

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11

# EPG and pasture larval count of gastrointestinal nematodes are strongly influenced by weather parameters: empirical evidence from Parbhani Marathwada

---

## ABSTRACT

**Aims:** the present study was aimed to develop a bioclimatograph of gastrointestinal nematodes of cattle in Marathwada region of Maharashtra.

**Study design:** A standard protocol as per published reports was followed for recording of prevalence of GI nematodes from cattle.

**Place and Duration of Study:** The study was conducted at livestock instructional farm of College of Veterinary and Animal Sciences Parbhani during the period February 2022 to January, 2023.

**Methodology:** In all total 253 faecal samples were collected from calves and adult cattle belonging to RK instructional farm, COVAS, Parbhani. Sample collection and processing was done by following standard parasitological procedures and only fresh fecal droppings were used for the laboratory investigation.

**Results:** The study conducted on availability of larvae on pasture revealed the overall prevalence of 61 percent (87 pasture were positive out of 143 examined). The PLC analysis showed the highest distribution of larvae on pasture during winter season i.e. 57.81 %, followed by monsoon season i.e. 57.81 % and 00.0% during summer season. The Pasture larval count observed during different seasons was 23.83, 33.07 and 0.00 per 100 gm, respectively. The abstract information drawn from the bioclimatographs plotted for 2000-2021 and its validation with real time data of 2022 ( Feb 2022-Jan 2023) was a) Suitable months for survival of *Heamonchus* and *Oesophagostomum* infective larvae on the pasture of the grazing land in year 2022-2023 were Jan - March and June – September and for *Trichostrongylus* Jan – March and October 2022- January 2023 and b) The climatic data and Bioclimatograph were plotted from year 2000-2021 and 2022+January 2023 showed the correlation between EPG and PLC.

**Conclusion:** The bioclimatographs can be developed and utilized according the regional agro-climatic variations and be useful for devising control measures against gastrointestinal nematodes of livestock.

12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22

*Keywords: bioclimatograph, cattle, nematodes, Maharashtra*

## 1. INTRODUCTION

The epidemiology of gastrointestinal parasites in livestock is widely recognized to be influenced by regional and local environmental factors, as well as grazing patterns and management strategies. Detailed mapping of parasitic fauna in different livestock species during various agro-climatic seasons provides crucial insights that can inform the development of additional management techniques [1]. This study, building upon the

23 aforementioned premise, also investigates the seasonal variations in gastrointestinal  
24 parasitism specifically in cattle.

25 Assessing the presence of infective larvae in pastures offers valuable insights into the level  
26 of infection risk faced by animals grazing in those areas. The enumeration of infective larvae  
27 in pasture herbage is increasingly utilized for diagnosing and predicting parasitic diseases in  
28 farm animals [2]. Utilizing pasture larval counts (PLC) and environmental data to construct  
29 bio-climatographs aids in determining optimal modeling approaches and making precise  
30 forecasts [3]. Given that contaminated pastures serve as a source of infection,  
31 understanding the prevalence of infective larvae in pastures is crucial for implementing  
32 appropriate grazing practices, highlighting the significance of pasture management in  
33 nematode parasite control initiatives [4]. As posited by these scholars, effective pasture  
34 management not only benefits productivity by enhancing weight gain, feed conversion, milk  
35 production, reproductive performance, carcass quality, immunological status, and reducing  
36 morbidity and mortality.

37 The primary consideration in selecting a diagnostic technique for parasites is the reliability of  
38 the information provided to address the issue at hand. However, the importance of the free-  
39 living stages of gastrointestinal nematodes (e.g., eggs, developing larvae, L3) is often  
40 overlooked when devising effective diagnostic methods for parasitic infections [5]. In such  
41 contexts, pasture larval counts (PLC) emerge as one of the most effective approaches,  
42 aiming to quantitatively and qualitatively identify nematode larval species to support  
43 investigations into parasite population dynamics. PLC also enables the detection of monthly  
44 and seasonal fluctuations in pasture infectivity, assigning a risk score for parasite exposure  
45 to grazing animals [6, 7]. Consequently, the current research was designed to estimate the  
46 burden of pasture larvae and examine its relationship with climatic factors in the Parbhani  
47 region..

