

A Study on Awareness of Livestock Owners about Zoonoses in Jaipur District of Rajasthan

Jyoti Meena*, Nirmal Singh Rajawat, Subhash Chand, Sanjay Kumar Rewani

ABSTRACT

The present investigation was conducted from July to November 2021 in Jaipur district of Rajasthan using an exploratory research design. The data were collected from randomly selected 120 livestock owners with the help of structured and pre-tested interview schedule. Awareness index was calculated by using weighed mean score and maximum obtainable score. Awareness of livestock owners about zoonoses was observed on five different aspects covering zoonotic diseases, their mode of transmission, animal food consumption pattern, detail information on particular zoonotic disease, their vaccination, these are which zoonotic diseases you heard, diseases of animals can transmit to man and vice versa through, animal product consumption pattern, awareness regarding various zoonotic diseases, awareness about vaccination for zoonotic diseases. The findings of study showed that majority of livestock owners had medium level of awareness for zoonotic diseases.

Key words: Awareness, Livestock owners, Rajasthan, Risk, Zoonotic diseases.

Ind J Vet Sci and Biotech (2025): 10.48165/ijvsbt.21.2.15

INTRODUCTION

Livestock is one in all the foremost vital assets of the poor to fulfil their living demands (Perry and Grace, 2009). Pet animals are good companions in many households and contribute to the physical, social, and emotional development of children and also the well-being of their owners (Robertson *et al.*, 2000), whereas non-domesticated animals provide a range of benefits to humans including economic, health, recreational, scientific, and ecological values (Soulsbury and White, 2016). The livestock provides livelihood to 2/3 of the rural community. It also employs about 8.8% of the population in India. The livestock sector contributes 4.11% of GDP and 25.6% of total Agriculture GDP (Anonymous, 2021). Animal diseases can have a crucial impact on the productivity and the quality of product produced (Rich and Perry, 2011), and also possess greatest risk for zoonotic disease transmission that occurs at the human-animal interface through direct or indirect human exposure to animals, their products (Dohoo *et al.*, 1998). Livestock excrete many micro-organisms like bacteria, virus, fungi etc. which have zoonotic potential (Atwill, 2005). Zoonotic diseases cause mortality and morbidity in human (Anonymous, 2006). Among all diseases, brucellosis is a second most important zoonotic disease of the world after rabies (Cutler and Whatmore, 2003) and economic losses due to brucellosis remain significant (Verma *et al.*, 2020). The recent COVID-19 outbreak in China and then other part of world is the 6th global health emergency in the current decade which killed around 3500 people and more than 100,000 people affected so far (Anonymous, 2006, Kumar *et al.*, 2020).

India has the world's second largest human population, two biodiversity hotspots (Myers *et al.*, 2000) and one of

Department of Veterinary and Animal Husbandry Extension Education, Post Graduate Institute of Veterinary Education and Research, RAJUVAS, Jaipur-302031, Rajasthan, India

***Corresponding Author:** Dr. Jyoti Meena, Department of Veterinary and Animal Husbandry Extension Education, Post Graduate Institute of Veterinary Education and Research, RAJUVAS, Jaipur-302031, Rajasthan, India. E-mail: drjiya96@gmail.com

How to cite this article: Meena, J., Rajawat, N. S., Chand, S., & Rewani, S. K. (2025). A Study on Awareness of Livestock Owners about Zoonoses in Jaipur District of Rajasthan. *Ind J Vet Sci and Biotech*, 21(2), 74-79.

Source of support: Nil

Conflict of interest: None.

Submitted 04/11/2024 **Accepted** 23/12/2024 **Published** 10/03/2025

the world's greatest densities of tropical livestock (Kruska *et al.*, 2003). The Central Bureau of Health Intelligence (CBHI) provisionally reported around 110 cases of rabies, 1674 cases of Japanies Encephelitis, 14971 cases of swine influenza virus during 2018 (Anonymous, 2019). India possesses a favourable environment for the transmission of communicable diseases between man and animals (Jones *et al.*, 2008; Forman *et al.*, 2008). In 2015 out of 362 cases of scrub typhus 251 cases were found in Jaipur. Some other diseases like cutaneous leishmaniosis, rabies, swine flu, anthrax were also reported in Rajasthan (Anonymous, 2015). Zoonotic diseases can spread in a variety of ways: through the air, by direct contact, by contact with an inanimate object that harbours the disease by oral ingestion, and by insect transmission (Pelzer and Currin, 2009). Zoonoses work as a double-edged weapon, one side causing serious and fatal diseases in human beings and the other side by undermining animal health and productivity thus producing great financial losses to the animal industries (Pal, 2013; Gezmu *et al.*, 2017). On other hand, "One Health

