



This document is a postprint version of an article published in *Veterinary Microbiology* © Elsevier after peer review. To access the final edited and published work see <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.vetmic.2018.04.005>

1 **Acclimation strategies in gilts to control *Mycoplasma hyopneumoniae* infection**

2
3 Laura Garza-Moreno¹, Joaquim Segalés^{2,3,*}, Maria Pieters⁴,

4 Anna Romagosa⁵, Marina Sibila¹

5 ¹IRTA, Centre de Recerca en Sanitat Animal (CRESA, IRTA-UAB),
6 Campus de la Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona, 08193 Bellaterra,
7 Spain

8 ²UAB, Centre de Recerca en Sanitat Animal (CRESA, IRTA-UAB),
9 Campus de la Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona, 08193 Bellaterra,
10 Spain

11 ³Departament de Sanitat i Anatomia Animals, Facultat de Veterinària,
12 UAB, 08193 Bellaterra Spain

13 ⁴Department of Veterinary Population Medicine and Veterinary
14 Diagnostic Laboratory, College of Veterinary Medicine, University of
15 Minnesota, St. Paul, MN 55108, United States

16 ⁵PIC Europe, C/ Pau Vila 22, 2^o 6^a, 08174 Sant Cugat del Vallés,
17 Barcelona, Spain

18 Laura Garza-Moreno: laura.garza@irta.cat

19 Joaquim Segalés: joaquim.segales@irta.cat

20 Maria Pieters: piet0094@umn.edu

21 Anna Romagosa: Anna.Romagosa@genusplc.com

22 Marina Sibila: marina.sibila@irta.cat

23 *corresponding author

24

25 **Abstract**

26 *Mycoplasma hyopneumoniae* (*M. hyopneumoniae*) is the primary causative agent of
27 enzootic pneumoniae (EP), one of the most economically important infectious disease
28 for the swine industry worldwide. *M. hyopneumoniae* transmission occurs mainly by
29 direct contact (nose-to-nose) between infected to susceptible pigs as well as from
30 infected dams to their offspring (sow-to-piglet). Since disease severity has been
31 correlated with *M. hyopneumoniae* prevalence at weaning in some studies, and gilts are
32 considered the main bacterial shedders, an effective gilt acclimation program should
33 help controlling *M. hyopneumoniae* in swine farms. The present review summarizes the
34 different *M. hyopneumoniae* monitoring strategies of incoming gilts and recipient herd
35 and proposes a farm classification according to their health statuses. The medication and
36 vaccination programs against *M. hyopneumoniae* most used in replacement gilts are
37 reviewed as well. Gilt replacement acclimation against *M. hyopneumoniae* in Europe
38 and North America indicates that vaccination is the main strategy used, but there is a
39 current trend in US to deliberately expose gilts to the pathogen.

40

41 **Keywords:** *Mycoplasma hyopneumoniae*, gilt acclimation, adaptation strategies,

42 Europe, North America

43 **1. Introduction**

44 *Mycoplasma hyopneumoniae* (*M. hyopneumoniae*) is the causative agent of
45 mycoplasmal pneumonia (MP), an important porcine respiratory disease. This infectious
46 process is frequently complicated by other respiratory bacteria (such as *Pasteurella*
47 *multocida*, *Actinobacillus pleuropneumoniae* and others) causing a more severe chronic
48 and economically important disease known as enzootic pneumonia (EP). In addition to
49 bacterial complication, viral pathogens like *Porcine reproductive and respiratory*
50 *syndrome virus*, *Porcine circovirus 2* and *Swine influenza virus* can aggravate the
51 disease scenario; this viral-bacteria complex is clinically referred as porcine respiratory
52 disease complex (PRDC) (Thacker and Minion, 2012). Despite all efforts implemented
53 to reduce the economic impact caused by *M. hyopneumoniae* (vaccination and
54 antimicrobial treatments together with improvement of management practices), EP and
55 PRDC still cause great concern in the swine industry worldwide.

56 EP mainly affects growing and finishing pigs and it is characterized by dry, non-
57 productive cough, reduction in growth rate, and increased feed conversion ratio. The
58 severity of the disease is dependent on the presence of co-infections and environmental
59 conditions (Maes et al., 1996) and on the virulence and number of *M. hyopneumoniae*
60 strains involved (Vicca et al., 2003; Woolley et al., 2012; Michiels et al., 2017). *M.*
61 *hyopneumoniae* is mostly transmitted by direct contact (nose-to-nose) between pigs,
62 horizontally from infected to susceptible/naïve pigs (Morris et al., 1995) as well as from
63 dam to their offspring (Sibila et al., 2008; Nathues et al., 2014; Pieters et al., 2014).
64 Other putative indirect transmission routes are aerosol and fomites. Whereas the aerosol
65 transmission has been experimentally proved (Fano et al., 2005; Otake et al., 2010),
66 transmission by fomites has not been clearly demonstrated and it can be potentially
67 prevented by basic biosecurity practices (Batista et al., 2004; Pitkin et al., 2011).

