World Journal of Biology Pharmacy and Health Sciences
eISSN: 2582-5542
Cross Ref DOI: 10.30574/wjbphs
Journal homepage: https://wjbphs.com/

(REVIEW ARTICLE)

Check for updates

Clinical and public health approaches to diagnosis and management of zoonotic infections

Dr.Densingh Johnrose [1, *], Mihir Sharma [1, 2], Azaruddin Gohil [3] and Shivam Singh [4]

[1] *Department of Microbiology, SDIS, Kim.*
[2] *IInd Year M. Pharm-SDPC, Kim.*
[3] *Department of Biotechnology, SDIS, Kim.*
[4] *IVth year B.Pharm, SDPC, Kim*

World Journal of Biology Pharmacy and Health Sciences, 2025, 22(03), 191-200

Publication history: Received on 23 April 2025; revised on 05 June 2025; accepted on 07 June 2025

Article DOI: https://doi.org/10.30574/wjbphs.2025.22.3.0579

Abstract

Zoonotic infections, which are diseases naturally transmitted between animals and humans, represent a persistent and escalating threat to global health security. These infections account for a significant proportion of both endemic and emerging infectious diseases, including high-impact pathogens such as SARS-CoV-2, H1N1 influenza, Nipah virus, and avian influenza. The epidemiology of zoonoses is influenced by complex interactions among environmental changes, human behavior, animal health, and socio-economic factors. This necessitates an integrated approach to diagnosis, prevention, and management.

Clinically, the diagnosis of zoonotic diseases remains challenging due to their often nonspecific symptoms, overlapping with other common infections. Timely and accurate diagnosis relies on a combination of traditional techniques such as microscopy, culture, and serology, alongside modern molecular diagnostics including PCR, ELISA, and next-generation sequencing. These methods not only enhance pathogen detection but also facilitate early outbreak identification and containment.

From a public health perspective, a One Health approach—integrating human, animal, and environmental health—is essential for effective management. Strategies include establishing robust surveillance systems, vector control programs, community education, risk communication, and vaccination efforts in both humans and animal reservoirs. Cross-sector collaboration between medical, veterinary, and ecological disciplines is key to implementing sustainable interventions.

Moreover, the paper reviews case studies that illustrate successful zoonotic outbreak responses and highlights gaps in global preparedness, particularly in resource-limited settings. Challenges such as insufficient diagnostic infrastructure, lack of coordinated policies, and underreporting are discussed, along with future priorities including policy integration, capacity building, and investment in early-warning systems.

This review underscores the critical importance of aligning clinical management with public health strategies to effectively control zoonotic infections. Adoption of a unified, interdisciplinary approach will be instrumental in reducing disease burden, mitigating pandemic risks, and ensuring global health resilience.

Keywords: Zoonotic infections; Global health resilience; Animal health; Public health

* Corresponding author: Densingh Johnrose

Copyright © 2025 Author(s) retain the copyright of this article. This article is published under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution Liscense 4.0.

1. Introduction

Zoonotic infections—diseases that are transmitted between animals and humans—have emerged as a critical public health concern worldwide. According to the World Health Organization (WHO), over 60% of known infectious diseases and approximately 75% of emerging infectious diseases in humans are zoonotic in origin. These diseases span a broad spectrum, including viral (e.g., rabies, Nipah, avian influenza), bacterial (e.g., brucellosis, leptospirosis), parasitic (e.g., echinococcosis), and fungal infections, many of which are endemic in low- and middle-income countries.

The increasing incidence of zoonoses is largely driven by anthropogenic factors such as rapid urbanization, deforestation, global travel and trade, climate change, and intensification of agriculture. These factors contribute to closer interactions between humans, animals (both domestic and wild), and their environments, thereby facilitating the spillover of pathogens.

Effective control of zoonotic diseases requires a dual-pronged approach—clinical and public health—addressing both individual patient management and population-level interventions. Clinically, early diagnosis and treatment are critical to preventing complications and secondary transmission. On the public health front, surveillance, outbreak response, risk communication, vaccination programs, and intersectoral collaboration form the cornerstone of disease prevention and control.

The One Health framework, which promotes coordinated efforts across human health, animal health, and environmental sectors, has gained international recognition as an essential strategy in addressing zoonotic threats. This integrated approach is particularly relevant in the context of emerging and re-emerging infections, where the boundaries between species and ecosystems are increasingly blurred.

