

**Epidemiological, experimental and diagnostic
investigations into an acute paralysis syndrome of
broiler chickens in Australia**

by

Brendan Sharpe

B.V.Sc. (Hons I) (University of Sydney, Australia)

a thesis submitted for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

in Animal Science, School of Environmental & Rural Sciences,
University of New England, Australia



January 2016.

Abstract

An acute paralysis syndrome (APS) of broiler chickens was first reported in 2010 in an Australian chicken meat production region. The APS was characterised by flaccid paralysis of the neck, prostration and eventually death of the affected chicken and elevated flock mortalities from 26 days of age. The purpose of the work presented in this doctoral thesis was to establish causation of the APS, risk factors for it and management strategies for controlling it. An initial review of literature (Chapter 2) enabled a broad differential diagnosis list to be devised in consideration of the potential causes of the APS. The collation and synthesis of diagnostic tests performed on field cases (Chapter 4) highlighted the need for further diagnostic testing to assess for the presence of serotype-1 Marek's disease virus (MDV1), avian encephalomyelitis virus (AEV) and flaviviruses in affected chickens. The main pathological findings from field cases were that 32 % of affected chickens displayed vasulocentric encephalitis focussed in the cerebrum. Neurological examination of affected chickens localised lesions to within the forebrain, consistent with the observed brain histopathology. Exclusion testing ruled out Newcastle disease and avian influenza and serum ELISA assays for *Clostridium botulinum* toxins C and D were consistently negative. MDV1 load in shed dust revealed very high counts of MDV1 in sheds in the affected region prior to the implementation of Marek's disease (MD) vaccination, after which a sharp reduction in MDV1 load in shed dust was observed. Despite this the APS continued to occur and MDV1 continued to be found in a small proportion of APS affected and MD vaccinated chickens.

A retrospective case-control study of farms affected with the APS was performed (Chapter 5) in order to describe the temporal and spatial distribution of the APS, define the impact of the APS on flock performance, identify risk factors which were associated with the APS and to devise mitigation strategies which may be implemented on farm. The APS caused bird losses but did not reduce growth rates. Flock wastage (mortality + culls) was significantly greater ($P < 0.0001$) for flocks with the APS (15.9 ± 0.6 %) than for flocks without the APS (5.5 ± 0.2 %). The majority of wastage in affected flocks occurred from 26-51 days of age. Mean bodyweights of flocks with the APS were significantly greater than flocks without the APS at 14, 21 and 28 days of age.

Multivariate logistic regression analysis showed that the most important risk factor for the APS was mean daily maximum shed temperatures from hatch to 7 days of age below the Ross 308 guidelines (odds ratio 3.99 per unit of 1.0°C , $P < 0.002$). Other risk factors relevant to APS mitigation included: bodyweights above the Ross 308 breed guidelines between 14 – 28 days of age, maximum shed temperatures exceeding the Ross 308 breed guidelines from 15 days of age, excessive fluctuations in shed temperatures and increased flock age at first thinning-out.

The APS was experimentally reproduced (Chapter 6) in broiler chickens inoculated at 21 days of age with spleen cells (35% of chickens) or whole blood (35% of chickens), and in chickens exposed to contaminated litter from 21 days of age (10% of chickens). The APS was not reproduced in broiler chickens inoculated with brain tissue or sham-challenged at 21 days of age, in broiler chickens challenged at hatch with any of the challenge materials or in specific pathogen-free layer chickens challenged at either age with any of the challenge materials. The pattern of reproduction confirmed an infectious aetiology (at least in part) of the APS and additionally suggested that maternal antibody may be protective against the APS from early challenge. Affected chickens demonstrated an identical clinical syndrome to affected field chickens. In broiler chicken groups challenged at 21 days of age, males had a significantly increased ($P = 0.02$) mortality compared to females confirming a greater susceptibility of males to the APS. The effect of MD vaccination on mortality was not significant. Histopathology of the brain was consistent with field findings. Polymerase chain reaction assays did not detect evidence of MDV1, AEV or flaviviruses in affected chicken tissue. Experimental reproduction of the syndrome was not achieved in three of four subsequent experiments (Chapters 7-8) and the most plausible reason for the difficulty in reproduction was due to low growth rates achieved in these subsequent experiments.

