Open Access Check for updates



# **Journal of Veterinary and Animal Sciences**

ISSN (Print): 0971-0701, (Online): 2582-0605





# Evaluation of serological tests for the diagnosis of *Mycoplasma* gallisepticum and *Mycoplasma synoviae* infections in broiler chickens with respiratory ailments

D Jay Prakash Yadav<sup>1,2</sup>, Yarvendra Singh<sup>1</sup>, Kanisht Batra<sup>3</sup>, and Udit Jain<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Department of Veterinary Public Health and Epidemiology, <sup>3</sup>Department of Animal Biotechnology, College of Veterinary Sciences, Lala Lajpat Rai University of Veterinary and animal Sciences, Hisar-125 001. <sup>2</sup>Department of Veterinary public Health and Epidemiology, College of Veterinary Science, Guru Angad Dev Veterinary and Animal Sciences University, Rampura Phul, Bathinda, India, <sup>4</sup>Department of Veterinary Public Health, College of Veterinary Science and Animal Husbandry, UP Pandit Deen Dayal Upadhyaya Pashu Chikitsa Vigyan Vishwavidyalaya Evam Go Anusandhan Sansthan, Mathura, India

*Citation:* Yadav, J.P., Singh, Y., Batra, K. and Jain, U. 2025. Evaluation of serological tests for diagnosis of *Mycoplasma gallisepticum* and *Mycoplasma synoviae* infections in broiler chickens with respiratory ailments. *J. Vet. Anim. Sci.* **56** (3):502-510

Received: 14.06.2025 Accepted: 25.08.2025 Published: 30.09.2025

#### **Abstract**

The pathogenic avian mycoplasmas, such as Mycoplasma gallisepticum (MG) and Mycoplasma synoviae (MS) are responsible for causing significant economic losses to the poultry industry. The present study was aimed at serodiagnosis of MG and MS infection in broiler chicken flocks using serum plate agglutination test (SPAT), indirectenzyme linked immunosorbent assay (i-ELISA) and Dot-ELISA, followed by measuring the relative diagnostic efficacy of SPAT and Dot-ELISA in reference to i-ELISA. The blood samples (n=68) collected from the broiler chicken aging 4-6 weeks affected with respiratory tract infection from poultry farms located in Mathura district of Uttar Pradesh, India were used in the study. Initially, SPAT was used to detect MG and MS antibodies in collected sera. In SPAT, 36.76% and 72.06% sera were found positive for MG and MS antibodies, respectively. Later, the samples were screened using laboratory standardized i-ELISA and Dot-ELISA. The culture of MG (NCBI accession no. KX759104.1) and MS (NCBI accession no. KY486506.1) isolates were used to prepare antigens to standardize i-ELISA and Dot-ELISA. Using i-ELISA, the seropositivity of MG and MS antibodies in collected sera was found to be 85.29% and 80.88%, respectively. However, seropositivity of MG and MS antibodies using Dot-ELISA was found to be 66.18% and 77.94%, respectively. The i-ELISA was used as gold standard test to compare the diagnostic efficacy of SPAT and Dot-ELISA. The relative diagnostic sensitivity, specificity and kappa values for the detection of MG and MS using SPAT was found to be 43.10%, 100%, 0.1822 and 86.09%, 100%, 0.7574, respectively. However, the relative diagnostic sensitivity, specificity and kappa values for the detection of MG and MS using Dot-ELISA was found to be 77.59%, 100%, 0.2524 and 96.36%, 100%, 0.9102, respectively. The present study reports that i-ELISA and Dot-ELISA should be used along with SPAT for accurate detection of avian mycoplasmas infection in poultry flocks affected with respiratory tract infection.

Keywords: Avian mycoplasmas, broiler chicken, Dot-ELISA, indirect-ELISA, standard plate agglutination test

Copyright: © 2025 Yadav *et al.* This is an open access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author and source are credited.

<sup>\*</sup>Corresponding author: ysingh@indovax.com, Ph. 9416648148

Mycoplasma gallisepticum (MG) and Mycoplasma synoviae (MS) are responsible for causing severe economic losses to the poultry industry (Zhang et al., 2015; Umar et al., 2017). Avian mycoplasmosis caused by MG and MS are responsible for 10-20% reduction in productivity, a 5-10% increase in embryo mortality, as well as the cost involved in the prevention and control of disease in poultry flocks (Kleven, 1990; Nascimento et al., 2005). The infection is widely reported from different geographical regions of India with a prevalence rate of 10-27% and 20.1-33% for MG and MS, respectively (Yadav et al., 2022). The MG is responsible for the causation of chronic respiratory disease (CRD) in chickens (Liu et al., 2001; Sprygin et al., 2010; Yadav et al., 2025). However, MS mainly causes infectious synovitis, airsacculitis, arthritis, mild upper respiratory tract infections, with or without symptoms of septicemia (Kleven, 2008; Yadav et al., 2021; Liu et al., 2025). Avian Mycoplasma infection in chicken triggers coinfection of other important poultry pathogens, such as Escherichia coli, infectious bronchitis virus and Newcastle disease virus, which may further enhance the economic losses (Bolha et al., 2013; Yadav et al., 2023). Therefore, it is important to establish a diagnostic facility for early detection of pathogens and to improve the disease surveillance to prevent major outbreaks (Alam et al., 2012; Liu et al., 2025). Serodiagnosis is considered to be the firstline diagnostic tool for the detection of avian Mycoplasma infection in a poultry flock (Mardassi et al., 2008). Various serological tests such as serum plate agglutination (SPA), enzyme linked immunosorbent assay (ELISA) and haemagglutination inhibition (HI) are commonly used for screening flocks for MG and MS infections, which are later confirmed by culture and polymerase chain reaction (PCR) based assays (Kleven, 1998; Nascimento et al., 2005; Sprygin et al., 2010; Yadav et al., 2021).