68 Different studies showed that disease severity in growing pigs is correlated with *M.*
69 *hyopneumoniae* prevalence of piglet colonization at weaning (Fano et al., 2007; Sibila
70 et al., 2008). However, other studies could not show this association (Vranckx et la,
71 2012b). This prevalence can be influenced by different factors such as housing and
72 management conditions of the production system as well as dam parity, piglet's age at
73 weaning and replacement rate (Nathues et al., 2013, 2014). Since newborn piglets are
74 *M. hyopneumoniae* free, the most logical source of infection is the dam at the time of
75 farrowing or during the lactation period (Sibila et al., 2007). Some authors suggested
76 this transmission could be influenced by the dam's parity (Calsamiglia and Pijoan,
77 2000; Fano et al., 2006). Indeed, bacterial shedding of gilts or young sows seems to be
78 higher than that of older parity sows (Boonsoongnern et al., 2012). Therefore, the first
79 farrowing is considered a critical moment at which *M. hyopneumoniae* excretion should
80 have ceased (Pieters and Fano, 2016). These latter data together with a low transmission
81 rate (reproduction ratio [R_n] varies among 1.16-1.28 and 0.56-0.71 under experimental
82 and field conditions, respectively) (Meyns et al., 2006; Villarreal et al., 2009; Roos et
83 al., 2016) and the persistence of infection in pigs (up to 214 days post infection, dpi)
84 (Pieters et al., 2009) imply the need of performing an effective gilt acclimation process.
85 This effective acclimatization protocol would reduce *M. hyopneumoniae* shedding at
86 first farrowing (Pieters and Fano, 2016) and, consequently, would decrease pre-weaning
87 prevalence, subsequent spread of the pathogen to growing pigs, and putative respiratory
88 problems in fattening animals (Fano et al., 2007; Sibila et al., 2008). Therefore,
89 assuming that gilt population are crucial in the spread of the infection, the purpose of
90 this review was to summarize different management practices, antimicrobial treatments
91 and vaccination protocols in replacement gilts to control *M. hyopneumoniae* infections
92 in pig herds.

93

94 **2. *M. hyopneumoniae* health status**

95 **2.1. Monitoring and diagnosis**

96 One of the main risks for *M. hyopneumoniae* colonization in piglets at weaning is a
97 high gilt replacement rate (Nathues et al., 2013). Therefore, the first step to perform an
98 appropriate adaptation of future replacements to *M. hyopneumoniae* is monitoring the
99 health status of the recipient breeding herd, as well as incoming gilts to detect potential
100 disease/infection indicators. In case of *M. hyopneumoniae* infection suspicion, a
101 definitive diagnosis should be performed.

102 Monitoring of *M. hyopneumoniae* associated disease is sometimes challenging as
103 the infection can take a clinical or subclinical course (Table 1). In clinical cases, the
104 observation of signs (dry, non-productive coughing) and lung lesions (pulmonary
105 craneo-ventral consolidation) are indicative, but not exclusive of *M. hyopneumoniae*. In
106 subclinical infections, animals can display *M. hyopneumoniae*-like lung lesions without
107 any evidence of coughing (Maes et al., 1996). Therefore, clinical diagnosis should be
108 confirmed by additional laboratory tests (Table 1).

109 The most commonly used herd monitoring method is *M. hyopneumoniae* antibody
110 detection by ELISA. It provides evidence of exposure to *M. hyopneumoniae* without
111 differentiating maternally derived antibodies, or antibodies elicited by infection, and/or
112 vaccination (Bandrick et al., 2011; Thacker and Minion, 2012). Moreover, absence of
113 antibodies (seronegative animals) may not be equivalent to a *M. hyopneumoniae* free
114 status in early infection scenarios, suggesting that antibody and pathogen detection
115 combined is the main goal for *M. hyopneumoniae* final diagnosis.

116 Different laboratory techniques have been described to confirm the presence of *M.*
117 *hyopneumoniae* (Table 1). The most useful technique to detect *M. hyopneumoniae* is

118 polymerase chain reaction (PCR), as it can be performed using different respiratory
119 tract samples. Up to now, there is no consensus on which type of sample from the
120 porcine respiratory tract is the most suitable to detect bacterial DNA in live pigs. To
121 confirm *M. hyopneumoniae* free status of live animals or to determine the involvement
122 of such pathogen in an outbreak, the desired sample should be collected from the lower
123 respiratory tract (i.e. laryngeal or tracheo-bronchial swabs or tracheo-bronchial lavage
124 fluids), where *M. hyopneumoniae* colonization of respiratory cilia occurs (Fablet et al.,
125 2010; Pieters et al., 2017). In dead animals, the sample of preference is lung tissue or
126 bronchial swab.