48

## 49 **2. MATERIAL AND METHODS**

50

51

52 The current study was conducted with the aim of investigating the gastrointestinal  
53 nematodes infecting livestock in the Parbhani region. The study was carried out at the  
54 Department of Veterinary Parasitology, within the College of Veterinary and Animal  
55 Sciences, (MAFSU) Parbhani. Located in the Marathwada division of Maharashtra state,  
56 Parbhani city is positioned at 19° 23' North latitude 76° 09' East longitudes, with an altitude  
57 of 454 m above mean sea level. Parbhani falls within a rain shadow area, receiving over  
58 80% of its rainfall from the south-west monsoon. Agro-climatically, this region is classified  
59 within the assured rainfall zone of Maharashtra state, with an average annual precipitation of  
60 approximately 938.7 mm, predominantly during the south-western monsoon period between  
61 June and September. Winter precipitation is irregular and minimal. The average maximum  
62 temperature ranges from 28.7-42.1°C (33.7°C), while the average minimum temperature  
63 varies between 9.0°C to 26.5°C (18.5°C) during winter and summer respectively.  
64 Consequently, Parbhani experiences cold winters and hot, arid summers. The area  
65 encounters Relative Humidity, RH-I 41-87% (71%) and RH-II (98%). The seasons in  
66 Parbhani are categorized as Southwest monsoon season (June to September), Post-  
67 monsoon season (October to January), and summer season (February to May) [8].

68 The research was carried out from February 2022-January 2023. The host animals included  
69 in the study were Red Kandhari Cattle of Marathwada region. The animals were selected  
70 from Red Kandhari Research and Instructional Farm of COVAS Parbhani.

71 Following seasons were considered for the present study. Seasons were as per months and  
72 weeks of a calendar according to standard meteorological norms designed for Marathwada  
73 region (VNMKV Vision- 2020, 1998). Seasons defined as per World Meteorological  
74 Organization(WMO) norms for the Marathwada region are monsoon, winter and summer.

75 Monsoon: 4th June- 4th November (23rd -44th week)

76 Winter : 5th November-4th March (45th -9th week)

77 Summer : 5th March-3rd June (10th -22nd week)

78 Six adult cattle and six calves were selected randomly from the ILFC, College of Veterinary  
79 and Animal Sciences, Parbhani. These animals are not dewormed throughout experimental  
80 period. However, they were treated for other illness and health fitness. EPG of the faecal  
81 samples from the selected animals were estimated twice in a month by Stoll's Egg counting  
82 technique as described earlier [2]. Pasture larval count (PLC) were estimated twice or thrice  
83 once in a month throughout experimental period by following standard procedure [9]. The  
84 recovered larvae from the herbage samples were killed and stained with Lugol's iodine  
85 solution for few minutes . Then a drop containing two-three larvae was taken on a glass slide  
86 with the help of pasture pipette and covered with a coverslip. It was examined under a  
87 compound microscope fixed with an oculomicrometer in the eyepiece. The Total Length of  
88 the larvae (TL) and Sheath Tail Extension (STE) was measured by oculomicrometer. The  
89 readings were subsequently calculated and converted into micrometres. The obtained  
90 lengths of TL and STE of larvae were matched according to the standard measurements of  
91 the infective larvae of gastrointestinal nematodes of sheep [10]. The data obtained from  
92 various parameters was analyzed by employing simple correlation, multiple regression and  
93 completely randomized design using computer application, WASP version 2.0  
94 ([www.ccari.res.in](http://www.ccari.res.in))