Although, HI test might be used as a confirmatory test, it has several drawbacks such as being timeconsuming, less sensitive and requires reagents that are not commercially available. Also, the result varies between different diagnostic laboratories (Mardassi et al., 2008; Feberwee et al., 2022). In routine, the primary screening of flocks for avian mycoplasmosis is usually done by serum plate agglutination test (SPAT) and/or ELISA. SPAT mainly detects the early stage of infection by detecting IgM antibodies; however, ELISA is used for the detection of chronic infection by measuring IgG antibodies (Wanasawaeng et al., 2015). The ELISA is more specific than SPA and HI tests and more sensitive than the HI (Hagan et al., 2004; Feberwee et al., 2005). Dot-ELISA is considered to be a simple, reliable and cost-effective technique compared to ELISA and was used earlier for the detection of important poultry diseases (Manoharan et al., 2004; He et al., 2010; Alam et al., 2012). The present study aimed to detect MG and MS infection in broiler chicken flocks affected with respiratory tract infections using SPAT, i-ELISA and Dot-ELISA, followed by measuring the relative diagnostic efficacy of SPAT and Dot-ELISA in reference to i-ELISA.

#### Material and methods

Sample collection and areas of study

The blood samples (n= 68) were collected from the broiler chicken aged 4–6 weeks affected with respiratory tract infections from poultry farms located in Mathura district of Uttar Pradesh, India (Table 1). The respiratory tract infections have been seen in chicken as they grow older in flocks (age group 4-6 weeks). Blood sample from each bird was collected aseptically in 5 mL capacity tube (BD Vacutainer® SST II Advance) for serum separation. In order to separate sera, the clot activator tubes containing blood samples were kept overnight at 4°C and then centrifuged at 2500 x g for 10 min. The separated sera were kept at -20°C for further use.

Serum plate agglutination test

The serum plate agglutination test was performed with coloured antigens of MG and MS (Soleil Biovac, Animal health, France) as per earlier described method (Shadmanesh and Mokhtari, 2013). The test was conducted by placing equal volume (25  $\mu$ L) of test serum and MG/MS coloured antigen on a grease free glass slide, mixed using micropipette tips and rotated clock wise and counter-clock wise direction. The presence of clear blue violet agglutinates (clumps) within two minutes was considered positive, whereas absence of agglutination was considered negative for avian mycoplasmosis. The MG and MS commercial test sera received from Soleil, BioVac Animal Health, France were used as positive and negative test controls to perform the test.

Indirect-Enzyme Linked Immunosorbent Assay

The indirect-Enzyme Linked Immunosorbent Assay (iELISA) was standardised as per the earlier described protocol (Muhammad et al., 2018), with some modifications (Yadav et al., 2021). In brief, 50 µL sonicated protein antigens of MG (70 μg/mL; NCBI accession no. KX759104.1) and MS (40 μg/mL; NCBI accession no. KY486506.1) field isolates, prepared in carbonate/ bicarbonate buffer (50 mM, pH 9.6), was used for coating the 96 wells microtitre plate and incubated overnight at 4°C. Next day, the plates were washed three times for a period of five minutes each with washing buffer [PBST (phosphate buffer saline {pH 7.2}, containing 0.05% Tween-20)], to remove the unadsorbed antigen. After that, 100 µL blocking agent (2% BSA in PBST) was added to each well and incubated for 1 hour at 37°C to block the residual binding sites in the plate. The plates were washed three times with washing buffer. Serial 10-fold dilutions of test sera (1:10 to 1:1280) were made and 50  $\mu$ L of dilution of each sample was added into wells of microtitre plate and incubated for 1 hour at 37°C. Plates were washed three times with washing buffer followed by addition of 50 μL of 1:10,000 diluted conjugate (Rabbit anti-chicken IgG HRP-Sigma, USA; PBST dilution) into each well. The plates were incubated for 1 hour at 37°C. After incubation and washing, 50 µL of substrate [OPD (Sigma, USA) with H<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub>] was added to each well and plates were incubated for 10 minutes for colour development (yellow to orange). The reaction was stopped by adding 50 µL of 4M H<sub>2</sub>SO<sub>4</sub> and optical density (OD) was measured at 492 nm in ELISA reader (Synergy™ 2, BioTek). The known positive and negative MG and MS commercial test sera received from Soleil, BioVac Animal Health, France was used to standardize the assay. The cross reactivity of sonicated MG and MS antigens was checked against each other and other commonly occurring poultry Mycoplasma species [M. gallinarum, M. gallinacium and Acholeplasma laidlawii) and found to be specific for MG and MS, respectively. The maximum optical density (OD) value in ELISA reading at 492 nm wavelength for known negative serum was considered as cut-off value. Test serum having OD value more than maximum OD value of known negative serum sample {cut-off value (amount of the analyte being tested, it varies in each ELISA plate reading)} and titre more than 1:10 was considered as positive for the respective organism (MG/MS) (Bansal et al., 2002).

#### Dot-ELISA

The Dot-ELISA was standardised as per the method described earlier (Alam et al., 2012), with some modifications (Yadav et al., 2021). The 2.0 µL sonicated protein antigens of MG (70 µg/mL; NCBI accession no. KX759104.1) and MS (40 µg/mL; NCBI accession no. KY486506.1), were used to develop Dot-ELISA. The 2 µL antigen of each MG and MS was spotted onto nitrocellulose membrane strips (6x75 mm, 0.45µ; Advanced Microdevices PVT. LTD.), and allowed to dry at 37°C for 10-15 minutes. The strips were rinsed briefly in washing buffer [PBST (phosphate buffer saline {pH 7.2}, containing 0.05% Tween-20)], and incubated overnight at 4°C in 3% BSA (PBST dilution) to block the residual binding sites. After that, the strips were rinsed three times for a period of five minutes each in washing buffer and then incubated with 1:20 diluted test sera in PBST for 1 hour at 37°C. After incubation, the strips were rinsed three times in washing buffer and further incubated for 30 minutes at 37°C with 1:5000 PBST dilution of rabbit anti-chicken IgG HRP conjugate (Sigma, USA). After that, the strips were thoroughly rinsed three times in washing buffer and then the substrate diaminobenzedine (50 mg DAB/100 ml of 50 mM Tris, pH 7.4 + 25  $\mu$ L of 30% H<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub>; Sigma, USA) was added to develop the coloured dots. The development of brown colored spot was indicative of a positive reaction. The test was standardised by using known positive and negative MG and MS commercial test sera received from Soleil, BioVac Animal Health, France. The cross reactivity of sonicated MG and MS antigens was checked against each other and other commonly occurring poultry Mycoplasma species [M. gallinarum, M. gallinacium and Acholeplasma laidlawii) and found to be specific for MG and MS.