127

128 ***2.2. Recipient herd and incoming replacement classification regarding M.*** 129 ***hyopneumoniae health status***

130 Once the *M. hyopneumoniae* health status of the recipient herds and the incoming
131 gilts has been assessed, farms and incoming replacement could be classified into
132 negative, provisional negative and positive according the following criteria
133 (summarized in Table 2):

134 *Negative herds/replacement.* Clinical signs and lung lesions associated with *M.*
135 *hyopneumoniae* are not present and serology and detection of pathogen in lung by PCR
136 are negative. This type of breeding and fattening farms is the less frequent one in the
137 current swine production in Europe (Garza-Moreno et al., 2017). Nevertheless, *M.*
138 *hyopneumoniae* negative farms are increasingly common among gilt producers, genetic
139 companies, high health farms and in certain countries such as United States (US), where
140 a trend for *M. hyopneumoniae* elimination is growing (Maria Pieters, personal
141 communication).

142 Provisional negative herds/replacement. *M. hyopneumoniae*-like clinical signs and
143 lung lesions are not observed but animals are seropositive and PCR negative. The
144 presence of antibodies against *M. hyopneumoniae* provides evidence of exposure to the
145 pathogen by prior infections and/or vaccination against it. This type of farms (PCR
146 negative and seropositive) is frequently found in US since they are applying vaccination
147 against *M. hyopneumoniae* (Maria Pieters, personal communication).

148 Positive herds/replacement. These farms can be classified into subclinical infected
149 or clinical affected. Subclinical infected farms can be differentiated in two different
150 categories (I and II) according to the presence of ELISA antibodies against *M.*
151 *hyopneumoniae*, the detection of the pathogen by PCR and the presence of lung lesions
152 attributed to *M. hyopneumoniae* (Table 2). In category I, lung lesions associated to *M.*
153 *hyopneumoniae* are not observed, the detection of antibodies depends on the disease
154 phase (in early stages might not be detected) but the presence of the pathogen is
155 confirmed. Animals from herds included in category II do not show clinical signs
156 compatible with *M. hyopneumoniae* but have *M. hyopneumoniae*-like lung lesions,
157 antibodies against the pathogen might be detected and the presence of *M.*
158 *hyopneumoniae* is confirmed by PCR. Finally, in clinical affected farms, infected pigs
159 also display signs and lung lesions associated to *M. hyopneumoniae*.

160

161 **3. Prevention and control**

162 **3.1. Vaccination**

163 Vaccination against *M. hyopneumoniae* is the most commonly used strategy to
164 control its associated diseases in worldwide swine production systems (Maes et al.,
165 2017). Most commercial vaccines against *M. hyopneumoniae* are inactivated whole-cell
166 preparations or bacterins, combined with an adjuvant to induce a stronger immune

167 response (Haesebrouck et al., 2004). Administration route of these commercial vaccines
168 is mainly intramuscular and the volume per dose can vary according to the vaccine used
169 (Table 3). Besides bacterins, attenuated vaccines against *M. hyopneumoniae* are also
170 available in Mexico and China (Feng et al., 2013).

171 An alternative to commercial vaccines may be autogenous vaccines, based on
172 isolated strains from the affected farm. These vaccines are not frequently used because
173 of the difficulty to isolate *M. hyopneumoniae* strains and the apparent lack of vaccine
174 safety and efficacy data. Although information is limited, a single study has compared
175 the efficacy of immunization with homologous and heterologous strains against an
176 experimental infection and no significant differences in protection were observed
177 (Villarreal et al., 2012). Further investigation on new vaccines, as recombinant subunit
178 or attenuated vaccines, is required to provide an effective and total protection against *M.*
179 *hyopneumoniae* (Simionatto et al., 2013).

180 Different vaccination schedules against *M. hyopneumoniae* have been implemented
181 depending on the type of herd, production system, infection dynamics, and number of
182 doses administered (Haesebrouck et al., 2004). Commercial vaccines are most
183 frequently applied to piglets, prior to or after weaning (Alarcon et al., 2014).
184 Additionally, previous studies have shown that the weaning process does not
185 significantly affect vaccination efficacy (Arsenakis et al., 2016), although numerical
186 differences in terms of performance among vaccinated and non-vaccinated groups were
187 detected (Arsenakis et al., 2017). Piglet vaccination efficacy has been widely
188 demonstrated by reduction of clinical signs and prevalence and severity of lung lesions,
189 improvement of production parameters, decrease of treatment costs and, in some cases,
190 lower mortality rates (Maes et al., 1996). Although vaccination against *M.*
191 *hyopneumoniae* does not prevent infection (Pieters et al., 2010; Villarreal et al., 2011,

192 2012), it is able to reduce the number of microorganisms in the swine respiratory tract
193 (Vranckx et al., 2012a; Woolley et al., 2012).