Whole genome next-generation sequencing (NGS) and subsequent bioinformatic analysis was performed from DNA and RNA extracted from spleen, blood and brain tissue from APS affected and clinically normal chickens in an attempt to identify infectious agents present in affected chickens and absent in normal chickens (Chapter 9). Evidence of feline herpesvirus 1 in 3/7 affected chicken DNA samples and respiratory syncytial virus in 3/6 affected chicken RNA samples were found.

In summary the APS is caused at least in-part by an infectious agent/s due to the pattern of reproduction demonstrated and the associated pathology. Various management strategies are recommended for reducing the incidence of the APS on farms including: maintaining shed temperatures to the guidelines recommended for the Ross 308 breed throughout the life of the flock but particularly within in the first 7 days of age, ensuring growth rates are within the breed guidelines and avoiding delays in flock thinning-out. Recommendations for future work include refining of the experimental reproduction model focussing on achieving adequate growth rates to allow disease manifestation, more extensive epidemiological analyses, testing any protective effect of early exposure to the putative agent/s by re-using litter on-farm and following up on NGS results utilising polymerase chain reaction based assays.

Certification

I certify that the substance of this thesis has not already been submitted for any degree and is not currently being submitted for any other degree or qualification.

I certify that any help received in preparing this thesis and all sources used have been acknowledged in this thesis.



.....

Brendan Sharpe

January, 2016

Acknowledgements

Firstly, sincere thanks to my principal supervisor Professor Steve Walkden-Brown for the expertise, mentorship and friendship that he has provided throughout this study. Steve encouraged me to not lose sight of the ‘journey’ that is a PhD whilst keeping clear outcomes in mind, which allowed me to complete my investigations in a timely manner and gain much more than what is presented in this thesis. To my co-supervisors Professor Margaret Katz, Professor Peter Groves and Dr Katrin Renz, thank you for your generous provision of time and expertise and the patience you have extended to me throughout this program. Thanks also to Dr Rodney Reece for his pathological expertise and more importantly his mentorship.

To my post-graduate colleagues Robin Achari, Sithara Ralapanawe, Mamdouh Alsharari, Kanchana Jayasundara and Salih Wajid; thank you for the assistance and friendship that each of you have provided throughout. Expert advice and technical assistance provided to me by Chris Morrow, Dieter Bulach, Fakhrul Islam, Sheridan Alfirevich, Sue Sharpe and technical staff within the School (Sue Burgess, Michael Raue, Andrew Blakely and Graham Chaffey) has been essential and I thank each for their generous provision of time.

I acknowledge research funding provided by the Australian Poultry CRC and the University of New England. Additional thanks for the support provided by staff within the Poultry CRC (Professor Minghan Choct, Liz Roan, Michael Warner and Lloyd Thompson) and within the School of Environmental and Rural Science (Frank Leayr, Shirley Fraser and Jo Porter).

Finally, I wish to thank my parents who have supported me right throughout my education and encouraged me to maintain focus. To Kate, thank you for the love and support that you have provided me with throughout this journey and the sacrifices that you have made.

Table of Contents

Chapter 1 General Introduction	1
Chapter 2 Review of the literature	4
2.1 Introduction	4
2.2 Veterinary epidemiology.....	4
2.2.1 Introduction to veterinary epidemiology.....	4
2.2.2 Measuring disease frequency in animal populations.....	6
2.2.3 Disease distribution.....	9
2.2.4 Determinants of disease	11
2.3 Neurological disease in broiler chickens.....	16
2.3.1 Veterinary disease diagnosis.....	16
2.3.2 Neurological evaluation of avian species	17
2.4 Differential diagnosis for neurological conditions of broiler chickens.....	23
2.5 Conclusion	30
Chapter 3 General materials and methods	31
3.1 Isolator facility.....	31
3.2 Harvesting, handling and storage of challenge materials.....	33
3.2.1 Collection and cryopreservation of whole blood.....	33
3.2.2 Collection, extraction and cryopreservation of spleen cells.....	33
3.2.3 Collection and cryopreservation of brain tissue	35
3.3 ELISA for Marek's disease virus in chicken sera	35
3.4 Molecular diagnostic methods.....	36
3.4.1 DNA extraction.....	36
3.4.2 RNA extraction.....	36
3.4.3 Standard polymerase chain reaction	37
3.4.4 Reverse-transcriptase polymerase chain reaction	37
3.4.5 Agarose-gel electrophoresis for analysis of standard PCR and RT-PCR products	37
3.4.6 Real-time polymerase chain reaction	38
Chapter 4 Analysis of existing information on the acute paralysis syndrome and refinement of the differential diagnosis list	39
4.1 Introduction and background to the APS.....	39
4.2 Materials and methods.....	41
4.3 Results and diagnostic features of the APS	41
4.3.1 Clinical appearance of the APS	41
4.3.2 Infectious disease diagnostics	42
4.3.3 Histological findings	43
4.3.4 Complete blood cell counts and biochemistry analyses.....	50
4.3.5 Neurological evaluation of affected chickens	51