#### Statistical analysis

The data obtained by all the three serological tests (SPAT, i-ELISA and Dot-ELISA) were statistically analysed using Epitools Epidemiological Calculators (Rogan and Gladen, 1978).

#### Results and discussion

A total of 68 serum samples from broiler chicken affected with respiratory tract infection were collected from poultry farms located in Mathura district of Uttar Pradesh, India and screened for the serodetection of avian mycoplasmas (MG and MS) infection using SPAT, i-ELISA and Dot-ELISA. The apparent prevalence of MG and MS using SPAT was found to be 36.76% (95% CI; 26.30-48.64) and 72.06% (95% CI; 60.44-81.32), respectively (Table 1; supplementary table 1). However, apparent seropositivity of MG and MS antibodies using i-ELISA was found to be 85.29% (95% CI; 75.0-91.81) and 80.88% (95% CI; 69.99-88.47), respectively. In Dot-ELISA, the apparent seropositivity of MG and MS antibodies were found to be 66.18% (95% CI; 54.34-76.29) and 77.94% (95% CI; 66.74-86.15), respectively. The relative diagnostic efficacy (relative sensitivity, specificity and kappa value) of SPAT and Dot-ELISA was measured in reference to i-ELISA (Table 2). Cohen's Kappa values between 0.10-0.20, 0.21-0.40, 0.41-0.60, 0.61-0.80 and 0.80-0.99 indicate slight agreement, fair agreement, moderate agreement, substantial agreement and near perfect agreement, respectively.

Avian respiratory tract infection, caused by pathogenic avian mycoplasmas (mainly MG and MS), adversely affects the poultry industry (Roussan et al., 2008; Sprygin et al., 2010). Early detection of these organisms in the poultry flock becomes important to initiate the effective control measures to prevent further spread of infection (Yadav et al., 2022). Isolation of the pathogen is considered to be the most confirmatory test for detection of avian mycoplasmas; however, this technique is laborious, time-consuming, expensive and faces over growth problem of secondary bacterial infection (Sprygin et al., 2010). Molecular tests are widely used for rapid and accurate detection of avian mycoplasmas (Wu et al., 2019; Yadav et al., 2024). However, it requires sophisticated laboratory facilities, skilled man power, and high cost involved in screening of samples for targeted pathogens; which hamper its wide application in resource poor laboratories, mostly in developing countries (Ahmed et al., 2015). Serological techniques could be useful in early diagnosis of infectious diseases by detection of specific antibodies for a particular pathogen, which helps to take necessary prophylactic measures to control the infection (Alam et al., 2012). In the present study, serum samples collected from broiler chicken flocks affected with respiratory tract infection were used for serodetection of MG and MS antibodies using SPAT, i-ELISA and Dot-ELISA, followed by measuring the relative diagnostic

**Table 1:** Statistical analysis of SPAT, i-ELISA and Dot-ELISA for serodiagnosis of *Mycoplasma gallisepticum* and *Mycoplasma synoviae* infection in broiler chicken

|                     | Diagnostic tests |               |                |               |               |               |  |  |
|---------------------|------------------|---------------|----------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|--|--|
| Variables           | SPAT             |               | i-EL           | ISA           | Dot-ELISA     |               |  |  |
|                     | MG               | MS            | MG             | MS            | MG            | MS            |  |  |
| Apparent prevalence | 36.76            | 72.06         | 85.29          | 80.88         | 66.18         | 77.94         |  |  |
| [% (95% CI)]        | (26.3-48.64)     | (60.44-8132)  | (75.0-91.81)   | (69.99-88.47) | (54.34-76.29) | (66.74-86.15) |  |  |
| True prevalence     | 40.19            | 79.84         | 90.71          | 89.76         | 73.23         | 86.45         |  |  |
| [% (95% CI)]        | (28.43-53.53)    | (66.78-90.25) | (83.15-102.04) | (77.52-98.28) | (59.93-84.59) | (73.87-95.68) |  |  |
| PPV                 | 0.9837           | 0.9972        | 0.9994         | 0.9987        | 0.996         | 0.9983        |  |  |
| NPV                 | 0.9365           | 0.7143        | 0.356          | 0.5305        | 0.7835        | 0.6081        |  |  |
| LR (+ve)            | 90               | 90            | 90             | 90            | 90            | 90            |  |  |
| LR (-ve)            | 0.101            | 0.101         | 0.101          | 0.101         | 0.101         | 0.101         |  |  |

efficacy of SPAT and Dot-ELISA in reference to i-ELISA.

SPAT- Serum plate agglutination test; i-ELISA-Indirect-enzyme linked immunosorbent assay; MG-Mycoplasma gallisepticum; MS- Mycoplasma synoviae; PPV- positive predictive value (proportion of individuals with a positive test result who actually have the disease); NPV- negative predictive value (proportion of individuals with a negative test result who actually free from the disease); LR- Likelihood ratio (LR (+ve)- indicates how much more likely a positive test result is in individual with the disease compared to those without it; LR (-ve)indicates how much less likely a positive test result is in individual with the disease compared to those without it. LR+ > 1 suggests the presence of disease is more likely with a positive result [sensitivity/(1-specificity]; LR- > 1 suggests the presence of disease is less likely with a negative result [(1-sensitivity)/specificity].

