

A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis of *Fasciola* Infections in Domestic Ruminants from the Mediterranean Region (2015–2025)

Fayçal AIMEUR¹, Nadjat Amina KHELIFI TOUHAMI², Abdeslam MEKROUD¹, Nassim OUCHENE*²

¹ PADESCA Laboratory, Institute of Veterinary Sciences, University of Constantine, Route de Batna, El Khroub, 25100 Constantine, Algeria

² Institute of Veterinary Sciences, Blida 1 University, 09000 Blida, Algeria

*Corresponding author: Nassim Ouchene, Institute of Veterinary Sciences, University of Blida 1, BP 270, 09000 Blida, Algeria. Email: ouchenenaa@gmail.com

ORCID: Nassim Ouchene : <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6000-595X>

Abstract

This systematic review and meta-analysis, conducted in full accordance with the PRISMA 2020 guidelines, aimed to provide an updated and comprehensive estimate of fasciolosis prevalence in ruminants (cattle, sheep, and goats) across the Mediterranean basin during the period 2015–2025. To ensure maximal coverage, an extensive literature search was performed in four major scientific databases—PubMed, Scopus, Web of Science, and ScienceDirect—without any restriction on language or publication country. The search strategy combined a structured set of keywords related to *Fasciola hepatica*, *Fasciola gigantica*, ruminant hosts, and the broader Mediterranean region. Studies were considered eligible when they reported primary data on animal-level prevalence, provided clear sample sizes, employed validated diagnostic techniques (including coproscopy, serological assays, molecular detection, or post-mortem inspection), and were published in peer-reviewed journals. Following screening and quality assessment, a total of 11 studies originating from eight Mediterranean countries—Algeria, Tunisia, Egypt, Turkey, Spain, France, Italy, and Greece—met the inclusion criteria. Altogether, these studies encompassed 23,020 examined ruminants and revealed a wide range of prevalence estimates, from less than 1% to as high as 57%, reflecting substantial regional and methodological variation. Species-specific prevalence averages were 7.9% in sheep, 5.2% in goats, and 25% in cattle, confirming the generally higher susceptibility and exposure risk in bovine populations. The pooled prevalence obtained through a random-effects DerSimonian–

32 Laird model was 13.96% (95% CI: 8.95–21.13). The analysis revealed extremely high
33 heterogeneity ($I^2 \approx 99\%$), suggesting that differences in climate, husbandry systems,
34 diagnostic tools, and ecological conditions strongly influence infection levels across the
35 Mediterranean basin. Overall, the highest prevalence values were documented in Spain and
36 France, whereas moderate levels predominated in North African and Eastern Mediterranean
37 countries. These findings underscore the considerable epidemiological variability of
38 fasciolosis in the region and highlight the urgent need for harmonized surveillance methods
39 and standardized diagnostic protocols. Strengthening these aspects would enhance the
40 accuracy of risk assessment, support early detection, and guide the implementation of targeted
41 and cost-effective control strategies.

42 **Keywords:** fasciolosis; Mediterranean basin; meta-analysis; prevalence; ruminants

43 1. Context

44 Fasciolosis is a hepatobiliary parasitic disease caused by the liver flukes *Fasciola hepatica*
45 and *F. gigantica*. This complex zoonosis, classified by the World Health Organization among
46 the neglected tropical diseases, affects a wide range of domestic animals (cattle, sheep, goats,
47 pigs, etc.) as well as humans, resulting in significant veterinary and public health concerns [1,
48 2]. Transmission occurs through a life cycle involving an aquatic intermediate host and the
49 ingestion of metacercariae attached to vegetation. The parasite has a worldwide distribution,
50 extending from tropical to temperate regions [1-5]. Fasciolosis causes severe economic and
51 health losses, estimated at USD 3–3.2 billion annually due to reduced productivity, liver
52 condemnation, treatment costs, and mortality [6-8]. In ruminants, chronic infection leads to
53 reduced meat, milk, and wool production, delayed growth, infertility, and weakened
54 immunity, heavily impacting livestock industries [8, 9]. Globally, more than 600 million
55 animals and about 2.4 million people are estimated to be infected, highlighting the One Health
56 dimension of this disease [2]. To reduce transmission risk, experts emphasize the need for
57 integrated multisectoral actions targeting the environment (wetlands, snails), livestock
58 reservoirs, and local populations [2].