Initiative” approach introduction takes a general strategy to combine human, animal, and ecosystem health, which means, it connects human medical and veterinary science (Papadopoulos and Wilmer, 2011). Keeping in view all these, a comprehensive study was conceptualized on understanding public awareness and practice of livestock owners about zoonotic diseases that have received much attention now a days aiming as a useful tool in developing and improving existing control measures.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

A study was purposively conducted in the Jaipur district of Rajasthan. Data was collected from the selected livestock owners by using the structured interview schedule developed for the purpose. After the selection of the villages, a preliminary survey was conducted in the selected villages to know the total number of livestock owners who were engaged in livestock farming from generation to generation and presently rearing at least 3-4 livestock. Out of them, 6 livestock owners from each village, five villages from each tehsil and four tehsils from Jaipur district were selected randomly for the study. Thus, a total of 120 livestock owners was selected and interviewed on various identified statements/items as per the objectives of the study. The data were collected with the help of structured and pre-tested interview schedule in the month of July in the year 2021. The data included information about the awareness of livestock owners about zoonoses. Responses of livestock owners were obtained on two-point continuum scale like “aware”, and “not aware” and weightage were given as 2 and 1, respectively. After collection of data, frequency, percent, mean, standard deviation values were computed by using Microsoft Excel and Adoption index was calculated by using formula:

$$\text{Adoption Index (\%)} = \frac{\text{weighted mean score}}{\text{Maximum obtainable score}} \times 10$$

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Distribution of Livestock Owners according to their Personal Attributes

Majority of the livestock owners were middle aged (50.83%) and illiterate (33.33%); 49.17% of them had agriculture as their primary occupation and 64.17% had livestock plus agriculture as their entrepreneurial occupation. Majority of the livestock owners had medium size families (68.34%) and were living in a joint family system (62.50%). Majority of the livestock owners had small land holding (33.33%), medium sized herd (83.33%) and medium level of experience in livestock farming (59.16%). The average livestock farming experience of livestock owners was 29.83 ±11.05 years. The average annual gross income of the livestock owners was ₹ 1,53,000 per annum and majority of the livestock owners

(75.83%) were under the medium income group. Majority of them had medium level of extension contact (60.84%), mass media exposure (68.33%), while majority of them (78.33%) had no social participation.

Table1: Distribution of livestock owners according to their personal attributes (n=120)

| Attributes | Description | No. | % |
|-----------------------------------|---------------------------------|-----|--------------|
| Age | Young (Up to 35years) | 21 | 17.50 |
| | Middle (36 to 50 years) | 61 | 50.83 |
| | Old (Above 50 years) | 38 | 31.67 |
| | Mean ± SD | | 43.78±9.96 |
| Education | Illiterate | 40 | 33.33 |
| | Primary level | 15 | 12.50 |
| | Middle level | 23 | 19.16 |
| | High school level | 17 | 14.17 |
| | Intermediate level | 05 | 4.17 |
| | Graduate & above | 20 | 16.67 |
| | Mean ± SD | | 6.85±2.8 |
| Family size | Small (Up to 4 members) | 20 | 16.66 |
| | Medium (5 to 9 members) | 82 | 68.34 |
| | Large (Above 9 members) | 18 | 15.00 |
| | Mean ± SD | | 6.85±2.8 |
| Family type | Nuclear | 45 | 37.50 |
| | Joint | 75 | 62.50 |
| Occupation (Enterprise basis) | Livestock farming + Agriculture | 77 | 64.17 |
| | Livestock farming (LF) + Labor | 07 | 05.83 |
| | LF + Agriculture + Business | 04 | 03.33 |
| | LF + Agriculture + Service | 32 | 26.67 |
| | Agriculture | 59 | 49.16 |
| Primary occupation | Livestock farming | 22 | 18.33 |
| | Labor | 3 | 2.50 |
| | Business | 4 | 3.34 |
| | Service | 32 | 26.67 |
| | Landless (0) | 04 | 3.34 |
| Land holding | Marginal (Upto1 hectares) | 21 | 17.50 |
| | Small (>1 to 2 hectares) | 40 | 33.33 |
| | Semi medium (>2 to 4 hectares) | 34 | 28.33 |
| | Medium (>4 to 10 hectares) | 09 | 7.50 |
| | Large (More than 10 hectares) | 12 | 10.00 |
| | Mean ± SD | | 7.66±5.19 |
| Herd size (Adult unit equivalent) | Small (Less than 2.47) | 5 | 4.17 |
| | Medium (2.47 to 12.85) | 100 | 83.33 |
| | Large (Above 12.85) | 15 | 12.50 |
| | Mean ± SD | | 7.66±5.19 |
| Annual gross income | Low (Less than ₹ 75,426) | 6 | 5 |
| | Medium (₹ 75,426 to ₹ 2,30,574) | 91 | 75.83 |
| | High (Above ₹ 2,30,574) | 23 | 19.17 |
| | Mean ± SD | | 153000±77574 |