This paper explores the current clinical practices and public health strategies employed in the diagnosis, management, and prevention of zoonotic infections, highlighting key challenges, global initiatives, and opportunities for strengthening resilience against future zoonotic threats

Table 1 Common Zoonotic Infections and Their Characteristics

Infection Name	Causative Agent	Animal Reservoir(s)	Mode of Transmission	Geographic Distribution	Clinical Manifestations	Diagnosis Methods	Treatment Options
Example: Rabies	Rabies virus	Dogs, bats, other mammals	Bite/scratch from infected animals	Worldwide (especially Asia, Africa)	Fever, encephalitis, paralysis	PCR, antibody tests	Post-exposure prophylaxis, supportive care

2. Clinical Diagnosis of Zoonotic Infections

Accurate clinical diagnosis of zoonotic infections remains a significant challenge due to the often nonspecific and overlapping clinical features these diseases present. Symptoms such as fever, malaise, headache, and myalgia are common across a wide spectrum of zoonotic and non-zoonotic infections, making clinical differentiation difficult without laboratory support. Additionally, in regions where multiple zoonoses are endemic, co-infections or misdiagnoses are not uncommon. Therefore, a multi-modal diagnostic approach that combines clinical assessment with targeted laboratory investigations is essential for accurate and timely diagnosis.

Table 2 Clinical Diagnostic Approaches for Zoonotic Diseases

Disease	Clinical Symptoms	Laboratory Tests	Imaging/Other Diagnostics	Differential Diagnoses	Challenges in Diagnosis
Example: Leptospirosis	Fever, myalgia, jaundice	Serology (MAT), PCR	Ultrasound (liver, kidney	Viral hepatitis, malaria	Cross-reactivity, early symptoms non-specific

Several diagnostic modalities are utilized in clinical practice

2.1. Microscopy and Culture

Traditional techniques such as direct microscopy and microbial culture remain foundational tools, particularly in resource-limited settings. These methods allow visualization and isolation of specific pathogens, especially for bacterial and parasitic zoonoses. However, they often require specialized staining, prolonged incubation, and expertise, and may have limited sensitivity in early stages of disease. *(Source: PubMed, National Academies Press)*

2.2. Serological Tests

Serology is frequently employed to detect host antibodies (IgM, IgG) against zoonotic pathogens. This method is particularly useful for retrospective diagnosis or in cases where direct detection is difficult (e.g., leptospirosis, brucellosis). Enzyme-linked immune sorbent assay (ELISA), indirect immunofluorescence, and agglutination tests are commonly used. However, cross-reactivity and false positives can affect interpretation. *(Source: National Academies Press)*

2.3. Molecular Techniques

Polymerase chain reaction (PCR) and real-time PCR have become gold standards for detecting specific genetic material of pathogens with high sensitivity and specificity. These tests are especially valuable in acute cases and in detecting viral zoonoses such as Hantavirus, Nipah, or Ebola. Molecular diagnostics can provide rapid results, aiding early intervention and public health response *(Source: PubMed)*

2.4. Metagenomic Sequencing

Next-generation sequencing (NGS) and clinical metagenomics are transformative tools in infectious disease diagnostics. These untargeted methods allow for the identification of a wide range of pathogens—including novel or unexpected agents—directly from clinical specimens. While currently limited by cost and accessibility, these techniques are proving invaluable in outbreak investigations and in detecting pathogens that are difficult to culture. *(Source: PubMed)*

In addition to laboratory methods, **advanced imaging techniques**—such as CT scans, MRI, and ultrasonography—can support diagnosis by revealing organ-specific involvement or characteristic lesions associated with certain zoonotic infections (e.g., neurocysticercosis, echinococcosis, or tuberculosis-like granulomas). Imaging is particularly useful in assessing disease severity and guiding treatment strategies.*(Source: PubMed)*

In summary, the clinical diagnosis of zoonotic infections necessitates an integrative approach that combines patient history (including travel and animal contact), clinical findings, and a judicious selection of laboratory and imaging studies. Strengthening diagnostic capacity at all levels of healthcare is essential for improving patient outcomes and curbing the spread of these infections.

3. Public Health Strategies for Zoonotic Disease Control

The control and prevention of zoonotic diseases extend beyond the clinical setting, requiring a comprehensive public health response that addresses the complex interface between humans, animals, and the environment. As emphasized by the World Health Organization (WHO), the increasing incidence of zoonoses—many of which have pandemic potential—demands an integrated, proactive approach rooted in the One Health framework. This approach prioritizes early detection, rapid response, sustained prevention, and cross-sector collaboration to mitigate zoonotic threats globally.