59 In the Mediterranean basin, climatic and ecological conditions are particularly favorable for
60 fasciolosis persistence. Mild, humid winters combined with hot, dry summers create typical
61 Mediterranean climates that sustain *Galba truncatula* habitats and metacercarial survival [10].
62 For instance, malacological studies in Corsica have identified several snail species, including

63 *G. truncatula*, capable of hosting *F. hepatica* [11]. Extensive sheep and goat grazing systems
64 common in the region maintain the transmission cycle, as animals become infected by
65 ingesting contaminated vegetation in wetlands. However, prevalence rates vary widely across
66 Mediterranean countries and farming systems. Recent surveys have reported low prevalence
67 (<2%) in arid Maghreb zones [12, 13], while wetter southern European regions show much
68 higher values (often 15–20%) [14]. For example, a Portuguese study found 19–20%
69 seropositivity in sheep from a mountain plateau [14]. Such differences reflect local influences
70 such as rainfall, altitude, watering and antiparasitic practices, livestock species, and diagnostic
71 methods.

72 Small ruminants (sheep and goats) play a major role in fasciolosis transmission but remain
73 less studied than cattle. Across the Mediterranean, *F. hepatica* mainly infects sheep, goats,
74 and cattle [1], yet epidemiological data focusing specifically on small ruminant flocks remain
75 scarce. This lack of information increases uncertainty about the true impact of fasciolosis in
76 Mediterranean small-ruminant farming.

77 Epidemiological data in the region are fragmented: numerous local studies (in Tunisia,
78 Algeria, Morocco, Italy, Spain, Greece, Turkey, etc.) have used heterogeneous protocols and
79 diagnostic techniques (coproscopy, ELISA, abattoir inspection, etc.), hindering direct
80 comparison. However, for an effective One Health approach and for guiding control strategies
81 (snail control, livestock treatment, health education, etc.), a comprehensive overview of the
82 true prevalence and underlying risk factors is essential. Therefore, a systematic meta-analysis
83 is required to estimate the weighted prevalence of fasciolosis in Mediterranean small
84 ruminants and to identify sources of heterogeneity (country, species, study period, diagnostic
85 method, farming practices, etc.). This synthesis aims to fill existing knowledge gaps, define
86 the actual burden of fasciolosis in Mediterranean livestock, and support optimized control
87 measures within an integrated One Health framework.

88 **2. Data Acquisition**

89 **2.1 Literature Search Strategy**

90 This systematic review was conducted in accordance with the **PRISMA 2020** guidelines [15].
91 A comprehensive search was performed in **PubMed**, **Scopus**, **Web of Science**, and
92 **ScienceDirect** for studies published between **January 1, 2015**, and **June 30, 2025**. No
93 language restrictions were applied.

94 Search strings combined terms related to the pathogen, host, and geographic area, connected
95 by Boolean operators (AND, OR) to maximize search sensitivity. The main keywords and
96 their synonyms were as follows:

- 97 • **Pathogen:** “*Fasciola hepatica*” OR “*Fasciola gigantica*” OR “fasciolosis”
- 98 • **Host:** “sheep” OR “goat” OR “cattle” OR “ruminant”
- 99 • **Geographic area:** “Mediterranean” OR “North Africa” OR “Southern Europe” OR
100 “Middle East”
- 101 • **Study parameter:** “prevalence” OR “epidemiology”

102 Each group of terms was combined with the others (e.g., *pathogen AND host AND geographic*
103 *area AND parameter*) to capture all prevalence studies of fasciolosis in small and large
104 ruminants across Mediterranean regions.

