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Summary  Wild nine-banded armadillos (Dasypus novemcinctus) in the south central United States are highly endemic natural hosts of Mycobacterium leprae. Surveys conducted over the last 30 years on more than 5000 animals confirm that the infection is present among armadillos in Arkansas, Louisiana, Mississippi and Texas. Highest prevalence rates are found among the animals in low-lying alluvial and coastal areas, primarily in Louisiana and Texas. Both animal density and local factors may contribute to the detectability of armadillo leprosy in those regions. Little evidence for M. leprae infection is found among armadillos elsewhere in the US range, and only a few reports relate finding the infection among animals in Central or South America. However, the issue has received only scant attention in other countries. Armadillos only recently expanded their range into the US, and leprosy was present in Texas and Louisiana prior to the arrival of armadillos. The ecological relationship between humans and armadillos with M. leprae in this region remains unclear. However, infected armadillos constitute a large reservoir of M. leprae and they may be a source of infection for some humans in this country, and perhaps in other locations across the animal’s range.

Introduction

Other than humans, nine-banded armadillos (Dasypus novemcinctus) are the only highly endemic natural hosts of Mycobacterium leprae. A leprosy like disease was first reported among wild armadillos in 1975, and by 1983 the sylvan agent had been confirmed to be identical to the M. leprae infecting humans. Numerous studies have shown that M. leprae is highly prevalent among wild armadillos in parts of Louisiana and Texas, but rare or absent in other locales. The probable origin of the infection, its geographic range, and the risks it might present to humans has been the subject of considerable speculation. This paper reviews our current understanding about the distribution of M. leprae infections among wild armadillos and the relative importance of these animals as the only confirmed, large, natural, non-human reservoir of M. leprae.
Natural history

Rudyard Kipling tells that armadillos originated through an effort by hedgehogs and tortoises to flummox jaguars. They are exotic looking, cat-sized animals with short legs and a hard flexible carapace armouring most of their body. Found only in the ‘New World’, armadillos range throughout South and Central America and into the United States. Members of the mammalian order Xenarthra, the term ‘armadillo’ is applied across several genera. The ‘armadillo’ of most importance to leprologists, and the only one present in North America, is Dasypus novemcinctus (also known as the nine-banded or long-nosed armadillo). In this review, the term ‘armadillo’ will refer only to the D. novemcinctus unless noted otherwise.

Armadillos are not native to the US, but began slowly expanding their range north from Mexico around 1880. They first entered Louisiana in 1926 and had crossed the state to the Mississippi river by 1957. Today, armadillos are found from Argentina to Colorado and through the southeastern US to Florida. They are present on many Caribbean islands and were probably carried there aboard trading ships. Several reports relate private citizens introducing armadillos into the state of Florida, beginning in about 1922. These animals established a second US population, which also slowly expanded its range and merged with the main US group around 1985.

Armadillos can occupy a diverse range of ecological habitats, but are usually found in close association with water supplies. Prodigious diggers, armadillos exchange between burrows with impunity. They do not hibernate. The main factors limiting their range appear to be a poor tolerance of cold temperatures, and the capacity of the environment to produce sufficient insects and grubs, the mainstays of their otherwise omnivorous diet.

Armadillos are not native to the US, but began slowly expanding their range north from Mexico around 1880. They first entered Louisiana in 1926 and had crossed the state to the Mississippi river by 1957. Today, armadillos are found from Argentina to Colorado and through the southeastern US to Florida. They are present on many Caribbean islands and were probably carried there aboard trading ships. Several reports relate private citizens introducing armadillos into the state of Florida, beginning in about 1922. These animals established a second US population, which also slowly expanded its range and merged with the main US group around 1985.

Armadillos can occupy a diverse range of ecological habitats, but are usually found in close association with water supplies. Prodigious diggers, armadillos exchange between burrows with impunity. They do not hibernate. The main factors limiting their range appear to be a poor tolerance of cold temperatures, and the capacity of the environment to produce sufficient insects and grubs, the mainstays of their otherwise omnivorous diet.

Physiology

Armadillos exhibit a number of interesting traits. As the most abundant Xenarthran, they are of particular interest to comparative and evolutionary biologists. To help support those efforts on a molecular level, the Human Genome Consortium recently sequenced the entire Dasypus novemcinctus genome. A 2X coverage, containing 75% of the total genomic sequence is already complete and available at the NCBI database (http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/BLAST/tracemb.html).