Standard plate agglutination test is a cheaper, rapid and sensitive serodiagnostic test for primary screening of avian mycoplasmas infection in poultry by detection of IgM antibodies (Wanasawaeng *et al.*, 2015; Tomar *et al.*, 2017). It can detect seroconversion a few days earlier than HI and ELISA. However, this test has several limitations such as, different sources of antigen may differ in sensitivity and specificity with the variations between batches, nonspecific reactions due to bad quality or freezing of the sera, properties of the antigen preparation,

and cross-reactions based on the antigenic relationship between MG, MS, and Mycoplasma imitans (Kleven, 1998; Feberwee et al., 2005). In the present study, through SPAT, the seropositivity of MG and MS antibodies was found to be 36.76% and 72.06%, respectively. Earlier studies from India reported lower seropositivity of MG (22.4%) and MS (18.3-51.1%) infection in chicken using SPAT (Sumitha and Sukumar, 2017; Tomar et al., 2017). Higher seropositivity of MG and MS in the present study may be due to all screened birds were affected with respiratory tract infections. Higher seropositivity of MG and MS in chicken was also reported in previous studies using SPAT. Aimeur et al. (2010) reported 43.3% seropositivity of MG in chicken at Eastern, Algeria. Heleili et al. (2012) reported 69.9% and 66.3% seropositivity of MG and MS in chicken at Batna commercial farms in Algeria. Shadmanesh and Mokhtari (2013) reported a very high prevalence of MG (85%) in native hens of Eghlid, Iran. Nouzha et al. (2013) reported 61.1% seropositivity of MG in chicken at Batna Governorate, Algeria. Amer et al. (2019) reported 35.0% and 87.5% seropositivity of MG and MS in chicken flock located in Dakahlia, Egypt. Shoaib et al. (2020) reported 45.9% and 40.4% seropositivity of MG and MS in chicken from the poultry farms located in the different regions of Rawalpindi, Pakistan. The differences in seropositivity of MG and MS in different studies may also be due to difference in health status of birds, season of studies and different geographical areas.

**Table 2:** Diagnostic efficacy of SPAT and Dot-ELISA in reference to i-ELISA for serodiagnosis of *Mycoplasma gallisepticum* and *Mycoplasma synoviae* infection in broiler chicken

| Diagnostic efficacy of test  | S                      | PAT                    | Dot-ELISA              |                        |  |
|--|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|--|
| SPAT vs i-ELISA (reference test)     Dot-ELISA vs i-ELISA (reference test) | MG                     | MS                     | MG                     | MS                     |  |
| Relative sensitivity [% (95% CI)]  | 43.10<br>(30.16-56.77) | 89.09<br>(77.75-95.89) | 77.59<br>(64.73-87.49) | 96.36<br>(87.47-99.56) |  |
| Relative specificity [% (95% CI)]  | 100<br>(69.15-100)     | 100<br>(75.29-100)     | 100<br>(69.15-100)     | 100<br>(75.29-100)     |  |
| Kappa value  | 0.1822                 | 0.7574                 | 0.2524                 | 0.9102                 |  |

Supplementary Table 1: Comparative analysis on SPAT, i-ELISA and Dot-ELISA for sero-diagnosis of *Mycoplasma gallisepticum* and *Mycoplasma synoviae* infection in broiler chicken