105 **2.2 Inclusion and Exclusion Criteria**

106 Studies were selected according to the following criteria:

- 107 • **Inclusion:** studies published between 2015 and 2025; involving cattle, sheep, and/or
108 goats; conducted in a Mediterranean country; reporting prevalence data for fasciolosis
109 with a known total sample size; using direct or indirect diagnostic methods
110 (coproscopy, serology, ELISA, PCR, necropsy, etc.); and published in peer-reviewed
111 scientific journals.
- 112 • **Exclusion:** experimental studies, single case reports, or studies not reporting
113 prevalence (e.g., clinical trials); secondary data sources (reviews, meta-analyses, non-
114 indexed reports, unpublished theses); studies that did not specify animal species or
115 sample size.

116 These criteria ensured the inclusion of original cross-sectional or observational studies
117 focused on the animal prevalence of fasciolosis in Mediterranean contexts.

118 **2.3 Data Extraction**

119 For each eligible study, the following data were extracted: country, study year, animal species
120 (cattle, sheep, goat), sample size examined, number of positive animals, observed prevalence,
121 diagnostic method used, and full bibliographic reference.

122 Data extraction was performed independently by two reviewers to minimize errors;
123 discrepancies were resolved by discussion and consensus within the research team. All data
124 were recorded in a standardized spreadsheet to facilitate subsequent analysis.

125 **2.4 Statistical Analysis**

126 The pooled prevalence of fasciolosis was estimated through a **random-effects meta-analysis**
127 following the method of **DerSimonian and Laird [16]**, which accounts for inter-study
128 variability. This model is appropriate for prevalence data as it incorporates heterogeneity
129 among independent samples.

130 Statistical heterogeneity was assessed using **Cochran's Q test** and the **I² statistic**. Subgroup
131 analyses were conducted to explore potential sources of heterogeneity, with results stratified
132 by country (e.g., North African vs. Southern European countries), animal species (cattle,
133 sheep, goats), and diagnostic technique (coproscopy vs. serology/ELISA vs. PCR, etc.).
134 All analyses were performed using **R software**, employing the *meta* and *metafor* packages,
135 which provide specialized functions for meta-analysis and related statistics.

136 **3. Results**

137 Marked geographical disparities in the prevalence of *Fasciola hepatica* were observed among
138 Mediterranean ruminants, largely explained by ecological, climatic, and agro-economic
139 factors. A total of 11 studies published between 2015 and 2025 were included in this meta-
140 analysis (Figure 1), covering eight Mediterranean countries: Algeria, Tunisia, Egypt, Turkey,
141 Spain, France, Italy, and Greece. These studies investigated *Fasciola* infections in cattle,
142 sheep, and goats.

143 The diagnostic methods used included: Coproscopy and sedimentation (Tunisia, Algeria);
144 Post-mortem liver examination (Algeria, Turkey); Bile examination (Tunisia); and ELISA
145 serology (Egypt, Spain, Portugal, Turkey).

146 The prevalence of fasciolosis varied widely among countries, animal species, and diagnostic
147 techniques (Table 1, Figure2).

148 In North Africa, studies from Tunisia reported prevalence rates ranging from 9.1 % to 16.5 %
149 in sheep, whereas in Algeria, rates reached 6.5 % in sheep, 2.5 % in goats, and 26.7 % in

150 cattle. In Egypt, prevalence ranged from 3.5 % to 23 %, depending on species and diagnostic
151 method.