95  
96

### 97 **3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

98  
99

#### 3.1 Prevalence of Gastro intestinal nematodes in cattle at Parbhani region

100 In all total 253 faecal samples were collected from calves and adult cattle belonging to RK  
101 instructional farm, College of Veterinary and Animal Sciences, Parbhani. Out of 253 samples  
102 examined 75 (30.00%) were positive for different species of GI nematode infection. At par  
103 prevalence was reported from Uttar Pradesh [11], from Gujrat [1] and from Meghalaya [12]  
104 states of India. Few scientists reported very less prevalence of GI parasitism 12.50 % [13];  
105 whereas very high prevalence of 75% by some of the researchers [14]. Comparison of  
106 prevalence from one geographic region with other region is not justifiable because

107 1. The development, growth, survival and transmission of infective larval stages on  
108 pasture is greatly influenced by rainfall, temperature, humidity, soil moisture and other  
109 conditions of a particular region. All these vary from place to place, country to country and  
110 year to year.

111 2. Similarly prevalence also depends on host factors such as breed and animal  
112 husbandry practices, which all differ at different locations.

113 During three different seasons the prevalence of GI nematode infections was 38.84%, during  
114 monsoon, 20.00% during winter and 22.22% during summer season. Study recorded the  
115 more incidences of Strongyles and Strongyloides spp. It is well known fact that during rainy

116 seasonthe survival of infective stages on pasture is for longer period of time,which  
 117 facilitatesuptake of infective stages by host and it results in increased prevalence. During  
 118 winter season due to presence of infective stages on pasture nearly same or to certain  
 119 extent lesser infection occur. In summer season, it is devoid of  
 120 optimumgeoclimaticconditionsi.e higher temperature and relative humidity and minimum  
 121 level of moisture are available, as a result nil or lowest level of infection occur.Seasonal  
 122 prevalence for GI parasitism is also reported by several researchers [11, 13, 15].  
 123

124 **Table 1 Prevalence and Eggs Per Gram (EPG) for nematode infections in Cattle at**  
 125 **Parbhani region.**

Season	Prevalence of GI parasitism		%	No of observations	EPG values	
	(TE)	(TP)			Mean ± SE	Range
Monsoon	121	47	38.84	47	90.09 a± 11.934	0-500
Winter	60	12	20.00	12	48.33b±13.96	0-400
Summer	72	16	22.22	16	30.56b±8.07	0-400
Stat	253	75	30.00	CD Value	HS CD(0.01) = 47.735 CD(0.05) = 36.320	

126 TP: Total Positive; TE: Total Examined: HS: Highly Significant  
 127

128 The mean EPG count recorded during the monsoon season peaked at 90.09, showed a  
 129 moderate level during the winter season at 48.33, and dropped to the lowest point at 30.56  
 130 during the summer season. Various workers have documented the EPG data from the  
 131 region as outlined in table 1.

### 132 3.2 Prevalence of pasture nematode larvae in cattle in the Parbhani

133 The research unveiled an overall prevalence of 61 percent, with 87 out of 143 pasture  
 134 samples testing positive. The analysis of PLC indicated an equal and highest distribution of  
 135 larvae in the pasture during both the winter and monsoon seasons, at 57.81 percent.  
 136 Minimal to no larvae were detected during the summer months.

137 Previous reports of PLC levels in India originated from Assam and Sikkim [16, 17]. Both  
 138 studies noted year-round PLC presence with seasonal fluctuations. In contrast, the current  
 139 research in Maharashtra identified PLC levels exclusively during the monsoon and winter  
 140 seasons. This discrepancy in PLC levels could be linked to geographical disparities. The  
 141 study, carried out in 2022, experienced the highest rainfall, resulting in a greater presence of  
 142 larvae on the pasture. This heightened exposure during the monsoon, followed by winter,  
 143 likely increased the risk of infection in animals [18]. The monsoon commenced in July,  
 144 concluded in September, with sporadic rains continuing until December, peaking in August.  
 145 These conditions likely favored the development and survival of pre-parasitic stages, leading  
 146 to a rise in infective larvae on the pasture during the monsoon and subsequent months [19].  
 147

