

1 **Live wildlife trade in markets – a scoping review to inform risk assessment**  
2 **of emerging infectious diseases**

3

4 V.J. Brookes<sup>1,2</sup>, O. Wismandanu<sup>3</sup>, E. Sudarnika<sup>4</sup>, J.A. Roby<sup>2,5</sup>, L. Hayes<sup>1,2</sup>, M.P. Ward<sup>6</sup>, C.  
5 Basri<sup>4</sup>, H. Wibawa<sup>7</sup>, J. Davis<sup>8</sup>, D. Indrawan<sup>9</sup>, J. Manyweathers<sup>1,2</sup>, W.S. Nugroho<sup>10</sup>, S.  
6 Windria<sup>11</sup>, M. Hernandez-Jover<sup>1,2</sup>

7

8 <sup>1</sup> School of Agriculture, Environmental and Veterinary Sciences, Faculty of Science and  
9 Health, Charles Sturt University, Wagga Wagga, NSW 2678, Australia

10 <sup>2</sup> Graham Centre for Agricultural Innovation, (NSW Dept. of Primary Industries and Charles  
11 Sturt University), Charles Sturt University, Wagga Wagga, NSW 2678, Australia

12 <sup>3</sup> Veterinary Medicine Study Program, Faculty of Medicine, Padjadjaran University,  
13 Indonesia

14 <sup>4</sup> Faculty of Veterinary Medicine, IPB (Institut Pertanian Bogor) University, Indonesia

15 <sup>5</sup> School of Dentistry and Medical Sciences, Faculty of Science and Health, Charles Sturt  
16 University, Wagga Wagga, NSW 2678, Australia

17 <sup>6</sup> Sydney School of Veterinary Science, The University of Sydney, Camden, 2570, Australia

18 <sup>7</sup> Disease Investigation Centre Wates, Directorate General of Livestock and Animal Health  
19 Services, Ministry of Agriculture of Indonesia

20 <sup>8</sup> Australian Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment, Canberra, Australia

21 <sup>9</sup> School of Business, IPB University, Indonesia

22 <sup>10</sup> Faculty of Veterinary Medicine, Universitas Gadjah Mada, Indonesia

23 <sup>11</sup> Department of Biomedical Sciences, Division of Microbiology, Veterinary Medicine Study

24 Program, Faculty of Medicine, Padjadjaran University, Indonesia

25

26 **Corresponding author**

27 Victoria J. Brookes, [victoria.brookes@sydney.edu.au](mailto:victoria.brookes@sydney.edu.au). Sydney School of Veterinary Science,

28 Faculty of Science, Camperdown, NSW, 2006, Australia.

29

30

31

32

33 **Abstract**

34 Wet markets are important for food security in many regions worldwide but have come under  
35 scrutiny due to their potential role in the emergence of infectious diseases. The sale of live  
36 wildlife has been highlighted as a particular risk, and the World Health Organisation has  
37 called for the banning of live, wild-caught mammalian species in markets unless risk  
38 assessment and effective regulations are in place. Following PRISMA guidelines, we  
39 conducted a global scoping review of peer-reviewed information about the sale of live,  
40 terrestrial wildlife in markets that are likely to sell fresh food, and collated data about the  
41 characteristics of such markets, activities involving live wildlife, the species sold, their  
42 purpose, and animal, human, and environmental health risks that were identified. Of the 59  
43 peer-reviewed records within scope, only 25% (n = 14) focussed on disease risks; the rest  
44 focused on the impact of wildlife sale on conservation. Although there were some global  
45 patterns (for example, the types of markets and purpose of sale of wildlife), there was wide  
46 diversity and huge epistemic uncertainty in all aspects associated with live, terrestrial wildlife  
47 sale in markets such that the feasibility of accurate assessment of the risk of emerging  
48 infectious disease associated with live wildlife trade in markets is limited. Given the value of  
49 both wet markets and wildlife trade and the need to support food affordability and  
50 accessibility, conservation, public health, and the social and economic aspects of livelihoods  
51 of often vulnerable people, there are major information gaps that need to be addressed to  
52 develop evidence-based policy in this environment. This review identifies these gaps and  
53 provides a foundation from which information for risk assessments can be collected.

54

55 **Key words**

56 Live wildlife trade, wet markets, emerging infectious disease, EID

## 57 **1. Introduction**

58 The COVID-19 pandemic – together with the emergence of SARS, Ebola virus disease and  
59 avian influenza H5N1 – has focused global attention on the potential role played by animal  
60 markets in the emergence of novel pathogens in human populations. Following the  
61 epidemiologic association between early cases of COVID-19 and the Huanan seafood market  
62 in Wuhan, Hubei, China (Chen et al., 2020; Huang et al., 2020), the potential for spill-over of  
63 potentially pathogenic microbes from live wildlife traded at fresh food markets, or ‘wet  
64 markets,’ was again highlighted as a risk for emergence of infectious diseases. Reactions  
65 have ranged from calls to improve risk assessment at wet markets to banning the sale of live  
66 wildlife in markets (World Health Organisation, 2021; Xiao et al., 2021). Although food-  
67 borne disease risks due to inadequate sanitation and hygiene practices at wet markets are  
68 well-documented (World Health Organization, 2006), the risk of pathogen spillover  
69 associated with live wildlife sale in wet markets and the circumstances in which this could  
70 lead to emergence of a new infectious disease are not well understood (Naguib et al., 2021;  
71 Pruvot et al., 2019).

