Biomarkers for Detecting Resilience against Mycobacterial Disease in Animals

Kathryn Wright,^a Karren Plain,^a Auriol Purdie,^a Bernadette M. Saunders,^b Kumudika de Silva^a

^aSydney School of Veterinary Science, Faculty of Science, The University of Sydney, Sydney, Australia

^bSchool of Life Science, Faculty of Science, University of Technology Sydney, Sydney, Australia

ABSTRACT Paratuberculosis and bovine tuberculosis are two mycobacterial diseases of ruminants which have a considerable impact on livestock health, welfare, and production. These are chronic “iceberg” diseases which take years to manifest and in which many subclinical cases remain undetected. Suggested biomarkers to detect infected or diseased animals are numerous and include cytokines, peptides, and expression of specific genes; however, these do not provide a strong correlation to disease. Despite these advances, disease detection still relies heavily on dated methods such as detection of pathogen shedding, skin tests, or serology. Here we review the evidence for suitable biomarkers and their mechanisms of action, with a focus on identifying animals that are resilient to disease. A better understanding of these factors will help establish new strategies to control the spread of these diseases.

KEYWORDS paratuberculosis, tuberculosis, biomarker, microRNA, resilience, immune markers

Resilience, in the context of health, can be defined as the capacity to overcome or recover from physiological challenges, be they infectious or otherwise. The health of an individual can start to deteriorate upon infection and progress further into ill health as the pathogen load increases. Pathology contributing to ill health can also be caused by the immune responses to eliminate the pathogen. Resilient individuals are able to reduce the pathogen load without exacerbating pathology and eventually recover (1).

A further complexity in the context of resilience to mycobacterial infections is pathogen survival strategies that enable them to remain dormant in the host and cause latent disease. In reality, it is difficult to definitively establish whether an individual is resistant or tolerant to a mycobacterial infection, in that the infection either does not establish or disease does not progress, or whether the individual has recovered from the disease. Sheep and cattle do recover from intestinal mycobacterial infection (paratuberculosis) (2, 3), and some are resistant to infection (4, 5). Resilience can thus be more broadly defined as the animal's ability to remain productive in the face of an endemic disease challenge, such as a mycobacterial infection. The ability to identify animals that have the potential to withstand disease progression in this setting is highly beneficial.

Paratuberculosis, a widespread mycobacterial infection of animals, is caused by *Mycobacterium avium* subsp. *paratuberculosis*, a nontuberculous mycobacterium (NTM) which preferentially infects ruminants. *M. avium* subsp. *paratuberculosis* has been detected in food sources such as milk (6, 7), and the pathogen has been found in humans with immunosuppressive conditions such as Crohn's disease (8–10). While there is no proven causative association between *M. avium* subsp. *paratuberculosis* and Crohn's disease, it is clear that urgent research attention is required to find new ways

Citation Wright K, Plain K, Purdie A, Saunders BM, de Silva K. 2020. Biomarkers for detecting resilience against mycobacterial disease in animals. *Infect Immun* 88:e00401-19. <https://doi.org/10.1128/IAI.00401-19>.

Editor Anthony T. Maurelli, University of Florida

Copyright © 2019 American Society for Microbiology. All Rights Reserved.

Address correspondence to Kumudika de Silva, kumi.desilva@sydney.edu.au.

Accepted manuscript posted online 16 September 2019

Published 17 December 2019

to halt global spread of the disease in the animal population in order to prevent *M. avium* subsp. *paratuberculosis* from entering the food chain and to reduce human exposure to this pathogen (11, 12). Current diagnostic tests, including detection of the mycobacteria in feces or the presence of serum antibodies to *M. avium* subsp. *paratuberculosis*, are inadequate for definitive diagnosis, due to the intermittent nature of *M. avium* subsp. *paratuberculosis* fecal shedding and the low sensitivity of serological tests during early, subclinical infection.

Bovine tuberculosis (bTB) caused by *Mycobacterium bovis* is an important zoonotic mycobacterial infection of ruminants, with significant impact on agricultural production globally; Australia is the only major livestock-exporting country to have eradicated bTB (13). The serious zoonotic potential and public health risk of bTB make the swift identification and control of this pathogen in animal hosts and wildlife populations a key focus across human and veterinary research programs (14, 15). Issues with interference in diagnosis due to coinfection and cross-reactivity with paratuberculosis, the generally low sensitivity of currently available tests, and the spread and maintenance of *M. bovis* in wildlife reservoirs have made eradication of bTB a difficult task (16). A final confounding factor in the diagnosis and treatment of veterinary mycobacterial infections is the presence of NTM. These bacteria include the *M. avium* complex (MAC) and the *Mycobacterium terrae* complex, which survive in environmental niches (17). NTM leading to general and chronic mycobacterioses have also been identified in fisheries, highlighting the widespread nature and the variety of mycobacterial species present in a range of environments (18). While mainly innocuous to livestock, simultaneous infection with NTM and either *M. avium* subsp. *paratuberculosis* or *M. bovis* creates further difficulty in the accurate diagnosis and delineation of disease, due to similarities between the antigens and cross-reactive host immune responses (19–21). In this situation, disease-specific biomarkers may provide an alternative to current diagnostic techniques such as the tuberculin test or serological tests.

Paratuberculosis and bTB have recently been ranked as the second most significant infectious veterinary diseases in food-producing animals and zoonoses, respectively (22). It is therefore evident that mycobacterial disease detection and management within animal populations must be improved, and while resilient animals may play a key role in reducing mycobacterial diseases, the accurate identification of such individuals is paramount to future efforts. New ways of distinguishing animals that are resilient, or susceptible, to disease will provide new strategies for managing the spread of disease. This has led us to consider the literature on other biological markers that could be useful in the diagnosis and control of these diseases.

Biomarkers of disease are objectively measurable indicators of normal and/or disease conditions, which must be highly specific and sensitive to accurately denote disease (23). As a diagnostic tool, biomarkers not only indicate the presence of disease but also may differentiate between disease states, treatment efficacy, and outcomes. In order for a biomarker to be considered acceptable and reliable, it must be both sensitive and specific for the appropriate disease or disease state (24). Ideally, biomarkers should also be from samples which are collected easily by minimally invasive methods and use measurement technologies that are readily available in diagnostic laboratories (25). The possibility of prognostic biomarkers to demonstrate the likelihood of, and resilience to, disease has promising applications to aid in the management and control of paratuberculosis and possibly that of bTB.

The chronicity of mycobacterial diseases and the spectrum of disease outcomes make it necessary to definitively characterize the disease “phenotype” being detected by any biomarker test. For example, using an experimental infection model for paratuberculosis in the natural host, we have shown that even resilient animals can shed *M. avium* subsp. *paratuberculosis* in feces for a limited time when young (4). To this end, we have recently published a guide to characterizing the spectrum of disease outcomes in ovine paratuberculosis (26) which will be useful for researchers interested in discovering biomarkers to identify specific disease outcomes. An additional benefit of characterizing protective immunity using biomarkers is that it can also be used to guide

FIG 1 Immunological markers predictive or associated with stages of mycobacterial infection. Following exposure to mycobacterial pathogens, hosts either may have a successful immune response to eliminate the bacteria before an infection is established or may progress along the spectrum of disease. When the pathogen remains in the host system and is able to persist, the infection remains latent/subclinical. At this stage in latent bTB, the IFN- γ and proinflammatory response is also elevated and coupled with a decrease in anti-inflammatory IL-10. In paratuberculosis, during the subclinical infection stage, there is an increase in a number of proinflammatory cytokines. From here, the animal may successfully control the infection and eliminate the bacteria (termed resilience) or progress to clinical disease. An early, elevated IFN- γ and antibody response is observed in infected sheep that progress down a pathway of resilience to disease. During clinical disease, the response is primarily anti-inflammatory, with a decrease in key proinflammatory cytokines. A similar response is observed in active bTB, where the immune response favors anti-inflammatory cytokines such as IL-10 and transforming growth factor β (TGF- β). Elevated IP-10 levels may be predictive of animals that will develop active bTB.

better vaccine design. Regardless of the vaccine formulation, ultimately the ability to mimic processes that overcome natural infection will provide effective protection against disease.

A range of novel biomarkers has been suggested for mycobacterial diseases, ranging from host immune proteins and molecules, including cytokines (summarized in Fig. 1), as well as differentially expressed microRNAs (miRNAs) and genes. Current biomarkers for paratuberculosis are primarily related to the identification and diagnosis of disease; however, as TB-associated biomarkers have demonstrated the ability to discriminate between active and latent disease while also functioning as prognostic markers (27–30), there is potential for paratuberculosis- and bTB-specific biomarkers to detect “silent,” subclinical infections and to identify disease-resilient animals.

IMMUNOLOGICAL BIOMARKERS

Antibodies. Although the role of the humoral immune response in host immunity to intracellular mycobacterial pathogens is not fully understood, it is recognized that specific antibodies are detectable in the serum and may be important in protective immunity (31–33). Serum and milk antibody enzyme-linked immunosorbent assays (ELISAs) are common diagnostic tests for paratuberculosis, although less commonly applied in bTB. Current commercial test methods for paratuberculosis have their highest diagnostic sensitivity in the later stages of disease, when animals are infectious, with low sensitivity to detect early disease (34). However, in an experimental challenge model in sheep, animals that were classified as resilient to disease as lambs had a stronger antibody response than those in which disease progressed (4). This offers potential new applications for serological tests to be used during subclinical disease stages to identify resilient animals.

The isotype of antibody detected, as well as the antigenic target, can impact serological test efficacy. A range of antigens have been tested in an attempt to improve early disease detection in both paratuberculosis and bTB (35–37). Immunoglobulin G (IgG) antibodies are the most common isotype used for mycobacterial antibody ELISAs; however, targeting different isotypes may be more informative. A recent study has shown that circulating *M. bovis* antigen in association with IgM was present in the serum during the early stages of infection (38). IgA, the main isotype present in mucosal secretions, has also shown potential for identifying resilience, being associated with protective responses in TB (39). An investigation into *M. avium* subsp. *paratuberculosis*-specific fecal IgA immunoglobulins has found that these antibodies can be detected during paratuberculosis disease progression, but this is transient and appears to be related to environmental *M. avium* subsp. *paratuberculosis* load (40).

While not as well understood as cell-mediated responses to mycobacterial infections, antibodies are clearly indicative of exposure to pathogens and disease states and may yet play a key role in defining phenotypes and resilience to mycobacteria.

Cytokines and chemokines. One of the key immunologic responses characteristic of mycobacterial infection is the elevation in gamma interferon (IFN- γ) secretion; however, the application of IFN- γ as a diagnostic cytokine is limited, as it is an indicator of exposure rather than disease *per se* (4, 41). There is potential for this cytokine as a biomarker of resilience in sheep, as these animals have a higher early IFN- γ response when young (4, 42). A range of other cytokines and chemokines have been reported as differentially regulated between infected and uninfected populations (summarized in Table 1), as well as between active and latent TB states, and these are likely applicable to other mycobacterial infections. These potential biomarkers warrant further investigation, although there is a lack of consistency across studies as to the degree and nature of cytokine expression, possibly due to differences in cell type assessed, stimulating antigen, and experimental techniques used. Activated T cell and related cytokines, including, but not limited to, interleukin 2 (IL-2), IL-3, IL-6, IL-7, IL-8, IL-9, and IL-10, have been reported to differ significantly even within infected and healthy control groups in studies of human mycobacterial infections (43–48). It is evident that further investigation, especially regarding pathogen-specific responses, is required to determine if cytokine profiles can accurately detect and differentiate between disease states.

Variations in cytokine signatures in active versus latent mycobacterial disease have also been demonstrated, with cytokines such as tumor necrosis factor alpha (TNF- α), IL-12, and IL-17 reported to be more abundantly expressed during active tuberculosis infections than during latent infection (49). More recent investigations into cytokines as biomarkers and discriminators of active versus latent infection have suggested that combinations or ratios of multiple cytokines are more efficient at categorizing disease than a single biomarker. One such combination with promising diagnostic potential is IL-2 and IL-10, not only detecting disease in TB patients but also distinguishing between active and latent infection (48). With IL-2 ligation activating JAK-STAT signaling and regulating T cell responses, and IL-10 acting as a key immunosuppressive

TABLE 1 Cytokine and chemokine responses to mycobacterial infections based on transcriptomic and proteomic data^a

Species	Hosts	Sample(s)	Immunological marker(s)	Reference(s)
<i>M. avium</i> subsp. <i>paratuberculosis</i>	Sheep, cattle, goats, camelids, deer	Bovine/ovine intestinal tissue	↑ : TRAF-1, IL-8, IFN- γ , TNF- α , IL-10, IL-12, TGF- β , IL-1 α , IL-1 β , IL-6 ↓ : IL-18	53, 150
		Bovine plasma + MDMs	↑ : IFN- γ , osteopontin ↓ : IL-4 ↑ ↓ : IL-17	55
		THP-1 cell line	↑ : TNF- α , IL-1 β , IL-10	151
		Bovine PBMCs + intestinal tissue + lymph node	↑ : IFN- γ , IL-1 α , IL-1 β , IL-5, IL-6, IL-8, IL-2, IL-10, IL-4, IL-2R ↓ : IL-16, IL-18 ↑ ↓ : TGF- β	54, 152
		Murine spleen/liver/ileum	↑ : IFN- γ , TNF- α , IL-4	153
		Caprine PBMCs	↑ : NOS2, IL-21, C2, C3, IL-34, IL-12A, TLR4, TNF ↓ : IL-17F, IL-9, IL-9R2, IL-36 β , IGF1, IL-18, IL-9, IL-5, IL-13, IL-11, granulysin, IFN- γ	154
		Whole blood (bovine)	↓ : TNF- α , RANTES, MCP-1	65
		Murine spleen/lung + bovine PBMCs	↑ : IFN- γ , IL-22, CXCL9, IL-17a, IP-10, granzyme B, IL-17Re, granzyme A	56
		Multinucleated giant cells	↑ : TNF- α , IL-17A, TGF- β , IL-10, IFN- γ	155
		Bovine PBMCs	↑ : IFN- γ , TNF- α , iNOS, IL-4 ↓ : IL-10	156
<i>M. bovis</i>	Cattle, possums, badgers, buffalo	Bovine lymph node	↑ : IFN- γ , TNF- α , TGF- β , IL-17A ↓ : IL-4, IL-6, IL-10, IL-22	157–159
		Goldfish spleen/kidney + leukocytes	↑ : ROI, NO, IL-1 β , IFNGR, TNFR ↑ ↓ : SOCS3, TGF- β , IL-10	160
		Murine mast cells + HMC-1	↑ : COX-2, TNF- α , NOD2	161
		Adult zebrafish (homogenized tissue)	↑ : MMP13, TNF- α , IFN- γ , IL-1 β	162
		Human M ϕ culture supernatant	↑ : IL-12p40, IL-6, TNF- α ↓ : IL-1 β	163
<i>M. marinum</i>	Fish, frogs, humans (NTM)	Kidney M ϕ (goldfish)	↑ : NRAMP, IL-10, TGF- β 1, SOCS3, TNF- α , IL-1 β 1, IFN- γ , CXCL8, IFN- γ rel, IDO, CCL1 ↓ : ROI	164
		Human PBMCs	↑ : IL-17 ↓ : IL-12p70	165
		Human PBMCs + alveolar M ϕ	↑ : IL-10, IL-17, TNF- α , IFN- γ ↓ : IFN- γ , IL-12, IL-12p70	165, 166
<i>M. leprae</i>	Humans, armadillos, primates	Human PBMCs	↑ : IL-4, IL-6, IL-8, TNF- α , TGF- β	167
		Human Schwann cells	↑ : TLR2, TLR4, MyD88, Irak4, IL-18, CCL2, CCL7, CCL9, CSF-1, Mif, CXCL1 ↓ : TLR1, TLR6	168
<i>M. smegmatis</i>	Soil; rarely found in animals or humans	RAW 264.7 cell line	↑ : TNF- α , IL-6, MCP-1	169
		Human PB M ϕ	↑ : IL-1, IL-6, TNF- α , GM-CSF	170

^aMDMs, marrow-derived macrophages; PBMCs, peripheral blood mononuclear cells; M ϕ , macrophages; CSF-1, colony-stimulating factor 1; GM-CSF, granulocyte-macrophage colony-stimulating factor.

cytokine, the combination of the two could prove to be a major indicator of mycobacterial disease. Multiple studies have also proposed the combination of IL-2 and IFN- γ and their respective levels as a diagnostic marker of latent TB infection (48, 50). *Ex vivo* studies of TB have also yielded possible combinations of predictive biomarkers and cytokines that act as correlates of treatment success. First, increased expression of IL-4 and its antagonist IL-4 δ 2 during treatment, and subsequent changes of the ratio between the two, have been reported to be indicative of disease outcome, with lower IL-4 and IL-4 δ 2 linked with better treatment outcomes (51). Similarly, the ratio of IFN- γ and IL-10 may also be indicative of treatment success in TB patients. IFN- γ characteristically increases during infection and IL-10 decreases, in keeping with the need for strong T cell responses to control an intracellular pathogen. Low ratios of IFN- γ and IL-10 were observed in early infection and subsequently improved during and after treatment, indicating that this may correlate with treatment efficacy (52).