152 In Southern Europe, infection prevalence showed marked geographic variability. Rates ranged
153 from 7.5% in sheep and 14.1% in goats in Turkey to over 50% in goats in Spain, while cattle
154 in Corsica (France) exhibited prevalences between 19% and 46%. In contrast, substantially
155 lower levels were reported in Italy (3–7.9%) and Greece, where prevalence remained below
156 1% in sheep flocks (Table 1). High infection rates were predominantly observed in humid
157 Mediterranean regions, including Corsica and parts of Spain, where mild winters, regular
158 rainfall, and extensive wet pastures create favorable conditions for transmission, leading to
159 seroprevalence levels of up to 46% in cattle in Corsica [10] and exceeding 50% in goats in
160 Spain [13].

161 By contrast, arid and semi-arid areas, including inland Algeria and Greece, generally show
162 much lower prevalence. In Greece, only 0.6% of sheep flocks were found to be infected in a
163 nationwide survey [22], reflecting climatic constraints and limited availability of permanent
164 water bodies.

165 In North Africa and the Middle East, prevalence patterns are more heterogeneous and largely
166 depend on irrigation and local environmental conditions. In northern Tunisia, reported
167 prevalence varied depending on the diagnostic method used [17], while an Algerian meta-
168 analysis estimated an overall prevalence of 1.57%, with markedly higher levels in
169 northeastern coastal regions [23].

170 Recent evidence from the Pyrenees indicates that *F. hepatica* can persist even at high altitudes
171 (~2000 m), likely due to moist microhabitats, transhumant grazing, and climate-driven
172 extensions of suitable ecological niches [5].

173 Analysis of 23,020 ruminants across Mediterranean countries revealed an overall crude
174 prevalence of 10.8 % for *Fasciola hepatica* infection. By species, mean prevalence was 7.9 %
175 in sheep (95 % CI: 7.4–8.5), 5.2 % in goats (95 % CI: 4.8–5.7), and markedly higher in cattle
176 (25.0 %; 95 % CI: 23.7–26.3) ($p < 0.001$) (Table 2).

177 The overall crude prevalence was distinguished from the pooled prevalence, which accounts
178 for inter-study variance under the DerSimonian–Laird random-effects model. The pooled

179 prevalence of *Fasciola* infection in Mediterranean ruminants (2015–2025) was estimated at
180 13.96 % (95 % CI: 8.95–21.13).

181 A high degree of heterogeneity was observed across studies ($I^2 \approx 99\%$), indicating substantial
182 variability related to host species, geographical settings, and diagnostic approaches.

183 In the forest plot (Figure 2), the red line represents the pooled prevalence (13.9 %) estimated
184 under the random-effects model. Marked heterogeneity among studies reflects variation in
185 species, countries, and diagnostic techniques.

186 The funnel plot (Figure 4) illustrates the distribution of prevalence estimates by precision
187 ($1/SE$). The approximate symmetry around the mean suggests moderate publication bias,
188 though a few small studies with high prevalence (e.g., from Spain and France) deviate from
189 the central zone.

190 By species, cattle exhibited the highest pooled prevalence ($\sim 20\%$), while sheep and goats
191 showed lower values (11–12 %). Heterogeneity remained high in all subgroups (high Q , $\tau^2 >$
192 0), reflecting differences in sampling contexts (Table 3). This can be explained by several
193 factors: cattle have a longer lifespan, graze for extended periods (often in wetter areas where
194 snails are abundant), and can harbor heavy infections without showing overt clinical signs,
195 allowing accumulation of parasites. Moreover, cattle often graze on floodplains or irrigated
196 meadows, increasing exposure.

197 The highest pooled prevalence rates were observed in Spain and France, whereas Maghreb
198 (Tunisia, Algeria) and Middle Eastern (Egypt, Turkey) countries displayed moderate to low
199 values (8–12 %). Inter-country heterogeneity was particularly marked in Algeria and Egypt
200 ($\tau^2 > 1$) (Table 4; Figure 5).

