e-ISSN: 2321-6190
p-ISSN: 2347-2294

Research & Reviews: Journal of Zoological Sciences

A Review on Rummaging Diseases

Sandeep Mylavarabhatla*
JSS College of Pharmacy, Ooty, Tamil Nadu, India,

Review Article

Received: 13/09/2016
Revised: 22/09/2016
Accepted: 29/09/2016

***Corresponding author:** Sandeep Mylavarabhatla, JSS College of Pharmacy, Ooty, Tamil Nadu, India; Tel: 919032958918;

E-mail: sandeepsmiley4ever@gmail.com

Keywords: Q fever, Epidemiology, Public wellbeing perils.

ABSTRACT

Q fever is a most part airborne zoonosis with general wellbeing worry all through the world brought about by the very infectious, committed intracellular microorganisms Coxiella burnetii. It is a vital word related zoonosis since its disclosure in 1935; it has been appeared to taint an extensive variety of hosts, including people. In spite of the fact that Q fever is an illness firmly identified with occupations, for example, taking care of animals, the greater part of the past studies worried with overall public. A late flare-up in Europe advises us this is still a noteworthy pathogen of concern, extremely transmissible with a low irresistible dosage. Thus it has likewise included consistently on different risk records, as it might be thought to be utilized as a bio-weapon. Accordingly, we explored the literary works on Q fever to highlight the epidemiologic, monetary and general wellbeing effect of Q fever as a premise for planning successful control systems.

INTRODUCTION

Q fever is an imperative word related zoonotic infection brought on by the commit intracellular bacterium and has incredible general wellbeing hugeness overall [1]. The sickness initially depicted in 1937 in Queensland by E.H. Derrick in relationship with the meat and domesticated animal's industry [2]. Q fever is a primarily airborne zoonosis, disease in household creatures is typically incessant and lethargic; the contaminated pregnant creatures discharge the life form into the earth in birth liquids, placenta, fetal films, pee and dung [3]. The most generally recognized wellsprings of human contamination are homestead creatures, particularly cows, goats and sheep, which constitute the best-known repositories of *C. burnetii* [3]. Taking into account epidemiological proofs, the fundamental course of disease in people is inward breath of polluted vaporized or tidy containing microorganisms shed by contaminated creatures. Oral transmission is additionally talked about and the utilization of polluted crude milk and dairy products speaks to a potential wellspring of human contamination [4,5]. The study of disease transmission and the precise methods of transmission of Q fever stays to be illustrated. In this way, promote exploration is important to enhance information of the infection itself. We investigated the literary works to highlight the epidemiologic, monetary and general wellbeing effect of Q fever as a premise for outlining successful control methodologies.

HISTORY

The expression "Q fever" (for question fever) was proposed in 1937 by Edward Holbrook Derrick to portray febrile sicknesses in abattoir laborers in Brisbane, Queensland, Australia. In 1935, an ailment of obscure inception was initially seen in slaughterhouse specialists. Patients gave fever, migraine, and disquietude. Serologic tests for a wide assortment of conceivable etiologic operators were negative [2]. Since the malady had an obscure etiology, it was given the name Q fever (for question). The etiologic operator was thought to be an infection [6]. Consequently, Berri et al. disengaged a picky intracellular bacterium from guinea pigs that had been infused with blood or pee from Derrick's patients and named it Rickettsia burnetii [3]. This bacterium was

e-ISSN: 2321-6190
p-ISSN: 2347-2294
Research & Reviews: Journal of Zoological Sciences

morphologically and biochemically like other gram-negative microscopic organisms. On the premise of social and biochemical attributes, Philip characterized Rickettsia burnetii in another variety [7], Coxiella, named after Herald R. Cox, who initially disconnected this microorganism in the United States from ticks, *Dermacentor andersoni*, and named it *Rickettsia diapora*. The two life forms were hence appeared to be indistinguishable and are presently known as *C. burnetii*, from that point forward, it has been confined from a few well evolved creatures and from ticks, and it might endure in the earth.