Their reproductive cycle has been of special interest because they exhibit both gestational diapause and polyembryony. After fertilization, the armadillo embryo undergoes a 4–5 month period of arrested development prior to implantation, after which it immediately divides to form four identical offspring. The female matures in her second year and can bear...
quadruplicate offspring through the remainder of her 12-year lifespan. Plasma progesterone concentrations are useful in age stratifying armadillo populations and for assessing their fecundity. Unfortunately, armadillos reproduce only rarely in captivity, and they must be obtained from the wild for investigative purposes.

Body temperature was the armadillo’s main trait that first attracted the attention of leprologists. Even under normal conditions the animal’s core temperature is in the 32–35°C range. The hard integument and lack of furry coat probably contribute to their poor thermal maintenance, and a cool temperature can be an effective defense against many parasites and pathogens. However, in extending on Shepard’s observation that cool temperatures favoured the growth of M. leprae in the mouse foot pad, Kirchheimer and Storrs began experimentally infecting armadillos in 1968. By 1971 they had shown that huge quantities of leprosy bacilli could now be made available through armadillos. The animals rapidly became the hosts of choice for in vivo propagation of M. leprae, and several armadillo colonies were founded around the world. However, while collecting wild armadillos near New Iberia, Louisiana in 1975, Walsh found a systemic mycobacteriosis among some of them that was indistinguishable from the disease caused by M. leprae.

Detecting M. leprae in armadillos

Armadillos exhibit the full spectrum of immunological responses to M. leprae, ranging from TT to LL, and can be classified according to the Ridley–Jopling scale with Lepromin. The majority of armadillos appear to be multibacillary types. Leprosy progresses very slowly in armadillos, and even laboratory infected animals require 18–24 months of incubation before they succumb to their leprosy. Obviously, nearly all the infected armadillos seen in the wild appear to be adults. There are no gender related differences in susceptibility or disease progress, and though armadillos exhibit characteristic nerve involvement, animals in the wild show little evidence of deformity or impairment. Such animals may quickly become prey or be easily out-competed in the wild, even though leprosy seems to offer little competitive disadvantage to the population overall.

M. leprae infection in armadillos produces few gross symptoms, and it is not possible to distinguish normal from M. leprae-infected animals by their outward appearance. Armadillos manifest a systemic illness that primarily involves the reticuloendothelial tissues. Intermittent low level bacteraemia leads to a generalized dissemination of bacilli in the late stages of the infection. No organ system is spared, but cooler body regions tend to exhibit greater involvement. M. leprae can be demonstrated in the skin, nodules, lymph nodes, blood or other organ tissues with direct smears, histopathological exam and PCR.

Multibacillary armadillos also have a strong antibody response to M. leprae. Among laboratory infected animals, IgM antibodies to the M. leprae-specific PGL-1 antigen arise in about a third of the time required for bacilli to become detectable in skin scrapings and ear biopsies. The timing of their appearance and general level is highly correlated with the bacterial load in the animal’s tissues. First detection is generally associated with a 1 + BI in some RES tissue. The levels of PGL-1 IgM increase with increasing bacterial load in the animal and they persist over the course of the disease.
Origin of the infection

The report of a ‘leprosy like’ disease among wild armadillos was highly controversial, and the enthusiasm of both lay and scientific writers about the subject was unrestrained. Some editorials suggested that a new agent had been discovered that could be useful in modeling human leprosy.40 Others hailed the report as revealing a new zoonosis and a threat to the public health. No earlier studies had found systemic mycobacteriosis among armadillos, and the report of a sylvan infection was not immediately confirmed by other laboratories.41 DNA homology studies showed that the sylvan agent actually was M. leprae.2 Skinsnes speculated that sylvan leprosy was newly evolved and that it might have originated through the escape or improper disposal of experimentally infected armadillos at one of the research centers working with armadillos.42 The accusation polarized the community and trivialized armadillo studies for years. The ‘environmental contamination’ claim was perpetuated by several groups, and is frequently alluded to even today by uninformed individuals.28,43 – 45