72 Wet markets are common in many parts of the world, selling fresh food such as meat,  
73 seafood, vegetables and fruits, and sometimes live animals – including wildlife – which  
74 might be slaughtered and butchered at the market (Nadimpalli and Pickering, 2020; Sigal,  
75 2020; Zhong et al., 2020). Such markets are found in China, Southeast Asia, Africa and South  
76 America (The Law Library of Congress, 2020). Food markets, including wet markets, serve  
77 local communities as social and commercial centres, and are especially important in urban  
78 settings in low income regions where they are important for food security by providing easy  
79 access to affordable food (World Health Organization, 2006).

80 Most emerging infectious diseases of humans have an animal origin (Jones et al., 2008;  
81 Taylor et al., 2001). Non-specific drivers of disease emergence – such as climate change and  
82 ecosystem degradation – are well-described, but exact mechanisms at interfaces between  
83 wildlife and other species such as livestock and people are generally poorly defined or  
84 unknown (Magouras et al., 2020; Plowright et al., 2017; Woolhouse et al., 2005). The  
85 probability of emergence of a pathogen depends on interacting factors associated with  
86 microorganism type, the characteristics and circumstances of the reservoir and potential new  
87 hosts, as well as opportunities for spill-over between these hosts by direct or indirect routes.  
88 These factors could facilitate or impede evolutionary processes and events that need to occur  
89 to enable cross-species transmission, and pathogenicity and transmissibility between  
90 individuals in the new host population (Plowright et al., 2017).

91 Wet markets provide an interface between live wildlife, domestic animals and people, and  
92 have previously been associated with disease emergence events (Woo et al., 2006). An  
93 outbreak of highly-pathogenic avian influenza (H5N1) in people in Hong Kong in 1997 was  
94 in part disseminated via live-bird markets (Tam, 2002). Crowding and mixing of bird species  
95 and unhygienic slaughter in markets, as well as proximity of markets to residential areas,  
96 were considered to be contributing factors. Similarly, live-poultry markets were considered a  
97 risk factor during an outbreak of H7N9 in people in Zhejiang, China (He et al., 2015). In the  
98 outbreak of severe acute respiratory syndrome (SARS) which emerged in late 2002 in  
99 Guangzhou Province, China, markets were again suggested as a risk factor because early  
100 community cases were more likely to have lived within walking distance of wet markets than  
101 community cases later in the outbreak (Xu et al., 2004). Supporting this, in markets in  
102 Guangzhou, there was evidence of greater exposure to SARS-CoV among live animal traders  
103 (seroprevalence 13.0%, N = 508), especially palm civet traders (seroprevalence 72%, N =  
104 22), compared to control groups (seroprevalence range 1.2—2.9%, N = 284) (Yu et al., 2003).

105 SARS-CoV-like virus was also isolated from live Himalayan palm civets (*Paguma larvata*) at  
106 a market in Shenzhen municipality, China, and evidence of infection with SARS-CoV-like  
107 virus was also found in a raccoon dog (*Nyctereutes procyonoides*), a Chinese ferret-badger  
108 (*Melogale moschata*), and people working at the market (Guan et al., 2003). Bats are  
109 considered to be natural reservoirs of many *Coronaviridae* and SARS-CoV-2 is closely  
110 related to a bat coronavirus (Andersen et al., 2020; Zhou et al., 2020). Although a route  
111 between bats and people has not been identified, species that are sometimes sold live in wet  
112 markets – for example, Pholidota (pangolin), one of the most trafficked animals in the world  
113 (Aisher, 2016) – have been suggested as intermediate hosts of SARS-CoV-2, though  
114 evidence for the role of any specific intermediate species is incomplete and consequently  
115 various theories remain controversial (Lam et al., 2020; Zhang et al., 2020). Additionally,  
116 evidence of the location or time during which transmission to humans could have occurred is  
117 lacking.

118 Whether live wildlife traded at markets provide opportunity for infectious disease emergence  
119 and the circumstances in which this might occur is of critical importance to developing and  
120 implementing policy to prevent pandemics. Risk assessments should form the basis of such  
121 policy by informing evidenced-based regulatory and surveillance frameworks that mitigate  
122 identified risks associated with the sale of live wildlife in food markets; such tools are already  
123 being developed (Wikramanayake et al., 2021). Detailed understanding of the hazards  
124 associated with live wildlife sold in markets is needed, not only to conduct meaningful risk  
125 assessments, but also to understand the policy environment of live wildlife trade in markets  
126 so that risk mitigation strategies can be implemented whilst supporting the essential socio-  
127 economic roles of markets.

128 In this review, our objective was to collate and describe peer-reviewed evidence of live,  
129 terrestrial wildlife sold in wet markets, including associated factors such as market type and

130 documented risks to animal, human and environmental health. We aimed to provide a  
131 baseline of current knowledge – and identify gaps in knowledge – to support risk assessment  
132 and policy development regarding disease emergence associated with the sale of live,  
133 terrestrial wildlife at markets.

## 134 **2. Materials and Methods**

### 135 2.1 Protocol

136 This scoping review was conducted according to the Preferred Reporting Items for  
137 Systematic reviews and Meta-Analyses extension for Scoping Reviews (PRISMA-ScR)  
138 guidelines (Tricco et al., 2018). An overview of this methodology is described at  
139 <http://www.prisma-statement.org/Extensions/ScopingReviews>, accessed 18 October 2020.

140 The review protocol included three levels: Level 1, screening on title and abstract; Level 2,  
141 screening on full record; Level 3, data extraction. The web-based review platform Sysrev<sup>®</sup>  
142 (Insilica LLC, 2020; [www.sysrev.com](http://www.sysrev.com), accessed 18 October 2020) was used for Levels 1 and  
143 2, and a spreadsheet in Excel<sup>®</sup> (Microsoft 2020, [www.microsoft.com](http://www.microsoft.com), accessed 18 October  
144 2020) was used for Level 3.

