# Response of Ferrets and Monkeys to Intranasal Infection with Human, Equine and Avian Influenza Viruses

P. Marois, A. Boudreault, E. DiFranco and V. Pavilanis\*

#### SUMMARY

Rhesus monkeys and ferrets were exposed to intranasal inoculation of several strains of egg-adapted avian, equine and human influenza viruses and to strains of mouse-adapted equine influenza viruses. Local replication of virus and seroconversion were observed in the majority of these animals. However, clinical infection was observed only in ferrets.

#### RÉSUMÉ

Des furets et des singes rhesus ont été inoculés par la voie intranasale avec diverses souches de virus influenza aviaire, équine et humaine adaptées à l'embryon de poussins et avec des souches equines adaptées à la souris. Chez la majorité de ces animaux, les virus se sont repliqués dans les voies respiratoires supérieures et ont produit une séroconversion importante. Toutefois, l'infection clinique n'a été observée que chez le furet.

### INTRODUCTION

The interrelationships between human and animal influenza viruses have long been studied, notably between swine and human influenza strains (1, 8, 11, 18, 26, 28). These studies have been intensified recently for four reasons: first, several A strains of influenza virus have been isolated from equine and avian spp. (23, 29, 33), one B strain from horses (7); second, that an A/Equine-2 isolate was obtained in the same locality as an antigenically related human influenza subtype 2 strain (19); third, that serological surveys and experimental studies have confirmed the antigenic relationships between some equine, avian and human influenza viruses (5, 10, 20, 21, 22, 25, 31, 32), and fourth, transmission studies in which man has been found susceptible to A-Equine-2 isolates (14, 15), ponies to human influenza (2-16) and dogs to human A2 and B strains of influenza viruses (30).

Information has been sought on the response of ferrets and monkeys to isolates of avian, equine and human strains of influenza since there has been little work by others in this area (3, 4, 13, 24).

# MATERIALS AND METHODS

SUBJECTS

Healthy four to five pound rhesus (*Macaca mulatta*) monkeys and nearly mature ferrets were used in these experiments. These animals were kept isolated throughout the observation period. Each animal was bled before, and 14 and/or 28 days after inoculation. Signs of illness were recorded daily.

#### VIRUSES

The avian Myxovirus influenzae strains AA6/Turkey/Ont/3724/63, AA5/Turkey/ Ont/6213/66, AA5/Turkey/Ont/7732/66 (17) as well as the Myxovirus parainfluenzae/Yucaipa/1959 (9) were kindly supplied by Dr. G. Lang from the Ontario Veterinary College, University of Guelph. The Myxovirus A/Equine-1/Prague/262/56 was supplied by Dr. J. T. Bryan from the University of Kentucky and the Human A2 variant Hong Kong virus was supplied by the Communicable Disease Center, Atlanta, Georgia. The A/Equine-2/Richelieu/63 was isolated by the authors in 1963 during a

<sup>\*</sup>Institut de Microbiologie et d'Hygiène de l'Université de Montréal, C.P. 100, Ville de Laval, Québec.

Supported partly by research grants from the Quebec Dept. of Agriculture (Agricultural Research Council grant No. MMH-67-292).

natural outbreak of equine influenza (19). All these strains have undergone several passages on chick embryo. Mouse-adapted A/Equine-1 and A/Equine-2 strains were also used in these experiments.

#### INOCULATION OF ANIMALS

The ferrets under ether anaesthesia received 0.5 ml of virus suspension in each nostril. The monkeys, under nembutal and ether anaesthesia, received in each nostril 1.0 ml of virus suspension.

# VIRUS RECOVERY

Nasal washings were collected 48 and 96 hours after infection. Five ml of antibiotic containing PBS were introduced into each nostril of the animals and approximately 5.0 to 7.0 ml of liquid were recovered in each case. The nasal washings were centrifuged at 2000 RPM for 30 minutes, then serial tenfold dilutions of the supernatants were titered in 11 day embryonated eggs, using five eggs per dilution. Eggs dying between two and six days after inoculation, as well as the embryos still alive 144 hours post inoculation, were examined for viral hemagglutinins.

#### SEROLOGICAL TECHNIQUES

The hemagglutination-inhibition (HI) tests were performed in plastic disposable trays, using the macrotiter method (6). Receptor-destroying enzyme of Vibrio cholerae was used to destroy non-specific inhibitors in the sera prior to HI tests (6).