194 Sow vaccination is less frequently applied, but gaining relevance every day (Bargen,
195 2004). Nevertheless, a limited number of vaccines are currently licensed for the
196 reproductive population (Table 3) and studies on their effect are scarce (Table 4). Dam
197 vaccination sought to decrease the infectious pressure, lowering bacterial load and,
198 consequently, transmission from sow to piglet (Vranckx et al., 2012b; Takeuti et al.,
199 2017), as well as conferring maternal immunity via colostrum (Bandrick et al., 2011).
200 Indeed, some studies have shown that sow vaccination prior to farrowing is able to
201 reduce dam-to-piglet transmission, the number of positive piglets from vaccinated sows
202 (Ruiz et al., 2003), and the EP lung lesions of them at abattoir (Sibila et al., 2008).

203 Gilt vaccination combined with optimal management strategies have also been
204 suggested to stimulate the immune response against a controlled exposure to *M.*
205 *hyopneumoniae* (Holst et al., 2015) or in endemically infected herds (Maes et al., 2008).
206 Additionally, gilt vaccination is recommended to homogenize immunity of the
207 replacement batch and avoid destabilization of recipient breeding herd (Bargen, 2004).
208 This is especially important when replacement is external and originates from *M.*
209 *hyopneumoniae* negative farms. In this situation, the introduction of negative
210 replacement stock into positive farms may contribute to the development of
211 subpopulations of non-infected pigs, increasing the risk of pathogen re-circulation and
212 its persistence in the farm (Takeuti et al., 2017).

213 The number of required vaccine doses, application timing and its benefits are not
214 standardized for sows and gilts. Nowadays, single vaccination is more frequently used
215 due to the ease of implementation in farm management practices. Nevertheless,
216 multiple-dose vaccination against *M. hyopneumoniae* could elicit a booster effect of the

217 consecutive vaccine doses. The potential benefits of applying multiple vaccine doses in
218 terms of reduction of shedding have not been yet investigated.

219

220 **3.2. Medication**

221 Since protection against *M. hyopneumoniae* infection and associated diseases
222 conferred by commercial vaccines is not complete, antimicrobial treatments are
223 frequently required in commercial swine farms to control disease outcome.

224 *Mycoplasmas* lack a cell wall, thus *M. hyopneumoniae* is resistant to β -lactam
225 antibiotics. Nevertheless, several antibiotic classes are effective in reducing the
226 incidence and severity of *M. hyopneumoniae* compatible lung lesions. Most commonly
227 used antibiotics are macrolides, lincosamides, tetracycline, and fluoroquinolones,
228 among others (Thacker and Minion, 2012). The route of administration can be
229 parenteral or mixed in feed / water depending on antibiotic choice.

230 Medication is currently used with different purposes. Parenteral medication is used
231 to treat animals suffering from severe clinical signs, normally associated with EP and
232 PRDC. Under field conditions medication is also commonly used to control *M.*
233 *hyopneumoniae* infection by means of minimizing pathogen transmission. Medication
234 of sows prior to farrowing could be utilized as an attempt to decrease the bacterial
235 shedding to the offspring (Thacker and Minion, 2012; Holst et al., 2015). Nevertheless,
236 it has been shown that antibacterial treatments do not eliminate the bacterium from the
237 host, and shedding of *M. hyopneumoniae* can be detected in pigs after medication
238 programs (Overesch and Kuhnert, 2017). Therefore, the use of antimicrobials should be
239 limited and only justified in specific situations to avoid the development of
240 antimicrobial resistance (Lee et al., 2013).

241

242 **3.3. *Acclimation scenarios in Europe and North America***

243 Different acclimation scenarios may be in place and should be managed according
244 to health status of the recipient herds, as well as the replacement batch (Table 5). In
245 addition, the different production systems, management practices, and acclimation
246 strategies used could have an impact on the acclimation process performed. To
247 understand these differences, available information about gilt acclimation strategies
248 used in Europe and North America are detailed (Table 6).

249 *3.3.1. European scenario*

250 Information on gilt acclimation strategies for *M. hyopneumoniae* utilized in Europe
251 is limited. Recently, Garza-Moreno *et al.* (2017) identified the current acclimation
252 strategies used in this continent. In this investigation, information was collected by 321
253 questionnaires voluntarily responded by 108 veterinarians from 18 countries. The
254 questionnaires were focused on the assessment of *M. hyopneumoniae* herd status,
255 replacement health status, acclimation strategies and methods utilized to determine its
256 effect.

257 This study showed that the most common replacement origin used in Europe was
258 external and that most respondents knew *M. hyopneumoniae* health status of
259 replacement on arrival, being in most of the cases seropositive. Nevertheless, only 28%
260 of respondents verified this theoretical *M. hyopneumoniae* status, being ELISA, the
261 most used technique (Garza-Moreno *et al.*, 2017).

