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TABLE 2: Results of the different testing methods for the three farms and number of goats removed from the farms
for each testing year

|  | Farm 1 |  |  |  | Farm 2 |  |  |  | Farm 3 |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Year | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 |
| Goats tested (N) | 229 | 366 | 402 | 453 | 340 | 383 | 365 | 340 | 298 | 247 | 203 | 212 |
| Evaluable faecal samples(N) | 209 | 362 | 402 | 446 | 318 | 350 | 309 | 213 | 297 | 246 | 203 | 209 |
| Faecal culture positiv goats (N) | 40 | 22 | 12 | 9 | 84 | 24 | 13 | 19 | 27 | 19 | 15 | 14 |
| ELISA positive (N) (thereof also faecal culture positive) | 35 (21) | - | - | - | $\begin{array}{\|l} \hline 118 \\ (63) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Apparent seroprevalence | 15.3\% | - | - | - | 32.7\% | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Apparent prevalence on faecal culture basis ( $95 \% \mathrm{CI}$ ) | $\begin{array}{\|l} \hline 19.1 \% \\ {[13.8-} \\ 24.4] \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 6.0 \% \\ & {[3.6-} \\ & 8.4] \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 3.0 \% \\ & {[1.3-} \\ & 4.7] \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 2.0 \% \\ & {[0.7-} \\ & 3.3] \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 26.4 \% \\ & {[21.5-} \\ & 31.3] \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l} \hline 6.9 \% \\ {[4.2-} \\ 9.6] \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 4.2 \% \\ & {[2.0-} \\ & 6.4] \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 8.9 \% \\ & {[5.1-} \\ & 12.7] \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l} \hline 9.1 \% \\ {[5.8-} \\ 12.4] \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 7.7 \% \\ & {[4.4-} \\ & 11.0] \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 7.4 \% \\ & {[3.8-} \\ & 11.0] \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 6.7 \% \\ & {[3.3-} \\ & 10.1] \end{aligned}$ |
| Combined prevalence from culture and ELISA | 23.6\% | - | - | - | 40.9\% | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Number of goats removed from farm due to MAP (and proportion (of goats tested) [of goats removed]) | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline 52 \\ (22.7 \%) \\ {[60.5 \%]} \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline 22 \\ (6.0 \%) \\ {[35.5 \%]} \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline 11 \\ (2.7 \%) \\ {[15.1 \%]} \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline \text { no } \\ \text { data } \end{array}$ | 134 <br> (39.4\%) <br> [77.9\%] | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline 18 \\ (4.7 \%) \\ {[35.3 \%]} \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline 13 \\ (3.6 \%) \\ {[16.5 \%]} \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline \text { no } \\ \text { data } \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 27 \\ & (9.1 \%) \\ & {[30.3 \%]} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline 19 \\ (7.7 \%) \\ {[34.5 \%]} \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline 13 \\ (6.4 \%) \\ {[28.3 \%]} \end{array}$ | no data |
| Number of goats removed from farm due to other reasons (and proportion (of goats tested) [of goats removed]) | 34 <br> (14.8\%) <br> [39.5\%] | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline 40 \\ (10.9 \%) \\ {[64.5 \%]} \end{array}$ | 62 <br> (15.4\%) <br> [84.9\%] | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline \text { no } \\ \text { data } \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline 38 \\ (11.2 \%) \\ {[22.1 \%]} \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline 33 \\ (8.6 \%) \\ {[64.7 \%]} \end{array}$ | 66 <br> (18.1\%) <br> [83.5\%] | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \text { no } \\ \text { data } \end{array}$ | 62 <br> (20.8\%) <br> [69.7\%] | 36 (14.6\%) [65.5\%] | 33 <br> (16.3\%) <br> [71.7\%] | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \text { no } \\ \text { data } \end{array}$ |

