



Kent Academic Repository

Ladjal, Somia, Al-Adilee, Yaseen Majid Salman, Dahmane, Abdeldjalil, Dashti, Alejandro, Sánchez, Sergio, Reghaissia, Nassiba, Samari, Housseem, Dif, Sofiane, Krioui, Abelhak, Baroudi, Djamel and others (2026) *Molecular prevalence and genotyping of Enterocytozoon bienersi in cattle from Central Algeria*. *Acta parasitologica*, 71 (48). ISSN 1230-2821.

Downloaded from

<https://kar.kent.ac.uk/113311/> The University of Kent's Academic Repository KAR

The version of record is available from

<https://doi.org/10.1007/s11686-026-01229-w>

This document version

Author's Accepted Manuscript

DOI for this version

Licence for this version

CC BY (Attribution)

Additional information

Versions of research works

Versions of Record

If this version is the version of record, it is the same as the published version available on the publisher's web site. Cite as the published version.

Author Accepted Manuscripts

If this document is identified as the Author Accepted Manuscript it is the version after peer review but before type setting, copy editing or publisher branding. Cite as Surname, Initial. (Year) 'Title of article'. To be published in **Title of Journal**, Volume and issue numbers [peer-reviewed accepted version]. Available at: DOI or URL (Accessed: date).

Enquiries

If you have questions about this document contact ResearchSupport@kent.ac.uk. Please include the URL of the record in KAR. If you believe that your, or a third party's rights have been compromised through this document please see our [Take Down policy](https://www.kent.ac.uk/guides/kar-the-kent-academic-repository#policies) (available from <https://www.kent.ac.uk/guides/kar-the-kent-academic-repository#policies>).

1 **Molecular prevalence and genotyping of *Enterocytozoon bieneusi* in cattle from central**

2 **Algeria**

3 Somia Ladjal¹, Yaseen Majid Salman Al-Adilee^{2,3}, Abdeldjalil Dahmane⁴, Alejandro Dashti⁵,
4 Sergio Sánchez⁵, Nassiba Reghaissia⁶, Houssef Samari⁷, Sofiane Dif⁸, Abelhak Krioui⁹,
5 Djamel Baroudi¹, Anastasios D. Tsaousis², David Carmena^{5,10}, AbdElkarim Laatamna^{11*}

6

7 ¹Food Hygiene and Quality Assurance System Research Laboratory, Higher National
8 Veterinary School, Issad Abbas Street, Bab Ezzouar, 16000 Algiers, Algeria

9 ²Laboratory of Molecular and Evolutionary Parasitology, School of Natural Sciences,
10 University of Kent, Canterbury, Kent, UK

11 ³Department of Medical Microbiology, College of Medicine, Ninevah University, Mosul,
12 Ninevah, Iraq

13 ⁴Department of Veterinary Sciences, Faculty of Natural and Life Sciences, and Earth and
14 Universe Sciences, Mohamed Khider University of Biskra, BP 145 RP, 07000, Biskra,
15 Algeria

16 ⁵Parasitology Reference and Research Laboratory, Spanish National Centre for Microbiology,
17 Health Institute Carlos III, Majadahonda, Spain

18 ⁶Laboratory of Sciences and Living Techniques, Institute of Agronomic and Veterinary
19 Sciences, University of Souk Ahras, Annaba Road 41000, Souk Ahras, Algeria

20 ⁷Faculty of Sciences, University of M'sila, 28000 M'sila, Algeria;

21 ⁸Vétérinaire Privé, Ouled Derradj, Wilaya de M'sila

22 ⁹Vétérinaire Privé, Berhoum, Wilaya de M'sila

23 ¹⁰Center for Biomedical Research Network (CIBER) in Infectious Diseases, Health Institute
24 Carlos III, Madrid, Spain

25 ¹¹Laboratory of Exploration and Valorization of Steppic Ecosystems, Faculty of Nature and
26 Life Sciences, University of Djelfa, Moudjbara Road, BP3117, Djelfa, Algeria

27

28 *Correspondence: AbdElkarim Laatamna, Faculty of Nature and Life Sciences, University of
29 Djelfa, Moudjbara Road, BP 3117, Djelfa, Algeria. E-mail: a.laatamna@univ-djelfa.dz