4.4 Discussion.....	53
4.5 Conclusion	59
Chapter 5 Epidemiological investigations into an acute paralysis syndrome of broiler chickens	60
5.1 Introduction	60
5.2 Materials & Methods	61
5.2.1 Experimental design.....	61
5.2.2 Dataset and overview of analytical techniques.....	61
5.2.3 Describing the APS: temporal and spatial distribution.....	63
5.2.4 Analysis of the effect of the APS on broiler flock performance	63
5.2.5 Identification of disease determinants for the APS.....	64
5.2.6 Multivariate logistic regression analysis	64
5.3 Results.....	65
5.3.1 Description of the APS: temporal and spatial distribution.....	65
5.3.2 Analysis of the effect of the APS on broiler flock performance	68
5.3.3 Identification of disease determinants for the APS.....	75
5.3.4 Multivariate logistic regression analysis	87
5.4 Discussion.....	89
5.4.1 Description of the APS: temporal and spatial distribution.....	89
5.4.2 Analysis of the effect of the APS on broiler flock performance	89
5.4.3 Risk factors for the APS	90
5.5 Conclusion	93
Chapter 6 Experimental reproduction of an acute paralysis syndrome of broiler chickens	94
6.1 Introduction	94
6.2 Materials and Methods	95
6.2.1 Experimental Design.....	95
6.2.2 Animals & Management.....	96
6.2.3 Treatments.....	97
6.2.4 Sample collection and chicken maintenance.....	97
6.2.5 Laboratory techniques.....	99
6.2.6 Statistical Analysis	102
6.3 Results.....	102
6.3.1 Reproduction of the APS	102
6.3.2 Mortality & Survivability	105
6.3.3 Bodyweights and relative immune organ weights.....	107
6.3.4 Histopathology and electron microscopy.....	112
6.3.5 Serology.....	117
6.3.6 Molecular Diagnostics	122

6.4 Discussion.....	125
6.5 Conclusion	130
Chapter 7 Further experimental investigations into an acute paralysis syndrome of broiler chickens: the protective effects of exposure to contaminated litter at placement and infectivity of first chicken passage and field harvested material	131
7.1 Introduction	131
7.2 Materials and Methods	132
7.2.1 Experimental Design.....	132
7.2.2 Animals & Management.....	134
7.2.3 Treatments.....	135
7.2.4 Sample collection	135
7.2.5 Laboratory techniques.....	136
7.2.6 Statistical Analysis	137
7.3 Results.....	137
7.3.1 Experiment 1	137
7.3.2 Experiment 2	142
7.3.3 Experiment 3	145
7.4 Discussion.....	151
7.5 Conclusion	155
Chapter 8 The effect of immunosuppression on the development of an acute paralysis syndrome of broiler chickens	156
8.1 Introduction	156
8.2 Materials and Methods	158
8.2.1 Experimental design and application of treatments.....	158
8.2.2 Chicken maintenance, measurements and sample collection	159
8.2.3 Laboratory techniques.....	160
8.2.4 Statistical analysis.....	162
8.3 Results.....	163
8.3.1 Survivability	163
8.3.2 Bodyweights	165
8.3.3 Bursa of Fabricius.....	167
8.3.4 Spleen.....	169
8.3.5 Histopathology.....	170
8.3.6 Serology.....	173
8.3.7 Molecular diagnostics.....	174
8.3.9 Further effects of immunosuppressive treatments.....	178
8.4 Discussion.....	179
8.5 Conclusion	183

