

Seropositivity of Main Vector-Borne Pathogens in Dogs Across Europe

Guadalupe Miró (✉ gmiro@ucm.es)

Universidad Complutense de Madrid Facultad de Veterinaria

Ian Wright

Veterinary Practitioner

Helen Michael

IDEXX Laboratories Inc

Wade Burton

IDEXX Laboratories Inc

Evan Hegarty

IDEXX Laboratories Inc

Jaume Rodón

IDEXX Laboratories Inc

Jesse Buch

IDEXX Laboratories Inc

Niko Pantchev

IDEXX Laboratories Inc

Georg von Samson-Himmelstjerna

Freie Universität Berlin

Research Article

Keywords: Leishmania, Dirofilaria immitis, Anaplasma, Ehrlichia, Borrelia burgdorferi, Dogs, Europe, Seropositivity

Posted Date: December 6th, 2021

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.21203/rs.3.rs-1135277/v1>

License:  This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.

[Read Full License](#)

Abstract

Introduction: Canine Vector-borne disease (CVBD) has been an area of increasing interest in Europe over the last few decades, and there have been changes in the prevalence and distribution of many of these diseases. Monitoring CVBD infections in Europe is often done by individual countries, but aggregated data for the European countries are helpful to understand the distribution of CVBDs.

Methods: We used an extensive retrospective database of results from point-of-care rapid enzyme-linked immunosorbent assay (ELISA) tests on dogs across Europe to identify distribution and seropositivity in animals tested for selected CVBDs (*Anaplasma* spp., *Ehrlichia* spp., *Borrelia burgdorferi*, *Leishmania* spp., and *Dirofilaria immitis*) from 2016 through 2020. Geographic distribution of positive tests and relative percent positive values were mapped by the Nomenclature of Territorial Units for Statistics classification for regions with sufficient test results for reporting.

Results: A total of 404,617 samples corresponding with 1,134,648 canine results were available from dogs tested in 35 countries over the 5-year study period. Over this period the number of test results per year increased whereas test positivity decreased. *Leishmania* spp. had the largest increase in total test results from 25,000 results in 2016 to over 60,000 results in 2020. Test positivity for *Leishmania* spp. fell from 13.9% in 2016 to 9.4% in 2020. Test positivity fell for *Anaplasma* spp. (7.3% to 5.3%), *Ehrlichia* spp. (4.3% to 3.4%), and *Borrelia burgdorferi* (3.3% to 2.4%). *D. immitis* test positivity trended down with a high of 2.7% in 2016 and low of 1.8% in 2018. *Leishmania* spp. test positivity was highest in endemic areas and in several non-endemic countries with low numbers of test results. Co-positivity rates were significantly higher than expected for all pathogen test positive pairs except for *Ehrlichia* spp. with *Borrelia burgdorferi* and *D. immitis* with *Borrelia burgdorferi*.

Conclusions: This study represents the largest data set on CVBD seropositivity in Europe to date. The increase in the number of test results and decreasing test positivity over the study period may reflect changes in testing behavior and increased screening of healthy animals. The Europe-wide mapping of CVBD provides expected test-positivity that can help inform veterinarians' decisions on screening and improve prevention and identification of these important, sometimes zoonotic, diseases.

Background

Canine Vector-borne disease (CVBD) is an area of increasing interest in Europe over the last few decades, and there have been changes in the prevalence and distribution of many of these diseases [1–6]. Many CVBDs, (including *Borrelia burgdorferi* complex, *Anaplasma phagocytophilum* and *Anaplasma platys*, *Ehrlichia canis* and *Ehrlichia ewingii*, *Babesia canis* and *Babesia vogeli*, *Dirofilaria immitis* and *Dirofilaria repens*, and *Leishmania infantum*) can infect both humans and dogs. For *L. infantum* and *Dirofilaria* spp, dogs are an essential reservoir species for the parasites in endemic areas.

The distribution of CVBDs across Europe has also shifted over recent decades. Changes to the climate and land use have affected the ranges and population size of many insect and tick vectors, and wildlife

reservoirs (e.g., rodents, tick transport hosts, migratory birds, wolves, jackals, foxes, wildcats, etc.). Additionally, tourism, travel with dogs, and importation of dogs from endemic areas have contributed to introduction of CVBDs to new areas [7, 8]. The range for *Ixodes ricinus*, the primary European tick vector for *Borrelia burgdorferi*, *Anaplasma* spp., and the tick-borne encephalitis virus, has expanded to northern regions and to higher elevations resulting in increased infections in those areas [9–13]. *Dermacentor reticulatus* i.e., the vector for *Babesia canis* in Europe, is also spreading [13, 14] and this has led to increasing cases of autochthonous *B. canis* infections in previously non-endemic geographical regions [15]. Another example is *Rhipicephalus sanguineus* (vector for *Ehrlichia canis*, *Hepatozoon canis* and presumably *Anaplasma platys* among others), which is being introduced to non-endemic countries (i.e. Germany and Poland) and can establish (at least temporarily) free-land populations and inside buildings all year round [13, 16, 17]. Increased *D. immitis* infections have been caused by range expansion of both native mosquitos and imported *Aedes* species, climatic changes, and importation of dogs from endemic areas [4, 5, 7, 8, 18]. Canine *L. infantum* infections in northern Europe are thus far almost all related to the importation of infected animals from, or travel to, endemic areas. Uncommon autochthonous non-vector spread has been reported in non-endemic areas, including Germany, United Kingdom, Hungary, and Finland. Vertical transmission or horizontal transmission through blood transfusion or mating are the most common causes for autochthonous infections in non-endemic areas [1, 3, 8, 19, 20], but rare cases of unexplained horizontal transmission have been reported [21]. Recently, *Phlebotomus* genus sand flies have been identified in regions of northern Europe where they had not previously been found and could potentially result in local transmission of *Leishmania* parasites under the right conditions [22–24] but the competence of these vectors for transmitting *L. infantum* is still questionable [25].

Monitoring CVBD infections in Europe is often done on a regional level in individual countries, but aggregated data for the European countries can be helpful in understanding the distribution of CVBDs on a broader scale. We used an extensive retrospective database of results from point-of-care rapid enzyme-linked immunosorbent assay (ELISA) tests on dogs across Europe to identify distribution and seropositivity in animals tested for selected VBDs from 2016 through 2020.