262 Replacement acclimation against *M. hyopneumoniae* was performed in most
263 participating European farms. Although most farms have isolation units where to
264 specifically acclimate replacement stock, several farms did not have those facilities or
265 respondents did not answer the question. Independently of these sites, the most used
266 strategy to acclimate gilt was vaccination alone (58%), being the number of doses most

267 frequently administered at acclimation one and two doses. Other acclimation strategy
268 used in Europe was the combination of vaccination together with natural exposure to
269 potentially infected animals. However, an effective exposure to *M. hyopneumoniae* is
270 difficult to reach into a natural infection scenario. Finally, among respondents who
271 performed the acclimation on gilts, only around 25% of them verified the effect of the
272 process, being the combination of ELISA and PCR tests the most used strategy.

273 3.3.2. North American scenario

274 The importance of proper gilt acclimation to the incoming breeding herd against *M.*
275 *hyopneumoniae* is paramount and highly recognized in the North American swine
276 industry. This importance can be evidenced in the assessment of *M. hyopneumoniae*
277 health status of the replacement and the existence of facilities for acclimatization against
278 herd pathogens (gilt development units; GDUs). GDUs are utilized to allow ample time
279 to incoming gilt to gradually adopt the health status of the recipient herd. According to
280 previous studies based on questionnaires collected in US (Fano and Payne, 2015) and
281 Mexico (Centeno et al., 2016), these acclimation facilities are in most of the cases
282 continuous flow (72% and 75%, respectively) allowing an effective gilt exposure to *M.*
283 *hyopneumoniae*.

284 Gilt vaccination in North American swine industry was also recognized as the most
285 common practice used at acclimation (Fano and Payne, 2015; Centeno et al., 2016).
286 Other methods as natural exposure to *M. hyopneumoniae*, alone or combined with
287 vaccination, and contact with infected cull sows or/and piglets are also used to acclimate
288 the gilts (Dalquist, 2014; Fano and Payne, 2015). Taking into account that pig-to-pig
289 transmission of this bacterium has proven to be extremely slow (Meyns et al., 2004;
290 Roos et al., 2016), the ratio of infected and naïve gilts as well as the time of exposure
291 are crucial and should be considered to achieve an effective exposure. Recently, early

292 controlled exposure has been attempted to expose the gilts by administering (intra-
293 tracheally) lung tissue homogenate containing *M. hyopneumoniae* (Fano and Payne,
294 2015; Centeno et al., 2016) to individual gilts or groups of them (via aerosol), since the
295 success of exposure is higher when these controlled procedures are used (Sponheim A.,
296 2017). Finally, according to aforementioned studies, overall, the verification of gilt
297 acclimation process is minimally performed in North American farms.

298

299 **4. Conclusion**

300 *M. hyopneumoniae* is a respiratory pathogen that causes important economic losses
301 to the swine industry worldwide. A proper gilt acclimation against *M. hyopneumoniae*
302 prior entrance into a recipient breeding farm could maintain the farm health stability and
303 control respiratory disease caused by this pathogen. Gilt replacement acclimation
304 procedures against *M. hyopneumoniae* in Europe and North America showed that
305 vaccination is the main strategy used, but there is a current trend in the US to
306 deliberately expose gilts to the pathogen. Further investigations are needed to identify
307 the ideal gilt acclimation protocol taking into account that these strategies must be based
308 on incoming and recipient herd health statuses and the characteristics of each farm.

309

310 **Conflict of interest**

311 The authors declare no conflict of interest.

312

313 **Acknowledgments**

314 Laura Garza-Moreno was supported by *Secretaria d'Universitats i Recerca del Dep.*
315 *d'Economia i Coneixement de la Generalitat de Catalunya (2015DI078)*. The funding
316 from CERCA Programme (*Generalitat de Catalunya*) to IRTA is also acknowledged.

317

318 **5. References**

- 319 Alarcon, P., Wieland, B., Mateus, A.L.P., Dewberry, C., 2014. Pig farmers' perceptions,
320 attitudes, influences and management of information in the decision-making
321 process for disease control. *Prev. Vet. Med.* 116, 223–242.
- 322 Alfonso, A., Geiger, J., Feixes, C., Fonz, J., Torremorell, M., 2004. *Mycoplasma*
323 *hyopneumoniae* and PRRSV elimination in a 1700 sows multi-site system. In:
324 Proceedings of the 18th IPVS Congress, Hamburg, Germany, pp. 174.
- 325 Arsenakis, I., Michiels, A., Sacristán, R.D.P., Boyen, F., Haesebrouck, F., Maes, D.,
326 2017. *Mycoplasma hyopneumoniae* vaccination at or shortly before weaning under
327 field conditions : a randomised efficacy trial. *Vet. Rec.* 181, 19.
- 328 Arsenakis, I., Panzavolta, L., Michiels, A., Del Pozo Sacristán, R., Boyen, F.,
329 Haesebrouck, F., Maes, D., 2016. Efficacy of *Mycoplasma hyopneumoniae*
330 vaccination before and at weaning against experimental challenge infection in pigs.
331 *BMC Vet. Res.* 12, 63.
- 332 Bandrick, M., Pieters, M., Pijoan, C., Baidoo, S.K., Molitor, T.W., 2011. Effect of
333 cross-fostering on transfer of maternal immunity to *Mycoplasma hyopneumoniae*
334 to piglets. *Vet. Rec.* 168, 100.
- 335 Barga, L.E., 2004. A system response to an outbreak of enzootic pneumonia in grow /
336 finish pigs. *Can. Vet. Journal* 45, 856–859.
- 337 Batista, L., Pijoan, C., Ruiz, A., Utrera, V., Dee, S., 2004. Assessment of transmission
338 of *Mycoplasma hyopneumoniae* by personnel. *J. Swine Health Prod.* 12, 75–77.
- 339 Boonsoongnern, A., Jirawattanapong, P., Lertwatcharasarakul, P., 2012. The Prevalence
340 of *Mycoplasma hyopneumoniae* in Commercial Suckling Pigs in Thailand. *World J*
341 *Vaccines* 2, 161–163.

