

1 **Zoonoses Frontier: Veterinarian, Producer, Processor and**  
2 **Beyond**

3 **Min Yue <sup>1,2,\*</sup>, Huanchun Chen<sup>3,4</sup>**

4 **<sup>1</sup>The Institute for Translational Medicine and Therapeutics; <sup>2</sup>Department of**  
5 **Pathobiology School of Veterinary Medicine, University of Pennsylvania,**  
6 **Philadelphia, PA 19104, United States of America; <sup>3</sup>Division of Animal Infectious**  
7 **Disease, State Key Laboratory of Agricultural Microbiology, Huazhong Agricultural**  
8 **University, Wuhan 430070, People's Republic of China; <sup>4</sup>Division of Animal**  
9 **Infectious Disease, College of Veterinary Medicine, Huazhong Agricultural**  
10 **University, Wuhan 430070, People's Republic of China**

11

12 **To whom correspondence should be addressed: [yuemin@vet.upenn.edu](mailto:yuemin@vet.upenn.edu)**

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24 **Abstract:**

25 As many emerging and re-emerging infectious diseases are associated with food  
26 animals, the relationship between available healthy food sources and population  
27 health and social stability has become evident. A recent example of the importance of  
28 this relationship was observed during the current flu pandemic. This recent pandemic  
29 brought attention to novel target groups of susceptible people at the interface of the  
30 animal and human populations. Veterinarians, producers and processors are uniquely  
31 exposed to emerging zoonoses. Therefore these individuals may serve as key  
32 sentinels and allow efficient evaluation of the effectiveness of zoonoses prophylaxis  
33 and control, including evaluation of the cost-effectiveness in the broader view. We  
34 also suggest some valuable approaches for rapid diagnosis of emerging and  
35 re-emerging infectious diseases and supportive systemic research which may  
36 address related ethical questions. We also highly recommend more research  
37 investigations characterizing this human/animal zoonosis interface, a potentially  
38 productive target for emerging disease diagnosis and control.

39

40

41

42

43

44

45 **SIGNIFICANCE:**

46 **In the global environment of emerging and re-emerging infectious disease,**  
47 **zoonoses are a potential threat to human health and economy. The current**  
48 **pandemic influenza outbreak was a significant public health threat that also had**  
49 **great impact on pork production and distribution. The workers at the interface**  
50 **between the animal and human populations provided evidence for their roles in**  
51 **establishment of disease and subsequent transmission. This interface could be**  
52 **a novel sentinel interface for zoonotic disease surveillance and control.**  
53 **Scientific funding and government policy should focus on this zoonotic**  
54 **interface, which could provide a novel approach to control emerging zoonotic**  
55 **disease.**

56

57 **Introduction**

58 Infectious diseases, as one of leading causes of death (>25% annual total death  
59 worldwide), pose serious threats to population health, animal well being as well as  
60 food safety, economic impact and social stability (Morens *et al.*, 2004). Economic  
61 development, public health, environmental quality and habitation quality have  
62 contributed to the prevention of infectious diseases. Even though such factors as the  
63 overall morbidity and mortality have declined slightly, there are still very serious  
64 challenges to human health that require global solutions for infectious disease  
65 prevention and control. The past few years have seen national and international  
66 disease outbreaks of significant veterinary and often zoonotic importance. This is

67 probably the result of several trends, including exponential growth in human and  
68 livestock populations, dramatic changes in farming practices, intimate interactions  
69 between livestock and wildlife, changes in ecosystems and climate, and globalization  
70 of trade of animals and animal products (Tomley & Shirley, 2009, Chomel *et al.*, 2007,  
71 Williams *et al.*, 2002). As diagnostic technologies have steadily increased the ability to  
72 detect pathogens, more than 1,600 human pathogens have been defined and an  
73 average of three new infectious diseases is reported approximately every 2 years. A  
74 new infectious agent is described in the medical literature almost every week (Tomley  
75 & Shirley, 2009). It has been estimated that the majority of more than 1,400  
76 recognized human diseases are zoonotic and that more than 70 percent of 177  
77 emerging or reemerging diseases have originated from animals (Baker & Gray, 2009,  
78 Cleaveland *et al.*, 2001, Tomley & Shirley, 2009). Zoonosis seems the major  
79 integrating theme of human and veterinary medicine. This theme of emerging and  
80 re-emerging zoonotic infectious diseases has linked world as a “global village”. This  
81 linkage indicates that no country can be free of risk in the face of an outbreak of an  
82 infectious agent anywhere on the planet. Since the first documented case of the  
83 outbreak H1N1 influenza pandemic infection in a Mexico City resident in 2009, the  
84 disease has spread to at least 208 countries with 9,596 confirmed deaths as reported  
85 by the World Health Organization (WHO)  
86 (<http://www.who.int/csr/disease/swineflu/updates/en/index.html>). Initial genetic  
87 characterization suggested swine as the origin of the novel H1N1 influenza virus, on  
88 the basis of sequence similarity to previously reported swine influenza isolates (Smith