Table 3 Public Health Strategies for Zoonotic Disease Control

Strategy	Description	Target Population	Implementation Examples	Challenges	Outcomes
Vaccination	Immunization of animals/humans	Domestic animals, high-risk humans	Rabies vaccination campaigns	Coverage gaps, logistics	Reduced incidence of rabies
Vector Control	Reducing vector population (e.g., ticks, mosquitoes)	General population in endemic areas	Insecticide spraying, habitat modification	Environmental impact, resistance	Lower transmission rates

Key public health strategies include

3.1. Surveillance Systems

Robust and integrated surveillance systems are the cornerstone of zoonotic disease control. A One Health surveillance model involves the systematic collection, analysis, and sharing of data across human health, animal health, and environmental sectors. This approach enhances early detection of emerging threats, allows for timely outbreak response, and supports evidence-based policymaking. Syndromic and laboratory-based surveillance, as well as event-based reporting systems, are critical components of such networks. *Source: Wikipedia – One Health*

3.2. Vaccination Programs

Vaccination is a highly effective intervention in controlling zoonotic diseases at both the animal and human levels. For instance, routine immunization of dogs is pivotal in rabies prevention, while poultry vaccination helps control avian influenza. Human vaccination is also essential in high-risk groups (e.g., veterinarians, farm workers, travelers). Coordinated immunization campaigns across species significantly reduce disease incidence and prevent interspecies transmission. *Source: Lippincott Journals – One Health Approaches*

3.2.1. Community Education

Behavioral interventions and health education are vital in reducing human exposure to zoonotic pathogens. Public awareness campaigns should focus on personal hygiene, food safety, safe animal handling practices, and the importance of seeking early medical care. Targeted education in rural and underserved areas, where animal-human interactions are frequent, is especially important. Mass media, school-based programs, and community workshops can all serve as effective platforms for outreach. *Source: PMC – One Health Literacy and Community Engagement*

3.2.2. Intersectoral Collaboration

Efficient control of zoonotic diseases necessitates active collaboration across diverse sectors—including public health, veterinary medicine, wildlife and environmental agencies, agriculture, and policy institutions. Interdisciplinary coordination ensures that risk assessments, interventions, and surveillance strategies are harmonized, reducing redundancy and improving resource utilization. Formalized mechanisms such as joint task forces and cross-sector committees can institutionalize this collaboration. *Source: Lippincott Journals – One Health Interventions*

In conclusion, a multifaceted public health approach anchored in the One Health paradigm is essential for sustainable control of zoonotic infections. By investing in surveillance, vaccination, education, and intersectoral collaboration, governments and global health agencies can build resilient systems capable of preventing future zoonotic outbreaks and pandemics.

4. Case Studies and Global Initiatives

The successful implementation of One Health strategies in various regions worldwide has demonstrated the value of integrated, multisectoral approaches to managing zoonotic diseases. These initiatives emphasize collaboration among human, animal, and environmental health sectors, and highlight the effectiveness of early detection, rapid response, and shared data systems. Below are two key examples that illustrate the impact of One Health in action:

4.1. H5N1 Outbreak in Egypt

During the early 2000s, Egypt experienced multiple outbreaks of the highly pathogenic avian influenza (H5N1), a zoonotic virus with significant pandemic potential. In response, Egyptian authorities adopted a One Health approach that involved collaboration between the Ministry of Health and Population (MOHP) and the Ministry of Agriculture and Land Reclamation (MALR). The strategy included:

- **Surveillance and case reporting** across poultry farms, live bird markets, and healthcare facilities.
- **Joint risk assessments** to identify hotspots and predict transmission patterns.
- **Mass poultry vaccination programs** and culling of infected flocks to reduce viral load.
- **Public awareness campaigns** to inform communities about safe handling and reporting of sick birds.
- **Training of healthcare workers and veterinarians** to enhance outbreak readiness.