30 ORCID: 0000-0003-0406-7467, Tel: +213(0)674416030, Fax: +213(0)35636832

31 Somia Ladjal and Yaseen Majid Salman Al-Adilee contributed equally

32 Anastasios D. Tsaousis, David Carmena, and AbdElkarim Laatamna shared the same position.

33

34

35

36

37

38

39

40

41

42

43

44

45

46

47

48

49

50 **Abstract**

51 *Enterocytozoon bieneusi* is an obligate intracellular eukaryotic parasite of the phylum
52 Microsporidia that infects a wide range of hosts, including humans. In Algeria,
53 epidemiological information on microsporidian infections caused by *E. bieneusi* is scarce,
54 with only three molecular studies conducted in equines, cattle, and dromedary camels. Here,
55 we investigated the prevalence and genotypic diversity of *E. bieneusi* in cattle ($n = 288$),
56 including cows ($n = 182$) and their calves ($n = 106$), from 54 farms in central Algeria. The
57 initial screening was conducted using a nested PCR targeting a partial sequence of the internal
58 transcribed spacer (ITS) region. *Enterocytozoon bieneusi* was identified in 16.0% (46/288) of
59 faecal samples and in 42.6% (23/54) of sampled farms. Infection rates varied from 10.9% to
60 17.7% across the study areas. Significant differences in prevalence were observed according
61 to cattle age, sex, and the presence/absence of other livestock species within cattle farms.
62 Conversely, study area, production system, and presence/absence of diarrhoea showed no
63 significant associations. **Out of 46 *E. bieneusi*-positive cattle, genotyping was successful for**
64 **56.5% (26/46) of isolates.** Phylogenetic analyses revealed seven known *E. bieneusi* genotypes
65 clustering within the zoonotic Group 1: Type IV (42.3%, 11/26), D (7.7%, 2/26), and Peru6
66 (3.8%, 1/26), and **the ruminant-adapted** Group 2: J (19.2%, 5/26), I (15.4%, 4/26), BEB6
67 (7.7%, **2/26**), and CM7 (3.8%, 1/26). The present study provides valuable molecular data on
68 *E. bieneusi* infections in cattle in Algeria. It highlights the important role that cattle can play
69 as reservoirs of zoonotic *E. bieneusi* genotypes.

70

71 **Keywords:** Distribution, *Enterocytozoon bieneusi*, genotypes, cattle, Algeria

72

73

74

75 **Introduction**

76 Microsporidia are a fungi-related ubiquitous group of obligate intracellular eukaryotic
77 parasites that infect humans and most major animal groups. Among them, *E. bieneusi* is the
78 most clinically significant species, being the main cause of human microsporidiosis [1, 2].
79 This parasite has also been widely reported in both farmed and wild animals [3]. Infections by
80 *E. bieneusi* can present with or without clinical manifestations in immunocompetent
81 individuals, whereas in immunocompromised hosts (e.g., HIV-infected patients), it often
82 causes severe disease, most notably chronic diarrhoea [4]. The species exhibits remarkable
83 genetic diversity, with more than 600 valid genotypes identified worldwide based on the
84 sequence analysis of the ribosomal internal transcribed spacer (ITS) genetic marker [3, 5, 6].
85 These genotypes cluster into 15 distinct groups, with Groups 1 and 2 comprising genotypes
86 with zoonotic potential, whereas Groups 3–15 consist mainly of host-adapted genotypes
87 found in non-human animals [7–9]. Cattle are recognised as important reservoirs of *E.*
88 *bieneusi* and play a key role in its epidemiology. To date, at least 97 genotypes have been
89 detected in bovids (cattle, yak, and water buffalo), 15 of which have also been reported in
90 humans [6, 10].

91 The prevalence of *E. bieneusi* in cattle varies considerably across countries worldwide and
92 can reach up to 52.0% [6, 10–12]. However, molecular epidemiological data on bovine
93 microsporidiosis remain limited in North Africa. In Algeria, only a few investigations have
94 previously addressed the prevalence and molecular diversity of *E. bieneusi* in livestock,
95 including equines, cattle, and dromedary camels [13–15].

96 The present study investigates the molecular prevalence, associated risk factors, and
97 genotype distribution of *E. bieneusi* in cows and their calves from different areas in central
98 Algeria. In this region, the epidemiology of this pathogen is unknown.

99 **Material and methods**

100 **Ethical statement**

101 This study was conducted in accordance with Algerian legislative guidelines (RD 08/1988).
102 The Ethics Committee of the Laboratory of Exploration and Valorization of Steppic
103 Ecosystems from the Faculty of Nature and Life Sciences (Ziane Achour University-Djelfa,
104 Algeria) approved the collection of cattle faecal samples (approval no. 005
105 EVES/FSNV/2021). Farm owners were individually contacted, informed about the objectives
106 of the study and the procedures involved, and written informed consent for faecal sample
107 collection was obtained from each participant.

108

109 **Study areas and sample collection**

110 The present study was carried out between June 2022 and April 2023 in three provinces from
111 central Algeria, namely Algiers, Tipaza, and M'sila (Fig. 1). Algiers and Tipaza are coastal
112 regions with a Mediterranean humid climate, while M'sila has a steppe environment marked
113 by an arid climate. In Algiers, industrial and tourism-related activities dominate, whereas in
114 Tipaza, agriculture, fishing, and tourism serve as the main economic sectors. Cattle breeding
115 is mainly found around Algiers and Tipaza, with sheep breeding being less prominent in these
116 provinces. Conversely, the pastoralism of small ruminants is a key agricultural activity in
117 M'sila, while cattle breeding and the rearing of other livestock such as dromedary camels are
118 less common.

119 A total of 288 faecal samples were collected from 54 farms, including 46 samples from
120 one farm in Algiers, 72 samples from 24 farms in Tipaza, and 170 samples from 29 farms in
121 M'sila (Fig. 1). From the three studied areas, farm selection and sampling were conducted
122 randomly. The herd size on the examined farms ranged from 4 to 46 animals, with cattle ages
123 varying from 13 days to 11 years (median: 24 months). The sampled farms were intended for

124 dairy and/or meat productions. Sample collection was carried out once from each farm
125 without repeated sampling.

126 Faecal samples were collected directly from the rectum of cattle, placed in individual
127 sterile plastic containers, and transported to the laboratory in an isotherm box. For each
128 animal, information was recorded on locality, sex, age, presence or absence of diarrhoea at the
129 time of sampling, production systems, and presence or absence of other livestock species
130 (mainly sheep and goats). The presence or absence of diarrhoea was assessed by clinical
131 examination of sampled cattle. All samples were preserved at +4 °C in 2.5% potassium
132 dichromate until molecular analysis.

