



Microbes and Infectious Diseases

Journal homepage: <https://mid.journals.ekb.eg/>

Original article

Impact of dose and route of administration on antibody responses of chickens inoculated with an inactivated avian influenza H5 vaccine

Abubakar Ojone Woziri ^{*1}, Clement Adebajo Meseko ², Faridah Ibrahim Nasir ³, Khadijat Abdulkarim ⁴, Folorunso Oludayo Fasina ⁵, Jibril Adamu ¹, Paul Ayuba Abdu ⁶

1- Department of Veterinary Microbiology, Ahmadu Bello University, Zaria - Nigeria.

2- Animal Influenza Division, Infectious and Transboundary Animal Diseases, National Veterinary Research Institute, Vom - Nigeria.

3- Department of Veterinary Public Health and Preventive Medicine, Ahmadu Bello University, Zaria - Nigeria.

4- Department of Zoology, Ahmadu Bello University, Zaria - Nigeria.

5- Emergency Centre for Transboundary Animal Diseases-Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (ECTAD-FAO), Dar es Salaam, Tanzania.

6- Department of Veterinary Medicine, Ahmadu Bello University, Zaria - Nigeria.

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:

Received 4 May 2021

Received in revised form 15 June 2021

Accepted 17 June 2021

Keywords:

Avian Influenza
Inactivated H5 vaccine
Dose
Intramuscular
Subcutaneous
Chickens
Nigeria

ABSTRACT

Background: The present study evaluated the influence of dose and route of administration of a commercial inactivated avian influenza virus (AIV) H5 vaccine on the humoral immune response of ISA brown chickens. **Methods:** Ninety “one-day-old” chickens were purchased from three commercial hatcheries ($n = 30$ chicks per hatchery), respectively, and chicks were vaccinated with either 0.2, 0.5 or 0.7 ml of the vaccine via either the intramuscular or subcutaneous route at days 14 and 28, respectively. Vaccinal antibody titres in chicks’ sera were quantified using an indirect ELISA kit at 14 (before vaccination), 21, 28, 35 and 42 days of age. **Results:** Results showed significant differences ($p < 0.001$) in the mean antibody titre levels at day 21 of age between chicks from hatcheries C ($2,205.0 \pm 409.1$) and A (57.7 ± 49.9) at 21 days of age when either 0.2 ml or 0.5 ml of the vaccine was administered IM or SC. In addition, there were intra- and inter dose significant differences ($p < 0.001$) between the chicks at 21, 28, 35 and 42 days of age. Furthermore, intra- and inter route significant differences ($p < 0.001$) were detected between the chicks at 21 and 35 days of age. **Conclusion:** Overall, the AIV H5 vaccine studied had variable outcomes and was poorly immunogenic. **Recommendation:** Further studies should be conducted to characterize the T- and B-lymphocytes in chickens post AIV H5 vaccines administration, and evaluate the sequence homologies between imported AIV H5 vaccines and circulating AIV strains in Nigeria.

Introduction

Avian influenza virus (AIV), a single-stranded, negative-sense RNA virus, is a member of the family Orthomyxoviridae, genus Orthomyxovirus, and diseases caused by type A

influenza viruses (IAVs) are common among members of the order Anseriformes (ducks, geese and swans) [1-6]. However, many influenza A virus subtypes in wild birds may differ between species

DOI: 10.21608/MID.2021.72759.1149

* Corresponding author: Abubakar Ojone Woziri

E-mail address: woziriabubakar@gmail.com

and geographical locations, with great tendencies for evolution over time [3,7,8].

Avian influenza virus has gained global recognition as one of the major diseases of public health and economic importance. Avian influenza (AI) vaccines are often used in integrated control strategies to protect poultry against highly pathogenic avian influenza (HPAI) such as H5N1, as vaccination decrease disease prevalence and reduce viral shedding among infected poultry [9]. Likewise, vaccination against HPAI has shown decreased rates of environmental contamination, especially where enforcement of biosecurity is impracticable [9]. However, in spite of the fact that mucosal routes serve as portals of entry for AIVs into susceptible hosts, many of the AI vaccines approved for use in poultry are inactivated whole virus vaccines, delivered with water-in-oil emulsions [10] through parenteral routes, and requiring adjuvants for the induction of antigen-specific immune responses [11].

Currently, there are three types of AIV vaccines that have been licensed or approved for use in poultry [12]; and between 2002 and 2010, over 113 billion doses of AI vaccines have been used in poultry as oil-emulsified inactivated whole AI vaccines (95.5%) and live vectored vaccines (4.5%) [13]. Most commercial vaccines rely on the generation of neutralizing antibodies against the antigenic protein – haemagglutinin (HA). However, the inability of neutralizing antibodies to cross-react with heterotypic viruses or even variant viruses of the same HA subtype limits the efficacy of such AI vaccines in providing the required protection against field infection [14,15].