89 *et al.*, 2009, Garten *et al.*, 2009). However, the generation of this novel influenza  
90 involves multiple species and reflects the complexity of the human and animal  
91 interface.

92

### 93 **Lessons from Influenza**

94 The recent H1N1 pandemic influenza virus has raised many questions about how  
95 animal-origin viruses spread to human populations and evolve as emerging  
96 pathogens. From the perspective of infectious disease generation, there are three  
97 basic components of this process. Undoubtedly, close human contact with animals  
98 provides more opportunity for infection and host transfer. However, direct contact  
99 does not always result in infection. Virus persistence in the environment and host  
100 innate resistance factors also determine successful disease transmission (Boon *et al.*,  
101 2009, Graham *et al.*, 2008). Veterinarians, abattoir workers, farmers and others  
102 closely associated with animal husbandry, with frequent and intense exposures to  
103 pigs and poultry for example, are likely to be at elevated risk of zoonotic influenza  
104 infection. Previous data indicated that veterinarians and farmers are at risk of infection  
105 with influenza virus because of occupational exposure (Kayali *et al.*, 2009, Gray &  
106 Kayali, 2009, Gray *et al.*, 2008, Gray *et al.*, 2007). Cross-species transfer infection  
107 seems an even more likely event with exposure to large numbers of concentrated  
108 animals. In most developing countries, most of the rural population of subsistence  
109 producers is involved in small-scale husbandry where livestock, poultry and even pets  
110 are housed together. However, farmers practicing small scale or free-ranging poultry

111 and livestock production methods are at an increased risk of infection with influenza  
112 virus with a novel tropism and pathogenicity, though there are limited case reports  
113 (Graham et al., 2008). Because influenza virus contains eight RNA genomic segments,  
114 mixed infections with multiple influenza strains within a production unit may result in  
115 genetic reassortment and driving the evolution of novel influenza viruses with the  
116 potential to create emerging pandemics. While there is no direct evidence that  
117 veterinarians or swine workers played a vital role in the current novel H1N1 pandemic,  
118 inevitably, veterinarians and swine workers could potentially serve as a "bridging  
119 population" spreading pathogens to their colleagues, families, community and to  
120 those animals for which they provide care (Gray & Kayali, 2009). Such events may  
121 occur on swine operations because pigs are naturally susceptible to infection with  
122 novel type A influenza viruses. What is more, persons who work with swine could play  
123 an important role in the mixing of influenza virus strains, directing the adaptive  
124 evolution to human beings, leading to reassortment and development of novel  
125 progeny strains with pandemic and zoonotic potential (Gray & Kayali, 2009). The  
126 primary swine or poultry care givers are potentially among the first to be infected in the  
127 event of an emerging virus becoming epizootic among swine herds, and those who  
128 work with swine may serve as a bridge for transmission of the virus to their  
129 communities. Persons who work with swine could also be considered for sentinel  
130 influenza surveillance and the early diagnosis of infection could indicate a potentially  
131 emerging endemic or pandemic pathogen within the population (Gray & Kayali, 2009).  
132 However, current policies to prevent an influenza pandemic often overlook

133 veterinarians and animal workers. Surveillance of these individuals is traditionally  
134 neglected and pathogen biology and ecology should focus on the workers at the  
135 animal-human interface. Policy measures and biosecurity procedures should be  
136 implemented to reduce hazards for veterinarians and animal workers that could  
137 prevent transmission of zoonotic diseases to others human and animal populations.

