



Brucellosis Vaccines: An Overview

Mohammad Reza Hasanjani-Roushan¹, Sohrab Kazemi², Fatemeh Fallah-Rostami³, Soheil Ebrahimipour^{1*}

Abstract

Objective: Brucellosis is considered as an important zoonotic and worldwide infection with more than half of million human cases, which it occurs more and more in animals like as wild and live stocks. Sheep, cattle, and goats are animal samples that listed. Symptoms of this disease in human are consisted of: undulant fever, back pains, faint, spondylitis, arthritis and orchitis. This infection causes abortion in livestock, and this point is one of the important economic losses. Reduction in milk production is another problem in this disease too.

Materials and Methods: This study is conducted by reviewing of the literatures, which are related to this concern, and also visiting PubMed, ISI and other websites.

Results: We must pay heed that most zoonoses are maintained in the animal reservoir. These diseases, such as leptospirosis, Q-fever, brucellosis etc. which among them brucellosis can transfer to human via close contact with infected animals or consumption of unpasteurized dairy. Therefore, eradication of this infection in human population is depended on omission of that in possible methods among animals reservoir. Such methods are like test-slaughter and vaccination of livestock. Hence, vaccination is not alone method for controlling, but it is probably economic one.

Conclusion: Nowadays a vaccine which is effective for this disease control in human is not available. Of course presented some different vaccines for this infection in livestock that cleave live attenuated, killed bacteria and sub unit. Therefore, for eradication of this disease some vaccines with more effectiveness protection mid fewer side effects are necessary.

Keywords: Abortion, Brucellosis, Vaccines, Zoonoses

Introduction

Brucellosis is a zoonotic disease which can be created by different bacteria species, this disease has reminded as a serious problem for human and animal health around the world (1). Middle East, Indian subcontinent, and Mexico are some areas that have high consideration for this disease (2,3). Iran is an endemic region for brucellosis. Therefore, this infection is an enormous challenge for health in Iran. Brucella bacterium is a Gram-negative and is considered as an intracellular pathogen for mammals. This bacteria has some species such as: Brucella abortus (mostly case infection in cow),

Brucella melitensis (sheep and goat), Brucella canis (canine), Brucella suis (pig), Brucella ovis (ovine), Brucella neotomae (rat), Brucella pinnipedialis (pinniped), Brucella ceti (marine mammal), Brucella microti (vole) and Brucella inopinata (4,5). The first four specieses are also pathogenic for human and meanwhile it should be remembered that B. melitensis is the most important cause of brucellosis in human for now (6). Brucella bacterium is transferred by connection with infected animals or consumption of non-pasteurized dairy or undercooked meat to human (7). Although some cases of transfer, human to human of this infection

Received: 16 Feb 2014, **Revised:** 21 Apr 2014, **Accepted:** 19 May 2014, **Available online:** 15 Jul 2014

¹ Infectious Diseases and Tropical Medicine Research Center, Babol University of Medical sciences, Babol, Iran

² Cellular and Molecular Biology Research Center, Babol University of Medical Sciences, Babol, Iran

³ Undersecretary for Research and Technology, Ministry of Health and Medical Education, Pediatric Neuro Rehabilitation Research Center, University of Social Welfare & Rehabilitation Sciences, Tehran, Iran

***Corresponding Author:** Soheil Ebrahimipour, Infectious Diseases and Tropical Medicine Research center, Babol university of Medical sciences, Babol, Iran

Tel: +98 9111149309, Email: drsoheil1503@yahoo.com

had been reported (8,9). Wild animals could be proposed as a source of infection for human and domestic animals. Brucellosis disease in human has many appearances that personate from other diseases. The symptoms of this infection in human consist of: undulant fever, malaise, night sweat, lose weight, arthritis, endocarditis and spondylitis (10,11). Common clinical sign of brucellosis in livestock is abortion (12). This abortion is so common in the last trimester of pregnancy period of cows (13). Affected by this disease can cause infertility in livestock (14). Other symptoms of this infection are reduction of milk production in infected cows and hence some studies showed that a reduction in disease prevalence is associated with an increase in milk production (15). It showed be cleared that some symptoms of brucellosis in goat, like abortion and reduction of milk production are the same as symptoms that occurred in cows (16).