| Sr.              | Type of Sample              | Collection place   | ID given       | SP  |     | i-ELIS/       |              |          | ELISA |
|------------------|-----------------------------|--------------------|----------------|-----|-----|---------------|--------------|----------|-------|
| No.              |                             | ·                  |                | MG  | MS  | MG            | MS           | MG       | MS    |
| 1.               | Poultry serum               | Mathura            | 70134          | +   | +   | 1:80          | 1:40         | +        | +     |
| 2.<br>3.         | Poultry serum               | Mathura<br>Mathura | 70136<br>70137 | -   | +   | 1:40<br>1:10  | 1:40<br>1:10 | +        | +     |
| 4.               | Poultry serum Poultry serum | Mathura            | 70137          | -   | -   | 1:20          | N N          | <u>-</u> | -     |
| 5.               | Poultry serum               | Mathura            | 70130          | -   | -   | N N           | 1:20         |          | -     |
| 6.               | Poultry serum               | Mathura            | 7012           | +   | _   | 1:160         | 1:80         | +        | +     |
| 7.               | Poultry serum               | Mathura            | 7014           | -   | -   | 1:40          | 1:10         | -        | -     |
| 8.               | Poultry serum               | Mathura            | 7015           | +   | +   | 1:160         | 1:40         | +        | -     |
| 9.               | Poultry serum               | Mathura            | 7016           | +   | +   | 1:160         | 1:40         | +        | +     |
| 10.              | Poultry serum               | Mathura            | 7041           | +   | +   | 1:160         | 1:20         | +        | +     |
| 11.              | Poultry serum               | Mathura            | 7042           | -   | -   | 1:40          | N            | +        | -     |
| 12.              | Poultry serum               | Mathura            | 7044           | -   | -   | 1:40          | 1:10         | +        | -     |
| 13.              | Poultry serum               | Mathura            | 7045           | +   | +   | 1:160         | 1:80         | +        | +     |
| 14.              | Poultry serum               | Mathura            | 7047           | -   | -   | 1:40          | 1:10         | +        | -     |
| 15.              | Poultry serum               | Mathura            | 7048           | +   | +   | 1:160         | 1:20         | +        | +     |
| 16.              | Poultry serum               | Mathura            | 7071           | -   | -   | 1:40          | 1:10         | +        | -     |
| 17.              | Poultry serum               | Mathura            | 7074           | -   | -   | 1:40          | N            | +        | -     |
| 18.              | Poultry serum               | Mathura            | 7079           | -   | +   | 1:40          | 1:20         | +        | +     |
| 19.<br>20.       | Poultry serum               | Mathura<br>Mathura | 7101<br>7103   | +   | +   | 1:160<br>1:80 | 1:20<br>1:40 | +        | +     |
| 21.              | Poultry serum Poultry serum | Mathura            | 7105           | + + | +   | 1:80          | 1:10         | + +      | +     |
| 22.              | Poultry serum               | Mathura            | 7105           | -   | +   | 1:80          | 1:80         | + +      | +     |
| 23.              | Poultry serum               | Mathura            | 7100           | +   | +   | 1:80          | 1:80         | +        | +     |
| 24.              | Poultry serum               | Mathura            | 7108           | +   | +   | 1:80          | 1:40         | +        | +     |
| 25.              | Poultry serum               | Mathura            | 7138           | +   | +   | 1:160         | 1:80         | +        | +     |
| 26.              | Poultry serum               | Mathura            | 7140           | +   | +   | 1:160         | 1:80         | +        | +     |
| 27.              | Poultry serum               | Mathura            | 7163           | -   | +   | 1:40          | 1:40         | +        | +     |
| 28.              | Poultry serum               | Mathura            | 7164           | -   | +   | 1:20          | 1:80         | -        | +     |
| 29.              | Poultry serum               | Mathura            | 7165           | -   | +   | 1:40          | 1:80         | +        | +     |
| 30.              | Poultry serum               | Mathura            | 7166           | +   | +   | 1:160         | 1:40         | -        | +     |
| 31.              | Poultry serum               | Mathura            | 7168           | -   | +   | 1:40          | 1:80         | +        | +     |
| 32.              | Poultry serum               | Mathura            | 7193           | -   | +   | 1:10          | 1:80         | -        | +     |
| 33.              | Poultry serum               | Mathura            | 7194           | +   | +   | 1:160         | 1:160        | +        | +     |
| 34.              | Poultry serum               | Mathura            | 7195           | +   | +   | 1:80          | 1:80         | +        | +     |
| 35.              | Poultry serum               | Mathura            | 7196           | -   | -   | 1:10          | 1:10         | -        | -     |
| 36.              | Poultry serum               | Mathura            | 7199           | -   | +   | 1:40          | 1:80         | +        | +     |
| 37.<br>38.       | Poultry serum               | Mathura            | 7200<br>7221   | -   | +   | 1:20<br>1:40  | 1:40<br>1:80 | +        | +     |
| 39.              | Poultry serum Poultry serum | Mathura<br>Mathura | 7223           | +   | + + | 1:160         | 1:80         |          | +     |
| 40.              | Poultry serum               | Mathura            | 7224           | -   | +   | 1:40          | 1:40         | +        | +     |
| 41.              | Poultry serum               | Mathura            | 7225           | -   | +   | 1:20          | 1:40         | -        | +     |
| 42.              | Poultry serum               | Mathura            | 7226           | -   | +   | 1:10          | 1:40         | _        | +     |
| 43.              | Poultry serum               | Mathura            | 7228           | -   | +   | 1:20          | 1:80         | -        | +     |
| 44.              | Poultry serum               | Mathura            | 7252           | -   | +   | N             | 1:40         | -        | +     |
| 45.              | Poultry serum               | Mathura            | 7253           | -   | +   | 1:10          | 1:20         | -        | +     |
| 46.              | Poultry serum               | Mathura            | 7257           | -   | +   | 1:20          | 1:80         | -        | +     |
| 47.              | Poultry serum               | Mathura            | 7258           | +   | +   | 1:160         | 1:80         | -        | +     |
| 48.              | Poultry serum               | Mathura            | 7260           | -   | +   | 1:20          | 1:80         | +        | +     |
| 49.              | Poultry serum               | Mathura            | 7281           | -   | +   | 1:40          | 1:40         | -        | +     |
| 50.              | Poultry serum               | Mathura            | 7282           | -   | +   | 1:20          | 1:80         | -        | +     |
| 51.              | Poultry serum               | Mathura            | 7284           | -   | +   | 1:40          | 1:40         | +        | +     |
| 52.<br>53.       | Poultry serum Poultry serum | Mathura<br>Mathura | 7287<br>7288   | +   | +   | 1:80<br>1:80  | 1:40<br>1:20 | +        | +     |
| 54.              | Poultry serum Poultry serum | Mathura<br>Mathura | 7288           | +   | -   | 1:10          | 1:20         | +        | +     |
| 5 <del>4</del> . | Poultry serum               | Mathura            | 7369           | +   | -   | 1:10          | 1:10         | +        | +     |
| 56.              | Poultry serum               | Mathura            | 7312           | -   | -   | 1:20          | 1:20         | +        | +     |
| 57.              | Poultry serum               | Mathura            | 7312           | +   | +   | 1:80          | 1:40         | +        | +     |
| 58.              | Poultry serum               | Mathura            | 7314           | +   | +   | 1:80          | 1:80         | +        | +     |
| 59.              | Poultry serum               | Mathura            | 7315           | +   | +   | 1:80          | 1:40         | +        | +     |
| 60.              | Poultry serum               | Mathura            | 7318           | -   | -   | 1:10          | 1:20         | -        | +     |
| 61.              | Poultry serum               | Mathura            | 7320           | -   | -   | 1:40          | 1:10         | +        | -     |
| 62.              | Poultry serum               | Mathura            | 7345           | -   | +   | 1:40          | 1:160        | +        | +     |
| 63.              | Poultry serum               | Mathura            | 7347           | -   | +   | 1:20          | 1:40         | +        | +     |
| 64.              | Poultry serum               | Mathura            | 7375           | -   | +   | 1:40          | 1:40         | +        | +     |
| 65.              | Poultry serum               | Mathura            | 7377           | -   | +   | 1:40          | 1:40         | +        | +     |
| 66.              | Poultry serum               | Mathura            | 7378           | -   | +   | 1:40          | 1:40         | +        | +     |
| 67.              | Poultry serum               | Mathura            | 7379           | -   | +   | 1:20          | 1:40         | -        | +     |
|                  | Poultry serum               | Mathura            | 7380           | -   | -   | 1:10          | N            | -        | -     |
| 68.              | i duiti y Serum             | Matridia           | 7 000          |     |     | 1.10          | - ' '        |          |       |