145 We use the term ‘record’ to describe any bibliographic citation captured in the searches. We  
146 use the term ‘study’ as an individual investigation of wildlife sale in a market. Whilst most  
147 records comprised only one study, if a record contained multiple relevant studies (for  
148 example, theses, books, conference proceedings and reports), each relevant study was  
149 evaluated separately within that record.

### 150 2.2 Eligibility criteria

151 Types of records that were eligible included theses, dissertations, and peer-reviewed  
152 literature for which the full text was available. Records were eligible if they were published  
153 in English, from 1980 onwards, and from any country, and contained primary research of  
154 interest about the sale of live terrestrial wildlife at markets likely to sell food.

155 Markets of interest were collections of stalls which were identified in the record as  
156 food, wet or fish markets, street markets (when the meaning was not in the context of covert



157 sale), medicinal markets, wildlife markets or open fairs. Pet shops, restaurants, bars or cafés  
158 were not included.

159 Terrestrial wildlife of interest were animals from classes Amphibia, Reptilia, Aves  
160 and Mammalia (see Supplementary Material for lists of orders in each class) which were  
161 presented live for sale at the market, and were not feral, companion or livestock animals.  
162 Vermin that lived in and around the market were not within scope unless presented live for  
163 sale at the market. Meat or other products from animals that were slaughtered prior to  
164 presentation for sale at the market were also not within scope. Live wildlife could be sold at  
165 the market for any purpose; for example, pets, medicine and consumption, including wildlife  
166 that were slaughtered at the market for these purposes.

167 Records which described the chain of events around wildlife trade (for example,  
168 hunting and sale of bushmeat) but did not include information about the sale of live wildlife  
169 at specific markets were excluded.

170

### 171 2.3 Information sources and search strategy

172 The literature search was conducted in July 2020, using the following combination of search  
173 terms:

- 174 (i) market\* OR sale,
- 175 (ii) AND: wildlife OR "wild life" OR "wild-life" OR "wild animal" OR "wild bird",
- 176 (iii) AND: food OR medicine,
- 177 (iv) timeframe: 1980—2020, language: "English."

178 Three electronic databases were searched: Web of Science, PubMed, and SCOPUS. Searches  
179 for theses and dissertations were conducted in ProQuest Thesis and Dissertations Global  
180 Database, and EBSCO Open Dissertations. A literature search was conducted via the Google

181 Scholar search engine, in which the first 100 results were screened. In addition, a search was  
182 conducted in Google Scholar with the addition of the term ‘TRAFFIC bulletin’ to identify  
183 relevant records from this journal, which was not available through the electronic databases.  
184 All records were exported into the citation manager software Endnote (<https://endnote.com/>,  
185 accessed 18 October 2020), and duplicates were removed. Records were then uploaded to  
186 Sysrev© for Level 1 agreement tests and screening.

#### 187 2.4 Selection of relevant records – Levels 1 and 2

188 Agreement tests were conducted prior to screening at Levels 1 and 2, in which all 10  
189 reviewers in Levels 1 and 2 screened the same records (50 and 30 records at Levels 1 and 2,  
190 respectively). Conflicting opinions about inclusion or exclusion of records were discussed to  
191 achieve consensus between reviewers and to refine and improve the clarity of the questions at  
192 each level (see Supplementary Material 1).

193 During Level 1 (screening on title and abstract), two reviewers assessed each record. To  
194 maximise the sensitivity of identification of relevant records, records progressed to Level 2 if  
195 either reviewer assessed that the record might be eligible. During Level 2 (screening on the  
196 full record), two reviewers initially assessed each record. Records were only included for  
197 charting in Level 3 if there was consensus that the record met the eligibility criteria between  
198 at least 2 reviewers. Consensus was achieved via discussion and if required, consultation with  
199 a third reviewer.

#### 200 2.5 Data items and charting process – Level 3

201 A spreadsheet was used to standardise data charting in Level 3 (Supplementary Material 1).  
202 Data items that were extracted included the year of publication, the location and year of the  
203 study, the driving concern for the study (for example, conservation or disease investigation),  
204 and then further data within the overarching topics of interest: markets, animals, and risks.

205 Data that were extracted about markets included the type of market (for example, wildlife or  
206 food), and the physical structure, frequency, and types of people and activities at the markets.  
207 Hygiene practices and temporal changes (for example, increased sale of live animal species)  
208 were also recorded.

209 Data that were extracted about animals at the markets included the species of live animals  
210 sold (if listed as individual species), their source, the volume sold and their physical condition  
211 and housing. Classes and orders of all wildlife (including dead animals and animal products)  
212 sold at the market were also extracted, as well as the total volume of all wildlife and the  
213 purposes of wildlife sale. Any non-wildlife species sold at the market were recorded, as well  
214 as contacts that were documented between wildlife species and any other live animal species.

215 Data that were extracted about risks included specific pathogens and diseases, measures of  
216 their frequency and how they were identified, and any other risks associated with human and  
217 animal health.

218 Due to the longer form at Level 3, four additional reviewers were included, and agreement  
219 amongst all reviewers was initially assessed with three records (selected based on diversity of  
220 study type). Modifications were made to the form following reviewer feedback. The form  
221 was then tested by all reviewers with two more records to assess agreement. All conflicts  
222 were discussed. Once consensus was achieved for all five records and further modifications  
223 to the Level 3 form were made to improve clarity and increase agreement, the full Level 3  
224 review was conducted. Conflicting opinions about extracted data were discussed between  
225 each record's pair of reviewers and a third reviewer to determine a consensus prior to  
226 synthesis of the extracted data.