Annual estimating of economic losses from brucellosis in cows in Latin America is about 600 million USD (17) which expresses only a small part of effects caused by this disease such as abortion, reduction in fertility and reduction of milk production (18).

With this interpretation, the control programs of brucellosis are due to protection of these losses which brucellosis disease caused in human and animal and can be also caused some economic problems.

In as much as consumption of non-pasteurized dairy is the first common way of infection transition, occupation contingence such as animal husbandry is the second cause of this infection which it is common (19). Hence, pasteurization and occupational exposure control programs which mentioned in before paragraph are important for protection of this infection.

The major necessary programs for elimination of this disease in livestock are: sanitation, test and slaughter and vaccination of livestock. Sanitation programs are mostly consisted of ranchers, producer training to avoid contamination, especially in areas with high prevalence of disease.

Regular programs of test and removal in low level of infection conditions can be used for obtaining disease-free livestock (20). However, this program in high prevalence of brucellosis infection areas might be made unacceptable economic costs, so this reason, makes hard usage of that program (21). Livestock vaccination is a critical factor for controlling of brucellosis in human and animal, so vaccination of suspicious livestock in high prevalence infection areas play an important role in the elimination of this disease (22). In low level of infection areas, elimination, and inadequate vaccination programs and just rely on test and slaughter program can be enhanced disease activity (23). We should pay heed to this point that in some poor countries in which many cases could not compensate costs of infected livestock for owners, so they also could not eliminate them, in this condition

vaccination alone is not applicable (24). A good and ideal vaccine totally has two common features, harmless and effectiveness (25).

Vaccines must have these features:

- It must prevent of infection in both sexes (male and female).
- Prevent of abortion.
- Vaccination just for one time makes long term prevention.
- It should not contaminate milk and meat.
- Free of reversion to virulence.

A pathogen encountered by innate immunity of the host is triggered by pattern recognition receptors (26), among them can be noted to toll-like receptors. These receptors signal through the adaptor molecule MyD88. Moreover had been showed that MyD88-dependent signaling is essential for activation of interferon gamma (IFN γ) cellular producer in Brucella infection (27). IFN γ acts as a macrophage activator for brucellosis control that itself produced by TCD $_4^+$, TCD $_8^+$, T γ λ . Desired protection against intracellular bacteria mostly related to Th1 and production of IFN γ (28). Although the TCD $_8^+$, cells can directly distorted infected cells (29) and T γ λ through cytolytic activity make protection against pathogens (30). In the production of good and ideal vaccine against brucellosis important functions of the immune system must be strengthened and activate. After ruminant's vaccination, IFN γ production by Th1 is reported (31).

Among different vaccines, live attenuated vaccine just by consumption of a dose, has the greatest impact against intracellular pathogens (32) whereas strengthen the cellular immune feature in killed vaccines can be seen so weak. Vaccines which are produced by strain, smooth Brucella can make humoral responses. Body also against O-side chain Brucella bacteria produces antibody, which diagnostic way is based on serological tests. Hence, determination of humoral responses that are due to vaccination and natural response's body against bacteria is difficult (33). According to this point, should pay heed to vaccine production. So based on logical reason that is mentioned in before paragraph, usage of R mutants as a vaccine should have a minimum overlap with serological tests. However, we had some reports based on antibody extension against O-polysaccharide when faced by S brucella in ruminants which vaccinated by R vaccines (34). In the livestock most of vaccination had been done in intramuscular or subcutaneous form, of course, some ways like oral and intraconjunctival has been also used (35).

Recommended vaccines for brucellosis control are various that we will try explaining these varieties in this article.

Evidence Acquisition

Live B. abortus vaccine strain 19 (S19)

S19 is recommended as a live smooth attenuated vaccine for brucellosis control in adult cattle. In 1941

this vaccine introduced for using in the field (36). Strain S19 is smooth, so usage of this vaccine makes problems such as identification by serological test that we explained before. Although there is a method as competitive enzyme-linked immunosorbent assay which can be used in the field and this method serologically offering separation between vaccinated cattle by S19 and infected cattle (37). *B. abortus* S19 vaccination makes high immunity against abortion in cattle (38). However in pregnant cows, it causes abortion (39) and it should be mentioned that possibility in the last trimester of pregnancy is higher than other times (40). Reduction of milk production had been also reported after usage of this vaccine (34). This vaccine is virulent for human and infection caused by this vaccine, especially for a person who involving in cattle vaccination can be transferred by injured skin and dust (41,42). In countries with high prevalent of brucellosis infection, this vaccine is a choice (43).