ETIOLOGICAL AGENT

Q fever comes about because of contamination by *C. burnetii*. This creature is a commit intracellular pathogen, it can be become just in embryonated eggs or cell societies or, when fundamental, in vaccinated research facility creatures. It is a little pleomorphic bar (0.2–0.4 mm wide, 0.4–1.0 mm long) with a layer like that of a Gram-negative bacterium [8]. It has been customarily put in the family Rickettsiaceae; nonetheless, late phylogenetic studies have exhibited that *C. burnetii* is all the more firmly identified with Legionella, Francisella and Rickettsiella. This life form is presently arranged in the family Coxiellaceae and request Legionellales in the gamma subdivision of Proteobacteria [9]. Not at all like rickettsiae, *C. burnetii* produces a little, thick, very safe spore-like shape that is profoundly steady in nature [10]. This capacity has been credited to the presence of *C. burnetii* formative cycle variations: huge cell variations (LCV), little cell variations (SCV), and little thick cells (SDC) [11]. The SDC and SCV speak to the types of the microorganisms liable to survive extracellularly as irresistible particles, and in addition its ability to survive generally great natural conditions. The SCV is impervious to warmth, weight, and substance operators [12]. The substantial cell variations (LCVs) are most likely the metabolically dynamic cells of this life form. It experiences sporogenic separation to create safe, spore-like structures, the little cell variations. These are discharged when the cells lyse and can make due for long stretches in the earth [13]. This creature likewise has two unmistakable antigenic stages, stage I and stage II. Stage I and II cells are morphologically indistinguishable, however contrast in some biochemical qualities including their lipopolysaccharide (LPS) sythesis. Living beings detached from contaminated creatures or people express stage I antigens and are profoundly irresistible. Living beings communicating stage II antigens are less irresistible and are recouped after the microorganisms are passaged over and over in cell societies or eggs. Tentatively tainted creatures first deliver antibodies to stage II antigens and later deliver antibodies to stage I antigens. A comparable reaction happens in people, and is utilized to recognize intense from interminable disease [14]. It has the ability to survive for all time inside the macrophages, bringing on an incessant malady after an intense scene.

THE STUDY OF DISEASE TRANSMISSION

Q fever has been portrayed around the world. Two attributes of the life form are essential in the study of disease transmission of the infection. These are its capacity to withstand unforgiving ecological conditions, most likely because of spore development [10], and its remarkable harmfulness for man. A solitary living being can bring about illness in man [15]. *C. burnetii* has been an exceptionally fruitful pathogen. By 1955, Q fever had been accounted for from 51 nations on five mainlands [16]. From 1999 to 2004, there were 18 reported episodes of Q fever from 12 unique nations [17]. Q fever considered as a general wellbeing issue in numerous nations, including France, the United Kingdom, Italy, Spain, Germany, Israel, Greece, and Canada (Nova Scotia). In France, the frequency of intense Q fever is assessed at 50 for each 100,000 occupants for every year, and that of Q fever endocarditis is evaluated at 1 for each 106 tenants every year [18]. From 1975 to 1995, 67 to 169 Q fever cases were accounted for yearly in United Kingdom to the Communicable Disease Surveillance Center by research facilities in England and Wales [19]. This speaks to a steady occurrence running from 0.15 to 0.35 cases for every 100,000 populaces for every year. Q fever is endemic in Israel somewhere around 1981 and 1990, 758 Q fever cases were accounted for to the Ministry of Health [20]. A progression of 34 patients with Q fever endocarditis was accounted for more as of late [21]. In Germany, it is considered as a notifiable ailment, 27 to 100 cases are accounted for yearly [22]. In May 1996, a Q fever flare-up happened in Rollshausen and five encompassing towns in the locale of Lohra [22,23]. In this provincial territory, two runs of sheep (1,000 to 2,000 and 20 creatures, separately) had been kept close Rollshausen before the Q fever flare-up. Lambing happened in December 1995 and January 1996. 7.8% out of 21,191 tried cows, 1.3% of 1346 tried sheep, and 2.5% of 278 tried goats had proof of *C. burnetii* disease [24]. The biggest already depicted flare-up happened in 2003, connected with an agriculturists' business sector in Soest [25]. Contaminated sheep have been embroiled as the wellspring of disease in 24 out of 40 archived flare-ups reported in Germany somewhere around 1947 and 1999 [24]. In Cyprus, the commonness of IgG antibodies against *C. burnetii* stage II antigen was assessed at 48.2% for goats, 18.9% for sheep, and 24% for bovines [26]. In Iran, goats had an altogether higher normal seroprevalence (65.78%) than dairy cattle (10.75%) [27]. In Zimbabwe, serological confirmation of Q fever disease was found in 39% of steers, and in 10% of goats [28]. In the USA goats had an essentially higher normal seroprevalence (41.6%) than sheep

(16.5%) or dairy cattle (3.4%) [29]. From 2007 to 2009, the Netherlands confronted huge occasional flare-ups of Q fever, with the most elevated crest in 2009 [30]. Observation of Q fever is obligatory in European Union (EU) nations. In 2009, a sum of 370 Q fever cases were accounted for in 24 EU nations, aside from the 2,317 cases from the 2009 flare-up in the Netherlands [31]. The low number of notices is as opposed to comes about because of seroprevalence studies, which propose that 2–10% of the overall public in EU nations, have beforehand been contaminated with *C. burnetii* [32].