227 2.6 Verification of the search strategy

228 Verification of the search strategy was undertaken by screening the bibliography list of three  
229 records that were retained for data analysis in Level 3 (one for each decade of the search  
230 window). Records which were potentially relevant to the study were included in the review  
231 process using the same methods as records identified in the initial search.

## 232 2.7 Synthesis of extracted data

233 Topics of interest were tabulated according to region, and information about each topic was  
234 then summarized and presented as a narrative.


235

236

### 237 3. Results

#### 238 3.1. Screening

239 Initial and verification searches identified 3721 records. Following removal of 512  
240 duplicates, 3209 records remained for screening (Figure 1). During Level 1 screening, 2795  
241 records were excluded, leaving 414 records for screening of full text (Level 2). The most  
242 common reason for exclusion of records in Level 1 was lack of information about wildlife in  
243 markets (for example, the study investigated wildlife in the context of hunting or fishing; 98.6  
244 %, n = 2757). During Level 2 screening, the most common reason for exclusion was lack of  
245 mention of live wildlife (92 %, n = 329). Of 133 records screened in the verification strategy,  
246 5 were eligible for inclusion. Overall, 56 records were included for data charting and  
247 synthesis in Level 3 (Supplementary Material 2).



249 Figure 1: Diagram of the flow of records through the levels of a scoping review of reported research  
250 (1980–2020) associated with live, terrestrial, vertebrate wildlife sold for any purpose at markets likely to sell  
251 food.


252

### 253 3.2. Data charting

254 Of 56 records included in Level 3, all were single studies. A spreadsheet of the Level 3  
255 studies and the data charted for each study is included in the Supporting Information.  
256 One record was sourced from a thesis (Edwards, 2012), and all other records were published  
257 in 35 peer-reviewed journals (Supplementary Material 3: Figure S1). The most frequently  
258 represented journal was *TRAFFIC Bulletin* (20%; n = 11), followed by *Biodiversity and*  
259 *Conservation* (7%; n = 4). Studies collected data from 28 countries (Figure 2). The most  
260 frequently represented study region was Southeast Asia (n = 22; mode country Lao PDR, n =  
261 6), followed by China (here, classified as a region due to its large geographic size and number  
262 of studies; n = 17; mode province Guangdong, n = 7), Africa (n = 16; mode country Nigeria,  
263 n = 4), and South America (n = 8; mode country Brazil, n = 6). Two studies were conducted  
264 in more than one region: Europe and Africa (Spanish enclaves of Ceuta and Melilla, and  
265 Morocco; Nijman and Bergin (2017)), and China and Southeast Asia (Vietnam; Yiming and  
266 Dianmo (1998)).  
267 Studies used data collected over 1—21-year periods from 1980—2019 and were published  
268 from 1998—2020. Although publications increased after the avian influenza outbreak in  
269 Hong Kong in 1997, and then subsequent to the SARS outbreak in 2003, data in the  
270 publications in the early 2000s was frequently collected prior to 1997; therefore, research  
271 intensity did not appear to be influenced by particular EID events (Figure 3).  
272 The most common focus for studies was investigation of the wildlife trade in relation to  
273 conservation concerns such as species depletion and loss of biodiversity (75%; n = 42).


274 Disease risk was the primary focus of study in only 14 studies (25%), and there was no  
 275 association between the focus of studies and global region ( $X^2 = 9.5$ , d.f. = 8,  $P = 0.3$ ).

276



277

278 Figure 2: Regions and countries (China by Province) in which data were collected in peer-reviewed records  
 279 identified in a scoping review of reported research (1980–2020) associated with live, terrestrial, vertebrate  
 280 wildlife sold for any purpose at markets likely to sell food.



281

282 Figure 3: Years in which data were collected (A) and published (B) in peer-reviewed records identified in a  
283 scoping review of research associated with live, terrestrial, vertebrate wildlife sold for any purpose at markets  
284 likely to sell food. Triangles denote major outbreaks of emerging infectious disease: brown = Avian influenza A  
285 H5N1, Hong Kong 1997; red = SARS, 2003; green = H1N1, 2009; yellow = Avian influenza A H7N9, China  
286 2013; purple = Ebola virus disease, West Africa 2007; blue = COVID-19, 2019.


287

### 288 3.2.1 Markets

289 The most frequent market types (according to author definitions and descriptions) were  
290 general markets in South America, traditional medicine and bushmeat markets in Africa, food  
291 in Southeast Asia and China, live-bird markets in Africa, and wildlife in Southeast Asia  
292 (Figure 4, and Supplementary Material 2). The frequency of topics associated with markets  
293 are shown in Table 1.



294 Market physical structure was described in 20 records (36%); a range of permanent and  
295 temporary structures were reported, either indoor or outdoor (for example, on the sides of  
296 roads or in car parks), and often in locations accessible for the arrival and distribution of  
297 goods. For example, in Belém, Brazil, market trade takes advantage of riverside ports (da  
298 Nobrega Alves and Pereira Filho, 2007), and in the Niger Delta, hunters deliver goods via  
299 rivercraft to one of the largest bushmeat markets in the region which is also accessible via  
300 recently constructed roads (Akani et al., 2015). In central Lao PDR, authors reported that the  
301 most active wildlife markets were located close to major roads which facilitated trade across  
302 Southeast Asia (Schweikhard et al., 2019).



303

304 Figure 4: Market types identified in a scoping review of reported research (1980–2020) associated with the sale  
305 of live, terrestrial, vertebrate wildlife at markets likely to sell food globally.

