RESEARCH



The detection and phylogenetic analysis of *Anaplasma phagocytophilum*-like 1, *A. ovis* and *A. capra* in sheep: *A. capra* divides into two genogroups

Kursat Altay¹ · Ufuk Erol¹ · Omer Faruk Sahin¹ · Ayperi Aytmirzakizi² · Ethem Mutlu Temizel³ · Mehmet Fatih Aydin⁴ · Nazir Dumanli⁵ · Munir Aktas⁵

Received: 28 June 2022 / Accepted: 6 September 2022 / Published online: 28 September 2022 © The Author(s), under exclusive licence to Springer Nature B.V. 2022

Abstract

In this study, the presence, prevalence, and genotypes of *Anaplasma phagocytophilum*, *A. ovis*, and *A. capra* in sheep were investigated based on 16 S SSU rRNA, *groEL*, and *gtlA* gene-specific polymerase chain reaction (PCR), respectively. The sequences of the genes were used for detection of the phylogenetic position of the species. Additionally, a restriction fragment length polymorphism (RFLP) were carried out for discrimination of *A. phagocytophilum* and related variants (*A. phagocytophilum*-like 1 and 2). The prevalence of *Anaplasma* spp. was found as 25.8% (101/391), while it was found that *A. ovis*, *A. phagocytophilum*-like 1, and *A. capra* are circulating in the sheep herds in Kyrgyzstan, according to the PCRs, RFLP and the partial DNA sequencing results. The positivity rates of *A. phagocytophilum*-like 1, *A. ovis*, and *A. capra* genotype-1 were 6.9, 22.5, and 5.3%, respectively. A total of 32 (8.2%) sheep were found to be mix infected. Moreover, phylogenetic analyses and sequence comparison with those available in the GenBank showed that *A. capra* formed two distinct genetic groups (*A. capra* genotype-1 and *A. capra* genotype-2). Considering the zoonotic potential of these species, it may be necessary to make changes in the interpretation of anaplasmosis cases in animals and there is a need for further studies to determine the pathogenicity of the species/genotypes circulating in animals.

Keywords Anaplasma species · Anaplasma capra genotypes · 16S SSU rRNA · groEL · gtlA · Sheep

Introduction

Anaplasmosis is one of the emerging-tick borne diseases,

Kursat Altay kaltay@cumhuriyet.edu.tr

- ¹ Department of Parasitology, Faculty of Veterinary Medicine, Sivas Cumhuriyet University, 58140 Sivas, Türkiye, Turkey
- ² Faculty of Veterinary Medicine, Kyrgyz-Turkish Manas University, 720044 Bishkek, Kyrgyzstan
- ³ Department of Internal Medicine, Faculty of Veterinary Medicine, Bursa Uludag University, 16059 Bursa, TÜRKİYE, Turkey
- ⁴ Department of Public Health, Faculty of Health Sciences, Karamanoglu Mehmetbey University, 70100 Karaman, Turkey
- ⁵ Department of Parasitology, Faculty of Veterinary Medicine, Firat University, 23119 Elazig, Turkey

and the disease affects both human and animal health. The genus *Anaplasma* (order Rickettsiales, family Anaplasma-taceae) includes the species of *A. marginale*, *A. centrale*, *A. bovis*, *A. platys*, *A. ovis*, *A. capra* and *A. phagocytophilum*, the last three of which cause infection in sheep (Friedhoff 1997; Dumler et al. 2001; Liu et al. 2012).

Anaplasma capra is a tick-borne pathogen discovered for the first time in China in 2012 (Liu et al. 2012). In Northern China, Anaplasma organisms identified from asymptomatic goats considered to be pathogenic in humans and were provisionally named as Anaplasma capra in 2015 based on the molecular and phylogenetic data (Li et al. 2015; Liu et al. 2012). The clinical manifestation of the species has not been clarified, however, fever, headache, weakness, dizziness, myalgia, chills, rash, eschar, lymphadenopathy, gastrointestinal symptoms, and neck stiffness were observed in humans (Li et al. 2015). After the first detection of A. capra in goats in China, its presence has been detected in goats in seven other countries, such as France, Iran, South Korea,





Kyrgyzstan, Malaysia, Spain, and Türkiye (Koh et al. 2018; Jouglin et al. 2019; Wei et al. 2020; Miranda et al. 2021; Staji et al. 2021; Altay et al. 2022a, b; Remesar et al. 2022). The novel species has been detected in humans, sheep, cattle, dog, wild animals (e.g. Korean water deer (Hydropotes inermis argyropus), forest musk deer (Moschus berezovskii), takin (Budorcas taxicolor), Persian onegar (Equus hemionus onager), Reeves's muntjacs (Muntiacus reevesi), serows (Capricornis crispus), and ixodid tick species such as Ixodes persulcatus, Dermacentor everestianus, Haemaphysalis longicornis, H. qinghaiensis, and Rhipicephalus microplus (Li et al. 2015; Fang et al. 2015; Yang et al. 2016; Qin et al. 2018; Guo et al. 2018, 2019; Amer et al. 2019; Han et al. 2019; Lu et al. 2022). Although the existing literature may interpret A. capra as a global pathogen, researches that will contribute to the understanding of its epidemiology and genetic diversity are still required, as it is a newly defined species.

Anaplasma phagocytophilum causes human granulocytic anaplasmosis, canine granulocytic anaplasmosis, equine granulocytic anaplasmosis, and tick-borne fever, in humans, dogs, horses, and ruminants, respectively (Karshima et al. 2022). As a result of recent phylogenetic analyses based on sequences of different genes such as 16 S SSU rRNA, *gltA*, and *groEL*, two *A. phagocytophilum*-related variants have been identified in cattle, *Cervus nippon*, and ixodid ticks from Japan, and in *Hyalomma asiaticum* and small ruminants from China. These variants were described as *A. phagocytophilum*-like 1 and *A. phagocytophilum*-like 2, respectively (Ohashi et al. 2005; Kawahara et al. 2006; Jilintai et al. 2009; Yoshimoto et al. 2010; Kang et al. 2014; Yang et al. 2015; Ben Said et al. 2015, 2017).