133

134 **Genomic DNA extraction and purification**

135 Total DNA was extracted from 200 mg of each faecal sample using the PureLink™
136 Microbiome DNA Purification Kit (Invitrogen, Carlsbad, CA, USA), following the
137 manufacturer's instructions. The DNA was eluted in 100 µL of elution buffer and stored at –
138 20 °C until PCR analysis.

139

140 **PCR detection of *Enterocytozoon bieneusi***

141 Detection of *E. bieneusi* was carried out using a nested PCR targeting a partial sequence of
142 the internal transcribed spacer (ITS) region, along with parts of the flanking large and small
143 subunit of the ribosomal RNA gene, as previously described [16]. In the primary PCR, a
144 fragment of approximately 435 bp was amplified using the primers EBITS3 (5'–
145 GGTCATAGGGATGAAGAG–3') and EBTIS4 (5'TTCGAGTTCTTTCGCGCTC–3'). The
146 secondary PCR amplified a fragment of approximately 390 bp using the primers EBITS1 (5'–
147 GCTCTGAATATCTATGGCT–3') and EBITS2.4 (5'–ATCGCCGACGGATCCAAGTG–
148 3').

149 Primary and secondary PCR reactions (50 μ L) contained 2 μ L of template DNA, 1 μ M
150 of each primer, and 25 μ L of 2 \times PCR BIO Taq Mix Red (PCR Biosystems Ltd, UK). In all
151 cases, cycling conditions were as follows: initial denaturation at 95 $^{\circ}$ C for 5 min; 35 cycles of
152 denaturation at 94 $^{\circ}$ C for 40 s, annealing at 53 $^{\circ}$ C for 45 s, and extension at 72 $^{\circ}$ C for 45 s;
153 followed by a final extension at 72 $^{\circ}$ C for 4 min. An *E. bieneusi*-positive isolate and nuclease-
154 free water were included as positive and negative controls, respectively, in each PCR run.

155

156 **Gel electrophoresis**

157 PCR amplicons of *E. bieneusi* were electrophoresed on 2% agarose (ZellBio GmbH,
158 Germany) gels stained with ethidium bromide and visualised under ultraviolet illumination.
159 PCR products of the expected size were subsequently purified using the GeneJET Gel
160 Extraction Kit (Thermo Fisher Scientific, CA, USA) following the manufacturer's
161 instructions, and **bidirectionally** sequenced at Eurofins (Cologne, Germany).

162

163 **Sequence and phylogenetic analyses**

164 Raw sequences were visualized and edited using the software Chromas Lite 2.1
165 (<http://chromas-lite.software.informer.com/2.1>). The generated consensus sequences were
166 assembled, then compared against GenBank entries via BLAST, and further analysed in
167 MEGA X to confirm species identity and assign genotypes [17].

168 The evolutionary history of the ITS sequences generated in this study was inferred
169 using the Maximum Likelihood (ML) method under the General Time Reversible (**GTR**)
170 model [18]. Sequences from representative genotypes of human, animal, and/or
171 environmental origin, covering all 15 groups of *E. bieneusi*, were included in the analysis for
172 comparative purposes. Initial trees for the heuristic search were obtained by applying the
173 Neighbour-Joining method to a matrix of pairwise distances estimated using the Maximum

174 Composite Likelihood (MCL) approach. A discrete Gamma distribution was used to model
175 evolutionary rate differences among sites. All positions containing gaps and missing data
176 were eliminated. Evolutionary analyses were conducted in MEGA X [17].

177 The representative sequences of *E. bieneusi* generated in this study have been
178 deposited in GenBank under accession numbers PX617831–PX617837.

179

180 **Statistical analysis**

181 All molecular analysis data were recorded in an Excel spreadsheet (Microsoft Corporation,
182 Redmond, WA, USA), and statistical analyses were performed using SPSS v.22.0 (IBM SPSS
183 Inc., Chicago, IL, USA). Differences in infection rates of *E. bieneusi* by cattle attributes
184 (independent variables) were assessed using the Chi-square test (two-tailed) and odds ratios
185 (OR) with 95% confidence intervals (CI). Variables found to be significant in the univariable
186 analysis were subsequently included in a binary logistic regression model to identify
187 independent risk factors. Additionally, to evaluate whether the presence of *E. bieneusi* in
188 faecal samples differed between cow–calf pairs, an exact McNemar’s test for paired
189 proportions was used to compare the discordant groups (cow-only positive and calf-only
190 positive pairs). The difference in proportions was calculated with a 95% CI to determine
191 whether it was statistically significant. The test assesses whether infection status tends to
192 differ systematically between cows and calves within pairs — i.e., whether calves are more
193 likely to be infected than their mothers.

194

195 **Results**

196 **Prevalence of *Enterocytozoon bieneusi***

197 Out of 288 PCR-screened cattle, *E. bieneusi* was detected in 16.0% (46/288; 95% CI: 11.9–
198 20.7) of faecal samples and in 42.6% (23/54; 95% CI: 29.2–56.8) of sampled farms.

199 *Enterocytozoon bieneusi* prevalence varied from 10.9% to 17.7% in the three study areas
200 (Table 1).