H2>Live B. abortus vaccine strain RB 51

B. abortus strain RB51 used for a vaccine that is protective against cattle brucellosis (44). This vaccine is a Rough attenuated mutant of *B. abortus* strain 2308 which is as an alternative vaccine for live *B. abortus* vaccine strain 19. Because RB51, unlike S19, is rough and has a minimum rate for expressing Lipopolysaccharide O-side chain, so doesn't led antibody to presentation against this *Brucella* LPSO antigen which is identifiable by common serological test like tube agglutination test and complement fixation (45-47). RB51 against virulent strain 2308 introduces a protective cell-mediated immunity response (48). This vaccine against abortion has the same protective performance as S19 vaccine (46). However, usage of this vaccine in pregnancy period of cattle causes abortion (34), however reduced dose of this vaccine which is used for pregnant cattle is harmless (49). RB51 vaccine pathogenic for human, especially for veterinarians who are involving in cattle vaccination as unintended inoculation form to human (42). In some countries which have a low prevalence, usage of RB51 vaccine is preferable to S19 vaccine (43).

Live B. melitensis vaccine strain Rev-1

Rev-1 vaccine is as the best vaccine for brucellosis control in sheep and goat that offered by some organizations such as World Health Organization (WHO) and the World Organization for Animal Health (OIE) (50,51). This vaccine derived of a virulent *B. melitensis* which is a passage on the media containing streptomycin. Therefore strain Rev-1 obtains streptomycin-resistant (52). So as a conclusion of these passages strain Rev-1 doesn't have reverse as pathogenic effect. *B. melitensis* Rev-1 is a smooth strain (53). Usage of this vaccine in subcutaneous form because creates serological immune responses namely titer antibody enhancement against O antigen. Makes interference in interpretation of serological tests especially in the identification

between vaccine animals and natural infection animals. Whereas vaccination in conjunctival method decreased these serological meddler responses in serological tests which are explained before. In other words, conjunctival method accompany with brucellosis control program in small ruminants has more prosperity than other methods (54,55). It is necessary to explain that although usage of this vaccine is recommended for protection of Rams of *B. ovis* infection. But, antibody meddler problem is also considered in this case, the same as other cases which we explained before (56,57). Rev-1 vaccine is hindering abortion in vaccine livestock which was infected (58). Usage of completed dose or reduced dose of this vaccine in pregnant sheep and goat makes abortion risk in high level (59,60). Of course, vaccination with low dose recommended by some researchers for abortion problem in pregnancy period (61), however this issue is controversial. Rev-1 vaccine causes brucellosis infection in human that is risk-related occupations and is considered as accidental inoculation (62). Usage of Rev-1 vaccine in cattle makes better protective effect than S19 vaccine against *B. melitensis* (63). Brucellosis prevalence rates in boars in some areas of the world are high, so it makes domestic animal in high risk of disease (64). However, prevalence of this disease in pig in more areas of the world is low. Vaccination with RB51 strain in oral or intramuscular form or usage of killed *B. suis* as vaccine has a protective function for pig against infected boars to brucellosis (31,65).

45/20

Heat-killed *B. abortus* strain 45/20 vaccine introduced for consumption in 1920s (66) which is the kind of rough strain, so for this reason does not have interference with serological diagnostic tests. Of course this vaccine cannot be used as an alive vaccine, because in in vivo environment back to its smooth form (67). Vaccines which are produced by killed *Brucella* make insufficient immunity and by using of these vaccines in inoculation place use local reaction that all of these points are disadvantages of them. Uses of adjuvant can be effective for some problems (68). This vaccine is useful for pregnant livestock (34).