148 **Table 2 Prevalence of Pasture larval count (PLC) for nematodes of cattle at Parbhani**  
 149 **region**

Season	Prevalence of GI parasitism			No of observations	PLC values	
	TE	TP	%		Mean ± SE	Range

Monsoon	64	37	57.81	37	23.83a± 3.575	0-105
Winter	57	50	87.71	50	33.07a± 4.034	0-83
Summer	22	0	0.00	0	0.00b	0.00
	143	87	61.00		S	
				CD Value	CD(0.01) = 21.115	
					CD(0.05) = 16.066	

150 TP:Total Positive; TE:Total Examined: S: Significant

151

### 152 **3.3 Pasture Larval Count (PLC)**

153 The Pasture larval count observed during different seasons was 23.83, 33.07 and 0.00 per  
 154 100 gm of pasture during monsoon, winter and summer season, respectively. Except a  
 155 single study from Sikkim [17]; no much work from India is available for comparison and  
 156 discussion.

157

### 158 **3.4 Identification of the larvae of helminth parasites recovered from the pasture**

159 In the present study various species of gastrointestinal nematodes found during the  
 160 morphometric examination of larvae. The larvae recovered from the pasture were identified  
 161 as *Bunostomum phlebotomum*, *Bunostomum* spp., *Haemonchus contortus*, *Trichostrongylus*  
 162 spp., *Oesophagostomum radiatum*, *Cooperia punctata*, *Ostertegia ostertegi* and  
 163 *Strongyloides papillosus* based on morphometric observations and its equating it with the  
 164 standard morphometric observations.

165 Among various species *Oesophagostomum radiatum* was the most prevalent as compared to  
 166 other followed by *Bunostomum phlebotomum* and *Haemonchus contortus* etc. Mixed infection  
 167 other than GI nematodes was also encountered such as *Schistosoma* infection in calves.

### 168 **3.5 EPG and its correlation with weather parameters**

169 The EPG levels was found to be significantly correlated with RH (E), while, with other  
 170 parameters like Tmin, Tmax, BSS, EVP, TRF are negatively non-significantly correlated and  
 171 RH-M positively non-significantly correlated. In nutshell humidity levels are positively  
 172 correlated while rests of the parameters are having negative (inverse) relationship. Positive  
 173 correlation of RH factor indicates that in the tropical region like Parbhani where abundant  
 174 quantum of heat (temperature) is available, humidity level matters.

### 175 **3.6 PLC and its correlation with weather parameters**

176 As like EPG correlations, more or less similar pattern of correlations between PLC levels and  
 177 weather parameters was observed. The only difference noted was that, RH-E has also  
 178 shown negative correlation, though its magnitude is non-significant. It indicates that in the  
 179 region where grazing of animals is done on pasture, humidity levels in the morning has more  
 180 impact. It helps in crawling and transfer of larvae on pasture/grass blades. EPG levels and  
 181 PLC levels showed negative correlation with each other.

182

183 **Table 3 Showing correlation matrix for EPG, PLC and weather parameters of Parbhani**  
 184 **region.**

**Correlation Matrix**

-	T <sub>min</sub> (°C)	T <sub>max</sub> (°C)	RH-M(%)	RH-E(%)	BSS(Hrs.)	EVP(mm)	TRF(mm)	EPG	PLC
T <sub>min</sub> (°C)	1.000								
T <sub>max</sub> (°C)	0.116	1.000							
RH-M(%)	-0.890	-0.070	1.000						
RH-E(%)	-0.662	0.374	0.656	1.000					
BSS(Hrs.)	-0.468	0.486	0.521	0.622	1.000				
EVP(mm)	-0.473	0.477	0.526	0.615	1.000	1.000			
TRF(mm)	0.938	0.191	-0.926	-0.640	-0.515	-0.520	1.000		
EPG	-0.544	-0.087	0.435	0.705	-0.033	-0.041	-0.457	1.000	
PLC	-0.374	-0.386	0.443	-0.002	-0.128	-0.120	-0.475	-0.008	1.000