201 In sheep and goats, mean prevalence was generally lower, but localized outbreaks can reach
202 high levels—sometimes comparable to those in cattle—especially when small ruminants
203 graze near stagnant water. For example, Hammami *et al.* [17] showed that in Tunisian sheep,
204 bile examination revealed higher prevalence than coproscopy, suggesting that many infections
205 go undetected by less sensitive classical methods. In the same region, 37.1% of slaughtered
206 sheep and 25.4% of goats had hepatic fasciolosis [24], indicating strong exposure among
207 animals grazing near ponds.

208 Recent Algerian data [23] reported prevalence rates of 3.91% in cattle (CI 3.84–3.98), 0.42%
209 in sheep, and 0.12% in goats ($p < 0.001$), underscoring the wide interspecies gap.

210 In Galicia (Spain), earlier studies also found high caprine prevalence (22.7% seropositive),
211 influenced by breed, with crossbreeds being more susceptible [13]. In Egypt, ewes from the
212 Nile Delta showed 22.2% seropositivity [20], a level comparable to local cattle.

213 Recent studies show that age of animals has a clear influence on the prevalence of fasciolosis.
214 For example, Hammami et al. [17] found that lambs under one year of age had a significantly
215 higher prevalence (8.1%) than older sheep. Conversely, other studies observed that older
216 animals were more frequently infected: among Egyptian cattle in the New Valley [18],
217 prevalence was higher in cattle over 3 years old (30.4%) compared to young animals under 1
218 year (12.7%). Similarly, age affected caprine fasciolosis in Spain, with a higher prevalence in
219 older goats [13].

220 Gender may also play a role. For instance, in Egyptian cattle, prevalence was higher in males
221 (24.9%) than in females (20.0%) [18]. Khalafalla [19] also reported a sex effect in Egyptian
222 cattle, while Selim et al. [20] found a slightly higher rate in ewes (♀), though the difference
223 was not statistically significant.

224 Breed is another identified factor. Pérez-Creo et al. [13] showed that crossbred goats had a
225 higher seropositivity rate (22.7%) than the local breed "Cabra Galega." Similarly, Hammami
226 et al. [17] found a higher prevalence in crossbred sheep compared to local breeds.

227 Farming practices and management also have an impact. Khalafalla [19] showed that the type
228 of farming significantly affected bovine fasciolosis in Egypt. Likewise, Alba et al. [10]
229 highlighted that risky farming practices (poor pasture management, inappropriate use of
230 flukicides) promoted transmission on the island of Corsica. Flooded or poorly drained
231 pastures where intermediate host snails thrive are especially problematic. In fact, the presence
232 of snail species such as *Galba truncatula* has been correlated with a higher risk of bovine
233 fasciolosis in Corsica [10]. In Tunisia, infection was more prevalent in summer when sheep
234 graze on wetland areas [17].

235 Feeding and environment are associated factors. Simply grazing can expose animals to
236 metacercariae on contaminated aquatic vegetation. Selim et al. [20] identified the presence of
237 snails and the lack of preventive treatment as significantly increasing the risk (Odds ratio ≈ 6.6

238 in winter and 3.0 for snail presence). Climate change (increased temperature and rainfall) has
239 even been linked to acute outbreaks in sheep in Italy [21].

240 Seasonal variation is also critical. Many studies show infection peaks during wet seasons:
241 Ouchene-Khelifi et al. [12] reported summer and winter peaks in Algerian cattle and goats;
242 Selim et al. [20] noted a higher risk in winter (OR \approx 6.6) for Egyptian sheep. The availability
243 of lymnaeid snails depends on temperature and rainfall. Likewise, Bosco et al. [21] linked an
244 acute outbreak in Italy to a recent increase in precipitation and temperatures.