201

202 **Risk association analysis**

203 Table 1 shows the distribution of *E. bieneusi* infections in the surveyed cattle population
204 according to the epidemiological (location, age, sex, production system, cohabitation) and
205 clinical (diarrhoea) variables considered in the present study.

206 The prevalence of *E. bieneusi* varied significantly according to cattle age, sex, and the
207 presence/absence of other livestock species within cattle farms. *Enterocytozoon bieneusi*
208 infections were more prevalent in calves younger than six months, while cattle over five years
209 old showed the lowest prevalence ($P = 0.029$). Males were significantly more frequently
210 infected than females ($P = 0.005$), with a 0.395-fold increased risk. Additionally, *E. bieneusi*
211 infections were more prevalent in cattle from farms without other livestock compared to
212 mixed farms ($P = 0.010$). Conversely, no significant differences in prevalence were observed
213 based on location (study area), production system, or the presence or absence of diarrhoea in
214 the infected cattle.

215 The binary logistic regression model, applied to variables (age, sex, and cohabitation
216 with other livestock species) significant in the univariable analysis, identified cohabitation as
217 the only factor significantly associated with *E. bieneusi* infection. The prevalence rate in cattle
218 from farms without other livestock was higher compared to cattle from mixed farms ($P =$
219 0.042), with OR of 0.503 (95% CI: 0.260–0.974). Age and sex of cattle showed no significant
220 association with *E. bieneusi* infection, with ORs of 0.736 (95% CI: 0.505–1.073, $P = 0.111$)
221 and 1.642 (95% CI: 0.752–3.586, $P = 0.214$), respectively.

222 Among the 65 examined cow–calf pairs, 7 (10.8%) were cow-only positive and 16
223 (24.6%) were calf-only positive for *E. bieneusi*. The presence of *E. bieneusi* varied between

224 cow-calf pairs in these discordant samples ($n = 23$). Only two pairs (3.1%) had *E. bieneusi* in
225 both cows and their calves. The exact McNemar's test showed that this difference was not
226 statistically significant ($P = 0.097$). The estimated difference in proportions was 0.39 (95%
227 CI: 0.13–0.66). Although the difference was not statistically significant ($P = 0.097$), it was
228 observed that calves were more often infected when their mother cows were negative.

229

230 **Genotyping of *Enterocytozoon bieneusi* isolates**

231 A total of 46 cattle isolates tested positive for *E. bieneusi* at the ITS locus. Of these, high-
232 quality sequencing data allowing genotype identification were obtained for 56.5% (26/46). In
233 the remaining 43.5% (20/46), sequencing quality was insufficient to determine the genotype,
234 although the presence of *E. bieneusi* was confirmed. Sequence analyses revealed seven known
235 genotypes of *E. bieneusi*. The most frequently detected genotype was Type IV (42.3%,
236 11/26), followed by J (19.2%, 5/26), I (15.4%, 4/26), BEB6 and D (7.7%, 2/26 each), and
237 CM7 and Peru6 (3.9%, 1/26 each). Phylogenetic analysis showed that all seven genotypes
238 clustered within zoonotic Groups 1 (Type IV, D, and Peru6) and 2 (J, I, BEB6, and CM7)
239 (Fig. 2, Table 2).

240 [Table 3](#) displays the distribution of *E. bieneusi* genotypes in the examined cattle based
241 on epidemiological factors (location, age, sex, production system, cohabitation) and clinical
242 status (diarrhoea) considered in this study. Geographically, the M'sila region showed both the
243 highest frequency (10.6%, 18/170) and the greatest diversity (100%, 7/7) of *E. bieneusi*
244 infections by the seven known genotypes. Type IV was the only genotype detected across all
245 three surveyed regions. The highest infection rates were observed in cattle older than 60
246 months (23.3%, 7/30) and in males (10.4%, 7/67). Interestingly, 10 out of 11 Type IV isolates
247 were detected in females. Farms raising both dairy and beef cattle exhibited the highest
248 infection rate (21.3%, 10/47). Genotypes CM7 and D were exclusively identified in non-

249 diarrhoeic cattle, while 80.0% (4/5) and 90.9% (10/11) of the isolates characterised as
250 genotypes J and Type IV (respectively) were also found in asymptomatic animals. In one
251 cow-calf pair, both animals were infected by the same *E. bieneusi* genotype J.

252

253 Discussion

254 The epidemiology of microsporidiosis in cattle is poorly documented in North African
255 countries including Algeria, particularly regarding molecular data. Here we report **molecular**
256 **prevalence** and genotyping data of *E. bieneusi* in cows and their calves from central Algeria.
257 The main strengths of this study were: (i) understanding of the distribution of *E. bieneusi*
258 genotypes in cattle, (ii) demonstration of the role that cattle can play as important reservoirs
259 of zoonotic genotypes of *E. bieneusi* in central Algeria.

260 In the present study, the PCR-based prevalence of *E. bieneusi* was estimated at **16.0%**.
261 A recent meta-analysis covering 37 studies across different geographical and epidemiological
262 settings estimated a global cattle prevalence of **14.0%** under comparable diagnostic conditions
263 [11]. Therefore, our prevalence aligns with the global average reported for this pathogen.
264 However, our prevalence is slightly higher than that reported in a previous Algerian study,
265 which documented a prevalence of 10.8% [14]. Similar prevalence rates (**14.0–18.0%**) have
266 been reported in South Africa, Brazil, Argentina, and **South** Korea [19–22]. In Turkey, Iran,
267 the USA, and China, higher prevalence rates (**29.0–52.0%**) were reported [23–26].
268 Conversely, lower rates (0.6–**10.0%**) were documented in Spain, China, **Austria**, and Thailand
269 [27–30]. These comparisons underscore the wide epidemiological variability of *E. bieneusi*
270 infections, influenced by factors such as host characteristics, **study design (e.g., sample size)**,
271 local husbandry systems, and diagnostic methods.