Methods

Source of data

Results from 2016-2020 were generated using point-of-care test kits (IDEXX Laboratories, Inc.) and included: SNAP® 4Dx® Plus Test kit, an in-clinic enzyme-linked immunosorbent assay (ELISA) for detection of *D. immitis* antigen and canine antibodies to *B. burgdorferi*, *Ehrlichia* spp. (*E. canis*, *E. ewingii*), and *Anaplasma* spp. (*A. phagocytophilum* and *A. platys*); SNAP® HW RT Test kit, an in-clinic ELISA for the detection of *D. immitis* antigen; SNAP® Leishmania Test kit, an in-clinic ELISA for the detection of antibodies to *L. infantum*. These SNAP® tests can be run on serum, plasma or whole blood. The sample used in individual patients was not captured. The performance of each test has been reported previously [26–29]. Results from veterinary clinics on the European continent and from island territories owned by European countries were included in the analysis.

It is important to note that the utilized VlsE C6 peptide (C6) for *B. burgdorferi* antibodies does not cross-react with other *Borrelia* spp. or Lyme vaccination (regardless of the vaccine type) [13]. Test results were collated directly from veterinary practices testing patients in their clinic (SNAP® Heartworm RT Test, SNAP® Leishmania Test and SNAP® 4Dx® Plus Test). Test results were stored in IDEXX VetLab® Instrumentation and Software and were entered automatically by the IDEXX SnapShot Dx® Instrument or SNAP Pro® Analyzer or manually by clinic staff. All sample results were obtained from practicing veterinarians in the course of their regular care of the dogs with the consent of the animal owner. To ensure data privacy, results were collected without owner information or canine patient identification and thus, repeat testing events or translocated dogs (i.e. dogs with a travel history to another region) cannot be identified or omitted. Similarly, no data were collected about the reason for CVBD testing or about vaccination or prophylaxis usage.

Data Analysis

Data analysis and mapping was done using R version 4.0.4 and various R packages [30].”

Test positive percentages are reported with 95% confidence intervals calculated using the Binomial Exact method. Specific tests for differences were not conducted because the intention of this study was to describe pathogen test positivity, not to test hypotheses about differences in test positivity. Positive percentages were presented in tables at country level only if the country had at least 135 results. This threshold was set to ensure precision in estimates.

Co-positivity percentages were estimated for each pair of infections as the percentage of samples that tested positive for multiple pathogens out of all samples that were tested for the respective pathogens. A series of Chi-square tests of independence were conducted to determine if the percentage of co-positives was higher than expected due to chance alone. P-values from the 10 pairwise comparisons were adjusted for multiple comparisons using the Holm-Bonferroni method.

Generation of regional test positivity maps

Mapping of test positivity was done using the Nomenclature of Territorial Units for Statistics (NUTS) classification for Europe. NUTS classifications have different levels of division within each European country [31]. NUTS 0 represents the boundaries of the country. NUTS 1 represents large regions within a country. NUTS 1 regions are further subdivided into NUTS 2 level regions and then further subdivided into NUTS 3. Each result was assigned to its NUTS 0 (country-level) through NUTS 3 units for analysis.

The preference was to display data at the smallest appropriate NUTS level for each region. To balance the desire to provide meaningful granular regional data with unequal distribution of data across different regions, the following system was used to determine which NUTS level would be displayed. First, a minimum of 3 clinics with at least 1 result each was required within each NUTS region to qualify for inclusion in the display at that NUTS level. This restriction was included to ensure privacy of the clinics. Second, at least 50% of the smaller NUTS regions within an individual larger NUTS region had to qualify for display (at least 3 clinics and at least 135 total results for the region) at the smaller NUTS region level.

If less than 50% of the smaller regions qualified for display, the corresponding next larger region was evaluated for inclusion. Mapping of *Leishmania* spp. positives in France and Germany was conducted at NUTS level 1, even though fewer than 50% of these regions qualified for display. This was done because most tests in these countries were from a few geographical areas, and very few tests were from outside of these areas. To present these limited data at the NUTS level 0 (country-level) was considered to be misrepresentative.

For regions that qualified for inclusion, test positivity rate over the 5-year study period was displayed on a gradient from green (lower test positivity) to red (higher test positivity). Regions that did not qualify for inclusion are colored pale gray. NUTS classification is not available in Russia. Russia was not included in the maps due to the low number of samples, which were not considered representative of CVBD. The Canary Islands of Spain were included in the map for *D. immitis* because they have been previously found to be hyperendemic for these infection (prevalence of 58%) since 1995 with an important decrease in the last decades (prevalence around 18%) [32, 33], and because travel to island territories with pets can spread disease.

[1] R Core Team (2020). R: A language and environment for statistical computing. R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria. URL <https://www.R-project.org/>.

[2] Wickham, H. 2021. <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=tidyverse>

[3] Lahti, L et al. 2021. Tools for Eurostat Open Data. <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=eurostat>

[4] <https://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/web/nuts/background>

Results

Summary

A total of 404,617 samples corresponding with 1,134,648 results were available from dogs tested in 26 European countries over the 5-year period summarized in the current paper. (Table 1). This represents results from over 251,000 tests for antigen of *D. Immitis*, 211,000 tests for antibodies to *L. infantum*, and 224,000 tests for antibodies to each *B. burgdorferi*, *Ehrlichia* spp., and *Anaplasma* spp. Geographic distribution of positive tests and relative percent positive values are shown by NUTS classification in Figs. 2,3,4,5,6. Overall, each disease showed a decrease in percent positive results (Fig. 1) as the total tests performed increased (Table 1).

Table 1
 Number of European dog sample tests by year for individual vector borne diseases.

Year	<i>Anaplasma spp</i>	<i>Ehrlichia spp</i>	<i>Borrelia burgdorferi</i>	<i>Dirofilaria immitis</i>	<i>Leishmania spp</i>
2016	34,657	34,658	34,661	38,126	25,394
2017	38,181	38,181	38,181	41,694	30,947
2018	42,529	42,529	42,533	47,535	39,676
2019	49,733	49,733	49,734	56,325	52,792
2020	58,924	58,924	58,924	67,324	62,753
Total	224,024	224,025	224,033	251,004	211,562

Anaplasma spp, Erlichia spp, and Borrelia burgdorferi

The total number of results for tick-borne diseases in Europe increased each year (Table 1) with a trend of declining rates of test positivity for each pathogen (Fig. 1). Similar trends of declining test positivity were noted for each of the pathogens. Annual European test positivity rates decreased from 7.3% in 2016 to 5.3% in 2020 for *Anaplasma spp.*, from 4.3% in 2016 to 3.4% in 2020 for *Ehrlichia spp.*, and from 3.3% in 2016 to 2.4% in 2020 for *Borrelia burgdorferi*. (Table 2).