Anaplasma ovis is the most prevalent Anaplasma species of sheep in the world, which also infects goats and wild ruminants (Friedhoff 1997; Dumler et al. 2001). Anaplasma *ovis* is transmitted by *Rhipicephalus bursa* and other ticks in the Old World, while *Dermacentor* species are vectors of *A. ovis* in the western United States (Friedhoff 1997). Although there is some evidence suggesting that *A. ovis* may cause zoonotic infections like *A. phagocytophilum*, these are very limited and need to be clarified. To date, *A. ovis* DNA has only been detected in a symptomatic human patient in Cyprus (Chochlakis et al. 2010) and an asymptomatic person in Iran (Hosseini-Vasoukolaei et al. 2014).

In this study, the presence, prevalence, and genotypes of *A. phagocytophilum*, *A. ovis*, and *A. capra* were investigated in sheep from Kyrgyzstan based on 16 S SSU rRNA, *groEL*, and *gtlA* gene-specific polymerase chain reaction (PCR), restriction fragment length polymorphism (RFLP) and sequencing.

Materials and methods

Collection of blood samples and DNA extraction

This study was conducted in five regions (Chuy, Talas, Jalal-Abad, Naryn, Issyk-Kul) of Kyrgyzstan (Fig. 1). Blood samples from sheep were collected between June, 2017 and September, 2018 from 34 sheep flocks. A total of 391 blood samples were taken into collection tubes with EDTA from randomly selected 22 different sheep flocks. Between 9 and 20 blood samples were collected from each flock. The animals were clinically healthy and at least 8 months age sheep and stored at -20 °C, until DNA isolation.

Total genomic DNA was extracted from EDTA-treated blood samples using commercial extraction kit (PureLink Genomic DNA kit, Cat. No.: K1820-02, Invitrogen, Carlsbad, USA), according to the manufacturer's instructions. During the DNA extraction, positive (*A. capra* positive

 Table 1
 Primers used for amplification of the 16 S SSU rRNA, groEL, and gltA gene of A. phagocytophilum and related variants (A. phagocytohilum-like 1 and 2), Anaplasma ovis and Anaplasma capra, respectively

Target	Primer	Primer sequence (5'-3')	Species	Refer-
gene	name			ence
16 S SSU rRNA	SSAP2f SSAP2r	GCTGAATGT GGGGATAATTTAT ATGGCTGCTTCCTTT CGGTTA	<i>A.phago-cytophilum</i> and related variants	Kawa- hara et al. 2006
groEL	JH0011 JH0012	TAAAAGCCAAGGAG- GCTGTG TTGCTCTCCTCGAC- CCTTAT	A.ovis	Haigh et al. 2008
gltA	Outer-f Outer-r	GCGATTTTAGAGT- GYGGAGATTG TACAATACCGGAGTA- AAAGTCAA	A.capra	Li et al. 2015
	Inner-f	TCATCTCCTGTTG- CACGGTGCCC		Yang et al. 2016
	Inner-r	CTCTGAATGAACAT- GCCCACCCT		

sheep blood sample, Accession number: OK267268, Altay et al. 2022b) and negative (DNase-RNase-free sterile water, Cat No.: 129,114, Qiagen®, Germany) samples were used in order to avoid false positive or negative results. Extracted total DNA samples were diluted with 200 μ l DNA elution buffer and stored at -20 °C until use.

Polymerase chain reaction (PCR)

In order to investigate the presence of *A. phagocytophilum* and related variants (*A. phagocytophilum*-like 1 and 2), *A. ovis*, and *A. capra* in sheep from Kyrgyzstan, the DNA of 391 blood samples were screened for 16 S SSU rRNA, *groEL*, and *gltA* genes by PCR, respectively. The primers used in this study are listed in Table 1.

The PCR assays were performed as described before (Kawahara et al. 2006; Haigh et al. 2008; Li et al. 2015; Yang et al. 2016), and the genomic DNA of *A. phagocytoph-ilum* (GenBank accession no: JF807995, Altay et al. 2014), A. *ovis* (HE580282, Altay et al. 2014)d *capra* (MW672115, Altay et al. 2022a) were used as the positive controls, and DNase-RNase-free sterile water (Cat No.: 129,114, Qiagen®, Germany) was used as the negative control in the PCRs.

PCR products were loaded on 1.6% agarose gel containing ethidium bromide and visualized under UV transilluminator. The DNA extraction, PCR, and gel electrophoresis were performed in separate compartments of the laboratory to minimize the risk of contamination.

Discrimination Anaplasma phagocytophilum and related variants (A. phagocytohilum-like 1 and 2) based restriction of 16 S SSU rRNA genes with XcmI and Bsal

A polymerase chain reaction-restriction fragment length polymorphism (PCR-RFLP) was performed to discriminate between *A. phagocytophilum*, *A. phagocytophilum*-like 1 and 2. After a 641/642 bp of the 16 S SSU rRNA gene of *A. phagocytophilum* and/or related variants (like 1 and 2) were amplified with SSAP2f and SSAP2r primers, the PCR products were digested with *Xcm*I and *Bsa*I enzymes as previously described (Ben Said et al. 2017; Aktas and Colak 2021).

The expected RFLP band profiles of *A. phagocytophilum* digested with *Xcm*I are 344 and 297 bp. *Xcm*I does not cut *A. phagocytophilum*-like 1 and 2. On the other hand, the expected RFLP band profiles of *A. phagocytophilum*-like 2 digested with *Bsa*I are 219 and 422/423 bp. *Bsa*I does not cut *A. phagocytophilum* and *A. phagocytophilum*-like 1. In the *A. phagocytophilum*-like 1 and 2 mix infections, band profiles of 219, 422/423 and 641/642 bp are expected in *Bsa*I restriction (Ben Said et al. 2017; Aktas and Colak 2021). The confirmation of RFLP results were carried out with the sequence analysis.

Sequencing and phylogenetic analysis

The 21 of *A. capra*, three of *A. phagocytophilum*-like 1, and two of *A. ovis* PCR positive samples were sequenced. To perform sequence analysis, the PCR products were purified from agarose gel using a commercial gel extraction kit (PCR Clean-Up & Gel Extraction Kit, GeneDireX®, Cat. No.: NA006-0300), according to the manufacturer's recommendations. The SSAP2f/r and the inner primer pairs listed in Table 1 used for sequencing of 16 S SSU rRNA gene of *A. phagocytophlum*-like 1 and *gltA* gene of *A. capra*, respectively. A part of 16 S SSU rRNA gene of *A. ovis* were sequenced using one set of primers (16S8FE and B-GA1B) which is specific 492–498 bp fragment of the 16 S SSU rRNA gene, spanning the V1 region of *Anaplasma* and *Ehrlichia* species (Schouls et al. 1999).