Sub unit vaccine

A vaccine which makes a protective and effective immunity against all types of *brucella* is introduced as an ideal one. The researcher could also reach to this aim by producing a Rough strain of *Brucella*. However, this kind of vaccine is explained before had some shortcomings. The subunit vaccines are introduced as a valuable replacement for other conventional vaccines, because they have some features such as: noninfectious and virulent (69). For producing of this vaccine used of purified proteins or DNA. Some reports had been showed that omp₃₁ is considered as nan outer membrane protein of *Brucella* can make protective effect infection in some

mouse models (70). Usage of unlipidated forms of outer membrane proteins and omp₁₉ for subunit vaccine make protective response from Th1 cells, which it shows the possibility of usage of this kind of protein in this type of vaccine (71). Omp₂₅ is also as a 25 k dalton outer membrane protein, which is introduced for usage in this kind of vaccine (72). DNAK as a cytoplasmic protein and SurA as a Periplasmic peptidyl prolyl cis-trans isomerase have been also evaluated in subunit vaccine, because they have the ability to introduce a humoral immunity and rich cytotoxic response (73). Some of these researches showed that liposomized proteins L7/L12 by effects like producing of Th1 cytokines make effective cell's immune and humoral responses (74). Besides of that cases other purified recombinant antigens as subunit vaccines have been studied and could make protective effect against brucellosis. These kinds of antigens consist of: Brucella lumazine synthase (BLS) which is a cytoplasmic protein and periplasmic binding protein (p39) which is as a periplasmic protein (75). DNA vaccines are rich inducer and produce long-lived cell immune responses such as Th1 and CTL and also humoral responses against pathogenic intracellular bacteria, especially brucella bacteria (76-78). However according to some expert's idea, immune responses that are due to this kind of vaccine are not more powerful than protein vaccine's responses (30). Of course some of these researches showed that injection of plasmid DNA carrying the BLS gene (PCDNA-BLS) as a immunogenic to BalB/C mouse could make humoral and cellular immune responses, which are more effectiveness than responses due to recombinant protein against *B. abortus* (79). DNA vaccine that codes for super oxide dismutase (SOD) can cause Th1 immune cellular response and protection against *B. abortus* 2308 strain (78). Yu et al. showed that combined DNA vaccine which is consisted of the genes encoding L7/L12, SOD and Bcsp31 antigens can make superior protection than live vaccine strains like RB51 and S19 (80) so this is one of the important advantages of DNA vaccines, it means usage of several antigens simultaneously are possible in them. One of the problems for consumption of DNA vaccine is the required amount of DNA to get the desired response (68).

Conclusion

According to the significance of brucellosis as a serious problem for public health, necessity of this disease control must be in the premiership. However available livestock's vaccines for this disease control had effective function until now, but had also some side-effects, so, because of this reason, for eradication of this disease some vaccines with more effectiveness protection mid fewer side-effects are more useful.

Ethical issues

We have no ethical issues to declare

Conflict of interests

We declare that we have no conflict of interests.

Acknowledgments

We would like to represent our gratitude to Marzieh Nourollahzadeh for her advice as a translator of this article.

References

1. Hasanjani Roushan MR, Mohraz M, Hajiahmadi M, Ramzani A, Valayati AA. Efficacy of gentamicin plus doxycycline versus streptomycin plus doxycycline in the treatment of brucellosis in humans. *Clin Infect Dis* 2006; 42: 1075-80.
2. Young EJ. An overview of human brucellosis. *Clin Infect Dis* 1995; 2: 283-9.
3. Ebrahimpour S, Youssefi MR, Karimi N, Kaighobadi M, Tabaripour R. The prevalence of human Brucellosis in Mazandaran province, Iran. *African Journal of Microbiology Research* 2012; 6: 4090-4.
4. Sohn AH, Probert WS, Glaser CA, Gupta N, Bollen AW, Wong JD, et al. Human neurobrucellosis with intracerebral granuloma caused by a marine mammal *Brucella* spp. *Emerg Infect Dis* 2003; 9: 485-8.
5. Galinska EM, Zagorski J. Brucellosis in humans-etiology, diagnostics, clinical forms. *Ann Agric Environ Med* 2013; 20: 233-8.
6. Pappas G, Akritidis N, Bosilkovski M, Tsianos E. Brucellosis. *N Engl J Med* 2005; 352: 2325-36.
7. Pappas G, Papadimitriou P, Akritidis N, Christou L, Tsianos EV. The new global map of human brucellosis. *Lancet Infect Dis* 2006; 6: 91-9.
8. Godfroid J, Cloeckeaert A, Liautard JP, Kohler S, Fretin D, Walravens K, et al. From the discovery of the Malta fever's agent to the discovery of a marine mammal reservoir, brucellosis has continuously been a re-emerging zoonosis. *Vet Res* 2005; 36: 313-26.
9. Arroyo C, I, Lopez Rodriguez MJ, Sapina AM, Lopez LA, Sacristan AR. Probable transmission of brucellosis by breast milk. *J Trop Pediatr* 2006; 52: 380-1.
10. Nouri HR, Marashi MA, Rahimi MT, Baleghi Damavandi D, Ebrahimpour S. Diagnostic Tests in Human Brucellosis. *International Journal of Enteric Pathogens* 2014; 2: e19422.
11. Hasanjani Roushan MR, Ebrahimpour S. Human brucellosis: An overview. *Caspian J Inte Med*. 2015; 6: 46-47.
12. Acha PN, Szyfres B. Zoonoses and Communicable Diseases Common to Man and Animals: Parasitoses. Geneva, Switzerland: World Health Organization; 2003.
13. Anka MS, Hassan L, Khairani-Bejo S, Zainal MA, Mohamad Rb, et al. A Case-Control Study of Risk Factors for Bovine Brucellosis Seropositivity in Peninsular Malaysia. *PLoS ONE* 2014; 9: e108673
14. Olsen SC, ThoenCO, Cheville NF. *Brucella*. In:

- Gyles CL, Editor. Pathogenesis of Bacterial Infections in Animals. New Jersey, NJ: Wiley; 2004. p. 309-19.
15. Herrera E, Palomares G, Diaz-Aparicio E. Milk production increase in a dairy farm under a six-year Brucellosis control program. *Ann N Y Acad Sci* 2008; 1149: 296-9.
 16. Lilenbaum W, de Souza GN, Ristow P, Moreira MC, Fraguas S, Cardoso VS, et al. A serological study on *Brucella abortus*, caprine arthritis-encephalitis virus and *Leptospira* in dairy goats in Rio de Janeiro, Brazil. *Vet J* 2007; 173: 408-12.
 17. Ragan VE. The Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service (APHIS) brucellosis eradication program in the United States. *Vet Microbiol* 2002; 90: 11-8.
 18. Dajer Abiberhi A, Gutierrez EJ, Zapata DM. Evaluación de una prueba de ensayo inmunoabsorbente ligado a enzimas de competencia (ELISA-C) para el diagnóstico serológico de la brucelosis bovina. *Rev Biomed* 2003; 14: 23-8.
 19. Atluri VL, Xavier MN, de Jong MF, den Hartigh AB, Tsolis RM. Interactions of the human pathogenic *Brucella* species with their hosts. *Annu Rev Microbiol* 2011; 65: 523-41.
 20. Jelastopulu E, Bikas C, Petropoulos C, Leotsinidis M. Incidence of human brucellosis in a rural area in Western Greece after the implementation of a vaccination programme against animal brucellosis. *BMC Public Health* 2008; 8: 241.
 21. Blasco JM. Existing and future vaccines against brucellosis in small ruminants. *Small Ruminant Research* 2006; 62: 33-7.
 22. Briones G, Inon d, I, Roset M, Vigliocco A, Paulo PS, Ugalde RA. *Brucella abortus* cyclic beta-1,2-glucan mutants have reduced virulence in mice and are defective in intracellular replication in HeLa cells. *Infect Immun* 2001; 69: 4528-35.
 23. Minas A, Minas M, Stournara A, Tselepidis S. The "effects" of Rev-1 vaccination of sheep and goats on human brucellosis in Greece. *Prev Vet Med* 2004; 64: 41-7.
 24. Ficht TA, Kahl-McDonagh MM, Arenas-Gamboia AM, Rice-Ficht AC. Brucellosis: the case for live, attenuated vaccines. *Vaccine* 2009; 27: D40-D43.
 25. World Health Organization. Brucellosis. Geneva, Switzerland: WHO; 1997.
 26. Kawai T, Akira S. TLR signaling. *Semin Immunol* 2007; 19: 24-32.
 27. Macedo GC, Magnani DM, Carvalho NB, Bruna-Romero O, Gazzinelli RT, Oliveira SC. Central role of MyD88-dependent dendritic cell maturation and proinflammatory cytokine production to control *Brucella abortus* infection. *J Immunol* 2008; 180: 1080-7.
 28. Huang L, Krieg AM, Eller N, Scott DE. Induction and regulation of Th1-inducing cytokines by bacterial DNA, lipopolysaccharide, and heat-inactivated bacteria. *Infect Immun* 1999; 67: 6257-63.
 29. Seder RA, Hill AV. Vaccines against intracellular infections requiring cellular immunity. *Nature* 2000; 406: 793-8.
 30. Perkins SD, Smither SJ, Atkins HS. Towards a *Brucella* vaccine for humans. *FEMS Microbiol Rev* 2010; 34: 379-94.
 31. Olsen SC. Recent developments in livestock and wildlife brucellosis vaccination. *Rev Sci Tech* 2013; 32: 207-17.
 32. Denisov AA, Korobovtseva YS, Karpova OM, Tretyakova AV, Mikhina LV, Ivanov AV, et al. Immunopotential of live brucellosis vaccine by adjuvants. *Vaccine* 2010; 28: F17-F22.
 33. Gonzalez D, Grillo MJ, De Miguel MJ, Ali T, Arce-Gorvel V, Delrue RM, et al. Brucellosis vaccines: assessment of *Brucella melitensis* lipopolysaccharide rough mutants defective in core and O-polysaccharide synthesis and export. *PLoS One* 2008; 3: e2760.
 34. Moriyon I, Grillo MJ, Monreal D, Gonzalez D, Marin C, Lopez-Goni I, et al. Rough vaccines in animal brucellosis: structural and genetic basis and present status. *Vet Res* 2004; 35: 1-38.
 35. Olsen SC, Stoffregen WS. Essential role of vaccines in brucellosis control and eradication programs for livestock. *Expert Rev Vaccines* 2005; 4: 915-28.
 36. Stevens M, Olsen S, Palmer M, Cheville N. *Brucella Abortus* Strain Rb51: a New Brucellosis Vaccine for Cattle. *Comp Control Educ Pract Vet* 1997; 19: 766-74.
 37. Adams LG, Mia SM. Field evaluation of "D-Tec *Brucella A*", a monoclonal antibody-based competitive enzyme-linked immunosorbent assay (cELISA) for serodiagnosis of brucellosis in cattle. *Proceedings of the United States Animal Health Association* 1991; 95: 92-112.
 38. Confer AW, Hall SM, Faulkner CB, Espe BH, Deyoe BL, Morton RJ, et al. Effects of challenge dose on the clinical and immune responses of cattle vaccinated with reduced doses of *Brucella abortus* strain 19. *Vet Microbiol* 1985; 10: 561-75.
 39. Schurig GG, Sriranganathan N, Corbel MJ. Brucellosis vaccines: past, present and future. *Vet Microbiol* 2002; 90: 479-96.
 40. Anka MS, Hassan L, Adzhar A, Khairani-Bejo S, Bin Mohamad R, Zainal MA. Bovine brucellosis trends in Malaysia between 2000 and 2008. *BMC Veterinary Research* 2013; 9:230.
 41. Vincent P, Joubert L, Prave M. 2 occupational cases of brucellar infection after inoculation of B 19 vaccine. *Bull Acad Vet Fr* 1970; 43: 89-97.
 42. Berkelman RL. Human illness associated with use of veterinary vaccines. *Clin Infect Dis* 2003; 37: 407-14.
 43. Olsen S, Tatum F. Bovine brucellosis. *Vet Clin North Am Food Anim Pract* 2010; 26: 15-27, table.
 44. Lord VR, Schurig GG, Cherwonogrodzky JW,