245 The diagnostic method used has a major influence on reported prevalence. Immunological
246 techniques (ELISA, antigen detection) are far more sensitive than coproscopy or macroscopic
247 inspection. They can detect early or subclinical infections before egg shedding occurs. For
248 example, a recent Algerian study reported 16.4% prevalence by ELISA, compared with only
249 1–2% detected at slaughter or by fecal examination—an 8–10-fold difference [23]. In Turkey,
250 Çelik and Çelik [25] found prevalences of 7.5% and 14.1% in sheep (ELISA) and goats (liver
251 inspection), respectively. Similarly, Alba *et al.* [10] observed 46% seropositive cattle in
252 Corsica, while only 19% had eggs detected in bile. This indicates that studies relying solely
253 on coproscopy systematically underestimate the true infection burden, while serological and
254 ELISA-based approaches reveal latent or subclinical infections. The methodological
255 heterogeneity (direct vs serological tests, bile vs feces) contributes substantially to local
256 variability.

257 Bile examination and liver dissection can detect adult flukes or eggs in the biliary ducts but
258 generally only identify advanced infections. In Hammami *et al.* [17] study, bile examination
259 detected 16.78% prevalence in sheep, compared to 9.12% by coproscopy ($p = 0.015$),
260 demonstrating a significant diagnostic effect.

261 Coproscopy is less sensitive, especially in light or prepatent infections, as it depends on egg
262 shedding, which varies with time of day, season, and animal age. For instance, comparative
263 work using Mini-FLOTAC, Flukefinder®, and sedimentation showed that detection
264 sensitivity varies with egg-per-gram load, with Mini-FLOTAC being more reliable at
265 moderate-to-high infection levels (>90% sensitivity above 20 EPG) but less so at lower
266 intensities [21].

267 **4. Conclusion**

268 This meta-analysis highlights a **high degree of heterogeneity** in fasciolosis among
269 Mediterranean ruminants, reflecting a complex interplay of ecological, zootechnical, and
270 methodological factors. Humid temperate regions of southern Europe (France, Spain, northern
271 Italy) show the **highest prevalence**, whereas more arid zones (Greece, inland Algeria and
272 Tunisia) remain **lightly affected**. Cattle are the **most exposed species** due to longevity and
273 preference for wet pastures, while sheep and goats may reach **high local prevalence**
274 depending on grazing systems. Diagnostic methods strongly influence estimates: **serological**
275 **and ELISA tests** are far more sensitive than coproscopy or liver inspection, for instance
276 16.4% versus 1–2% in Algerian cattle. These discrepancies emphasize the need for
277 **standardized diagnostic approaches** and the incorporation of **local ecological factors** in
278 surveillance and control programs.

279 Finally, recent findings suggest that **climate change** and **alterations in water ecosystems**
280 could expand the parasite's range, underscoring the necessity for **integrated and adaptive**
281 **monitoring systems** to prevent fasciolosis resurgence in Mediterranean livestock production.

282 **Author Contributions**

283 FA, NAKT, NO designed the study, developed the questionnaire, collected and analyzed the data, interpreted the
284 results, and drafted the manuscript. NAKT, MA performed statistical analyses and provided methodological and
285 bibliographic support. All authors read and approved the submitted version.

286 **Conflict of Interest**

287 The authors declare no competing interests.

288 **Ethics Approval**

289 The study complied with current ethical standards and national veterinary research guidelines, with prior
290 Electronic informed consent were obtained from all participants prior to accessing the questionnaire.

291 **Funding**

292 Not applicable.

293 **Data availability**

294 Data are available from the corresponding author upon reasonable request but are not publicly deposited for
295 ethical and confidentiality reasons.