This coordinated response significantly reduced the incidence of human cases and limited the spread of the virus, becoming a reference model for zoonotic outbreak response globally. Source: PMC – H5N1 and One Health

Table 4 Management Protocols for Selected Zoonotic Infections

Disease	Initial Management	Antimicrobial Therapy	Supportive Care	Isolation/ Quarantine Needs	Follow-up Recommendations
Example: Brucellosis	Symptom assessment, baseline labs	Doxycycline + Rifampin	Symptomatic relief, hydration	Usually not required	Long-term monitoring for relapse

4.1.1. PREDICT Project

The PREDICT Project, launched in 2009 by USAID under the Emerging Pandemic Threats (EPT) program, exemplifies a global effort to identify, monitor, and mitigate zoonotic threats before they become pandemics. Operational in over 30 countries, the project aimed to strengthen global capacities for disease detection and preparedness. Key components included:

- **Surveillance of wildlife and livestock** to identify high-risk pathogens at the human-animal interface.
- **Sample collection and genomic sequencing** of viruses (e.g., coronaviruses, filoviruses) to assess spillover potential.
- **Capacity building in local laboratories**, including training in biosafety, diagnostics, and molecular tools.
- **Risk modeling and data sharing** to inform national and international health policies.
- **Promotion of One Health networks**, facilitating collaboration between ecologists, veterinarians, physicians, and policymakers.

By the end of the project, over 1,000 novel viruses were discovered, including several coronaviruses closely related to SARS and MERS. The initiative significantly enhanced early warning capabilities and remains a foundation for future pandemic preparedness. Source: Wikipedia – PREDICT Project. These case studies underscore the power of proactive, interdisciplinary collaboration in tackling zoonotic threats. Whether responding to outbreaks like H5N1 in Egypt or enhancing global preparedness through initiatives like PREDICT, the One Health approach has proven effective in reducing disease risks, strengthening surveillance systems, and fostering global resilience against future zoonoses.

5. Challenges and Future Directions

While significant advancements have been made in the diagnosis, management, and prevention of zoonotic diseases through the One Health approach, multiple persistent challenges continue to hinder comprehensive implementation and sustained impact—particularly in low- and middle-income countries.

Table 5 Challenges and Barriers in Diagnosis and Management of Zoonoses

Challenge	Description	Impact on Patient Care	Suggested Solutions
Limited diagnostic facilities	Lack of access to PCR or serology in rural areas	Delayed or missed diagnosis	Mobile labs, point-of-care tests
Animal-human interface complexity	Multiple reservoirs complicate source tracking	Ineffective control measures	Integrated One Health approaches

5.1.1. Resource Constraints

Many regions affected by zoonotic diseases face **limited financial, technical, and infrastructural resources**. Shortages in diagnostic tools, trained personnel, laboratory infrastructure, and surveillance systems compromise early detection and timely response. Rural and underserved communities often lack access to even basic veterinary or public health services, leading to underdiagnosis and uncontrolled transmission.

5.1.2. Data Sharing Barriers

Effective zoonotic disease control requires **real-time, cross-sectoral data sharing** between human health, animal health, and environmental authorities. However, institutional silos, lack of standardized reporting protocols, and concerns about data ownership or misuse often result in delays or gaps in surveillance and response. These barriers weaken outbreak preparedness and hinder coordinated action.

5.1.3. Policy Gaps

Many countries still lack cohesive policies and regulatory frameworks that integrate human and animal health systems. The absence of unified national One Health strategies, inconsistent implementation at the local level, and fragmented governance can limit the success of public health interventions. Without political commitment and legal mandates, collaborative efforts often remain limited to pilot projects or emergency responses.

5.1.4. Future Directions

To overcome these challenges and build long-term resilience against zoonotic threats, several key strategies should be prioritized:

- **Strengthen Intersectoral Collaboration:** Establish formalized One Health platforms at national and regional levels to foster routine collaboration among health, agriculture, wildlife, and environmental sectors.
- **Enhance Surveillance Systems:** Invest in integrated, digital surveillance infrastructure that facilitates real-time data sharing and early warning across disciplines.
- **Capacity Building and Training:** Develop multidisciplinary training programs for healthcare providers, veterinarians, ecologists, and laboratory personnel to enhance local expertise and preparedness.
- **Policy and Legal Reform:** Advocate for the creation and enforcement of unified policies that support One Health implementation, including zoonotic disease control, animal health regulations, and environmental protections.
- **Research and Innovation:** Promote cross-sectoral research on zoonotic pathogens, vector ecology, human behavior, and emerging risks to inform more effective control strategies and novel diagnostic and therapeutic tools.

In conclusion, addressing these challenges through sustained investment, policy integration, and international cooperation will be critical in reducing the global burden of zoonotic diseases. Strengthening the One Health framework is not only essential for current disease threats but is also a cornerstone of pandemic prevention in an increasingly interconnected world.

6. Conclusion

Zoonotic infections represent a complex and evolving global health challenge, responsible for a significant proportion of both endemic diseases and emerging pandemics. The intertwined nature of human, animal, and environmental health demands a holistic response that bridges the gap between clinical medicine and public health. As outlined in this review, the diagnosis and management of zoonotic diseases require not only accurate and timely clinical diagnostics but also robust, proactive public health systems.