Like in many developing countries, poultry production in Nigeria is an important income generating activity, contributing to the general economy through its linkage with other sectors [16]. However, in spite of the number of outbreaks of HPAI caused by H5N1 and H5N8 in the presence of various surveillance efforts in Nigeria, vaccination policies against AIVs have not gained government approval; hence, farm owners decide which vaccine to use, if any, in a bid to protect their investments. However, a study has shown that some of these AI vaccines, when used, could confer partial protection in targeted host species and thus lead to vaccine-induced escape mutants, which may either revert to virulence or adapt to new hosts [17]. Previous reports have also indicated that improper antigenic matching between vaccines and circulating viruses

might reduce vaccine efficacy [18,19]. Studies in humans have shown that H5N1 viruses elicit a poor humoral immune response, providing low antibody titres that fade over a short period [20,21]. As most AI vaccines used for poultry globally are inactivated, current knowledge of immunity against AI is largely based on humoral immune responses [22]. The present study was therefore aimed at evaluating the influence of dose and route of administration of AI H5 inactivated vaccine on the humoral immune response of ISA brown chickens. This is expected to provide baseline data on humoral immune response of vaccinated birds against AIV in Nigeria.

Materials and Methods

Experimental animals

A total of 90 one-day-old ISA Brown chickens were purchased from three different commercial hatcheries A, B and C ($n = 30$ chicks per hatchery), respectively. The animals were housed in a hygienic environment at the Poultry Research facility of the Faculty of Veterinary Medicine, Ahmadu Bello University, Nigeria. All the chicks were wing-banded with alpha-numeric tags for ease of identification.

Vaccine

An inactivated oil-emulsion avian influenza H5 vaccine (AVIFLU[®] H5 – Izovac, Italy, containing H5N9 subtype antigen and recommended for use in chickens at a dose of either 0.25 or 0.5 ml administered either subcutaneously or intramuscularly) was used under natural field conditions.

Experimental design

Treatment groups

The chicks were divided on the day of purchase into three (3) groups of A, B and C ($n = 30$ per hatchery), respectively. All the chicks were wing-banded with alphanumeric ribbons for ease of identification, and housed in clean and hygienic elevated wire cages (10 chicks per 60 cm x 55 cm cell) in the Poultry Research Unit of the Veterinary Teaching Hospital, Ahmadu Bello University, Zaria – Nigeria. The chicks were acclimatised for 14 days prior to the commencement of the experiment. All chicks were granted access to water and a commercial broiler's starter ration *ad libitum* throughout the duration of the experiment.

Treatment protocols

Chicks from Hatchery A: The chicks were subdivided into three subgroups of A1, A2 and A3

($n = 10$ each) based on the dose of the AI H5 vaccine to be administered. Chicks in A1 were administered 0.2 ml of the vaccine via either the subcutaneous (at the nape of the neck) ($n = 5$) or intramuscular routes (in the breast muscles) ($n = 5$), respectively on days 14 and 28 of age. Chicks in A2 were administered 0.5 ml of the vaccine via either the subcutaneous ($n = 5$) or intramuscular routes ($n = 5$), respectively on days 14 and 28 of age. Chicks in A3 were administered 0.7 ml of the vaccine via either the subcutaneous ($n = 5$) or intramuscular routes ($n = 5$), respectively on days 14 and 28 of age. The 0.2 ml and 0.5 ml dose regimes were chosen on the basis of the manufacturer's recommendation while the 0.7 ml dose regime was used to depict field scenario of possible over-dosing.

Chicks from Hatcheries B and C were treated similar to those from Hatchery A.

All the chicks were monitored daily for welfare, apparent clinical signs of infection and or adverse vaccine reaction.

Collection of blood samples

Evaluation of the Humoral Immune Responses of Pullet Chicks to commercial Inactivated AI H5 vaccine

Two (2) ml of blood was collected randomly via the brachial vein of 3 chicks in each subgroup ($n = 3$) using sterile 23G hypodermic needles and syringes on day 14 of age into plain vacutainers for serology. The tubes were kept standing at room temperature for 24 h for serum formation. Thereafter, serum from each tube was aspirated using sterile pipettes into another set of 1 ml labelled microcentrifuge tubes (Eppendorf®), and stored at $-20\text{ }^{\circ}\text{C}$ until assayed for serum ant-AIV antibodies. The sampling procedure was repeated on the birds at 21, 28, 35, and 42 days of age.

Analyses of samples

Assessment of antibody response to Avian Influenza H5 inactivated vaccine

A 96-well AIV enzyme-linked immunosorbent assay (ELISA) kit (ProfLOK®, Zoetis Inc., U.S.A)

was used for the *in vitro* assessment of H5 vaccinal IgY in the sera of chickens according to the manufacturer's instructions. The optical density (O.D) of each well on the plates were read at 450 nm wavelength using an ELISA reader (UNIEQUIP®) within 5 min of adding the stop solution. The OD values were then converted to antibody titres according to the manufacturer's instructions.

Data analyses

All the antibody titres from this study were inputted into a computer (Hp® Pavilion dv6) and analyzed using GraphPad Prism statistical software version 5.3 (Graph Pad software, San Diego, California, USA). Data obtained were expressed as mean \pm standard error of means (SEM) and a two-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) followed by a post-hoc test (Bonferroni posttest) was used to determine significant differences between variables among all the sampled chicks, and P -values less than 0.05 was considered statistically significant at 95% confidence interval (CI). All data were presented in tables using Microsoft® excel version 13.