FIG 2 Host biomarker responses to mycobacterial infection. Potential biomarkers for mycobacterial infection play many different roles in the host response. Some commonly measured biomarkers and the likelihood of either a successful host response or successful modulation of the response by the pathogen are shown here. Vitamin D is a key antimicrobial agent involved in mycobacterial infections. Host upregulation of the vitamin D receptor (VDR) and the subsequent binding of vitamin D (D25/calcitriol) trigger nuclear translocation and specific cellular responses. A resulting increase in genes such as *Defb1/10* and the production of antimicrobial defensins reduce bacterial burden and facilitate mycobacterial killing. An opposing response favoring mycobacterial persistence is associated with an increase in IL-10 and a subsequent upregulation of STAT3 transcription. Acting through MARCH1, STAT3 is able to reduce MHC class II (MHC-II) expression and therefore reduces further antigen presentation. Concurrently, increased levels of STAT3 block the release of chemoattractant signals from IL-12 to prevent an influx of immune cells.

Cytokine profiles during *M. avium* subsp. *paratuberculosis* infection in both sheep and cattle also provide possible biomarker targets. These include cytokines such as IL-10, IL-12p40, and IL-3, as they are often associated with different disease pathologies in paratuberculosis (53) (Fig. 2). IL-18 and similar Th₂-related cytokines are symptomatic of specific pathological lesion types in bovine *M. avium* subsp. *paratuberculosis* infections (54), while an increase in IFN- γ , osteopontin, and IL-17 may suggest a shift towards a Th₁₇ response in *M. avium* subsp. *paratuberculosis* infections (55). A similar range of T cell cytokines and chemokines, including IP-10, IL-22, and IL-17A, has been suggested for bTB; however, as with paratuberculosis and TB, there is no widely accepted or employable signature (56–58). Originally called CXCL10, IP-10 was first described for its chemoattractant properties and role in the recruitment of T cells to sites of inflammation, but it has been identified as a possible biomarker of infection in TB and bTB with the potential to differentiate between latent and active disease (59, 60). IP-10 is currently one of the most promising chemokine biomarker candidates for bTB, with evidence of a specific response to *M. bovis* which correlated strongly to the production of IFN- γ , further suggesting that the combination of cytokine and chemokine biomarkers may be more applicable than single-marker measurement (60). As IP-10 has also been shown to distinguish between culture-positive and culture-negative *M. bovis* samples, this biomarker can potentially provide a rapid alternative to traditional culture diagnostics for bTB (61).

Studies profiling the chemokine immune responses in pathological presentations of paratuberculosis and bTB have often found contrasting results and patterns of expression and could have been influenced by differences in experimental design, including *in vitro* or *in vivo* conditions of the study (53, 56, 62–64). Suggested cytokine and chemokine biomarkers for each stage of disease and pathologies are summarized in Fig. 1. Due to the granulomatous nature of mycobacteria, chemokine recruitment of leukocytes may be a host response to contain the invading bacteria, and the restriction of this process by mycobacteria may act to subvert the host immune response and establish a latent infection. Downregulation of key chemokines such as RANTES (CCL5) and monocyte chemoattractant protein 1 (MCP-1 [CCL2]) in paratuberculosis could provide alternative biomarkers for diagnosis alongside IFN- γ assays. To date, there has been no discernible pattern of expression of significant chemokines such as CCL3, CCR, and CXCL11 between disease pathologies of paratuberculosis and bTB, suggesting that the immunological response may be too variable and individual specific to function as accurate and repeatable biomarkers across differing populations (65, 66).

Although these combinations require further validation across animal breeds, sample types, and mycobacterial species, their role as indicators of disease in *M. avium* subsp. *paratuberculosis*- and *M. bovis*-infected animals may prove to be valuable in rapid, reliable, and simple detection of disease with improvements in diagnostic technologies.

Transcriptomic biomarkers. Many studies have investigated gene expression in paratuberculosis and bTB pathogenesis, resulting in a long list of differentially expressed genes for these diseases, and are summarized in Table 2. Key functional pathways such as antigen presentation and major histocompatibility complex (MHC) processing and lipid metabolism are altered during mycobacterial infection (67–71). Genes from these pathways may yet provide key resilience or susceptibility biomarkers in *M. avium* subsp. *paratuberculosis* infection.

Among the differentially regulated genes with potential as diagnostic biomarkers in mycobacterial infections are *Tfrc*, which encodes the transferrin receptor, and *LTF*, which regulates lactoferrin; they are often attributed to the pathogen's metabolism of host iron via the action of mycobactins (72–74). Similarly, *S100a8* and *S100a9* are differentially regulated and have been proposed as biomarkers for comparable inflammatory bowel diseases (73, 74). Together, the *S100a8/9* proteins form the heterodimer calprotectin, a biomarker for inflammation which leads to inflammatory responses and immune cell migration and has been detected in *M. avium* subsp. *paratuberculosis* lesions, suggesting that these genes play a role in disease pathology (75, 76). Haptoglobin, controlled by the *Hp* gene, is an anti-inflammatory agent that not only disrupts neutrophil and phagosomal activity but also disrupts bacterial iron sequestration. This response is thought to be a result of the host's immune system limiting the harmful immunopathology of *M. avium* subsp. *paratuberculosis* infection. The gene for matrix metalloproteinase 9 (*MMP9*) and its inhibitor *TIMP1* are both upregulated during paratuberculosis and TB and are documented as consistently upregulated genes in TB (72, 73, 77). Two β -defensin genes, *Defb1* and *Defb10*, have also recently been shown to be upregulated in *M. avium* subsp. *paratuberculosis*, indicating that their antimicrobial and immunomodulatory roles may be indicative of host responses to bacterial infection (72). Along with this gene subset, Th₁ chemokine genes, such as *CCL4*, *CCL5*, *CXCL9*, and *CXCL10* and genes related to metabolism, including *IGF1* and *TCF7L2*, are up- and down-regulated, respectively, in paratuberculosis (74). A novel biomarker signature has been established from these differentially regulated genes in early *M. avium* subsp. *paratuberculosis* infections. Combinations of these 8 genes (*TIMP1*, *MMP9*, *Hp*, *Tfrc*, *Defb1*, *Defb10*, *S100a8*, and *Serpine1*) have been demonstrated as potential biomarkers of various disease and exposure states of paratuberculosis (72) (Fig. 2). Differences between case definitions and disease classifications between studies do, however, make comparison difficult and support the need for standardized practices (26). Although this is extremely promising for disease detection and as biomarkers for paratuberculosis, further validation in both labo-

TABLE 2 Differentially expressed genes in mycobacterial infections of animals^a

Species	Hosts	Sample(s)	Genes	Reference(s)
<i>M. avium</i> subsp. <i>paratuberculosis</i>	Sheep, cattle, goats, camelids, deer	Whole blood (bovine)	↑: <i>KLRB1</i> , <i>MPO</i> , <i>LTF</i> , <i>SERPINE1</i> , <i>S100A8/9</i> , <i>TFRC</i> , <i>GBP6</i> , <i>PIGR</i> , <i>IL-10</i> , <i>CXCR3</i> , <i>CD14</i> , <i>ELANE</i> , <i>CHI3L1</i> , <i>HP</i> , <i>HGF</i> , <i>MMP9</i> , <i>DEFB1</i> , <i>DEFB10</i> , <i>TIMP1</i> , <i>PIP5K1C</i> , <i>IRF5</i> , <i>IRF7</i> , <i>CORO1A</i> ↓: <i>IL17F</i> , <i>IL17F</i> , <i>IL22</i> , <i>IL26</i> , <i>HMGB1</i> , <i>IRF4</i>	72, 73, 171
		THP-1 cell line	↑: <i>CD14</i> , <i>CD68</i> , <i>S100A8/9</i> , <i>ELANE</i> , <i>LTF</i> , <i>HP</i> , <i>CCL4</i> , <i>CCL5</i> , <i>CXCL9</i> , <i>CXCL10</i> ↓: <i>ELANE</i> , <i>IGF1</i> , <i>TCF7L2</i> , <i>MPO</i>	74
		RAW 264.7 cell line	↑: <i>ABCA1</i> , <i>APOE</i> , <i>LDLR</i> , <i>RFTN1</i> , <i>HMCGR</i> , <i>IL1A</i> , <i>IL1B</i> , <i>IL6</i> , <i>MCPI</i> , <i>TNFA</i> , <i>INOS</i> , <i>LAMP1</i> , <i>P53</i> , <i>TLR4</i> , <i>PLIN2</i> , <i>SREBF1</i> , <i>RAB7</i> ↑ ↓: <i>TFRC</i> , <i>CXCR31</i> , <i>CCNE2</i> , <i>COX62A</i> , <i>GDF15</i> , <i>YPEL3</i> , <i>AQP9</i> , <i>SLC40A1</i> , <i>TMEM154</i> , <i>CD74</i> , <i>AATK</i> , <i>RRAS</i> , <i>GADD45α</i> , <i>YPEL5</i> , <i>HEBP1</i> , <i>ENO2</i> , <i>MACROD1</i> , <i>IRF7</i> , <i>NFKB1</i> , <i>LCN2</i>	172, 173
		Bovine monocytes + WBCs + PBMCs	↑: <i>TGFB</i> , <i>TSP1</i> , <i>BCL2L1</i> , <i>TGF</i> , <i>IL6</i> , <i>MMP12</i> , <i>MT1A/B/E/F/H/I</i> , <i>17A-HYDROXYLASE</i> , <i>CD40L</i> , <i>CRF</i> , <i>CRFR1</i> , <i>EP2</i> , <i>FSG-R</i> , <i>IL1</i> , <i>IL10</i> , <i>IL12</i> , <i>IL2</i> , <i>IL4</i> , <i>IL5</i> , <i>IFNG</i> , <i>MMP1</i> , <i>MMP3</i> , <i>MMP7</i> , <i>MMP9</i> , <i>MMP15</i> , <i>MMP16</i> , <i>MMP19</i> , <i>MMP23</i> , <i>PAI1/2</i> , <i>SCC</i> , <i>SPARC</i> , <i>TGFB</i> , <i>TIMP1</i> , <i>TIMP2</i> , <i>V3</i> ↓: <i>SFK</i> , <i>ADRB</i> , <i>cAMPPK</i> , <i>VTAP</i> , <i>TNFB</i> , <i>DQB</i> , <i>IA6</i> , <i>MAPK2K5</i> , <i>MEK5B</i> , <i>CD38</i> , <i>GIMAP6</i> , <i>SCD-1</i> , <i>24DHCR</i> , <i>LDLR</i>	174–176
<i>M. bovis</i>	Cattle, possums, badgers, buffalo	Lymph nodes + tonsils + spleen (wild boar)	↑: <i>VDR</i> , <i>ANX</i> , <i>LAP</i> , <i>VCAM</i> , <i>CXCR4</i> , <i>MHC-I</i> <i>SLA-31</i> , <i>B2M</i> , <i>MHC-II</i> , <i>SLA-DRA</i> , <i>C3</i> , <i>C7</i> , <i>HSPG96</i> , <i>LYZS</i> , <i>ARG</i> , <i>OPN</i> , <i>CUL</i> , <i>ARP3</i> , <i>MUT</i> , <i>DEFB129</i> , <i>BAP29</i> , <i>CD8A</i> ↑: <i>LGALS1</i> , <i>C1QB</i> , <i>CD74</i> , <i>SLA</i>	177, 178
		Bovine PBMCs + MDMs	↑: <i>PPP2R5B</i> , <i>ZDHHC19</i> , <i>28S</i> , <i>GPR98</i> , <i>PDGFA/B</i> , <i>ECGF1</i> , <i>MHCR1</i> , <i>AXL</i> , <i>CD84</i> , <i>CCL15</i> , <i>NFATC4</i> , <i>TLR2</i> , <i>CD80</i> , <i>NFKB1</i> , <i>IL8</i> , <i>CXCL6</i> , <i>ADORA3</i> ↓: <i>PRKCB1</i> , <i>PRKCA</i> , <i>AKT1/2</i> , <i>EEF2</i> , <i>EEF1G</i> , <i>GATA4</i> , <i>IER5</i> , <i>CSF2</i> , <i>CD14</i> , <i>CCL1</i> , <i>CHUK</i> , <i>NFKB1</i> , <i>TBK1</i> , <i>MIF</i> , <i>CCR7</i> , <i>BOLA</i> , <i>ADAM17</i> , <i>CXCR3</i> , <i>PHB2</i> , <i>STK17B</i> , <i>MCL1</i> , <i>CCL1</i> , <i>IL8</i> , <i>TLR2</i> , <i>TLR4</i> , <i>BCL2</i> , <i>NCOR1</i> , <i>UCP2</i> , <i>UNC84B</i> , <i>GAN</i> , <i>SFPQ</i> , <i>NRM</i> , <i>FGFR1</i>	78, 179
		Whole blood (bovine)	↑: <i>CD83</i> , <i>CTLA4</i> , <i>IL1A</i> , <i>IL8</i> , <i>STAT1</i> , <i>TLR4</i> ↓: <i>CASP1</i> , <i>DEFB10</i> , <i>IFNGR2</i> , <i>IL15</i> , <i>KIR3DS1</i> , <i>MYD88</i> , <i>STAT2</i> , <i>TLR3</i> , <i>TREM1</i> , <i>TYROBP</i>	180
<i>M. marinum</i>	Fish, frogs, humans (NTM)	Muscle wound tissue + homogenized zebrafish	↑: <i>ATF3</i> , <i>BCL3</i> , <i>CEBPB/D</i> , <i>ELF3</i> , <i>IRF1B</i> , <i>IRF3</i> , <i>FOSL2</i> , <i>JUNBA/B</i> , <i>NFKB</i> , <i>IL1B</i> , <i>TNF</i> , <i>CXCL8A/B</i> , <i>MMP9/13A</i> , <i>TIMP2B</i> , <i>C3/7/8/9</i> , <i>IRG1</i> , <i>SAA</i> , <i>STEAP4</i> , <i>HAMP</i> , <i>DRAM1</i> , <i>IRAK1</i> , <i>SOCS3</i> , <i>NCF</i> , <i>NOX</i> , <i>CYB</i> , <i>IL1B</i> , <i>TNFAIP2/3/6</i> ↓: <i>CKMA/B</i> , <i>MYLPFA</i> , <i>MYLZ3</i> , <i>MYL10</i> , <i>ACTA1B</i> , <i>MYOZ1A</i> , <i>MYOM1A</i> , <i>MB</i> , <i>MYBPC2A</i> , <i>MURCA</i> , <i>MYOM2</i> , <i>MYL1</i> , <i>MYOZ3A</i> ↑ ↓: <i>APOA</i> , <i>APOE</i> , <i>APOB</i> , <i>FOSL1A</i> , <i>FOSAB</i>	181, 182
<i>M. hominissuis</i>	Pigs, humans,	Human MDMs	↑: <i>INHBA</i> , <i>CCL1/3/4/5/18/20</i> , <i>ILI</i> , <i>VEGFC</i> , <i>MMP1/3/10</i> , <i>SLAMF1</i> , <i>CCR7</i> , <i>TNFAIP6</i> , <i>TNIP3</i> , <i>IL7R</i> , <i>PROCR</i> , <i>PDGFB</i> , <i>CSF2</i> , <i>TNF</i> , <i>IL8</i> , <i>IL3RA</i> , <i>BMP6</i> , <i>MSC</i> , <i>TM4SF1</i> , <i>TNFRSF9/19</i> , <i>MRC1</i> , <i>LAMB3</i> , <i>CHST2</i> , <i>ETS2</i> , <i>PTGS2</i> , <i>IL10</i> , <i>SOCS3</i> , <i>SERPINB2</i> , <i>SERPINE1</i> , <i>TIMPI</i> , <i>BTG1</i> , <i>SOD2</i> , <i>CD14</i> , <i>PLAUR</i> ↓: <i>STMN1</i> , <i>LTA4H</i> , <i>CD36</i>	142
<i>M. avium</i>	Poultry, humans	U937 cell line	↑: <i>ERBB3</i> , <i>EPHA3</i> , <i>PTPN7</i> , <i>LAT</i> , <i>CSF1</i> , <i>NFKB</i> , <i>JUN</i> , <i>SPI1</i> , <i>ARHGDI</i> , <i>GNB1</i> , <i>GNB2L1</i> , <i>FGF11</i> , <i>ITGA5</i> , <i>ITGAL</i> , <i>ICAM1</i> , <i>IEX1L</i> , <i>CASP10</i> , <i>RPS19</i> , <i>TNFA</i> , <i>RANTES</i> , <i>MIP2</i> , <i>IL1B</i> , <i>IL8</i> , <i>IL2RA/G</i> , <i>TNFRSF1B</i> , <i>CDKN1A</i> , <i>TIMP1</i> , <i>MMP9/11</i> , <i>CAPN4</i> , <i>PI</i> , <i>AZU1</i> , <i>MT1H</i> , <i>DTR</i> ↓: <i>ID2</i> , <i>SPN</i> , <i>BCL2L1</i> , <i>TMSB4X</i> , <i>AP2M1</i> , <i>CTSD</i>	183
<i>M. leprae</i>	Humans, armadillos, primates	FFPE leprosy lesions	↑: <i>NOD2</i> , <i>TNFSF15</i> , <i>RIPK</i> , <i>CCDC122</i> , <i>HLA-DR</i> , <i>C13ORF31</i> , <i>LRRK2</i>	184
		Whole blood (human)	↑: <i>VEGF</i> , <i>GNLY</i> , <i>GZMA/B</i> , <i>PRF1</i> ↓: <i>IGF</i> , <i>KIF1B</i> , <i>LRRK2</i>	185
<i>M. smegmatis</i>	Soil; rarely found in animals or humans	U937 cell line	↑: <i>CDKN1A</i> , <i>ERBB3</i> , <i>BRF1</i> , <i>NSEP1</i> , <i>JUN</i> , <i>GNB1</i> , <i>FGF11</i> , <i>GRN</i> , <i>PGF</i> , <i>NDUFB7</i> , <i>ICAM1</i> , <i>IEX-L1</i> , <i>LIF</i> , <i>RANTES</i> , <i>MIP2</i> , <i>IL1B</i> , <i>TNF</i> , <i>IL8</i> , <i>SPP1</i> , <i>IL2RG</i> , <i>MMP1/9</i> , <i>HSPA1A</i> , <i>FTH1</i> , <i>BTG1</i> ↓: <i>IQGAP1</i> , <i>CRHR1</i>	183