185

186

187 **Table 4 Showing Student T-test for EPG, PLC and weather parameters of Parbhani**  
 188 **region.**

Variables Tested	T Value	T Table	Significance at 5%
Tmax -RH(M)	5.865	2.262	Significant
Tmax -RH(E)	2.651	2.262	Significant
Tmax -EVP	8.097	2.262	Significant
RH(M) -RH(E)	2.605	2.262	Significant
RH(M) -EVP	7.36	2.262	Significant
RH(E) -TRF	2.384	2.262	Significant
RH(E) -BSS	2.34	2.262	Significant
RH(E) -EVP	2.499	2.262	Significant

<b>RH(E) -EPG</b>	<b>2.98</b>	<b>2.262</b>	<b>Significant</b>
TRF -BSS	190.376	2.262	Significant
Tmax -Tmin	0.349	2.262	Non Significant
Tmax -TRF	1.591	2.262	Non Significant
Tmax -BSS	1.61	2.262	Non Significant
Tmax -EPG	1.945	2.262	Non Significant
Tmax -PLC	1.209	2.262	Non Significant
Tmin -RH(M)	0.211	2.262	Non Significant
Tmin -RH(E)	1.211	2.262	Non Significant
Tmin -TRF	1.666	2.262	Non Significant
Tmin -BSS	1.63	2.262	Non Significant
Tmin -EVP	0.583	2.262	Non Significant
<b>Tmin -EPG</b>	<b>0.262</b>	<b>2.262</b>	<b>Non Significant</b>
<b>Tmin -PLC</b>	<b>1.257</b>	<b>2.262</b>	<b>Non Significant</b>
RH(M) -TRF	1.832	2.262	Non Significant
RH(M) -BSS	1.857	2.262	Non Significant
<b>RH(M) -EPG</b>	<b>1.45</b>	<b>2.262</b>	<b>Non Significant</b>
<b>RH(M) -PLC</b>	<b>1.481</b>	<b>2.262</b>	<b>Non Significant</b>
<b>RH(E) -PLC</b>	<b>0.005</b>	<b>2.262</b>	<b>Non Significant</b>
TRF -EVP	1.802	2.262	Non Significant
<b>TRF -EPG</b>	<b>0.1</b>	<b>2.262</b>	<b>Non Significant</b>
<b>TRF -PLC</b>	<b>0.389</b>	<b>2.262</b>	<b>Non Significant</b>
BSS -EVP	1.829	2.262	Non Significant
<b>BSS -EPG</b>	<b>0.122</b>	<b>2.262</b>	<b>Non Significant</b>

190 Regression analysis value  $R^2$ (square)=82.95%indicated the role of environmental factors to  
 191 the extent of 82.9% and remaining almost 17% remains unexplained or factors could not be  
 192 predicted. The regression analysis indicates RH(E), TRF,BSS,EVP are negatively correlated  
 193 and showing negative impact on EPG count while Tmax, Tmin ,RH(M) are positively  
 194 correlated having positive impact on EPG levels.

195 **Table 5 Regression analysis – EPG as dependent factor and all environmental factors**  
 196 **and PLC as independent factors**

Independent Variables	Average	Reg. coefficients (b)	Standard Error(SE(b))	T Test	T table (0.05)
$T_{min}(^{\circ}C)$	32.936	0.530	nan	nan	4.303
$T_{max}(^{\circ}C)$	19.291	0.065	nan	nan	4.303
RH-(M) (%)	19.291	0.000	nan	nan	4.303
RH-(E) (%)	78.818	-39.894	nan	nan	4.303
BSS(Hrs.)	69.636	-38.047	nan	nan	4.303
EVP (mm)	98.064	-521.110	nan	nan	4.303
TRF (mm)	98.727	-522.226	nan	nan	4.303
PLC	74.996	93.514	nan	nan	4.303