Dot-ELISA is a simple, cheaper and reliable solid-phase immunoassay used for sero detection of important poultry diseases (Manoharan et al., 2004; He et al., 2010; Alam et al., 2012; Khanal et al., 2018). The advantage of Dot-ELISA is that single strip can be used for serodetection of more than one poultry pathogens at a time, hence considered to be more cost effective and reproducible as compare to liquid ELISA. However, Dot-ELISA is slightly less sensitive to ELISA, because more antibodies are required to give a visible reaction, but it is very specific, highly sensitive, less time-consuming, with fewer false positive results (Alam et al., 2012). It detects antibodies earlier than other more specific serological test i.e., haemagglutination inhibition (HI), and hence could be used directly at the farm level as an initial screening test for the detection of avian Mycoplasma infection (Folitse et al., 1998). The seropositivity of MG and MS antibodies in the present study using Dot-ELISA were found to be 66.18% and 77.94%, respectively. Earlier studies reported 54.7% and 58.7% seropositivity of MG using Dot-ELISA from Pakistan (Alam et al., 2012) and Nepal (Khanal et al., 2018), respectively, and 41.83% and 53.92% seropositivity of MG and MS antibodies, respectively from India (Yadav et al., 2021). The relative diagnostic sensitivity of the developed Dot-ELISA for the detection of MG and MS antibodies was found to be 77.59% and 96.36%; while, relative diagnostic specificity for the detection of MG and MS antibodies was found to be 100%. The earlier study from India also reported the relative diagnostic sensitivity of the developed DOT blot assay for the detection of MG and MS antibodies as 69.48% and 82.01%; while, relative diagnostic specificity was 86.18% and 91.45%, respectively as compare to i-ELISA (Yadav et al., 2021). Higher seropositivity of MG and MS antibodies in the present study using Dot-ELISA might be attributable to all the birds were clinically affected with respiratory tract infections and different geographical area of study.

ELISA is considered to be more sensitive and specific as compared to other serological tests for detection of avian mycoplasmas infection (Wanasawaeng et al., 2015; Muhammad et al., 2018). It has several widely accepted advantages, such as, it is rapid, capable of being used to screen large numbers of sera and use technology as microtiter plate readers that are now in wide-spread use in both developing and developed countries (Miao et al., 2000). The present study reported seropositivity of MG and MS antibodies in collected sera using i-ELISA as 85.29% and 80.88%, respectively. Earlier studies carried out in different regions of India reported 16.3-62.1% (Sumitha et al., 2015; Udhayavel et al., 2016; Rajkumar et al., 2018) and 52.1-100% (Sumitha et al., 2015; Sumitha and Sukumar, 2018; Rajkumar et al., 2018), seropositivity of MG and MS, respectively using ELISA. However, at global level, 46.5-67.4% (Reda and Abd El-Samie, 2012; Sun et al., 2014; Abbas et al., 2018) and 46.1-100% (Nassik et al., 2014; Hong, 2018) seropositivity of MG and MS, respectively were reported using ELISA. The similar

type of i-ELISA used for screening of serum samples in the present study was earlier validated on testing 566 serum samples of chickens collected from commercial poultry farms of Pakistan and reported seropositivity of 72% in clinically affected birds for the detection of MG antibodies (Muhammad *et al.*, 2018). Similarly, the assay was earlier validated on testing 306 serum samples of chickens collected from different parts of Haryana, India and reported seropositivity of 50.32% and 61.76% for the detection of MG and MS antibodies, respectively (Yadav *et al.*, 2021). The higher seropositivity of MG and MS in the present study might be attributable to all the birds were clinically affected with respiratory tract infections and different geographical area of study.

#### Conclusions

In the present study, the MG and MS infections in broiler chicken affected with respiratory tract infection was evaluated using SPAT, i-ELISA and Dot-ELISA, followed by measuring the relative diagnostic efficacy (relative sensitivity, specificity and kappa value) of SPAT and Dot-ELISA in reference to i-ELISA. The present study delineates the seropositivity of MG and MS infections in broiler chicken flock of studied area. On screening the serum samples, higher seropositivity of avian mycoplasmas was reported using i-ELISA, as compared to SPAT and Dot-ELISA indicating its higher sensitivity. The study suggests that ELISA based serological tests should be included along with SPAT for accurate detection of avian mycoplasmas in poultry flocks affected with respiratory tract infection.

#### **Funding**

The research was supported from the grant (F. No. 9(2)/2019-ES-HRD) received under the Emeritus Scientist scheme on avian mycoplasmosis to Yarvendra Singh by Indian Council of Agricultural Research, New Delhi, India.

### **Declaration of Competing Interest**

The authors have declared that there is no conflict of interest.

#### **Data Availability**

All the data generated are included in the manuscript and tables.

# **Acknowledgements**

The authors thank Lala Lajpat Rai University of Veterinary and Animal Sciences, Hisar administration for providing the necessary facilities to carry out the research work.

## References

Abbas, N., Suleman, M., Khan, N., Ijaz, A., Rauf, M. and ur Rahman, S. 2018. Prevalence of *Mycoplasma* 

- gallisepticum in poultry and wild life birds suspected of chronic respiratory disease in northern Pakistan. *Pak. J. Zool.* **50**(3): 1071-1077.
- Ahmed, S.S., Alp, E., Ulu-Kilic, A. and Doganay, M. 2015. Establishing molecular microbiology facilities in developing countries. *J. Infect. Public Hlth.* **8**(6): 513–525.
- Aimeur, R., Bouaziz, O., Kabouia, R. and Bererhi, E.H. 2010. Prevalence of *Mycoplasma gallisepticum* and *Mycoplasma synoviae* in poultry farms in Eastern Algeria. *Rev Med Vet.* **161**(3): 141-145.
- Alam, J., Muhammad, F., Siddiqui, M.U., Khan, S.A., Rehmani, S. and Ahmad, A. 2012. Dot ELISA for Newcastle disease, infectious Bursal disease and mycoplasmosis. *Pak. J. Zool.* 44 (5): 1301–1305.
- Amer, M.M., Mekky, H.M. and Fedawy, H.S. 2019. Molecular identification of *Mycoplasma synoviae* from breeder chicken flock showing arthritis in Egypt. *Vet. World.* **12**(4): 535-541.
- Bansal, V.K., Garg, D.N. and Singh, Y. 2002. Seroprevalence of *M. bovoculi* by ELISA in conjunctivitis affected and healthy bovines. *Haryana Vet.* **41**: 48–51.
- Bolha, L., Benčina, D., Cizelj, I., Oven, I., Slavec, B., Rojs, O.Z. and Narat, M. 2013. Effect of *Mycoplasma synoviae* and lentogenic Newcastle disease virus coinfection on cytokine and chemokine gene expression in chicken embryos. *Poult. Sci.* 92(12): 3134-3143.
- Feberwee, A., de Wit, S. and Dijkman, R. 2022. Clinical expression, epidemiology, and monitoring of *Mycoplasma gallisepticum* and *Mycoplasma synoviae*: an update. *Avian Pathol.* **51**(1): 2-18.
- Feberwee, A., Mekkes, D.R., De Wit, J.J., Hartman, E.G. and Pijpers, A. 2005. Comparison of culture, PCR, and different serologic tests for detection of *Mycoplasma gallisepticum* and *Mycoplasma synoviae* infections. *Avian Dis.* **49**(2): 260-268.
- Folitse, R., Halvorson, D.A. and Sivanandan, V. 1998. A dot immunoblotting assay (dot blot ELISA) for early detection of Newcastle disease antibodies in chickens. *Avian Dis.* **42**: 14-19.
- Hagan, J.C., Ashton, N.J., Bradbury, J.M. and Morgan, K.L. 2004. Evaluation of an egg yolk enzyme-linked immunosorbent assay antibody test and its use to assess the prevalence of Mycoplasma synoviae in UK laying hens. *Avian Pathol.* **33**(1): 91-95.
- He, F., Soejoedono, R.D., Murtini, S., Goutama, M. and

