

## **Evaluation of methods for short-term marking of domestic dogs for rabies control**

Conan Anne<sup>a\*\*†</sup>, Kent Alice<sup>b</sup> Koman Kim<sup>c</sup>, Konink Simone<sup>c</sup>, Knobel Darryn<sup>a†</sup>

<sup>a</sup> Department of Veterinary Tropical Diseases, Faculty of Veterinary Science, University of Pretoria, Private Bag X04, Onderstepoort, 0110, South Africa

<sup>b</sup> 50 Oaklands Grove, London, W12 0JB

<sup>c</sup> Faculty of Veterinary Medicine, Utrecht University, Yalelaan 1, 3584 CL, Utrecht, The Netherlands

**\*Corresponding author:** tel.: +27 82 057 5603, email address: [anne.conan@up.ac.za](mailto:anne.conan@up.ac.za); Postal address: Department of Veterinary Tropical Diseases, Faculty of Veterinary Science, University of Pretoria, Private Bag X04, Onderstepoort, 0110, South Africa

**†Current address:** Ross University School of Veterinary Medicine, PO Box 334, Basseterre, St Kitts

### **Abstract**

Rabies transmitted by domestic dogs is a serious yet neglected public health threat in many underserved communities in Africa and Asia. Achieving 70% vaccination coverage in dog populations through annual mass vaccination campaigns is an effective means of controlling the disease in these communities. Evaluating the extent to which this target coverage is achieved requires either accurate pre-campaign estimates of the dog population size or accurate estimates of the coverage attained by conducting post-vaccination surveys. Short-term marking of dogs by applying visible marks may be useful to achieve these estimates, but will be affected by the performance of the marking methods. We evaluated the longevity and visibility of two readily-available livestock marking methods applied to owned, free roaming dogs.

We applied two types of marks (spray and crayon) with three different colours (red, blue and green) to each of 21 dogs and compared the time of persistence of the marks over several weeks. Two independent observers assessed the visibility and colour of the marks. Each dog was observed over

eight to 37 days (median: 28 days). Kaplan-Meier survival analyses and semi-parametric log-rank tests were performed separately for both observers. Spray marks remained visible significantly longer (median of 24 days for both observers) compared with crayon marks (medians of 10 and 13 days). After 10 days, 90% of spray marks were still visible, compared with only 46% of crayon marks. Visibility of marks was reduced in darker-coloured dogs. Colours of marks were frequently misclassified, and agreement between observers on the colours of the marks was low (Cohen's kappa coefficient = 0.27).

The livestock marker spray can effectively be used to mark dogs that are physically restrained, for example during vaccination campaigns. Resight surveys should be conducted within a short a time as possible after marking; however, our results suggest that loss of marks will not have a significant impact if surveys are conducted within 5-7 days after marking with the spray. Results that depend on observers' abilities to distinguish between the three colours which we evaluated may not be reliable.

### **Keywords**

Dogs, free roaming, survival analysis, mark-resight, rabies, vaccination

### **Introduction**

Domestic dogs are the primary reservoir hosts for rabies virus (RABV) across most of its distribution in Africa and Asia. Dogs are responsible for the vast majority (>90%) of human exposures and deaths due to this virus (WHO, 1999). Rabies transmitted from dogs kills an estimated 55,000 people each year in Africa and Asia, and millions of dollars are spent on post-exposure prophylaxis (PEP) to prevent the disease developing in patients bitten by suspect rabid dogs (Knobel et al., 2005). Rabies in dogs, , reintroduction of rabies from bats or wildlife in dog population, and cases of the disease transmitted from dogs to people, can be controlled and in certain circumstances eliminated by the mass vaccination of dogs against the virus (Cleaveland et al., 2006; De Lucca et al., 2013; Lembo et

al., 2010; Velasco-Villa et al., 2008). Using estimates of the basic reproductive rate of rabies from a number of outbreaks in dogs around the world, Hampson et al. (2009) estimate that a critical vaccination coverage of only 20-40% of a dog population is sufficient to prevent outbreaks of rabies. In circumstances when vaccination is applied through annual campaigns of relatively short duration, vaccination coverage declines in the period between campaigns as vaccinated dogs die or migrate out and susceptible dogs are born or migrate in. While studies on these demographic rates in dog populations are limited, data from northern Tanzania show that attaining 60% vaccination coverage during annual campaigns will be sufficient to prevent vaccination coverage falling below this critical threshold in the period between campaigns (Hampson et al., 2009). This is in line with the empirically-derived recommendation of 70% vaccination coverage in dogs to control rabies (WHO, 2013).