A wide assortment of creatures can be contaminated with *C. burnetii*, including: trained creatures, for example, dairy animals, goats, sheep, canines, and felines; nonhuman primates; wild rodents and little warm blooded animals; big game natural life; and non-mammalian creatures, including reptiles, creatures of land and water, feathered creatures (tamed and wild), angle, and numerous ticks. More than 40 ticks' species can be normally tainted [4]. They are prone to assume a noteworthy part in transmission among wild vertebrates, yet are not thought to be crucial in the cycle of *C. burnetii* disease in animals [33]. Be that as it may, the living being increase in the gut cells of ticks and substantial quantities of *C. burnetii* are shed in tick defecation [13]. Polluted stows away and fleece might be a wellspring of contamination for individuals either by direct contact or after the excrement have dried and been breathed in as airborne dust particles. Overwhelming convergences of microorganisms are emitted in milk, pee, dung, and particularly in parturient results of contaminated pregnant creatures. Because of the steadiness of this operator, dried, irresistible particles in corrals, fields, and slows down can be a wellspring of contamination for times of up to 150 days [34]. Amid unending contamination, *C. burnetii* is for the most part found in the uterus and mammary organs [33]. Shedding of *C. burnetii* into the earth fundamentally happens amid parturition; more than 109 microscopic organisms are discharged at the season of conveyance [33]. Goats and cows for the most part shed *C. burnetii* in milk and vaginal bodily fluid [35,36] though ovines shed generally in defecation [35]. Goats and bovines shed *C. burnetii* in milk for a while or years [37].

The airborne course (inward breath of tainted fomites) is the essential method of human pollution with *C. burnetii* [38]. Ingestion (for the most part drinking crude milk) is likely a minor element in the transmission of *C. burnetii* [39] and is presently a state of debate concerning the likelihood of contamination by oral course [40]. Further research is required to clear up the likelihood of contamination by oral course. On the off chance that disease by oral course is turned out to be proficient, the adequate number of pathogens equipped for bringing about Q fever ought to be resolved [41].

Individual to-individual transmission is to a great degree uncommon. Albeit occasional, sporadic human Q fever cases have happened taking after contact with a tainted parturient lady (in an obstetrician who played out a fetus removal on the pregnant lady) [42]. The contamination can likewise be spread by the wind [43]. Therefore, Q fever may happen in patients with no clear contact with creatures.

Q FEVER IN ANIMALS

Q fever in animals can taint an expansive number of creature species including animals [33]. Diseases in creatures are generally asymptomatic and are not viewed as a veterinary issue. At the point when clinical ailment happens, regenerative disappointment is typically the main indication displayed. Regenerative disappointment can be showed as premature births, stillbirths, held placenta, barrenness, feeble babies and mastitis in dairy cows. Anorexia and premature births have been accounted for more as often as possible in sheep and goats, while fruitlessness, sporadic fetus removal and low birth weights are found in steers [44]. *C. burnetii* limits in the uterus and mammary organs of tainted creatures [33,45]. Epidemiological information demonstrate that dairy bovines are more much of the time constantly contaminated than sheep and therefore may speak to the most vital wellspring of human disease.

Q FEVER IN PRIMATES

People are the main species to create symptomatic malady. The range of sickness in man is wide and comprises of intense and endless structures. The irresistible measurements is assessed to be 10 microorganisms or less [46]. The diseases are essentially found in people occupationally uncovered, for example, farmers, veterinarians, and specialists in meatpacking plants. Residential ungulates, for example, dairy cattle, sheep, and goats, normally secure and transmit C burnetii; local pets (principally felines) can be an essential wellspring of human disease in urban situations [47,48]. The great presentation is a flulike disease showed by fevers, sweats, hack (beneficial on occasion), myalgias, and arthralgias. A high rate of patients additionally have pneumonia and hepatitis. Pneumonia is commonly gentle, yet movement to intense respiratory trouble disorder can happen [49]. Intense Q fever is discovered fundamentally as a granulomatous hepatitis. Nonetheless, in patients tainted by the

e-ISSN: 2321-6190
p-ISSN: 2347-2294
Research & Reviews: Journal of Zoological Sciences

airborne course, Q fever pneumonia is more basic. Life-undermining difficulties may happen, including meningoencephalitis, myocarditis, or pericarditis. The irresistible measurements have been appeared to shift conversely with the length of the brooding time frame [34]. Individual to-individual transmission is exceptionally uncommon, although presentation amid labor, through sexual transmission and blood transfusions, is conceivable [50].