Anaplasma spp. antibody test positivity rates for the study period varied regionally and were higher (>10%) in Austria, Bosnia & Herzegovina, Czech Republic, Germany, Poland, Slovakia, Slovenia, and Sweden, and lower (<5%) in Andorra, Belgium, Finland, France, Hungary, Italy, Malta, Norway, Portugal, Russia, Spain, Switzerland, and the UK (Table 3). Remaining countries had test positivity between 5% and 10%. Geographic distribution of positive test results using the NUTS classification is displayed for regions with sufficient test results for reporting (Fig. 2).

Table 3

Percent of positive test results, total number of dog samples tested, and 95% confidence intervals for each country and respective vector-borne disease for the 2016-2020 study period.

Year	<i>Anaplasma spp</i>	<i>Ehrlichia spp</i>	<i>Borrelia burgdorferi</i>	<i>Dirofilaria immitis</i>	<i>Leishmania spp</i>
Positive % of Tests (95% CI)					
2016	7.3% (7.1% - 7.6%)	4.3% (4.1% - 4.6%)	3.3% (3.1% - 3.5%)	2.7% (2.6% - 2.9%)	13.9% (13.5% - 14.4%)
2017	7.5% (7.2% - 7.7%)	4.4% (4.2% - 4.6%)	2.9% (2.7% - 3.1%)	2.6% (2.4% - 2.7%)	12.9% (12.5% - 13.2%)
2018	6.2% (5.9% - 6.4%)	3.9% (3.7% - 4.1%)	2.6% (2.5% - 2.8%)	1.8% (1.7% - 1.9%)	12.5% (12.2% - 12.9%)
2019	5.5% (5.3% - 5.7%)	3.5% (3.3% - 3.7%)	2.6% (2.4% - 2.7%)	2.0% (1.8% - 2.1%)	11.0% (10.7% - 11.2%)
2020	5.3% (5.1% - 5.5%)	3.4% (3.2% - 3.5%)	2.4% (2.2% - 2.5%)	1.9% (1.8% - 2.0%)	9.4% (9.2% - 9.6%)
Percent Positives by Country					

Ehrlichia spp. antibody test positivity rates were higher (>3%) in Greece, Italy, Lithuania, Netherlands, Portugal, Romania, Russia, Spain, and Switzerland, and lower (<1%) in Denmark, Estonia, Finland, Hungary, Norway, Slovakia, Slovenia, and Sweden (Table 3). Remaining countries had test positivity between 1% and 3%. Greece showed the highest percent positive results (19.6%) while Denmark, Estonia, Hungary, and Slovenia all reported fewer than 0.5% positive results during the study period (Fig. 3).

Borrelia burgdorferi antibody positivity was concentrated in Northern and Eastern Europe with higher rates of positivity (>5%) in Austria, Czech Republic, Estonia, Finland, Germany, Lithuania, Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Slovenia, Sweden, and Switzerland, and lowest rates (<1%) in Andorra, Croatia, Greece, Hungary, Italy, Malta, Portugal, Romania, and Spain (Table 3). Remaining countries had test positivity between 1% and 5%. The highest test positivity was seen in Sweden (13.3%) and lowest in Greece (<0.1%). Test positivity based on NUTS classification in the EU and UK is presented in Fig. 4.

Dirofilaria immitis

The total number of *D. immitis* test results in Europe increased steadily over the study period with 1.8x more tests run in 2020 than in 2016 (Table 1). The yearly percent positive results for *D. Immitis* antigen trended down over the 5-year study period (Fig. 1) with a high of 2.7% in 2016 and low of 1.8% in 2018 (Table 5).

D. immitis positivity rates varied regionally with >9% positive tests in Hungary, Romania, and Russia, and <1% positive results in 12 countries, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Malta,

Norway, Poland, Slovakia, Slovenia, and Sweden (Table 3). Remaining countries had between 1% and 9% test positivity. Malta and Norway each had <0.1% positive results (Table 3).

Leishmania spp

Leishmania spp. infection showed a similar trend of increasing result numbers each year in Europe and decreasing test positivity. The yearly percent of positive *Leishmania* antibody test results decreased from 13.9% in 2016 to 9.4% in 2020 (Table 2). Substantial year-over-year decreases with non-overlapping confidence intervals suggest significant decreases for each pair of sequential years except 2017-2018 (Fig. 1).

Leishmania spp. results were primarily available from endemic areas in southern Europe (Table 3, Fig. 6). There was wide variability in the number of test results from different countries. Italy and Spain each had over 90,000 test results and test positivity of 11.9% and 10.7%, respectively. All other endemic countries had fewer than 10,000 test results. Greece and Malta had the highest rate of test positivity in the endemic countries with 18.5% and 15.9%, respectively. All other endemic areas, other than Romania, had test positivity rates >7%. Within France, most test results originated from endemic areas in southern regions. Only three non-endemic countries, Netherlands, Switzerland and Germany, had sufficient tests to report test positivity. These countries had high test positivity and fewer than 700 test results (Table 3).

Co-positivity

Co-positivity was evaluated on a Europe-wide scale. Actual co-positivity rates were significantly higher than expected for all pathogen test positive pairs except for *Ehrlichia* spp and *Borrelia burgdorferi* co-positivity and *D. immitis* and *Borrelia burgdorferi* (Table 4). The overall total rate of co-positives was 2-3 times more than the expected for most pairings. The highest percentage of co-positivity was for *Ehrlichia* spp and *Leishmania* spp. (1.44%), *Anaplasma* spp. and *Ehrlichia* spp. (0.81%), and *Anaplasma* spp. and *Leishmania* spp. (0.78%).

Table 4

Rate of co-positives vs expected rate by chance for all results within the study period 2016-2020. Vector commonalities or endemic rates within geographies was not included in the comparison.