#### DETERMINATIONS OF THE SPECIFICITY OF THE ANIMAL RESPONSES

In the two series of infection trials with the different viruses, specificity of the serological response in individual animals was determined by the cross-HI test, using the stock virus strains as antigens.

	Information a Deser	A 1	Virus Isola Nasal W log <sub>10</sub> EI	HI Antibodies Days after Infection			
Virus Strains	log <sub>10</sub> EID <sub>50</sub> /ml	No.	48 hours	96 hours	0	14	28
Monkeys Parainfluenza/Yucaipa/59	9.5	$\frac{1}{2}$	1.1 $2.1$	1.7 $2.2$	0 0	60 10	30ª 0
AA6/Turkey/Ont/3724/63	8.5	$3\\4$	$3.9 \\ 1.5$	$\begin{array}{c} 3.2\\ 0.0 \end{array}$	0 0	0 5	30 60
A2/Hong Kong/1/68	7.5	5 6	4.0 0.9	$3.9 \\ 1.5$	0 0	160 160	320 320
A/Equi-1/Prague/56	4.2	7 8	$\begin{array}{c} 1.7\\ 2.8\end{array}$	$2.0 \\ 2.5$	0 0	30 80	30 60
A/Equi-2/Richelieu/63	6.7	9 10	$\begin{array}{c} 0.8\\ 1.0\end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} 2.3 \\ 1.2 \end{array}$	0 0	40 20	30 0
AA5/Turkey/Ont/7732/66	6.0	11 12	0.0 0.0	0.0 0.0	$\begin{array}{c} 0 \\ 0 \end{array}$	0 80	0 120
<b>Ferrets</b> AA6/Turkey/Ont/3724/63	8.5	$\frac{1}{2}$	4.2 4.5	$\begin{array}{c} 6.5 \\ 4.0 \end{array}$	0 0	$\frac{160}{240}$	
AA5/Turkey/Ont/7732/66	7.8	$3 \\ 4$	$3.7 \\ 2.5$	$\begin{array}{c} 4.7 \\ 1.8 \end{array}$	0 0	$\begin{array}{c} 160 \\ 240 \end{array}$	
AA5/Turkey/Ont/6213/66	8.2	5 6	4.5 5.2	$\begin{array}{c} 4.4\\ 4.7\end{array}$	0 0	120 480	

TABLE I. Response of Ferrets and Monkeys to Various Strains of Myxoviruses Inoculated Intranasally

Reciprocal of serum dilution.

In addition, in the second series of infection trials, the viruses isolated from the nasal washings were identified by the cross HI test, using standard antisera.

### RESULTS

#### FIRST SERIES OF INFECTION TRIALS

Following intranasal inoculation of monkeys and ferrets with the virus strains indicated in Table I, evidence of virus replication was observed in all animals, except in the two monkeys inoculated with the avian strain AA5/Turkey/Ont/7732/66. HI antibodies were detectable in all the experimental animals, except in one monkey inoculated with the above mentioned strain. None of the monkeys showed evidence of clinical infection. However, all the ferrets inoculated showed some signs of rhinitis accompanied sometimes by sneezing and shivering. No appreciable rise in temperature was noted in monkeys or ferrets. Cross-HI test performed on individual sera demonstrated that these animals were infected by the inoculated viruses (Table II).

### SECOND SERIES OF INFECTION TRIALS

Four monkeys were inoculated with two mouse-adapted equine strains. Eight ferrets were inoculated with the same mouseadapted equine strains, human A2/Hong Kong/59 strain and the avian paramyxovirus strain Yucaipa/1959. All the animals infected with the influenza viruses excreted virus 48 and 96 hours after inoculation,

<b>FABLE</b>	II.	Cross Inhibition-Hemagglutination	Test with	<b>Convalescent Sera vs Stock</b>	Virus
--------------	-----	-----------------------------------	-----------	-----------------------------------	-------