Sequencing was performed using ABI 3730XL analyzer (Applied Biosystems, Foster City, CA) and BigDye Terminator v3.1 Cycle sequencing kit (Applied Biosystems, Foster City, CA).

The consensus sequences in this study were determined using the MUSCLE algorithm of MEGA-X software (Kumar et al. 2018). These consensus sequences were compared with sequences present in the GenBank to determine nucleotide similarities with the BLAST algorithm. The



Fig. 2 Phylogenetic tree based on the *gltA* gene sequences of *A. capra* (OM100820-OM100840) using the maximum likelihood method. Numbers at the nodes represent the bootstrap values with 1000 replicates. The evolutionary history was inferred by using the Maximum Likelihood method and Kimura 2-parameter model (Kimura 1980). Scale bar represents 0.20 substitutions per nucleotide position. *Rickettsia ricketsii* (Accession number: U59729) was used as an outgroup in the tree. Evolutionary analyses were conducted in MEGA X (Kumar et al. 2018)

 Table 2 Distribution and frequency of Anaplasma species detected in sheep from Kyrgyzstan (n:391)

	Number	Anaplasma species			
	of positive samples	A. phagocyto- philum-like 1	A.ovis	A.capra	
	3	+	-	-	
	62	-	+	-	
	4	-	-	+	
	15	+	+	-	
	8	-	+	+	
	6	+	-	+	
	3	+	+	+	
Total	101 (25.8%)	27 (6.9%)	88 (22.5%)	21 (5.3%)	

sequences from this study were submitted to the GenBank database and their accession numbers were obtained.

Phylogenetic analyzes of the sequences identified in this study were performed using other *gltA* and 16 S SSU rRNA nucleotide sequences of *Anaplasma* species available in the GenBank. The phylogenetic tree was carried out with maximum likelihood analysis in Mega X (Kumar et al. 2018). The best-fit model for maximum likelihood was considered as the Kimura-2 parameter model for *gltA* and 16 S SSU rRNA genes (Kimura 1980) using the Find Best-Fit Substitution Model in Mega X (Kumar et al. 2018). Bootstrap values were performed with 1,000 replicates (Fig. 2).

Prevalence and distribution of *Anaplasma* spp. in sheep

The result of PCR and RFLP of 391 samples revealed the presence of A. phagocytophilum-like 1, A. ovis and A. capra in sheep in Kyrgyzstan. The prevalence and frequency of A. phagocytophilum-like 1, A. ovis and A. capra is shown in Table 2. Overall prevalence of Anaplasma species in sheep was found to be 25.8% (101/391) by three different species-specific PCR. The most abundant species was A. ovis (88/391, 22.5%) followed by A. phagocytophilum-like 1 (27/391, 6.9%) and A. capra (21/391, 5.3%). Only one Anaplasma species was found in 69 sheep, whereas mixed infections with two or three species were detected in 32 sheep in this study. A total of 15 sheep were infected with both A. phagocytophilum-like 1 and A. ovis, eight sheep were infected with both A. ovis and A. capra whereas six sheep were infected with both A. phagocytophilum-like 1 and A. capra and three sheep were infected with the three species.

Discrimination of *Anaplasma phagocytophilum* and related variants *A. phagocytophilum*-like 1 and 2

In this study, *A. phagocytophilum* or related variants were detected in 27 samples by PCR (Table 2). All of the 27 PCR products were analyzed with RFLP using *XcmI* and *BsaI* restriction enzymes. *A. phagocytophilum*-like 1 was detected in all 27 sample by PCR-RFLP, while *A. phagocytophilum* and *A. phagocytophilum*-like 2 were not detected.

To confirm the RFLP results, randomly selected three representative samples were sequenced. These sequences were submitted to the Genbank, and deposited with accession numbers: OM540435-OM540437. The sequences were 99.83–100% similar to *A. phagocytophilum*-like 1 sequences available in the GenBank. The *A. phagocytophilum*-like 1 sequence obtained in this study were 100% identical to those of *A. phagocytophilum*-like 1 detected in sheep from Tunisia (KM285230), cattle from Türkiye (GU223365), goat from China (OL678408) and Sika deer (*Cervus nippon*) from Japan (JM055357).

Analysis of the *gtlA* gene sequences for determination of *A. capra* genotypes

All the positive samples (21 samples) were sequenced and aligned with *A. capra* sequences present in the GenBank and then all the sequences were deposited in the GenBank, as accession numbers: OM100820-OM100840.

 Table 3
 The homolog rates between A. capra sequences obtained from this study and other A. capra based the gltA gene sequences present in GenBank

Accession	Host	Country	Homol-	References
number	11000	country	ogy	11010101000
			rates	
MH084719	Swamp deer	France	100%	Jouglin et al. 2019
MH084720	Red deer	France	100%	Jouglin et al. 2019
MH094751	Siberian roe deer	China	98.70%	Wang et al. 2019
MH192360	Takin	China	98.70%	Yang et al. 2018
MH192362	Forest musk deer	China	98.52%	Yang et al. 2018
MH192363	Reeve's muntjac	China	98.33%	Yang et al. 2018
LC432155	Korean water deer	South Korea	98.56%	Amer et al. 2019
MG940872	Derma- centor everestianus	China	98.39%	Han et al. 2019
OK267267	Cattle	Türkiye	99.25%	Altay et al. 2022b
OK267272	Sheep	Türkiye	99.08%	Altay et al. 2022b
MT721147	Cattle	South Korea	86.24%	Miranda et al. 2021
MG932657	Goat	China	86.04%	Peng et al. 2018
KM206274	Human	China	86.03%	Li et al. 2015
MG869279	Sheep	China	86.03%	Guo et al. 2018
MH940871	Haema- physalis qinghaiensis	China	86.03%	Han et al. 2019
MH029895	Haema- physalis longicornis	China	86.03%	Qin et al. 2018
MW428303	Rhipi- cephalus microplus	China	86.03%	Lu et al. 2022
MK838609	Dog	China	86.01%	Shi et al. 2019