^aWBCs, white blood cells; FFPE, formalin fixed, paraffin embedded.

ratory and on-farm settings must be undertaken before their potential for identifying resilient and susceptible animals is confirmed.

In a similar manner to that in human TB and paratuberculosis, early gene expression in bTB correlates to the immune response and pathology, with an early increase in Th₁

TABLE 3 Dysregulated protein responses to mycobacterial infections of animals^a

Species	Hosts	Sample(s)	Protein/peptide	Reference(s)
<i>M. avium</i> subsp. paratuberculosis	Sheep, cattle, goats, camelids, deer	Bovine serum	↑ : VDBP, thransthyretin, RBP, alpha-2 glycoprotein, SERPINA3, cathelicidin, VDBP precursor, leucine-rich alpha-2-glycoprotein	80
		Bovine plasma	↑ ↓ : Fetuin, serine proteinase inhibitor, alpha-1-B glycoprotein, alpha-1 acid glycoprotein	82
		Camelid serum	↑ : Transferrin, gelsolin α/β , actin binding protein, C1r, C3, AOC3, thrombin ↓ : COAFXIII, FCG ↑ : Hp, serum amyloid A, Fb FbpA/B, FbpC2, PirG, Wag31, MetC, PepA, Csp, ModD, thioredoxin, thiol peroxidase, FadB4, FabG5_2, FabG3_2, AhpC, Hsp7-, Hsp65/K, superoxide dismutase, FixA, pstA, EchA20/8_1, DesA2, MoaA3	186 187
<i>M. bovis</i>	Cattle, possums, badgers, buffalo	Bovine serum	↑ : Alpha-1 antiproteinase, fetuin, VDBP, alpha-1 acid glycoprotein, alpha-2 glycoprotein 1, alpha-1-B glycoprotein, RBP, Pks5 ↓ : SERPINA3	79, 80
		Buffy coat (bovine)	↑ : TLR2/4/9, MHC1, Syngap1, Alox5, Adar, Mpo, tyrosine-protein kinase, Pxx, MHC-II ↓ : C8 α/β , TINAGL1, Drosha, Ifn κ , PIK3C2B, Tyk2, P2x, IL1RL2, oligoadenylate synthase, protein kinase C, beta-1,4-galactosyltransferase 1, CXCL2, Lif, thrombospondin-1, AP-3, azacytidine-induced protein, CCL20	188
		THP-1 cell line	↑ ↓ : 8B, ADAM15, Rnf19B, PLAA ↑ : Sod2, Krt99, CCL20, ICAM1, Ncf1, Tnnt1, Vps26A, Apoe, Rbm17, Agtrap, REP15, Cmtm6, Pklr, Yars2, CCDC124/51/93, Dpysl4, Acaa1, Mthfd2, Ckap4, Derl1, Ndrgr1, LAMTOR2, TBC1D9B, Rnf2 ↓ : Tma7, Mtpn, Tmsb10, Tmsb4X	189
<i>M. marinum</i>	Fish, frogs, humans (NTM)	Murine BMDMs, RAW 264.7 cell line, and THP-1 cell line	↑ ↓ : ESAT-6, CFP-10, LC3, MMP13, Arp2/3, WASP, N-WASP	162, 190, 191
<i>M. hominissuis</i>	Pigs, humans	BEAS-2B cell line	↑ : Snd1, NADPH dehydrogenase, Ddx6, Cbr1, importin, exportin 5, Cndp2, dynamin 1-like protein, HNRPK/L, Pafah1B3, GCP60, Ubap2L, glutathione synthetase, PPP2A, calnexin, Banf1, lactoferroxin C, MBP-1	192, 193
<i>M. avium</i>	Poultry, humans	U937 cell line	↑ ↓ : CAM1/2/3, PPP3R1, Dffa, Bub3, Smc1A, CDK1, CycB, HDAC2, TUBA1B, ItgB2, UBA1, ACTB, H1.4, PP1, PP2A, ITGA	194
<i>M. leprae</i>	Humans, armadillos, primates		↑ ↓ : PGL1, ErbB2, α -DG, laminin 2, MMP1/2/9, IDO, VDR, SMAD, VD, SLC11A1	195, 196
<i>M. smegmatis</i>	Soil; rarely found in animals or humans	Murine BMDMs and BMDDs	↑ ↓ : Calmodulin, cAMP, CREB, caspase 8, caspase-3	197

^aBMDMs, bone marrow-derived macrophages; BMDDs, bone marrow-derived dendritic cells.

cytokine-related genes and a switch toward Th₂ cytokines as infection progresses. A panel of transcriptomic biomarkers have been suggested, including the chemokine genes *CXCR3* and *CCL1* and Toll-like receptor 2/4 (TLR2/4) genes, along with *TNF*, *BCL2*, *NFKB1*, *IL-16*, *IL-8*, *EEF1G*, *ADAM17*, *IER5*, *PHB2*, *STK17B*, *CD84*, *CD81*, *MCL1*, *TBK1*, *ATK1*, *PRKCB1*, and *RPS6KB2* (78). While this panel consists predominantly of protein binding and transcription-related genes, it displays the trend of immune suppression by mycobacteria and *M. bovis* and may provide an alternative to the current immune based diagnostics used in bTB identification.

Protein biomarkers. The analysis of circulating proteins and serum proteomes has also yielded promising candidates for biomarkers in *M. avium* subsp. *paratuberculosis* and other mycobacterial infections (Table 3). Mass spectrometry has detected a number of proteins either over- or underexpressed, with some specific to *M. avium* subsp.

paratuberculosis infection (79). Studies assessing both early and late stages of mycobacterial infection have shown a dysregulation of several pathogenically significant proteins, including vitamin D-binding protein, a potential biomarker for general mycobacterial infection found in both *paratuberculosis* and bTB (79–81). As vitamin D is involved in macrophage activation and is a known antituberculous agent acting via TLR signaling pathways, its expression in *paratuberculosis* may be attributed to the immune response in the early stages of infection. Glycoproteins, proinflammatory fetuin, alpha-hemoglobin, and serine protease inhibitor are also differentially expressed proteins in both bTB and *paratuberculosis*, acting as biomarkers for general mycobacterial diseases in animals (79–81).

Proteomic analysis of serum proteins of *M. avium* subsp. *paratuberculosis*-infected cattle has yielded further possible specific biomarker targets, such as complement proteins, actin binding proteins, and clotting factors associated with thrombin and fibrinogen (82). These proteins of interest, along with their corresponding coding genes, may provide diagnostic biomarker signatures. Transthyretin and retinol binding proteins have been identified as *M. avium* subsp. *paratuberculosis*-specific biomarkers. Vitamin A (retinol) is involved in the maintenance and differentiation of immune cells. It is transported by the negative acute-phase protein transthyretin, which may be an indicator of early disease (80, 81). Transthyretin is also an indicator of malnourishment in diseases such as HIV and cancer and may show similar changes in a chronic wasting disease like *paratuberculosis*. Cathelicidin is specific for advanced *M. avium* subsp. *paratuberculosis* infection, possibly related to a shift in the bacterial response to induce shedding and escaping from macrophages or a host antimicrobial control response (80). Investigation of the proteome may provide potential pathogen protein biomarker candidates; however, the homologous nature of mycobacteria and issues with cross-reactivity mean that this requires much greater research and validation. Preliminary research into identifying specific proteins from the secretome has provided promising novel antigens as serodiagnostic biomarkers, although further investigation must be undertaken (83).

Other suggested bTB protein biomarkers include the host proteins alpha-1-antitrypsin, alpha-1-antiproteinase, and fetuin A and the pathogen proteins ESAT-6, CFP-10, MB2515c, and Pks5 (79, 80, 84). Advances in protein array chips and mass spectrometry technologies will allow discovery of other biomarkers using pathogen proteomes and circulating peptides in the future.

Extracellular vesicles. Extracellular vesicles (EVs) include exosomes, microparticles, and apoptotic vesicles and are key cellular transport and signaling entities. The importance of these vesicles was originally underestimated; they were believed to be waste disposal units removing cellular debris during reticulocyte maturation (85). Both exosomes (<200 nm) and microparticles (<1,000 nm) are now prime targets for targeted drug delivery and gene therapy, with several technologies for their use in the treatment of major human diseases in development (86–88).

Exosomes are released from multivesicular bodies following fusion with the plasma membrane and are formed through a series of endocytic events. Following their formation, multivesicular bodies fuse with the plasma membrane and release their cytosolic endosomal bodies, which become exosomes once liberated (89). In comparison, microparticles (also known as microvesicles and ectosomes) are formed and released via budding or “blebbing” of the cellular membrane. This is a steady-state process which may be upregulated following stimuli such as infection and include specifically enriched cargo for biological communication. Both exosomes and microparticles contain a range of enzymes, proteins, and RNA molecules and have several functions, often highly dependent on the constituents and therefore their cell of origin (Fig. 3).

Vesicles transport mycobacterial products such as lipoarabinomannan and phosphatidylinositol mannosides, which are contained in and released from mycobacterium-infected macrophages through EV secretion. The shuttling of both bacterial and viral compo-

FIG 3 General extracellular vesicle structure. A phospholipid bilayer membrane surrounds the vesicle and contains several key molecules: annexins assist in transport and membrane fusion, lipid rafts consisting of flotillin-1, cholesterol, etc., aid in internalization, MHC classes I and II enable peptide binding, and adhesion molecules such as $\beta 2$ integrin and ICAM-1 and tetraspanins such as CD63 and CD81 are for cell recognition. The internal compartment also contains a range of important components, including miRNA, Rab proteins for exosome docking, heat shock proteins (HSPs) to aid in MHC peptide binding, and cytoskeletal proteins.

nents further supports the role of exosomes in immune surveillance and intracellular communication (90). These EVs secreted from macrophages are able to stimulate a proinflammatory response, triggering the release of $\text{TNF-}\alpha$, nitric oxide, and the chemokine RANTES (91–93), as well as transferring mycobacterial RNA and ultimately affecting infection outcomes (94). Similarly, EVs secreted from host neutrophils appear to work in favor of the immune response and promote clearance and mycobactericidal activity (95).

Extracellular vesicles may prove to be extremely useful vaccine candidates and diagnostic or predictive biomarkers for mycobacterial diseases such as paratuberculosis and bTB. Their stability and circulating nature, as well as their ability to be isolated from minimally invasive biological samples such as saliva, urine, and blood, make them prime targets. Differentially expressed proteins and molecules contained in vesicular compartments may also provide useful markers for treatment efficacy and indicate disease resilience to mycobacterial infections. A small number of studies have identified *M. tuberculosis*-specific proteins in serum-derived exosomes that differentiated individuals with active and latent TB infection (96, 97). These small-scale studies remain to be

verified but suggest that further examination of the biomarker potential of extracellular vesicles is warranted.

MicroRNAs. miRNAs are a subset of small RNAs (~22 nucleotides long) which are noncoding posttranscriptional regulators. Originally considered to be genetic junk, along with other noncoding parts of the genome, miRNAs were first discovered in *Caenorhabditis elegans* and are now known to be master regulators of gene expression and protein translation (98). Many of these miRNAs are highly conserved (99) and play key roles in regulating mRNAs that control complex host signaling networks, as well as immune function. miRNAs control the stability (i.e., degradation), translation, and suppression of specific mRNAs in order to regulate a large network of genes and proteins. They have also been indicated in various diseases and as possible drug therapy targets. Their abundance and stability in circulating extracellular vesicles such as exosomes and microparticles have made them potential candidates as disease biomarkers (100–103). Although reports into the role of miRNA in mycobacterial infections, relative to other major diseases, are sparse, their demonstrated differential expression has elevated them to the forefront of mycobacterial research in the last few years. It is currently estimated that over 60% of genes are directly regulated by miRNAs (104), exemplifying the importance of the previously disregarded noncoding aspect of the genome, particularly in regard to biomarker discovery.