The One Health approach serves as a critical framework in this context, offering a comprehensive strategy that brings together professionals from diverse sectors—including human healthcare, veterinary science, environmental management, agriculture, and wildlife conservation. By fostering interdisciplinary collaboration, One Health enhances surveillance systems, streamlines outbreak response, and enables the design of effective prevention and control programs tailored to local and global risks.

From clinical diagnosis using molecular and serological tools to large-scale public health interventions such as vaccination, education, and intersectoral policy development, integrated strategies are proving indispensable in addressing zoonoses. Case studies, such as Egypt's response to the H5N1 outbreak and the global PREDICT Project, demonstrate how multisectoral coordination can lead to early containment and long-term capacity building.

Despite these successes, challenges such as limited resources, fragmented policies, and poor data sharing continue to hinder progress. Therefore, future efforts must prioritize investment in infrastructure, unified surveillance networks, and sustained political commitment. Building local and global capacities, particularly in vulnerable regions, will be crucial in creating resilient health systems capable of withstanding future zoonotic threats.

In conclusion, the synergy of clinical and public health efforts under the One Health paradigm is not just beneficial—it is essential. By institutionalizing this approach at every level of healthcare and governance, we can significantly reduce the burden of zoonotic diseases, protect at-risk populations, and enhance preparedness for future outbreaks. The fight against zoonoses is a shared responsibility, and its success depends on collective action, innovation, and global solidarity

Compliance with ethical standards

Disclosure of conflict of interest

No conflict of interest to be disclosed.

References

[1] Thompson A., Kutz S. Introduction to the Special Issue on 'Emerging Zoonoses and Wildlife'. Int. J. Parasitol. Parasites Wildl. 2019;9:322. doi: 10.1016/j.ijppaw.2019.07.002. [DOI] [PMC free article] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]

[2] World Health Organization Asia Pacific Strategy for Emerging Diseases: 2010. [(accessed on 20 July 2020)];Manila: WHO Regional Office for the Western Pacific. Available online: https://iris.wpro.who.int/bitstream/handle/10665.1/7819/9789290615040_eng.pdf.

[3] Slingenbergh J. World Livestock 2013: Changing Disease Landscapes. Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO); Rome, Italy: 2013. p. 2. [Google Scholar]

[4] World Health Organization WHO Health Topic Page: Zoonoses. [(accessed on 20 July 2020)]; Available online: https://www.who.int/topics/zoonoses/en/

[5] Taylor L.H., Latham S.M., Woolhouse M.E. Risk factors for human disease emergence. Philos. Trans. R. Soc. Lond. B Biol. Sci. 2001;356:983–989. doi: 10.1098/rstb.2001.0888. [DOI] [PMC free article] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]

[6] Grace D., Mutua F., Ochungo P., Kruska R., Jones K., Brierley L., Lapar L., Said M., Herrero M., Phuc P.M., et al. Zoonoses Project 4. Report to the UK Department for International Development. International Livestock Research Institute; Nairobi, Kenya: 2012. Mapping of poverty and likely zoonoses hotspots. [Google Scholar]

[7] Chomel B.B. Encyclopedia of Microbiology. 3rd ed. Elsevier Inc., University of California; Davis, CA, USA: 2009. Zoonoses; pp. 820–829. [Google Scholar]

[8] Hubálek Z. Emerging human infectious diseases: Anthroponoses, zoonoses, and sapronoses. Emerg. Infect. Dis. 2003;9:403–404. doi: 10.3201/eid0903.020208. [DOI] [PMC free article] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]

[9] McDaniel C.J., Cardwell D.M., Moeller R.B., Gray G.C. Humans and cattle: A review of bovine zoonoses. Vector Borne Zoonotic Dis. 2014;14:1–19. doi: 10.1089/vbz.2012.1164. [DOI] [PMC free article] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]

[10] Bae S.E., Son H.S. Classification of viral zoonosis through receptor pattern analysis. BMC Bioinform. 2011;12:96. doi: 10.1186/1471-2105-12-96. [DOI] [PMC free article] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]

[11] Mortimer P.P. Influenza: The centennial of a zoonosis. Rev. Med. Virol. 2019;29:e2030. doi: 10.1002/rmv.2030. [DOI] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]