Chapter 9 Advanced molecular investigations into an acute paralysis syndrome of broiler chickens	184
9.1 Introduction	184
9.2 Materials and methods.....	186
9.2.1 Sample preparation	186
9.2.2 Sequencing	187
9.2.3 Bioinformatics	188
9.2.4 Further analysis at UNE	189
9.3 Results.....	189
9.3.1 Sequence data quality assessment and mapping to reference genomes.....	189
9.3.2 Screening of reads for bacterial and viral sequences using Kraken software.....	190
9.3.3 Further detection of viral sequences using BLAST.....	191
9.3.4 Determination of sensitivity and specificity of the NGS protocol.....	195
9.4 Discussion.....	195
9.5 Conclusion	199
Chapter 10 General discussion and conclusions	200
10.1 Background to the APS.....	200
10.2 Epidemiological findings associated with the APS.....	202
10.3 Initial experimental reproduction of the APS.....	206
10.4 Further attempts at experimental reproduction of the APS	211
10.5 Advanced molecular investigations into the APS	215
10.6 Summary of findings	217
10.7 Future work.....	218
10.8.1 Early litter exposure and the polio model.....	218
10.8.2 Traditional virus isolation techniques	219
10.8.3 Summary of future work	220
References	222

List of Figures

Figure 3.1 UNE isolator facility	31
Figure 3.2 View of individual isolator unit showing disposable sides and arm-pieces	32
Figure 3.3 View through two adjacent isolator units	32
Figure 3.4 View through one isolator with complete litter flooring trays installed	33
Figure 4.1 Approximate location of 14 of the broiler growing farms in proximity to the local feed mill and processing plant	40
Figure 4.2 Typical clinical manifestation of the APS	42
Figure 4.4 Base of the cerebrum from a 35 day old broiler affected with the APS, showing a small perivascular cuff of mononuclear cells surrounding a blood vessel	44
Figure 4.5 Base of the cerebrum from a 33 day old broiler affected with the APS, showing marked perivascular cuffing of lymphocytes and macrophages and associated endothelial hypertrophy and mild perivascular oedema	45
Figure 4.6 Cervical spinal cord from a 50 day old broiler showing chains of digestion chambers containing axonal debris consistent with Wallerian degeneration	45
Figure 5.1 Three-monthly rolling averages for the percentage of flocks with the APS and mean percentage mortality of all flocks by month/year of placement.	66
Figure 5.2 Farm cluster locations based on direction from the feed mill and processing plant	67
Figure 5.3 Mean percentage daily mortality of flocks with and without the APS	69
Figure 5.4 Flock mortality showing effect of the interaction between sex and the presence/absence of the APS within sexed flocks	69
Figure 5.5 Mean daily percentage culls of flocks with and without the APS	70
Figure 5.6 Mean weekly flock bodyweights by presence/absence of the APS	74
Figure 5.7 Daily maximum shed temperatures for flocks with and without the APS	77
Figure 5.8 Daily shed temperature fluctuations for flocks with and without the APS	78
Figure 5.9 Daily maximum external temperatures for flocks with and without the APS	82
Figure 5.10 Daily fluctuations in external temperatures for flocks with and without the APS	83
Figure 6.1 Photographs of experimental chickens demonstrating acute paralysis	104
Figure 6.2 Survival patterns of broiler chickens challenged on Expt d0 and Expt d21 by challenge material grouping	107
Figure 6.3 Survival patterns of SPF chickens challenged on Expt d0 and Expt d21 by challenge material grouping	107
Figure 6.4 Survival analyses considering by sex and HVT vaccination status	107
Figure 6.5 Bodyweights by challenge material of broilers on Expt d0	110
Figure 6.6 Relative bursal weights on Expt d56 by treatment and age at treatment for SPF chickens	111
Figure 6.7 Relative spleen weights	112
Figure 6.8 Neuropathology associated with APS affected experimental chickens	113
Figure 6.9 Agarose gel analysis of amplified DNA using pp38 primer set	122
Figure 6.10 Agarose gel analysis of meq amplified DNA using BCH342/SJW1 primer set	122
Figure 6.11 Agarose gel analysis for RT-PCR products using the AEV primer set	125
Figure 6.12 Agarose gel analysis of RT-PCR products using the pan-flavivirus primer set	125
Figure 7.1 Survival patterns of chickens in experiment 1	138
Figure 7.2 Experiment 1. Bodyweights by early exposure to litter treatment and challenge material at 35 and 42 days of age	138
Figure 7.3 Experiment 1. Relative bursal weights by early exposure to litter treatment and challenge material at 35 and 42 days of age	139
Figure 7.4 Experiment 1. Relative spleen weights by early exposure to litter treatment and challenge material at 35 and 42 days of age	140
Figure 7.5 Survival patterns of chickens in experiment 2	142