306

307 Market frequency was highly variable although usually regular, with markets occurring every  
308 day on weekdays, on one day of the week only, on mornings only, at weekends only, at times  
309 dependent on the lunar calendar, or on special occasions. Unpredictable times and locations  
310 were a feature of some markets; for example, in Yunnan Province, China, wildlife trade could  
311 occur at irregular times and sites, and sometimes, markets appeared to be the sites of  
312 advertising and negotiation as vendors displayed their goods (including live wildlife in cages)  
313 whilst transfer of goods occurred elsewhere (Haibin and Kunming, 1999).

314 The types of people involved in markets were vendors and consumers – also called traders  
315 and buyers – as well as hunters and trappers, middlemen (also termed intermediaries and  
316 brokers), wildlife farmers, restaurant owners, government officials, slaughtermen, traditional  
317 healers and drivers. Middlemen could be involved in the chain of events before or after the  
318 market between wildlife acquisition and the end-user. For example, some middlemen traded  
319 between hunters and market vendors (these people could also be termed ‘collectors’ because  
320 they house wildlife as well as facilitated transactions), and others traded between market  
321 vendors and end-users such as restaurants, traditional medicine shops and tourists. Market  
322 trade was also associated with families as younger generations inherited the family business  
323 (for example, turtle collectors in Kerala, India; Krishnakumar et al. (2009)).

324 Illegal trade was reported in most records (68 %, n = 38), particularly if the focus was  
325 wildlife trade rather than disease risk (OR 17.0, 95 % CI 3.4—120.0, P < 0.001). Reports of  
326 illegal trade were not associated with a particular region ( $X^2 = 5.1$ , d.f. = 7, P = 0.64). Types  
327 of illegal trade included the sale of wildlife species that were prohibited for sale by national  
328 or international laws, sourced from protected areas such as National Parks (for example, in  
329 Liberia and the Democratic Republic of the Congo and Liberia, reported by Greengrass  
330 (2016) and Van Vliet et al. (2012), respectively), collected by illegal methods such as hunting  
331 (for example, pangolin in Myanmar; McEvoy et al. (2019)), and illegally imported (for

332 example, wildlife from Vietnam sold in Yunnan Province, China; Zhang et al. (2008)).  
333 Sometimes, laws were open to misinterpretation because they varied according to animal  
334 purpose (for example, hunting could be allowed depending on the destination and purpose of  
335 the wildlife in Indonesia; Chng et al. (2018); Janssen and Gomez (2019)) or were inconsistent  
336 between regional and national levels (for example, in Brazil; Fernandes-Ferreira et al.  
337 (2012)). Illegal trade was often conducted openly because it was either unregulated or  
338 ineffectively regulated. Examples include open trade despite signage that trade is illegal in  
339 Lao (Schweikhard et al., 2019), and turtle collectors in Kerala, India who were aware that  
340 trade was illegal, but were not deterred by small fines from local police and forest officials  
341 (Krishnakumar et al., 2009). Government officials were reportedly sometimes corrupt and  
342 therefore, not necessarily promoting regulatory activities (Haibin and Kunming, 1999).  
343 Sometimes illegal trade was clandestine. In Lao PDR, Davenport and Heatwole (2013)  
344 suspected that as live wildlife on display were sold, they were replenished from bags that  
345 were kept out of sight to avoid attention from local authorities, and in Mozambique, live  
346 wildlife and their products were concealed unless trade was likely (Williams et al., 2016).  
347 Other than trade, activities directly associated with live wildlife included slaughter and  
348 butchering. This was most frequently reported in the context of reptile and amphibian trade  
349 (for example, in Africa, South America and Southeast Asia (Catenazzi et al., 2010; da  
350 Nobrega Alves and Pereira Filho, 2007; Edwards, 2012; Gilbert et al., 2012; Kusrini and  
351 Alford, 2006; Pruvot et al., 2019)). Levels of hygiene and sanitation were reported in only 6  
352 records (11%) and were not more associated with studies which investigated disease risk than  
353 studies of trade ( $X^2 = 2.7$ , d.f. = 1,  $P = 0.10$ ). Cronin et al. (2015) observed that a bushmeat  
354 market in Bioko Island, Equatorial Guinea, Africa was occasionally closed for cleaning, and  
355 Van Vliet et al. (2012) noted that lack of refrigeration might be a reason for the high  
356 proportion of smoked bushmeat for sale at a market in Kisingani, DRC, Africa (and not an

357 indication of a large catchment area of wildlife as some have previously suggested). Others  
358 also noted lack of refrigeration of fresh meat in studies in Asia (Pruvot et al., 2019; Shepherd  
359 and Nijman, 2007). In an assessment of zoonotic disease risk in markets throughout Lao  
360 PDR, (Greatorex et al., 2016) noted that hygiene practices such as hand-washing were rare,  
361 sanitation was poor (butchers knives and tables were rarely cleaned; blood and entrails were  
362 on the floor) and wildlife contact with fresh food was high in most markets. In a study from  
363 Nigeria and Egypt in which biosecurity compliance was evaluated (Fasanmi et al., 2016),  
364 wild animal trade was predictive for detection of highly-pathogenic avian influenza virus  
365 H5N1, and although not specific to activities involving wild animals, hygiene and sanitation  
366 measures were poor at many of the markets.