197 Intercept (a) = 148.171

198 Coefficient of determination (R Square) = 82.95 %

199 Multiple Correlation Coefficient (R) = 0.977

200 Standard Error = 26.541

201

202 The resultant equation for regression model derived as –

203  $EPG = 148.171 + (-4.073) \times T_{min} + (-2.647) \times T_{max} + (0.479) \times RH-M + (1.759) \times RH-$   
 204  $E + (6.915) \times TRF + (-7.204) \times BSS + (-0.958) \times EVP + (-0.251) \times PLC + 26.541$

205

206

207 In another set of analysis PLC was taken as a dependent factor and weather  
 208 parameters and EPG were taken as independent factors. here the regression analysis value  
 209 i.e  $R^2$ (square)=88.4 % indicates the environmental factors has played role to the extent of  
 210 88.4 % and remaining almost 11.6 % remains unexplained or could not be predicted. The  
 211 regression analysis also indicated that RH-M and BSS are negatively correlated and shows  
 212 negative impact on PLC count while Tmax, Tmin, RH(E), EVP and TRF are positively  
 213 correlated with PLC and has got positive impact on PLC levels.

214

215 **Table 6 Regression analysis –PLC as dependent factor and all environmental factors**  
 216 **and EPG as independent factors**

Independent Variables	Average	Reg. coefficients (b)	Standard Error(SE(b))	T Test	T table (0.05)
T <sub>min</sub> (°C)	32.936	13.282	12.329	1.077	4.303
T <sub>max</sub> (°C)	19.291	0.651	6.429	0.101	4.303
RH-(M) (%)	78.818	-6.239	5.005	-1.246	4.303
RH-(E) (%)	69.636	12.671	5.667	2.236	4.303
BSS(Hrs.)	98.064	-86.766	50.763	-1.709	4.303
EVP(mm)	98.727	86.369	50.861	1.698	4.303
TRF(mm)	6.565	2.325	15.942	0.146	4.303
PLC	74.996	-0.561	0.979	-0.573	4.303

217 Intercept (a) = -797.320

218 Coefficient of determination (R Square) = 88.4 %

219 Multiple Correlation Coefficient (R) = 0.940

220 Standard Error = 39.662

221 The resultant equation for regression model of PLC is derived as –

222  $PLC = -797.320 + (13.282) \times T_{min} + (0.651) \times T_{max} + (-6.239) \times RH-M + (12.671) \times RH-E + (-$   
 223  $86.766) \times TRF + (86.369) \times BSS + (2.325) \times EVP + (-0.561) \times EPG + 39.662$

224 It is apparent from the regression model presented above that the Population of Lactating  
 225 Cows (PLC) exerts a positive influence on Egg Per Gram (EPG), indicating that an increase  
 226 in PLC results in a corresponding increase in EPG count. It is noteworthy that Total Rainfall  
 227 (TRF) demonstrates a negative effect, which could possibly be attributed to the elevated  
 228 precipitation levels experienced in the year 2022 leading to the displacement and reduction  
 229 of larvae from the pasture, consequently reducing infections due to decreased consumption  
 230 of grass from the pasture with high water content.

231 It is widely recognized that the prevailing weather and climatic conditions in a specific  
 232 geographical area significantly impact the proliferation of helminthic infections in ruminants  
 233 [3]. Various climatic elements including temperature, rainfall, humidity, wind patterns, speed,  
 234 sunlight intensity, and duration play pivotal roles in determining the prevalence of helminthic  
 235 infections. Research conducted by scholars worldwide has convincingly demonstrated that  
 236 the development, survival, transmission, and presence of parasitic stages of strongyle  
 237 nematodes in ruminants on pasture are intricately influenced by temperature and moisture  
 238 [20, 21].