| | | | |
|--|-------------------------|----|-------------|
| Experience in livestock farming (in years) | Low (Less than 18.78) | 23 | 19.16 |
| | Medium (18.78 to 40.88) | 71 | 59.17 |
| | High (Above 40.88) | 26 | 21.67 |
| | Mean ± S.D. | | 29.83±11.05 |
| Extension contacts | Low (Less than 3.13) | 25 | 20.83 |
| | Medium (3.13 to 8.59) | 73 | 60.84 |
| | High (Above 8.59) | 22 | 18.33 |
| | Mean ± SD | | 5.86±2.73 |
| Mass media exposure | Low (Less than 2.56) | 20 | 16.67 |
| | Medium (2.56 to 11.3) | 82 | 68.33 |
| | High (Above 11.3) | 18 | 15.00 |
| | Mean ± SD | | 6.93±4.37 |
| Social participation* | No participation | 94 | 78.33 |
| | Member | 31 | 25.83 |
| | Office bearer | 02 | 01.67 |

*Sum of frequency exceeds the number of observations (n=120) due to multiple responses

Awareness of Livestock Owners about Zoonoses

Awareness of livestock owners about zoonoses was observed on five different aspects covering zoonotic diseases, their mode of transmission, animal food consumption pattern, detailed information on particular zoonotic disease and their vaccination. The results obtained are presented below in Tables from 2 to 5.

(A) Which zoonotic disease have you heard

Among six major zoonotic disease, 98.33% of respondents heard about rabies, 94.17% heard about tuberculosis, 40.00% heard about babesiosis, 5.00% heard about anthrax, 17.50% heard about brucellosis, while 29.16% of respondents heard about dermatophytosis. These findings were similar to Hundal *et al.* (2016), Rajput *et al.* (2016), and Kerorsa (2019).

Table 2: Distribution of livestock owners according to the zoonotic disease they heard (n=120)

| Diseases | Aware | Not Aware |
|-----------------|-------------|-------------|
| Rabies | 118 (98.33) | 02 (1.67) |
| Brucellosis | 21 (17.50) | 99 (82.50) |
| Tuberculosis | 113 (94.17) | 07 (5.83) |
| Anthrax | 06 (5.00) | 114 (95.00) |
| Dermatophytosis | 35 (29.16) | 85 (70.84) |
| Babesiosis | 48 (40.00) | 72 (60.00) |

Values in parenthesis indicate the percentage

(B) Awareness about mode of transmission of zoonotic diseases

Majority (98.33%) of the livestock owners were aware of animal diseases that can be transmitted by ingestion of

contaminated milk and water, and through the bite of animals or contact of animal's saliva. 88.33% of the livestock owners were aware of the transmission of diseases through the bite of arthropods, while 14.17% only new regarding inhalation as a mode of transmission. Moreover, only one-third (33.33%) of the respondents were aware about transmission of diseases by direct and indirect contact with animals, which was in line with Abera *et al.* (2016), who showed 25.6% respondents having awareness about the mode of transmission of zoonotic diseases by contact.