			Viruses						
Antisera	Ani	mal 0.	Parainfluenza/ Yucaipa/59	AA6/Turkey/Ont/ 3724/63	AA5/Turkey/Ont/ 7732/66	A/Equi-1/Prague/56	A/Equi-2/Richelieu/63	A2/Hong Kong/1/68	
Yucaipa/1959	Monkey	$\frac{1}{2}$	0/20ª 0/0	0/0 0/0	0/0 0/0	0/0 0/0	0/0 0/0	0/0 0/0	
AA6/3724/63	››	3	0/0	0/15	0/0	0/0	0/0	0/0	
	››	4	0/0	0/20	0/0	0/0	0/0	0/0	
AA5/7732/66	,,	11	0/0/0	0/0/0	0/0/0	0/0/0	0/0/0	0/0/0	
	,,	12	0/0/0	0/0/0	0/80/120	0/0/0	0/0/0	0/0/0	
A/Equi-1/Prague/56	,,	7	0/0/0	0/0/0	0/0/0	0/30/30	0/0/0	0/0/0	
	,,	8	0/0/0	0/0/0	0/0/0	0/80/60	0/0/0	0/0/0	
A/Equi-2/Richelieu/63	,,	9	0/0/0	0/0/0	0/0/0	0/0/0	0/40/30	0/0/0	
	,,	10	0/0/0	0/0/0	0/0/0	0/0/0	0/20/0	0/0/0	
A2/Hong Kong/1/68	,,	5	0/0	0/0	0/0	0/0	0/0	0/480	
	,,	6	0/0	0/0	0/0	0/0	0/0	0/32 <b>0</b>	
AA6/3724/63	Ferret	$\frac{1}{2}$	0/0 0/0	0/120 0/240	0/0 0/0	N.D. <sup>b</sup> N.D.	0/0 0/0	30/30 15/15	
AA5/7732/66	,,	3	0/0	0/0	0/240	N.D.	0/0	15/15	
	,,	4	0/0	0/0	40/480	N.D.	0/0	N.D.	
AA5/6213/66	,,	5	0/0	0/0	20/40	0/0	0/0	15/15	
	,,	6	0/0	0/0	0/160	0/0	0/0	15/15	

Reciprocal of serum dilution: Serum before infection/Serum two weeks after infection/Serum four weeks after infection.
 N.D. = Not done.

developed antibodies against the inoculated virus (Table III) and presented clinical reactions similar to those observed in the previous experiment. The sera of each animal reacted specifically in the cross HI test (Table IV).

Isolates from the nasal washings of each animal were found by the cross HI test to be identical to the inoculated viruses (Table V). Two ferrets inoculated with the mouse-adapted strain A/Equine-1/Prague/ 56 shed the inoculated virus strains 48 and 96 hours post infection and showed specific seroconversion, as shown in Table IV. However, these animals presented a significant rise of temperature on the seventh day post inoculation. The fever was followed by dyspnea, depression, heavy nasal discharge and the ferrets were moribund on day 14. At necropsy, discoloration of the liver and spleen and a purulent sinusitis were observed in both animals; in one of these, a hemorrhagic gastroenteritis was also observed. The turbinates of these ferrets were removed and a hemagglutinating agent was recovered in high concentration from the homogenates of these turbinates. No inhibition of the

hemagglutination was observed when this agent was tested against standard antisera prepared with the egg-adapted myxovirus strain A2/Aichi/68, A/Equine-1/Prague/ 56 and A/Equine-2/Richelieu/63. Therefore we can assume that these ferrets were secondarily infected with another hemagglutinating agent. Work is underway to identify this agent. It is reported that low concentration of virus has been isolated from the turbinates of ferrets inoculated with the influenza virus strain A/PR8/34 up to 14 days after intranasal inoculation. However, these authors did not mention identification of the isolated viruses (12).

The two ferrets inoculated with the Myxovirus parainfluenzae Yucaipa/1959 did not excrete virus 48 and 96 hours after injection nor produce antibodies against that strain (Table III).

## DISCUSSION

The data obtained in this study indicate that infection of ferrets and of non-human primates with egg-adapted strains of influenza viruses isolated from different animal species can be easily accomplished. Al-

TABLE 1	III.	<b>Response of Ferrets and</b>	Monkeys to	Various	Strains	of	Myxoviruses	Inoculated
Intranasa	lly		-				•	

			Virus Isolation from Nasal Washings log <sub>10</sub> EID <sub>50</sub> /ml		HI Antibodies Days after Infection	
Virus Strains	log <sub>10</sub> EID <sub>50</sub> /ml	No.	48 hours	96 hours	0	14
Monkeys A/Equi-1/Prague/56 (M.A.) <sup>a</sup>	6.6	15 16	3.1 1.8	0.9 0.8	0 0	240 <sup>b</sup> 2560
A/Equi-2/Richelieu/63 (M.A.)	6.8	17 18	$\begin{array}{c} 2.4 \\ 1.0 \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} 1.0\\ 1.7\end{array}$	0 0	160 480
Ferrets A/Equi-1/Prague/56 (M.A.)	6.6	9 10	$\begin{array}{c} 4.2\\ 4.0\end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} 2.7\\ 1.3\end{array}$	0 0	320 640
A/Equi-2/Richelieu/63 (M.A.)	6.8	7 8	$5.0\\4.3$	2.3 3.3	0 0	320 320
Parainfluenza/Yucaipa /59	9.1	11 12	0.0 0.0	$\begin{array}{c} 0.0\\ 0.0\end{array}$	0 0	0 0
A2/Hong Kong/1/68	9.8	13 14	$\begin{array}{c} 4.3\\ 3.0\end{array}$	$4.5 \\ 5.2$	$\begin{array}{c} 30\\ 40 \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} 240\\ 240\end{array}$