Figure 7.6 Experiment 2. Bodyweights by challenge material	142
Figure 7.7 Experiment 2. Relative bursa of Fabricius weights by challenge material	143
Figure 7.8 Experiment 2. Relative spleen weights by challenge material	143
Figure 7.9 Bird 17 from experiment 3 demonstrating stage 3 of the APS	145
Figure 7.10 Neuropathology associated with chickens from experiment 3	147
Figure 7.11 Survival patterns of chickens in experiment 3	148
Figure 7.12 Experiment 3. Bodyweights by challenge material and challenge dose	148
Figure 7.13 Experiment 3. Relative bursa of Fabricius weights by challenge material and challenge material dose	149
Figure 7.14 Experiment 3. Relative spleen weights by challenge material and challenge material dose	149
Figure 7.15 Mean bodyweights achieved in experiments 1-3 in comparison to the Ross 308 guidelines and results from 13-C-REP1	152
Figure 8.1 Survivability by chicken batch, sex, immunosuppressive treatment and challenge material	163
Figure 8.2 Photographs showing pronounced jaundice of coelomic fat and liver	164
Figure 8.3 Survival curve between experiment days 21 and 51 for cyclophosphamide treated chickens	164
Figure 8.4 Bodyweights (Expt d36) by immunosuppressive treatment and challenge material/batch combination	165
Figure 8.5 Bodyweights (Expt d51) by immunosuppressive treatment and challenge material	166
Figure 8.6 Bodyweight by sex and chicken batch combination and challenge material and batch combination	166
Figure 8.7 Relative bursal weight by immunosuppressive treatment	167
Figure 8.8 Bursae of Fabricius on Expt d51 from PBS1 and CY treatment chickens	168
Figure 8.9 Relative bursal weight by challenge material and challenge material/batch combination on Expt d51	168
Figure 8.10 Relative spleen weight by challenge material and challenge material/batch combination	169
Figure 8.11 Relative spleen weight by challenge material on Expt d51	170
Figure 8.12 Agarose gel analysis of amplified DNA from FAV8 PCR	175
Figure 8.13 Agarose gel analysis of amplified DNA from CAV PCR	175
Figure 8.14 Log ₁₀ CAV/ mg liver tissue by immunosuppressive treatment group	176
Figure 8.15 Feather breaks observed in cyclophosphamide treated chickens	178
Table 8.8 Circulating white blood cells by immunosuppressive treatment group	178
Figure 8.16 Serum glucose concentrations of DEX and PBS2 treated chickens	179
Figure 8.17 Bodyweights by sex and batch as compared to the Ross 308 guidelines and results from 13-C-REP1 and 13-C-REP4	180
Figure 9.1 Viral protein matches from affected chicken DNA samples	193
Figure 9.2 Viral protein matches from affected chicken RNA samples	194
Figure 10.1 Bodyweight comparisons between field and experimental flocks	212