(C) Animal product consumption pattern

Table 4 indicates that majority (97.50%) of livestock owners were aware to consume boiled and properly cooked meat. Similarly, 95.83% of livestock owners were aware to consume boiled and properly cooked egg and 89.17% regarding aware about consumption of boiled milk. These results however contradicted with Abera *et al.* (2016) as there is a deep-rooted culture of raw meat consumption in Ethiopia where individuals were having the chance to consume more raw meat in different social ceremonies such as weddings and other local holy days.

Table 3: Distribution of livestock owners according to their awareness about diseases of animals can transmit to man and vice versa through various modes (n=120)

| Statements | Aware | Not Aware |
|--|-------------|-------------|
| Direct contact or indirect contact of materials that have come in contact with animals | 40 (33.33) | 80 (66.67) |
| Ingestion of contaminated milk and water | 118 (98.33) | 2 (1.67) |
| Inhalation route | 17 (14.17) | 103 (85.83) |
| Bite of animals or contact of animal's saliva | 118 (98.33) | 2 (1.67) |
| Bite of vectors (flies, mosquitos, etc.) | 106 (88.33) | 14 (11.67) |

Values in parenthesis indicate the percentage

Table 4: Distribution of livestock owners according to their awareness to consume boiled & properly cooked animal product (n=120)

| Product | Aware | Not aware |
|---------|-------------|------------|
| Milk | 107 (89.17) | 13 (10.83) |
| Meat | 117 (97.50) | 03 (2.50) |
| Egg | 115 (95.83) | 05 (4.17) |

Values in parenthesis indicate the percentage

(D) Awareness regarding various zoonotic diseases

Table 5 shows that only 5.00% of the livestock owner had knowledge that anthrax can be transmitted by direct contact with animals, while 5.00%, 4.17%, 0.84%, 0.84% and 5.00% of them had knowledge that anthrax is highly fatal disease in dairy animals, anthrax can be transmitted by direct contact with discharge of animals, anthrax is highly fatal disease in human beings, anthrax can be transmitted by inhalation and death due to anthrax leads to bleeding from natural



orifices that doesn't clot, respectively. Majority (99.16%) of the livestock owners were not aware, while 00.84 % were aware that brucellosis can be transmitted by airborne infection, consumption of raw milk; brucellosis can cause orchitis and undulant fever in men, and brucella testing in animals needs to be done twice a year.

Further, majority (58.33%) of livestock owners were aware, while 41.67 % had no awareness about transmission of tuberculosis through inhalation of the droplet from

pulmonary lesions. Majority (89.17%) of the livestock owners had awareness that tuberculosis can be transmitted by consumption of raw milk. Moreover, majority (98.33%) of livestock owners were aware that rabies to animals can be caused by the bite of rabid dog/cat, whereas 87.50 % of them knew that rabies in animals causes profuse salivation, depression and convulsions (Table 5). These findings were similar to those of Mohan (2012), Thakkar (2013), Rajput *et al.* (2016), and Pawar (2018)

Table 5: Distribution of livestock owners according to their awareness regarding various zoonotic diseases (n=120)