272 **The molecular prevalence** of *E. bieneusi* varied significantly by age group in the
273 present study, with a higher infection rate in calves compared to adults. This pattern aligns

274 with previous studies [31–34] and reflects age-dependent susceptibility stemming from both
275 physiological and behavioural factors. Calves' susceptibility to *E. bieneusi* may be linked to
276 immature immune function [34]. However, age-related differences are not always observed;
277 for example, some studies in China found no significant correlation [12, 35], while in Turkey
278 it was reported that older (more than three years) cattle were more prone to infection [23].
279 Such discrepancies suggest that both young and adult animals can contribute to transmission
280 dynamics, either as susceptible hosts or as chronic asymptomatic shedders. A sex-related
281 difference was also noted in this study, with males being significantly more infected than
282 females. Similar results have been reported [34], whereas other studies documented opposite
283 findings [36], or no sex-related differences at all [20, 23]. The susceptibility of males or
284 females to *E. bieneusi* infections remains unclear, and further research is necessary to clarify
285 whether sex factors influence this susceptibility.

286 *Although infection rates of E. bieneusi varied insignificantly between M'sila, Tipaza,*
287 *and Algiers, the variation of prevalence rates observed among these areas can be the result of*
288 *several factors including regional sampling imbalance, or local differences in sources of*
289 *infection or transmission pathways.*

290 Farm management also appeared to influence the risk of infection with *E. bieneusi*.
291 Cattle raised without contact with other ruminant species were 2.28 times more likely to be
292 infected than those reared alongside sheep or goats. *Various cattle-related factors such as*
293 *management practices, stocking density, and hygienic conditions within cattle farms could*
294 *increase the risk of E. bieneusi infections in cattle populations without co-habitation and co-*
295 *grazing with small ruminants.* However, the relationship between cattle susceptibility to *E.*
296 *bieneusi* and their cohabitation with other *livestock* species (*including potential cross-species*
297 *transmission with sheep and goats*) remains unclear and requires further investigation.

298 In this study, *E. bienersi* detection differed slightly between cows and their calves,
299 with calves showing a higher infection frequency (16 calf-only-positive pairs) than their cows
300 (7 cow-only-positive pairs). Although this difference was not statistically significant, the
301 observed pattern suggests that young animals may be more susceptible to *E. bienersi*
302 infection than their older counterparts. In addition to the immature immune system of calves,
303 this greater susceptibility could be related to environmental exposure to contaminated faecal
304 material or stress associated with early life management conditions. The environmental
305 transmission of *E. bienersi* could play an important role on the recurrence of infections in
306 calves. These findings highlight the need for attention to hygiene practices, manure
307 management, and calf-rearing environments to reduce potential exposure and transmission of
308 *E. bienersi* within herds.

309 Genotyping analysis identified seven potentially zoonotic *E. bienersi* genotypes,
310 including Type IV (42.3%), J (19.2%), I (15.4%), BEB6 and D (7.7% each), and CM7 and
311 Peru6 (3.9% each). This diversity surpasses that reported by Baroudi et al. (2017) [14], who
312 detected six genotypes (BEB3, BEB4, BEB6, I, J, and PtEb IX) in Algerian cattle. Compared
313 with Tipaza and Algiers regions, M'sila exhibited both the highest prevalence and the greatest
314 diversity of *E. bienersi* genotypes. This regional difference is likely attributable to the larger
315 and more representative sample size obtained in M'sila. The recurrence of genotypes BEB6, I,
316 and J in both Algerian studies suggests long-term circulation and potential host adaptation
317 within local cattle populations. The predominance of Type IV (a zoonotic genotype with
318 broad host range) in this study contrasts with the cattle-adapted BEB4 reported previously in
319 Algeria. This shift may reflect regional or temporal changes in genotype epidemiology, with
320 potential implications for cross-species transmission. The identification of CM7, D, and Peru6
321 genotypes (unreported in Algerian cattle to date) may suggest recent introduction or local
322 emergence, possibly linked to livestock trade or changing environmental conditions. Globally,

323 *E. bieneusi* genotypes BEB4, I, and J, were most frequently detected in cattle [11, 29, 37, 38],
324 but many of the variants identified here (BEB6, CM7, D, Peru6, Type IV) have also been
325 found in humans, non-human primates, domestic animals, and wildlife [3, 6, 39, 40]. The
326 detection of such zoonotic genotypes highlights the public health relevance of cattle as
327 reservoirs of *E. bieneusi* and underscores the importance of integrating veterinary and human
328 surveillance within a One Health framework.

329 **Genotype determination was unsuccessful for approximately half (43.5%) of the *E.***
330 ***bieneusi* PCR-positive samples due to suboptimal sequence quality, most likely associated**
331 **with low DNA concentrations. The inability to genotype all PCR-positive samples represents**
332 **a limitation of the present study and restricts a more comprehensive understanding of the**
333 **distribution of *E. bieneusi* genotypes in cattle populations.** Consequently, the molecular
334 findings reported here may not fully reflect the overall epidemiological situation of *E.*
335 *bieneusi* in Algeria.