A number of surveys were launched to determine the geographic range of armadillo leprosy. By 1977, Walsh had found 50 M. leprae-infected armadillos from among 459 animals sampled at 11 different locations around the state of Louisiana and one in Texas.46 With such a wide geographical distribution, it seemed unlikely that sylvan leprosy might be a recent phenomenon. However, no evidence of the infection was found among armadillos in Florida, and only one (1/218) M. leprae-infected armadillo was found in Mississippi.28,46,47 Kirchheimer examined more than 400 armadillos from various locations in central Texas, Louisiana and Florida, before confirming existence of the disease in a single Louisiana animal.28,43,44,48 Smith showed that leprosy was highly prevalent (21/451) among armadillos in counties along the Texas coastline and extended towards Mexico.2,49 However, only one (1/96) infected armadillo was found in Mexico.50 Eventually, one other infected armadillo was found in Argentina.51 Otherwise, none (0/536) of the mixed armadillo varieties examined in either Colombia52 or Paraguay53 appeared to be infected. The apparent geographical distribution of the infection fueled continued speculation that armadillos had acquired leprosy in the US, perhaps through natural mechanisms,30 or from contamination of their environment.

The environmental contamination hypothesis was disproved finally in 1985. With the advent of serological screening methods to detect antibodies to the PGL-1 antigen, we examined sera taken from wild armadillos in years predating the animal’s use in leprosy research to determine the time frame that armadillos might have acquired M. leprae.36 Collected by Roth54 in 1960–1964 as part of a survey for leptospires in Louisiana wildlife, the sera had been stored frozen at Louisiana State University for 25 years prior to our study. We found that 17/182 sera reacted specifically with PGL-1, indicating that M. leprae must have been enzootic among armadillos at least by 1961. Armadillo leprosy could not have originated through any possible accidental contamination of the environment on the part of leprosy researchers, who only started working with armadillos in 1968.36 Therefore, it must have evolved by natural means and armadillos could have acquired the infection in any number of different locations or repeated the event many times over the years.

Geographic distribution of armadillo leprosy

Seeking mainly to confirm the presence or absence of disease in distant locales, early workers sampled small numbers of armadillos at random locations and often reported disparate
prevalence rates. The size and structure of animal populations vary in different environments, and can influence the observable prevalence of disease. Louisiana is a low-land area at the mouth of the Mississippi river. Among its most prominent features are the alluvial swamps and bottoms associated with the Mississippi, Red and Atchafalaya rivers, and the generally similar low prairies and marshes that form the coastal margin and extend on through southern Texas. This region juxtaposes mixed pine and deciduous forests that are easily identified in geologic soil maps and satellite images of the region. A representative drawing of the region on a county basis is shown in Figure 1.

There is a large reservoir of *M. leprae* among wild armadillos in this low-land region. By 1986, investigators had described at least 136 armadillos with histopathologically detectable *M. leprae* in their ear tissues among some 3500 animals sampled mainly in the low-land areas of Louisiana and Texas. A systematic survey among 565 animals spanning four locations in this area between north Louisiana and Corpus Christi, Texas, confirmed the average 3.8% histopathological prevalence rate reported by others, and showed that about 16% of the armadillos populating the area also had detectable IgM antibodies to PGL-1. Repeated observations at the same location where Roth had taken armadillos in the 1960–1964 survey, showed a steady maintenance of the infection from year to year, and confirmed that the prevalence rate had not changed significantly over the ensuing 30-year period. *M. leprae* is intensely transmitted among armadillos in this region. In one location, the incidence density estimate based on PGL-1 IgM seroconversion was 3.5 cases/1000 animal days. The antibody positive animals are almost entirely in the adult cohort. Using

![Figure 1. Map of southeastern United States by county.](image)

The northern range of armadillos in the US. Grey counties are part of the alluvial and coastal low-lands. Stippled counties have had native-born residents presenting with leprosy. Numbers identify general locations where armadillos have been surveyed. All locations are approximate: 1 = Carville, Louisiana; 2 = New Ibera, Louisiana; 3 = Picayune, Mississippi and area nearby Kentwood, Louisiana; 4 = Woodville Mississippi and Louisiana parishes; 5 = Leesville, Louisiana; 6 = Houston, Texas; 7 = Corpus Christi, Texas and Welder Wildlife Refuge; 8 = Luckenbach, Texas; 9 = area of College Station and Palestine, Texas; 10 = Lawton, Oklahoma, Wichita Mountains National Wildlife Refuge; 11 = Clarksville, Arkansas; 12 = Desha County, Arkansas; 13 = Tallahassee, Florida and St Marks National Wildlife Refuge; A,B,C = Louisiana locations for systematic survey of armadillos for *M. leprae*, a = Tensas River National Wildlife Refuge, b = East Atchafalaya Management Area, c = Lacassine National Wildlife Refuge.
plasma progesterone concentrations to age stratify the populations showed that the age adjusted antibody prevalence rate remained reliably consistent between the different locations, and nearly a third of all the adult armadillos surveyed appeared to harbour *M. leprae*. Therefore, *M. leprae* infection is really quite common among armadillos in these low-land areas; and steady maintenance of high rates of disease over a very large geographic area suggests that they have harboured *M. leprae* for many generations.