ANALYSIS

The confinement of the pathogen is the best quality level yet it remains tedious and risky and in this manner limited to research facilities [51]. Routine analysis of Q fever is for the most part considering serological tests, for example, immunofluorescence, compound connected immunosorbent test and supplement obsession test. Immunofluorescence measure (IFA) is presently utilized as the "Reference" technique for the serodiagnosis of Q fever and it can separate antibodies to stage I and stage II variations in IgG, IgM and IgA portions [52]. The chemical connected immunosorbent test (ELISA) has been accounted for to be delicate, simple to perform, with a potential for adoptability for computerization, and can be connected in epidemiological review. It has been appeared to be of significant worth for the analysis of intense and interminable Q fever [53]. At present, the polymerase chain response (PCR) is a standout amongst the most scientifically delicate and quick means for both the immediate identification of *C. burnetii* and the recognizable proof of shedders. PCR can be utilized on an extensive variety of tests (vaginal release, fetus removal material, defecation and milk (mass or person)). It has turned out to be progressively basic in indicative research centers with PCR capacity [54,55]. The level of location of routine PCR is identified with the specimen under scrutiny (1–500 microorganisms/ml of milk; 1 microscopic organisms/mg of dung). A few target qualities have been utilized, for example, the multicopy inclusion arrangement (IS1111) or single duplicate qualities encoding different proteins (e.g dismutase [sodB]; com1 encoding a 27 kDa external layer protein; heat stun proteins [htpA and htpB]; isocitrate dehydrogenase [icd]; macrophage infectivity potentiator protein [cbmip]). Constant PCR systems have likewise been depicted [56,57]. For routine diagnostics, it is generally acknowledged that realtime PCR innovation is desirable over customary gel-based recognition strategies. It permits high example throughput, has a decreased potential for extend pollution and is most appropriate for measurement of *C. burnetii* in natural examples. A few writing techniques have been utilized for the portrayal of *C. burnetii* strains, including limitation endonucleae of genomic DNA [58], PFGE (beat field gel electrophoresis) [59,60], and succession and/or PCR-RFLP (confinement part length polymorphism) investigation of icd, com1 and mucZ qualities. More as of late, two PCR-based writing techniques have been portrayed, MLVA (multi-locus variable number of couple rehashes investigation) [5,61] and multispacer arrangement writing (MST) [62-65]. These strategies may turn out to be extremely helpful for epidemiological examinations.

Multilocus Variable-number couple rehash Analyses (MLVA) depends on variety in rehash number in tandemly rehashed DNA components on different loci in the genome of *C. burnetii* and may be more biased than multispacer grouping writing [63,66-75]. MLVA likewise can be performed on *C. burnetii* strains [5] or straightforwardly on DNA extricated from clinical specimens [64]. An aggregate of 17 distinctive minisatellite and microsatellite rehash markers have been depicted [5,76-78].

CONTROL AND PREVENTION

In the event of Q fever flare-up, sterile and prophylactic measures ought to be connected at crowd and human level, keeping in mind the end goal to cutoff malady transmission. Human-to-human transmission is to a great degree uncommon and Q fever is mostly an airborne sickness, measures of aversion are gone for maintaining a strategic distance from the presentation of people and especially people at danger, to creature and ecological pollution [79-84]. To avert and lessen the creature and ecological sullying, a few activities can be proposed. *C. burnetii* can be lessened in the homestead environment by consistent cleaning and purification of creature offices, with specific consideration of parturition zones, utilizing 10% sodium hypochlorite. In the UK, Health Protection Agency rules recommend the utilization of 2% formaldehyde, 1% Lysol, 5% hydrogen peroxide, 70% ethanol, or 5% chloroform for disinfecting of surfaces [65,85-90]. Pregnant creatures must be kept in discrete pens, placentas and prematurely ended embryos must be evacuated rapidly and arranged under hygienic condition to abstain from being ingested by pooches, felines or untamed life. Spreading excrement from defiled homesteads in rural regions and greenery enclosures ought to be maintained a strategic distance from. Keeping in mind the end goal to secure and keep up sans coxiella domesticated animals, presentation of creatures, regrouping of herds, contacts with natural life and infestation by ticks ought to be minimized. These strategies might be compelling in controlling malady yet uncovered creatures may stay contaminated. In spite of the fact that immunizations for creature Q fever have been produced, there are not industrially accessible in many nations [32,66]. At human level, counteractive action of introduction to creatures or wearing gloves and covers amid control

of creatures or their litter is exhorted [67,91-95].

Since Q fever is enzootic among wild and residential creatures, controlling *C. burnetii* contamination in helpless creatures is troublesome. The best way to truly keep the illness in ruminants is to inoculate uninfected groups, with an effective antibody. Antibodies can forestall fetus removal in creatures, and a stage I immunization must be utilized to control the sickness and to decrease natural tainting and along these lines, the danger of transmission to people. The far-reaching utilization of such immunization in cows in Slovakia in the 1970s and 1980s altogether diminished the event of Q fever in that nation [68,96-100].

At last, recall that *C. burnetii* is greatly risky to people, and lab contaminations are basic. Due to its capacity to bring about debilitating illness in substantial gatherings of individuals, its low irresistible measurements, resistance in the earth, and airborne course of transmission, *C. burnetii* is viewed as a potential operator of bioterrorism and is arranged by the CDC as a gathering B specialist. Suitable precautionary measures must be gone out on a limb bunch 3 operators. Live culture or tainted material from contaminated creatures should just be taken care of in offices that meet the prerequisites for regulation gathering 3 pathogens.