239 Upon emerging from eggs laid by parasites, the initial stage larvae (L.) engage in feeding on  
240 bacteria present in fecal matter, before progressing to the second stage where they continue  
241 their bacterial diet. Subsequently, they molt into ensheathed infective third stage larvae (L3).  
242 These transformations occur naturally in grazing areas, contingent upon factors such as  
243 temperature, atmospheric oxygen levels, and sufficient moisture. Consequently, in specific  
244 tropical regions, the primary determinant shaping the life cycle of helminth parasites is  
245 rainfall. The L3 larvae transition from feces to vegetation, where they linger until either being  
246 consumed by a potential host or perishing. This exogenous phase of the life cycle  
247 encompasses two distinct processes: the development of infective larvae and the  
248 transmission of said larvae onto grass blades to heighten the probability of infecting the  
249 definitive host [3]. Environmental conditions conducive to one process may not be beneficial  
250 for the other. Typically, the optimal temperature for larval development exceeds that required  
251 for survival and transmission. By considering the grazing system alongside the larvae's  
252 developmental rate, crucial insights can be gleaned to anticipate infection likelihood, pinpoint  
253 peak periods, and consequently devise an effective deworming regimen.

#### 254 **4. CONCLUSION**

255

256 From results of the current study, it is concluded that the suitable months for survival of  
257 *Haemonchus* and *Oesophagostomum* infective larvae on the pasture of the grazing land in  
258 year 2022-2023 were Jan - March and June - September and for *Trichostrongylus* Jan -  
259 March and October 2022- January 2023. Therefore the deworming schedule should be  
260 formulated in this region accordingly.

261

#### 262 **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

263

264 The authors of this paper are indebted to the entire faculty and staff of the Department of  
265 Instructional Livestock Farm Complex of College of Veterinary and Animal Sciences,  
266 Parbhani for their invaluable support during the research process.

267

#### 268 **COMPETING INTERESTS**

269

270 "Authors have declared that no competing interests exist."

271

272

#### 273 **REFERENCES**

274

275

276 1. Maharana BR, KumarB, SudhakarNR, BeheraSK,PatbandhaTK. Prevalence of  
277 gastrointestinal parasites in bovines in and around Junagadh (Gujarat). Journal of  
278 parasitic Diseases. 2016; 40(4): 1174-1178.

279 2. Soulsby, E.J.L. Helminth,Arthropod&Protozoa of domesticated Animals. London:  
280 Baillière Tindall, 1965; 7th Edition

281 3. Van Dijk J, SargisonND, KenyonF, SkucePJ. Climate change and infectious  
282 disease: helminthological challenges to farmed ruminants in temperate regions.  
283 Animal, 2010; 4(3): 377-392.

284 4. Almeida FA, AlbuquerqueACA, BassettoCC, StarlingRZ, Lins JGG, AmaranteAF.  
285 Long spelling periods are required for pasture to become free of contamination by