[12] Huang Y.J.S., Higgs S., Vanlandingham D.L. Arbovirus-mosquito vector-host interactions and the impact on transmission and disease pathogenesis of arboviruses. Front. Microbiol. 2019;10:22. doi: 10.3389/fmicb.2019.00022. [DOI] [PMC free article] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]

[13] Pavlovsky E.N. Natural Nidality of Transmissible Diseases with Special Reference to the Landscape Epidemiology of Zooanthroponoses. University of Illinois Press; Champaign, IL, USA: 1966. [Google Scholar]

[14] Beaty B.J., Marquardt W.C. The Biology of Disease Vector. University Press of Colorado; Niwot, CO, USA: 1996. [Google Scholar]

[15] Somov G.P., Litvin V.J. Saprophytism and Parasitism of Pathogenic Bacteria—Ecological Aspects. Nauka; Novosibirsk, Russia: 1988. (In Russian) [Google Scholar]

[16] Schwabe C.W. Veterinary Medicine and Human Health. The Williams & Wilkins Company, 428 E. Preston St.; Baltimore, MD, USA: 1964. Veterinary medicine and human health. [Google Scholar]

[17] Olayemi A., Adesina A.S., Strecker T., Magassouba N.F., Fichet-Calvet E. Determining Ancestry between Rodent- and Human-Derived Virus Sequences in Endemic Foci: Towards a More Integral Molecular Epidemiology of Lassa Fever within West Africa. Biology. 2020;9:26. doi: 10.3390/biology9020026. [DOI] [PMC free article] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]

[18] Cerdà-Cuéllar M., Moré E., Ayats T., Aguilera M., Muñoz-González S., Antilles N., Ryan P.G., González-Solís J. Do humans spread zoonotic enteric bacteria in Antarctica? Sci. Total Environ. 2019;654:190–196. doi: 10.1016/j.scitotenv.2018.10.272. [DOI] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]

[19] 19.Adesokan H.K., Akinseye V.O., Streicher E.M., Van Helden P., Warren R.M., Cadmus S.I. Reverse zoonotic tuberculosis transmission from an emerging Uganda I strain between pastoralists and cattle in South-Eastern Nigeria. BMC Vet. Res. 2019;15:1–7. doi: 10.1186/s12917-019-2185-1. [DOI] [PMC free article] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]

[20] Messenger A.M., Barnes A.N., Gray G.C. Reverse zoonotic disease transmission (zooanthroponosis): A systematic review of seldom-documented human biological threats to animals. PLoS ONE. 2014;9:e89055. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0089055. [DOI] [PMC free article] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]

[21] County of Los Angeles Public Health Overview of Zoonoses. [(accessed on 20 July 2020)]; Available online: http://www.lapublichealth.org/vet/guides/vetzooman.htm.

[22] Morand S., McIntyre K.M., Baylis M. Domesticated animals and human infectious diseases of zoonotic origins: Domestication time matters. Infect. Genet. Evol. 2014;24:76–81. doi: 10.1016/j.meegid.2014.02.013. [DOI] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]

[23] McNeill W.H. Plagues and People. Anchor Press; New York, NY, USA: 1976. [Google Scholar]

[24] Klous G., Huss A., Heederik D.J., Coutinho R.A. Human–livestock contacts and their relationship to transmission of zoonotic pathogens, a systematic review of literature. One Health. 2016;2:65–76. doi: 10.1016/j.onehlt.2016.03.001. [DOI] [PMC free article] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]

[25] Pearce-Duvet J.M. The origin of human pathogens: Evaluating the role of agriculture and domestic animals in the evolution of human disease. Biol. Rev. 2006;81:369–382. doi: 10.1017/S1464793106007020. [DOI] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]

[26] Samad M.A. Public health threat caused by zoonotic diseases in Bangladesh. Bangladesh J. Vet. Med. 2011;9:95–120. doi: 10.3329/bjvm.v9i2.13451. [DOI] [Google Scholar]

[27] Ghasemzadeh I., Namazi S.H. Review of bacterial and viral zoonotic infections transmitted by dogs. J. Med. Life. 2015;8:1–5. [PMC free article] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]

[28] Goel A.K. Anthrax: A disease of biowarfare and public health importance. World J. Clin. Cases. 2015;3:20–33. doi: 10.12998/wjcc.v3.i1.20. [DOI] [PMC free article] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]

[29] Kamal S.M., Rashid A.K., Bakar M.A., Ahad M.A. Anthrax: An update. Asian Pac. J. Trop. Biomed. 2011;1:496–501. doi: 10.1016/S2221-1691(11)60109-3. [DOI] [PMC free article] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]