Results

Results from this study showed that the varying doses of the inactivated AIV vaccine had significant effects on the antibody responses of the ISA Brown chicks from the three commercial hatcheries when the vaccine was administered via the intramuscular (IM) (**Table 1**) and subcutaneous (SC) (**Table 2**). Also, the 0.2 ml (**Table 3**) dose-regime had varied significant effects on the antibody responses of the chicks when the antigen was administered via either the IM or SC routes. However, the 0.5 ml (**Table 4**) and 0.7 ml (**Table 5**) dose-regimes had no significant difference in the antibody levels of the chicks when the vaccine was administered via either the IM or SC routes, respectively.

Table 1. Antibody responses of ISA brown pullets from three commercial hatcheries to different doses of avian influenza H5 inactivated vaccine administered at 14 and 28 days of age via the intramuscular route.

	Group of chicks								
	A1	B1	C1	A2	B2	C2	A3	B3	C3
Age (days)	Antibody titre (mean ± SEM)			Antibody titre (mean ± SEM)			Antibody titre (mean ± SEM)		
14	293.7± 53.9 ^a	182.7± 129.1 ^a	354.0 ± 354.0 ^a	27.3± 21.6 ^a	69.3± 16.6 ^a	82.0 ± 43.1 ^a	89.0 ± 65.2 ^a	88.7± 88.7 ^a	203.0 ± 191.1 ^a
21	57.7± 49.9 ^a	260.7± 124.8 ^b	2,205.0±409 .1 ^{ac**}	776.7± 420.0 ^{cd**}	399.0± 160.1 ^{bce}	1,993.0± 978.4 ^{abdef}	2,12.3± 209.8 ^{cfg**}	221.7± 51.6 ^{beh**}	1,834.3±638.9 ^{abeg hi**}
28	424.7± 321.4 ^{ab}	0.0± 0.0 ^b	1,372.3± 341.1 ^{cdegh**}	59.0± 59.0 ^d	84.0± 51.3 ^e	576.7± 500.7 ^f	47.0± 44.0 ^g	0.0 ± 0.0 ^h	703.0 ± 352.0 ⁱ
35	968.7± 268.2 ^a	678.3± 376.8 ^a	208.3± 101.7 ^a	1,080.7± 224.2 ^a	642.0± 341.1 ^a	135.0± 84.5 ^a	566.3± 351.8 ^a	970.0± 486.2 ^a	214.0 ± 74.3 ^a
42	288.3± 257.1 ^a	4.0± 4.0 ^b	932.3± 550.3 ^c	1,327.3± 199.3 ^{bdgh}	775.3± 399.8 ^e	1,822.3± 176.7 ^{abf}	66.7±20.4 ^g	2.7 ± 2.7 ^h	687.0 ± 393.5 ⁱ

Mean ± SEM values in the same row with multiple superscripts are statistically significantly different at $p < 0.05$ according to Bonferroni Posthoc test.

Mean ± SEM values in the same row with same and or single superscript are NOT statistically significantly different at $p > 0.05$ according to Bonferroni Posthoc test.

Key: A1, B1, C1 = Chicks administered 0.2 ml; A2, B2, C2 = Chicks administered 0.5 ml; A3, B3, C3 = Chicks administered 0.7 ml; SEM = Standard error of mean.

Table 2. Antibody responses of ISA brown pullets from three commercial hatcheries to different doses of avian influenza H5 inactivated vaccine administered at 14 and 28 days of age via the subcutaneous route.

	Group of chicks								
	A1	B1	C1	A2	B2	C2	A3	B3	C3
Age (days)	Antibody titre (mean ± SEM)			Antibody titre (mean ± SEM)			Antibody titre (mean ± SEM)		
14	293.7 ± 53.9 ^a	182.7± 129.1 ^a	354.0 ± 354.0 ^a	27.3 ± 21.6 ^a	69.3± 16.6 ^a	82.0 ± 43.1 ^a	89.0± 65.2 ^a	88.7± 88.7 ^a	203.0 ± 191.1 ^a
21	53.3 ± 36.0 ^{ac}	646.3± 237.9 ^{bc}	2444.3± 1110.6 ^{cdefghi}	469.3 ± 444.1 ^d	568.3± 151.2 ^e	131.7 ± 69.4 ^f	881.0± 215.4 ^g	293.7± 168.4 ^h	876.0 ± 539.3 ⁱ
28	554.3± 487.0 ^a	61.0± 38.4 ^{bdf}	371.7 ± 371.7 ^c	1,639.3± 1451.8 ^{degh}	14.0 ± 1.0 ^{ef}	1,653.7± 181.3 ^{fgh}	182.7± 115.7 ^g	171.3± 171.3 ^h	321.7 ± 218.6 ⁱ
35	1,271.0 ± 163.7 ^a	1,196.0 ± 113.8 ^b	46.7 ± 13.5 ^{ce}	1,169.3± 248.1 ^d	1,500.0 ± 60.1 ^{ei}	392.0 ± 269.9 ^f	968.7± 488.2 ^g	972.3± 486.6 ^h	70.7 ± 21.2 ⁱ
42	1,137.7± 86.7 ^a	770.3± 389.9 ^a	1,112.3 ± 564.5 ^a	170.0 ± 167.0 ^a	0.0 ± 0.0 ^a	1,212.0± 405.6 ^a	1,149.3 ± 29.7 ^a	255.3± 242.4 ^a	9.0 ± 4.9 ^a

Mean ± SEM values in the same row with multiple superscripts are statistically significantly different at $p < 0.05$ according to Bonferroni Posthoc test.