There are several mechanisms through which miRNAs can exert their “gene silencing” effect, with the degree of miRNA-mRNA complementarity the primary determinant. In general, a high complementarity and perfect to near perfect binding will result in mRNA cleavage, while mismatches in the miRNA-mRNA complex will reduce protein synthesis through translational repression, a more common phenomenon in animal miRNAs (105, 106).

miRNA biomarkers have been successful in the diagnosis and prediction of outcomes in cancer (107–109), and multiple studies have indicated that miRNA signatures have the potential to distinguish active TB patients from healthy controls and latent TB (110–112). One of the major obstacles to miRNA biomarker investigations is the lack of consistency and established scientific practices, as well as the lack of standardization across experiments. Variance in case classification, source of biological samples, and study size can affect reproducibility of results, making comparison across studies difficult. Variability in miRNA expression due to tissue specificity and miRNA origin, i.e., circulating or exosomal, must also be considered when investigating potential miRNA biomarkers. Further, studies have also indicated that environmental or ethnic differences may also influence miRNA expression (113–115). Analysis of differentially expressed miRNAs in TB has yielded multiple potential biomarker sets, yet a rigorous definable signature remains to be confirmed. A large number of miRNAs have been reported to be modulated during TB, including the potential biomarkers miR-378, miR-483-5p, miR-22, and miR-29c, which are upregulated, and miR-101 and miR-320b, which are downregulated (116, 117). These miRNAs have been suggested as biomarkers of specific TB disease states, with sensitivity and specificity of 95.0% and 91.8%, respectively (117). Similar studies have also suggested that the miRNAs miR-22, miR-25, miR-365, miR-590-5p, and miR-885-5p may also be useful in diagnosing TB (116–120). The promising biomarker combinations from human TB research suggest that markers for diseases such as paratuberculosis and bTB may yet be uncovered and that discovering signatures of resilience to infection is highly plausible.

Several recent studies have focused on miRNAs as biomarkers in paratuberculosis and bTB (121–126); however, the relatively minor research effort into veterinary diseases compared to TB or similar human diseases has meant that the majority of these studies are still exploratory and further research is required to produce a true diagnostic signature. Potential bovine miRNAs which may be key biomarkers include immune and inflammatory related miRNAs such as miR-19b, miR-196b, and miR-146, which are modulated during infection and linked to bTB, TB, and Crohn's disease (121–123, 127–131). Although no definitive biomarkers have been elucidated, strong evidence for

FIG 4 miRNA responses to mycobacterial infection. Conflicting miRNA responses are common in bacterial infections, resulting in either pro- or antisurvival conditions, with an example of each given here. Upon encountering mycobacteria, miR-29a can be either up- or downregulated. When miR-29a is decreased, its effect on mitochondrial membrane potential is lessened, allowing for the release of cytochrome c and eventual activation of caspases, which results in cell death and possible bacterial clearance. In contrast, recognition of mycobacteria by TLR2 and MyD88/TIRAP results in an increase in miR-146a, which directly targets and reduces TRAF6. This reduction leads to a decrease in iNOS and NO production and an overall decline in mycobacterial clearance. The specific miRNA response is dependent on the pathogen and host immune response and may therefore contribute to the disease progression and phenotype.

their modulation following *M. avium* subsp. *paratuberculosis* infection indicates that they may be significant candidates for diagnostic markers.

miRNA regulation in mycobacterial infections. Several key miRNAs have been identified in mycobacterial infections, and the similarity in host responses and pathogenesis between mycobacterial species allows for some extrapolation to paratuberculosis and bTB. One of the miRNAs first identified in host immune responses to mycobacteria, miR-146, targets mRNA of TNF receptor-associated factor 6 (TRAF6) and IL-1 receptor-associated kinase 1 (IRAK1) (132, 133). Acting on TRAF6, miR-146 dampens inducible nitric oxide synthase (iNOS) and therefore nitric oxide production, an important host microbicidal response (134), while IRAK1 is a key receptor-associated molecule involved in activation of NF-κB transcription (135). Through targeting these molecules, which are essentially downstream signals from TLR cascades, miR-146 can control TLR and cytokine signaling through a negative-feedback loop, fundamentally altering the immune response and decreasing proinflammatory effects (Fig. 4).

Another major miRNA modulated by mycobacterial pathogens is miR-142-3p. This miRNA targets an mRNA that negatively regulates a key cell surface signal transducer involved in actin-based cellular motility and assembly of the phagosome for internalized pathogens. miR-142-3p is overexpressed during the early stages of mycobacterial infection and therefore impairs phagocytosis of bacteria (136). miR-142-3p is also a

major regulator of proinflammatory cytokines, decreasing production and expression of molecules such as TNF- α and IL-6, also acting on IRAK1 and the TLR/NF- κ B pathway (137).

miR-155 inhibits autophagy and antimicrobial immune effects through ESAT6 inducing expression, preventing immune modulators Cox-2 and IL-6 induction, as well as decreasing Bach1 and SHIP1 (involved in mycobacterial survival and dormancy, as well as production of reactive oxygen intermediates) (138). Nitric oxide production is also limited by increased miR-155 expression in *M. marinum* infections, enhancing survival of pathogenic bacteria (139). As with many miRNAs, miR-155 has multiple functions, including modulating the innate TLR response through acting on a number of genes. SOCS1, TAB2 (TLR adaptor molecule), and a dendritic cell (DC)-specific adhesion molecule are all decreased following overexpression of miR-155, impacting the pathogen binding capability of dendritic cells and possibly contributing to the establishment of disease (140, 141). miRNAs targeting host cell apoptosis are also modulated by virulent mycobacteria, with miR29a and let-7e upregulated, in turn decreasing caspase 7 and 3 activity, respectively (142). As caspases 3 and 7 are both executioner caspases, which induce morphological changes for induction of apoptosis, their decreased expression in mycobacterial infections further aids the pathogen in intracellular survival and evasion of immune responses. miR-29 also has a role in decreasing early-stage Th₁ responses through targeting IFN- γ , with differential expression following infection with both *M. bovis* BCG and *Listeria monocytogenes* (143). miR-582-5p, which regulates Forkhead box protein O1 (FOXO1), is upregulated in TB, inhibiting apoptosis by decreasing FOXO1 (144). miR-155 has been implicated as a regulator promoting apoptosis via the TLR2 and phosphatidylinositol 3-kinase (PI3K)-APT pathways. Pathogenic mycobacteria are able to upregulate miR-155 after activation of TLR2 signaling, and, through a series of cascades and cross talk between pathways such as mitogen-activated protein kinase (MAPK) and protein kinase C δ (PKC δ), induce apoptosis by activating caspase 3 and translocating mitochondrial cytochrome c (145). miR-21 is also a significant miRNA in apoptosis, as it acts on IL-12p35 (IL-12A protein) to decrease IL-12 and therefore activation of Th1 and NK cells. This miRNA also functions to activate apoptosis by targeting Bcl-2, thus further modulating early Th1 responses following *M. bovis* exposure (146).

miRNAs are also carried within EVs, while exosomal miRNA may be a key regulator of host gene expression and immune defenses in mycobacterial infections. Exosomal miR-21 and -29a, for example, act as ligands for TLR signaling, suggesting several functional roles and possible roles in paratuberculosis and bTB pathogenesis (147).

While these miRNAs clearly play a role in mycobacterial infection, they are only a small number of differentially regulated miRNAs observed in mycobacterial infections; the current understanding of the mycobacterium-miRNA relationships is summarized in Table 4 and Fig. 5. It is clear that the regulation, and either over- or underexpression of these miRNAs, is altered during infection, and their effects are often related to critical events in mycobacterial pathogenesis. The interconnected nature of miRNA, mRNA, and cell signaling pathways is complex. Although current research efforts into the specific functions and modes of action of miRNAs are producing promising results, much of the current research focuses on TB; greater investigation into miRNAs and their profiles in bTB and *M. avium* subsp. *paratuberculosis* is warranted.

FUTURE DIRECTIONS

It is evident, from the nature of mycobacterial diseases, their global distribution, and the spread of animal pathogens into the human sphere, that new management strategies are needed to control diseases like paratuberculosis and bTB to ensure that subclinically infected animals do not enter the food chain. Directing the focus of production towards identifying animals that are resilient to these diseases may be a means to reduce the economic impact and welfare implications of subclinical infection. Biomarkers are at the forefront here, not only for diagnosis of mycobacterial infections but also for the differentiation of clinical and subclinical states and identifying resilient

TABLE 4 miRNA responses to mycobacterial infections of animals

Species	Hosts	Sample(s)	MiRNA(s)	Reference(s)
<i>M. avium</i> subsp. paratuberculosis	Sheep, cattle, goats, camelids, deer	Bovine whole blood	↑ : miR-6517, miR-7857, miR-24-1, miR-24-2, miR-378c ↓ : miR-19b, miR-19b-2, miR-1271, miR-100, miR-301a, miR-32a	127
		Bovine intestinal tissue	↑ : miR-146b, miR-1247, miR-196b, miR-184, miR-202 ↓ : miR-137, miR-105a, miR-433, miR-133b	122
<i>M. bovis</i>	Cattle, possums, badgers, buffalo	Murine BMDMs	↓ : miR-27a-3p	198
		Bovine alveolar Mφ	↑ : miR-146b, miR-146a, miR-147, miR-29c, miR-22-3p, miR-21-3p, miR-142-5p, miR-210, miR-32, miR-125a, miR-155, miR-99b, miR-27a-5p, miR-149-5p, miR-28, miR-15a, miR-23a, miR-29a, miR-30b-5p, miR-151-5p ↓ : miR-92a, miR-34a, let-7a/b/c/d/e/f, miR-6529, miR-107, miR-744, miR-328, miR-423-3p/5p, miR-345-3p, miR-128, miR-874, miR-378b, miR-296	124
		HEK293T, EL4 cell lines + human MPMs	↓ : miR-29a	143
		Human MDMs (BCG)	↑ : miR-135b, miR-296-5p, miR-645 ↓ : miR-629	199
<i>M. marinum</i>	Fish, frogs, humans (NTM)	RAW 264.7, THP-1, HEK293T cell lines + MPMs	↑ : miR-155	139
		Adult zebrafish (homogenized tissue)	↑ : Let-7a/c/d, miR-142b, miR-146a-3p/5p, miR-146b-3p/5p, miR-15c, miR-16b, miR-181a, miR-181b, miR-20b, miR-21-3p/-5p, miR-219, miR-223-3p/5p, miR-23b, miR-26a, miR-29a, miR-29b, miR-430a/i, miR-457b, miR-462, miR-728-3p/5p, miR-731-3p/5p, miR-732 ↓ : miR-10d, miR-25, miR-30b/c, miR-128, miR-150, miR-181c, miR-184, miR-204, miR-216a/b, miR-217, miR-365, miR-430b, miR-454b, miR-461, miR-489, miR-724, miR-727, miR-730	200
<i>M. hominissuis</i>	Pigs, humans	Human MDMs	↑ : miR-155, miR-146a, miR-146b-5p, miR-886-5p ↓ : miR-20a, miR-191, miR-378, miR-30c, miR-423-5p, miR-374a, miR-185, miR-768-5p, miR-18 ↑ ↓ : let-7e/i, miR-146b-5p, miR-29a, miR-193a-5p, miR-483	142
<i>M. avium</i> <i>M. leprae</i>	Poultry, humans Humans, armadillos, primates	Human MDMs	↑ ↓ : miR-29a, let-7e, miR-146a	142
		Skin biopsy	↑ : miR-21, miR-24, miR-146a, miR-451, miR-30a/b/e, miR-22, miR-181b, miR-34a, miR-93, miR-422a, miR-29c	201
<i>M. smegmatis</i>	Soil; rarely found in animals or humans	Skin biopsy	↑ : miR-142-3p/5p, miR-146b-5p, miR-342-3p/5p, miR-361-3p, miR-3653, miR-484, miR-155, miR-146, miR-21, miR-150, miR-181 ↓ : miR-1290, miR-429, miR-141, miR-205, miR-193b, miR-200c, miR-224	202
		Human MDMs and J774A.1 cells	↑ : miR-125b, miR-142-3p ↓ : miR-155	203, 204

animals. In addition, this type of research will undoubtedly provide the ability to characterize immune protection in mycobacterial diseases of animals, which can then be utilized to develop better vaccines with potential for providing sterile immunity. However, this requires well-designed controlled experimental trials in which resilience to disease can be identified accurately. With recent efforts globally to limit the use of

FIG 5 miRNA responses to mycobacterial infection. Infection and exposure to mycobacteria result in a large-scale miRNA response with changes in different functional and biological pathways. The miRNAs shown are some that have been observed as being dysregulated during infection and their functions identified. There are likely many other miRNAs that are of importance in mycobacterial infections which fall into these, and other, canonical pathways.

antimicrobials in both humans and animals, vaccines can provide advantageous control strategies (148).

The inability to adequately compare current biomarker studies hampers progress. Ideally, complete expression patterns of immunologic, proteomic, and transcriptomic markers during the course of infection should be studied *in vivo*. The generation of a complete data set would allow for key molecules to be prioritized and a possible combinational signature to be determined. While this would be a large and costly undertaking, the investigation of each of the separate biomarker candidates (e.g., cytokines/chemokines, proteins, and genes) from early subclinical to late clinical infection would still provide invaluable information as to the applicability of markers for diagnosis and the host response to mycobacteria. Archived sample biobanks may be integral in these future research efforts, abrogating the cost of establishing *in vivo* infection models and providing multiple sample types, i.e., blood products and tissue samples, as well as defined infection outcomes and the ability to profile a vast array of biomarker candidates from the same individual over multiple time points. These would also allow the validation of any potential markers across not only different animal species but also different breeds, which may have differing responses to infection (149). A complete picture of host responses to infection could be obtained through the combination of a variety of omics technologies, including transcriptomics, proteomics, and metabolomics.

Biomarkers for resilience to mycobacterial infection are a promising resource for better control of both paratuberculosis and bTB. In our estimation, miRNAs are the frontrunners for discovering biomarker signatures of resilience. Not only are they ideal biomolecules because of their stability in the circulation and under storage conditions, but also miRNAs can be isolated from a range of minimally invasive biological sources such as plasma, serum, or saliva. They are master regulators of gene expression and mediate many biological and metabolic processes; thus, they are upstream of the transcriptomic, proteomic, and metabolomic effects. Changes in their expression and patterns of regulation are likely indicators not only of infection but also of the disease

phenotype and/or resilience to mycobacterial disease. One drawback could be their inability to be pathogen specific; to overcome this limitation, there may be a diagnostic role for a combined pathogen-specific cytokine or chemokine (e.g., IFN- γ) response and miRNA signature to identify resilient animals. With rapid advancements of biomarker discovery platforms such as next-generation sequencing and array technologies, we envisage the capacity to develop robust signatures for significant global diseases.