The *gltA* gene sequences of 21 positive samples obtained in this study showed a complete consensus. However, BLAST analysis showed that the *gtlA* sequences of *A. capra* obtained in this study were found 86.01-100% similar to the 174 A. capra sequences present in the GenBank. There was a high homology (98.33–100%) between sequences obtained in this study and 27 *gltA* sequences of *A. capra* present in the GenBank. In contrast, a low homology was determined (86.01-86.24%) with 147 sequences present in GenBank. Detailed information about nucleotide similarity rates between *A. capra* genotypes was given in Table 3. Additionally, the sequence alignment results showed that only 0-7 nucleotides differences emerged between sequences obtained from the present study and the sequences from red deer, swamp deer (*Rucervus duvaucelii*), Siberian roe deer (*Capreolus pygargus*), takin, Reeve's muntjac, Forest musk deer, *D. everestianus*, Korean water deer, cattle, and sheep, while 68–70 nucleotides differences were observed between the sequences from dog, cattle, sheep, goat, human, *H. qinghaiensis H. longicornis*, and *R. microplus* (Fig. 3).

Phylogenetic analysis

The phylogenetic analysis based on the *gltA* gene revealed that *A. capra* was separated into two clusters, and *A. capra* identified in this study clustered within red deer, swamp deer, Siberian roe deer, takin, Reeve's muntjac, Forest musk deer, *D. everestianus*, Korean water deer, cattle, and sheep (Fig. 2).

Anaplasma phagocytophilum-like 1 variant isolated in the present study clustered a distinct group with those of previously published sequences of *A. phagocytophilum*-like 1 (Fig. 4).

In this study, we also determined a partial sequence of 16 S SSU rRNA gene of *A. ovis* to validate the PCR results. Two sequences of *A. ovis* were deposited in the GenBank under the accession numbers of OM453952 and OM453953. The BLAST and phylogenetic analysis of the sequences showed that the *A. ovis* sequences obtained in this study were in full compliance with the *A. ovis* sequences present in the Genbank (data not shown).

Discussion

Tick-borne diseases such as anaplasmosis have enormous negative effects on the livestock industry almost all over the world (Kocan et al. 2010). The prevalence of TBDs like anaplasmosis may vary according to multiple factors, including sampling seasons, differences in animal feeding and husbandry, presence and abundance of ticks and other vectors, sampling area (especially climatic and ecological factors), host resistance, and sample processing methods (Torina et al. 2008; Kocan et al. 2010; Belkahia et al. 2014). In this study, the overall prevalence of anaplasmosis in sheep was found to be 25.8% (101/391). The prevalence at the species level of *A. ovis, A. phagocytophilum*-like 1 and *A. capra* genotype-1 were determined to be 22.5, 6.9 and, 5.3%, respectively.

Anaplasma capra is a newly described species which has zoonotic character and can infect a wide range of hosts. In this study, we investigated the presence and prevalence of A. capra in sheep, and genotypes of the species were documented for the first time. The results (5.3%) in this study were compared with other countries, the prevalence of A. capra was lower than that previously found in sheep Fig. 3 Nucleotide differences in the same positions among the *gltA* sequences from *Anaplasma capra* (594 bp)

GenBank Accession	Host	Nucleotide Positions ^a			
Numbers					
OM100820- OM100840	Sheep	T C T G T A T G A G C G T C C G C C C T T G G T G C T A A G C C T T A G G T A T T T T C A C C C A A A T T A A C G G T T A T A T A	Present study		
MH084719	Swamp deer	Je	ouglin et al. 2019		
MH084720	Red deer	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	ouglin et al. 2019		
OK267272	Sheep	* * C * * * * * * * * * * * * * *	ltay et al. 2022b		
OK267267	Cattle		ltay et al. 2022b		
MH094751	Siberian roe deer	•••••• G•••••• C••••••• C• C•••••••••••	Wang et al. 2019		
MH192360	Takin	•••••• C •••••••••••••••• C • C • • • •	Yang et al. 2018		
LC432155	Korean water deer	с	Amer et al. 2019		
MH192363	Reeves' muntjac	····· G······ C· C····· T····· T····· ··· ··· ·	Yang et al. 2018		
MG940872	D. everestianus	с. с	Han et al. 2019		
MH192362	Forest musk deer	с	Yang et al. 2018		
MK838609	Dog	CTCTCGCTGAGAGTGAATTCCCCTAACATCGGCATTCCGAACGCCCCTGTTTTGGGCGGTAT* CCGCCCG	Shi et al. 2019		
MT721147	Cattle	CTCTCGCTGAGAGTGAATTCCCCTAACATCGGCATTCCGAACGCCCCTGTTTTGGGCGGTAT* CCGCCCG M	iranda et al. 2021		
KM206274	Human	CTCTCGCTGAGAGTGAATTCCCCTAACATCGGCATTCCGAACGCCCCTGTTTTGGGCCGGTATCCCGCCCG	Li et al. 2015		
MW428303	R. microplus	CTCTCGCTGAGAGTGAATTCCCCTAACATCGGCATTCCGAACGCCCCTGTTTTGGGCGGTATCCCGCCCG	Lu et al., 2022		
MG932657	Goat	CTCTCGCTGAGAGTGAATTCCCCTAACATCGGCATTCCGAACGCCCCTGTTTTGGGCCGGTATCCCGCCCG	Peng et al., 2018		
MG869279	Sheep	CTCTCGCTGAGAGTGAATTCCCCTAACATCGGCATTCCGAACGCCCCTGTTTTGGGCCGGTATCCCGCCCG	Guo et al., 2018		
MG940871	H. qinghaiensis	CTCTCGCTGAGAGTGAATTCCCCTAACATCGGCATTCCGAACGCCCCTGTTTTGGGCCGGTATCCCGCCCG	Han et al. 2019		
MH029895	H. longicornis	CTCTCGCTGAGAGTGAATTCCCCTAACATCGGCATTCCGAACGCCCCTGTTTTGGGCGGTATCCCGCCCG	Qin et al., 2018		
Abbreviations: Nucleotides C, Cytosine; T, Thymine; G, Guanine; A, Adenine. * Asterisks show the conserved nucleotide positions.					