Armadillos are more difficult to acquire outside low-land areas, and most surveys in non-low-land regions have had to rely on samples from ‘road-killed’ animals or commercial trappers. However, numerous results show that *M. leprae* infection is significantly less common among armadillos in those locales. No infected armadillos have been reported from among nearly 1000 animals examined in Florida, and, similarly, we found no evidence of the infection (0/67) among armadillos taken near the other end of their range around Lawton, Oklahoma (Table 1). In Texas, one infected armadillo was reported from around College Station and Walsh found one (1/61) infected armadillo among a group taken near Palestine, Texas in 1977. Otherwise, no evidence for leprosy has been reported among 427 armadillos sampled more than 100 k from the Texas coastal margin, including (0/86) a group of animals from near Luckenbach, Texas that also was screened serologically (Table 1). A large survey of ear tissues taken from 853 road-killed armadillos in Alabama, Arkansas, Florida, Georgia and Mississippi also failed to find any histopathological evidence for *M. leprae* infection in those areas. Walsh too reported no evidence for *M. leprae* (0/178) among armadillos taken near Picayune, Mississippi. Otherwise, one armadillo (1/40) with histopathologically detectable bacilli in its ear tissues was found near Natchez, and we

Table 1. Additional wild armadillos examined for naturally acquired leprosy at the NHDP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Number sampled</th>
<th>Number PGL-1 IgM+(^a)</th>
<th>Number histopath+(^b)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Argentina</td>
<td>Corrientes</td>
<td>Mercedes</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grenada</td>
<td></td>
<td>St George’s</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>Clarksville</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>Sarasota</td>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>St Mark’s NWR</td>
<td></td>
<td>37</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tallahassee</td>
<td></td>
<td>142</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>Kentwood</td>
<td></td>
<td>145</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Deritter</td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Felecianas</td>
<td></td>
<td>135</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Atchafalaya(^c)</td>
<td></td>
<td>550</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tensas NWR(^c)</td>
<td></td>
<td>77</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lucassine NWR(^c)</td>
<td></td>
<td>78</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>Woodville</td>
<td></td>
<td>54</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td>Lawton</td>
<td></td>
<td>67</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>Luckenbach</td>
<td></td>
<td>86</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Corpus Christi</td>
<td></td>
<td>35</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Armadillos were acquired by local trappers at various locations and examined for evidence of infection with *M. leprae*.

\(^a\) ELISA positive for IgM antibodies for PGL-1.

\(^b\) Histopathological examination of ear tissues detected acid fast bacilli in dermal nerves.

\(^c\) Values recorded for comparison purposes; prevalence previously reported Truman *et al.* and Paige *et al*.

ND = not done; NWR = National Wildlife Refuge.
captured one (1/54) PGL-1 IgM positive armadillos near Woodville, Mississippi (Table 1). In addition, we found serological evidence for the infection (9/42) among armadillos in the eastern Arkansas low-lands around Desha county, but armadillos in western Arkansas near Clarksville appear to be free (0/67) of \textit{M. leprae} (Table 1). \textit{M. leprae} infection is found among Louisiana armadillos outside the low-land area, but the prevalence appears to be less. We captured one (1/12) PGL-1 IgM positive armadillos near Deritter, three (3/135) in the Feliciana parishes and nine (9/145) near Kentwood, Louisiana (Table 1).

The distribution of the infection among armadillos does not seem to be influenced by local variations in susceptibility or disease type. Laboratory studies with armadillos from all these locations show that they are susceptible to experimental infection with \textit{M. leprae} and tend to react similarly to Lepromin-A. The low-land areas appear to favour both the number of armadillos and a high prevalence of infection. Animal density may play some role in the observed prevalence of disease, but measures indexing animal crowding are more reliable and systematic studies outside the low-land region are needed to address the issue.