Evaluating the extent to which this target coverage is achieved requires either accurate pre-campaign estimates of the dog population size along with the number of dogs vaccinated during the campaign, or accurate estimates of the coverage attained by conducting post-vaccination surveys. Various methods have been used to estimate dog population sizes and vaccination coverage. Household surveys are commonly used (e.g. Acosta-Jamett et al., 2010; Kongkaew et al., 2004), but are prone to biases (Downes et al., 2013) and may be logistically difficult and costly. Other studies to estimate population sizes have applied mark-resight methods (Totton et al., 2010). While these methods may make use of natural marks or other physical characteristics of dogs (e.g. Amaral et al., 2013; Belsare and Gompper, 2013), in other cases dogs are artificially marked, often during vaccination campaigns (e.g. Gsell et al., 2012; Kayali et al., 2003). Collars may be applied to mark dogs (Gsell et al., 2012), but these can be removed by owners or dogs themselves. Paint marks may provide short-term, cost-effective alternatives sufficient for most purposes (Totton et al., 2010). The accuracy of population estimates derived through mark-recapture methods relies on a number of assumptions being met (Totton et al., 2010) including the assumption that marks are neither lost

before nor overlooked during the resight survey. The degree to which this assumption is met depends on the interval between marking and survey, and will be influenced by the type of mark applied (Childs et al., 1998). The longevity and visibility of marks applied during vaccination also influences the accuracy of estimates of vaccination coverage derived from post-campaign surveys (Townsend et al., 2013). In this study, we evaluate the longevity and visibility of two readily-available livestock marking methods applied to owned, free-roaming domestic dogs.

### **Materials and methods**

The study was conducted among owned, free-roaming dogs in Hluvukani, Mpumalanga Province, South Africa (S 24°39'; E 31°20'), from 7<sup>th</sup> October to the 15<sup>th</sup> November 2013 during the rainy season. Hluvukani has been the site of a health and demographic surveillance system in dogs (HDSS-Dogs) conducted since 2011 by the University of Pretoria. For this project, all of the nearly 2,000 households in the designated surveillance area are visited quarterly to update data on the demographics of the owned dog population (births, deaths, migrations and rabies vaccination status). Photographs and microchip implants (Backhome Biotech, Virbac®) are used to individually identify dogs.

For the present study, 21 healthy adult ( $\geq 1$  year old) dogs were selected from the HDSS-Dogs population. The selection of dogs was a convenience sample, representing dogs from households that were visited over a two-week period for quarterly updates. Owners of selected dogs were approached and informed consent was verbally obtained before dogs were enrolled in the study. A dog was included if it was easy to restrain it and if the size of its side allowed application of three marks. All selected dogs had short coats. Colour of dogs was recorded at enrolment and classified in three categories: light (white and light brown coats), fawn and dark (dark brown and black coats). At enrolment, six marks – three colours (blue, red and green) of each of two marking types (RAIDEX animal-marking spray and crayon, RAIDEX GmbH, Dettingen an der Erms, Germany) – were applied on the sides of each dog (three marks per side). The safety aspects of the RAIDEX spray

(composition: ethanol) and crayon (waxes and paraffin oil) in dogs were considered the same as in livestock, and no harmful consequences have been noticed after application (Identification Methods for Dogs and Cats, available from <http://www.icam-coalition.org/resources>). All dogs were restrained by their owners and marks were applied by the same member of the study team. Stripes of about 5 cm width were applied on the sides, from shoulder to hip. Each of the six marks (type and colour combination) was randomly assigned to one of the six positions on the sides of each dog. Following this process, all 126 marks were applied to the assigned positions on the 21 dogs.