| Diseases | Statements | Aware | Not Aware |
|-------------|--|-------------|-------------|
| Anthrax | Anthrax can be transmitted by direct contact with animal | 6 (05.00) | 114 (95.00) |
| | can be transmitted by direct contact with the discharge of animals | 5 (04.17) | 115 (95.83) |
| | can be transmitted by inhalation | 1 (0.84) | 119 (99.16) |
| | death due to anthrax leads to bleeding from natural orifices that doesn't clot | 6 (05.00) | 114 (95.00) |
| | is a highly fatal disease in livestock | 6 (05.00) | 114 (95.00) |
| | is a highly fatal disease in human beings | 1 (0.84) | 119 (99.16) |
| Brucellosis | Brucellosis can be transmitted by airborne infection | 1 (0.84) | 119 (99.16) |
| | can be transmitted by consumption of raw milk | 1 (0.84) | 119 (99.16) |
| | It can be caused by direct contact with infected uterine discharge, aborted fetus, placenta, urine and other body fluids | 19 (15.84) | 101 (84.16) |
| | causes abortion in the last trimester in animals | 15 (12.50) | 105 (87.50) |
| | causes retention of the placenta in animals | 20 (16.67) | 100 (83.33) |
| | causes anestrus in animals | 18 (15.00) | 102 (85.00) |
| | causes repeat breeding in animals | 20 (16.67) | 100 (83.33) |
| | causes orchitis in man | 1 (0.84) | 119 (99.16) |
| | causes undulant fever in man | 1 (0.84) | 119 (99.16) |
| | Brucella testing in animals needs to be done twice a year | 1 (0.84) | 119 (99.16) |
| TB | TB can be transmitted by consumption of raw milk | 107 (89.17) | 13 (10.83) |
| | TB can be transmitted by inhalation of the droplet from a pulmonary lesion | 70 (58.33) | 50 (41.67) |
| | TB can be caused by indirect contact with contaminated material | 53 (44.16) | 67 (55.84) |
| | TB can be caused by direct invasion of bacillus through mucus membrane or abraded skin | 2 (01.67) | 118 (98.33) |
| | TB is curable in animals | 93 (77.50) | 27 (22.50) |
| | TB in an animal is characterized by chronic cough, dyspnea and emaciation | 94 (78.33) | 26 (21.67) |
| | TB in humans is characterized by hemoptysis, cough (not responding to treatment), fever and weight loss | 107 (89.17) | 13 (10.83) |
| | TB is curable in human beings | 114 (95.00) | 6 (05.00) |
| Rabies | Rabies to animals can be caused by the bite of a rabid dog/cat | 118 (98.33) | 2 (01.67) |
| | Rabies in animals causes profuse salivation, depression and convulsions | 105 (87.50) | 15 (12.50) |
| | Rabies to livestock owners can be caused by contact of bruised or injured body parts with the saliva of a rabid animal | 53 (44.17) | 67 (55.83) |
| | Rabies in human causes salivation, excitement, dysphagia, hydrophobia and convulsions | 75 (62.50) | 45 (37.50) |

Values in parenthesis indicate the percentage

Majority (68.33%) of livestock owners were aware of vaccination of rabies, followed by 30.83 % were aware of vaccination of tuberculosis, while majority (94.14%) were not aware about the brucellosis vaccination.

Overall Awareness Level of Livestock Owners About Zoonoses

Majority (76.67%) of livestock owners had a medium level of awareness for zoonotic diseases followed by 12.50 %

and 10.83 % had high and low-level awareness for zoonotic diseases, respectively. The data presented in Table 6 indicate that awareness of livestock owners about zoonotic diseases they heard was 47.36 %, mode of diseases transmitted to man and vice versa was 66.50 %, animal product consumption

pattern showed the highest level of awareness as 94.17 %, information on various zoonotic diseases was 33.15 % and for vaccination of zoonotic disease 35.00 %. The overall awareness level of livestock owners about zoonoses was 42.94 %.

Table 6: Awareness level of livestock owners on different aspects of zoonoses

| Awareness aspect | No. of statements | Obtained score | Maximum obtainable score | Awareness level (%) |
|--|-------------------|----------------|--------------------------|---------------------|
| Which zoonotic disease have you heard | 6 | 341 | 720 | 47.36 |
| Diseases of animals can transmit to man and vice versa | 5 | 399 | 600 | 66.50 |
| Animal product consumption pattern | 3 | 399 | 360 | 94.17 |
| Awareness regarding various zoonotic disease | 28 | 1114 | 3360 | 33.15 |
| Awareness about vaccination for zoonotic disease | 3 | 126 | 360 | 35.00 |
| Overall average | 45 | 2319 | 5400 | 42.94 |

Values in parenthesis indicate the percentage

Relationship between the Profile of Livestock Owners and their Awareness of Zoonotic Diseases

The age, land holding, and experience in livestock farming had a significant ($p < 0.01$) negative relationship with their awareness of zoonotic diseases ($r = -0.574, -0.362, -0.574$), while education, extension contact, mass media contact, social participation and preventive and control measures had a significant ($p < 0.01$) positive relationship with awareness of zoonotic diseases ($r = 0.728, 0.425, 0.716, 0.311, 0.431$, respectively). Family size, and annual gross income had a negative and non-significant relationship ($-0.089, -0.047$), whereas herd size had a positive and non-significant relationship (0.164) with awareness of livestock owners towards zoonotic diseases.