Fig. 4 Phylogenetic tree based on the 16 S SSU rRNA gene sequences of *A. phagocytophilum*- like 1 (OM540435-OM540437) using the maximum likelihood method. Numbers at the nodes represent the bootstrap values with 1000 replicates. The evolutionary history was inferred by using the Maximum Likelihood method and Kimura 2-parameter model (Kimura 1980). Scale bar represents 0.0050 substitutions per nucleotide position. *Anaplasma capra* (Accession number: LC432126) was used as an outgroup in the tree. Evolutionary analyses were conducted in MEGA X (Kumar et al. 2018)

(16.3%) and goats (12.3%) from China (Yang et al. 2017), Korean water deer (13.8%) from Korea (Amer et al. 2019), dogs (12.1%) from China (Shi et al. 2019). The *A. capra* prevalence determined in this study was higher than in cattle (0.3%) and goats (0.3%) from Korea (Miranda et al. 2021), deer (swamp and red deer) (4.5%) from France (Jouglin et al. 2019), and cattle (0.3%) from Kyrgyzstan (Altay et al. 2022a), but was close to that found in roe deer (5.8%) from Spain (Remesar et al. 2022). This work was the first to reveal the presence of *A. capra* in Kyrgyzstan sheep, and it will contribute to the understanding of the epidemiology of this species in the world. However, further research is needed to determine its vectors and the pathogenicity of the novel *Anaplasma* species. In this study, all samples were collected from clinically healthy animals and no ticks were collected from sheep in the sampling process. The pathogenicity of *A. capra* is not clear among animal host, and a research conducted by Jouglin et al. (2019) showed that *A. capra* can persist in red deer for four months. The persistently infected animals may serve as reservoirs for vectors, and these animals are important in the epidemiology of the pathogens (Kocan et al. 2010; Brown and Barbet 2016). In this study, animals infected with *A. capra* were clinically healthy, and probably these animals were persistently infected with *A. capra*.

With the increase in the number of the hosts in the countries where A. capra is detected by molecular studies, the sequence registration rate in the GenBank of this species also increases. Thus, it is possible to compare different A. capra samples genetically. In the present study, 21 A. capra PCR positive samples were detected by the gltA gene sequences. The phylogenetic and BLAST analyses, including the A. capra sequences identified in this study and sequences present in the GenBank revealed that A. capra is divided into two different geno-groups (A. capra genotype-1 and A. capra genotype-2) (Figs. 2 and 3). A relationship between these geno-groups, the host, or the region from which they were isolated, could not be determined. While the similarity rates of 27 A. capra samples in the first group and sequences obtained in this study were 98.33-100%, the 147 A. capra sequences in the second group differ significantly from this group and the similarity rate decreases to 86.01-86.24%. Although the difference between the two groups was significant, the homology within the groups was quite high (Table 3). A. capra genotype-1 and A. capra genotype-2 are clearly distinguished from each other according to the gltA gene sequences compared to other gene sequences such as 16 S SSU rRNA and groEL (Unpublished data). We think that the naming of these two groups can be used until we reach research results that will provide a further nomenclature.

Recently based molecular studies has documented that A. phagocytophilum consists of one species and two related variants (A. phagocytophilum-like 1 and 2) (Ben Said et al. 2015, 2017). According to the results of PCR, RFLP and DNA sequence in this study, A. phagocytophilum-like 1 was found in 27 samples (6.9%). The prevalence was close to that reported in Tunisian sheep (7%) (Ben Said et al. 2017), but lower than that reported in small ruminants from Türkiye (26.5%) (Aktas et al. 2021). The phylogenetic tree based on 16 S SSU rRNA sequence revealed that samples identified in this study clustered in A. phagocytophilum-like 1 group (Fig. 4). Studies in which the presence of A. phagocytophilum related variants in farm animals were determined, stated that both variants did not cause clinical symptoms (Ben Said et al. 2015, 2017; Aktas and Colak 2021). In this study, all the animals sampled were clinically healthy, and this result was compatible with the previous studies (Aktas and Colak 2021; Noaman, 2022). When the studies are evaluated together, it can be thought that A. phagocytophilum variants do not cause clinical disease in farm animals. However, detailed studies are needed to determine its clinical effect.

Anaplasma ovis is known as the most prevalent Anaplasma species in sheep all over the world (Dumler et al. 2001). We also detected that A. ovis was the most prevalent species in sheep from Kyrgyzstan (22.5%). When the prevalence studies and the results from this study are evaluated together, it can be seen that A. ovis is an endemic species in many countries (Liu et al. 2012; Altay et al. 2014; Belkahia et al. 2014; Noaman and Sazmand 2022). Although A. ovis is generally thought to cause mild disease, it has been reported that it causes severe clinical symptoms and even death in the presence of secondary infections or predisposing factors (Friedhoff 1997; Renneker et al. 2013). Therefore, A. ovis infection should be taken into consideration more often in sheep flocks.

In conclusion, this study indicated that *Anaplasma* species are widespread in sheep from Kyrgyzstan with having a 25.8% prevalence. The results of this work indicate the presence of *A. phagocytophilum*-like 1, *A. ovis*, and *A. capra* in sheep in Kyrgyzstan for the first time. In the study, we documented that *A. capra* has two different genotypes. We suggest that the naming of these two groups, *A. capra* genotype-1 and *A. capra* genotype-2 can be used until we reach research results that will provide a further nomenclature. All the results show that *Anaplasma* species are important in sheep breeding in Kyrgyzstan, while revealing the necessity of considering genotypes in studies to be carried out on *A. capra*.

Acknowledgements The authors would like to thank all veterinarians and technicians for their kind help during sample collection.