Mean ± SEM values in the same row with same and or single superscript are NOT statistically significantly different at $p > 0.05$ according to Bonferroni Posthoc test.

Key: A1, B1, C1 = Chicks administered 0.2 ml; A2, B2, C2 = Chicks administered 0.5 ml; A3, B3, C3 = Chicks administered 0.7 ml; SEM= Standard error of mean.

Table 3. Antibody responses of ISA brown pullets from three commercial hatcheries to 0.2 ml dose-regime of inactivated avian influenza H5 vaccine administered at 14 and 28 days of age via either intramuscular or subcutaneous routes.

	Source of Chicks					
	Hatchery A		Hatchery B		Hatchery C	
	Intramuscular	Subcutaneous	Intramuscular	Subcutaneous	Intramuscular	Subcutaneous
Age (days)	Antibody titre (mean ± SEM)		Antibody titre (mean ± SEM)		Antibody titre (mean ± SEM)	
14	293.7 ± 53.9 ^a	293.7 ± 53.9 ^a	182.7 ± 129.1 ^a	182.7 ± 129.1 ^a	354.0 ± 354.0 ^a	354.0 ± 354.0 ^a
21	57.7 ± 49.9 ^{ae}	53.3 ± 36.0 ^{be}	260.7 ± 124.8 ^{ce}	646.3 ± 237.9 ^d	2,205.0 ± 409.1 ^{de}	2,444.3 ± 1110.6 ^{df}
28	424.7 ± 321.4 ^a	544.3 ± 478.0 ^b	0.0 ± 0.0 ^c	61.3 ± 38.4 ^d	1,372.3 ± 341.1 ^{cde}	371.7 ± 371.7 ^f
35	968.7 ± 268.2 ^a	1,271.0 ± 163.7 ^a	678.3 ± 376.8 ^a	1,196.0 ± 113.8 ^a	208.3 ± 101.7 ^a	46.7 ± 13.5 ^a
42	288.3 ± 257.1 ^a	1,137.7 ± 86.7 ^a	4.0 ± 4.0 ^a	770.3 ± 389.9 ^a	932.3 ± 550.3 ^a	1,112.3 ± 564.5 ^a

Mean ± SEM values in the same row with multiple superscripts are statistically significantly different at $p < 0.05$ according to Bonferroni Posthoc test.

Mean ± SEM values in the same row with same and or single superscript are not statistically significantly different at $p > 0.05$ according to Bonferroni Posthoc test.

Key: SEM= Standard error of mean

Table 4. Effects of 0.5 ml of avian influenza H5 vaccine administered at 14 and 28 days of age via either intramuscular or subcutaneous routes.

	Source of Chicks					
	Hatchery A		Hatchery B		Hatchery C	
	Intramuscular	Subcutaneous	Intramuscular	Subcutaneous	Intramuscular	Subcutaneous
Age (days)	Antibody titre (mean ± SEM)		Antibody titre (mean ± SEM)		Antibody titre (mean ± SEM)	
14	27.3 ± 21.6 ^a	27.3 ± 21.6 ^a	69.3 ± 16.6 ^a	69.3 ± 16.6 ^a	82.0 ± 43.1 ^a	82.0 ± 43.1 ^a
21	776.7 ± 420.0 ^a	469.3 ± 444.1 ^{bf}	399.0 ± 160.1 ^c	568.3 ± 151.2 ^{df}	1,993.0 ± 978.4 ^{ef}	131.7 ± 69.4 ^f
28	59.0 ± 59.0 ^a	1,639.3 ± 1451.8 ^{abcd}	84.0 ± 51.3 ^c	14.0 ± 1.0 ^d	576.7 ± 500.7 ^e	1,653.7 ± 181.3 ^{acdf}
35	1,080.7 ± 224.2 ^a	1169.3 ± 248.1 ^a	642.0 ± 341.1 ^a	1,500.0 ± 60.1 ^a	135.0 ± 84.5 ^a	392.0 ± 269.9 ^a
42	1,327.3 ± 199.3 ^a	170.0 ± 167.0 ^b	775.3 ± 399.0 ^c	0.0 ± 0.0 ^d	1,822.3 ± 176.7 ^{de}	1,212.0 ± 405.6 ^{bf}

Mean ± SEM values in the same row with multiple superscripts are statistically significantly different at $P < 0.05$ according to Bonferroni Posthoc test.

Mean ± SEM values in the same row with same and or single superscript are not statistically significantly different at $P > 0.05$ according to Bonferroni Posthoc test.

Key: SEM= Standard error of mean

Table 5. Antibody responses of ISA brown pullets from three commercial hatcheries to 0.7 ml dose-regime of inactivated avian influenza H5 vaccine administered at 14 and 28 days of age via either intramuscular or subcutaneous routes.