REFERENCES

1. Hattab MA and Ghaly A. Microalgae Oil Extraction Pretreatment Methods: Critical Review and Comparative Analysis. J Fundam Renewable Energy Appl 2015;5:172.
2. Rahman MS et al. Aerobic Conversion of Glycerol to 2,3-Butanediol by a Novel Klebsiella variicola SRP3 Strain. J Microb Biochem Technol 2015;7:299-304.
3. Sajith V and Mohamed JP. Development of Stable Cerium Zirconium Mixed Oxide Nanoparticle Additive for Emission Reduction in Biodiesel Blends. Research & Reviews: Journal of Engineering and Technology 2015.
4. Bouaid A et al. Biodiesel Production from Babassu Oil: A Statistical Approach. J Chem Eng Process Technol 2015;6:232.
5. Rahman MS et al. Aerobic Conversion of Glycerol to 2,3-Butanediol by a Novel Klebsiella variicola SRP3 Strain. J Microb Biochem Technol 2015;7:299-304.
6. Yang J et al. The Optimization of Alkali-Catalyzed Biodiesel Production from Camelina sativa Oil Using a Response Surface Methodology. J Bioprocess Biotech 2015;5:235.
7. Praveen AH et al. Simarouba Biodiesel as an Alternative Fuel for CI Engine: Review. International Journal of Innovative Research in Science, Engineering and Technology 2015.
8. Olalekan A. The Effect of Palm Kernel Oil (PKO) Biodiesel-Contaminated Soil on Morphological and Biochemical Properties of Zea mays. J Plant Biochem Physiol 2014;2:138.
9. Liu M et al. Bacterial Isolation from Palm Oil Plantation Soil for Biodiesel Production: Isolation and Molecular Identification as Inferred by 16s RNA. J Biotechnol Biomater 2014;4:165.
10. Swain KC. Biofuel Production in India: Potential, Prospectus and Technology. J Fundam Renewable Energy Appl 2014;4:129.
11. Stephen S et al. Tracking Interfacial Adsorption/Desorption Phenomena in Polypropylene/Biofuel Media using Trace Cr^{3+}/Cr^{6+} and As^{3+}/As^{5+}-A Study by Liquid Chromatography-plasma Mass Spectrometry. J Pet Environ Biotechnol 2015;6:239.
12. Katiyar P. Modified Fractionation Process via Organic Solvents for Wheat Straw and Ground Nut Shells. J Fundam Renewable Energy Appl 2015;5:178.
13. Banapurmath NR et al. Effect of Combustion Chamber Shapes on the Performance of Mahua and Neem Biodiesel Operated Diesel Engines. J Pet Environ Biotechnol 2015;6:230.
14. Saldivar RP et al. Algae Biofuels Production Processes, Carbon Dioxide Fixation and Biorefinery Concept. J Pet Environ Biotechnol 2014;5:185.
15. de Castro JS et al. Bioconversion of Commercial and Waste Glycerol into Value-Added Polyhydroxyalkanoates by Bacterial Strains. J Microb Biochem Technol 2014;6:337-345.
16. Nguyen PLT et al. In Situ Transesterification of Wet Activated Sludge under Subcritical Conditions. J Pet Environ Biotechnol 2014;5:182.
17. Dave D et al. Marine Oils as Potential Feedstock for Biodiesel Production: Physicochemical Characterization. J Bioprocess Biotech 2014;4:168.
18. Díaz L and Brito A. FFA Adsorption from Waste Oils or Non-Edible Oils onto an Anion-Exchange Resin as Alternative Method to Esterification Reaction Prior to Transesterification Reaction for Biodiesel Production. J Adv Chem Eng 2014;4:105.