Dogs were visited twice a week after enrolment until all marks could no longer be observed. The team member who had applied the mark restrained the dog, while two observers (A and B) independently assessed the marks from a distance of 30 m (measured on each occasion using a laser ranger finder). At the time of observation, observers were unaware of the colour or type of mark applied to each position on the dog. For each position (1-6), the observers independently recorded whether a mark was visible, and if so, its colour. Neither observer was known to have any major deficiency of their vision. Results were captured on paper forms in the field and entered into a Microsoft Excel spreadsheet. Survival analysis was performed with R (R Core Team, 2014) using the package *survival* (Therneau, 2014). A failure event was defined as the first non-observation of the mark. Kaplan-Meier survival functions were plotted and the effect of variables (type of mark, colour of mark, and coat colour) on survival time was compared by univariate analyses using the log-rank test. The correct identification of the colour of visible marks was evaluated using Chi-square tests. Correctness of observations (correct/incorrect) was compared 1) between colours for each observer and for spray and crayon separately, and 2) between observers for each combination of type and colour. Survival times of all marks were compared between both observers. Afterwards, analyses were performed independently for each of the two observers to avoid non-independence of the observations. To evaluate the influence of individual observer on the correct identification of the colour of visible marks, Cohen's kappa coefficient  $\kappa$  was calculated.


## Results

Each dog was assessed during one to nine visits (median: six visits) over eight to 37 days (median: 28 days). There was no significant difference in survival time of marks between observers A and B (log-rank test,  $p = 1$ ). For each observer, the results of the univariate analyses of the survival data are shown in Table 1. Significant differences in survival time were found for the type of mark (spray vs. crayon) and the coat colour of the dog (for observer A). The colour of the mark did not significantly affect survival time. There was no difference in the survival times between colour of dogs if the analysis was separated by colour of marks ( $p > 0.1$  for all comparisons).

		Observer A				Observer B		
		No. of marks applied	No. of failures	Median time in days to event (95% CI)	p-value	No. of failures	Median time in days to event (95% CI)	p-value
Mark type	Spray	63	34	24 (23-∞)	<0.001	34	24 (20-∞)	<0.001
	Crayon	63	58	10 (8-13)		60	13 (10-15)	
Mark colour	Blue	42	31	17 (14-24)	0.6	31	14 (11-18)	0.7
	Green	41	31	13 (10-21)		32	17 (13-21)	
	Red	43	30	17 (14-26)		31	20 (14-25)	
Coat colour	Dark	36	31	15 (10-21)	0.04	25	15 (13-20)	0.6
	Fawn	72	50	17 (14-20)		55	14 (13-21)	
	Light	18	11	21 (10-∞)		14	20 (13-∞)	

**Table 1:** Univariate analyses of the Kaplan-Meier curves by type and colour of mark and colour of dog coat. The failures correspond to the first non-observation of the mark. The comparison is done with a semi-parametric log rank test.

The Kaplan-Meier survival functions for the two types of marks for observer A are shown in Figure 1. After 10 days, 90.4% of spray marks were still visible, compared with only 46% of crayon marks. Fewer than 90% (82.5%) of crayon marks were visible up to 5 days. In the case of dark-coloured dogs, the probability of survival of spray marks up to eight days was still high (83.3%), but was only 50% for crayon marks.



**Figure 1:** Kaplan-Meier survival function for crayon and spray marks, shown here for Observer A. Grey shading shows the 95% confidence intervals of the cumulative survival for each type of mark.

For all observations when a mark was visible, the observer recorded the perceived colour of the mark. This was compared with the actual colour of the mark. Table 2 shows the results of this comparison. Within observers, red spray marks were most often correctly classified, while green

Type	Colour	Observer A			Observer B			p-value†
		Total observations	Correct observations	p-value*	Total Observations	Correct observation	p-value*	
Spray	Blue	86	67 (78 %)	<b>&lt;0.00001</b>	87	71 (82 %)	<b>&lt;0.00001</b>	0.7
	Green	83	51 (61 %)		84	28 (33 %)		<b>0.0005</b>
	Red	84	79 (94 %)		73	64 (88 %)		0.3
Crayon	Blue	38	32 (84 %)	<b>&lt;0.00001</b>	40	24 (60 %)	<b>&lt;0.00001</b>	<b>0.03</b>
	Green	37	12 (32 %)		42	8 (19 %)		0.3
	Red	41	34 (83 %)		78	41 (53 %)		0.6

\*Chi-squared test within observer

† Chi-squared test between observers

**Table 2:** Comparison by chi-squared test of the correctness of the observed colours of spray and crayon.

crayon marks were most often incorrectly classified. There was a significant difference between observers in the classification of green spray and of blue crayon, with observer B misclassifying them

more frequently than expected. Overall, agreement between observers on the colours of the marks was low ( $\kappa = 0.27$ ).