Country	<i>Anaplasma</i> spp.	<i>Ehrlichia</i> spp.	<i>Borrelia burgdorferi</i>	<i>Dirofilaria immitis</i>	<i>Leishmania</i> spp.
Positive % of Tests (Tests, 95% CI)					
Andorra	2.7% (187; 0.9% - 6.1%)	2.1% (187; 0.6% - 5.4%)	0.0% (187; 0.0% - 2.0%)	2.1% (187; 0.6% - 5.4%)	—
Austria	17.3% (4,572; 16.2% - 18.4%)	2.5% (4,572; 2.0% - 3.0%)	6.1% (4,572; 5.4% - 6.9%)	1.9% (4,578; 1.6% - 2.4%)	—
Belgium	4.5% (772; 3.2% - 6.2%)	2.8% (772; 1.8% - 4.3%)	3.0% (772; 1.9% - 4.4%)	1.5% (843; 0.8% - 2.6%)	—
Bosnia and Herzegovina	21.4% (3,671; 20.1% - 22.7%)	1.1% (3,671; 0.8% - 1.5%)	2.2% (3,671; 1.7% - 2.7%)	1.0% (3,698; 0.7% - 1.4%)	11.0% (172; 6.8% - 16.7%)
Croatia	7.4% (2,417; 6.4% - 8.5%)	1.4% (2,417; 0.9% - 1.9%)	0.4% (2,417; 0.2% - 0.7%)	2.6% (2,417; 2.0% - 3.3%)	7.0% (1,761; 5.9% - 8.3%)
Czech Republic	19.3% (6,238; 18.3% - 20.3%)	1.5% (6,238; 1.2% - 1.8%)	7.6% (6,238; 7.0% - 8.3%)	0.2% (6,244; 0.1% - 0.4%)	—
Denmark	7.7% (7,784; 7.1% - 8.3%)	0.3% (7,784; 0.2% - 0.5%)	4.4% (7,784; 4.0% - 4.9%)	0.4% (8,978; 0.2% - 0.5%)	—
Estonia	9.1% (451; 6.6% - 12.1%)	0.4% (451; 0.1% - 1.6%)	8.6% (451; 6.2% - 11.6%)	0.2% (451; 0.0% - 1.2%)	—
Finland	3.5% (6,084; 3.0% - 3.9%)	0.6% (6,084; 0.4% - 0.8%)	5.6% (6,084; 5.0% - 6.2%)	0.4% (6,084; 0.2% - 0.5%)	—
France	2.7% (18,070; 2.5% - 3.0%)	2.8% (18,070; 2.6% - 3.1%)	2.7% (18,074; 2.5% - 3.0%)	0.8% (18,356; 0.7% - 1.0%)	8.7% (5,307; 8.0% - 9.5%)
Germany	14.2% (20,582; 13.7% - 14.7%)	1.4% (20,582; 1.2% - 1.5%)	6.0% (20,583; 5.7% - 6.3%)	0.8% (20,632; 0.7% - 1.0%)	11.8% (686; 9.5% - 14.5%)
Greece	9.9% (6,488; 9.1% - 10.6%)	19.6% (6,488; 18.6% - 20.6%)	0.0% (6,488; 0.0% - 0.1%)	2.4% (6,497; 2.1% - 2.8%)	18.5% (9,568; 17.7% - 19.3%)

Country	<i>Anaplasma</i> spp.	<i>Ehrlichia</i> spp.	<i>Borrelia burgdorferi</i>	<i>Dirofilaria immitis</i>	<i>Leishmania</i> spp.
Hungary	3.9% (593; 2.5% - 5.8%)	0.2% (593; 0.0% - 0.9%)	0.8% (593; 0.3% - 2.0%)	11.5% (724; 9.2% - 14.0%)	—
Italy	2.6% (64,879; 2.5% - 2.7%)	5.1% (64,879; 5.0% - 5.3%)	0.4% (64,879; 0.4% - 0.5%)	1.9% (84,105; 1.8% - 2.0%)	11.9% (90,532; 11.7% - 12.1%)
Lithuania	8.9% (203; 5.3% - 13.7%)	5.4% (203; 2.7% - 9.5%)	11.8% (203; 7.7% - 17.1%)	5.4% (203; 2.7% - 9.5%)	—
Malta	0.0% (161; 0.0% - 2.3%)	11.8% (161; 7.3% - 17.8%)	0.0% (161; 0.0% - 2.3%)	0.0% (161; 0.0% - 2.3%)	15.9% (289; 11.9% - 20.7%)
Netherlands	9.1% (1,154; 7.5% - 10.9%)	4.7% (1,154; 3.5% - 6.1%)	9.7% (1,154; 8.1% - 11.6%)	1.8% (1,170; 1.1% - 2.7%)	32.4% (136; 24.6% - 40.9%)
Norway	3.5% (3,051; 2.9% - 4.2%)	0.7% (3,051; 0.4% - 1.0%)	10.2% (3,051; 9.1% - 11.3%)	0.0% (3,051; 0.0% - 0.2%)	—
Poland	10.5% (3,812; 9.6% - 11.5%)	1.2% (3,812; 0.9% - 1.6%)	5.4% (3,812; 4.7% - 6.1%)	0.8% (3,816; 0.6% - 1.2%)	—
Portugal	4.7% (1,285; 3.7% - 6.1%)	8.2% (1,285; 6.7% - 9.8%)	0.2% (1,285; 0.0% - 0.7%)	3.1% (1,690; 2.3% - 4.0%)	13.8% (1,329; 12.0% - 15.7%)
Romania	5.9% (13,995; 5.6% - 6.3%)	7.0% (13,995; 6.5% - 7.4%)	0.6% (13,995; 0.5% - 0.8%)	11.5% (14,169; 11.0% - 12.1%)	0.6% (2,546; 0.3% - 1.0%)
Russia	4.7% (1,819; 3.7% - 5.7%)	10.9% (1,819; 9.5% - 12.4%)	2.1% (1,819; 1.5% - 2.9%)	9.2% (2,004; 8.0% - 10.5%)	—
Slovakia	13.5% (1,584; 11.9% - 15.3%)	0.8% (1,584; 0.4% - 1.4%)	3.3% (1,584; 2.5% - 4.4%)	0.4% (1,585; 0.2% - 0.9%)	—
Slovenia	13.1% (731; 10.8% - 15.8%)	0.4% (731; 0.1% - 1.2%)	7.4% (731; 5.6% - 9.5%)	0.1% (732; 0.0% - 0.8%)	—
Spain	2.4% (39,526; 2.3% - 2.6%)	3.1% (39,526; 3.0% - 3.3%)	0.2% (39,526; 0.2% - 0.3%)	1.9% (44,559; 1.8% - 2.1%)	10.7% (98,737; 10.5% - 10.9%)

Country	<i>Anaplasma</i> spp.	<i>Ehrlichia</i> spp.	<i>Borrelia burgdorferi</i>	<i>Dirofilaria immitis</i>	<i>Leishmania</i> spp.
Sweden	12.7% (10,046; 12.1% - 13.4%)	0.6% (10,047; 0.5% - 0.8%)	13.3% (10,050; 12.7% - 14.0%)	0.1% (10,050; 0.1% - 0.2%)	—
Switzerland	4.7% (1,006; 3.5% - 6.2%)	3.1% (1,006; 2.1% - 4.3%)	7.5% (1,006; 5.9% - 9.3%)	2.0% (1,013; 1.2% - 3.0%)	12.2% (221; 8.2% - 17.3%)
United Kingdom	1.2% (2,631; 0.8% - 1.7%)	1.4% (2,631; 1.0% - 1.9%)	1.1% (2,631; 0.8% - 1.6%)	1.1% (2,774; 0.8% - 1.6%)	—