REFERENCES

- Torres BY, Oliveira JHM, Thomas Tate A, Rath P, Cumnock K, Schneider DS. 2016. Tracking resilience to infections by mapping disease space. *PLoS Biol* 14:e1002436. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pbio.1002436>.
- Dennis MM, Reddacliff LA, Whittington RJ. 2011. Longitudinal study of clinicopathological features of Johne's disease in sheep naturally exposed to *Mycobacterium avium* subspecies paratuberculosis. *Vet Pathol* 48:565–575. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0300985810375049>.
- Begg DJ, Plain KM, de Silva K, Gurung R, Gunn A, Purdie AC, Whittington RJ. 2018. Immunopathological changes and apparent recovery from infection revealed in cattle in an experimental model of Johne's disease using a lyophilised culture of *Mycobacterium avium* subspecies paratuberculosis. *Vet Microbiol* 219:53–62. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.vetmic.2018.03.029>.
- de Silva K, Plain K, Purdie A, Begg D, Whittington R. 2018. Defining resilience to mycobacterial disease: characteristics of survivors of ovine paratuberculosis. *Vet Immunol Immunopathol* 195:56–64. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.vetimm.2017.11.008>.
- Stinson KJ, Baquero MM, Plattner BL. 2018. Resilience to infection by *Mycobacterium avium* subspecies paratuberculosis following direct intestinal inoculation in calves. *Vet Res* 49:58. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s13567-018-0553-7>.
- Botsaris G, Swift BMC, Slana I, Liapi M, Christodoulou M, Hatzitofi M, Christodoulou V, Rees C. 2016. Detection of viable *Mycobacterium avium* subspecies paratuberculosis in powdered infant formula by phage-PCR and confirmed by culture. *Int J Food Microbiol* 216:91–94. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jifoodmicro.2015.09.011>.
- Gerrard ZE, Swift BMC, Botsaris G, Davidson RS, Hutchings MR, Huxley JN, Rees C. 2018. Survival of *Mycobacterium avium* subspecies paratuberculosis in retail pasteurised milk. *Food Microbiol* 74:57–63. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.fm.2018.03.004>.
- Naser SA, Ghobrial G, Romero C, Valentine JF. 2004. Culture of *Mycobacterium avium* subspecies paratuberculosis from the blood of patients with Crohn's disease. *Lancet* 364:1039–1044. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736\(04\)17058-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(04)17058-X).
- Bull TJ, McMinn EJ, Sidi-Boumedine K, Skull A, Durkin D, Neild P, Rhodes G, Pickup R, Hermon-Taylor J. 2003. Detection and verification of *Mycobacterium avium* subsp. paratuberculosis in fresh ileocolonic mucosal biopsy specimens from individuals with and without Crohn's disease. *J Clin Microbiol* 41:2915. <https://doi.org/10.1128/jcm.41.7.2915-2923.2003>.
- Sharp RC, Beg SA, Naser SA. 2018. Polymorphisms in protein tyrosine phosphatase non-receptor type 2 and 22 (PTPN22/22) are linked to hyper-proliferative T-cells and susceptibility to mycobacteria in rheumatoid arthritis. *Front Cell Infect Microbiol* 8:11. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fcimb.2018.00011>.
- Waddell L, Rajić A, Sargeant J, Harris J, Amezcua R, Downey L, Read S, McEwen S. 2008. The zoonotic potential of *Mycobacterium avium* spp. paratuberculosis. *Can J Public Health* 99:145–155. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF03405464>.
- Kuenstner JT, Naser S, Chamberlin W, Borody T, Graham DY, McNees A, Hermon-Taylor J, Hermon-Taylor A, Dow CT, Thayer W, Biesecker J, Collins MT, Sechi LA, Singh SV, Zhang P, Shafran I, Weg S, Telega G, Rothstein R, Oken H, Schimpff S, Bach H, Bull T, Grant I, Ellingson J, Dahmen H, Lipton J, Gupta S, Chaubey K, Singh M, Agarwal P, Kumar A, Misri J, Sohal J, Dhama K, Hemati Z, Davis W, Hier M, Aitken J, Pierce E, Parrish N, Goldberg N, Kali M, Bendre S, Agrawal G, Baldassano R, Linn P, Sweeney RW, Fecteau M, Hofstaedter C, Potula R, Timofeeva O, Geier S, John K, Zayanni N, Malaty HM, Kahlenborn C, Kravitz A, Bulfon A, Daskalopoulos G, Mitchell H, Neilan B, Timms V, Cossu D, Mameli G, Angermeier P, Jelic T, Goethe R, Juste RA, Kuenstner L. 2017. The consensus from the *Mycobacterium avium* ssp. paratuberculosis (MAP) Conference 2017. *Front Public Health* 5:208. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpubh.2017.00208>.
- More SJ, Radunz B, Glanville RJ. 2015. Lessons learned during the successful eradication of bovine tuberculosis from Australia. *Vet Rec* 177:224–232. <https://doi.org/10.1136/vr.103163>.
- Biet F, Boschiroli ML, Thorel MF, Guilloteau LA. 2005. Zoonotic aspects of *Mycobacterium bovis* and *Mycobacterium avium*-intracellular complex (MAC). *Vet Res* 36:411–436. <https://doi.org/10.1051/vetres:2005001>.
- Thirunavukkarasu S, Plain K, de Silva K, Marais B, Whittington R. 2017. Applying the One Health concept to mycobacterial research—overcoming parochialism. *Zoonoses Public Health* 64:401–422. <https://doi.org/10.1111/zph.12334>.
- Schiller I, Oesch B, Vordermeier HM, Palmer MV, Harris BN, Orloski KA, Buddle BM, Thacker TC, Lyashchenko KP, Waters WR. 2010. Bovine tuberculosis: a review of current and emerging diagnostic techniques in view of their relevance for disease control and eradication. *Transbound Emerg Dis* 57:205–220. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1865-1682.2010.01148.x>.
- Biet F, Boschiroli ML. 2014. Non-tuberculous mycobacterial infections of veterinary relevance. *Res Vet Sci* 97:S69–S77. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rvsc.2014.08.007>.
- Gcebe N, Michel AL, Hlokwé TM. 2018. Non-tuberculous *Mycobacterium* species causing mycobacteriosis in farmed aquatic animals of South Africa. *BMC Microbiol* 18:32. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12866-018-1177-9>.
- Hope JC, Thom ML, Villarreal-Ramos B, Vordermeier HM, Hewinson RG, Howard CJ. 2005. Exposure to *Mycobacterium avium* induces low-level protection from *Mycobacterium bovis* infection but compromises diagnosis of disease in cattle. *Clin Exp Immunol* 141:432–439. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2249.2005.02882.x>.
- Álvarez J, de Juan L, Bezos J, Romero B, Sáez JL, Marqués S, Domínguez C, Mínguez O, Fernández-Mardomingo B, Mateos A, Domínguez L, Aranaz A. 2009. Effect of paratuberculosis on the diagnosis of bovine tuberculosis in a cattle herd with a mixed infection using interferon-gamma detection assay. *Vet Microbiol* 135:389–393. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.vetmic.2008.09.060>.
- Jenkins AO, Gormley E, Gcebe N, Fosgate GT, Conan A, Aagaard C, Michel AL, Rutten V. 2018. Cross reactive immune responses in cattle arising from exposure to *Mycobacterium bovis* and non-tuberculous mycobacteria. *Prev Vet Med* 152:16–22. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.prevetmed.2018.02.003>.
- O'Brien D, Scudamore J, Charlier J, Delavergne M. 2017. DISCONTTOOLS: a database to identify research gaps on vaccines, pharmaceuticals and diagnostics for the control of infectious diseases of animals. *BMC Vet Res* 13:1. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12917-016-0931-1>.
- Biomarkers Definitions Working Group. 2001. Biomarkers and surrogate endpoints: preferred definitions and conceptual framework. *Clin Pharmacol Ther* 69:89–95. <https://doi.org/10.1067/mcp.2001.113989>.
- Strimbu K, Tavel JA. 2010. What are biomarkers? *Curr Opin HIV AIDS* 5:463–466. <https://doi.org/10.1097/COH.0b013e32833ed177>.
- Correia CN, Nalpas NC, McLoughlin KE, Browne JA, Gordon SV, MacHugh DE, Shaughnessy RG. 2017. Circulating microRNAs as potential biomarkers of infectious disease. *Front Immunol* 8:118. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fimmu.2017.00118>.
- Whittington RJ, Begg DJ, de Silva K, Purdie AC, Dhand NK, Plain KM. 2017. Case definition terminology for paratuberculosis (Johne's disease). *BMC Vet Res* 13:328. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12917-017-1254-6>.
- Frahm M, Goswami ND, Owzar K, Hecker E, Mosher A, Cadogan E, Nahid P, Ferrari G, Stout JE. 2011. Discriminating between latent and active tuberculosis with multiple biomarker responses. *Tuberculosis (Edinb)* 91:250–256. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tube.2011.02.006>.

28. Lu C, Wu J, Wang H, Wang S, Diao N, Wang F, Gao Y, Chen J, Shao L, Weng X, Zhang Y, Zhang W. 2011. Novel biomarkers distinguishing active tuberculosis from latent infection identified by gene expression profile of peripheral blood mononuclear cells. *PLoS One* 6:e24290. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0024290>.
29. Wang S, Diao N, Lu C, Wu J, Gao Y, Chen J, Zhou Z, Huang H, Shao L, Jin J, Weng X, Zhang Y, Zhang W. 2012. Evaluation of the diagnostic potential of IP-10 and IL-2 as biomarkers for the diagnosis of active and latent tuberculosis in a BCG-vaccinated population. *PLoS One* 7:e51338. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0051338>.
30. Shu C-C, Wu M-F, Hsu C-L, Huang C-T, Wang J-Y, Hsieh S-L, Yu C-J, Lee L-N, Yang P-C. 2013. Apoptosis-associated biomarkers in tuberculosis: promising for diagnosis and prognosis prediction. *BMC Infect Dis* 13:45. <https://doi.org/10.1186/1471-2334-13-45>.
31. Achkar JM, Prados-Rosales R. 2018. Updates on antibody functions in Mycobacterium tuberculosis infection and their relevance for developing a vaccine against tuberculosis. *Curr Opin Immunol* 53:30–37. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.coi.2018.04.004>.
32. Dyatlov AV, Apt AS, Linge IA. 2019. B lymphocytes in anti-mycobacterial immune responses: pathogenesis or protection? *Tuberculosis (Edinb)* 114:1–8. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tube.2018.10.011>.
33. Pooley HB, Begg DJ, Plain KM, Whittington RJ, Purdie AC, de Silva K. 2019. The humoral immune response is essential for successful vaccine protection against paratuberculosis in sheep. *BMC Vet Res* 15:223. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12917-019-1972-z>.
34. Nielsen SS, Toft N. 2008. Ante mortem diagnosis of paratuberculosis: a review of accuracies of ELISA, interferon-gamma assay and faecal culture techniques. *Vet Microbiol* 129(3–4):217–235. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.vetmic.2007.12.011>.
35. Li L, Wagner B, Freer H, Schilling M, Bannantine JP, Campo JJ, Katani R, Grohn YT, Radzio-Basu J, Kapur V. 2017. Early detection of Mycobacterium avium subsp. paratuberculosis infection in cattle with multiplex-bead based immunoassays. *PLoS One* 12:e0189783. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0189783>.
36. Fontana S, Pacciarini M, Boifava M, Pellesi R, Casto B, Gastaldelli M, Koehler H, Pozzato N, Casalini F, Boniotti MB. 2018. Development and evaluation of two multi-antigen serological assays for the diagnosis of bovine tuberculosis in cattle. *J Microbiol Methods* 153:118–126. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jmimet.2018.09.013>.
37. Lyashchenko KP, Grandison A, Keskinen K, Sikar-Gang A, Lambotte P, Esfandiari J, Ireton GC, Vallur A, Reed SG, Jones G, Vordermeier HM, Stabel JR, Thacker TC, Palmer MV, Waters WR. 2017. Identification of novel antigens recognized by serum antibodies in bovine tuberculosis. *Clin Vaccine Immunol* 24:e00259-17. <https://doi.org/10.1128/CI.00259-17>.
38. Lyashchenko KP, Greenwald R, Sikar-Gang A, Sridhara AA, Johnathan A, Lambotte P, Esfandiari J, Maggioli MF, Thacker TC, Palmer MV, Waters WR. 2017. Early detection of circulating antigen and IgM-associated immune complexes during experimental Mycobacterium bovis infection in cattle. *Clin Vaccine Immunol* 24:e00069-17. <https://doi.org/10.1128/CI.00069-17>.
39. Tjærnlund A, Rodríguez A, Cardona P-J, Guirado E, Ivanyi J, Singh M, Troye-Blomberg M, Fernández C. 2006. Polymeric IgR knockout mice are more susceptible to mycobacterial infections in the respiratory tract than wild-type mice. *Int Immunol* 18:807–816. <https://doi.org/10.1093/intimm/dxl017>.
40. Begg DJ, de Silva K, Plain KM, Purdie AC, Dhand N, Whittington RJ. 2015. Specific faecal antibody responses in sheep infected with Mycobacterium avium subspecies paratuberculosis. *Vet Immunol Immunopathol* 166:125–131. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.vetimm.2015.06.011>.
41. Jungersen G, Mikkelsen H, Grell SN. 2012. Use of the johnin PPD interferon-gamma assay in control of bovine paratuberculosis. *Vet Immunol Immunopathol* 148:48–54. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.vetimm.2011.05.010>.
42. de Silva K, Begg DJ, Plain KM, Purdie AC, Kawaji S, Dhand NK, Whittington RJ. 2013. Can early host responses to mycobacterial infection predict eventual disease outcomes? *Prev Vet Med* 112:203–212. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.prevetmed.2013.08.006>.
43. Anbarasu D, Ponnu Raja C, Raja A. 2013. Multiplex analysis of cytokines/chemokines as biomarkers that differentiate healthy contacts from tuberculosis patients in high endemic settings. *Cytokine* 61:747–754. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cyto.2012.12.031>.
44. Singh PP, Goyal A. 2013. Interleukin-6: a potent biomarker of mycobacterial infection. *SpringerPlus* 2:686. <https://doi.org/10.1186/2193-1801-2-686>.
45. Suzukawa M, Akashi S, Nagai H, Nagase H, Nakamura H, Matsui H, Hebisawa A, Ohta K. 2016. Combined analysis of IFN- γ , IL-2, IL-5, IL-10, IL-1RA and MCP-1 in QFT supernatant is useful for distinguishing active tuberculosis from latent infection. *PLoS One* 11:e0152483. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0152483>.
46. Tebruegge M, Dutta B, Donath S, Ritz N, Forbes B, Camacho-Badilla K, Clifford V, Zufferey C, Robins-Browne R, Hanekom W, Graham SM, Connell T, Curtis N. 2015. Mycobacteria-specific cytokine responses detect tuberculosis infection and distinguish latent from active tuberculosis. *Am J Respir Crit Care Med* 192:485–499. <https://doi.org/10.1164/rccm.201501-0059OC>.
47. Won EJ, Choi JH, Cho YN, Jin HM, Kee HJ, Park YW, Kwon YS, Kee SJ. 2017. Biomarkers for discrimination between latent tuberculosis infection and active tuberculosis disease. *J Infect* 74:281–293. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jinf.2016.11.010>.
48. Wu J, Wang S, Lu C, Shao L, Gao Y, Zhou Z, Huang H, Zhang Y, Zhang W. 2017. Multiple cytokine responses in discriminating between active tuberculosis and latent tuberculosis infection. *Tuberculosis (Edinb)* 102: 68–75. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tube.2016.06.001>.
49. Sutherland JS, de Jong BC, Jeffries DJ, Adetifa IM, Ota M. 2010. Production of TNF- α , IL-12(p40) and IL-17 can discriminate between active TB disease and latent infection in a West African cohort. *PLoS One* 5:e12365. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0012365>.
50. Biselli R, Mariotti S, Sargentini V, Sauzullo I, Lastilla M, Mengoni F, Vanini V, Girardi E, Goletti D, D'Amelio R, Nisini R. 2010. Detection of interleukin-2 in addition to interferon- γ discriminates active tuberculosis patients, latently infected individuals, and controls. *Clin Microbiol Infect* 16:1282–1284. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1469-0691.2009.03104.x>.
51. Wassie L, Demissie A, Aseffa A, Abebe M, Yamuah L, Tilahun H, Petros B, Rook G, Zumla A, Andersen P, Doherty TM, VACSEL Study Group. 2008. Ex vivo cytokine mRNA levels correlate with changing clinical status of Ethiopian TB patients and their contacts over time. *PLoS One* 3:e1522. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0001522>.
52. Sai Priya VH, Latha GS, Hasnain SE, Murthy KJR, Valluri VL. 2010. Enhanced T cell responsiveness to Mycobacterium bovis BCG r32-kDa Ag correlates with successful anti-tuberculosis treatment in humans. *Cytokine* 52:190–193. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cyto.2010.07.001>.
53. Smeed JA, Watkins CA, Rhind SM, Hopkins J. 2007. Differential cytokine gene expression profiles in the three pathological forms of sheep paratuberculosis. *BMC Vet Res* 3:18. <https://doi.org/10.1186/1746-6148-3-18>.
54. Tanaka S, Sato M, Onitsuka T, Kamata H, Yokomizo Y. 2005. Inflammatory cytokine gene expression in different types of granulomatous lesions during asymptomatic stages of bovine paratuberculosis. *Vet Pathol* 42:579–588. <https://doi.org/10.1354/vp.42-5-579>.
55. Dudemaine PL, Fecteau G, Lessard M, Labrecque O, Roy JP, Bissonnette N. 2014. Increased blood-circulating interferon- γ , interleukin-17, and osteopontin levels in bovine paratuberculosis. *J Dairy Sci* 97:3382–3393. <https://doi.org/10.3168/jds.2013-7059>.
56. Aranday-Cortes E, Hogarth PJ, Kaveh DA, Whelan AO, Villarreal-Ramos B, Lalvani A, Vordermeier HM. 2012. Transcriptional profiling of disease-induced host responses in bovine tuberculosis and the identification of potential diagnostic biomarkers. *PLoS One* 7:e30626. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0030626>.
57. Goosen WJ, Cooper D, Miller MA, van Helden PD, Parsons S. 2015. IP-10 is a sensitive biomarker of antigen recognition in whole blood stimulation assays used for the diagnosis of Mycobacterium bovis infection in African buffaloes (Syncerus caffer). *Clin Vaccine Immunol* 22:974. <https://doi.org/10.1128/CI.00324-15>.
58. Waters WR, Maggioli MF, Palmer MV, Thacker TC, McGill JL, Vordermeier HM, Berney-Meyer L, Jacobs WR, Larsen MH. 2016. Interleukin-17A as a biomarker for bovine tuberculosis. *Clin Vaccine Immunol* 23:168–180. <https://doi.org/10.1128/CI.00637-15>.
59. Clifford V, Tebruegge M, Zufferey C, Germano S, Denholm J, Street A, McBryde E, Eisen D, Curtis N. 2015. Serum IP-10 in the diagnosis of latent and active tuberculosis. *J Infect* 71:696–698. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jinf.2015.08.001>.
60. Parsons SDC, McGill K, Doyle MB, Goosen WJ, van Helden PD, Gormley E. 2016. Antigen-specific IP-10 release is a sensitive biomarker of Mycobacterium bovis infection in cattle. *PLoS One* 11:e0155440. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0155440>.
61. Roos EO, Olea-Popelka F, Buss P, de Klerk-Lorist L-M, Cooper D, Warren RM, van Helden PD, Parsons SDC, Miller MA. 2018. IP-10: a potential biomarker for detection of Mycobacterium bovis infection in warthogs