- Marcano MJ, Melendez GE. Field study of vaccination of cattle with *Brucella abortus* strains RB51 and 19 under high and low disease prevalence. *Am J Vet Res* 1998; 59: 1016-20.
45. Stevens MG, Hennager SG, Olsen SC, Cheville NF. Serologic responses in diagnostic tests for brucellosis in cattle vaccinated with *Brucella abortus* 19 or RB51. *J Clin Microbiol* 1994; 32: 1065-6.
 46. Cheville NF, Olsen SC, Jensen AE, Stevens MG, Palmer MV, Florance AM. Effects of age at vaccination on efficacy of *Brucella abortus* strain RB51 to protect cattle against brucellosis. *Am J Vet Res* 1996; 57: 1153-6.
 47. Cloeckaert A, Zygmunt MS, Guilloteau LA. *Brucella abortus* vaccine strain RB51 produces low levels of M-like O-antigen. *Vaccine* 2002; 20: 1820-2.
 48. Stevens MG, Olsen SC, Cheville NF. Comparative analysis of immune responses in cattle vaccinated with *Brucella abortus* strain 19 or strain RB51. *Vet Immunol Immunopathol* 1995; 44: 223-35.
 49. Palmer MV, Olsen SC, Cheville NF. Safety and immunogenicity of *Brucella abortus* strain RB51 vaccine in pregnant cattle. *Am J Vet Res* 1997; 58: 472-7.
 50. Munoz PM, De Miguel MJ, Grillo MJ, Marin CM, Barberan M, Blasco JM. Immunopathological responses and kinetics of *Brucella melitensis* Rev 1 infection after subcutaneous or conjunctival vaccination in rams. *Vaccine* 2008; 26: 2562-9.
 51. Behroozikhah A, Alamian S, Pourahmadi A, Moghadampour M. Evaluation on stability process of *Brucella melitensis*-Rev. 1 vaccine in Iran. *Razi j Med Sci* 2009; 64: 85-90.
 52. ELBERG SS, FAUNCE K, Jr. Immunization against *Brucella* infection. VI. Immunity conferred on goats by a nondependent mutant from a streptomycin-dependent mutant strain of *Brucella melitensis*. *J Bacteriol* 1957; 73: 211-7.
 53. Diaz-Aparicio E, Hernandez L, Suarez-Guemes F. Protection against brucellosis in goats, five years after vaccination with reduced-dose *Brucella melitensis* Rev 1 vaccine. *Trop Anim Health Prod* 2004; 36: 117-21.
 54. Fensterbank R, Pardon P, Marly J. Vaccination of ewes by a single conjunctival administration of *Brucella melitensis* Rev. 1 vaccine. *Ann Rech Vet* 1985; 16: 351-6.
 55. Garin-Bastuji B, Blasco JM, Grayon M, Verger JM. *Brucella melitensis* infection in sheep: present and future. *Vet Res* 1998; 29: 255-74.
 56. Reichel MP, Baber DJ, Armitage PW, Lampard D, Whitley RS, Hilbink F. Eradication of *Brucella ovis* from the Falkland Islands 1977-1993. *Vet Rec* 1994; 134: 595-7.
 57. Marin CM, Barberan M, Jimenez de Bagues MP, Blasco JM. Comparison of subcutaneous and conjunctival routes of Rev 1 vaccination for the prophylaxis of *Brucella ovis* infection in rams. *Res Vet Sci* 1990; 48: 209-15.