367 Temporal trends were mentioned in 18 records (32%), with changes in activity and species  
368 availability observed in some markets. In Yunnan Province, China, Haibin and Kunming  
369 (1999) noted increased smaller markets as well as underground wildlife trade networks. This  
370 could have been driven by increased regulation, reduced availability of some species, and  
371 increased consumption associated with development of the local economy and transport  
372 networks. Seasonality was observed in some markets; trade increased in the wet season in  
373 Nigeria (Akani et al., 2015) and in winter in Guangdong, China (Dong et al., 2007), and  
374 season was associated with species availability in Lao PDR and Brazil (Baía et al., 2010;  
375 Davenport and Heatwole, 2013; Schweikhard et al., 2019). Trade increased overall in Bioko  
376 Island (Cronin et al., 2015; Fa et al., 2000), and decreased in Togo, Mozambique and Papua  
377 New Guinea (D'Cruze et al., 2020; Eisemberg et al., 2011; Williams et al., 2016), whilst in  
378 markets in Myanmar, increases and decreases of particular species were observed over time  
379 (Min, 2012). Actors at markets also changed over time; for example, trade with non-locals  
380 has increased at Mong La market in Myanmar (Shepherd and Nijman, 2007). Trade also

381 sometimes increased around religious festivals; for example, in Belém, Brazil (Nobrega  
382 Alves and Rosa, 2010).

383

### 384 *3.2.2 Wildlife Species*


385 A total of 534 individual species of live, vertebrate, terrestrial wildlife were reported in the  
386 records from all taxonomic classes of vertebrates (Supplementary Material 3: Table S1). Of  
387 these, the most frequent orders were Testudines (37%, n = 197), followed by Passeriformes  
388 (20%, n= 109) and Squamata (12%, n = 65; Supplementary Material 3: Figure S2). Of  
389 mammalian orders that have been considered high risk for EID events (Delahay et al., 2021;  
390 Wikramanayake et al., 2021), no live species of Chiroptera (bats) were reported. Live  
391 Viverridae (large Indian, lesser Indian and masked palm civets) were reported in 4 records  
392 from China (Chow et al., 2014; Dong et al., 2007; Haibin and Kunming, 1999; Yiming and  
393 Dianmo, 1998). Pholidota (pangolins) were reported in 10 records from Africa (n = 5),  
394 Southeast Asia (n = 4) and China (n = 2) (Nijman 2016, (Akani et al., 2015; Edwards, 2012;  
395 Haibin and Kunming, 1999; Ingram et al., 2019; McEvoy et al., 2019; Shepherd and Nijman,  
396 2007; Sodeinde and Soewu, 1999; Soewu and Ayodele, 2009; Yiming and Dianmo, 1998).  
397 Primate species were observed in markets in Africa, China and Southeast Asia, including a  
398 live chimpanzee in a bushmeat market in Liberia (Greengrass, 2016). Mustelidae species  
399 were observed in markets in China (Dong et al., 2007), and squirrels (Sciuridae) were  
400 observed in Southeast Asia and China (Pruvot et al., 2019; Yiming and Dianmo, 1998).

401 Most species were reported in records from China (51%, n= 271) and Southeast Asia (24%,  
402 n= 129), and the most frequent classes sold in China and Southeast Asia were Reptilia and  
403 Aves, respectively (Figure 5). Relatively few live species were reported in records from  
404 South America (n =73), or from the Middle East, Africa, Europe, the Indian subcontinent and  
405 Oceania (35, 29, 6, 2, and 1 species, respectively). In South America and the Middle East,

406 most species were also of class Aves, and in the remaining regions combined, Reptilia were  
407 most frequently reported. Some records reported live wildlife by a common name only or by  
408 their genus (Figure 5 inset; Supplementary Material 3: Table S2). Of these, wildlife of class  
409 Aves were most frequently reported.

410 The greatest number of individual species of live, vertebrate, terrestrial wildlife reported in a  
411 single study was 157 turtle species reported from a 35-month survey of turtle trade in Hong  
412 Kong, Shenzhen and Guangzhou in southern China (Cheung and Dudgeon, 2006). Large  
413 numbers of live wildlife species were also reported from agricultural and general markets in  
414 Yunnan, China (n = 85; Haibin and Kunming (1999)), bird markets in Brazil (n = 51;  
415 Fernandes-Ferreira et al. (2012)), and wildlife markets in Sumatra (n= 48; Chng et al. (2018),  
416 at the Guangxi border between China and Vietnam (n = 47; Yiming and Dianmo (1998)), in  
417 South China (n = 26; Chow et al. (2014)), and in Tabuk, Saudi Arabia (n = 31; Aloufi and  
418 Eid (2014)). However, nearly half of the records only reported one live wildlife species (48%,  
419 n = 26; Figure S3).

It is made available under a [CC-BY 4.0 International license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/) .



420

421 Figure 5: Classes of live, vertebrate, terrestrial wildlife reported in records in a scoping review of reported  
422 research (1980–2020) associated with the sale of live wildlife at markets likely to sell food globally. Main plot:  
423 classes of wildlife that were identified by species. Inset plot: classes of wildlife that were identified by common  
424 name, genus or order.

425

426 Wildlife (live or products) were mostly sold for food and medicine globally, as well as pets in  
427 Southeast Asia and China, and spiritual purposes in South America and Africa (Figure 6).