A negative and significant association with the age of livestock owners with awareness of zoonotic diseases showed that awareness is decreasing with an increase in age, *i.e.*, older age group was having a low level of awareness on zoonoses. Positive and significant association of education of livestock owners with awareness of zoonotic diseases may be attributed to the fact that educated people know the effect of zoonotic diseases and their negative impact on the productivity of animals. Further, a positive and significant association of mass media exposure, extension contact and social participation with awareness of livestock owners indicated that when the livestock owners have wide communication and use of mass media tools that increases their awareness regarding the effect of zoonotic diseases on health and animal productivity. Similarly, a positive and significant association of preventive and control measures with awareness of livestock owners suggested that farmer having better adopted these measures were having high awareness level.

CONCLUSION

It can be concluded from the study that majority of livestock owners were middle aged and had small land holding with agriculture as primary and dairy farming as their secondary

occupation, low level of education, social participation, medium herd size, annual gross income, and limited sources of information for newly developed emerging diseases were the major constraint in awareness of zoonotic diseases. The study revealed that majority of livestock owners had low level of awareness of disease symptoms, transmission mode and their vaccination. Majority of livestock owners were not aware of vaccination and government programme for zoonotic diseases like anthrax, rabies, tuberculosis, brucellosis. Therefore, it is suggested to promote mass awareness programmes for enhancing knowledge on limiting zoonoses.

REFERENCES

Abera, G., Kumar, N., Gebrewahd, T., & Yizengaw, H. (2016). Study on assessment of community awareness towards common zoonotic diseases in and around Asella, Eastern Arsi Zone, Ethiopia. *International Journal of Livestock Research*, 6(5), 83-90.

Anonymous (2006). The control of neglected zoonotic diseases: A route to poverty alleviation: Report of a joint world health organization (No. WHO/SDE/FOS/2006.1). Available from https://www.who.int/neglected_diseases/zoonoses/9789241594301/en/.

Anonymous (2015). Trends of Communicable Diseases and IDSP Reporting in the State of Rajasthan. Available from <http://164.100.222.222/content/dam/doiassets/education/medicaleducation/smsmedicalcollegejaipur/pdf/Trends%20of%20Communicable%20Disease%20&%20IDSP%20reporting%20in%20Rajasthan-%20Dr.%20Monika%20Rathore.pdf>. Accessed on 10th March, 2021.

Anonymous (2019). National Health Profile - 2019. Central bureau of health intelligence, Directorate general of health services, Ministry of Health and Family Welfare, Government of India. Available from <http://www.cbhidghs.nic.in/showfile.php?lid=1147>. Accessed on 20th March, 2021.

Anonymous (2021). Vikaspedia. Role of Livestock in Indian Economy. Available from <https://vikaspedia.in/agriculture/livestock/role-of-livestock-in-indian-economy>. Accessed on 10th March, 2021

Atwill, E.R. (2005). Microbial pathogens excreted by livestock and potentially transmitted to humans through water. School of