- (Phacochoerus africanus). *Vet Immunol Immunopathol* 201:43–48. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.vetimm.2018.05.007>.
62. Zhang X, Li S, Luo Y, Chen Y, Cheng S, Zhang G, Hu C, Chen H, Guo A. 2013. Mycobacterium bovis and BCG induce different patterns of cytokine and chemokine production in dendritic cells and differentiation patterns in CD4+ T cells. *Microbiology* 159:366–379. <https://doi.org/10.1099/mic.0.058198-0>.
 63. Shin M-K, Park H-E, Park H-T, Jung M, Kang H-L, Baik SC, Lee W-K, Jung YH, Yoo HS. 2018. Gene expression profiles of Th1-type chemokines in whole blood of Mycobacterium avium subsp. paratuberculosis-infected cattle. *J Bacteriol Virol* 48:130–136. <https://doi.org/10.4167/jbv.2018.48.4.130>.
 64. Motiwala AS, Janagama HK, Paustian ML, Zhu X, Bannantine JP, Kapur V, Sreevatsan S. 2006. Comparative transcriptional analysis of human macrophages exposed to animal and human isolates of Mycobacterium avium subspecies paratuberculosis with diverse genotypes. *Infect Immun* 74:6046–6056. <https://doi.org/10.1128/IAI.00326-06>.
 65. Buza JJ, Mori Y, Bari AM, Hikono Aodon-Geril H, Hirayama S, Shu Y, Momotani E. 2003. Mycobacterium avium subsp. paratuberculosis infection causes suppression of RANTES, monocyte chemoattractant protein 1, and tumor necrosis factor alpha expression in peripheral blood of experimentally infected cattle. *Infect Immun* 71:2223–2227. <https://doi.org/10.1128/IAI.71.12.2223-2227.2003>.
 66. Gossner A, Watkins C, Chianini F, Hopkins J. 2017. Pathways and genes associated with immune dysfunction in sheep paratuberculosis. *Sci Rep* 7:46695. <https://doi.org/10.1038/srep46695>.
 67. Purdie AC, Plain KM, Begg DJ, de Silva K, Whittington RJ. 2012. Expression of genes associated with the antigen presentation and processing pathway are consistently regulated in early Mycobacterium avium subsp. paratuberculosis infection. *Comp Immunol Microbiol Infect Dis* 35:151–162. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cimid.2011.12.007>.
 68. Weiss DJ, Evanson OA, McClenahan DJ, Abrahamsen MS, Walcheck BK. 2001. Regulation of expression of major histocompatibility antigens by bovine macrophages infected with Mycobacterium avium subsp. paratuberculosis or Mycobacterium avium subsp. avium. *Infect Immun* 69:1002–1008. <https://doi.org/10.1128/IAI.69.2.1002-1008.2001>.
 69. Purdie AC, Plain KM, Begg DJ, de Silva K, Whittington RJ. 2019. Gene expression profiles during subclinical Mycobacterium avium subspecies paratuberculosis infection in sheep can predict disease outcome. *Sci Rep* 9:8245. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-019-44670-w>.
 70. Gago G, Diacovich L, Gramajo H. 2018. Lipid metabolism and its implication in mycobacteria-host interaction. *Curr Opin Microbiol* 41:36–42. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.mib.2017.11.020>.
 71. Hmama Z, Peña-Díaz S, Joseph S, Av-Gay Y. 2015. Immuno-evasion and immunosuppression of the macrophage by Mycobacterium tuberculosis. *Immunol Rev* 264:220–232. <https://doi.org/10.1111/immr.12268>.
 72. Park HE, Park HT, Jung YH, Yoo HS. 2017. Establishment a real-time reverse transcription PCR based on host biomarkers for the detection of the subclinical cases of Mycobacterium avium subsp. paratuberculosis. *PLoS One* 12:e0178336. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0178336>.
 73. Park HE, Shin MK, Park HT, Jung M, Cho YI, Yoo HS. 2016. Gene expression profiles of putative biomarker candidates in Mycobacterium avium subsp. paratuberculosis-infected cattle. *Pathog Dis* 74:ftw022. <https://doi.org/10.1093/femspd/ftw022>.
 74. Shin MK, Shin SW, Jung M, Park H, Park HE, Yoo HS. 2015. Host gene expression for Mycobacterium avium subsp. paratuberculosis infection in human THP-1 macrophages. *Pathog Dis* 73:ftv031. <https://doi.org/10.1093/femspd/ftv031>.
 75. Fernández M, Benavides J, Castaño P, Elguezal N, Fuertes M, Muñoz M, Royo M, Ferreras MC, Pérez V. 2017. Macrophage subsets within granulomatous intestinal lesions in bovine paratuberculosis. *Vet Pathol* 54:82–93. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0300985816653794>.
 76. Vogl T, Tenbrock K, Ludwig S, Leukert N, Ehrhardt C, van Zoelen MAD, Nacken W, Foell D, van der Poll T, Sorg C, Roth J. 2007. Mrp8 and Mrp14 are endogenous activators of Toll-like receptor 4, promoting lethal, endotoxin-induced shock. *Nat Med* 13:1042. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nm1638>.
 77. Friedland JS, Shaw TC, Price NM, Dayer JM. 2002. Differential regulation of MMP-1/9 and TIMP-1 secretion in human monocytic cells in response to Mycobacterium tuberculosis. *Matrix Biol* 21:103–110. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0945-053X\(01\)00175-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0945-053X(01)00175-5).
 78. Meade KG, Gormley E, Doyle MB, Fitzsimons T, O'Farrelly C, Costello E, Keane J, Zhao Y, MacHugh DE. 2007. Innate gene repression associated with Mycobacterium bovis infection in cattle: toward a gene signature of disease. *BMC Genomics* 8:400. <https://doi.org/10.1186/1471-2164-8-400>.
 79. Lamont EA, Janagama HK, Ribeiro-Lima J, Vulchanova L, Seth M, Yang M, Kurmi K, Waters WR, Thacker T, Sreevatsan S. 2014. Circulating Mycobacterium bovis peptides and host response proteins as biomarkers for unambiguous detection of subclinical infection. *J Clin Microbiol* 52:536–543. <https://doi.org/10.1128/JCM.02433-13>.
 80. Seth M, Lamont EA, Janagama HK, Widdel A, Vulchanova L, Stabel JR, Waters WR, Palmer MV, Sreevatsan S. 2009. Biomarker discovery in subclinical mycobacterial infections of cattle. *PLoS One* 4:e5478. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0005478>.
 81. Zhong L, Taylor D, Begg DJ, Whittington RJ. 2011. Biomarker discovery for ovine paratuberculosis (Johne's disease) by proteomic serum profiling. *Comp Immunol Microbiol Infect Dis* 34:315–326. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cimid.2011.03.001>.
 82. You Q, Verschoor CP, Pant SD, Macri J, Kirby GM, Karrow NA. 2012. Proteomic analysis of plasma from Holstein cows testing positive for Mycobacterium avium subsp. paratuberculosis (MAP). *Vet Immunol Immunopathol* 148:243–251. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.vetimm.2012.05.002>.
 83. Facciolo A, Kelton DF, Mutharia LM. 2013. Novel secreted antigens of Mycobacterium paratuberculosis as serodiagnostic biomarkers for Johne's disease in cattle. *Clin Vaccine Immunol* 20:1783–1791. <https://doi.org/10.1128/CVI.00380-13>.
 84. Vordermeier HM, Whelan A, Cockle PJ, Farrant L, Palmer N, Hewinson RG. 2001. Use of synthetic peptides derived from the antigens ESAT-6 and CFP-10 for differential diagnosis of bovine tuberculosis in cattle. *Clin Diagn Lab Immunol* 8:571–578. <https://doi.org/10.1128/CDLI.8.3.571-578.2001>.
 85. Johnstone RM, Adam M, Hammond JR, Orr L, Turbide C. 1987. Vesicle formation during reticulocyte maturation. Association of plasma membrane activities with released vesicles (exosomes). *J Biol Chem* 262:9412–9420.
 86. Kamerkar S, LeBleu VS, Sugimoto H, Yang S, Ruivo CF, Melo SA, Lee JJ, Kalluri R. 2017. Exosomes facilitate therapeutic targeting of oncogenic KRAS in pancreatic cancer. *Nature* 546:498. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nature22341>.
 87. Willis GR, Fernandez-Gonzalez A, Anastas J, Vitali SH, Liu X, Ericsson M, Kwong A, Mitsialis SA, Kourembanas S. 2018. Mesenchymal stromal cell exosomes ameliorate experimental bronchopulmonary dysplasia and restore lung function through macrophage immunomodulation. *Am J Respir Crit Care Med* 197:104–116. <https://doi.org/10.1164/rccm.201705-0925OC>.
 88. Webb RL, Kaiser EE, Jurgielewicz BJ, Spellacy S, Scoville SL, Thompson TA, Swetenburg RL, Hess DC, West FD, Stice SL. 2018. Human neural stem cell extracellular vesicles improve recovery in a porcine model of ischemic stroke. *Stroke* 49:1248–1256. <https://doi.org/10.1161/STROKEAHA.117.020353>.
 89. Mathivanan S, Ji H, Simpson RJ. 2010. Exosomes: extracellular organelles important in intercellular communication. *J Proteomics* 73:1907–1920. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jprot.2010.06.006>.
 90. Beatty WL, Rhoades ER, Ullrich H-J, Chatterjee D, Heuser JE, Russell DG. 2000. Trafficking and release of mycobacterial lipids from infected macrophages. *Traffic* 1:235–247. <https://doi.org/10.1034/j.1600-0854.2000.010306.x>.
 91. Bhatnagar S, Schorey JS. 2007. Exosomes released from infected macrophages contain Mycobacterium avium glycopeptidolipids and are proinflammatory. *J Biol Chem* 282:25779–25789. <https://doi.org/10.1074/jbc.M702277200>.
 92. Bhatnagar S, Shinagawa K, Castellino FJ, Schorey JS. 2007. Exosomes released from macrophages infected with intracellular pathogens stimulate a proinflammatory response in vitro and in vivo. *Blood* 110:3234–3244. <https://doi.org/10.1182/blood-2007-03-079152>.
 93. Wang J-J, Chen C, Xie P-F, Pan Y, Tan Y-H, Tang L-J. 2014. Proteomic analysis and immune properties of exosomes released by macrophages infected with Mycobacterium avium. *Microbes Infect* 16:283–291. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.micinf.2013.12.001>.
 94. Cheng Y, Schorey JS. 2019. Extracellular vesicles deliver Mycobacterium RNA to promote host immunity and bacterial killing. *EMBO Rep* 20:e46613. <https://doi.org/10.15252/embr.201846613>.
 95. Alvarez-Jiménez VD, Leyva-Paredes K, García-Martínez M, Vázquez-Flores L, García-Paredes VG, Campillo-Navarro M, Romo-Cruz I, Rosales-García VH, Castañeda-Casimiro J, González-Pozos S, Hernández JM, Wong-Baeza C, García-Pérez BE, Ortiz-Navarrete V, Estrada-Parra S,