342 Calsamiglia, M., Pijoan, C., 2000. Colonisation state and colostral immunity to
343 *Mycoplasma hyopneumoniae* of different parity sows. *Vet. Rec.* 146, 530–2.

344 Centeno, N., Chévez, J., Fano, E., 2016. Mexican swine industry on *Mycoplasma*
345 *hyopneumoniae* gilts acclimatation. In: Proceedings of the 24th IPVS Congress,
346 Dublin, Ireland, 31, 2013.

347 Dalquist, L., 2014. *Mycoplasma hyopneumoniae* acclimation: Overcoming challenges
348 in the field. In: Allen D. Leman Swine Conference, St. Paul, MN.

349 Fablet, C., Marois, C., Kobisch, M., Madec, F., Rose, N., 2010. Estimation of the
350 sensitivity of four sampling methods for *Mycoplasma hyopneumoniae* detection in
351 live pigs using a Bayesian approach. *Vet. Microbiol.* 143, 238–245.

352 Fano, E., Payne, B., 2015. *Mycoplasma hyopneumoniae* gilt acclimation and sow herd
353 stability: Essentials to the systematic control - approach, In: AASV Annual
354 Meeting, Orlando, Florida, pp. 175–178.

355 Fano, E., Pijoan, C., Dee, S., 2005. Evaluation of the aerosol transmission of a mixed
356 infection of *Mycoplasma hyopneumoniae* and porcine reproductive and respiratory
357 syndrome virus. *Vet. Rec.* 157, 105–108.

358 Fano, E., Pijoan, C., Dee, S., Deen, J., 2007. Effect of *Mycoplasma hyopneumoniae*
359 colonization at weaning on disease severity in growing pigs. *Can. J. Vet. Res.* 71,
360 195–200.

361 Fano, E., Pijoan, C., Dee, S., Torremorell, M., 2006. Assessment of the effect of sow
362 parity on the prevalence of *Mycoplasma hyopneumoniae* in piglets at weaning. In:
363 Proceedings of the 19th IPVS Congress, Copenhagen, Denmark, pp. 96.

364 Feng, Z., Wei, Y., Li, G., Lu, X., Wan, X., Pharr, G.T., Wang, Z., Kong, M., Gan, Y.,
365 Bai, F., Liu, M., Xiong, Q., Wu, X., Shao, G., 2013. Development and validation
366 of an attenuated *Mycoplasma hyopneumoniae* aerosol vaccine. *Vet. Microbiol.*

367 167, 417–424.

368 Garza-Moreno, L., Segalés, J., Pieters, M., Romagosa, A., Sibila, M., 2017. Survey on
369 *Mycoplasma hyopneumoniae* gilt acclimation practices in Europe. *Porcine Health*
370 *Manag.* 3, 21.

371 Haesebrouck, F., Pasmans, F., Chiers, K., Maes, D., Ducatelle, R., Decostere, A., 2004.
372 Efficacy of vaccines against bacterial diseases in swine: What can we expect? *Vet.*
373 *Microbiol.* 100, 255–268.

374 Holst, S., Yeske, P., Pieters, M., 2015. Elimination of *Mycoplasma hyopneumoniae*
375 from breed-to-wean farms: A review of current protocols with emphasis on herd
376 closure and medication. *J. Swine Health Prod.* 23, 321–330.

377 Lee, C., Cho, I.H., Jeong, B.C., Lee, S.H., 2013. Strategies to Minimize Antibiotic
378 Resistance. *Int. J. Environ. Res. Public Heal.* 10, 4274–4305.

379 Lorenzen, J., 2000. Eradication of *Mycoplasma hyopneumoniae* from an acutely infected
380 Danish 2-site 390 sow herd without restocking. In: *Proceedings of the 16th IPVS*
381 *Congress, Melbourne, Australia*, pp. 340.