Author's contribution Kursat Altay (DVM, PhD, Prof.) Conceptualization, Field Work, Methodology, Validation, Formal Analysis, Supervision, Writing- Original Draft Preparation, Reviewing and Editing. Ufuk EROL (DVM, PhD, Assist. Prof.) Conceptualization, Field Work, Methodology, Validation, Data Curation, Formal Analysis, Writing- Original Draft Preparation. Omer Faruk SAHIN (DVM, Res. Assist.) Field Work, Data Curation, Methodology, Formal Analysis. Ayperi AYTMIRZAKIZI (DVM, Res. Assist.) Field Work, Data Curation, Formal Analysis. Ethem Mutlu TEMIZEL (DVM, PhD, Prof.) Field Work, Data Curation, Formal Analysis. Mehmet Fatih AYDIN (DVM, PhD, Assist. Prof.) Data Curation, Methodology, Formal Analysis, Nazir DUMANLI (DVM, PhD, Prof.) Field Work, Data Curation, Methodology, Formal Analysis, Writing- Original Draft Preparation, Reviewing and Editing. Munir AKTAS (DVM, PhD, Prof.) Data Curation, Methodology, Formal Analysis, Writing-Original Draft Preparation, Reviewing and Editing.

Funding Not applicable.

Data Availability All data generated or analyzed during this study are included in this manuscript.

Code Availability Not applicable.

Declarations

Conflict of interest The authors declare that they have no conflict of interest.

Ethics approval All procedures performed in studies involving animals were in accordance with the ethical standards approved by Experimentation Ethics Committee of Kyrgyz-Turkish Manas University (30.06.2017/2017–06/02) and the Sivas Cumhuriyet University Animal Experiments Local Ethics Committee (Approval number: 12.07.2021-564).

Consent to participate The consent of all animal owners was sorted before this study was carried out.

Consent for publication All authors have seen and approved the final version of the manuscript being submitted. They warrant that the article is the authors' original work, has not received prior publication, and is not under consideration for publication elsewhere.

References

- Aktas M, Colak S (2021) Molecular detection and phylogeny of Anaplasma spp. in cattle reveals the presence of novel strains closely related to A. phagocytophilum in Turkey. Ticks Tick Borne Dis 12:101604. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ttbdis.2020.101604
- Aktas M, Ozubek S, Ulucesme MC (2021) Molecular detection and phylogeny of *Anaplasma phagocytophilum* and related variants in small ruminants from Turkey. Animals 11:814. https://doi. org/10.3390/ani11030814
- Altay K, Dumanli N, Aktas M, Ozubek S (2014) Survey of Anaplasma Infections in Small Ruminants from East Part of Turkey. Kafkas Univ Vet Fak Derg 20:1–4. https://doi.org/10.9775/ kvfd.2013.9189
- Altay K, Erol U, Sahin OF, Aytmirzakizi A (2022a) () First molecular detection of Anaplasma species in cattle from Kyrgyzstan; molecular identification of human pathogenic novel genotype Anaplasma capra and Anaplasma phagocytophilum

related strain. Ticks Ticks Borne Dis 13:101861. https://doi. org/10.1016/j.ttbdis.2021.101861

- Altay K, Erol U, Sahin OF (2022b) The first molecular detection of Anaplasma caprain domestic ruminants in the central part of Turkey, with genetic diversity and genotyping of Anaplasma capra. Trop Anim Health Prod 54:1–8. https://doi.org/10.1007/ s11250-022-03125-7. doi
- Amer S, Kim S, Yun Y, Na KJ (2019) Novel variants of the newly emergedAnaplasma caprafrom Korean water deer (Hydropotes inermis argyropus) in South Korea. Parasit Vectors 12:1– 9. https://doi.org/10.1186/s13071-019-3622-5.)
- Belkahia H, Ben Said M, El Hamdi S, Yahiaoui M, Gharbi M, Daaloul-Jedidi M, Messadi L (2014) First molecular identification and genetic characterization of *Anaplasma ovis* in sheep from Tunisia. Small Rum Res 121:404–410. https://doi.org/10.1016/j. smallrumres.2014.07.009
- Ben Said M, Belkahia H, Alberti A, Zobba R, Bousrih M, Yahiaoui M, Daaloul-Jedidi M, Mamlouk A, Gharbi M, Messadi L (2015) Molecular survey of *Anaplasma* species in small ruminants reveals the presence of novel strains closely related to *A. phagocytophilum* in Tunisia. Vector Borne Zoonotic Dis 15:580–590. https://doi.org/10.1089/vbz.2015.1796
- Ben Said M, Belkahia H, El Mabrouk N, Saidani M, Ben Hassen M, Alberti A, Zobba R, Bouattour S, Bouattour A, Messadi L (2017) Molecular typing and diagnosis of *Anaplasma* spp. closely related to *Anaplasma phagocytophilum* in ruminants from Tunisia. Ticks Tick Borne Dis 8:412–422. https://doi.org/10.1016/j. ttbdis.2017.01.005
- Brown WC, Barbet AF (2016) Persistent infections and immunity in ruminants to arthropod-borne bacteria in the family Anaplasmataceae. Annu Rev Anim Biosci 4:177–197. https://doi.org/10.1146/ annurev-animal-022513-114206
- Chochlakis D, Ioannou I, Tselentis Y, Psaroulaki A (2010) Human anaplasmosis and *Anaplasma ovis* variant. Emerg Infect Dis 16:1031–1032. https://doi.org/10.3201/eid1606.090175
- Dumler JS, Barbet AF, Bekker CP, Dasch GA, Palmer GH, Ray SC, Rikihisa Y, Rurangirwa FR (2001) Reorganization of genera in the families Rickettsiaceae and Anaplasmataceae in the order Rickettsiales: unification of some species of *Ehrlichia* with *Anaplasma*, *Cowdria* with *Ehrlichia* and *Ehrlichia* with *Neorickettsia*, descriptions of six new species combinations and designation of *Ehrlichia equi* and 'HGE agent' as subjective synonyms of *Ehrlichia phagocytophila*. Int J Syst Evol Microbiol 51:2145– 2165. https://doi.org/10.1099/00207713-51-6-2145
- Fang LQ, Liu K, Li XL, Liang S, Yang Y, Yao HW, Sun RX, Sun Y, Chen WJ, Zuo SQ, Ma MJ, Li H, Jiang JF, Liu W, Yang XF, Gray GC, Krause PJ, Cao WC (2015) Emerging tick-borne infections in mainland China: an increasing public health threat. Lancet Infect Dis 15:1467–1479. https://doi.org/10.1016/S1473-3099(15)00177-2
- Friedhoff KT (1997) Tick-borne diseases of sheep and goats caused by Babesia, Theileria or Anaplasma spp. Parassitologia 39:99–109
- Guo WP, Huang B, Zhao Q, Xu G, Liu B, Wang YH, Zhou EM (2018) Human-pathogenic *Anaplasma* spp., and *Rickettsia* spp. in animals in Xi'an, China. PLoS Negl Trop Dis 12:e0006916. https:// doi.org/10.1371/journal.pntd.0006916
- Guo WP, Zhang B, Wang YH, Xu G, Wang X, Ni X, Zhou EM (2019) Molecular identification and characterization of *Anaplasma capra* and *Anaplasma* platys-like in *Rhipicephalus microplus* in Ankang, Northwest China. BMC Infect Dis 19:434. https://doi. org/10.1186/s12879-019-4075-3
- Haigh JC, Gerwing V, Erdenebaatar J, Hill JE (2008) A novel clinical syndrome and detection of *Anaplasma ovis* in Mongolian reindeer (*Rangifer tarandus*). J Wildl Dis 44:569–577. https://doi. org/10.7589/0090-3558-44.3.569