 58. Ebrahimi M, Nejad RB, Alamian S, Mokhberralsafa L, Abedini F, Ghaderi R, et al. Safety and efficacy of reduced doses of *Brucella melitensis* strain Rev. 1 vaccine in pregnant Iranian fat-tailed ewes. *Vet Ital* 2012; 48: 405-12.
 59. Zundel E, Verger JM, Grayon M, Michel R. Conjunctival vaccination of pregnant ewes and goats with *Brucella melitensis* Rev 1 vaccine: safety and serological responses. *Ann Rech Vet* 1992; 23: 177-88.
 60. Saeedzadeh A, Sharifiyazdi H, Firouzi R. Molecular characterization of *Brucella melitensis* Rev.1 strain in aborted sheep and goats in Iran. *Comparative Clinical Pathology* 2013; 22: 409-12.
 61. Alton GG. Vaccination of goats with reduced doses of Rev. I *Brucella melitensis* vaccine. *Res Vet Sci* 1970; 11: 54-9.
 62. Squarcione S, Maggi P, Lo CS, De GM, Carbonara S. (A case of human brucellosis caused by accidental injection of animal vaccine). *G Ital Med Lav* 1990; 12: 25-6.
 63. Horwell FD, van Drimmelen GG. *Brucella melitensis* strain Rev I as a vaccine for cattle. *J S Afr Vet Med Assoc* 1971; 42: 233-5.
 64. Mason RJ, Fleming PJ. Serological survey for *Brucella* antibodies in feral pigs from eastern Australia. *Aust Vet J* 1999; 77: 331-2.
 65. Alton GG, ELBERG SS, Crouch D. Rev. 1 *Brucella melitensis* vaccine. The stability of the degree of attenuation. *J Comp Pathol* 1967; 77: 293-300.
 66. McEwen AD. Experiments on contagious abortion. The immunity of cattle inoculated with vaccines of graded virulence. *Vet Rec* 1940; 52: 815.
 67. Wildon Taylor A, Mc Diarmid A. The stability of the avirulent characters of *Brucella abortus* strain 19 and strain 45/20 in lacting and pregnant cows. *Vet Rec* 1949; 61: 317-8.
 68. Cutler SJ, Whatmore AM, Commander NJ. Brucellosis--new aspects of an old disease. *J Appl Microbiol* 2005; 98: 1270-81.
 69. Pasquevich KA, Ibanez AE, Coria LM, Garcia SC, Estein SM, Zwerdling A, et al. An oral vaccine based on U-Omp19 induces protection against *B. abortus* mucosal challenge by inducing an adaptive IL-17 immune response in mice. *PLoS One* 2011; 6: e16203.
 70. Cassataro J, Estein SM, Pasquevich KA, Velikovskiy CA, de la Barrera S, Bowden R, et al. Vaccination with the recombinant *Brucella* outer membrane protein 31 or a derived 27-amino-acid synthetic peptide elicits a CD4+ T helper 1 response that protects against *Brucella melitensis* infection. *Infect Immun* 2005; 73: 8079-88.
 71. Pasquevich KA, Estein SM, Garcia SC, Zwerdling A, Coria LM, Barrionuevo P, et al. Immunization with recombinant *Brucella* species outer