- Serafin-López J, Wong-Baeza I, Chacón-Salinas R, Estrada-García I. 2018. Extracellular vesicles released from *Mycobacterium tuberculosis*-infected neutrophils promote macrophage autophagy and decrease intracellular mycobacterial survival. *Front Immunol* 9:272. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fimmu.2018.00272>.
96. Lv L, Li C, Zhang X, Ding N, Cao T, Jia X, Wang J, Pan L, Jia H, Li Z, Zhang J, Chen F, Zhang Z. 2017. RNA profiling analysis of the serum exosomes derived from patients with active and latent *Mycobacterium tuberculosis* infection. *Front Microbiol* 8:1051. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fmicb.2017.01051>.
 97. Kruh-Garcia NA, Wolfe LM, Chaisson LH, Worodria WO, Nahid P, Schorey JS, Davis JL, Dobos KM. 2014. Detection of *Mycobacterium tuberculosis* peptides in the exosomes of patients with active and latent *M. tuberculosis* infection using MRM-MS. *PLoS One* 9:e103811. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0103811>.
 98. Lee RC, Feinbaum RL, Ambros V. 1993. The *C. elegans* heterochronic gene *lin-4* encodes small RNAs with antisense complementarity to *lin-14*. *Cell* 75:843–854. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0092-8674\(93\)90529-Y](https://doi.org/10.1016/0092-8674(93)90529-Y).
 99. Jin W, Grant JR, Stothard P, Moore SS, Guan LL. 2009. Characterization of bovine miRNAs by sequencing and bioinformatics analysis. *BMC Mol Biol* 10:90. <https://doi.org/10.1186/1471-2199-10-90>.
 100. Lindow M, Kauppinen S. 2012. Discovering the first microRNA-targeted drug. *J Cell Biol* 199:407–412. <https://doi.org/10.1083/jcb.201208082>.
 101. Ma R, Jiang T, Kang X. 2012. Circulating microRNAs in cancer: origin, function and application. *J Exp Clin Cancer Res* 31:38–38. <https://doi.org/10.1186/1756-9966-31-38>.
 102. Rosenfeld N, Aharonov R, Meiri E, Rosenwald S, Spector Y, Zepeniuk M, Benjamin H, Shabes N, Tabak S, Levy A, Lebanony D, Goren Y, Silberschein E, Targan N, Ben-Ari A, Gilad S, Sion-Vardy N, Tobar A, Feinmesser M, Kharenko O, Nativ O, Nass D, Perelman M, Yosepovich A, Shalmon B, Polak-Charcon S, Fridman E, Avniel A, Bentwich I, Bentwich Z, Cohen D, Chajut A, Barshack I. 2008. MicroRNAs accurately identify cancer tissue origin. *Nat Biotechnol* 26:462–469. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nbt1392>.
 103. Wiggins JF, Ruffino L, Kelnar K, Omotola M, Patrawala L, Brown D, Bader AG. 2010. Development of a lung cancer therapeutic based on the tumor suppressor microRNA-34. *Cancer Res* 70:5923–5930. <https://doi.org/10.1158/0008-5472.CAN-10-0655>.
 104. Friedman RC, Farh KK-H, Burge CB, Bartel DP. 2008. Most mammalian mRNAs are conserved targets of microRNAs. *Genome Res* 19:92–105. <https://doi.org/10.1101/gr.082701.108>.
 105. Hutvagner G, Zamore PD. 2002. A microRNA in a multiple-turnover RNAi enzyme complex. *Science* 297:2056–2060. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1073827>.
 106. Bartel DP. 2004. MicroRNAs: genomics, biogenesis, mechanism, and function. *Cell* 116:281–297. [https://doi.org/10.1016/s0092-8674\(04\)00045-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/s0092-8674(04)00045-5).
 107. Peng Y, Croce CM. 2016. The role of microRNAs in human cancer. *Signal Transduct Target Ther* 1:15004. <https://doi.org/10.1038/sigtrans.2015.4>.
 108. Calin GA, Croce CM. 2006. MicroRNA signatures in human cancers. *Nat Rev Cancer* 6:857. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nrc1997>.
 109. Taylor DD, Gercler-Taylor C. 2008. MicroRNA signatures of tumor-derived exosomes as diagnostic biomarkers of ovarian cancer. *Gynecol Oncol* 110:13–21. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ygyno.2008.04.033>.
 110. Ueberberg B, Kohns M, Mayatepek E, Jacobsen M. 2014. Are microRNAs suitable biomarkers of immunity to tuberculosis? *Mol Cell Pediatr* 1:8. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40348-014-0008-9>.
 111. Volinia S, Calin GA, Liu C-G, Ambs S, Cimmino A, Petrocca F, Visone R, Iorio M, Roldo C, Ferracin M, Prueitt RL, Yanaihara N, Lanza G, Scarpa A, Vecchione A, Negrini M, Harris CC, Croce CM. 2006. A microRNA expression signature of human solid tumors defines cancer gene targets. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* 103:2257–2261. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.0510565103>.
 112. Barry SE, Ellis M, Yang Y, Guan G, Wang X, Britton WJ, Saunders BM. 2018. Identification of a plasma microRNA profile in untreated pulmonary tuberculosis patients that is modulated by anti-mycobacterial therapy. *J Infect* 77:341–348. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jinf.2018.03.006>.
 113. Barry SE, Chan B, Ellis M, Yang Y, Plit ML, Guan G, Wang X, Britton WJ, Saunders BM. 2015. Identification of miR-93 as a suitable miR for normalizing miRNA in plasma of tuberculosis patients. *J Cell Mol Med* 19:1606–1613. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jcmm.12535>.
 114. Huang RS, Gamazon ER, Ziliak D, Wen Y, Im HK, Zhang W, Wing C, Duan S, Bleibel WK, Cox NJ, Dolan ME. 2011. Population differences in microRNA expression and biological implications. *RNA Biol* 8:692–701. <https://doi.org/10.4161/rna.8.4.16029>.
 115. Duffy FJ, Thompson E, Downing K, Suliman S, Mayanja-Kizza H, Boom WH, Thiel B, Weiner IJ, Kaufmann SHE, Dover D, Tabb DL, Dockrell HM, Ottenhoff THM, Tromp G, Scriba TJ, Zak DE, Walzl G, GC6-74 Consortium. 2018. A serum circulating miRNA signature for short-term risk of progression to active tuberculosis among household contacts. *Front Immunol* 9:661. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fimmu.2018.00661>.
 116. Miotto P, Mwangoka G, Valente IC, Norbis L, Sotgiu G, Bosu R, Ambrosi A, Codecasa LR, Goletti D, Matteelli A, Ntinginya EN, Aloï F, Heinrich N, Reither K, Cirillo DM. 2013. miRNA signatures in sera of patients with active pulmonary tuberculosis. *PLoS One* 8:e80149. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0080149>.
 117. Zhang X, Guo J, Fan S, Li Y, Wei L, Yang X, Jiang T, Chen Z, Wang C, Liu J, Ping Z, Xu D, Wang J, Li Z, Qiu Y, Li J-C. 2013. Screening and identification of six serum microRNAs as novel potential combination biomarkers for pulmonary tuberculosis diagnosis. *PLoS One* 8:e81076. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0081076>.
 118. Abd-El-Fattah AA, Sadik NAH, Shaker OG, Aboulftouh ML. 2013. Differential microRNAs expression in serum of patients with lung cancer, pulmonary tuberculosis, and pneumonia. *Cell Biochem Biophys* 67: 875–884. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12013-013-9575-y>.
 119. Fu Y, Yi Z, Wu X, Li J, Xu F. 2011. Circulating microRNAs in patients with active pulmonary tuberculosis. *J Clin Microbiol* 49:4246–4251. <https://doi.org/10.1128/JCM.05459-11>.
 120. Qi Y, Cui L, Ge Y, Shi Z, Zhao K, Guo X, Yang D, Yu H, Cui L, Shan Y, Zhou M, Wang H, Lu Z. 2012. Altered serum microRNAs as biomarkers for the early diagnosis of pulmonary tuberculosis infection. *BMC Infect Dis* 12:384. <https://doi.org/10.1186/1471-2334-12-384>.
 121. Farrell D, Shaughnessy RG, Britton L, MacHugh DE, Markey B, Gordon SV. 2015. The identification of circulating miRNA in bovine serum and their potential as novel biomarkers of early *Mycobacterium avium* subsp. *paratuberculosis* infection. *PLoS One* 10:e0134310. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0134310>.
 122. Liang G, Malmuthuge N, Guan Y, Ren Y, Griebel PJ, Guan LL. 2016. Altered microRNA expression and pre-mRNA splicing events reveal new mechanisms associated with early stage *Mycobacterium avium* subspecies *paratuberculosis* infection. *Sci Rep* 6:24964. <https://doi.org/10.1038/srep24964>.
 123. Shaughnessy RG, Farrell D, Riepema K, Bakker D, Stephen V, Gordon SV. 2015. Analysis of biobanked serum from a *Mycobacterium avium* subsp. *paratuberculosis* bovine infection model confirms the remarkable stability of circulating miRNA profiles and defines a bovine serum miRNA repertoire. *PLoS One* 10:e0145089. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0145089>.
 124. Vegh P, Magee DA, Nalpas NC, Bryan K, McCabe MS, Browne JA, Conlon KM, Gordon SV, Bradley DG, MacHugh DE, Lynn DJ. 2015. MicroRNA profiling of the bovine alveolar macrophage response to *Mycobacterium bovis* infection suggests pathogen survival is enhanced by microRNA regulation of endocytosis and lysosome trafficking. *Tuberculosis (Edinb)* 95:60–67. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tube.2014.10.011>.
 125. Gupta SK, Maclean PH, Ganesh S, Shu D, Buddle BM, Weddell DN, Heiser A. 2018. Detection of microRNA in cattle serum and their potential use to diagnose severity of Johne's disease. *J Dairy Sci* 101:10259–10270. <https://doi.org/10.3168/jds.2018-14785>.
 126. Golby P, Villarreal-Ramos B, Dean G, Jones GJ, Vordermeier M. 2014. MicroRNA expression profiling of PPD-B stimulated PBMC from *M. bovis*-challenged unvaccinated and BCG vaccinated cattle. *Vaccine* 32:5839–5844. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.vaccine.2014.07.034>.
 127. Malvisi M, Palazzo F, Morandi N, Lazzari B, Williams JL, Pagnacco G, Minozzi G. 2016. Responses of bovine innate immunity to *Mycobacterium avium* subsp. *paratuberculosis* infection revealed by changes in gene expression and levels of microRNA. *PLoS One* 11:e0164461. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0164461>.
 128. Wu F, Zhang S, Dassopoulos T, Harris ML, Bayless TM, Meltzer SJ, Brant SR, Kwon JH. 2010. Identification of microRNAs associated with ileal and colonic Crohn's disease. *Inflamm Bowel Dis* 16:1729–1738. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ibd.21267>.
 129. Xu Z, Zhou A, Ni J, Zhang Q, Wang Y, Lu J, Wu W, Karakousis PC, Lu S, Yao Y. 2015. Differential expression of miRNAs and their relation to active tuberculosis. *Tuberculosis (Edinb)* 95:395–403. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tube.2015.02.043>.
 130. Yi Z, Fu Y, Ji R, Li R, Guan Z. 2012. Altered microRNA signatures in

- sputum of patients with active pulmonary tuberculosis. *PLoS One* 7:e43184. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0043184>.
131. Iannaccone M, Cosenza G, Paucillo A, Garofalo F, Proroga YT, Capuano F, Capparelli R. 2018. Milk microRNA-146a as a potential biomarker in bovine tuberculosis. *J Dairy Res* 85:178–180. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0022029918000122>.
 132. Li S, Yue Y, Xu W, Xiong S. 2013. MicroRNA-146a represses mycobacteria-induced inflammatory response and facilitates bacterial replication via targeting IRAK-1 and TRAF-6. *PLoS One* 8:e81438. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0081438>.
 133. Roos J, Enlund E, Funcke J-B, Tews D, Holzmann K, Debatin K-M, Wabitsch M, Fischer-Posovszky P. 2016. miR-146a-mediated suppression of the inflammatory response in human adipocytes. *Sci Rep* 6:38339. <https://doi.org/10.1038/srep38339>.
 134. Li M, Wang J, Fang Y, Gong S, Li M, Wu M, Lai X, Zeng G, Wang Y, Yang K, Huang X. 2016. microRNA-146a promotes mycobacterial survival in macrophages through suppressing nitric oxide production. *Sci Rep* 6:23351. <https://doi.org/10.1038/srep23351>.
 135. Wu D, Cerutti C, Lopez-Ramirez MA, Pryce G, King-Robson J, Simpson JE, van der Pol SMA, Hirst MC, de Vries HE, Sharrack B, Baker D, Male DK, Michael GJ, Romero IA. 2015. Brain endothelial miR-146a negatively modulates T-cell adhesion through repressing multiple targets to inhibit NF- κ B activation. *J Cereb Blood Flow Metab* 35:412–423. <https://doi.org/10.1038/jcbfm.2014.207>.
 136. Naqvi AR, Fordham JB, Nares S. 2015. miR-24, miR-30b and miR-142-3p regulate phagocytosis in myeloid inflammatory cells. *J Immunol* 194: 1916–1927. <https://doi.org/10.4049/jimmunol.1401893>.
 137. Xu G, Zhang Z, Wei J, Zhang Y, Zhang Y, Guo L, Liu X. 2013. microR-142-3p down-regulates IRAK-1 in response to *Mycobacterium bovis* BCG infection in macrophages. *Tuberculosis (Edinb)* 93:606–611. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tube.2013.08.006>.
 138. Kumar R, Halder P, Sahu SK, Kumar M, Kumari M, Jana K, Ghosh Z, Sharma P, Kundu M, Basu J. 2012. Identification of a novel role of ESAT-6-dependent miR-155 induction during infection of macrophages with *Mycobacterium tuberculosis*. *Cell Microbiol* 14:1620–1631. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1462-5822.2012.01827.x>.
 139. Qin Y, Wang Q, Zhou Y, Duan Y, Gao Q. 2016. Inhibition of IFN- γ -induced nitric oxide dependent antimicrobial activity by miR-155 and C/EBP β . *Int J Mol Sci* 17:535. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijms17040535>.
 140. Ceppi M, Pereira PM, Dunand-Sauthier I, Barras E, Reith W, Santos MA, Pierre P. 2009. MicroRNA-155 modulates the interleukin-1 signaling pathway in activated human monocyte-derived dendritic cells. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* 106:2735–2740. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.0811073106>.
 141. Martinez-Nunez RT, Louafi F, Friedmann PS, Sanchez-Elsner T. 2009. MicroRNA-155 modulates the pathogen binding ability of dendritic cells (DCs) by down-regulation of DC-specific intercellular adhesion molecule-3 grabbing non-integrin (DC-SIGN). *J Biol Chem* 284: 16334–16342. <https://doi.org/10.1074/jbc.M109.011601>.
 142. Sharbati J, Lewin A, Kutz-Lohroff B, Kamal E, Einspanier R, Sharbati S. 2011. Integrated microRNA-mRNA-analysis of human monocyte derived macrophages upon *Mycobacterium avium* subsp. hominissus infection. *PLoS One* 6:e20258. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0020258>.
 143. Ma F, Xu S, Liu X, Zhang Q, Xu X, Liu M, Hua M, Li N, Yao H, Cao X. 2011. The microRNA miR-29 controls innate and adaptive immune responses to intracellular bacterial infection by targeting interferon- γ . *Nat Immunol* 12:861–869. <https://doi.org/10.1038/ni.2073>.
 144. Liu Y, Jiang J, Wang X, Zhai F, Cheng X. 2013. miR-582-5p is upregulated in patients with active tuberculosis and inhibits apoptosis of monocytes by targeting FOXO1. *PLoS One* 8:e78381. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0078381>.
 145. Ghorpade DS, Leyland R, Kurowska-Stolarska M, Patil SA, Balaji KN. 2012. MicroRNA-155 is required for *Mycobacterium bovis* BCG-mediated apoptosis of macrophages. *Mol Cell Biol* 32:2239–2253. <https://doi.org/10.1128/MCB.06597-11>.
 146. Wu Z, Lu H, Sheng J, Li L. 2012. Inductive microRNA-21 impairs anti-mycobacterial responses by targeting IL-12 and Bcl-2. *FEBS Lett* 586: 2459–2467. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.febslet.2012.06.004>.
 147. Fabbri M, Paone A, Calore F, Galli R, Gaudio E, Santhanam R, Lovat F, Fadda P, Mao C, Nuovo GJ, Zanesi N, Crawford M, Ozer GH, Wernicke D, Alder H, Caligiuri MA, Nana-Sinkam P, Perrotti D, Croce CM. 2012. MicroRNAs bind to Toll-like receptors to induce prometastatic inflammatory response. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* 109:E2110–E2116. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1209414109>.
 148. Jansen KU, Anderson AS. 2018. The role of vaccines in fighting antimicrobial resistance (AMR). *Hum Vaccin Immunother* 14:2142–2149. <https://doi.org/10.1080/21645515.2018.1476814>.
 149. Begg DJ, Purdie AC, de Silva K, Dhand NK, Plain KM, Whittington RJ. 2017. Variation in susceptibility of different breeds of sheep to *Mycobacterium avium* subspecies paratuberculosis following experimental inoculation. *Vet Res* 48:36. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s13567-017-0440-7>.
 150. Lee H, Stabel JR, Kehrl ME. 2001. Cytokine gene expression in ileal tissues of cattle infected with *Mycobacterium paratuberculosis*. *Vet Immunol Immunopathol* 82:73–85. [https://doi.org/10.1016/s0165-2427\(01\)00340-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/s0165-2427(01)00340-3).
 151. Borrmann E, Möbius P, Diller R, Köhler H. 2011. Divergent cytokine responses of macrophages to *Mycobacterium avium* subsp. paratuberculosis strains of types II and III in a standardized in vitro model. *Vet Microbiol* 152:101–111. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.vetmic.2011.04.002>.
 152. Coussens PM, Verman N, Coussens MA, Elftman MD, McNulty AM. 2004. Cytokine gene expression in peripheral blood mononuclear cells and tissues of cattle infected with *Mycobacterium avium* subsp. paratuberculosis: evidence for an inherent proinflammatory gene expression pattern. *Infect Immun* 72:1409–1422. <https://doi.org/10.1128/iai.72.3.1409-1422.2004>.
 153. Schwarz DGG, Pietralonga PAG, Souza MCC, Carvalho IA, Cruzeiro RS, Malaquias JV, Benjamin LA, Silva Júnior A, Moreira M. 2015. Cytokine gene expression and molecular detection of *Mycobacterium avium* subspecies paratuberculosis in organs of experimentally infected mice. *Pesq Vet Bras* 35:396–402. <https://doi.org/10.1590/S0100-736X2015000500002>.
 154. Berry A, Wu C-w, Venturino AJ, Talaat AM. 2018. Biomarkers for early stages of Johne's disease infection and immunization in goats. *Front Microbiol* 9:2284. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fmicb.2018.02284>.
 155. Palmer MV, Thacker TC, Waters WR. 2016. Multinucleated giant cell cytokine expression in pulmonary granulomas of cattle experimentally infected with *Mycobacterium bovis*. *Vet Immunol Immunopathol* 180: 34–39. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.vetimm.2016.08.015>.
 156. Thacker TC, Palmer MV, Waters WR. 2007. Associations between cytokine gene expression and pathology in *Mycobacterium bovis* infected cattle. *Vet Immunol Immunopathol* 119:204–213. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.vetimm.2007.05.009>.
 157. Wittchell J, Maddipati S, Wangoo A, Vordermeier M, Goyal M. 2010. Time dependent expression of cytokines in *Mycobacterium bovis* infected cattle lymph nodes. *Vet Immunol Immunopathol* 138:79–84. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.vetimm.2010.07.004>.
 158. Widdison S, Schreuder LJ, Villarreal-Ramos B, Howard CJ, Watson M, Coffey TJ. 2006. Cytokine expression profiles of bovine lymph nodes: effects of *Mycobacterium bovis* infection and bacille Calmette-Guérin vaccination. *Clin Exp Immunol* 144:281. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2249.2006.03053.x>.
 159. Palmer MV, Thacker TC, Waters WR. 2016. Differential cytokine gene expression in granulomas from lungs and lymph nodes of cattle experimentally infected with aerosolized *Mycobacterium bovis*. *PLoS One* 11:e0167471. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0167471>.
 160. Hodgkinson JW, Ge J-Q, Grayfer L, Stafford J, Belosevic M. 2012. Analysis of the immune response in infections of the goldfish (*Carassius auratus* L.) with *Mycobacterium marinum*. *Dev Comp Immunol* 38: 456–465. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dci.2012.07.006>.
 161. Siad S, Byrne S, Mukamolova G, Stover C. 2016. Intracellular localisation of *Mycobacterium marinum* in mast cells. *World J Immunol* 27:83–95. <https://doi.org/10.5411/wji.v6.i1.83>.
 162. Weerdenburg EM, Abdallah AM, Mitra S, de Punder K, van der Wel NN, Bird S, Appelmek BJ, Bitter W, van der Sar AM. 2012. ESX-5-deficient *Mycobacterium marinum* is hypervirulent in adult zebrafish. *Cell Microbiol* 14:728–739. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1462-5822.2012.01755.x>.
 163. Abdallah AM, Savage ND, van Zon M, Wilson L, Vandenbroucke-Grauls C, van der Wel NN, Ottenhoff THM, Bitter W. 2008. The ESX-5 secretion system of *Mycobacterium marinum* modulates the macrophage response. *J Immunol* 181:7166. <https://doi.org/10.4049/jimmunol.181.10.7166>.
 164. Grayfer L, Hodgkinson JW, Belosevic M. 2011. Analysis of the antimicrobial responses of primary phagocytes of the goldfish (*Carassius auratus* L.) against *Mycobacterium marinum*. *Dev Comp Immunol* 35: 1146–1158. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dci.2011.04.007>.
 165. Thegerström J, Jönsson B, Brudin L, Olsen B, Wold AE, Enerudh J,