- Kwang, J. 2010. Complementary monoclonal antibody-based dot ELISA for universal detection of H5 avian influenza virus. *BMC Microbiol.* **10**: 330.
- Heleili, N., Ayachi, A., Mamache, B. and Chelihi, A.J. 2012. Seroprevalence of *Mycoplasma synoviae* and *Mycoplasma gallisepticum* at Batna commercial poultry farms in Algeria. *Vet World*. **5**(12): 709–712.
- Hong, N.N. 2018. Serosurvey for infections with poultry *Mycoplasma gallisepticum* and *Mycoplasma synoviae* in Guizhou Province, southwestern China. *Res. J. Poult. Sci.* **11**: 1–4.
- Khanal, D.R., Ranjit, E., Adhikari, S.K., Ghemosu, B., Prajapati, M. and Shrestha, S.P., 2018. Seroprevalence of mycoplasmosis in poultry of Bhaktapur. Int. J. Appl. Sci. Biotechnol. 6(1): 23-26.
- Kleven, S. 1990. Summary of discussions of avian mycoplasma team international research program on comparative mycoplasmology Babolna, Hungary October 16–20, 1989. Avian Pathol. 19 (4): 795–800.
- Kleven, S.H. 1998. Mycoplasmosis. In: Swayne, D.E., John, R., Jackwood, M.W., Pearson, J.E., Reed, W.M. (Eds.), A Laboratory Manual for the Isolation and Identification of Avian Pathogens, 4th edn. University of Pennsylvania, New Bolton Center, Kennett Square, PA, p. 100105.
- Kleven, S.H. 2008. Control of avian mycoplasma infections in commercial poultry. *Avian Dis.* **52**(3): 367–374.
- Liu, T., Garcia, M., Levisohn, S., Yogev, D. and Kleven, S.H., 2001. Molecular variability of the adhesin-encoding GenepvpA among *Mycoplasma gallisepticum* strains and its application in diagnosis. *J. Clin. Microbiol.* **39**(5): 1882–1888.
- Liu, Y., You, G., Shi, J., Gao, L., Li, X., Cao, H., Wang, Y. and Zheng, S.J. 2025. Indirect ELISA developed to detect antibodies against *Mycoplasma synoviae* P50 protein via immunoproteomic screening. *Appl. Microbiol. Biotechnol.* **109**(1): 1-13.
- Manoharan, S., Parthiban, M., Prabhakar, T.G., Ravikumar, G., Koteeswaran, A., Chandran, N.D.J. and Rajavelu, G. 2004. Rapid serological profiling by an immunocomb-based dot-enzyme-linked immunosorbent test for three major poultry diseases. *Vet. Res. Commun.* **28**: 339-346.
- Mardassi, B.B.A., Béjaoui, A., Oussaeif, L., Mlik, B. and Amouna, F. 2008. A recombinant antigenbased ELISA for the simultaneous differential serodiagnosis of *Mycoplasma gallisepticum*,

- Mycoplasma synoviae, and Mycoplasma meleagridis infections. Avian Dis. **52**(2): 214-221.
- Miao, D., Zhang, P., Gong, Y., Yamaguchi, T., Iritani, Y. and Blackall, P.J. 2000. The development and application of a blocking ELISA kit for the diagnosis of infectious coryza. *Avian Pathol.* **29**: 219-225.
- Muhammad, F., Alam, J., Hussain, J., Fareed, S.K., Zafar, U., Khan, S.A. and Ahmad, A., 2018. Development of ELISA and its comparison with other diagnostic tests for avian mycoplasmosis. *Int. J. Biol. Biotechnol.* **15**(1): 39–45.
- Nascimento, E.R., Pereira, V.L., Nascimento, M.G. and Barreto, M.L. 2005. Avian mycoplasmosis update. *Braz. J. Poult. Sci.* **7**(1): 1–9.
- Nassik, S., Aboukhalid, R., Azzam, F., Rahmatallah, N., Lahlou-Amine, I., Fassi-Fihri, O. and El Houadfi M. 2014. Detection of *Mycoplasma synoviae* infection in broiler breeder farms of Morocco using serological assays and real time PCR. *Life Sci. J.* 8:815–821.
- Nouzha, H., Ammar, A., Bakir, M. and Ahmed, K.L. 2013. Comparison of three diagnostics methods of *Mycoplasma gallisepticum* in Batna Governorate (Algeria). *J. Vet. Advances.* **3**: 125-129.
- Rajkumar, S., Reddy, M.R. and Somvanshi, R., 2018.

