all were  
148 identical, sharing 98.9% with *R. sanguines* (MK732015.1) from Portugal. From the  
149 total of 95 ticks studied, three (3.1%) were found positive for rickettsiae using the  
150 16srRNA assay, all in *R. sanguines* ticks. Further characterization of the 16srRNA  
151 sequences showed an identity between 99.8 with *R. conorii* (NR\_074480.2). When  
152 screening for *Babesia* genera using the 18S rRNA gene only three tick (*H.*  
153 *marginatum*) (3.1%) amplified a product of the expected size. The analysis of 18S  
154 rRNA sequence obtained showed 99.4% identity with *Babesia bovis* (OL583948.1).  
155 When screening for *Theileria* genera using the 18S rRNA gene only one tick (*R.*  
156 *sanguineus*) (1%) amplified a product of the expected size. The analysis of 8S  
157 rRNA sequence obtained showed 99.6% identity with *T. annulata* (MF287930.1).  
158 Regarding blood specimens, five sample was found positive for rickettsiae, by using  
159 the 16SrRNA PCR assays. From the 100 blood specimens tested for *Theileria*  
160 protozoan parasites four (4%) presented amplified products of the expected size.

161 The amplified sequences of rickettsiae and *Theileria* were same as the tick isolated.  
 162 GenBank accession numbers of tick sequences obtained in this study are:  
 163 PV490755 (*Hyalomma marginatum*), PV490754 (*Dermacentor marginatus*),  
 164 PV490756 (*Rhipicephalus sanguines*). GenBank accession numbers of *Rickettsia*  
 165 sequences obtained in this study is: PV490810 (*R. conorii*). GenBank accession  
 166 numbers of *Theileria* sequences obtained in this study is: PV490808. GenBank  
 167 accession numbers of *Babesia* sequences obtained in this study is PV490811.  
 168 (Table 2).

169 Table2.Tick-borne pathogens present in cattle blood and tick specimens

	<i>R. conorii</i>	<i>B. bovis</i>	<i>T. annulata</i>
<b>Cattle blood</b>	5	0	4
<b>Adult ticks</b>	3	3	1

170

#### 171 4- DISCUSSION

172 In the present study, molecular methods were employed to detect *Rickettsia*,  
 173 *Babesia*, and *Theileria* species in blood samples obtained from apparently healthy  
 174 cattle as well as from their associated tick specimens. Morphological examination  
 175 revealed that cattle in Iran were predominantly infested with *Hyalomma*  
 176 *marginatum*, *Dermacentor marginatus*, and *Rhipicephalus sanguineus*. The  
 177 findings showed that 10% of cattle with heavy tick infestations were positive for  
 178 tick-borne pathogens (TBPs), indicating a notable level of pathogen exposure  
 179 among animals in the study area. This prevalence is slightly higher than that  
 180 reported in a previous Iranian study, which documented a TBP infection rate of 8%  
 181 [10]. Among the detected agents, *Rickettsia conorii* was the most frequently  
 182 identified pathogen, being found in 5% of cattle blood samples and 3% of pooled  
 183 tick DNA samples. This result differs from earlier reports in Iran that described a  
 184 considerably higher overall prevalence of *Rickettsia* spp. (24.9%; 95% CI: 20.28–  
 185 29.52) [11]. The pronounced level of tick infestation observed in the current study

186 suggests a high degree of environmental contamination in the sampled regions,  
187 which likely increases the risk of cattle exposure to infected ticks, as also noted by  
188 previous studies [12]. These observations emphasize the need for effective control  
189 measures directed at both livestock and their ectoparasites [13,14]. The 18S rRNA  
190 gene of *Theileria* and *Babesia* was detected exclusively in *R. sanguineus* and *H.*  
191 *marginatum* ticks collected from cattle, respectively. Partial sequencing of the 18S  
192 rRNA gene from positive tick samples demonstrated a high degree of sequence  
193 similarity with *Theileria annulata* and *Babesia bovis* sequences available in the  
194 GenBank database. Both *T. annulata* and *B. bovis* are well-known tick-borne  
195 pathogens affecting cattle and other domestic ruminants, including sheep and goats,  
196 as well as wild ruminant species [15]. Theileriosis and babesiosis are among the  
197 most important parasitic diseases of livestock, causing substantial economic losses  
198 worldwide [16,17]. Previous investigations have examined the distribution of  
199 bovine theileriosis in eastern and northern regions of Iran and have also reported  
200 molecular characterization and phylogenetic analysis of the 18S rRNA gene from  
201 *Theileria* and *Babesia* isolates recovered from domestic animals in these areas [18].  
202 Molecular techniques, particularly PCR amplification followed by DNA  
203 sequencing, are widely accepted as reliable methods for epidemiological studies  
204 and phylogenetic analysis of tick-borne pathogens, especially piroplasmids [19]. In  
205 the present study, PCR targeting the 18S rRNA gene was applied for the detection  
206 of *Theileria* and *Babesia* DNA. Broad-range PCR assays directed at this gene,  
207 together with partial sequencing, have previously enabled the identification of  
208 several known and novel *Babesia* and *Theileria* species [20]. In contrast, the  
209 relatively low prevalence of *B. bovis* observed in this study is comparable with  
210 findings from Egypt and Tunisia, where prevalence rates of 8.0% [21] and 3.0%  
211 [22] were reported, respectively.