428 The reported volume of live wildlife and total wildlife products sold was dependent on the  
429 study design (number of markets and frequency of visits), and inventories were not possible

430 in some markets due to covert trading – information from records about volume of wildlife is

431 included in the Supplementary Material 2. Most studies reported that wildlife were sourced


432 locally, often from national parks and similarly protected areas; however, in markets in

433 Africa, the Middle East, China and Southeast Asia, wildlife (not necessarily live) were

434 sometimes imported (Figure S4). The condition of live wildlife was rarely reported although

435 Chow et al. (2014) noted tooth-like wounds of the feet of mammals that indicated they had  
436 been caught in traps, and Nekaris et al. (2010) found that the front teeth of lorises were  
437 clipped so that they made safer pets. In Lao PDR, Gilbert et al. (2012) observed animals tied  
438 with twine or bamboo through their hind limbs or foot webs, and Davenport and Heatwole  
439 (2013) observed frogs tied together, and lizards with their feet tied or their mouths wired or  
440 tied closed. In Brazil, Maloney et al. (2020) found that birds were in good condition. Live  
441 wildlife were often reported in unhygienic conditions in sacks, buckets in the case of reptiles  
442 and amphibians, or in overcrowded cages (Catenazzi et al., 2010; Nijman and Bergin, 2017;  
443 Stuart et al., 2000). The presence of other live animals was rarely reported (livestock in  
444 Mozambique; Williams et al. (2016), and poultry in Vietnam and China; Chow et al. (2014);  
445 Edmunds et al. (2011)). Likewise, proximity or contact between live wildlife and other  
446 species was rarely reported (contact with people; Pruvot et al. (2019), wild birds; Fasanmi et  
447 al. (2016), and poultry in the markets; Edmunds et al. (2011)).





448

449 Figure 6: Purpose of sale of live wildlife and wildlife products reported in records in a scoping review of  
450 reported research (1980–2020) associated with the sale of live wildlife at markets likely to sell food globally.  
451 Main plot: classes of wildlife that were identified by species. Inset plot: classes of wildlife that were identified  
452 by common name, genus or order.

453

### 454 3.2.2 Health risks associated with live wildlife

455 Twelve records identified specific diseases or microbes. Chytridiomycosis (caused by the  
456 fungus, *Batrachochytrium dendrobatidis*) was diagnosed by PCR and histological  
457 examination in 4 of 37 (10.8%) live bullfrogs in a food market in Yunnan Province, China  
458 (Bai et al., 2010). *B. dendrobatidis* was also detected in all live frogs sampled in a study in

459 Peru (N = 5; Catenazzi et al. (2010)), and in one live bullfrog in Cambodia (N = 71; Gilbert et  
460 al. (2012)).

461 *Spirometra*, a zoonotic cestode that causes sparganosis, was detected with > 25% prevalence  
462 in snakes sampled in Guangdong (Wang et al., 2014; Wang et al., 2011) and Indonesia  
463 (Yudhana et al., 2019). In a study in markets in Brazil, the protozoan, *Blastocystis*, was  
464 detected with approximately 20% prevalence in Galliformes, Struthioniformes and  
465 Anseriformes, although not found in wild birds for sale (Maloney et al., 2020). Whilst some  
466 subtypes of *Blastocystis* have zoonotic potential, pathogenicity in people is variable; the  
467 authors noted that isolation of a subtype of *Blastocystis*, ST5, in ostriches in the study was  
468 significant because ST5 has been found in pigs and pig caretakers in China and Australia.

469 Eighteen isolates of avian influenza virus (H5N1, H9N2, H7N3, H7N9, H10N6, H3N6) were  
470 found in migratory Anseriformes in live-bird markets in Egypt (Kayed et al., 2019). Highly  
471 pathogenic H5N1 was also detected in tracheal and cloacal swabs, post-mortem, and  
472 moribund or freshly killed birds in 65% of live-bird markets surveyed in Nigeria and Egypt  
473 (N= 91; Fasanmi et al. (2016)).

474 In a study to examine the ecology and evolutionary pathways of *Coronaviridae* (CoV),  
475 Vijaykrishna et al. (2007) investigated viral sequences obtained from species including bats,  
476 humans and livestock, as well as wild animals (raccoon dog and Chinese ferret badger)  
477 sampled at live-animal markets in Guangdong Province, China. The circumstances of the  
478 animals at the markets or the frequency of positive CoV identification was not described. In  
479 another study in live-animal markets in Guangdong and Guangxi Province, China, 24 live  
480 wildlife species were sampled (Dong et al., 2007). CoV was detected in several Asian leopard  
481 cats (*Prionailurus bengalensis*; n = 35/1,453, 2.4%) and Chinese ferret badgers (*Melogale*  
482 *moschata*; n = 11/934, 1.1%), and once in 6 other species: yellow-bellied weasel (*Mustela*

483 *kathiah*), Siberian weasel (*M. sibirica*), masked palm civet (*Paguma larvata*), Chinese  
484 bamboo rat (*Rhizomys sinensis*), lesser Indian civet (*Viverricula indica*), and flying squirrel  
485 (*Petaurista sp.*). Ferret badgers and Asian leopard cats were available in the markets all year  
486 round, although most CoV positive swabs were detected in winter.  
487 Zoonotic disease risks that were mentioned other than those associated with disease and  
488 pathogens detected in the studies included acknowledgement of the presence of large  
489 numbers of species susceptible to HPAI H5N1 in ornamental bird markets in Vietnam  
490 (Edmunds et al., 2011), and concern about zoonoses such as Ebola virus disease, rabies, and  
491 tuberculosis associated with handling primates in Benin, Africa (Sogbohossou et al., 2018).  
492 In markets in Guangxi at the China-Vietnam border, Yiming and Dianmo (1998) noted that  
493 wildlife mortality could be as high as 50%, especially during transport due to unhygienic  
494 conditions and overcrowding and that subsequent disposal of animals around trading areas  
495 and in forests could result in disease spread. Chow et al. (2014) commented that  
496 overcrowding could increase the probability of disease spread, and Kusrini and Alford (2006)  
497 noted that escaped exotic species (bullfrogs found in rice fields in West Java, Indonesia)  
498 could be a disease risk to local frog species.  
499  
500

Table 1: Number of records (percentage) from each region, which contained information from specific topics of interest in a scoping review of reported research (1980–2020) associated with live, terrestrial, vertebrate wildlife sold for any purpose at markets likely to sell food. Bold indicates that  $\geq 50\%$  of studies from that region contained information on this topic (excluding regions in which there were  $\leq 2$  studies).