19. Abd El Baky HH et al. Lipid Induction in Dunaliella salina Culture Aerated with Various Levels CO2 and Its Biodiesel Production. J Aquac Res Development 2014;5:223.
20. Martin MZ et al. Genetic Improvement, Sustainable Production and Scalable Small Microenterprise of Jatropha as a Biodiesel Feedstock. J Bioremed Biodeg 2013;S4:002.
21. Ramakrishnan VV et al. Extraction of Oil from Mackerel Fish Processing Waste using Alcalase Enzyme. Enz Eng 2013;2:115.
22. Ragauskas AME and Ragauskas AJ. Re-defining the Future of FOG and Biodiesel. J Phylogenetics Evol Biol 2013;4:e118.
23. Alemán-Nava GS et al. Bioenergy Sources and Representative Case Studies in Mexico. J Pet Environ Biotechnol 2014;5:190.
24. Azad AK et al. Production of Microbial Lipids from Rice Straw Hydrolysates by Lipomyces starkeyi for Biodiesel Synthesis. J Microb Biochem Technol 2014;S8:008.
25. Gautam G et al. A Cost Effective Strategy for Production of Bio-surfactant from Locally Isolated Penicillium chrysogenum SNP5 and Its Applications. J Bioprocess Biotech 2014;4:177.
26. Joshi CP and Nookaraju A. New Avenues of Bioenergy Production from Plants: Green Alternatives to Petroleum. J Phylogenetics Evol Biol 2012;3:134.
27. Mansourpoor M and Shariati A. Optimization of Biodiesel Production from Sunflower Oil Using Response Surface Methodology. J Chem Eng Process Technol 2012;3:141.
28. West TP. Crude Glycerol: A Feedstock for Organic Acid Production by Microbial Bioconversion. J Microbial Biochem Technol 2012;4:e106.
29. Owolabi RU et al. Biodiesel from Household/Restaurant Waste Cooking Oil (WCO). J Chem Eng Process Technol 2011;2:112.
30. Kumar S et al. Effectiveness of Enzymatic Transesterification of Beeftallow Using Experimental Enzyme Ns88001 with Methanol and Hexane. Enz Eng 2013;2:116.
31. Ghaly AE et al. Fish Processing Wastes as a Potential Source of Proteins, Amino Acids and Oils: A Critical Review. J Microb Biochem Technol 2013;5:107-129.
32. Feng Y et al. Wide geographic distribution of Cryptosporidium bovis and the deer-like genotype in bovines. Veterinary parasitology 2007;144:1-9.
33. Wieler LH et al. Shiga toxin-producing Escherichia coli strains from bovines: association of adhesion with carriage of eae and other genes. Journal of Clinical Microbiology 1996;34:2980-2984.
34. Autrup H et al. Metabolism of benzo [a] pyrene by cultured tracheobronchial tissues from mice, rats, hamsters, bovines and humans. International Journal of Cancer 1980;25:293-300.
35. Twort FW and Ingram GLY. A method for isolating and cultivating the Mycobacterium enteritidis chronicae pseudotuberculosae bovis, Johne, and some experiments on the preparation of a diagnostic vaccine for pseudo-tuberculous enteritis of bovines. Proceedings of the Royal Society of London. Series B, Containing Papers of a Biological Character 1912; 84:517-542.
36. Li Q et al. Insect Fat, a Promising Resource for Biodiesel. J Phylogenetics Evol Biol 2011;S2:001.
37. Meng L and Salihon J. Conversion of Palm Oil to Methyl and Ethyl Ester using Crude Enzymes. J Biotechnol Biomaterial 2011;1:110.
38. Montasser MS et al. A Novel Eco-friendly Method of Using Red Algae (Laurencia papillosa) to Synthesize Gold Nanoprisms. J Nanomed Nanotechnol 2016;7:383.
39. Kurup GM and Jose GM. In Vitro Antioxidant Properties of Edible Marine Algae Sargassum swartzii, Ulva fasciata and Chaetomorpha antennina of Kerala Coast. J Pharma Reports 2016;1:112.
40. Oramary SOM et al. Feeding Common Carp Fish (Cyprinus carpio) on Natural Foods (Algae, Phytoplankton, Zooplankton and Others) on Tigris River in Mosul Dam / Duhok, Kurdistan Region of Iraq. J Aquac Res Development 2016;7:413.
41. Sano Y et al. Microalgal Culture for Chlorella sp. using a Hollow Fiber Membrane Module. J Membra Sci Technol 2016;6:147.
42. Pérez L. Biofuels from Microalgae, A Promising Alternative. Pharm Anal Chem Open Access 2016;2:e103.
43. Benmoussa M. Algomics for the Development of a Sustainable Microalgae Biorefinery. Single Cell Biol 2016;5:132.
44. Jana BB et al. Evidences of Manure Driven and C:N Regulated Enhanced Carbon Status and Microalgal Productivity in Managed Aquatic System under Simulated Green House Conditions. J Earth Sci Clim Change 2016;7:336.
45. Sarpal AS et al. Investigation of Biodiesel Potential of Biomasses of Microalgaes Chlorella, Spirulina and Tetraselmis by NMR and GC-MS Techniques. J Biotechnol Biomater 2016;6:220.
46. Ouma SO et al. Seasonal Variation of the Physicochemical and Bacteriological Quality of Water from Five Rural Catchment Areas of Lake Victoria Basin in Kenya. J Environ Anal Chem 2016;3:170.