## **Discussion**

Short-term marking of dogs may be useful for mark-resight surveys to determine population size, or for post-vaccination campaign surveys to estimate the vaccination coverage achieved. The animal-marking spray and crayon that we evaluated are readily available and easy to apply, although animals may be startled by the noise of the canister during the application of the spray mark. In this study, spray marks were visible for significantly longer than crayon marks: only 10% of spray marks were no longer visible from a distance of 30 m after 10 days, while more than 17% of crayon marks were no longer visible five days after application. Crayon marks may therefore only be suitable for circumstances in which surveys are conducted within one or two days of application.

There was no effect of observer on the survival time of marks in our study, although the coat colour of the dog did significantly affect the visibility of marks for one observer. The survival time of a mark was not significantly affected by its colour. We did however find that observers misidentified mark colours. This finding may have implications for some studies, for example those that may wish to investigate the age or sex structure of dog populations through mark-resight methods by applying different coloured marks to different segments of the population, or those that wish to determine when and where initial capture took place by applying different coloured marks to dogs captured on different days or in different locations (e.g. Kloeck, 1997).

A limitation of our study is that observers knew that all dogs were marked and may therefore have looked more intently for a mark than may be the case in a population with a high proportion of unmarked dogs. This may overestimate the survival time of marks when compared to a more realistic field situation. Although our study did take place during the onset of the rainy season, the



effect of weather conditions on the longevity and visibility of the marks was not assessed. Furthermore, we only assessed marks at a single distance of 30 m, taken to represent the maximum expected distance from the centre of a road to the centre of a yard in our study area. The visibility of marks may naturally be expected to vary in circumstances where the expected maximum observation distance is longer or shorter than this.

### **Conclusion**

Achieving 70% vaccination coverage through annual campaigns is recommended for effective dog rabies control and elimination programmes in underserved communities. Acquiring accurate pre-campaign estimates of the dog population size is challenging. Accurate estimates of vaccination coverage achieved may therefore best be attained by conducting post-vaccination surveys. Immediate follow-up campaigns can then be conducted if coverage falls short of the 70% target. Livestock marking spray is as an effective method to mark dogs at vaccination, and loss of marks will not have a significant impact if surveys are conducted within 5-7 days after marking. Follow-up campaigns conducted during this time could also reliably focus on unmarked dogs.

### **Acknowledgements**

This study was funded by the Morris Animal Foundation, through a First Investigator Award to DK (grant no D12CA-312). This publication has not been reviewed or endorsed by the Foundation, and the views expressed herein do not necessarily reflect the views of the Foundation, its officers, directors, affiliates or agents.

We would like to thank the Mnisi Community Program (Faculty of Veterinary Sciences, University of Pretoria) for allowing and facilitating this study. We are also grateful to Julia Sithole and Liven Ndlovu, Environmental Monitors for the University of Pretoria, who assisted with the data collection.