Pathogen 1	Pathogen 2	Positive Pathogen 1	Positive pathogen 2	Expected Co-positivity	Co-positivity	Total n	Chi Square
<i>Anaplasma</i> spp.	<i>Ehrlichia</i> spp.	6.19%	3.82%	0.24%	0.81%	224,023	p<0.001*
<i>Anaplasma</i> spp.	<i>Dirofilaria immitis</i>	6.19%	1.89%	0.12%	0.17%	224,022	p<0.001*
<i>Anaplasma</i> spp.	<i>Leishmania</i> spp.	3.19%	9.71%	0.31%	0.78%	53,505	p<0.001*
<i>Anaplasma</i> spp.	<i>Borrelia burgdorferi</i>	6.19%	2.69%	0.17%	0.50%	224,022	p<0.001*
<i>Ehrlichia</i> spp.	<i>Dirofilaria immitis</i>	3.82%	1.89%	0.07%	0.22%	224,022	p<0.001*
<i>Ehrlichia</i> spp.	<i>Leishmania</i> spp.	5.44%	9.71%	0.53%	1.44%	53,504	p<0.001*
<i>Ehrlichia</i> spp.	<i>Borrelia burgdorferi</i>	3.82%	2.69%	0.10%	0.10%	224,024	p=0.657
<i>Dirofilaria immitis</i>	<i>Leishmania</i> spp.	1.39%	9.17%	0.13%	0.30%	57,953	p<0.001*
<i>Dirofilaria immitis</i>	<i>Borrelia burgdorferi</i>	1.89%	2.69%	0.05%	0.06%	224,030	p=0.083
<i>Leishmania</i> spp.	<i>Borrelia burgdorferi</i>	9.71%	0.18%	0.02%	0.04%	53,504	p<0.001*

Table 1. Number of European dog sample tests by year for individual vector borne diseases.

Table 2. Percent of positive test results and 95% confidence intervals by year for individual vector-borne diseases.

Table 3. Percent of positive test results, total number of dog samples tested, and 95% confidence intervals.

Table 4. Rate of co-positives vs expected rate by chance for all results within the study period.

Discussion

In this study we used data from point-of-care testing to map distribution and test positivity of CVBDs across Europe. This is to date the most extensive study done on vector borne infection in dogs in Europe with more than 1.1 million test results over a 5-year period. It provides valuable data about the current state of vector borne infection in tested dogs but is not an unbiased random sample representing prevalence in all dogs in Europe. Over the study period, the yearly number of tests run increased by a factor of 1.7-2.5 from 2016 to 2020 for all pathogens while the percentage of positive test results declined. Testing behavior likely impacted these trends. Substantial variation exists between veterinarians and between countries in whether CVBD testing is performed as part of preventative care or primarily in cases with clinical illness [34, 35]. For instance, perceptions of veterinarians around the prevalence of *Leishmania* in their area of practice is related to their likelihood to test and to prescribe preventative measures to their patients [35, 36]. The European Scientific Counsel Companion Animal Parasites (ESCCAP) recommends serologic screening for CVBDs endemic in the animal's home region and within 3-6 months following travel to areas where other CVBDs are endemic. Increasing adoption of these screening recommendations helps to identify infected animals who are not sick and reduces the expected percentage of positive test results [37–39]. The most notable year-over-year declines were in *Leishmania* spp. test positivity in this study. In addition to changes in testing behavior, increased prevention of new *Leishmania* spp. infections through increased usage of insect repellents with proven efficacy to prevent sand fly bites [40, 41] and antiparasite products [42] likely contribute to this decline. Finally, long-term reductions in antibody levels of patients treated with domperidone [43, 44] and the use of other immunomodulators [45, 46] may contribute. In contrast to our findings, one study from Germany, where testing for *Leishmania* spp. is mostly in animals following travel to, or importation from, endemic areas, did not find differences in test positivity of *Leishmania* spp. between 2004-2006 and 2014-2016 (23.5%/IFA vs 22.7%/qELISA) [8]. For other CVBDs, the more modest declines may be similarly multifactorial with changes in screening behavior and preventative use in combination with year-to-year climate effects on vector populations. This study was not designed to identify causes of variation in test positivity. Determining the contribution of potential causal factors in these declines would require additional study.

Using point-of-care testing results from a single manufacturer provides a convenient retrospective method to evaluate CVBDs without confounding factors of different test modalities. However, testing behavior differences across countries in Europe introduces some bias into the data. Individual countries have different recommendations about screening for individual CVBDs, resulting in different percentages of sick and healthy animals in the test population. Testing may have occurred primarily in sick animals in some regions while in others, testing was primarily in healthy animals. These differences in testing

strategy notably affect the test positivity of *Leishmania* spp in different regions. Although Spain and Germany have similar test positivity in the population, the test positivity is based on 98,737 tests in Spain and 686 tests in Germany. Therefore, these two countries likely have very different seroprevalence in the total dog population despite the similar test positivity results. In Germany, testing primarily is performed as screening for dogs imported from or returning from travel to endemic areas [47]. In Spain, where *L. infantum* infection is endemic, testing has been focused on patients with clinical disease, but screening of clinically healthy animals is increasingly performed annually as part of a wellness strategy [36, 48]. Since many dogs can be infected without compatible signs of leishmaniasis, testing behavior can impact test positivity and may not reflect changes in actual infection rates [37, 39, 49]. While we note this bias in the study, the data nevertheless provide useful information about trends in test positivity across Europe and in individual regions where sufficient numbers of tests are being performed.

Differences in the number of test results in a particular region are reflected in the regional resolution of the maps. The NUTS system is a convenient system for mapping subregions of European countries that is tied to the population in each subregion. Countries (NUTS 0) are divided, when population size allows, into large regions with 3-7 million residents (NUTS 1) which are subdivided into smaller regions with 800,000-3 million residents (NUTS 2) which are then subdivided again into regions of 150,000-800,000 residents (NUTS 3). Since different regions had different numbers of tests available and the goal of the study was to show clinically meaningful data for as many regions as possible, the granularity of regional data presented varies. Where possible, NUTS 3 classification was used to generate regional maps, but in some instances the results were presented at country-level when the number of results did not support finer resolution.

Using these data, it was not possible to draw information about whether there was an expansion of CVBDs into new areas since we cannot identify where dogs were infected by a particular pathogen. Positive test results outside of endemic areas could represent imported cases or expansion of CVBDs into new areas. False positive results on the SNAP HW RT tests, but not the SNAP 4Dx Plus test, have been reported in *Angiostrongylus vasorum* positive dogs [50]. This potential for false positives is not likely to have substantially impacted the data since almost all *D. immitis* results in the data set were from SNAP 4Dx Plus tests.