- Veterinary Medicine, University of California, Davis, published online at <http://forestry.berkeley.edu/rangelandwq/pdfs/AtwillArcfinal.pdf>.
- Cutler, S., & Whatmore, A. (2003). Progress in understanding brucellosis. *The Veterinary Record*, 153(21), 641-642.
- Dohoo, I.R., McDonnell, W.N., Rhodes, C.S., & Elazhary, Y.L. (1998). Veterinary research and human health. *The Canadian Veterinary Journal*, 39(9), 548-556.
- Forman, S., Hungerford, N., Yamakawa, M., Yanase, T., Tsai, H.J., Joo, Y.S., Yang, D.K., & Nha, J.J. (2008). Climate change impacts and risks for animal health in Asia. *Revue Scientifique et Technique. International Office of Epizootics*, 27(2), 581-597.
- Gezmu, M., Bsrat, A., & Mekuria, A. (2017). Assessment of community knowledge, attitude and practice on zoonotic disease in and around Dodola town, west Arsi zone, Ethiopia. *Ethiopian Journal of Veterinary Science and Animal Production* 1(1), 57-65.
- Hundal, J.S., Sodhi, S.S., Gupta, A., Singh, J., & Chahal, U.S. (2016). Awareness, knowledge, and risks of zoonotic diseases among livestock farmers in Punjab. *Veterinary World*, 9(2), 186-191.
- Jones, K.E., Patel, N.G., Levy, M.A., Storeygard, A., Balk, D., Gittleman, J.L., & Daszak, P. (2008). Global trends in emerging infectious diseases. *Nature* 451(7181), 990-993.
- Kerorsa, G.B. (2019). Assessment of public awareness on common zoonotic diseases in Lalo Kile district, Kellem Wollega Zone, Ethiopia. *Young*, 101, 22-95.
- Kruska, R.L., Reid, R.S., Thornton, P.K., Henninger, N., & Kristjanson, P.M. (2003). Mapping livestock-oriented agricultural production systems for the developing world. *Agricultural Systems* 77(1), 39-63.
- Kumar, S., Swain, S., Preetha, G.S., Singh, B.S., & Aggarwal, D. (2020). Zoonotic diseases in India. *Indian Journal of Community Medicine*, 45(Suppl 1), S1-S2.
- Mohan, S.K. (2012). Farmer's knowledge analysis about major bovine zoonotic diseases in Kerala. *Doctoral Dissertation*. National Dairy Research Institute, Karnal, India. Retrieved from <http://krishkosh.egranth.ac.in/handle/1/83990>
- Myers, N., Mittermeier, R.A., Mittermeier, C.G., Da Fonseca, G.A., & Kent, J. (2000). Biodiversity hotspots for conservation priorities. *Nature* 403(6772), 853-858.
- Pal, M. (2013). Public health concern due to emerging and re-emerging zoonoses. *International Journal of Livestock Research* 3(1), 56-62.
- Papadopoulos, A., & Wilmer, S. (2011). One Health: A Primer. National Collaborating Centre for Environmental Health. Available from http://scholar.google.co.in/scholar_url?url=https://otru.pw/k_f.pdf&hl=en&sa=X&ei=6WGYLq5FomyyASJmIS4AQ&scisig=AAGBfm25dbbqO6BLotsIzhXANns-NUjXg&nossl=1&oi=scholar Accessed on 17 march, 2021.
- Pawar, A.N. (2018). Knowledge level of dairy farmers regarding zoonotic diseases in Beed district of Maharashtra. *Doctoral Dissertation*. MAFSU, Nagpur, India. Retrieved from <http://krishkosh.egranth.ac.in/handle/1/5810062082>
- Pelzer, K.D., & Currin, N. (2009). *Zoonotic Diseases of Cattle*. Virginia Cooperative Extension, Publication, pp. 400-460.
- Perry, B., & Grace, D. (2009). The impacts of livestock diseases and their control on growth and development processes that are pro-poor. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences* 364(1530), 2643-2655.
- Rajput, M.B., Bhati, N.B., Thakkar, A.P., Patel, N., & Sheikh, A.S. (2016). Knowledge and adoption level of zoonotic diseases among dairy farmers of Banaskantha district. *International Journal of Agriculture Sciences*, 8(52), 2586-2590.
- Rich, K.M., & Perry, B.D. (2011). The economic and poverty impacts of animal diseases in developing countries: New roles, new demands for economics and epidemiology. *Preventive Veterinary Medicine*, 101(3-4), 133-147.
- Robertson, I.D., Irwin, P.J., Lymbery, A.J., & Thompson, R.C.A. (2000). The role of companion animals in the emergence of parasitic zoonoses. *International Journal for Parasitology* 30(12-13), 1369-1377.
- Soulsbury, C.D., & White, P.C. (2016). Human-wildlife interactions in urban areas: A review of conflicts, benefits and opportunities. *Wildlife Research* 42(7), 541-553.
- Thakkar, A.P. (2013). Study on knowledge of dairy farmers of Anand district about zoonotic diseases. *Doctoral Dissertation*. Anand Agricultural University, Anand, Gujarat, India. Retrieved from <http://krishkosh.egranth.ac.in/handle/1/5810005796>
- Verma, A., Meena, H., Patel, D., & Kar, P. (2020). Constraints perceived by field veterinarians for providing animal health services in Haryana and Punjab State. *International Journal of Livestock Research*, 10(3), 152-159.