212 Unlike previous studies conducted in Iran, which reported a prevalence of  
213 babesiosis in cattle up to 42% [23]., no cases were observed in the present study. In  
214 the present study, the prevalence of *Babesia spp* in ticks collected from cattle being  
215 3% while being zero in the cattle. This discrepancy could be due to several reasons:  
216 The infected ticks did not successfully transmit the *Babesia* parasite to the cattle  
217 during the feeding process; The cattle may have had some level of immunity against

218 *Babesia* that prevented them from becoming infected even when exposed to  
219 infected ticks and the tick population collected for the study may not have been  
220 actively feeding on the cattle, leading to a lower likelihood of transmission [24].

221

222

## 223 **CONCLUSION**

224 This study verifies the presence of multiple vector-borne pathogens (VBPs) in cattle  
225 in east of Iran, likely due to their significant exposure to arthropod vectors like ticks.  
226 While the implementation of regular preventive measures may be hindered by a  
227 lack of financial resources, public-private partnerships could enhance efforts to  
228 reduce the risk of VBP transmission, particularly those of zoonotic significance.  
229 This study concludes that *R. sanguineus* and *H. marginatum* are the primary vectors  
230 responsible for babesiosis and theileriosis in east of Iran.

## 231 **Acknowledgements**

232 The authors would like to express the deepest thanks from the Birjand university of  
233 medical science for their assistance.

## 234 **Ethical approval**

235 All animal owners were interviewed for sampling and consents were taken. This  
236 study has been approved by the Research Ethics Committee at Azad University  
237 IR.IAU.SRB.REC.1403.330. All authors read and approved the final manuscript.

## 238 **Fund**

239 The authors declare that no funds, grants, or other support were received during the  
240 preparation of this manuscript.

## 241 **Conflict of interest**

242 The authors have no relevant financial or non-financial interests to disclose.

## 243 **Author Contributions**

244 Study concept and design:P.T

245 Acquisition of data:,M.S

246 Analysis and interpretation of data: S.SH &R.S  
247 Drafting of the manuscript: S.SH &R.S Critical  
248 revision of the manuscript for important  
249 intellectual content: R.S  
250 Statistical analysis: M.S, P.T  
251 Administrative, technical, and material support:P.T **Data**

252 **Availability Statement:**

253 The data that support the findings of this study are available  
254 upon request from the corresponding author

255

256

257

258

259 REFERENCES

- 260 1. Nuttall PA. Tick saliva and its role in pathogen transmission. Wiener  
261 klinische Wochenschrift. 2023;135(7):165–76.
- 262 2. Kalmar Z, Cozma V, Sprong H, Jahfari S, D’Amico G, Mărcuțan DI, et al.  
263 Transstadial transmission of *Borrelia turcica* in *Hyalomma aegyptium* ticks. PLoS  
264 One. 2015;10(2):e0115520.
- 265 3. Mostafavi SM, Khalili M, Akhtardanesh B, Nourollahifard SR, Esmaili S.  
266 *Rickettsia* spp. in *Rhipicephalus sanguineus sensu lato* ticks collected from stray  
267 dogs in Kerman city, Iran. *Ticks and Tick-borne Diseases* 2022;13(5):101985.
- 268 4. Alieva E, Bondarenko E, Maliy K, Shvalov A, Verbenets E, Gafarova M. The role  
269 of *Rhipicephalus sanguineus* ticks parasitizing dogs in the spread of tick-borne  
270 rickettsial pathogens in the city of Sevastopol. *New microbes and new infections*  
271 2020;36:100704.