Co-positivity was higher than expected by chance for almost all pairs of pathogens. Results are presented in aggregate representing tests from all available European countries. They do not account for differences in regional risk of infection for different CVBDs or identify if co-positives were higher in some regions. The number of dogs positive for two pathogens was relatively low, but dogs positive for one pathogen should be tested for other CVBD pathogens. High co-positivity rates for *Leishmania* spp. and *Ehrlichia* spp., and *Leishmania* spp. and *Anaplasma* spp. have previously been described in dogs in, or imported from, southern Europe [51–55]. For example, dogs imported to Germany showed a significant rate of co-positivity for *Leishmania* spp. and *Ehrlichia* spp. (617 out of 15,955 tested dogs), and to a lesser, but still significant extent for *Leishmania* spp. and *Babesia canis*, *Ehrlichia* spp. and *Babesia canis*, and *Leishmania* spp. and *Anaplasma* spp. [8]. Dogs with clinical leishmaniasis are more likely to be infected

with other vector-borne diseases than *Leishmania* spp. negative healthy controls [54, 55] and to have more severe clinical presentations. The cause for the higher than expected co-positivity is not clear and potential contributing factors for increased co-infection risk may include distribution of CVBDs and associated vectors, outdoor dog housing and associated increased exposure to vectors, lack of effective insect repellents or antiparasitic treatments, and immunocompromised status [56–58].

Conclusions

This study provides CVBD test positivity and geographic test positivity at the most granular scale possible for countries in Europe from 2016-2020. During the study period, increasing numbers of test results were available each year even as the proportion of positive tests decreased. The most substantial decline was in *Leishmania* spp. test positivity. Increased use of preventative pyrethroid repellents to prevent *Leishmania* spp. infection is likely a key contributor to this decrease. Further, increases in routine screening and preventative care of animals without clinical leishmaniasis also likely play roles in the increasing total number of tests and decreasing test positivity. This study represents the largest data set on test positivity for these CVBDs for European countries and can help inform veterinarians on the results in their geography and improve prevention of these important clinical and zoonotic diseases.

Abbreviations

CVBD = canine vector-borne disease

IFA = Immunofluorescence assay

qELISA = quantitative enzyme linked immunosorbant assay

Declarations

All manuscripts must contain the following sections under the heading 'Declarations':

Ethics approval and consent to participate

Consent for publication

Availability of data and materials

Competing interests

Funding

Authors' contributions

Acknowledgements

Authors' information (optional)

Ethics approval and consent to participate

Competing interests

Funding

Authors' contributions

Authors' information

References

1. Bogdan C, Schonian G, Banuls A-L, Hide M, Pratlong F, Lorenz E, et al. Visceral Leishmaniasis in a German Child Who Had Never Entered a Known Endemic Area: Case Report and Review of the Literature. *Clinical Infectious Diseases*. 2001;32:302–6.
2. Traversa D, Di Cesare A. Cardio-Pulmonary Parasitic Nematodes Affecting Cats in Europe: Unraveling the Past, Depicting the Present, and Predicting the Future. *Front Vet Sci* [Internet]. 2014 [cited 2021 Feb 22];1. Available from: <http://journal.frontiersin.org/article/10.3389/fvets.2014.00011/abstract>
3. Tánczos B, Balogh N, Király L, Biksi I, Szeredi L, Gyurkovsky M, et al. First Record of Autochthonous Canine Leishmaniasis in Hungary. *Vector-Borne and Zoonotic Diseases*. 2012;12:588–94.
4. Morchón R, Carretón E, González-Miguel J, Mellado-Hernández I. Heartworm Disease (*Dirofilaria immitis*) and Their Vectors in Europe – New Distribution Trends. *Front Physio* [Internet]. 2012 [cited 2021 Feb 18];3. Available from: <http://journal.frontiersin.org/article/10.3389/fphys.2012.00196/abstract>
5. Genchi C, Mortarino M, Rinaldi L, Cringoli G, Traldi G, Genchi M. Changing climate and changing vector-borne disease distribution: The example of *Dirofilaria* in Europe. *Veterinary Parasitology*. 2011;176:295–9.
6. Beugnet F, Marié J-L. Emerging arthropod-borne diseases of companion animals in Europe. *Veterinary Parasitology*. 2009;163:298–305.
7. Pantchev N, Etzold M, Dauschies A, Dyachenko V. Diagnosis of Imported Canine Filarial Infections in Germany 2008 – 2010. *Parasitol Res*. 2011;109:61–76.
8. Vrhovec MG, Pantchev N, Failing K, Bauer C, Travers-Martin N, Zahner H. Retrospective Analysis of Canine Vector-borne Diseases (CVBD) in Germany with Emphasis on the Endemicity and Risk Factors of Leishmaniosis. *Parasitol Res*. 2017;116:131–44.
9. Jore S, Vanwambeke SO, Viljugrein H, Isaksen K, Kristoffersen AB, Woldehiwet Z, et al. Climate and environmental change drives *Ixodes ricinus* geographical expansion at the northern range margin. *Parasit Vectors*. 2014;7:11.