[30] Torgerson P.R., Torgerson D.J. Public health and bovine tuberculosis: What's all the fuss about? Trends Microbiol. 2010;18:67–72. doi: 10.1016/j.tim.2009.11.002. [DOI] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]

[31] Bayraktar B., Bulut E., Barış A.B., Toksoy B., Dalgıc N., Celikkan C., Sevgi D. Species distribution of the Mycobacterium tuberculosis complex in clinical isolates from 2007 to 2010 in Turkey: A prospective study. J. Clin. Microbiol. 2011;49:3837–3841. doi: 10.1128/JCM.01172-11. [DOI] [PMC free article] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]

[32] Bayraktar B., Togay A., Gencer H., Kockaya T., Dalgic N., Bulut E. Mycobacterium caprae causing lymphadenitis in a child. Pediatr. Infect. Dis. J. 2011;30:1012–1013. doi: 10.1097/INF.0b013e3182276f7c. [DOI] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]

[33] Moda G., Daborn C.J., Grange J.M., Cosivi O. The zoonotic importance of Mycobacterium bovis. Tuber. Lung Dis. 1996;77:103–108. doi: 10.1016/S0962-8479(96)90022-2. [DOI] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]

[34] Ocepek M., Pate M., Žolnir-Dovč M., Poljak M. Transmission of Mycobacterium tuberculosis from human to cattle. J. Clin. Microbiol. 2005;43:3555–3557. doi: 10.1128/JCM.43.7.3555-3557.2005. [DOI] [PMC free article] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]

[35] Hull N.C., Schumaker B.A. Comparisons of brucellosis between human and veterinary medicine. Infect. Ecol. Epidemiol. 2018;8:1500846. doi: 10.1080/20008686.2018.1500846. [DOI] [PMC free article] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]

[36] WHO . The Control of Neglected Zoonotic Diseases: From Advocacy to Action: Report of the Fourth International Meeting Held at WHO Headquarters, Geneva, Switzerland, 19–20 November 2014. World Health Organization; Geneva, Switzerland: 2015. p. 44. [Google Scholar]

[37] Corbel M.J., Alton G.G., Banai M., Díaz R., Dranovskaia B.A., Elberg S.S., Garin-Bastuji B., Kolar J., Mantovani A., Mousa A.M., et al. Brucellosis in Humans and Animals. WHO Press; Geneva, Switzerland: 2006. [Google Scholar]

[38] Rahman M.S., Han J.C., Park J., Lee J.H., Eo S.K., Chae J.S. Prevalence of brucellosis and its association with reproductive problems in cows in Bangladesh. Vet. Rec. 2006;159:180–182. doi: 10.1136/vr.159.6.180. [DOI] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]

[39] Krebs J.W., Mandel E.J., Swerdlow D.L., Rupprecht C.E. Rabies surveillance in the United States during 2003. J. Am. Vet. Med. Assoc. 2004;225:1837–1849. doi: 10.2460/javma.2004.225.1837. [DOI] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]

[40] Tang X., Luo M., Zhang S., Fooks A.R., Hu R., Tu C. Pivotal role of dogs in rabies transmission, China. Emerg. Infect. Dis. 2005;11:1970–1972. doi: 10.3201/eid1112.050271. [DOI] [PMC free article] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]

[41] Liu Q., Wang X., Liu B., Gong Y., Mkandawire N., Li W., Fu W., Li L., Gan Y., Shi J., et al. Improper wound treatment and delay of rabies post-exposure prophylaxis of animal bite victims in China: Prevalence and determinants. PLoS Neglect. Trop. Dis. 2017;11:e0005663. doi: 10.1371/journal.pntd.0005663. [DOI] [PMC free article] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]

[42] World Health Organization Rabies vaccines: WHO position paper. Wkly. Epidemiol. Rec. 2018;93:201–220. [Google Scholar]

[43] Ghosh S., Rana M.S., Islam M.K., Chowdhury S., Haider N., Kafi M.A.H., Ullah S.M., Shah M.R.A., Jahan A.A., Mursalin H.S., et al. Trends and clinico-epidemiological features of human rabies cases in Bangladesh 2006–2018. Sci. Rep. 2020;10:1–11. doi: 10.1038/s41598-020-59109-w. [DOI] [PMC free article] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]

[44] Plotkin S., Orenstein W., Offit P., Edwards M.K. Plotkin's Vaccines. 7th ed. Elsevier; Philadelphia, PA, USA: 2017. Vaccine; pp. 918–942. [Google Scholar]