- Han R, Yang JF, Mukhtar MU, Chen Z, Niu QL, Lin YQ, Liu GY, Lou JX, Yin H, Liu ZJ (2019) Molecular detection of *Anaplasma* infections in ixodid ticks from the Qinghai-Tibet Plateau. Infect Dis Poverty 8:1–8. https://doi.org/10.1186/s40249-019-0522-z
- Hosseini-Vasoukolaei N, Oshaghi MA, Shayan P, Vatandoost H, Babamahmoudi F, Yaghoobi-Ershadi MR, Telmadarraiy Z, Mohtarami F (2014) *Anaplasma* infection in ticks, livestock and human in Ghaemshahr, Mazandaran Province, Iran. J Arthropod Borne Dis 8:204–211
- Jilintai SN, Hayakawa D, Suzuki M, Hata H, Kondo S, Matsumoto K, Yokoyama N, Inokuma H (2009) Molecular survey for Anaplasma bovis and Anaplasma phagocytophilum infection in cattle in a pastureland where sika deer appear in Hokkaido, Japan. Jpn J Infect Dis 62:73–75
- Jouglin M, Blanc B, de la Cotte N, Bastian S, Ortiz K, Malandrin L (2019) First detection and molecular identification of the zoonotic *Anaplasma capra* in deer in France. PLoS ONE 14:0219184. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0219184
- Kang YJ, Diao XN, Zhao GY, Chen MH, Xiong Y, Shi M, Fu WM, Guo YJ, Pan B, Chen XP, Holmes EC, Gillespie JJ, Dumler SJ, Zhang YZ (2014) Extensive diversity of Rickettsiales bacteria in two species of ticks from China and the evolution of the Rickettsiales. BMC Evol Biol 14:167. https://doi.org/10.1186/ s12862-014-0167-2
- Karshima SN, Ahmed MI, Kogi CE, Iliya PS (2022) Anaplasma phagocytophilum infection rates in questing and host-attached ticks: a global systematic review and meta-analysis. Acta Trop 228:106299. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.actatropica.2021.106299
- Kawahara M, Rikihisa Y, Lin Q, Isogai E, Tahara K, Itagaki A, Hiramitsu Y, Tajima T (2006) Novel genetic variants of Anaplasma phagocytophilum, Anaplasma bovis, Anaplasma centrale, and a novel Ehrlichia sp. in wild deer and ticks on two major islands in Japan. Appl Environ Microbiol 72:1102–1109. https:// doi.org/10.1128/AEM.72.2.1102-1109.2006
- Kimura M (1980) A simple method for estimating evolutionary rate of base substitutions through comparative studies of nucleotide sequences. J Mol Evol 16:111–120. https://doi.org/10.1007/ BF01731581
- Kocan KM, de la Fuente J, Blouin EF, Coetzee JF, Ewing SA (2010) The natural history of *Anaplasma marginale*. Vet Parasitol 167:95–107. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.vetpar.2009.09.012
- Koh FX, Panchadcharam C, Sitam FT, Tay ST (2018) Molecular investigation of *Anaplasma* spp. in domestic and wildlife animals in Peninsular Malaysia. Vet Parasitol Reg Stud Reports 13:141–147. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.vprsr.2018.05.006
- Kumar S, Stecher G, Li M, Knyaz C, Tamura K (2018) MEGA X: molecular evolutionary genetics analysis across computing platforms. Mol Biol Evol 35:1547–1549. https://doi.org/10.1093/ molbev/msy096
- Li H, Zheng YC, Ma L, Jia N, Jiang BG, Jiang RR, Huo QB, Wang YW, Liu HB, Chu YL, Song YD, Yao NN, Sun T, Zeng FY, Dumler JS, Jiang JF, Cao WC (2015) Human infection with a novel tick-borne *Anaplasma* species in China: a surveillance study. Lancet Infect Dis 15:663–670. https://doi.org/10.1016/ S1473-3099(15)70051-4
- Liu Z, Ma M, Wang Z, Wang J, Peng Y, Li Y, Guan G, Luo J, Yin H (2012) Molecular survey and genetic identification of *Anaplasma* species in goats from central and southern China. Appl Environ Microbiol 78:464–470. https://doi.org/10.1128/AEM.06848-11
- Lu M, Tian J, Pan X, Qin X, Wang W, Chen J, Guo W, Li K (2022) Identification of *Rickettsia* spp., *Anaplasma* spp., and an *Ehrlichia canis*-like agent in *Rhipicephalus microplus* from Southwest and South-Central China. Ticks Tick Borne Dis 13:101884. https:// doi.org/10.1016/j.ttbdis.2021.101884
- Miranda EA, Han SW, Cho YK, Choi KS, Chae JS (2021) Co-Infection with *Anaplasma* Species and Novel Genetic Variants Detected

in Cattle and Goats in the Republic of Korea. Pathogens 10:28. https://doi.org/10.3390/pathogens10010028