296 **AI use**

297 No AI tools were used in preparing this manuscript.

298 **References**

299 1. Beesley NJ, Caminade C, Charlier J, Flynn RJ, Hodgkinson JE, Martinez-Moreno A, Martinez-Valladares M,
300 Perez J, Rinaldi L, and Williams DJL. *Fasciola* and fasciolosis in ruminants in Europe: Identifying research
301 needs. *Transbound Emerg Dis.* 2018, 65 Suppl 1(Suppl 1):199-216. <https://doi.org/10.1111/tbed.12682>

- 302 2. Mas-Coma S, Valero MA, and Bargues MD. One Health for fascioliasis control in human endemic areas.
303 **Trends Parasitol.** (2023) 39(8):650–667. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pt.2023.05.009>
- 304 3. Cwiklinski K and Dalton JP. Advances in *Fasciola hepatica* research using 'omics' technologies. **Int J**
305 **Parasitol.** (2018) 48(5):321–331. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijpara.2017.12.001>
- 306 4. Ogbaje LJ, Malann YD, Azare BA, Njoku M, and Jegede OC. Economic impact of high burden of fascioliasis
307 in FCT, caused by damage to liver. **Direct Res J Agric Food Sci.** (2025) 13(2):37–41.
- 308 5. Roldán C, Begovoeva M, López-Olvera JR, Velarde R, Cabezón Ó, Molinar Min AR, Pizzato F, Pasquetti M,
309 Fernández Aguilar X, Mentaberre G, Serrano E, Puig Ribas M, Espunyes J, Castillo-Contreras R, Estruch J, and
310 Rossi L. Endemic occurrence of *Fasciola hepatica* in an alpine ecosystem, Pyrenees, Northeastern Spain.
311 **Transbound Emerg Dis.** (2021) 68(4):2589–2594. <https://doi.org/10.1111/tbed.13865>
- 312 6. Malatji MP, Pfukenyi DM, and Mukaratirwa S. *Fasciola* species and their vertebrate and snail intermediate
313 hosts in East and Southern Africa: a review. **J Helminthol.** (2020) 94:e63.
314 <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0022149X19000531>
- 315 7. Aguilar-Marcelino L, Bautista-Garfias CR, Zaheer T, Maqsood A, Bamarni SSI, Abdullah BH, et al. Potential
316 of anisakiasis in foodborne zoonosis. **Pak Vet J.** (2022) 42:433–44. <https://doi.org/10.29261/pakvetj/2022.080>
- 317 8. Zerna G, Spithill TW, and Beddoe T. Current status for controlling the overlooked caprine fasciolosis.
318 **Animals (Basel).** (2021)11(6):1819. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ani11061819>
- 319 9. Mas-Coma S, Buchon P, Funatsu IR, Angles R, Artigas P, Valero MA, et al. Sheep and cattle reservoirs in the
320 highest human fascioliasis hyperendemic area: Experimental transmission capacity, field epidemiology, and
321 control within a One Health initiative in Bolivia. **Front Vet Sci.** (2020) 7:583204.
322 <https://doi.org/10.3389/fvets.2020.583204>
- 323 10. Alba A, Grech-Angelini S, Vázquez AA, Alda P, Blin Q, Lemmonier L, Chauvin A, Chartier C, Douchet P,
324 Hurtrez-Boussès S, Rey O, Foata J, Boissier J, and Quilichini Y. Fasciolosis in the Mediterranean island of
325 Corsica (France): Insights from epidemiological and malacological investigations. **Food Waterborne Parasitol.**
326 (2023) 30:e00188. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.fawpar.2023.e00188>
- 327 11. Vázquez AA, Alda P, Lounnas M, Sabourin E, Alba A, Pointier JP, and Hurtrez-Boussès S. Lymnaeid snails
328 hosts of *Fasciola hepatica* and *Fasciola gigantica* (Trematoda: Digenea): A worldwide review. **CAB Rev.** (2018)
329 13:062.
- 330 12. Ouchene-Khelifi NA, Ouchene N, Dahmani H, Dahmani A, Sadi M, and Douifi M. Fasciolosis due to
331 *Fasciola hepatica* in ruminants in abattoirs and its economic impact in two regions in Algeria. **Trop Biomed.**
332 (2018) 35(1):181–187.
- 333 13. Pérez-Creo A, Díaz P, López C, Béjar JP, Martínez-Sernández V, Panadero R, Díez-Baños P, Ubeira FM,
334 and Morrondo P. *Fasciola hepatica* in goats from north-western Spain: Risk factor analysis using a capture
335 ELISA. **Vet J.** 2(2016) 08:104–105. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tvjl.2015.07.033>
- 336 14. Coelho C, Cruz R, Esteves F, Vala H, Pereira MA, Amorim I, Nóbrega C, and Mesquita JR. Occurrence and
337 distribution of fasciolosis in a cohort of ovine livestock restricted to a mountain plateau in Central Portugal.
338 **Animals** (2021) 11(12):3344. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ani11123344>
- 339 15. Page MJ, et al. The PRISMA 2020 statement: An updated guideline for reporting systematic reviews. **BMJ.**
340 (2021)372:n71. <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.n71>