 $^{a}(M,A) = Mouse-adapted.$ 

<sup>b</sup>Reciprocal of serum dilution.

					Viruses					
			A/Equi-1/	Parainfluenza Yucaipa/59		A <sub>2</sub> /Aichi /68				
Antisera	Anima No.	1	Pre- infe	Post- ction	Pre- infe	Post- ction	Pre- infe	Post- ction	Pre- infe	Post- ction
A/Equi-1/Pra-	Moņkey	15	0	240 <sup>ь</sup>	0	0	0	0	0	0
gue/56 (M.A. <sup>a</sup> )		16	0	2560	0	0	0	0	0	0
A/Equi-2/Rich.	,,	17	0	0	0	$\begin{array}{c} 160 \\ 480 \end{array}$	0	0	0	0
/63 (M.A.)	,,	18	0	0	0		0	0	0	0
A/Equi-1/Pra- gue/56 (M.A.)	Ferret	9 10	0 0	320 640	0 0	$\begin{array}{c} 0 \\ 0 \end{array}$	0 0	0 0	40 40	60 80
A/Equi-2/Rich.	, <b>,</b>	7	0	0	0	320	0	0	40	80
/63 (M.A.)		8	0	0	0	320	0	0	60	80
Parainfluenza/	,,	11	0	0	10	$\begin{array}{c} 10\\ 0 \end{array}$	0	0	60	80
Yucaipa/59	,,	12	0	0	10		0	0	80	40
A2/Hong Kong	,,	13	0	0	0	$\begin{array}{c} 10\\ 0\end{array}$	0	0	30	240
/69	,,	14	0	0	0		0	0	40	240

TABLE IV. Cross Inhibition-Hemagglutination Test with Convalescent Sera vs Stock Viruses

(M.A.) = Mouse adapted

<sup>b</sup>Reciprocal of serum dilution

	TABLE V.	Cross Inhibition-Hemagglutination	Test with Virus	Isolates vs Standard Antisera
--	----------	-----------------------------------	-----------------	-------------------------------

Virus			Standard Antisera							
Isolates from Animals Inoculated with	Animal No.		A2/Aichi/68	A2/Montreal /68	A/Equi-1/ Prague/56	A/Equi-2/ Richelieu/63				
A/Equi-1/Prague/56	Monkey	15	0	0	480 <sup>⊾</sup>	0				
(M.A.) <sup>a</sup>		16	0	0	960	0				
A/Equi-2/Richelieu/63	,,	17	15	0	0	960				
(M.A.)	,,	18	15	0	0	960				
A/Equi-1/Prague/56	Ferret	9	0	0	1280	0				
(M.A.)		10	0	0	960	0				
A/Equi-2/Richelieu/63	,,	7	5	0	0	$\begin{array}{c} 1280\\ 480 \end{array}$				
(M.A.)	,,	8	15	0	0					
A2/Hong Kong/69	,,	13	960	0	0	5				
	,,	14	960	0	0	10				

(M.A.) = Mouse-adapted

<sup>b</sup>Reciprocal of serum dilution

though signs of infection in monkeys exposed to virus were essentially subclinical in nature, it appeared that these animals were nevertheless infected. Antibody production and/or virus replication have been obtained in each group of monkeys. Mouseadapted strains of equine viruses appear to stimulate a higher production of circulating HI antibodies than the egg-adapted strains, although local virus replication was similar in both cases. As reported earlier (24), the susceptibility of monkeys to a mouseadapted human influenza strain can be increased by subjecting the animals to experimentally altered conditions such as diet, cold or route of inoculation. Successful natural transmission to cage mates was recently reported (13). This indicates that a non-human primate may act either as a vector or as a host for human influenza viruses. Cage mate transmission and experimentally altered conditions were not undertaken in our study and it would be interesting to see if avian and equine influenza infections could be transmitted by similar techniques.