	Source of Chicks					
	Hatchery A		Hatchery B		Hatchery C	
	Intramuscular	Subcutaneous	Intramuscular	Subcutaneous	Intramuscular	Subcutaneous
Age (days)	Antibody titre (mean ± SEM)		Antibody titre (mean ± SEM)		Antibody titre (mean ± SEM)	
14	89.0 ± 65.2 ^a	.0 ± 65.2 ^a	88.7 ± 88.7 ^a	88.7 ± 88.7 ^a	203.0 ± 191.1 ^a	203.0 ± 191.1 ^a
21	212.3 ± 209.8 ^a	881.0 ± 215.4 ^b	221.7 ± 51.6 ^c	293.7 ± 168.4 ^d	1,834.3 ± 638.9 ^{acde}	876.0 ± 539.3 ^f
28	47.0 ± 44.0 ^a	182.7 ± 115.7 ^a	0.0 ± 0.0 ^a	171.3 ± 171.3 ^a	703.0 ± 352.0 ^a	321.7 ± 218.6 ^a
35	566.3 ± 351.8 ^a	968.7 ± 488.2 ^a	970.0 ± 486.2 ^a	972.3 ± 486.6 ^a	214.0 ± 74.3 ^a	70.7 ± 21.2 ^a
42	66.7 ± 20.4 ^a	1,149.3 ± 29.7 ^{abce}	2.7 ± 2.7 ^c	255.3 ± 242.4 ^d	687.0 ± 393.5 ^e	9.0 ± 4.9 ^f

Mean ± SEM values in the same row with multiple superscripts are statistically significantly different at $p < 0.05$ according to Bonferroni Posthoc test.

Mean ± SEM values in the same row with same and or single superscript are not statistically significantly different at $p > 0.05$ according to Bonferroni Posthoc test.

Key: SEM=Standard error of mean

Discussion

The route and or dose of administration of biologics are fundamental in the pathodynamics and or recovery rate and pattern of any disease process in an individual [23]. Most inactivated vaccines are usually administered either intramuscularly or subcutaneously [24]; however, very few studies have directly compared the immunogenicity and reactogenicity of the same vaccine administered via these routes. The findings from the present study showed significant differences at day 14 of age for both the intramuscular and subcutaneous routes across all treatment groups. This could be due to the presence of maternally-derived antibodies (MDA) in the groups as samples were collected prior to vaccination with the inactivated AI H5 vaccine. The findings from this study also indicated that after two doses of the AI H5 vaccine inactivated vaccine (primary and booster), there were delayed seroconversions and varied immunogenicity (expressed as antibody levels) in all the chicks when administered via the intramuscular route, irrespective of dose. Some chicks showed high ELISA titre levels, whereas others showed low ELISA titre levels or were even seronegative. Specifically, ELISA titres post-vaccination of

individual chicks from hatchery C differed significantly from those of chicks from hatcheries A and B. These variations in seroconversion could be attributed to the high levels of maternally derived antibodies in all the chicks sampled, especially after the primary vaccine dose. Likewise, these differences may have been due to the impacts of environmental factors such as temperature and lighting [25] on individual chick's immune apparatus in response to the immunogen. These results are consistent with the findings from previous work that reported that the outcomes of field AI H5N1 vaccination were highly variable and farm-related [26]. Our speculations are also in tandem with the reports of other authors that stated that interference by maternally derived antibodies can render inactivated vaccines impotent [27].

Although several studies have shown that more than one vaccination dose is required to induce protective immunity and prevent H5N1 HPAI transmission in ducks and other poultry in field conditions [28-31], the present study showed that although there was delayed seroconversion to the AI H5 vaccine in all the chicks, the mean ELISA antibody titres varied significantly based on the dose of antigen injected intramuscularly. These

variations could be due to the varied level of anamnestic (memory) immune responses in all the chicks as well as the immunogenic potential of the vaccine virus used in the vaccine. Variations in immunogenicity observed in this study after intramuscular injection of the antigen at different dose levels could be due to the quality of the H5 vaccine used as well as the chicks' antigen processing capabilities. The decreased variability in antibody responses even after booster vaccination that was observed in this study has important implications in terms of the effectiveness of avian influenza vaccination program as immune escape and antigenic drift, as a result of the selective pressure induced by immunization, may be one of the critical reasons behind vaccine failure as previously reported [32,33]. These results suggest that vaccination may actually play a role in driving the evolution of AIVs [32,33], as the vaccinated animals may then act as silent carriers for AIVs, spreading the virus to naive animals through poultry transports or Live Bird Markets [33-36].