  Molecular prevalence and seroprevalence of 
  Mycoplasma gallisepticum and M. synoviae in 
  Indian poultry flcks. J. Anim. Res. 8 (1): 15–19.
- Reda, L.M. and Abd El-Samie, L.K. 2012. Some studies on the diagnosis of *Mycoplasma gallisepticum* in chicken. *Nat. Sci.* **10**(12): 247–251.
- Rogan, W.J. and Gladen, B. 1978. Estimating prevalence from the results of a screening test. *Am. J. Epidemiol.* **107**: 71-76.
- Roussan, D.A., Haddad, R. and Khawaldeh, G. 2008. Molecular survey of avian respiratory pathogens in commercial broiler chicken flocks with respiratory diseases in Jordan. *Poult. Sci.* **87**(3): 444–448.
- Shadmanesh, A. and Mokhtari, M.M. 2013. Serological investigation of five diseases; Influenza, Newcastle disease, Salmonella, *Mycoplasma gallisepticum* and *Mycoplasma synoviae* in native hens of Eghlid, Iran. *Vet. World* **6**(3): 126-130.
- Shoaib, M., Riaz, A., Yousaf, A., Zafar, M.A., Kamran, M., Amir, R.M. and Malik, A.M. 2020. Sero-prevalence and associated risk factors of *Mycoplasma gallisepticum*, *Mycoplasma synoviae* and *Salmonella pullorum/gallinarium* in poultry. *Pak. Vet. J.* **40**(02): 253-256.

- Sprygin, A.V., Andreychuk, D.B., Kolotilov, A.N., Volkov, M.S., Runina, I.A., Mudrak, N. S., Borisov, A.V., Irza, V.N., Drygin, V.V. and Perevozchikova, N.A. 2010. Development of a duplex real-time TaqMan PCR assay with an internal control for the detection of *Mycoplasma gallisepticum* and *Mycoplasma synoviae* in clinical samples from commercial and backyard poultry. *Avian Pathol.* **39**(2): 99–109.
- Sumitha, P. and Sukumar, K. 2017. Development of rapid serum plate agglutination test (rspa) for screening of *Mycoplasma Synoviae* antibodies using Namakkal regional isolate. *Indian J. Comp. Microbiol. Immunol. Infect. Dis.* **38**(1): 29–33.
- Sumitha, P. and Sukumar, K. 2018. Comparative evaluation of diagnostic assays with clinical signs for detection of *Mycoplasma synoviae* infection in commercial layer chicken. *Indian J. Comp. Microbiol. Immunol. Infect. Dis.* **39**(1): 7–11.
- Sumitha, P., Moorthy, M., Sukumar, K., Mani, K. and Eswaran, M.A.2015. Prevalence of *Ornithobacterium rhinotracheale*, *Mycoplasma gallisepticum* and *Mycoplasma synoviae* antibodies in layers. *Indian Vet. J.* **92**: 78–79.
- Sun, Y., Lin, L., Chen, Z., Wu, L., Xiong, Z. and Li, X. 2014. Serology study of *Mycoplasma gallisepticum* in broiler chickens in Chongqing. *J. Anim. Vet. Adv.* 13(1): 5–8.
- Tomar, P., Singh, Y., Kundu, P., Narang, G. and Rani, N. 2017. Seroprevalence of *Mycoplasma gallisepticum* and *Mycoplasma synoviae* antibodies by rapid plate agglutination test in broiler chicken flcks of Haryana. *Int. J. Adv. Biol. Res.* **7**: 757–760.
- Udhayavel, S., Murthy, T.R., Gowthaman, V., Senthilvel, K. and Sureshkumar, G. 2016. Detection of sub clinical infection of *Mycoplasma gallisepticum* in commercial chicken by indirect ELISA. *Adv. Anim. Vet. Sci.* **4**(8): 438–440.
- Umar, S., Munir, M.T., Ur-Rehman, Z., Subhan, S., Azam, T. and Shah, M.A. 2017. Mycoplasmosis in poultry: update on diagnosis and preventive measures. *Worlds Poult. Sci. J.* **73**(1): 1-12.
- Wanasawaeng, W., Chaichote, S. and Chansiripornchai, N. 2015. Development of ELISA and serum plate agglutination for detecting antibodies of *Mycoplasma gallisepticum* using strain of Thai isolate. *Thai J. Vet. Med.* **45**(4): 499-507.
- Wu, Q., Xu, X., Chen, Q., Zuo, K., Zhou, Y., Zhang, Z., Kan, Y., Yao, L., Ji, J., Bi, Y. and Xie, Q. 2019. Rapid and visible detection of *Mycoplasma synoviae* using a novel polymerase spiral reaction assay. *Poult. Sci.* 98(11): 5355–5360.

ı et al. 50

- Yadav, J.P., Batra, K., Singh, Y. and Singh, M. 2021.
  Comparative evaluation of indirect-ELISA and DOT blot assay for serodetection of *Mycoplasma gallisepticum* and *Mycoplasma synoviae* antibodies in poultry. *J. Microbiol. Methods.* **189**: 106317.
- Yadav, J.P., Batra, K., Singh, Y., Khurana, S.K. and Jindal, N. 2024. Comparative study on conventional and real-time PCR assays for rapid and specific detection of *Mycoplasma gallisepticum* infection in poultry. *The Microbe* **3**: 100066.
- Yadav, J.P., Singh, Y., Batra, K., Khurana, S.K., Mahajan, N.K. and Jindal, N. 2023. Molecular detection of respiratory avian mycoplasmosis associated bacterial and viral concurrent infections in the poultry flocks. *Anim. Biotechnol.* 34(4): 1474-1482.
- Yadav, J.P., Singh, Y., Batra, K., Kumar, R., Mahajan, N.K. and Jindal, N. 2025. Isolation, molecular characterization and phylogenetic analysis of *Mycoplasma gallisepticum* and *Mycoplasma synoviae* strains recovered from commercial broiler chicken flocks affected with respiratory tract infections. *The Microbe* 8: 100485.

- Yadav, J.P., Tomar, P., Singh, Y. and Khurana, S.K. 2022. Insights on *Mycoplasma gallisepticum* and *Mycoplasma synoviae* infection in poultry: a systematic review. *Anim. Biotechnol.* **33**(7): 1711-1720.
- Zhang, F., Bao, S., Yu, S., Cheng, J., Tan, L., Qiu, X., Song, C., Dai, Y., Fei, R. and Ding, C. 2015. Development of a loop-mediated isothermal amplification targeting a gene within the pyruvate dehydrogenase complex, the pdhA gene, for rapid detection of Mycoplasma gallisepticum. J. Vet. Diagn. Investig. 27(3): 260–267.