138

### 139 **Multiple Roles of “Bridging Groups”**

140 “Bridging groups” are people whom are in close contact with or have direct exposure  
141 to animals and animal products. These groups include veterinarians, farmers, and  
142 abattoir workers. A broader definition would include those individuals that could link  
143 an emerging disease from animals to the human community such as field workers,  
144 outdoor and wildlife enthusiasts, zoo keepers and pet owners. Their relationships with  
145 zoonotic disease are described in Figure 1. For influenza virus, veterinarians are just  
146 one important segment of the zoonotic disease frontier. The workers living and/or  
147 working on large scale progressive production units, people in developing countries in  
148 close proximity to their various domestic animals (usually pigs, chickens ducks, geese  
149 and water buffaloes), workers at processing facilities should all be considered as  
150 potential “bridging groups” for transmission and spread of influenza as well as other  
151 zoonotic diseases (Sahani *et al.*, 2001). Those who have frequent exposure to wildlife  
152 are also a potential surveillance target group for emerging zoonotic diseases (Moll  
153 van Charante *et al.*, 1998). Also, pet owners and zoo workers could be included as  
154 potential bridging groups. People who are chronically ill and possibly

155 immunosuppressed but dependent on animals for companionship and/or for their  
156 livelihoods may also represent a unique set of bridging groups (Chomel et al., 2007,  
157 Trevejo *et al.*, 2005).

158 In the past research focused on either the animal or human population for zoonotic  
159 disease research, particularly with regard to diagnostics, pathogenesis and clinical  
160 prevention or management. While these populations are individually very important  
161 for disease surveillance and control the people in direct contact with the animals may  
162 better serve as sentinels for emerging infectious diseases. This concept provides an  
163 opportunity for reconsideration of the zoonotic disease frontier between humans and  
164 animals. The appreciation of pathogen ecology at the human/animal interface may  
165 facilitate recognition of emerging and reemerging disease events. Previous reports  
166 include numerous publications about occupational disease among workers in animal  
167 agriculture that focus on the chronic diseases associated with environmental factors  
168 and host atopy. There is little information regarding relative risk of contracting zoonotic  
169 disease, whether in reference to an established disease or an emerging, novel  
170 infectious disease (Hoppin *et al.*, 2003, Radon *et al.*, 2001). Sometimes individuals in  
171 the bridging groups may have specific immunity to pathogens and exhibit few clinical  
172 signs and may become a healthy carrier and transmitter of infection. This  
173 asymptomatic colonization and shedding could increase the potential of the carrier  
174 individual as a threat to the general public health. Therefore, surveillance of these  
175 bridging groups seems to be a promising frontier in human health and this deserves  
176 considerable attention. Because of the unpredictability of pathogen emergence, the



177 first line of defence has to be aggressive and effective surveillance, requiring  
178 identification and monitoring of high-risk populations or individuals - the “bridging  
179 populations” seem to be the ideal target for disease identification and monitoring.

180

### 181 **Additional Suggestions for Related Research**

182 Based on these considerations, the following two major objectives have been  
183 identified as areas of possible emphasis by national authorities and scientists who are  
184 engaged in infectious disease research and surveillance. The first goal is the  
185 enhancement of available resources for disease surveillance and subsequent  
186 responses to emergencies. For known infectious agents, we need to focus on the  
187 specific agents as targets for molecular and serological surveillance within the  
188 “bridging population”. Monitoring and surveillance programs should be developed  
189 according to conditions present in individual countries or regions. For very rare and/or  
190 low risk disease situations, passive monitoring and surveillance approach of reporting  
191 of clinical suspect and confirmed cases is likely sufficient. For more common and  
192 higher risk diseases, active monitoring and surveillance along with regular, periodic  
193 collection of case reports can be applied to epidemic area (Doherr & Audige, 2001).  
194 Novel rapid, integrated assays for specific dangerous infectious agents with high  
195 throughput capability based on population requirements are urgently need. Common  
196 primers for PCR and sequencing may represent an ideal way for pathogen screening  
197 and identification as well as for epidemiological investigations. Microarray and  
198 metagenomics may also be applied to simultaneously detect multiple pathogens of

199 interest. Epidemic early warning mechanisms and preparedness plans are also  
200 needed to complete the surveillance programs. More importantly, national authorities  
201 play a key role in devising, financing and implementing these intervention tools.