Although the chicks from C had higher antibody ELISA titres than chicks from hatcheries A and B when 0.2 ml and 0.5 ml of the AI H5 inactivated vaccine were administered either via the intramuscular or subcutaneous routes respectively (which were more significant at 21 and 28 and 21, 28 and 42 days of age for the 0.2 ml and 0.5 ml doses respectively), findings revealed that the antigen was more immunogenic when administered subcutaneously in comparison to the intramuscular route for chicks from the three commercial hatcheries studied. Likewise, at 21 and 42 days of age, the chicks administered 0.7 ml of the antigen from the different hatcheries via the both routes showed that although there were varied antibody titres between the chicks, the antigen was more immunogenic in the chicks from C than from hatcheries A and B when the antigen was administered subcutaneously. These differences in the immunogenicity of the H5 vaccine injected via the intramuscular and subcutaneous routes could be due to "depot effects" emanating from subcutaneous fat issues in the animals which aid in the slow but prolonged release of vaccines. This possibility is in agreement with the findings from previous studies [37,38]. Also, the observed enhanced immunogenicity via subcutaneous route compared to the intramuscular route in the present study could be attributable to the marked differences in the cellular composition of muscle and dermal tissues

that may affect these vaccination outcomes. For instance, the subcutaneous fat beds contain few immune cells; however, they are adjacent to the skin dermal layers, which contain higher numbers of lymphocytes, macrophages, and specialized dermal dendritic cells (DCs) that drain into the local lymph node, whereas muscle tissue contains few immune cells and very low DC numbers [37,38]. These arguments are in tandem with previous studies in murine where it was noted that the DC populations in lymph nodes draining the intramuscular and subcutaneous sites of injections were different, which may lead to altered antigen-specific immune responses [39]. However, little is known regarding the trafficking of cells within the lymphatic vessels that connect the muscle injection site with the local lymph node and whether this may contribute to altered immune responses observed between the routes of administration. Although previous works have shown that subcutaneous injections of adjuvanted inactivated vaccines are associated with increased rates of site reactions compared to the intramuscular vaccinations [40,41], the present study detected very minimal reaction at the site of subcutaneous injection of the antigen (nape of the neck).

Primary and booster vaccinations are immunogenic and could induce antibody responses in ducks at levels that meet the targets of the national mass vaccination program. Results from a recent study in ducks support the notion that compared with the single-dose immunization regimen, the two-dose immunization regimen more intensely induced protective antibody production and, thus, provides better humoral immunity against the HPAI virus [42]. Furthermore, the single-dose vaccination regimen has been shown to be suitable for short-lived meat ducks, whereas two-dose vaccination regimen is suitable for long-lived ducks, as for layers or breeders, to increase their protective humoral immunity and strengthen flock immunity [42]. However, the findings of the present study showed that in spite of booster vaccination, there were significant intra- and inter-route variations in immunogenicity of the H5 vaccine at certain ages of the chicks, even at same and or different antigen dose levels. This variability could be due to the possible differences in immune-competences of chicks within the same hatchery population as well as differences in the lymphatic drainages between the intramuscular and subcutaneous sites of antigen administration. The findings from the current study

also showed that the immunity in the different groups of chicks varied considerable in response to the same and or different dose of antigen administered. These findings further reiterate the possible variable outcomes in field vaccination with H5 AI inactivated vaccines in a population.

Conclusion

The present study has shown that the immunity in a population varied considerable in the face of the same and or different dose of H5 vaccine administered, reiterating the variable outcomes in field vaccination with H5 AI inactivated vaccines in a population. Also, the immune response of the chicks to the AI H5 vaccine via different routes in this study was variable at 21 and 35 days of age for the IM and SC routes, respectively. Therefore, further studies should be conducted to characterize the T- and B-lymphocytes in chickens post AI H5 vaccines administration, and studies evaluating sequence homologies between imported AI H5 vaccines and the circulating AIV strains in Nigeria be conducted.

Funding

This research was funded by the Tertiary Education Trust Fund (tetFund) of the Federal Ministry of Education, Nigeria, under the Institutional Based Research grant for Ahmadu Bello University, Zaria (Grant No.: DAPM/TETFUND/01/12).

Conflict of interest

The authors declare that there is no conflict of interest, as the Funders had no role nor interfered with the outcome of the research.

Authors' contributions

Woziri OA, Abdu PA, Meseko CA and Fasina FO conceptualized the experiments; Woziri OA, Abdu PA and Adamu J designed the experiments; Woziri OA, Abdu PA, Nasir FI and Abdulkarim K performed the experiments; Woziri OA and Abdu PA analyzed the data; Woziri OA, Abdu PA, Meseko, CA and Fasina FO wrote the manuscript; All authors read and approved the final manuscript.

Ethical statement

Ethical approval for this study was obtained from the Animal Care and Use for Research Committee of Ahmadu Bello University, Zaria (Approval number: ABUCAUC/2019/23). The animals and methods for the experiments were handled and conducted in accordance with the

International Standards for the Care and Use of Laboratory Animals for Research Purposes.

Acknowledgements

The authors graciously thank Zoetis Int, USA for the kind donation of the ProFlok® ELISA kits for this research. They also wish to thank Mr. Edima Obaja, David Leo and Yahuza Maitalla of the Faculty of Veterinary Medicine, Ahmadu Bello University, Nigeria, for their technical assistance during the course of this research.