- Friman V. 2012. *Mycobacterium avium* subsp. *avium* and subsp. *hominissuis* give different cytokine responses after in vitro stimulation of human blood mononuclear cells. *PLoS One* 7:e34391. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0034391>.
166. Vankayalapati R, Wizel B, Samten B, Griffith DE, Shams H, Galland MR, von Reyn CF, Girard WM, Wallace RJ, Jr, Barnes PF. 2001. Cytokine profiles in immunocompetent persons infected with *Mycobacterium avium* complex. *J Infect Dis* 183:478–484. <https://doi.org/10.1086/318087>.
 167. Fulya I, Mehmet O, Handan A, Vedat B. 2006. Cytokine measurement in lymphocyte culture supernatant of inactive lepromatous leprosy patients. *Indian J Med Microbiol* 24:121–123. <https://doi.org/10.4103/0255-0857.25195>.
 168. Masaki T, McGlinchey A, Cholewa-Waclaw J, Qu J, Tomlinson SR, Rambukkana A. 2014. Innate immune response precedes *Mycobacterium leprae*-induced reprogramming of adult Schwann cells. *Cell Reprogram* 16:9–17. <https://doi.org/10.1089/cell.2013.0064>.
 169. Kim S-H, Cho S-N, Lim Y-J, Choi J-A, Lee J, Go D, Song C-H. 2018. Phagocytosis influences the intracellular survival of *Mycobacterium smegmatis* via the endoplasmic reticulum stress response. *Cell Biosci* 8:52. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s13578-018-0250-2>.
 170. Beltan E, Horgen L, Rastogi N. 2000. Secretion of cytokines by human macrophages upon infection by pathogenic and non-pathogenic mycobacteria. *Microb Pathog* 28:313–318. <https://doi.org/10.1006/mpat.1999.0345>.
 171. Park H-E, Park H-T, Jung YH, Yoo HS. 2018. Gene expression profiles of immune-regulatory genes in whole blood of cattle with a subclinical infection of *Mycobacterium avium* subsp. *paratuberculosis*. *PLoS One* 13:e0196502. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0196502>.
 172. Johansen MD, de Silva K, Plain KM, Whittington RJ, Purdie AC. 2019. *Mycobacterium avium* subspecies *paratuberculosis* is able to manipulate host lipid metabolism and accumulate cholesterol within macrophages. *Microb Pathog* 130:44–53. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.micpath.2019.02.031>.
 173. Cha SB, Yoo A, Park HT, Sung KY, Shin MK, Yoo HS. 2013. Analysis of transcriptional profiles to discover biomarker candidates in *Mycobacterium avium* subsp. *paratuberculosis*-infected macrophages. *RAW* 264:7. *J Microbiol Biotechnol* 23:1167–1175. <https://doi.org/10.4014/jmb.1302.02021>.
 174. Thirunavukkarasu S, Plain KM, de Silva K, Begg D, Whittington RJ, Purdie AC. 2014. Expression of genes associated with cholesterol and lipid metabolism identified as a novel pathway in the early pathogenesis of *Mycobacterium avium* subspecies *paratuberculosis*-infection in cattle. *Vet Immunol Immunopathol* 160:147–157. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.vetimm.2014.04.002>.
 175. Weiss DJ, Evanson OA, Deng M, Abrahamsen MS. 2004. Gene expression and antimicrobial activity of bovine macrophages in response to *Mycobacterium avium* subsp. *paratuberculosis*. *Vet Pathol* 41:326–337. <https://doi.org/10.1354/vp.41-4-326>.
 176. Coussens PM, Colvin CJ, Wiersma K, Abouzied A, Sipkovsky S. 2002. Gene expression profiling of peripheral blood mononuclear cells from cattle infected with *Mycobacterium paratuberculosis*. *Infect Immun* 70:5494–5502. <https://doi.org/10.1128/IAI.70.10.5494-5502.2002>.
 177. Naranjo V, Höfle U, Vicente J, Martín MP, Ruiz-Fons F, Gortazar C, Kocan KM, de la Fuente J. 2006. Genes differentially expressed in oropharyngeal tonsils and mandibular lymph nodes of tuberculous and nontuberculous European wild boars naturally exposed to *Mycobacterium bovis*. *FEMS Immunol Med Microbiol* 46:298–312. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1574-695X.2005.00035.x>.
 178. Galindo RC, Ayoubi P, Naranjo V, Gortazar C, Kocan KM, de la Fuente J. 2009. Gene expression profiles of European wild boar naturally infected with *Mycobacterium bovis*. *Vet Immunol Immunopathol* 129:119–125. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.vetimm.2008.12.012>.
 179. Shukla SK, Shukla S, Chauhan A, Sarvjeet, Khan R, Ahuja A, Singh LV, Sharma N, Prakash C, Singh AV, Panigrahi M. 2017. Differential gene expression in *Mycobacterium bovis* challenged monocyte-derived macrophages of cattle. *Microb Pathog* 113:480–489. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.micpath.2017.11.030>.
 180. Killick KE, Browne JA, Park SD, Magee DA, Martin I, Meade KG, Gordon SV, Gormley E, O'Farrelly C, Hokamp K, MacHugh DE. 2011. Genome-wide transcriptional profiling of peripheral blood leukocytes from cattle infected with *Mycobacterium bovis* reveals suppression of host immune genes. *BMC Genomics* 12:611. <https://doi.org/10.1186/1471-2164-12-611>.
 181. Chen L, Liu Z, Su Y, Wang D, Yin B, Shu B, Zhang J, Zhu X, Jia C. 2017. Characterization of *Mycobacterium marinum* infections in zebrafish wounds and sinus tracts. *Wound Repair Regen* 25:536–540. <https://doi.org/10.1111/wrr.12540>.
 182. Benard EL, Rougeot J, Racz PI, Spaink HP, Meijer AH. 2016. Transcriptomic approaches in the zebrafish model for tuberculosis—insights into host- and pathogen-specific determinants of the innate immune response. *Adv Genet* 95:217–251. <https://doi.org/10.1016/bs.adgen.2016.04.004>.
 183. McGarvey JA, Wagner D, Bermudez LE. 2004. Differential gene expression in mononuclear phagocytes infected with pathogenic and non-pathogenic mycobacteria. *Clin Exp Immunol* 136:490–500. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2249.2004.02490.x>.
 184. Sun Y, Liu H, Yu G, Chen X, Liu H, Tian H, Zhou G, Zhang F. 2011. Gene expression analysis of leprosy by using a multiplex branched DNA assay. *Exp Dermatol* 20:520–522. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1600-0625.2011.01270.x>.
 185. Geluk A, van Meijgaarden KE, Wilson L, Bobosha K, van der Ploeg-van Schip JJ, van den Eeden SJF, Quinten E, Dijkman K, Franken K, Haisma EM, Haks MC, van Hees CLM, Ottenhoff T. 2014. Longitudinal immune responses and gene expression profiles in type 1 leprosy reactions. *J Clin Immunol* 34:245–255. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10875-013-9979-x>.
 186. El-Deeb PDW, Fouda T, El-Bahr S. 2014. Clinico-biochemical investigation of paratuberculosis of dromedary camels in Saudi Arabia: proinflammatory cytokines, acute phase proteins and oxidative stress biomarkers. *Pak Vet J* 34:484–488.
 187. Piras C, Soggiu A, Greco V, Alloggio I, Bonizzi L, Roncada P. 2015. Peptidomics in veterinary science: focus on bovine paratuberculosis. *Peptidomics* 2:1–16. <https://doi.org/10.1515/ped-2015-0001>.
 188. Lopez V, van der Heijden E, Villar M, Michel A, Alberdi P, Gortázar C, Rutten V, de la Fuente J. 2018. Comparative proteomics identified immune response proteins involved in response to vaccination with heat-inactivated *Mycobacterium bovis* and mycobacterial challenge in cattle. *Vet Immunol Immunopathol* 206:54–64. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.vetimm.2018.10.013>.
 189. Li P, Wang R, Dong W, Hu L, Zong B, Zhang Y, Wang X, Guo A, Zhang A, Xiang Y, Chen H, Tan C. 2017. Comparative proteomics analysis of human macrophages infected with virulent *Mycobacterium bovis*. *Front Cell Infect Microbiol* 7:65. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fcimb.2017.00065>.
 190. Stamm LM, Pak MA, Morisaki JH, Snapper SB, Rottner K, Lommel S, Brown EJ. 2005. Role of the WASP family proteins for *Mycobacterium marinum* actin tail formation. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* 102:14837–14842. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.0504663102>.
 191. Stamm LM, Morisaki JH, Gao L-Y, Jeng RL, McDonald KL, Rott R, Takeshita S, Heuser J, Welch MD, Brown EJ. 2003. *Mycobacterium marinum* escapes from phagosomes and is propelled by actin-based motility. *J Exp Med* 198:1361–1368. <https://doi.org/10.1084/jem.20031072>.
 192. Babrak L, Bermudez LE. 2018. Response of the respiratory mucosal cells to *Mycobacterium avium* subsp. *hominissuis* microaggregate. *Arch Microbiol* 200:729–742. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00203-018-1479-1>.
 193. Babrak L, Danelishvili L, Rose SJ, Kornberg T, Bermudez LE. 2015. The environment of “*Mycobacterium avium* subsp. *hominissuis*” microaggregates induces synthesis of small proteins associated with efficient infection of respiratory epithelial cells. *Infect Immun* 83:625–636. <https://doi.org/10.1128/IAI.02699-14>.
 194. Yang D, Fu X, He S, Ning X, Ling M. 2017. Analysis of differentially expressed proteins in *Mycobacterium avium*-infected macrophages comparing with *Mycobacterium tuberculosis*-infected macrophages. *BioMed Res Int* 2017:9. <https://doi.org/10.1155/2017/5103803>.
 195. Goulart LR, Goulart I. 2009. Leprosy pathogenetic background: a review and lessons from other mycobacterial diseases. *Arch Dermatol Res* 301:123–137. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00403-008-0917-3>.
 196. Pinheiro RO, de Souza Salles J, Sarno EN, Sampaio EP. 2011. *Mycobacterium leprae*-host-cell interactions and genetic determinants in leprosy: an overview. *Future Microbiol* 6:217–230. <https://doi.org/10.2217/fmb.10.173>.
 197. Bohsali A, Abdalla H, Velmurugan K, Briken V. 2010. The non-pathogenic mycobacteria *M. smegmatis* and *M. fortuitum* induce rapid host cell apoptosis via a caspase-3 and TNF dependent pathway. *BMC Microbiol* 10:237.
 198. Hussain T, Zhao D, Shah SZA, Wang J, Yue R, Liao Y, Sabir N, Yang L, Zhou X. 2018. MicroRNA 27a-3p regulates antimicrobial responses of murine macrophages infected by *Mycobacterium avium* subspecies

- paratuberculosis by targeting interleukin-10 and TGF- β -activated protein kinase 1 binding protein 2. *Front Immunol* 8:1915. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fimmu.2017.01915>.
199. Furci L, Schena E, Miotto P, Cirillo DM. 2013. Alteration of human macrophages microRNA expression profile upon infection with *Mycobacterium tuberculosis*. *Int J Mycobacteriol* 2:128–134. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijmyco.2013.04.006>.
200. Ordas A, Kanwal Z, Lindenberg V, Rougeot J, Mink M, Spaik HP, Meijer AH. 2013. MicroRNA-146 function in the innate immune transcriptome response of zebrafish embryos to *Salmonella typhimurium* infection. *BMC Genomics* 14:696. <https://doi.org/10.1186/1471-2164-14-696>.
201. Liu PT, Wheelwright M, Teles R, Komisopoulou E, Edfeldt K, Ferguson B, Mehta MD, Vazirnia A, Rea TH, Sarno EN, Graeber TG, Modlin RL. 2012. MicroRNA-21 targets the vitamin D-dependent antimicrobial pathway in leprosy. *Nat Med* 18:267. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nm.2584>.
202. Soares CT, Trombone APF, Fachin LRV, Rosa PS, Ghidella CC, Ramalho RF, Pinilla MG, Carvalho AF, Carrara DN, Soares FA, Belone A. 2017. Differential expression of microRNAs in leprosy skin lesions. *Front Immunol* 8:1035. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fimmu.2017.01035>.
203. Rajaram MVS, Ni B, Morris JD, Brooks MN, Carlson TK, Bakthavachalu B, Schoenberg DR, Torrelles JB, Schlesinger LS. 2011. *Mycobacterium tuberculosis* lipomannan blocks TNF biosynthesis by regulating macrophage MAPK-activated protein kinase 2 (MK2) and microRNA miR-125b. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* 108:17408–17413. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1112660108>.
204. Bettencourt P, Marion S, Pires D, Santos L, Lastrucci C, Carmo N, Blake J, Benes V, Griffiths G, Neyrolles O, Lugo-Villarino G, Anes E. 2013. Actin-binding protein regulation by microRNAs as a novel microbial strategy to modulate phagocytosis by host cells: the case of N-Wasp and miR-142-3p. *Front Cell Infect Microbiol* 3:19. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fcimb.2013.00019>.