[45] Jackson A.C. Human rabies: A 2016 update. Curr. Infect. Dis. Rep. 2016;18:38. doi: 10.1007/s11908-016-0540-y. [DOI] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]

[46] Mitrabhakdi E., Shuangshoti S., Wannakrairot P., Lewis R.A., Susuki K., Laothamatas J., Hemachudha T. Difference in neuropathogenetic mechanisms in human furious and paralytic rabies. J. Neurol. Sci. 2005;238:3–10. doi: 10.1016/j.jns.2005.05.004. [DOI] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]

[47] Hemachudha T., Laothamatas J., Rupprecht C.E. Human rabies: A disease of complex neuropathogenetic mechanisms and diagnostic challenges. Lancet Neurol. 2002;1:101–109. doi: 10.1016/S1474-4422(02)00041-8. [DOI] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]

[48] Dimaano E.M., Scholand S.J., Alera M.T.P., Belandres D.B. Clinical and epidemiological features of human rabies cases in the Philippines: A review from 1987 to 2006. Int. J. Infect. Dis. 2011;15:e495–e499. doi: 10.1016/j.ijid.2011.03.023. [DOI] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]

[49] 49.Chomel B.B., Sun B. Zoonoses in the bedroom. Emerg. Infect. Dis. 2011;17:167–172. doi: 10.3201/eid1702.101070. [DOI] [PMC free article] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]

[50] 50.Halsby K.D., Walsh A.L., Campbell C., Hewitt K., Morgan D. Healthy animals, healthy people: Zoonosis risk from animal contact in pet shops, a systematic review of the literature. PLoS ONE. 2014;9:e89309. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0089309. [DOI] [PMC free article] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]

[51] Day M.J. Pet-Related Infections. Am. Fam. Physician. 2016;94:794–802. [PubMed] [Google Scholar]

[52] Jacob J., Lorber B. Diseases transmitted by man's best friend: The dog. Infect. Leis. 2015;3:111–131. doi: 10.1128/microbiolspec.IOL5-0002-2015. [DOI] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]

[53] Boseret G., Losson B., Mainil J.G., Thiry E., Saegerman C. Zoonoses in pet birds: Review and perspectives. Vet. Res. 2013;44:36. doi: 10.1186/1297-9716-44-36. [DOI] [PMC free article] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]

[54] Moro C.V., Chauve C., Zenner L. Vectorial role of some dermanyssoid mites (Acari, Mesostigmata, Dermanyssoidea) Parasite. 2005;12:99–109. doi: 10.1051/parasite/2005122099. [DOI] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]

[55] Dorrestein G.M. Bacterial and parasitic diseases of passerines. Vet. Clin. North Am. Exot. Anim. Pract. 2009;12:433–451. doi: 10.1016/j.cvex.2009.07.005. [DOI] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]

[56] Jorn K.S., Thompson K.M., Larson J.M., Blair J.E. Polly can make you sick: Pet bird-associated diseases. Cleve. Clin. J. Med. 2009;76:235–243. doi: 10.3949/ccjm.76a.08018. [DOI] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]

[57] Zaman S.B., Sobur M.A., Hossain M.J., Pondit A., Khatun M.M., Choudhury M.A., Tawyabur M., Rahman M.T. Molecular detection of methicillin-resistant Staphylococcus aureus (MRSA) in ornamental birds having public health significance. J. Bangladesh Agril. Univ. 2020;18:415–420. doi: 10.5455/JBAU.80165. [DOI] [Google Scholar]

[58] Kauffman M.D., LeJeune J. European starlings (Sturnus vulgaris) challenged with Escherichia coli O157 can carry and transmit the human pathogen to cattle. Lett. Appl. Microbiol. 2011;53:596–601. doi: 10.1111/j.1472-765X.2011.03163.x. [DOI] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]

[59] Belchior E., Barataud D., Ollivier R., Capek I., Laroucau K., De Barbeyrac B., Hubert B. Psittacosis outbreak after participation in a bird fair, Western France, December 2008. Epidemiol. Infect. 2011;139:1637–1641. doi: 10.1017/S0950268811000409. [DOI] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]

[60] Vanrompay D., Harkinezhad T., Van de Walle M., Beeckman D., Van Droogenbroeck C., Verminnen K., Leten R., Martel A., Cauwerts K. Chlamydophila psittaci transmission from pet birds to humans. Emerg. Infect. Dis. 2007;13:1108–1110. doi: 10.3201/eid1307.070074. [DOI] [PMC free article] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]