References

- 1-**Swayne DE**. Avian influenza. In: Foreign Animal Diseases, Boca Raton, FL: United States Animal Health Association 2008: 137 - 146.
- 2-**Brown IH**. Summary of avian influenza Activity in Europe, Asia, and Africa: 2006-2009. Avian Diseases 2010;54(1):187 - 193.
- 3-**Germundsson A, Madslie KI, Hjortaa MJ, Handeland K, Jonassen CM**. Prevalence and subtypes of influenza A viruses in wild waterfowl in Norway 2006-2007. Acta Veterinaria Scandinavica 2010;52: 28.
- 4-**Marchenko VY, Alekseev AY, Sharshov KA, Petrov VN, Silko NY, Susloparov IM, et al**. Ecology of influenza virus in wild bird populations in Central Asia. Avian Diseases 2012; 56(1): 234 - 237.
- 5-**Tonnessen R, Kristoffersen AB, Jonassen C M, Hjortaa MJ, Hansen EF, Rimstad E, et al**. Molecular and epidemiological characterization of avian influenza viruses from gulls and dabbling ducks in Norway. Virology Journal 2013; 10: 112.
- 6-**Swayne DE**. Overview of avian influenza. In: Aiello SE, Moses MA editors. The Merck Veterinary Manual (online). Whitehouse Station, NJ, Merck and Co, 2015.
- 7-**Kang HM, Jeong OM, Kim MC, Kwon JS, Paek MR, Choi JG, et al**. Surveillance of avian influenza virus in wild bird fecal samples from

- South Korea, 2003-2008. *Journal of Wildlife Diseases* 2010; 46(3): 878 - 888.
- 8-**Wille M, Huang Y, Robertson GJ, Ryan P, Wilhelm SI, Fifield D.** Evaluation of seabirds in Newfoundland and Labrador, Canada, as hosts of influenza A viruses. *Journal of Wildlife Diseases* 2014; 50(1): 98 - 103.
- 9-**Swayne DE, Kapczynski D.** Strategies and challenges for eliciting immunity against avian influenza virus in birds. *Immunological Reviews* 2008; 225: 314 – 331.
- 10-**Swayne DE, Kapczynski D.** Vaccines, vaccination, and immunology for avian influenza viruses in poultry. In *Avian Influenza*, Blackwell Publishing Ltd.2009. 407 - 451.
- 11-**Singh SM, Alkie TN, Hodgins DC, Nagy É, Shojadoost B, Sharif S.** Systemic immune responses to an inactivated, whole H9N2 avian influenza virus vaccine using class B CpG oligonucleotides in chickens. *Vaccine* 2015; 33: 3947 - 3952.
- 12-**van den Berg T, Lambrecht B, Marché S, Steensels M, Van Borm S, Bublot M.** Influenza vaccines and vaccination strategies in birds. *Comparative Immunology, Microbiology and Infectious Diseases* 2008;31: 121 - 165.
- 13-**Swayne DE, Spackman E, Pantin-Jackwood M.** Success Factors for Avian Influenza Vaccine Use in Poultry and Potential Impact at the Wild Bird–Agricultural Interface. *Eco Health* 2014; 11: 94 – 108.
- 14-**Jang YH, Seong BL.** The quest for a truly universal influenza vaccine. *Frontiers in Cellular and Infection Microbiology* 2019; 9(344): 1 – 24.
- 15-**Sautto GA, Kirchenbaum GA, Ross TM.** Towards a universal influenza vaccine: different approaches for one goal. *Virology Journal* 2018; 15(17): 1 – 12.
- 16-**Oladokun AT, Meseke CA, Ighodalo E, John B, Ekong P.** Effect of intervention on the control of Highly Pathogenic Avian Influenza in Nigeria. *Pan African Medical Journal* 2012: 1 – 8.
- 17-**Abdallah F, Hassanin O.** Positive regulation of humoral and innate immune responses induced by inactivated Avian Influenza Virus vaccine in broiler chickens. *Veterinary Research Communications* 2015, 1 – 6.
- 18-**Chen H.** Avian influenza vaccination: the experience in China. *Review of Science and Technology* 2009; 28: 267 – 274.
- 19-**Kapczynski DR, Pantin-Jackwood M, Guzman SG, Ricardez Y, Spackman E, Bertran K.** Characterization of the 2012 highly pathogenic avian influenza H7N3 virus isolated from poultry in an outbreak in Mexico: pathobiology and vaccine protection. *Journal of Virology* 2013; 87(16): 9086 – 9096.
- 20-**Nolan TM, Richmond PC, Skeljo MV, Pearce G, Hartel G, Formica NT.** Phase I and II randomised trials of the safety and immunogenicity of a prototype adjuvanted inactivated split-virus influenza A (H5N1) vaccine in healthy adults. *Vaccine* 2008; 26: 4160 – 4167.
- 21-**Juno J, Fowke KR, Keynan Y.** Immunogenetic factors associated with severe respiratory illness caused by zoonotic H1N1 and H5N1 influenza viruses. *Clinical and Developmental Immunology* 2012; 2012: 797180.
- 22-**Kapczynski DR, Liljebjelke K, Kulkarni G, Hunt H, Jiang HJ, Petkov D.** Cross reactive cellular immune responses in chickens previously exposed to low pathogenic avian influenza. *BMC Proceeding* 2011; 5: S13.