202 The second goal is basic research in pathogen biology and the continued discovery  
203 and characterization of new infectious agents. A better understanding of the factors  
204 controlling the emergence and spread of infectious diseases is needed. The “jumping”  
205 mechanisms for cross-species infection and spreading need to be understood.

206 Strategic research to enable targeted disease control programs which can be applied  
207 to disease control is essential. The exploration of previously unknown agents,  
208 including those agents with new host tropisms, biological phenotypes or causing new  
209 clinical presentations can provide valuable information for understanding disease  
210 transmission, pathogenesis and control. Projects such as the current Human  
211 Microbiome Project can provide tremendous information for understanding emerging  
212 diseases. These data can also be applied to disease surveillance and potential risk  
213 evaluation within target animal populations. For the “bridging group”, the  
214 metagenomic approach may be an ideal approach in the HMP for surveillance and  
215 potential risk evaluation.

216

#### 217 **Questions remain and Future direction**

218 The concept of “bridging groups” represents a novel concept from Dr. Gray (Gray, et al  
219 2008). The first and greatest obstacle in utilizing these potential surveillance  
220 populations is the existing scientific limitations. Though we have evidence about

221 zoonotic disease transmission directly from animals to humans, there are also other  
222 unknown factors that need to be understood. The second obstacle is evident in the  
223 decision-making process of disease surveillance. Though medicine has classic  
224 concepts of infectious disease control, these concepts must be considered from the  
225 perspective of the “bridging group”. The cost-effectiveness of the control programs  
226 must also be evaluated within the “bridging group”. The range and numbers of people  
227 included for regular monitoring, possible vaccination and other intervention measures  
228 in specific disease control programs must also be evaluated (Gray & Kayali, 2009,  
229 Murphy, 2008). The additional expenditures and effort associated with total disease  
230 control and surveillance may impact the human rights and ethics of the specific  
231 occupational population association with animal agriculture. Therefore this is more  
232 than a scientific problem. Surveillance of the “bridging groups” may also have direct  
233 impact on safety of animal products, which is another important route for zoonotic  
234 disease transmission.

235 It is possible to have an even higher order of baseline preparedness through animal  
236 surveillance of a range of pathogens before they have the opportunity to infect and  
237 spread disease to humans. Initiating preventive actions by dealing with the causes  
238 and drivers of infectious diseases, particularly at the animal–human–ecosystems  
239 interface, seems also to be a promising approach. With regard to zoonosis control and  
240 prevention, integration and analysis of the surveillance data from both animal and  
241 human populations with simultaneous analysis would facilitate early warning and risk  
242 reduction. Systematic pathogen surveillance of animals and recognition of changes in


243 pathogen prevalence, host range tropisms and pathogenesis or virulence as signals  
244 at the herd or production unit level could presage an emerging disease and possibly  
245 minimize the consequences to human and animal health. Neglected groups which are  
246 in close contact with animals due to occupational exposure need considerable more  
247 surveillance and disease prevention efforts to block an emerging zoonotic disease  
248 situation (Myers *et al.*, 2007). These approaches seem a better choice for zoonotic  
249 disease prevention. It is highly unlikely that there will be any way to predict when or  
250 where the next important, new zoonotic pathogen will emerge; nor will there likely be  
251 any way to predict a new pathogen's ultimate importance from its early behavior. The  
252 health and safety of the animal and human populace depends on the continuous  
253 ability to rapidly detect, monitor and control newly emerging or re-emerging livestock  
254 disease and zoonoses rapidly (Doherr & Audige, 2001).