- 272 5. Huynh LN, Diarra AZ, Pham QL, Le-Viet N, Berenger J-M, Ho VH, et al.  
273 Morphological, molecular and MALDI-TOF MS identification of ticks and  
274 tick-associated pathogens in Vietnam. *PLoS Neglected Tropical Diseases*  
275 2021;15(9):e0009813.
- 276 6. Fathi A, Nabavi R, Noaman V, Sarani A, Saadati D, Ben Said M, et al. Molecular  
277 identification, risk factor assessment, and phylogenetic analysis of tick-borne  
278 pathogens in symptomatic and asymptomatic cattle from South-Eastern Iran.  
279 *Experimental and Applied Acarology* 2024;92(3):479-506.
- 280 7. Lorusso V, Dantas-Torres F, Lia RP, Tarallo V, Mencke N, Capelli G, et al.  
281 Seasonal dynamics of the brown dog tick, *Rhipicephalus sanguineus*, on a confined  
282 dog population in Italy. *Medical and Veterinary Entomology* 2010;24(3):309-15.
- 283 8. Nava S, Beati L, Venzal JM, Labruna MB, Szabó MP, Petney T, et al.  
284 *Rhipicephalus sanguineus* (Latreille, 1806): Neotype designation, morphological  
285 re-description of all parasitic stages and molecular characterization. *Ticks and*  
286 *tickborne diseases* 2018;9(6):1573-85.
- 287 9. Latrofa MS, Dantas-Torres F, Annoscia G, Cantacessi C, Otranto D. Comparative  
288 analyses of mitochondrial and nuclear genetic markers for the molecular  
289 identification of *Rhipicephalus* spp. *Infection, Genetics and Evolution* 2013;20:422-  
290 7.
- 291 10. Iatta R, Sazmand A, Nguyen V-L, Nemati F, Ayaz MM, Bahiraei Z, et al.  
292 Vector-borne pathogens in dogs of different regions of Iran and Pakistan.  
293 *Parasitology Research* 2021:1-10.
- 294 11. Qorbani A, Khalili M, Nourollahifard S, Mostafavi E, Farrokhnia M, Esmaili  
295 S. Diversity of *Rickettsia* species in collected ticks from Southeast Iran. *BMC*  
296 *Veterinary Research* 2024;20(1):279.
- 297 12. Otranto D, Dantas-Torres F, Weigl S, Latrofa MS, Stanneck D, Decapriaris D,  
298 et al. Diagnosis of *Hepatozoon canis* in young dogs by cytology and PCR.  
299 *Parasites & vectors* 2011;4:1-6.

- 300 13. Otranto D, Mendoza-Roldan JA, Beugnet F, Baneth G, Dantas-Torres F. New  
301 paradigms in the prevention of canine vector-borne diseases. *Trends in*  
302 *Parasitology* 2024.
- 303 14. Rakhshanpour A, Malmasi A, Mohebali M, Nabian S, Mirhendi H, Zarei Z, et  
304 al. Transmission of *Leishmania infantum* by *Rhipicephalus sanguineus* (Acari:  
305 Ixodidae) in dogs. *Iranian journal of parasitology* 2017;12(4):482.
- 306 15. Majidiani H, Nabavi R, Ganjali M, Saadati D. Detection of *Theileria annulata*  
307 carriers in Holstein–Friesian (*Bos taurus taurus*) and Sistani (*Bos taurus*  
308 *indicus*) cattle breeds by polymerase chain reaction in Sistan region, Iran.  
309 *Journal of parasitic diseases* 2016;40:1184-8.
- 310 16. Almazán C, Scimeca RC, Reichard MV, Mosqueda J. Babesiosis and  
311 theileriosis in North America. *Pathogens* 2022;11(2):168.
- 312 17. Rashid M, Akbar H, Rashid I, Saeed K, Ahmad L, Ahmad AS, et al. Economic  
313 significance of tropical theileriosis on a Holstein Friesian dairy farm in  
314 Pakistan. *The Journal of parasitology* 2018;104(3):310-2.
- 315 18. Soosaraei M, Haghi MM, Etemadifar F, Fakhari M, Teshnizi SH, Hezarjaribi  
316 HZ, et al. Status of theileriosis among herbivores in Iran: A systematic review  
317 and meta-analysis. *Veterinary world* 2018;11(3):332.
- 318 19. Soares JF, Giroto A, Brandão PE, Da Silva AS, Franca RT, Lopes ST, et al.  
319 Detection and molecular characterization of a canine piroplasm from Brazil.  
320 *Veterinary Parasitology* 2011;180(3-4):203-8.
- 321 20. Adjou Moumouni PF, Aboge GO, Terkawi MA, Masatani T, Cao S,  
322 Kamyngkird K, et al. Molecular detection and characterization of *Babesia bovis*,  
323 *Babesia bigemina*, *Theileria* species and *Anaplasma marginale* isolated from cattle  
324 in Kenya. *Parasites & vectors* 2015;8:1-14.
- 325 21. Mahmoud HY, Shahat MS, Fereig RM, Ali AO, Emeish WF, Soliman AM, et  
326 al. Molecular detection and characterization of *Anaplasma marginale* and  
327 *Babesia canis vogeli* infecting dogs in Luxor, Egypt. *Scientific Reports*  
328 2024;14(1):16888.

- 329 22. Bouattour A, Chabchoub A, Hajjaji I, M'ghirbi Y. Hepatozoon canis and  
330 Babesia vogeli infections of dogs in Tunisia. *Veterinary Parasitology:*  
331 *Regional Studies and Reports* 2021;23:100512.
- 332 23. Razmi G. A review on Babesia spp. and tick vectors in animals in Iran. *Iranian*  
333 *Journal of Veterinary Science and Technology* 2022;14(2):1-0.
- 334 24. Fesseha H, Mathewos M, Eshetu E, Tefera B. Babesiosis in cattle and ixodid  
335 tick distribution in Dasenech and Salamago Districts, southern Ethiopia.  
336 *Scientific reports* 2022; 12(1):6385.

Preprint