336 In conclusion, our findings indicate a globally consistent prevalence and significant
337 genetic diversity of *E. bieneusi* in Algerian cattle, including zoonotic genotypes reported for
338 the first time in Algeria. These results strengthen the evidence of cattle as potential **reservoirs**
339 **contributing to** environmental contamination and zoonotic transmission of *E. bieneusi*,
340 highlighting the importance of coordinated monitoring strategies across animal, human, and
341 environmental health sectors.

342

343 **Acknowledgements**

344 We thank all farm owners for their help during the sampling process.

345

346 **Author Contributions**

347 S.L. Conceptualization, sample collection, and manuscript drafting. Y.M.S.A. Executing
348 laboratory experiments and manuscript drafting. A.D. Data analysis and manuscript drafting.
349 A.D. Molecular and phylogenetic analysis, reviewing and editing. S.S. Molecular and
350 phylogenetic analysis. N.R. Sample collection and executing laboratory experiments. H.S.
351 Sample collection. S.D. Sample collection. A.K. Sample collection. D.B. Manuscript drafting.
352 A.D.T. Supervising, reviewing and editing. D.C. Supervising, checking molecular analysis,
353 reviewing and editing. A.K.L. Manuscript drafting, supervising, checking molecular analysis,
354 reviewing and editing.

355

356 **Funding**

357 This research did not receive any specific grant from funding agencies in the public,
358 commercial, or not-for-profit sectors.

359

360 **Data Availability**

361 **Not applicable.**

362

363 **Ethical Approval**

364 Faecal samples were collected from cattle after obtaining informed consent from the farm
365 owners.

366

367 **Competing Interests**

368 The authors declare no competing interests.

369

370 **References**

- 371 1. Didier ES, Stovall ME, Green LC, Brindley PJ, Sestak K, Didier PJ (2004)
372 Epidemiology of microsporidiosis: sources and modes of transmission. *Vet Parasitol*
373 126(1–2):145–166. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.vetpar.2004.09.006>
- 374 2. Didier ES, Weiss LM (2006) Microsporidiosis: current status. *Curr Opin Infect Dis*
375 19(5):485–492. <https://doi.org/10.1097/01.qco.0000244055.46382.23>
- 376 3. Santín M, Fayer R (2011) Microsporidiosis: *Enterocytozoon bienersi* in domesticated
377 and wild animals. *Res Vet Sci* 90(3):363–371. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rvsc.2010.07.014>
- 378 4. Matos O, Lobo ML, Xiao L (2012) Epidemiology of *Enterocytozoon bienersi* infection
379 in humans. *J Parasitol Res* 2012:981424. <https://doi.org/10.1155/2012/981424>
- 380 5. Santín M, Fayer R (2009) *Enterocytozoon bienersi* genotype nomenclature based on the
381 internal transcribed spacer sequence: A consensus. *J Eukaryot Microbiol* 56(1):34–38.
382 <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1550-7408.2008.00380.x>
- 383 6. Koehler AV, Zhang Y, Gasser RB (2022) A perspective on the molecular identification,
384 classification, and epidemiology of *Enterocytozoon bienersi* of animals. *Experientia*
385 *Supplementum* 114:389–415. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-93306-7_14
- 386 7. Thellier M, Breton J (2008) *Enterocytozoon bienersi* in human and animals: focus on
387 laboratory identification and molecular epidemiology. *Parasite* 15:349–358.
388 <https://doi.org/10.1051/parasite/2008153349>
- 389 8. Jiang Y, Tao W, Wan Q, Li Q, Yang Y, Lin Y, Zhang S, Li W (2015) Zoonotic and
390 potentially host-adapted *Enterocytozoon bienersi* genotypes in sheep and cattle in
391 Northeast China and an increasing concern about the zoonotic importance of previously
392 considered ruminant-adapted genotypes. *Appl Environ Microbiol* 81(10):3326–3335.
393 <https://doi.org/10.1128/AEM.00328-15>
- 394 9. Jiang S, Yu S, Feng Y, Zhang L, Santín M, Xiao L, Li W (2024) Widespread
395 distribution of human-infective *Enterocytozoon bienersi* genotypes in small rodents in