- 286 infective larvae of *Haemonchus contortus* in a humid subtropical climate of São  
287 Paulo state, Brazil. *Veterinary Parasitology*, 2020; 279 :109060
- 288 5. Bartley DJ, Andrews L, Melville LA, McBean D, Skuce P, Morrison AA. Integrating  
289 applied parasitological and molecular epidemiological methodologies to investigate  
290 the capacity of *Haemonchus contortus* to over-winter on pasture in Scotland.  
291 *Veterinary Record*, 2021; 189(3): e137.
- 292 6. McFarland C, Rose Vineer H, Chesney L, Henry N, Brown C, Airs P, Nicholson C,  
293 Scollan N, Lively F, Kyriazakis I, Morgan ER. Tracking gastrointestinal nematode  
294 risk on cattle farms through pasture contamination mapping. *International Journal of*  
295 *Parasitology*, 2022; 52(10):691-703. doi: 10.1016/j.ijpara.2022.07.003.
- 296 7. Dakhore KD, Yadav EK, Shaikh AR. In *Climatic Normals and Extreme Events at*  
297 *Parbhani*. Published by Dr D P Waskar, Director of Research, Vasant Rao Naik  
298 Marathwada Krishi Vidyapeeth, Parbhani 431402 (M.S.) 2020;  
299 VNMKV/DOR/Technical Bulletin/10/2020 pp01-02.
- 300 8. Martin RR, Beveridge J, Pullman AL, Brown TH. A modified technique for the  
301 estimation of the number of infective nematode larvae present on pasture, and its  
302 application in the field under South Australian conditions. *Veterinary*  
303 *Parasitology*, 1990; 37(2): 133-143.
- 304 9. Van Wyk JA, Mayhew E. Morphological identification of parasitic nematode infective  
305 larvae of small ruminants and cattle: A practical lab guide. *Onderstepoort Journal of*  
306 *Veterinary Research*. 2013; 80(1): 1-14.
- 307 10. Singh A, Gangwar AK, Shinde NK, Srivastava S. Gastrointestinal parasitism in  
308 bovines of Faizabad. *Journal of Veterinary Parasitology*. 2008; 22(1): 31-33.
- 309 11. Laha R, Das M, Goswami A. Gastrointestinal parasitic infections in organized cattle  
310 farms of Meghalaya. *Veterinary World*. 2013; 6(2): 109
- 311 12. Wadhwa A, Tanwar R K, Singla LD, Eda S, Kumar N, Kumar Y. Prevalence of  
312 gastrointestinal helminthes in cattle and buffaloes in Bikaner, Rajasthan, India.  
313 *Veterinary World*. 2011; 4(9): 417.
- 314 13. Marskole P, Verma Y, Dixit AK, Swamy M. Prevalence and burden of gastrointestinal  
315 parasites in cattle and buffaloes in Jabalpur, India. *Veterinary World*. 2016;  
316 9(11): 1214.
- 317 14. Raman M, Pandian ASS, Manikkavasagan I. Impact of climatological parameters on  
318 prevalence of gastrointestinal helminths of small ruminants in Tamil Nadu. *Journal of*  
319 *Agrometeorology*. 2015; 17(2): 256- 258.

- 320 15. Das M, DekaDK, IslamS, SarmahPC, BhattacharjeeK. Gastrointestinal nematode  
321 larvae in the grazing land of cattle in Guwahati, Assam. *Veterinary World*. 2016;  
322 9(12): 1343.
- 323 16. Pal P, ChatlodLR, AvastheRK. Preparation of bioclimatograph for Haemonchosis  
324 and trichostrongylosis in goats of subtropical high humid zone of Sikkim. *The Indian*  
325 *Journal of Animal Sciences*. 2017; 87(7).
- 326 17. Wang T, Avramenko RW, Redman EM. et al. High levels of third-stage larvae (L3)  
327 overwinter survival for multiple cattle gastrointestinal nematode species on western  
328 Canadian pastures as revealed by ITS2 rDNA metabarcoding. *Parasites Vectors*.  
329 2020; 13: 458. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s13071-020-04337-2>.
- 330 18. Suarez VH, Martínez GM, OlmosLH. Epidemiology of Goat Nematode Infections in  
331 Different Ecological Regions of Argentina S Northwest. *Global Press Hub. Asian*  
332 *Journal of Research in Biosciences*, 2021; 3(1): 29-37.
- 333 19. Swarnkar CP, Singh D. Influence of annual rainfall on epidemiology of  
334 gastrointestinal parasites in sheep flocks of Rajasthan. *Indian Journal of Animal*  
335 *Sciences*. 2014; 84(11): 1171-1176.
- 336 20. Melville LA, Van Dijk J, Mitchell S, Innocent G, Bartley DJ. Variation in hatching  
337 responses of *Nematodirus battus* eggs to temperature experiences. *Parasites and*  
338 *Vectors*. 2020; 13(1): 494. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s13071-020-04368-9>
- 339 21. Marcelo Beltrão Molento, Andréia Buzatti, Lew Kan Sprenger. Pasture larval count  
340 as a supporting method for parasite epidemiology, population dynamic and control in  
341 ruminants. *Livestock Science*; 2016; 192: 48-54.  
342 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.livsci.2016.08.013>

343