- 23-**Ezan E.** Pharmacokinetic studies of protein drugs: past, present and future. *Advances in Drug Delivery Review* 2013; 65(8): 1065–1073.
- 24-**Nataša ŠB.** Biologics: the role of delivery systems in improved therapy. *Biologics: Targets and Therapy* 2014; 8: 107 – 114.
- 25-**Tung DH, Van Quyen D, Nguyen T, Xuan H T, Nam TN, Duy KD.** Molecular characterization of a H5N1 highly pathogenic avian influenza virus clade 2.3.2.1b circulating in Vietnam in 2011. *Veterinary Microbiology* 2013;165(3-4): 341 – 348.
- 26-**Tarigan S, Wibowo MH, Indriani R, Sumarningsih S, Artanto S, Idris S, et al.** Field effectiveness of highly pathogenic avian influenza H5N1 vaccination in commercial layers in Indonesia. *PLoS ONE* 2018; 13(1): e0190947.
- 27-**Kapczynski DR, Tumpey TM, Hidajat R, Zsak, A, Chrastek, K, Tretyakova I.** Vaccination with virus-like particles containing H5 antigens from three H5N1 clades protects chickens from H5N1 and H5N8 influenza viruses. *Vaccine* 2016; 34(13): 1575 – 1581.
- 28-**Swayne DE.** In: *Avian influenza*. Hoboken: John Wiley and Sons. NJ, USA. 2009.
- 29-**Lecu A, De Langhe C, Petit T, Bernard F, Swam H.** Serologic response and safety to vaccination against avian influenza using inactivated H5N2 vaccine in zoo birds. *Journal of Zoo and Wildlife Medicine* 2009;40(4): 731 – 743.
- 30-**Van der Goot JA, Van Boven M, De Jong MC, Koch G.** Effect of vaccination on transmission of HPAI H5N1: the effect of a single vaccination dose on transmission of highly pathogenic avian influenza H5N1 in Peking ducks. *Avian Diseases* 2007; 51(1): 323 - 324.
- 31-**Pantin-Jackwood MJ, Suarez DL.** Vaccination of domestic ducks against H5N1 HPAI: a review. *Virus Research* 2013;178(1): 21 – 34.
- 32-**Smith GJ, Fan XH, Wang J, Li KS, Qin K, Zhang JX, et al.** Emergence and predominance of an H5N1 influenza variant in China. *Proceedings of National Academy of Science* 2006;103: 16936 – 16941.
- 33-**Pu J, Wang S, Yin Y, Zhang G, Carter RA, Wang J, et al.** Evolution of the H9N2 influenza genotype that facilitated the genesis of the novel H7N9 virus. *Proceedings of National Academy of Science* 2015; 112: 548 – 553.
- 34-**Chen J, Fang F, Yang Z, Liu X, Zhang H, Zhang Z, et al.** Characterization of highly pathogenic H5N1 avian influenza viruses isolated from poultry markets in central China. *Virus Research* 2009, 146, 19 – 28.
- 35-**Guan Y, Smith GJ.** The emergence and diversification of panzootic H5N1 influenza viruses. *Virus Research* 2013;178: 35 – 43.
- 36-**Bi Y, Mei K, Shi W, Liu D, Yu X, Gao Z, et al.** Two novel reassortants of avian influenza A (H5N6) virus in China. *Journal of General Virology* 2015; 96: 975 – 981.
- 37-**Didierlaurent AM, Collignon C, Bourguignon P, Wouters S, Fierens K, Fochesato M, et al.** of adaptive immunity by the human vaccine adjuvant AS01 depends on activated dendritic cells. *Journal of Immunology* 2014, 193, 1920 – 1930.
- 38-**Malissen B, Tamoutounour S, Henri S.** The origins and functions of dendritic cells and macrophages in the skin. *Nature Reviews Immunology* 2014;14: 417 – 428.
- 39-**Guilliams M, Henri S, Tamoutounour S, Ardouin L, Schwartz-Cornil I, Dalod M, et al.** From skin dendritic cells to a simplified classification of human and mouse dendritic cell

- subsets. *European Journal of Immunology* 2010; 40: 2089 – 2094.
- 40-**Cook IF**. Evidence based route of administration of vaccines. *Human Vaccines* 2008 ; 4: 67 – 73.
- 41-**Diez-Domingo J, Weinke T, Garcia de Lomas J, Meyer CU, Bertrand I, Eymin C, et al**. Comparison of intramuscular and subcutaneous administration of a herpes zoster live-attenuated vaccine in adults aged ≥ 50 years: a randomised non-inferiority clinical trial. *Vaccine* 2015; 33: 789 – 795.
- 42-**Huynh HTT, Truong LT, Meeyam T, Le HT, Punyapornwithaya V**. Individual and flock immunity responses of naïve ducks on smallholder farms after vaccination with H5N1 avian influenza vaccine: a study in a province of the Mekong Delta, Vietnam. *Peer J* 2019; 1: 14.

Woziri AO, Meseko CA, Nasir FI, Abdulkarim K, Fasina FO, Adamu J, Abdu PA. Impact of dose and route of administration on antibody responses of chickens inoculated with an inactivated avian influenza H5 vaccine. *Microbes Infect Dis* 2022; 3(3): 733-743.