255 Zoonotic diseases require multidisciplinary and comprehensive research studies.  
256 Multi-sectoral collaboration and policy-oriented discussion will allow disease  
257 prevention and control. Where specific occupational exposure and close contact with  
258 animals or animal products, this discussion provides some information about how to  
259 do the supportive research and subsequent disease prevention and control on  
260 zoonotic diseases. Specific strengthening of research and testing efforts on the  
261 "bridging populations" promises a new and hopeful frontier for early warning and  
262 control of emerging zoonotic diseases. Different countries may have different levels of  
263 surveillance and control of specific diseases. Nevertheless, collaboration and  
264 cooperation will allow new surveillance and control programs to prevent the

265 emergence of pandemic disease from the bridging populations at the interface of

266 animals and humans.

267



269

270 **Fig.1 Overview of the zoonoses front line and the “Bridging groups”.**

271 Solid arrows indicate the EID or zoonoses pathogens transmission in animals. Dotted

272 arrows indicate the zoonoses pathogens transmission between human and animals.

273 The figure specifically emphasizes the zoonoses transmission interface, which was

274 defined as the “Bridging groups”. There are conclusive three major pathways for

275 zoonoses disease contribute to “Bridging groups” at animal-human interface.

276 Environmental pathway through wild animals and environments exposure,

277 occupational pathway through exposure to industrial-scale livestock operation and

278 lifestyle pathway during daytime exposure to companion animals.

279

280 **Acknowledgement**

281 This work was supported by the 973 Program (grant no. 2006CB504404) and Innovation

282 Teams of Ministry of Education (grant no. IRT0726). All the authors would like to thank D Scott

283 McVey for his critical comments.

284

285 **References**

- 286 Baker, W. S. and G. C. Gray, 2009: A review of published reports regarding zoonotic pathogen infection  
287 in veterinarians. *JAVMA*, **234**, 1271-1278.
- 288 Boon, A. C., J. deBeauchamp, A. Hollmann, J. Luke, M. Kotb, S. Rowe, D. Finkelstein, G. Neale, L. Lu, R.  
289 W. Williams and R. J. Webby, 2009: Host genetic variation affects resistance to infection with a  
290 highly pathogenic H5N1 influenza A virus in mice. *J Virol*, **83**, 10417-10426.
- 291 Chomel, B. B., A. Belotto and F. X. Meslin, 2007: Wildlife, exotic pets, and emerging zoonoses. *Emerg*  
292 *Infect Dis*, **13**, 6-11.
- 293 Cleaveland, S., M. K. Laurenson and L. H. Taylor, 2001: Diseases of humans and their domestic  
294 mammals: pathogen characteristics, host range and the risk of emergence. *Philos Trans R Soc*  
295 *Lond B Biol Sci*, **356**, 991-999.
- 296 Doherr, M. G. and L. Audige, 2001: Monitoring and surveillance for rare health-related events: a review  
297 from the veterinary perspective. *Philos Trans R Soc Lond B Biol Sci*, **356**, 1097-1106.
- 298 Garten, R. J., C. T. Davis, C. A. Russell, B. Shu, S. Lindstrom, A. Balish, W. M. Sessions, X. Xu, E.  
299 Skepner, V. Deyde, M. Okomo-Adhiambo, L. Gubareva, J. Barnes, C. B. Smith, S. L. Emery, M.  
300 J. Hillman, P. Rivaller, J. Smagala, M. de Graaf, D. F. Burke, R. A. Fouchier, C. Pappas, C. M.  
301 Alpuche-Aranda, H. Lopez-Gatell, H. Olivera, I. Lopez, C. A. Myers, D. Faix, P. J. Blair, C. Yu, K.  
302 M. Keene, P. D. Dotson, Jr., D. Boxrud, A. R. Sambol, S. H. Abid, K. St George, T. Bannerman,  
303 A. L. Moore, D. J. Stringer, P. Blevins, G. J. Demmler-Harrison, M. Ginsberg, P. Kriner, S.  
304 Waterman, S. Smole, H. F. Guevara, E. A. Belongia, P. A. Clark, S. T. Beatrice, R. Donis, J.  
305 Katz, L. Finelli, C. B. Bridges, M. Shaw, D. B. Jernigan, T. M. Uyeki, D. J. Smith, A. I. Klimov and  
306 N. J. Cox, 2009: Antigenic and genetic characteristics of swine-origin 2009 A(H1N1) influenza  
307 viruses circulating in humans. *Science*, **325**, 197-201.
- 308 Graham, J. P., J. H. Leibler, L. B. Price, J. M. Otte, D. U. Pfeiffer, T. Tiensin and E. K. Silbergeld, 2008:  
309 The animal-human interface and infectious disease in industrial food animal production:  
310 rethinking biosecurity and biocontainment. *Public Health Rep*, **123**, 282-299.
- 311 Gray, G. C. and G. Kayali, 2009: Facing pandemic influenza threats: the importance of including poultry  
312 and swine workers in preparedness plans. *Poult Sci*, **88**, 880-884.
- 313 Gray, G. C., T. McCarthy, A. W. Capuano, S. F. Setterquist, M. C. Alavanja and C. F. Lynch, 2008:  
314 Evidence for avian influenza A infections among Iowa's agricultural workers. *Influenza Other*  
315 *Respi Viruses*, **2**, 61-69.
- 316 Gray, G. C., T. McCarthy, A. W. Capuano, S. F. Setterquist, C. W. Olsen and M. C. Alavanja, 2007:  
317 Swine workers and swine influenza virus infections. *Emerg Infect Dis*, **13**, 1871-1878.
- 318 Hoppin, J. A., D. M. Umbach, S. J. London, M. C. Alavanja and D. P. Sandler, 2003: Animal production  
319 and wheeze in the Agricultural Health Study: interactions with atopy, asthma, and smoking.  
320 *Occup Environ Med*, **60**, e3.
- 321 Kayali, G., E. J. Ortiz, M. L. Chorazy and G. C. Gray, 2009: Evidence of Previous Avian Influenza  
322 Infection among US Turkey Workers. *Zoonoses Public Health*.
- 323 Moll van Charante, A. W., J. Groen, P. G. Mulder, S. G. Rijpkema and A. D. Osterhaus, 1998:  
324 Occupational risks of zoonotic infections in Dutch forestry workers and muskrat catchers. *Eur J*  
325 *Epidemiol*, **14**, 109-116.
- 326 Morens, D. M., G. K. Folkers and A. S. Fauci, 2004: The challenge of emerging and re-emerging  
327 infectious diseases. *Nature*, **430**, 242-249.