## **References**

- Acosta-Jamett, G., Cleaveland, S., Cunningham, A.A., Bronsvoort, B.M.D., 2010. Demography of domestic dogs in rural and urban areas of the Coquimbo region of Chile and implications for disease transmission. *Prev. Vet. Med.* 94, 272–281.
- Amaral, A.C., Ward, M.P., da Costa Freitas, J., 2013. Estimation of roaming dog populations in Timor Leste. *Prev. Vet. Med.* 113, 608–613.
- Belsare, A.V., Gompper, M.E., 2013. Assessing demographic and epidemiologic parameters of rural dog populations in India during mass vaccination campaigns. *Prev. Vet. Med.*
- Childs, J.E., Robinson, L.E., Sadek, R., Madden, A., Miranda, M.E., Miranda, N.L., 1998. Density estimates of rural dog populations and an assessment of marking methods during a rabies vaccination campaign in the Philippines. *Prev. Vet. Med.* 33, 207–218.
- Cleaveland, S., Kaare, M., Knobel, D., Laurenson, M.K., 2006. Canine vaccination--providing broader benefits for disease control. *Vet Microbiol* 117, 43–50.
- De Lucca, T., Rodrigues, R.C.A., Castagna, C., Presotto, D., De Nadai, D.V., Fagre, A., Braga, G.B., Guilloux, A.G.A., e Alves, A.J.S., Martins, C.M., Amaku, M., Ferreira, F., Dias, R.A., 2013. Assessing the rabies control and surveillance systems in Brazil: an experience of measures toward bats after the halt of massive vaccination of dogs and cats in Campinas, Sao Paulo. *Prev. Vet. Med.* 111, 126–133. doi:10.1016/j.prevetmed.2013.03.007
- Downes, M.J., Dean, R.S., Stavisky, J.H., Adams, V.J., Grindlay, D.J., Brennan, M.L., 2013. Methods used to estimate the size of the owned cat and dog population: a systematic review. *BMC Vet. Res.* 9, 121.
- Gsell, A.S., Knobel, D.L., Kazwala, R.R., Vounatsou, P., Zinsstag, J., 2012. Domestic dog demographic structure and dynamics relevant to rabies control planning in urban areas in Africa: the case of Iringa, Tanzania. *BMC Vet. Res.* 8, 1–10.
- Hampson, K., Dushoff, J., Cleaveland, S., Haydon, D.T., Kaare, M., Packer, C., Dobson, A., 2009. Transmission dynamics and prospects for the elimination of canine rabies. *PLoS Biol* 7, e1000053.
- Kayali, U., Mindekem, R., Yémadji, N., Vounatsou, P., Kaininga, Y., Ndoutamia, A.G., Zinsstag, J., 2003. Coverage of pilot parenteral vaccination campaign against canine rabies in N'Djaména, Chad. *Bull. World Health Organ.* 81, 739–744.
- KloECK, P.E., 1997. Rabies control in Mpumalanga, South Africa'. Presented at the 4th Southern and Easterb African Rabies Group/World Health Organization Conference Proceedings, P. Kitala, B. Perry, J. Barrat & A. Kings (eds), Nairobi, Kenya, pp. 153–159.

Knobel, D.L., Cleaveland, S., Coleman, P.G., Fèvre, E.M., Meltzer, M.I., Miranda, M.E.G., Shaw, A., Zinsstag, J., Meslin, F.X., 2005. Re-evaluating the burden of rabies in Africa and Asia. *Bull. World Health Organ.* 83, 360–368.

Kongkaew, W., Coleman, P., Pfeiffer, D.U., Antarasena, C., Thiptara, A., 2004. Vaccination coverage and epidemiological parameters of the owned-dog population in Thungsong District, Thailand. *Prev. Vet. Med.* 65, 105–115.

Lembo, T., Hampson, K., Kaare, M.T., Ernest, E., Knobel, D., Kazwala, R.R., Haydon, D.T., Cleaveland, S. 2010. The feasibility of canine rabies elimination in Africa: dispelling doubts with data. *PLoS Negl Trop Dis* 4, e626.

R Core Team, 2014. R: A language and environment for statistical computing.

Therneau, T., 2014. A package for survival analysis in S.

Totton, S.C., Wandeler, A.I., Zinsstag, J., Bauch, C.T., Ribble, C.S., Rosatte, R.C., McEwen, S.A., 2010. Stray dog population demographics in Jodhpur, India following a population control/rabies vaccination program. *Prev. Vet. Med.* 97, 51–57.

Townsend, S.E., Sumantra, I.P., Pudjiatmoko, Bagus, G.N., Brum, E., Cleaveland, S., Crafter, S., Dewi, A.P.M., Dharma, D.M.N., Dushoff, J., Girardi, J., Gunata, I.K., Hiby, E.F., Kalalo, C., Knobel, D.L., Mardiana, I.W., Putra, A.A.G., Schoonman, L., Scott-Orr, H., Shand, M., Sukanadi, I.W., Suseno, P.P., Haydon, D.T., Hampson, K., 2013. Designing programs for eliminating canine rabies from islands: Bali, Indonesia as a case study. *PLoS Negl. Trop. Dis.* 7.

Velasco-Villa, A., Reeder, S.A., Orciari, L.A., Yager, P.A., Franka, R., Blanton, J.D., Zuckero, L., Hunt, P., Oertli, E.H., Robinson, L.E., Rupprecht, C.E., 2008. Enzootic rabies elimination from dogs and reemergence in wild terrestrial carnivores, United States. *Emerg. Infect. Dis.* 14, 1849–1854.

WHO, 2013. WHO expert consultation on rabies: second report. W.H.O. (Ed.). Geneva, Switzerland

WHO, 1999. World survey of rabies No. 34 for the year 1998 (WHO/CDS/CSR/APH/99.6). Geneva, Switzerland