- membrane protein Omp16 or Omp19 in adjuvant induces specific CD4+ and CD8+ T cells as well as systemic and oral protection against *Brucella abortus* infection. *Infect Immun* 2009; 77: 436-45.
72. Commander NJ, Spencer SA, Wren BW, MacMillan AP. The identification of two protective DNA vaccines from a panel of five plasmid constructs encoding *Brucella melitensis* 16M genes. *Vaccine* 2007; 25: 43-54.
 73. Delpino MV, Estein SM, Fossati CA, Baldi PC, Cassataro J. Vaccination with *Brucella* recombinant DnaK and SurA proteins induces protection against *Brucella abortus* infection in BALB/c mice. *Vaccine* 2007; 25: 6721-9.
 74. Mallick AI, Singha H, Chaudhuri P, Nadeem A, Khan SA, Dar KA, et al. Liposomised recombinant ribosomal L7/L12 protein protects BALB/c mice against *Brucella abortus* 544 infection. *Vaccine* 2007; 25: 3692-704.
 75. Oliveira SC, Giambartolomei GH, Cassataro J. Confronting the barriers to develop novel vaccines against brucellosis. *Expert Rev Vaccines* 2011; 10: 1291-305.
 76. Gurunathan S, Klinman DM, Seder RA. DNA vaccines: immunology, application, and optimization. *Annu Rev Immunol* 2000; 18: 927-74.
 77. Leclercq SY, Oliveira SC. Protective immunity induced by DNA-library immunization against an intracellular bacterial infection. *J Drug Target* 2003; 11: 531-8.
 78. Munoz-Montesino C, Andrews E, Rivers R, Gonzalez-Smith A, Moraga-Cid G, Folch H, et al. Intraspleen delivery of a DNA vaccine coding for superoxide dismutase (SOD) of *Brucella abortus* induces SOD-specific CD4+ and CD8+ T cells. *Infect Immun* 2004; 72: 2081-7.
 79. Velikovskiy CA, Cassataro J, Giambartolomei GH, Goldbaum FA, Estein S, Bowden RA, et al. A DNA vaccine encoding lumazine synthase from *Brucella abortus* induces protective immunity in BALB/c mice. *Infect Immun* 2002; 70: 2507-11.
 80. Yu DH, Hu XD, Cai H. A combined DNA vaccine encoding BCSP31, SOD, and L7/L12 confers high protection against *Brucella abortus* 2308 by inducing specific CTL responses. *DNA Cell Biol* 2007; 26: 435-43.

Citation: Hasanjani-Roushan MR, Kazemi S, Fallah-Rostami F, Ebrahimpour S. **Brucellosis Vaccines: An Overview.** *Crescent J Med & Biol Sci* 2014; 1(4): 118-24.