- 396 northeast China and phylogeny and zoonotic implications revisited. *Acta Trop*
397 253:107160. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.actatropica.2024.107160>
- 398 10. Qin Y, Chen C, Qin YF, Yang XB, Li MH, Meng XZ, Zhao ZY, Ma N, Cai Y, Zhang
399 Y, Zhao Q (2022) Prevalence and related factors of *Enterocytozoon bieneusi* in cattle: a
400 global systematic review and meta-analysis. *Prev Vet Med* 208:105775.
401 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.prevetmed.2022.105775>
- 402 11. Taghipour A, Bahadory S, Abdoli A (2022) A systematic review and meta-analysis on
403 the global prevalence of cattle microsporidiosis with focus on *Enterocytozoon bieneusi*:
404 an emerging zoonotic pathogen. *Prev Vet Med* 200:105581.
405 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.prevetmed.2022.105581>
- 406 12. Zhao JQ, Fan YY, Lei YD, Liu D, Wang JW, Yang X, Song JK, Zhao GH (2024)
407 Molecular characterization of common zoonotic protozoan parasites and bacteria
408 causing diarrhea in dairy calves in Ningxia Hui Autonomous Region, China. *Parasite*
409 31:60. <https://doi.org/10.1051/parasite/2024059>
- 410 13. Laataamna AE, Wagnerová P, Sak B, Květoňová D, Xiao L, Rost M, McEvoy J, Saadi
411 AR, Aissi M, Kváč M (2015) Microsporidia and *Cryptosporidium* in horses and
412 donkeys in Algeria: detection of a novel *Cryptosporidium hominis* subtype family (Ik)
413 in a horse. *Vet Parasitol* 208(3–4):135–142.
414 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.vetpar.2015.01.007>
- 415 14. Baroudi D, Khelef D, Hakem A, Abdelaziz A, Chen X, Lysen C, Roellig D, Xiao L
416 (2017) Molecular characterization of zoonotic pathogens *Cryptosporidium* spp., *Giardia*
417 *duodenalis* and *Enterocytozoon bieneusi* in calves in Algeria. *Vet Parasitol Reg Stud*
418 *Rep* 8:66–69. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.vprsr.2017.02.005>
- 419 15. Baroudi D, Zhang H, Amer S, Khelef D, Roellig DM, Wang Y, Feng Y, Xiao L (2018)
420 Divergent *Cryptosporidium parvum* subtype and *Enterocytozoon bieneusi* genotypes in

- 421 dromedary camels in Algeria. *Parasitol Res* 117(3):905–910.
422 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00436-017-5734-1>
- 423 16. Buckholt MA, Lee JH, Tzipori S (2002) Prevalence of *Enterocytozoon bieneusi* in
424 swine: an 18-month survey at a slaughterhouse in Massachusetts. *Appl Environ*
425 *Microbiol* 68(5):2595–2599. <https://doi.org/10.1128/AEM.68.5.2595-2599.2002>
- 426 17. Kumar S, Stecher G, Li M, Knyaz C, Tamura K (2018) MEGAX: Molecular
427 Evolutionary Genetics Analysis across Computing Platforms. *Mol Biol Evol* 35(6):1547–
428 1549. <https://doi.org/10.1093/molbev/msy096>
- 429 18. Nei M, Kumar S (2000) Molecular Evolution and Phylogenetics. Oxford University
430 Press, New York. <https://global.oup.com/academic/product/molecular-evolution-and-phylogenetics-9780195135855>
- 432 19. Abu Samra N, Thompson PN, Jori F, Zhang H, Xiao L (2012) *Enterocytozoon bieneusi*
433 at the wildlife/livestock interface of the Kruger National Park, South Africa. *Vet*
434 *Parasitol* 190(3–4):587–590. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.vetpar.2012.06.031>
- 435 20. Fiuza VRS, Lopes CW, Oliveira FC, Fayer R, Santín M (2016) New findings of
436 *Enterocytozoon bieneusi* in beef and dairy cattle in Brazil. *Vet Parasitol* 216:46–51.
437 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.vetpar.2015.12.008>
- 438 21. Del Coco VF, Córdoba MA, Bilbao G, de Almeida Castro P, Basualdo JA, Santín M
439 (2014) First report of *Enterocytozoon bieneusi* from dairy cattle in Argentina. *Vet*
440 *Parasitol* 199:112–115. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.vetpar.2013.09.024>
- 441 22. Lee JH (2007) Prevalence and molecular characteristics of *Enterocytozoon bieneusi* in
442 cattle in Korea. *Parasitol Res* 101:391–396. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00436-007-0468-0>
- 443 23. Bilgin T, Usluğ S, Karademir GK, Okur M, Yetişmiş G, Yıldırım A (2020) Molecular
444 prevalence and phylogenetic characterization of *Enterocytozoon bieneusi* in healthy

- 445 cattle. *Turkiye Parazitol Derg* 44(1):36–42.
446 <https://doi.org/10.4274/tpd.galenos.2020.6851>
- 447 24. Rahimi HM, Mirjalali H, Zali MR (2021) Molecular epidemiology and
448 genotype/subtype distribution of *Blastocystis* sp., *Enterocytozoon bieneusi*, and
449 *Encephalitozoon* spp. in livestock: concern for emerging zoonotic infections. *Sci*
450 *Rep*11:17467. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-021-96960-x>
- 451 25. Santín M, Dargatz D, Fayer R (2012) Prevalence and genotypes of *Enterocytozoon*
452 *bieneusi* in weaned beef calves on cow-calf operations in the USA. *Parasitol Res*
453 110(5):2033–2041. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00436-011-2732-6>
- 454 26. Zhao A, Zhang K, Xu C, Wang T, Qi M, Li J (2020) Longitudinal identification of
455 *Enterocytozoon bieneusi* in dairy calves on a farm in Southern Xinjiang, China. *Comp*
456 *Immunol Microbiol Infect Dis* 73:101550. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cimid.2020.101550>
- 457 27. Abarca N, Santín M, Ortega S, Maloney JG, George NS, Molokin A, Cardona GA,
458 Dashti A, Köster PC, Bailo B, Hernández-de-Mingo M, Muadica AS, Calero-Bernal R,
459 Carmena D, González-Barrio D (2021) Molecular detection and characterization of
460 *Blastocystis* sp. and *Enterocytozoon bieneusi* in cattle in northern Spain. *Vet Sci* 8(9):191.
461 <https://doi.org/10.3390/vetsci8090191>
- 462 28. Gao H, Liang G, Su N, Li Q, Wang D, Wang J, Zhao L, Kang X, Guo K (2023)
463 Prevalence and molecular characterization of *Cryptosporidium* spp., *Giardia*
464 *duodenalis*, and *Enterocytozoon bieneusi* in diarrheic and non-diarrheic calves from
465 Ningxia, northwestern China. *Animals* 13:1983. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ani13121983>
- 466 29. Lichtmannsperger K, Harl J, Roehl SR, Schoiswohl J, Eibl C, Wittek T, Hinney B,
467 Wiedermann S, Joachim A (2023) *Enterocytozoon bieneusi* in fecal samples from calves
468 and cows in Austria. *Parasitol Res* 122:333–340. [https://doi.org/10.1007/s00436-022-](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00436-022-07733-y)
469 [07733-y](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00436-022-07733-y)