The results obtained in ferrets show that these animals are more susceptible than monkeys, except for the avian paramyxovirus strain Yucaipa/59. With this strain. no virus replication or antibody production occurred. All the other ferrets showed some signs of a mild clinical infection, except those ferrets inoculated with the mouse-adapted A/Equine-1/Prague strain which developed a severe illness on day 7. The nature of this particular event is under investigation. Most investigators have found that it is not unusual to find circuulating HI antibodies against human strains in normal ferrets and it is also interesting to note the relative susceptibility of ferrets to egg-adapted influenza viruses.

From the results reported in this paper and from those reported by other investigators, one can observe that the host barrier of influenza viruses can be readily overcome under experimental conditions and there is no reason why this could not happen naturally. These findings support the reported serological evidence that strains found in animals may have been responsible for human influenza in the past. They also suggest, along with other reported data, that human influenza viruses could be the origin of some animal influenzas.

#### **ACKNOWLEDGMENTS**

The authors are indebted to Miss S. Bélair for technical assistance.

#### REFERENCES

- REFERENCES
   ANDREWES, C. H., P. P. LAIDLAW and W. SMITH. Influenza: observation on the recovery of virus from man and on the antibody. Br. J. exp. Path. 16: 566-582. 1935.
   BLASKOVIC, D., B. KAPITANCIK, A. SABO, B. STYK, O. VRTIAK and M. KAPLAN. Experimental infection of horses with A-Equi 2/Miami/1/68 and human A2/Hong Kong/1/68 influenza viruses. I. The course of infection and virus recovery. Acta virol., Prague 13: 499-506. 1969.
   BOUDREAULT, A., P. MAROIS, E. DI FRANCO and V. PAVILANIS. Response of some experimental animals to selected strains of human and animal influenza viruses. Can. J. publ. Hith 61: 74. 1970. (Abstract of paper, 37th Annual Meeting, Lab. Sec-tion, Can. Public Health Ass. 1969).
   CHURCHILL, A. E. The isolation of parainfluenza 3 virus from fatal cases of pneumonia in Erythroce-bus Patas monkeys. Br. J. exp. Path. 44: 529-539. 1963.
   COLEMAN M. T. W. B. DOWDLE H. C. DEDEL
- COLEMAN, M. T., W. R. DOWDLE, H. G. PEREI-RA, G. C. SCHILD and W. K. CHANG. The Hong Kong/68 influenza A<sub>2</sub> variant. Lancet 2: 1384-1386. 1968
- 1968.
   Comité d'Experts des Maladies à Virus des Voies Respiratoires. O.M.S. Sér. Rapp. Tech., n° 170. 1959.
   COMPAGNUCCI, M., F. MARTONE and A. BONA-DUCE. Influenza del Cavallo da Myxovirus influen-zae typo B, Nota 1 Caratteristiche dei ceppi isolati. Boll. Ist. sieroter. milan. 48: 4, 305-316. 1969.
   DAVENPORT, F. M. and A. V. HENNESSY. A serologic recapitulation of past experiences with influenza A: antibody response to monovalent vac-cine. J. exp. Med. 104: 85-97. 1956.