There have been few contemporary studies on armadillos from outside the US. Pena found 2/83 PGL-1 IgM positive armadillos in northern Argentina (Table 1), but was unable to demonstrate presence of \textit{M. leprae} in the tissues examined (unpublished observation). We found no evidence for the infection (0/25) among armadillos on the island of Grenada in the Caribbean (Table 1). However, Deps recently reported finding 5/14 Brazilian armadillos sampled near Vitoria to be positive by PCR for \textit{M. leprae} in their blood. Her results await confirmation, but armadillo leprosy is likely to be more common in other countries than is currently recognized.

Clearly, armadillos in parts of Louisiana and Texas are a large natural reservoir of \textit{M. leprae}. Between the two states, there are more than 60,000 square miles of these low-land habitats where we find a high prevalence of sylvan leprosy. If armadillos utilize even 1% of that space at a density of just one or two animals per acre, then there are likely more than 100,000 \textit{M. leprae} infected armadillos in Louisiana and Texas. The size of this reservoir alone suggests that armadillos may contribute to some cases of human infection, but the impact that they have had on human health in the region has been difficult to discern.

Association with humans

Most cases of leprosy in the US arise among immigrants from endemic countries or nationals who may have acquired their disease while living abroad. However, there is persistent autochthonous transmission of the infection in Texas and Louisiana that gives rise to 30–40 cases each year among native citizens. The county of residence of those native-born cases, as derived from the National Hansen’s Disease Registry (NHDP, Baton Rouge, LA), shows a clustering within areas bordering the western crescent of the Gulf of Mexico (Figure 1).

Published case reports relate development of leprosy among at least 13 individuals from Louisiana or Texas who had no known exposure to \textit{M. leprae}, other than perhaps their contact with the organism through armadillos. Though casual exposure also was implicated, these people generally reported extensive direct contact with armadillos, such as handling the animals, or preparing and consuming their flesh. However, in an early case-control study with 19 native-born patients in Louisiana, Filice found no association between contact with armadillos and the presence of leprosy in humans. Both cases and controls reported no difference in the nature or frequency of their contact with the animals.
Exposure to armadillos is quite common in this region. About half of all the leprosy cases attending a Houston clinic acknowledged some direct or indirect exposure to the animals. In another case-control study among Mexican born patients attending health clinics in Los Angeles, Thomas found a significantly increased risk for leprosy among cases who reported a history of contact with armadillos in Mexico. Unfortunately, the geographical distribution and prevalence of leprosy among Mexican armadillos has not been described, and it is uncertain if the risk attributed in this study relates to contact with *M. leprae* through armadillos or might have been associable with other factors.

Definitive conclusions about zoonotic transmission of leprosy may come only with establishment of suitable molecular strain typing systems. Recent analysis based on single nucleotide polymorphisms (SNP) predicts that leprosy was carried to North America by European immigrants and African slaves. Armadillos too are relatively recent arrivals to the area. The SNP strain-type seen among armadillos matches that of the human settlers to the region, and the animals must have acquired *M. leprae* from humans at some point in time. Both humans and armadillos have established a persistent focus of infection in the US region lining the western Gulf of Mexico. Deciphering the factors which underlie the relationship between humans and armadillos to *M. leprae* in this region could provide significant new insights into leprosy transmission.

**Conclusions**

Nine-banded armadillos in parts of the southern United States are known to harbour *M. leprae* and they represent a large natural reservoir for infection. It is unclear where or when the animals might first have acquired *M. leprae*. However, the infection appears to have evolved by natural means and armadillos today support intense transmission of *M. leprae* in their communities. The disease is most common among armadillos in low-land habitats and may be rare or absent elsewhere. Few studies have addressed its occurrence among armadillos outside the US. Animal densities and local topographical or environmental circumstances may influence detection of the disease in some locales. However, it seems unlikely that the infection would be confined wholly to a single nidus in the US and the issue merits investigation elsewhere in the armadillo range.

Leprosy remains rare in the US, while exposure to armadillos is common. The impact that infected armadillos have on human health is difficult to discern. Colonists, slaves and armadillos were all relatively recent arrivals to this region, but both the humans and animals now show similarities in the geographical distribution of their infections. Understanding the ecological relationship of humans and armadillos with *M. leprae* in this region may come only with establishment of more suitable molecular strain-typing methods. Additional studies with these animals could benefit our basic understanding of leprosy transmission. Presently, armadillos should be viewed as a potential source of infection for our citizens.
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