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Abstract:

A cross-sectional epidemiological study was conducted from November 2015 to January 2015 to estimate the prevalence and investigate risk factors associated with the Fasciolosis due to the disease in cattle slaughtered at two abattoirs Ganaua and El Sahafa were selected from the localities of Khartoum State. Among the total of 375 cattle examined at post mortem and fecal examination by sedimentation, 32 animals were positive and prevalence of Fasciolosis was 8.5%.
Univariate analysis showed that there was statistically significant association between infection and age of animal ($X^2 = 9.278$) (p-value = 0.002). Association body condition of animal and disease ($X^2 = 17.436$) (p-value = 0.000). Also, The Chi-square test showed significant association between Fasciola infection and grazing system ($X = 0.337$, p-value = 0.562). Vegetation statistically significant association with disease ($X = 3.098$, p-value = 0.078). Using drug shows that there was statistically significant association with disease ($X^2 = 9.730$, p-value = 0.002). Present of snail statistically significant association with disease ($X^2 = 3.724$, p-value = 0.002). Manure disposal statistically significant association with disease ($X^2 = 3.044$, p-value = 0.081). However sex, breed, source of animal, water body, and knowledge were not found significant association (p-value $\leq 0.05$).

Multivariate analysis showed strength of association between risk factors (age, body condition and vegetation and disease), showed statistically significant association (p-value $\leq 0.05$).

ملخص البحث

أجريت دراسة مقطعية وبيئية في الفترة ما بين من نوفمبر 2015 حتى يناير 2015.
لتقدير معدل انتشار وعوامل الخطر المرتبطة بمرض الفاشيولا في الأبقار المذبوحة في سلخانة قناوة والصحافة تم اختيارها من محلات ولاية الخرطوم. من بين ما مجموعه 375 من الأبقار تم فحصها بعد الذبح في السلخانة و بواسطة تحليل البراز بطريقة التسرب، فوجد أن 32 رأس من الأبقار مصابة بمرض الفاشيولا.

وأظهر الدراسة أن نسبة انتشار الفاشيولا 8.5% من خلال الفحص الروتيني لللحوم وفحص البراز له علاقة معنوية تحت قيم معنوية أقل من أو تساوي (0.05) هناك ارتباط ذات دلالة إحصائية بين العدوى وعمر الحيوان (مربع كاى = 3.062) (قيمة ف = 0.02)، وارتباط بين الصحة الجسمية للحيوان والمرض (مربع كاى = 17.436) (قيمة ف = 0.009).

وأظهر اختبار مربع كاي علاقة ذات دلالة إحصائية بين العدوى ونظام الري (مربع كاى = 0.337) (قيمة ف = 0.002) وارتباط بين وجود الأعشاب ووجود المرض (مربع كاى = 3.012) (قيمة ف = 0.002) وارتباط ذات دلالة إحصائية بين وجود القواقع ومرض الفاشيولا (مربع كاى = 0.009) وارتباط ذات دلالة إحصائية بين الري والمرض (مربع كاى = 0.005) ومع ذلك الجنس، والسلالة، مصدر الحيوانات، مصدر المياه، ومعرفة المرض ليس له علاقة معنوية مع حدوث الفاشيولا تحت قيم معنوية أكبر من (0.25). نظهر التحليل متعدد المتغيرات قوة الارتباط بين عوامل الخطر (العمر، حالة الجسم والغطاء النباتي والمرض، تحت قيم معنوية أقل من أو تساوي (قيمة 0.05)).