382 Maes, D., Sibila, M., Kuhnert, P., Segalés, J., Haesebrouck, F., Pieters, M., 2017.
383 Update on *Mycoplasma hyopneumoniae* infections in pigs: Knowledge gaps for
384 improved disease control. *Transbound Emerg Dis.* doi:10.1111/tbed.12677

385 Maes, D., Segales, J., Meyns, T., Sibila, M., Pieters, M., Haesebrouck, F., 2008. Control
386 of *Mycoplasma hyopneumoniae* infections in pigs. *Vet. Microbiol.* 126, 297–309.

387 Maes, D., Verdonck, M., Deluyker, H., de Kruif, A., 1996. Enzootic pneumonia in
388 pigs. *Vet. Q.* 18, 104–109.

389 Meyns, T., Dewulf, J., de Kruif, A., Calus, D., Haesebrouck, F., Maes, D., 2006.
390 Comparison of transmission of *Mycoplasma hyopneumoniae* in vaccinated and
391 non-vaccinated populations. *Vaccine* 24, 7081–7086.

392 Meyns, T., Maes, D., Dewulf, J., Vicca, J., Haesebrouck, F., Kruijff, A. De, 2004.
393 Quantification of the spread of *Mycoplasma hyopneumoniae* in nursery pigs using
394 transmission experiments. *Prev. Vet. Med.* 66, 265–275.

395 Michiels, A., Vranckx, K., Piepers, S., Del Pozo Sacristán, R., Arsenakis, I., Boyen, F.,
396 Haesebrouck, F., Maes, D., 2017. Impact of diversity of *Mycoplasma*
397 *hyopneumoniae* strains on lung lesions in slaughter pigs. *Vet. Res.* 48, 2.

398 Morris, C.R., Gardner, I.A., Hietala, S.K., Carpenter, T.E., Anderson, R.J., Parker,
399 K.M., 1995. Seroepidemiologic study of natural transmission of *Mycoplasma*
400 *hyopneumoniae* in a swine herd. *Prev. Vet. Med.* 21, 323–337.

401 Nathues, H., Chang, Y.M., Wieland, B., Rechter, G., Spargser, J., Rosengarten, R.,
402 Kreienbrock, L., grosse Beilage, E., 2014. Herd-Level risk factors for the
403 seropositivity to *mycoplasma hyopneumoniae* and the occurrence of enzootic
404 pneumonia among fattening pigs in areas of endemic infection and high pig
405 density. *Transbound. Emerg. Dis.* 61, 316–328.

406 Nathues, H., Doehring, S., Woeste, H., Fahrion, A.S., Doherr, M.G., grosse Beilage, E.,
407 2013. Individual risk factors for *Mycoplasma hyopneumoniae* infections in
408 suckling pigs at the age of weaning. *Acta Vet. Scand.* 55, 44.

409 Otake, S., Dee, S., Corzo, C., Oliveira, S., Deen, J., 2010. Long-distance airborne
410 transport of infectious PRRSV and *Mycoplasma hyopneumoniae* from a swine
411 population infected with multiple viral variants. *Vet. Microbiol.* 145, 198–208.

412 Overesch, G., Kuhnert, P., 2017. Persistence of *Mycoplasma hyopneumoniae* sequence
413 types in spite of a control program for enzootic pneumonia in pigs. *Prev. Vet. Med.*
414 145, 67–72.

415 Pieters, M., Cline, G.S., Payne, B.J., Prado, C., Ertl, J.R., Rendahl, A.K., 2014. Intra-
416 farm risk factors for *Mycoplasma hyopneumoniae* colonization at weaning age.

417 Vet. Microbiol. 172, 575–580.

418 Pieters, M., Daniels, J., Rovira, A., 2017. Comparison of sample types and diagnostic
419 methods for in vivo detection of *Mycoplasma hyopneumoniae* during early stages
420 of infection. Vet. Microbiol. 203, 103–109.

421 Pieters, M., Fano, E., 2016. *Mycoplasma hyopneumoniae* management in gilts. Vet.
422 Rec. 178, 122.1-123.

423 Pieters, M., Fano, E., Pijoan, C., Dee, S., 2010. An experimental model to evaluate
424 *Mycoplasma hyopneumoniae* transmission from asymptomatic carriers to
425 unvaccinated and vaccinated sentinel pigs. Can. J. Vet. Res. 74, 157–160.

426 Pieters, M., Pijoan, C., Fano, E., Dee, S., 2009. An assessment of the duration of
427 *Mycoplasma hyopneumoniae* infection in an experimentally infected population of
428 pigs. Vet. Microbiol. 134, 261–266.

429 Pitkin, A., Otake, S., Dee, S., 2011. A one-night downtime period prevents the spread of
430 porcine reproductive and respiratory syndrome virus and *Mycoplasma*
431 *hyopneumoniae* by personnel and fomites (boots and coveralls). J. Swine Health
432 Prod. 19, 345–348.

433 Roos, L.R., Fano, E., Homwong, N., Payne, B., Pieters, M., 2016. A model to
434 investigate the optimal seeder-to-naïve ratio for successful natural *Mycoplasma*
435 *hyopneumoniae* gilt exposure prior to entering the breeding herd. Vet. Microbiol.
436 184, 51–58.