- DINTER, Z. S., S. HERMODSON and L. HERMOD-SON. Studies on Myxovirus Yucaipa: its classification as a member of the paramyxovirus group. Virology 22: 297-304. 1964.
   DRESCHER, J. and D. WEIDAUER. Antigenic analysis of the hemagglutinating subunits of the influenza virus strains A/Equine 2/Mifod/2/63, A/Equine 2/Miami/63 and A/Duck/England/62. J. Immun. 102: 1050-1057. 1969.
   FRANCIS, Jr. T. and R. E. SHOPE. Neutralization tests with sera of convalescent or immunized animals and the viruses of swine and human influenza. J. exp. Med. 63: 645-653. 1936.
   HAFF, R. H., P. W. SCHRIVER, C. G. ENGLE and R. C. STEWART. Pathogenesis of influenza in ferrets. I. Tissue and blood manifestations of disease. J. Immun. 96: 659-667. 1966.
   KALTER, S. S., R. L. HEBERLING, T. E. VICE, F. S. LIEF and A. R. RODRIGUEZ. Influenza A2/Hong Kong/68 in the baboon (Papio sp.) Proc. Soc. exp. Biol. Med. 132: 337-361. 1969.
   KASEL, J. A., R. H. ALFORD, V. KNIGHT, G. H. WADDELL and M. M. SIEGEL. Experimental infection of human volunteers with equine influenza virus. Nature, Lond. 206: 41-43. 1965.
   KASEL, J. A., R. V. FULK and R. B. COUCH. Antigenic relationship between the equine and Hong Kong human variant of influenza type 2 virus. J. Immun. 102: 530-532. 1969.
   KASEL, J. A. and R. B. COUCH. Experimental infection in man and horses with influenza A viruses. Bull. Wid Hith Org. 41: 447-452. 1969.
   KASEL, J. A. and R. B. COUCH. Experimental infection in turkeys. II. A hichly pathogenic variant, A/Turkey/Ontario 7732/66. Can. vet. J. 9: 151-160. 1968.
   MAROIS, P. Les virus de l'influenza de l'homme et du "Hog-Flu". L'Union Médicale du Canada 76: 1-4. 1947.
   MAROIS, P. Les virus de l'influenza de l'homme et du "Hog-Flu". L'Union Médicale du Canada 76: 1-4. 1947.
- du "Hog-1-4. 1947.
- MAROIS, P., V. PAVILANIS, A. BOUDREAULT and E. DI FRANCO. An outbreak of type A<sub>2</sub> influ-enza among horses. Can. J. comp. Med. 27: 257-260. 19. MAROIS. 1963
- MASUREL, M. and J. MULDER. Studies on the content of antibodies for equine influenza viruses in human sera. Bull. Wld Hlth Org. 34: 885-893. 1966
- MCQUEEN, J. L., N. S. KAYE, M. T. COLEMAN and W. R. DOWDLE. Immunology of equine influ-enza. J. Am. vet. med. Ass. 155: 265-271. 1969.
   MINUSE, E., J. L. MCQUEEN, F. M. DAVEN-PORT and T. FRANCIS, Jr. Studies of antibodies to 1956 and 1963 equine influenza viruses in horses and man. J. Immun. 94: 563-566. 1965.
   PEREIRA, H. G., B. TUMOVA and V. G. LAW. Avian influenza A viruses. Bull. Wild Hilth Org. 32: 855-860. 1965.
   SASLAW, S., H. E. WILSON, C. A. DOAN, O. O. WOOLPERT and J. L. SCHWAB. Reactions of
- 855-860. 1965.
  24. SASLAW, S., H. E. WILSON, C. A. DOAN, O. O. WOOLPERT and J. L. SCHWAB. Reactions of monkeys to experimentally induced influenza virus A infection. J. exp. Med. 84: 113-125. 1946.
  25. SCHLD, G. C. and G. H. STUART-HARRIS. Serological epidemiological studies with influenza A viruses. J. Hyg., Camb. 63: 479-490. 1965.
  26. SHOPE, R. E. Immunological relationship between the swine and human influenza virus in swine. J. exp. Med. 66: 151-168. 1937.
  27. SHOPE, R. E. Surgical avidence for the surger of the surger o

- SHOPE, R. E. Serological evidence for the occur-rence of infection with human influenza virus in swine. J. exp. Med. 67: 739-748. 1938.
   SHOPE, R. E. Influenza history, epidemiology and speculation. Publ. Hith Rep., Wash. 73: 163-178. 1958.
- SOVINOVA, O., B. TUMOVA, F. POUTSKA and J. NEMA. Isolation of a virus causing respiratory disease in horses. Acta virol., Prague 2: 52-61. 1958. 29. SOVINOVA,
- 30. TODD, J. D. and D. COHEN. Studies of influenza in dogs. I. Susceptibility of dogs to natural and ex-perimental infection with human A<sub>2</sub> and B strains of influenza virus. Am. J. Epidem. 87: 426-439. 1968.
- 31. TUMOVA, B., E. SVANDOVA and G. STUMPA. Findings of antibodies to animal influenza viruses in human sera and their significance for the study of interviral antigenic relationship. J. Hyg. Epidem. Praha. 12: 284-295. 1968.
- 32. VOTH, D. W. and N. A. FELDMAN. Aqueous repository and placebo influenza vaccines in elderly pository and placebo influenza vaccines in elderly population. Am. J. publ. Hith 53: 1512. 1963. (Com-munication, 91st Annual Meeting Amer. Public Health Ass., Nov. 11-15. 1963).
- WADDELL, G. H., M. B. TEIGLAND and M. M. SIEGEL. A new influenza virus associated with equine respiratory disease. J. Am. vet. med. Ass. 143: 587-590. 1963.