47. Lin X and Peter P. Cool Water Off-flavor Algae and Water Quality in Four Arkansas Commercial Catfish Farms. J Fisheries Livest Prod 2016;4:158.
48. Alassali A et al. Methods for Upstream Extraction and Chemical Characterization of Secondary Metabolites from Algae Biomass. Adv Tech Biol Med 2016;4:163.
49. Fenta AD and Kidanemariam AA. Assessment of Cyanobactrial Blooms Associated with Water Quality Status of Lake Chamo, South Ethiopia. J Environ Anal Toxicol 2016;6:343.
50. Nadeem F et al. Red Sea Microbial Diversity for Antimicrobial and Anticancer Agents. J Mol Biomark Diagn 2015;7:267.
51. Hayase S et al. Consumption of Bone Mineral Density-Associated Nutrients, and Their Food Sources in Pre-school Japanese Children. Vitam Miner 2015;4:133.
52. Rajkumar R and Takriff MS. Prospects of Algae and their Environmental Applications in Malaysia: A Case Study. J Bioremed Biodeg 2016;7:321.
53. Karthik R et al. Attenuation of Negative Impacts by Micro Algae and Enriched Artemia Salina on Penaeus Monodon and Litopenaeus Vannamei Larval Culture. J Aquac Res Development 2015;6:365.
54. Iturriaga R. Photo Adaptation Response of Microalgae to Environmental Changes. Oceanography 2015;3:e113.
55. Gautam K et al. A Method to Utilize Waste Nutrient Sources in Aqueous Extracts for Enhancement of Biomass and Lipid Content in Potential Green Algal Species for Biodiesel Production. J Bioprocess Biotech 2015;5:259.
56. Kadokawa H et al. Bovine C-terminal octapeptide of RFamide-related peptide-3 suppresses luteinizing hormone (LH) secretion from the pituitary as well as pulsatile LH secretion in bovines. Domestic animal endocrinology 2009;36:219-224.
57. Guo JG et al. A baseline study on the importance of bovines for human Schistosoma japonicum infection around Poyang Lake, China. The American journal of tropical medicine and hygiene 2001;65:272-278.
58. Von Blumröder D et al. Comparison and standardisation of serological methods for the diagnosis of Neospora caninum infection in bovines. Veterinary parasitology 2004;120:11-22.
59. Hedger RS and Condy JB. Transmission of foot-and-mouth disease from African buffalo virus carriers to bovines. Veterinary record 1985;117:205.
60. Sedki A et al. Toxic and essential trace metals in muscle, liver and kidney of bovines from a polluted area of Morocco. Science of the total environment 2003;317:201-205.
61. da Silva Vaz I et al. Immunization of bovines with an aspartic proteinase precursor isolated from Boophilus microplus eggs. Veterinary immunology and immunopathology 1998;66:331-341.
62. Bashir M et al. Evaluation of defined antigen vaccines against Schistosoma bovis and S. japonicum in bovines. Tropical and geographical medicine 1993;46:255-258.
63. Costa AJ et al. Experimental infection of bovines with oocysts of Toxoplasma gondii. The Journal of parasitology 1977;1:212-218.
64. Leal AT et al. Vaccination of bovines with recombinant Boophilus Yolk pro-Cathepsin. Veterinary immunology and immunopathology 2006;114:341-345.
65. Viljoen NF. Cysticercosis in swine and bovines, with special reference to South African conditions. Onderstepoort Journal of Veterinary Science and Animal Industry 1937;9:337-570.
66. Gomez-Mares M et al. Comparative Study of the Effects of Diesel and Biodiesel Over POM, PPA and PPS Polymers Used in Automotive Industry. J Material Sci Eng 2014;3:142.
67. Hong JW et al. Mass Cultivation from a Korean Raceway Pond System of Indigenous Microalgae as Potential Biofuel Feedstock. Oil Gas Res 2016;2:108.
68. Rotermund LM et al. A Submersible Holographic Microscope for 4-D In-Situ Studies of Micro-Organisms in the Ocean with Intensity and Quantitative Phase Imaging. J Marine Sci Res Dev 2016;6:181.
69. Qunju H et al. Evaluation of Five Nannocfhloropsis Sp. Strains for Biodiesel and Poly-Unsaturated Fatty Acids (PUFAs) Production. Curr Synthetic Sys Biol 2016;4:128.
70. Taucher J et al. Cell Disruption and Pressurized Liquid Extraction of Carotenoids from Microalgae. J Thermodyn Catal 2016;7:158.
71. Sahay S and Shyam M. Storage Conditions to Improve the Shelf Life of Jatropha curcas Seeds in Terms of Quality of Oil. J Fundam Renewable Energy Appl 2014;4:136.
72. Piechota G et al. Green Technologies in Polish Energy Sector - Overview. J Fundam Renewable Energy Appl 2014;4:133.
73. Ghosh R and Mitra A. Suitability of Green Macroalgae Enteromorpha intestinalis as a Feed Form Macrobrachium rosenbergii. J Fisheries Livest Prod 2015;3:138.
74. El-Sharony TF et al. Effect of Foliar Application with Algae and Plant Extracts on Growth, Yield and Fruit Quality of Fruitful Mango Trees Cv. Fagri Kalan. J Horticulture 2015;2:162.