List of Tables

Table 2.1 Temporal descriptions of disease	10
Table 2.2 HPE determinants for disease expression	14
Table 2.3 Cranial nerves and their function in avian species	19
Table 2.4 Possible clinical signs associated with lesions of the major divisions of the avian brain and spinal cord	22
Table 2.5 Differential diagnosis list for the acute paralysis syndrome	24
Table 4.1 Summary of histological findings	47
Table 4.2 Summary of haematological analyses from 10 chickens from one flock	50
Table 4.3 Biochemical and blood gas measurements from 10 chickens from one flock	51
Table 4.4 Summary of findings from neurological examinations from 10 affected chickens	52
Table 4.5 Comparison of the neurological presentation and CNS pathology between the APS and viral diseases of similar presentation	57
Table 5.1 Summary of the dataset used for epidemiological analyses	62
Table 5.2 Description of sheds by farm in the dataset	63
Table 5.3 Monthly regional average prevailing wind directions and their association with the period between placement and peak mortality in flocks with the APS	68
Table 5.4 Continuous variable analyses of flock factors in relation to mortality, culls, wastage and weekly bodyweights	71
Table 5.5 Odds ratios associated with weekly bodyweight increases above the Ross 308 standard performance guidelines and the presence of the APS	75
Table 5.6 Continuous variable analyses of flock factors in relation to maximum and fluctuations in shed temperatures	79
Table 5.7 Odds ratios associated with weekly maximum shed temperature deviations from the standard Ross 308 shed temperature guidelines and the presence of the APS	81
Table 5.8 Summary data in relation to stocking density	84
Table 5.9 Summary of hatchery supply of flocks in the data set	84
Table 5.10 Univariate analyses of thin-out times in relation to presence/absence of the APS	85
Table 5.11 Results from univariate analysis in order of descending odds ratios	86
Table 5.14 Final multivariate logistic regression model of predictive factors for the APS	87
Table 6.1 Experimental design	96
Table 6.2 Challenge material used	97
Table 6.3 Serological tests performed at Birling Avian Laboratories	100
Table 6.4 Sequence of primers used in PCR tests for Marek's disease virus, avian encephalomyelitis virus and flaviviruses	101
Table 6.5 Summary of chickens which developed the APS	103
Table 6.6 Summary of the clinical signs observed at each sequential stage of the APS as allocated in this experiment	104
Table 6.7 Summary of mortality due to the APS or other causes by experimental factor	106
Table 6.8 Analysis of bodyweight and relative bursal and spleen weight data	108
Table 6.9 Clinical and histopathological findings of chickens demonstrating the APS	114
Table 6.10 Serological results from a portion of individual chickens that developed the APS	118
Table 6.11 Day 56 Serological results for broilers	119
Table 6.12 Day 56 serological results for SPF chickens	120
Table 6.13 Summary of DNA samples used for MDV PCR and qPCR	123
Table 6.14 Summary of HVT qPCR results by treatment	124
Table 7.1 Experiment 1 design	133
Table 7.2 Experiment 2 design	133
Table 7.3 Experiment 3 design	134
Table 7.4 Challenge materials and doses used for each experiment	135

Table 7.5 ELISA kit details for serological tests performed at Birling Avian Laboratories	137
Table 7.6 Experiment 1: bodyweight and relative immune organ weight data	140
Table 7.7 Experiment 1: serological results	141
Table 7.8 Experiment 2: bodyweight and relative immune organ weight data	144
Table 7.9 Experiment 2: serological results	144
Table 7.10 Experiment 3: histopathological findings of brain and spinal cord sections	146
Table 7.11 Experiment 3: bodyweight and relative immune organ weight data	149
Table 7.12 Experiment 3: maternal antibody status of chickens used	150
Table 7.13 Experiment 3: serological results	150
Table 7.14 Parent flock source of chickens for experiments 1-3 and 13-C-REP1	150
Table 8.1 Experimental design	159
Table 8.2 ELISA kit details for serological tests performed at Birling Avian Laboratories	161
Table 8.3 Liver histopathological from a selection of mortalities	171
Table 8.4 Central nervous system histopathological findings	172
Table 8.5 Maternal antibody status for key viral diseases at placement by batch and virus	173
Table 8.6 Antibody status on Expt d51 by immunosuppressive treatment, challenge material and virus	174
Table 8.7 Summary of results from molecular diagnostics by experimental bird number	177
Table 8.8 Circulating white blood cells by immunosuppressive treatment	178
Table 9.1 Summary of DNA and RNA extractions for NGS	187
Table 9.2 Summary of sequencing reads	190
Table 9.3 Summary of read screening results from Kraken software search	191
Table 9.4 Summary of the total number of viral protein matches in samples from affected birds for the four viruses with the highest number of matches from BLAST screening	192
Table 9.5 Consistent viral protein matches through positive samples	192
Table 9.6 Comparison of HVT detection ability of NGS with HVT qPCR results	195
Table 10.1 Identification of parent flocks of broiler chickens used in each experiment and extent of APS induced in groups inoculated or exposed to putatively infective materials	213

List of Publications

Materials from this thesis have been published in the following conference papers.

1. Sharpe, Brendan; Katz, Margaret; Reece, Rodney; Renz, Katrin and Walkden-Brown, Steve. Investigations into an acute paralysis syndrome of broiler chickens. *Australasian Veterinary Poultry Association*, Gold Coast QLD, May 2014.
2. Sharpe, Brendan; Groves, Peter; Katz, Margaret; Reece, Rodney; Renz, Katrin and Walkden-Brown, Steve. Epidemiological and experimental investigations into an acute paralysis syndrome of broiler chickens in Australia. *British Veterinary Poultry Association Spring Meeting*, Harrogate UK, March 2015.