437 Ruiz, A.R., Utrera, V., Pijoan, C., 2003. Effect of *Mycoplasma hyopneumoniae* sow
438 vaccination on piglet colonization at weaning. J. Swine Health Prod. 11, 131–135.

439 Schneider, P., 2006. Experiences with *Mycoplasma hyopneumoniae* and Transmissible
440 Gastroenteritis eradication from sow herd. Proceedings of Allen D. Leman Swine
441 Conference, St Paul, MN, pp. 82–86.

442 Sibila, M., Bernal, R., Torrents, D., Riera, P., Llopart, D., Calsamiglia, M., Segalés, J.,
443 2008. Effect of sow vaccination against *Mycoplasma hyopneumoniae* on sow and
444 piglet colonization and seroconversion, and pig lung lesions at slaughter. *Vet.*
445 *Microbiol.* 127, 165–170.

446 Sibila, M., Nofrarías, M., López-Soria, S., Segalés, J., Riera, P., Llopart, D.,
447 Calsamiglia, M., 2007. Exploratory field study on *Mycoplasma hyopneumoniae*
448 infection in suckling pigs. *Vet. Microbiol.* 121, 352–356.

449 Simionatto, S., Marchioro, S.B., Maes, D., Dellagostin, O.A., 2013. *Mycoplasma*
450 *hyopneumoniae*: From disease to vaccine development. *Vet. Microbiol.* 165, 234–
451 242.

452 Sponheim A., 2017. A diagnostic Approach to Confirm Day Zero. In: Allen D. Leman
453 Swine Conference, St. Paul, MN.

454 Takeuti, K.L., de Barcellos, D.E.S.N., de Lara, A.C., Kunrath, C.F., Pieters, M., 2017.
455 Detection of *Mycoplasma hyopneumoniae* in naturally infected gilts over time.
456 *Vet. Microbiol.* 203, 215–220.

457 Thacker, E.L., Minion, F.C., 2012. Mycoplasmosis, In: Zimmerman, J.J., Karriker,
458 L.A., Schwartz, K.J (Eds), *Diseases of Swine*. 10th ed. Wiley-Blackwell, Oxford,
459 UK, pp. 779-797.

460 Vicca, J., Stakenborg, T., Maes, D., Butaye, P., Peeters, J., De Kruif, A., Haesebrouck,
461 F., 2003. Evaluation of virulence of *Mycoplasma hyopneumoniae* field isolates.
462 *Vet. Microbiol.* 97, 177–190.

463 Villarreal, I., Maes, D., Meyns, T., Gebruers, F., Calus, D., Pasmans, F., Haesebrouck,
464 F., 2009. Infection with a low virulent *Mycoplasma hyopneumoniae* isolate does
465 not protect piglets against subsequent infection with a highly virulent *M.*
466 *hyopneumoniae* isolate. *Vaccine* 27, 1875–1879.

467 Villarreal, I., Maes, D., Vranckx, K., Calus, D., Pasmans, F., Haesebrouck, F., 2011.
468 Effect of vaccination of pigs against experimental infection with high and low
469 virulence *Mycoplasma hyopneumoniae* strains. *Vaccine* 29, 1731–1735.

470 Villarreal, I., Vranckx, K., Calus, D., Pasmans, F., Haesebrouck, F., Maes, D., 2012.
471 Effect of challenge of pigs previously immunised with inactivated vaccines
472 containing homologous and heterologous *Mycoplasma hyopneumoniae* strains.
473 *BMC Vet. Res.* 8, 2.

474 Vranckx, K., Maes, D., Marchioro, S.B., Villarreal, I., Chiers, K., Pasmans, F.,
475 Haesebrouck, F., 2012a. Vaccination reduces macrophage infiltration in bronchus-
476 associated lymphoid tissue in pigs infected with a highly virulent *Mycoplasma*
477 *hyopneumoniae* strain. *BMC Vet. Res.* 8, 24.

478 Vranckx, K., Maes, D., Sacristán, R.D.P., Pasmans, F., Haesebrouck, F., 2012b. A
479 longitudinal study of the diversity and dynamics of *Mycoplasma hyopneumoniae*
480 infections in pig herds. *Vet. Microbiol.* 156, 315–321.

481 Woolley, L.K., Fell, S., Gonsalves, J.R., Walker, M.J., Djordjevic, S.P., Jenkins, C.,
482 Eamens, G.J., 2012. Evaluation of clinical, histological and immunological
483 changes and qPCR detection of *Mycoplasma hyopneumoniae* in tissues during the
484 early stages of mycoplasmal pneumonia in pigs after experimental challenge with
485 two field isolates. *Vet. Microbiol.* 161, 186–195.

486 Yeske, P., 2007. *Mycoplasma* eradication strategies. In: AASV Anual Meeting,
487 Orlando, Florida, pp. 367–370.