328 Murphy, F. A., 2008: Emerging zoonoses: the challenge for public health and biodefense. *Prev Vet Med*,  
329 **86**, 216-223.

330 Myers, K. P., C. W. Olsen and G. C. Gray, 2007: Cases of swine influenza in humans: a review of the  
331 literature. *Clin Infect Dis*, **44**, 1084-1088.

332 Radon, K., C. Weber, M. Iversen, B. Danuser, S. Pedersen and D. Nowak, 2001: Exposure assessment  
333 and lung function in pig and poultry farmers. *Occup Environ Med*, **58**, 405-410.

334 Sahani, M., U. D. Parashar, R. Ali, P. Das, M. S. Lye, M. M. Isa, M. T. Arif, T. G. Ksiazek and M.  
335 Sivamoorthy, 2001: Nipah virus infection among abattoir workers in Malaysia, 1998-1999. *Int J*  
336 *Epidemiol*, **30**, 1017-1020.

337 Smith, G. J., D. Vijaykrishna, J. Bahl, S. J. Lycett, M. Worobey, O. G. Pybus, S. K. Ma, C. L. Cheung, J.  
338 Raghvani, S. Bhatt, J. S. Peiris, Y. Guan and A. Rambaut, 2009: Origins and evolutionary  
339 genomics of the 2009 swine-origin H1N1 influenza A epidemic. *Nature*, **459**, 1122-1125.

340 Tomley, F. M. and M. W. Shirley, 2009: Livestock infectious diseases and zoonoses. *Philos Trans R Soc*  
341 *Lond B Biol Sci*, **364**, 2637-2642.

342 Trevejo, R. T., M. C. Barr and R. A. Robinson, 2005: Important emerging bacterial zoonotic infections  
343 affecting the immunocompromised. *Vet Res*, **36**, 493-506.

344 Williams, E. S., T. Yuill, M. Artois, J. Fischer and S. A. Haigh, 2002: Emerging infectious diseases in  
345 wildlife. *Rev Sci Tech*, **21**, 139-157.

346

347