75. Stoyneva-Gärtner MP and Uzunov BA. An Ethnobiological Glance on Globalization Impact on the Traditional Use of Algae and Fungi as Food in Bulgaria. J Nutr Food Sci 2015;5:413.
76. Sankalp D and Savita D. Optimization and Fuel Properties of Water Degummed Linseed Biodiesel from Transesterification Process. Chem Sci J 2015;7:131.
77. Erinç Uludamar. Vibration Analysis of a Diesel Engine Fuelled with Sunflower and Canola Biodiesels. Adv Automob Eng 2016;5:137.
78. Dhan LF et al. Microbial Lipid Accumulation Capability of Activated Sludge Feeding on Short Chain Fatty Acids as Carbon Sources through Fed-Batch Cultivation. J Bioprocess Biotech 2016;6:275.
79. Sarpal AS et al. Investigation of Biodiesel Potential of Biomasses of Microalgaes Chlorella, Spirulina and Tetraselmis by NMR and GC-MS Techniques. J Biotechnol Biomater 2016;6:220.
80. Tse H et al. Performances, Emissions and Soot Properties from a Diesel-Biodiesel- Ethanol Blend Fuelled Engine, Adv Automob Eng 2016;S1-005.
81. Hu Qunju et al. Evaluation of Five Nannocfhloropsis Sp. Strains for Biodiesel and Poly-Unsaturated Fatty Acids (PUFAs) Production. Curr Synthetic Sys Biol 2016;4:128.
82. Raquel R dos Santos et al. Assessment of Triacylglycerol Content in Chlorella vulgaris Cultivated in a Two-Stage Process. J Biotechnol Biomater 2015;5:212.
83. Harris RL et al. Horn flies, stable flies, and house flies: development in feces of bovines treated orally with juvenile hormone analogues. Journal of economic entomology 1973;66:1099-1102.
84. Reinecke R. A field study of some nematode parasites of bovines in a semi-arid area, with special reference to their biology and possible methods of prophylaxis. Onderstepoort Journal of Veterinary Research 1960;28:365-464.
85. Silva RA et al. Outbreak of trypanosomiasis due to Trypanosoma vivax (Ziemann, 1905) in bovines of the Pantanal, Brazil. Memórias do Instituto Oswaldo Cruz 1996;91:561-562.
86. Hsü SY et al. Vaccination of bovines against schistosomiasis japonica with highly irradiated schistosomula in China. The American journal of tropical medicine and hygiene. 1984;33:891-898.
87. Chamoiseau G. Etiology of Farcy in African Bovines. International Journal of Systematic and Evolutionary Microbiology. 1979;29:407-410.
88. Gautam K et al. A Method to Utilize Waste Nutrient Sources in Aqueous Extracts for Enhancement of Biomass and Lipid Content in Potential Green Algal Species for Biodiesel Production. J Bioprocess Biotech 2015;5:259.
89. Luisa WM et al. Culture-Independent Analysis of Bacterial Diversity during Bioremediation of Soil Contaminated with a Diesel-Biodiesel Blend (B10)S. J Bioremed Biodeg 2015;6:318.
90. Saborimanesh N and Mulligan CN. Effect of Sophorolipid Biosurfactant on Oil Biodegradation by the Natural Oil-Degrading Bacteria on the Weathered Biodiesel, Diesel and Light Crude Oil. J Bioremed Biodeg 2015;6:314.
91. Vrushali HJ. Cellulose Hydrolysis: An Unsolved Problem. Research & Reviews: Journal of Chemistry 2015.
92. Sticklen M. Consolidating the Feedstock Crops Cellulosic Biodiesel with Cellulosic Bioethanol Technologies: A Biotechnology Approach. Adv Crop Sci Tech 2015;3:e133.
93. Ang GT et al. Supercritical and Superheated Technologies: Future of Biodiesel Production. J Adv Chem Eng 2015;5:e106.
94. Ammann AA. Hydroxyl Radical Production by Light Driven Iron Redox Cycling in Natural and Test Systems. J Environ Anal Chem 2016;3:182.
95. Eriksen NT. Research Trends in the Dominating Microalgal Pigments, β-carotene, Astaxanthin, and Phycocyanin Used in Feed, in Foods, and in Health Applications. J Nutr Food Sci 2016;6:507.
96. Garcia JS et al. Nutritional Potential of Four Seaweed Species Collected in the Barbate Estuary (Gulf of Cadiz, Spain). J Nutr Food Sci 2016;6:505.
97. Zhao Y et al. Identification of NaHCO3 Stress Responsive Proteins in Dunaliella salina HTBS using iTRAQ-based Analysis. J Proteomics Bioinform 2016;9:137-143.
98. Jajesniak P et al. Carbon Dioxide Capture and Utilization using Biological Systems: Opportunities and Challenges. J Bioprocess Biotech 2014;4:155.
99. Lai EPC. Biodiesel: Environmental Friendly Alternative to Petrodiesel. J Pet Environ Biotechnol 2014;5:e122.
100. Dhama K et al. Rotavirus diarrhea in bovines and other domestic animals. Veterinary research communications 2009;33:1-23.