- 341 16. DerSimonian R and Laird N. Meta-analysis in clinical trials. **Control Clin Trials.** (1986) 7(3):177–188.
342 [https://doi.org/10.1016/0197-2456\(86\)90046-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/0197-2456(86)90046-2)
- 343 17. Hammami I, Amdouni Y, Romdhane R, Sassi L, Farhat N, Rekik M, and Gharbi M. Prevalence of Fasciola
344 hepatica infection in slaughtered sheep from Northwest Tunisia and its risk factors: Association with
345 gastrointestinal helminth infection and anaemia. **Vet Med Sci.** (2024) 10(5):e1575.
346 <https://doi.org/10.1002/vms3.1575>
- 347 18. Khedr AA, Abdel-Hakeem SS, Mahmoud WG, Abdel-Hakeem SS, Al-Hakami AM, Tolba MEM, Abd-
348 Elrahman SM, and Khalifa MM. An overview of fasciolosis in human and cattle populations in New Valley,
349 Egypt. **Front Vet Sci.** (2025) 12:1572946. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fvets.2025.1572946>
- 350 19. Khalafala RE. Prevalence and phylogenetic analysis of Fasciola species in upper Egypt based on ribosomal
351 ITS-2 gene sequencing. **Egypt Vet Med Soc Parasitol J.** (2020)16(1):142–158.
352 <https://doi.org/10.21608/evmspj.2020.132162>
- 353 20. Selim A, Marzok M, Gattan HS, Alruhaili MH, AlJabr OA, and Salem M. Seroprevalence and associated
354 risk factors for Fasciola hepatica in sheep in the Nile Delta of Egypt. **Parasitol Int.** (2025) 104:102989.
355 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.parint.2024.102989>
- 356 21. Bosco A, Rinaldi L, Musella V, Amadesi A, and Cringoli G. Outbreak of acute fasciolosis in sheep farms in
357 a Mediterranean area arising as a possible consequence of climate change. **Geospat Health.** (2015)9(2):319-24.
358 <https://doi.org/10.4081/gh.2015.354>
- 359 22. Lianou DT, Arsenopoulos KV, Michael CK, Mavrogianni VS, Papadopoulos E, and Fthenakis GC. Helminth
360 infections in dairy sheep found in an extensive countrywide study in Greece and potential predictors for their
361 presence in faecal samples. **Microorganisms.** (2023)11(3):571.
362 <https://doi.org/10.3390/microorganisms11030571>
- 363 23. Fennouh C, Nabi M, Ouchetati I, et al. A comprehensive analysis of fasciolosis prevalence and risk factors in
364 humans and animals: First report in Algeria. **J Helminthol.** (2025) 99:e26.
365 <https://doi.org/10.1017/s0022149x25000124>
- 366 24. Hamed N and Ayadi A. Epidemiological studies on fasciolosis in northern Tunisia. **Rev Méd Vét.** (2014)
367 165(1–2):49–56.
- 368 25. Çelik ÖY, and Çelik AB. Investigation of the Prevalence of Fasciola hepatica in Small Ruminants in the Siirt
369 Region, Turkey. **Iran J Parasitol.** (2018) 13(4):627-631.