10. Jaenson TG, Jaenson DG, Eisen L, Petersson E, Lindgren E. Changes in the geographical distribution and abundance of the tick *Ixodes ricinus* during the past 30 years in Sweden. *Parasites Vectors*. 2012;5:8.
11. Martello E, Mannelli A, Ragagli C, Ambrogi C, Selmi M, Ceballos LA, et al. Range expansion of *Ixodes ricinus* to higher altitude, and co-infestation of small rodents with *Dermacentor marginatus* in the Northern Apennines, Italy. *Ticks and Tick-borne Diseases*. 2014;5:970–4.
12. Lindgren E, Tälleklint L, Polfeldt T. Impact of climatic change on the northern latitude limit and population density of the disease-transmitting European tick *Ixodes ricinus*. *Environmental Health Perspectives*. 2000;108:119–23.
13. Pantchev N, Pluta S, Huisinga E, Nather S, Scheufelen M, Vrhovec MG, et al. Tick-borne Diseases (Borreliosis, Anaplasmosis, Babesiosis) in German and Austrian Dogs: Status quo and Review of Distribution, Transmission, Clinical Findings, Diagnostics and Prophylaxis. *Parasitol Res*. 2015;114:19–54.
14. Drehmann M, Springer A, Lindau A, Facht K, Mai S, Thoma D, et al. The Spatial Distribution of *Dermacentor* Ticks (Ixodidae) in Germany—Evidence of a Continuing Spread of *Dermacentor reticulatus*. *Front Vet Sci*. 2020;7:578220.
15. Helm C, Weingart C, Ramünke S, Schäfer I, Müller E, von Samson-Himmelstjerna G, et al. High genetic diversity of *Babesia canis* in a recent outbreak in Berlin/Brandenburg. in preparation.
16. Dongus H, Zahler M, Gothe R. [The brown dog tick, *Rhipicephalus sanguineus* (Ixodidae), in Germany: an epidemiologic study and control measures]. *Berl Munch Tierarztl Wochenschr*. 1996;109:245–8.
17. Buczek A, Buczek W. Importation of Ticks on Companion Animals and the Risk of Spread of Tick-Borne Diseases to Non-Endemic Regions in Europe. *Animals*. 2020;11:6.
18. Pantchev N, Norden N, Lorentzen L, Rossi M, Rossi U, Brand B, et al. Current Surveys on the Prevalence and Distribution of *Dirofilaria* spp. in Dogs in Germany. *Parasitol Res*. 2009;105:63–74.
19. Dujardin J-C, Campino L, Cañavate C, Dedet J-P, Gradoni L, Soteriadou K, et al. Spread of Vector-borne Diseases and Neglect of Leishmaniasis, Europe. *Emerg Infect Dis*. 2008;14:1013–8.
20. Karkamo V, Kaistinen A, Näreaho A, Dillard K, Vainio-Siukola K, Vidgrén G, et al. The first report of autochthonous non-vector-borne transmission of canine leishmaniasis in the Nordic countries. *Acta Vet Scand*. 2014;56:84.
21. Wright I, Baker S. Leishmaniasis in a dog with no history of travel outside the UK. *Veterinary Record*. 2019;184:387–8.
22. Naucke TJ, Menn B, Massberg D, Lorentz S. Sandflies and leishmaniasis in Germany. *Parasitol Res*. 2008;103:65–8.
23. Melaun C, Krüger A, Werblow A, Klimpel S. New record of the suspected leishmaniasis vector *Phlebotomus* (*Transphlebotomus*) *mascittii* Grassi, 1908 (Diptera: Psychodidae: Phlebotominae) — the northernmost phlebotomine sandfly occurrence in the Palearctic region. *Parasitol Res*. 2014;113:2295–301.

24. Oerther S, Jöst H, Heitmann A, Lühken R, Krüger A, Steinhausen I, et al. Phlebotomine sand flies in Southwest Germany: an update with records in new locations. *Parasites Vectors*. 2020;13:173.
25. Obwaller AG, Karakus M, Poepl W, Töz S, Özbel Y, Aspöck H, et al. Could *Phlebotomus mascittii* play a role as a natural vector for *Leishmania infantum*? New data. *Parasites Vectors*. 2016;9:458.
26. Stillman BA, Monn M, Liu J, Thatcher B, Foster P, Andrews B, et al. Performance of a commercially available in-clinic ELISA for detection of antibodies against *Anaplasma phagocytophilum*, *Anaplasma platys*, *Borrelia burgdorferi*, *Ehrlichia canis*, and *Ehrlichia ewingii* and *Dirofilaria immitis* antigen in dogs. *Journal of the American Veterinary Medical Association*. 2014;245:80–6.
27. Atkins CE. Comparison of results of three commercial heartworm antigen test kits in dogs with low heartworm burdens. *Journal of the American Veterinary Medical Association*. 2003;222:1221–3.
28. Marcondes M, Biondo AW, Gomes AAD, Silva ARS, Vieira RFC, Camacho AA, et al. Validation of a *Leishmania infantum* ELISA rapid test for serological diagnosis of *Leishmania chagasi* in dogs. *Veterinary Parasitology*. 2011;175:15–9.
29. Ferroglio E, Centaro E, Mignone W, Trisciuglio A. Evaluation of an ELISA rapid device for the serological diagnosis of *Leishmania infantum* infection in dog as compared with immunofluorescence assay and Western blot. *Veterinary Parasitology*. 2007;144:162–6.
30. Wickham H, Averick M, Bryan J, Chang W, McGowan L, François R, et al. Welcome to the Tidyverse. *JOSS*. 2019;4:1686.
31. Eurostat. Postcodes and NUTS. [cited 2021 Apr 22]. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.2807/1560-7917.ES.2020.25.3.2000045>
32. Montoya-Alonso JA, Carretón E, Morchón R, Silveira-Viera L, Falcón Y, Simón F. The impact of the climate on the epidemiology of *Dirofilaria immitis* in the pet population of the Canary Islands. *Veterinary Parasitology*. 2016;216:66–71.
33. Montoya JA, Morales M, Ferrer O, Molina JM, Corbera JA. The prevalence of *Dirofilaria immitis* in Gran Canaria, Canary Islands, Spain (1994–1996). *Veterinary Parasitology*. 1998;75:221–6.
34. Nichol GK, Weese JS, Evason M, Clow KM. Assessing knowledge, attitudes, and practices of Canadian veterinarians with regard to Lyme disease in dogs. *J Vet Intern Med*. 2021;35:294–302.
35. Zini E, Muscardin L, D’Anna N, Fondati A, Gradoni L, Lubas G, et al. Preventive measures of canine leishmaniosis in Italy: Attitudes of veterinarians based on a questionnaire. *Preventive Veterinary Medicine*. 2020;183:105148.
36. Le Rutte EA, van Straten R, Overgaauw PAM. Awareness and control of canine leishmaniosis: A survey among Spanish and French veterinarians. *Veterinary Parasitology*. 2018;253:87–93.
37. Baneth G, Koutinas AF, Solano-Gallego L, Bourdeau P, Ferrer L. Canine leishmaniosis – new concepts and insights on an expanding zoonosis: part one. *Trends in Parasitology*. 2008;24:324–30.
38. Lladró S, Picado A, Ballart C, Portús M, Gállego M. Management, prevention and treatment of canine leishmaniosis in north-eastern Spain: an online questionnaire-based survey in the province of Girona with special emphasis on new preventive methods (CaniLeish vaccine and domperidone). *Veterinary Record*. 2017;180:47–47.