- Noaman V (2022) Factors associated with *Anaplasma phagocytophilum* infection in sheep in Iran. Small Rum Res 208:106617. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.smallrumres.2022.106617
- Noaman V, Sazmand A (2022) Anaplasma ovis infection in sheep from Iran: molecular prevalence, associated risk factors, and spatial clustering. Trop Anim Health Prod 54:1–11. doi: https://doi. org/10.1007/s11250-021-03007-4
- Ohashi N, Inayoshi M, Kitamura K, Kawamori F, Kawaguchi D, Nishimura Y, Naitou H, Hiroi M, Masuzawa T (2005) Anaplasma phagocytophilum-infected ticks, Japan. Emerg Infect Dis 11:1780–1783. https://doi.org/10.3201/eid1111.050407
- Peng Y, Wang K, Zhao S, Yan Y, Wang H, Jing J, Jian F, Wang R, Zhang L, Ning C (2018) Detection and phylogenetic characterization of *Anaplasma capra*: an emerging pathogen in sheep and goats in China. Front Cell Infect Microbiol 8:283. https://doi. org/10.3389/fcimb.2018.00283
- Qin XR, Han FJ, Luo LM, Zhao FM, Han HJ, Zhang ZT, Liu JW, Xue ZF, Liu MM, Ma DQ, Huang YT, Sun Y, Sun XF, Li WQ, Zhao L, Yu H, Yu XJ (2018) *Anaplasma* species detected in *Haemaphysalis longicornis* tick from China. Ticks Tick Borne Dis 9:840–843. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ttbdis.2018.03.014
- Remesar S, Prieto A, Garcia-Dios D, Lopez-Lorenzo G, Martinez-Calabuig N, Diaz-Cao JM, Panadero R, Lopez CM, Fernandez G, Diez-Banos P, Morrondo P, Dia P (2022) Diversity of *Anaplasma* species and importance of mixed infections in roe deer from Spain. Transbound Emerg Dis 1–12. https://doi.org/10.1111/ tbed.14319
- Renneker S, Abdo J, Salih DE, Karagenc T, Bilgic H, Torina A, Oliva AG, Campos J, Kullmann B, Ahmed J, Seitzer U (2013) Can Anaplasma ovis in Small Ruminants be Neglected any Longer? Transbound Emerg Dis 2:105–112. https://doi.org/10.1111/tbed.12149
- Schouls LM, Van De Pol I, Rijpkema SG, Schot CS (1999) Detection and identification of *Ehrlichia, Borrelia burgdorferi* sensu lato, and *Bartonella* species in Dutch *Ixodes ricinus* ticks. J Clin Microbiol 37:2215–2222. https://doi.org/10.1128/ JCM.37.7.2215-2222.1999
- Shi K, Li J, Yan Y, Chen Q, Wang K, Zhou Y, Li D, Chen Y, Yu F, Peng Y, Zhang L, Ning C (2019) Dogs as new hosts for the emerging zoonotic pathogen *Anaplasma capra* in China. Front Cell Infect Microbiol 9:394. https://doi.org/10.3389/fcimb.2019.00394
- Staji H, Yousefi M, Hamedani MA, Tamai IA, Khaligh SG (2021) Genetic characterization and phylogenetic of *Anaplasma capra* in Persian onagers (*Equus hemionus onager*). Vet Microbiol 261:109199. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.vetmic.2021.109199
- Torina A, Alongi A, Naranjo V, Estrada-Pena A, Vicente J, Scimeca S, Marino AM, Salina F, Caracappa S, de la Fuente J (2008)

Prevalence and genotypes of *Anaplasma* species and habitat suitability for ticks in a Mediterranean ecosystem. Appl Environ Microbiol 74:7578–7584. https://doi.org/10.1128/ AEM.01625-08

- Wang H, Yang J, Mukhtar MZ, Liu Z, Zhang M, Wang X (2019) Molecular detection and identification of tick-borne bacteria and protozoans in goats and wild Siberian roe deer (*Capreolus pyg-argus*) from Heilongjiang Province, northeastern China. Parasit Vectors 12:296. https://doi.org/10.1186/s13071-019-3553-1
- Wei W, Li J, Wang YW, Jiang BG, Liu HB, Wei R, Jiang RR, Cui XM, Li LF, Yuan TT, Wang Q, Zhao L, Xia LY, Jiang JF, Qui YF, Jia N, Cao WC, Hu YL (2020) *Anaplasma platys*-Like Infection in Goats, Beijing, China. Vector Borne Zoonotic Dis 20:755–762. https://doi.org/10.1089/vbz.2019.2597
- Yang J, Li Y, Liu Z, Liu J, Niu Q, Ren Q, Chen Z, Guan G, Luo J, Yin H (2015) Molecular detection and characterization of *Anaplasma* spp. in sheep and cattle from Xinjiang, northwest China. Parasit Vectors 19:108. https://doi.org/10.1186/s13071-015-0727-3
- Yang J, Liu Z, Niu Q, Liu J, Han R, Liu G, Shi Y, Luo J, Yin H (2016) Molecular survey and characterization of a novel *Anaplasma* species closely related to *Anaplasma capra* in ticks, northwestern China. Parasit Vectors 9:1–5. https://doi.org/10.1186/ s13071-016-1886-6
- Yang J, Liu Z, Niu Q, Liu J, Han R, Guan G, Hassan MD, Liu G, Luo J, Yin H (2017) A novel zoonotic *Anaplasma* species is prevalent in small ruminants: potential public health implications. Parasit Vectors 10:1–6. https://doi.org/10.1186/s13071-017-2182-9
- Yang J, Liu Z, Niu Q, Mukhtar MU, Guan G, Liu G, Luo J, Yin H (2018) A novel genotype of "Anaplasma capra" in wildlife and its phylogenetic relationship with the human genotypes. Emerg Microbes Infect 7:1–4. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41426-018-0212-0
- Yoshimoto K, Matsuyama Y, Matsuda H, Sakamoto L, Matsumoto K, Yokoyama N, Inokuma H (2010) Detection of Anaplasma bovis and Anaplasma phagocytophilum DNA from Haemaphysalis megaspinosain Hokkaido, Japan. Vet Parasitol 168:170–172. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.vetpar.2009.10.008

Publisher's Note Springer Nature remains neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.

Springer Nature or its licensor holds exclusive rights to this article under a publishing agreement with the author(s) or other rightsholder(s); author self-archiving of the accepted manuscript version of this article is solely governed by the terms of such publishing agreement and applicable law.