- 470 30. Udonsom R, Prasertbun R, Mahittikorn A, Chiabchalard R, Sutthikornchai C,
471 Palasuwan A, Popruk S (2019) Identification of *Enterocytozoon bieneusi* in goats and
472 cattle in Thailand. *BMC Vet Res* 15:308. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12917-019-2054-y>
- 473 31. Santín M, Fayer R (2009) A longitudinal study of *Enterocytozoon bieneusi* in dairy
474 cattle. *Parasitol Res* 105(1):141–144. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00436-009-1374-4>
- 475 32. Li J, Luo N, Wang C, Qi M, Cao J, Cui Z, Huang J, Wang R, Zhang L (2016)
476 Occurrence, molecular characterization and predominant genotypes of *Enterocytozoon*
477 *bieneusi* in dairy cattle in Henan and Ningxia, China. *Parasites Vectors* 9:142.
478 <https://doi.org/10.1186/s13071-016-1425-5>
- 479 33. Tang C, Cai M, Wang L, Guo Y, Li N, Feng Y, Xiao L (2018) Genetic diversity within
480 dominant *Enterocytozoon bieneusi* genotypes in pre-weaned calves. *Parasites Vectors*
481 11:170. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s13071-018-2768-x>
- 482 34. Liu Y-Y, Qin R-L, Mei J-J, Zou Y, Zhang Z-H, Zheng W-B, Liu Q, Zhu X-Q, Gao W-W,
483 Xie S-C (2022) Molecular detection and genotyping of *Enterocytozoon bieneusi* in beef
484 cattle in Shanxi province, north China. *Animals* 12, 2961.
485 <https://doi.org/10.3390/ani12212961>
- 486 35. Sun TB, Lin XY, Pan SM, Chen LF, Shi QM, Li WC, Wang QY (2023) Prevalence of
487 *Cryptosporidium* spp. and *Enterocytozoon bieneusi* in beef cattle in the Hebei Province
488 of China. *Med Weter* 79(3):142–147. <http://dx.doi.org/10.21521/mw.6748>
- 489 36. Song HY, Wang KS, Yang JF, Mao HM, Pu LH, Zou Y, Ma J, Zhu XQ, Zou FC, He JJ
490 (2021) Prevalence and novel genotypes identification of *Enterocytozoon bieneusi* in
491 dairy cattle in Yunnan province, China. *Animals* 11:3014.
492 <https://doi.org/10.3390/ani11113014>

- 493 37. Li W, Feng Y, Santin M (2019) Host specificity of *Enterocytozoon bieneusi* and public
494 health implications. *Trends Parasitol* 35(6):436–451.
495 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pt.2019.04.004>
- 496 38. Wang MY, Zhang S, Zhang ZS, Qian XY, Chai HL, Wang Y, Fan WJ, Yi C, Ding YL,
497 Han WX, Zhao L, Liu YH (2024) Prevalence and molecular characterization of
498 *Cryptosporidium* spp., *Enterocytozoon bieneusi*, and *Giardia duodenalis* in dairy cattle in
499 Ningxia, Northwestern China. *Vet Res Commun* 48:2629–2643.
500 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11259-024-10364-6>
- 501 39. Sak B, Brady D, Pelikánová M, Květoňová D, Rost M, Kostka M, Tolarová V, Hůzová
502 Z, Kváč M (2011) Unapparent microsporidial infection among immunocompetent
503 humans in the Czech Republic. *J Clin Microbiol* 49(3):1064–1070.
504 <https://doi.org/10.1128/JCM.01147-10>
- 505 40. Wang L, Xiao L, Duan L, Ye J, Guo Y, Guo M, Liu L, Feng Y (2013) Concurrent
506 infections of *Giardia duodenalis*, *Enterocytozoon bieneusi*, and *Clostridium difficile* in
507 children during a cryptosporidiosis outbreak in a pediatric hospital in China. *PLoS Negl*
508 *Trop Dis* 7(9):e2437. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pntd.0002437>

509

510 **Figure legends**

511 **Fig. 1** The map of study areas in Algeria where faecal samples from cattle were collected.

512 **Fig. 2** Phylogenetic relationship among *Enterocytozoon bieneusi* genotypes inferred based on
513 partial sequences of the internal transcribed spacer (ITS) region using the Maximum
514 likelihood method implemented in MEGA X. The tree shows the phylogenetic relationship
515 among sequences generated from the present study and reference sequences retrieved from
516 GenBank. Genotype PtEb XI (belonging to Group 11) was used as outgroup to root the tree.
517 Sequences generated in this study are represented with green filled circles.