39. Velez R, Ballart C, Domenech E, Abras A, Fernández-Arévalo A, Gómez SA, et al. Seroprevalence of canine *Leishmania infantum* infection in the Mediterranean region and identification of risk factors: The example of North-Eastern and Pyrenean areas of Spain. *Preventive Veterinary Medicine*. 2019;162:67–75.
40. Miró G, Montoya A, Roura X, Gálvez R, Sainz A. Seropositivity rates for agents of canine vector-borne diseases in Spain: a multicentre study. *Parasites Vectors*. 2013;6:117.
41. Miró G, Petersen C, Cardoso L, Bourdeau P, Baneth G, Solano-Gallego L, et al. Novel Areas for Prevention and Control of Canine Leishmaniasis. *Trends in Parasitology*. 2017;33:718–30.
42. Animal's Health. La prevención frente a *Leishmania* en perros se dispara en España. [cited 2021 Jun 1]. Available from: <https://www.animalshealth.es/empresas/prevencion-leishmania-perros-espana-dispara>
43. Gómez-Ochoa P, Castillo JA, Gascón M, Zarate JJ, Alvarez F, Couto CG. Use of domperidone in the treatment of canine visceral leishmaniasis: A clinical trial. *The Veterinary Journal*. 2009;179:259–63.
44. Sabaté D, Llinás J, Homedes J, Sust M, Ferrer L. A single-centre, open-label, controlled, randomized clinical trial to assess the preventive efficacy of a domperidone-based treatment programme against clinical canine leishmaniasis in a high prevalence area. *Preventive Veterinary Medicine*. 2014;115:56–63.
45. Segarra S, Miró G, Montoya A, Pardo-Marín L, Teichenné J, Ferrer L, et al. Prevention of disease progression in *Leishmania infantum*-infected dogs with dietary nucleotides and active hexose correlated compound. *Parasites Vectors*. 2018;11:103.
46. Segarra S, Miró G, Montoya A, Pardo-Marín L, Boqué N, Ferrer L, et al. Randomized, allopurinol-controlled trial of the effects of dietary nucleotides and active hexose correlated compound in the treatment of canine leishmaniasis. *Veterinary Parasitology*. 2017;239:50–6.
47. Mencke N. The importance of canine leishmaniasis in non-endemic areas, with special emphasis on the situation in Germany. *Berl Munch Tierarztl Wochenschr*. 2011;124:434–42.
48. Montoya A, Gálvez R, Checa R, Sarquis J, Plaza A, Barrera JP, et al. Latest trends in *L. infantum* infection in dogs in Spain, Part II: current clinical management and control according to a national survey of veterinary practitioners. *Parasit Vectors*. 2020;13:205.
49. Gálvez R, Montoya A, Cruz I, Fernández C, Martín O, Checa R, et al. Latest trends in *Leishmania infantum* infection in dogs in Spain, Part I: mapped seroprevalence and sand fly distributions. *Parasites Vectors*. 2020;13:204.
50. Schnyder M, Deplazes P. Cross-reactions of sera from dogs infected with *Angiostrongylus vasorum* in commercially available *Dirofilaria immitis* test kits. *Parasites Vectors*. 2012;5:258.
51. Schäfer I, Volkmann M, Beelitz P, Merle R, Müller E, Kohn B. Retrospective evaluation of vector-borne infections in dogs imported from the Mediterranean region and southeastern Europe (2007–2015). *Parasites Vectors*. 2019;12:30.
52. Montoya-Alonso JA, Morchón R, Costa-Rodríguez N, Matos JI, Falcón-Cordón Y, Carretón E. Current Distribution of Selected Vector-Borne Diseases in Dogs in Spain. *Front Vet Sci*. 2020;7:564429.

53. Díaz-Regañón D, Roura X, Suárez ML, León M, Sainz Á. Serological evaluation of selected vector-borne pathogens in owned dogs from northern Spain based on a multicenter study using a commercial test. *Parasites Vectors*. 2020;13:301.
54. Attipa C, Solano-Gallego L, Papasouliotis K, Soutter F, Morris D, Helps C, et al. Association between canine leishmaniosis and Ehrlichia canis co-infection: a prospective case-control study. *Parasites Vectors*. 2018;11:184.
55. Baxarias M, Álvarez-Fernández A, Martínez-Orellana P, Montserrat-Sangrà S, Ordeix L, Rojas A, et al. Does co-infection with vector-borne pathogens play a role in clinical canine leishmaniosis? *Parasites Vectors*. 2018;11:135.
56. Ballart C, Alcover MM, Picado A, Nieto J, Castillejo S, Portús M, et al. First survey on canine leishmaniasis in a non classical area of the disease in Spain (Lleida, Catalonia) based on a veterinary questionnaire and a cross-sectional study. *Preventive Veterinary Medicine*. 2013;109:116–27.
57. Cortes S, Vaz Y, Neves R, Maia C, Cardoso L, Campino L. Risk factors for canine leishmaniasis in an endemic Mediterranean region. *Veterinary Parasitology*. 2012;189:189–96.
58. Martín-Sánchez J, Morales-Yuste M, Acedo-Sánchez C, Barón S, Díaz V, Morillas-Márquez F. Canine Leishmaniasis in Southeastern Spain. *Emerg Infect Dis*. 2009;15:795–8.

Figures

Figure 1

Yearly European test positivity for each pathogen. Positive percent of all tests and 95% confidence intervals (bars) are shown for each year. Non-overlapping confidence intervals support significant differences in test positivity between years.

Figure 2

Anaplasma spp. antibody test positivity for NUTS regions or country over the study period (2016-2020). NUTS levels are shown at the with the most geographic detail allowed by the regional data. Gray regions did not have sufficient results for evaluation of region-specific test positivity analysis.

Figure 3

Ehrlichia spp. antibody test positivity for NUTS regions over the study period (2016-2020). NUTS levels are shown at the with the most geographic detail allowed by the regional data. Gray regions did not have sufficient results for evaluation of region-specific test positivity analysis.

Figure 4

Borrelia burgdorferi antibody test positivity for NUTS regions or country over the study period (2016-2020). NUTS levels are shown at the with the most geographic detail allowed by the regional data. Gray regions did not have sufficient results for evaluation of region-specific test positivity analysis.

Figure 5

Dirofilaria immitis antigen test positivity for NUTS regions or country over the study period (2016-2020). NUTS levels are shown at the with the most geographic detail allowed by the regional data. Gray regions did not have sufficient results for evaluation of region-specific test positivity analysis. Test positivity in the Canary Islands (a high endemic area) was added to the figure (not to scale) for reference.

Figure 6

Leishmania spp. antibody test positivity for NUTS regions or country over the study period (2016-2020). NUTS levels are shown at the with the most geographic detail allowed by the regional data. Gray regions did not have sufficient results for evaluation of region-specific test positivity analysis. Results from Germany and France are shown at NUTS level 1 since test results were restricted to a few areas within the country.

Supplementary Files

This is a list of supplementary files associated with this preprint. Click to download.

- [Miroetal2021Graphicalabstract.jpg](#)