Region		South America	Africa	Africa/Europe	Middle East	Indian subcontinent	Southeast Asia	China	China/Southeast Asia	Oceania	Total
Median year of publication (minimum – maximum)		2010 (1999—2020)	2015 (1999—2020)	2017 (2017—2017)	2016 (2014—2018)	2009 (2009—2009)	2015 (2000—2019)	2007 (1999—2014)	1998 (1998—1998)	2011 (2011—2011)	
Broad topic	Topic										
Market	Physical structure	3 (38%)	<b>7 (50%)</b>	0	1 (50%)	0	8 (47%)	0	1 (100%)	0	20 (36%)
	Frequency	2 (25%)	6 (43%)	0	1 (50%)	0	6 (35%)	1 (9%)	0	1 (100%)	17 (30%)
	Activities	3 (38%)	6 (43%)	0	0	1 (100%)	7 (41%)	1 (9%)	0	0	18 (32%)
	Illegal wildlife trade	<b>6 (75%)</b>	<b>11 (79%)</b>	1 (100%)	1 (50%)	1 (100%)	<b>11 (65%)</b>	<b>6 (54%)</b>	1 (100%)	0	<b>38 (68%)</b>
	General hygiene	0	3 (21%)	0	0	0	2 (12%)	0	0	0	5 (9%)
	Temporal trend	2 (25%)	6 (43%)	0	0	1 (100%)	6 (35%)	2 (18%)	0	1 (100%)	18 (32%)
Live wildlife	Listed by species	<b>8 (100%)</b>	<b>10 (71%)</b>	1 (100%)	2 (100%)	1 (100%)	<b>14 (82%)</b>	<b>9 (81%)</b>	0	1 (100%)	<b>46 (82%)</b>
	Source	<b>6 (75%)</b>	<b>11 (79%)</b>	0	1 (50%)	1 (100%)	<b>14 (82%)</b>	<b>9 (81%)</b>	1 (100%)	1 (100%)	<b>44 (78%)</b>
	Volume	<b>5 (63%)</b>	<b>7 (50%)</b>	1 (100%)	0	1 (100%)	<b>11 (65%)</b>	3 (27%)	0	1 (100%)	29 (52%)
	Purpose of sale	<b>7 (88%)</b>	<b>13 (93%)</b>	1 (100%)	1 (50%)	1 (100%)	<b>15 (88%)</b>	<b>10 (91%)</b>	1 (100%)	1 (100%)	<b>50 (89%)</b>
	Condition of wildlife	3 (38%)	1 (7%)	0	0	0	5 (29%)	1 (9%)	0	0	10 (18%)
	Housing	<b>4 (50%)</b>	4 (28%)	1 (100%)	0	1 (100%)	8 (47%)	2 (18%)	0	0	21 (38%)
Contact between species	0	0	0	1 (50%)	0	2 (12%)	0	0	0	3 (5%)	

	Other species	2 (25%)	3 (21%)	0	0	0	1 (6%)	2 (18%)	0	0	8 (14%)
Study focus	Disease	2 (25%)	1 (7%)	0	1 (50%)	0	4 (22%)	<b>6 (54%)</b>	0	0	14 (25%)
Risks	Disease identified	0	0	0	0	0	1(6%)	3 (27%)	0	0	4 (7%)
	Microbe identified	2 (25%)	1 (7%)	0	1 (50%)	0	2 (12%)	5 (46%)	0	0	10 (18%)
	Other risk identified	1 (13%)	1 (7%)	0	0	0	3 (19%)	2 (18%)	1 (100%)	0	8 (14%)
Total records		8	14	1	2	1	16	11	1	1	56

#### 4. Discussion

This review highlighted enormous global variability and epistemic uncertainty in all aspects regarding circumstances in which live, terrestrial wildlife are sold in markets that are likely to sell fresh food. Specific insights included the limited research focus on disease associated with live wildlife in markets, the wide variety of live wildlife species traded at markets especially in China and Southeast Asia, and the high accessibility of markets (both socially and geographically). These insights, as well as the variability and uncertainty related to the markets, the wildlife, and associated risks, greatly influence the feasibility of accurate assessment of the risk of emerging infectious disease associated with live wildlife trade in markets, and the development of effective, sustainable policy in this environment.

Most studies in this review focused on the impact of live wildlife trade in markets on conservation, particularly biodiversity loss. Whilst this can indirectly inform the scale of biodiversity loss as a broad driver of emerging infectious disease, focus on potential pathogens and disease is needed for risk analysis frameworks, which require information about specific hazards and exposure pathways. Many zoonotic and foodborne microorganisms have been identified in items other than live wildlife (including fresh meat, vegetables, and the environment) in wet markets worldwide, such as *Leptospira* spp., *Vibrio* spp., *Toxoplasma* spp., *Campylobacter* spp., and *Salmonella* spp. (Hamid et al., 2020; Kottawattage et al., 2017; Ngan et al., 2020; Sekoai et al., 2020), yet only three potentially zoonotic microorganisms (*Spirometra* species, *Coronaviridae*, and avian influenza virus) were reported from live wildlife in this review. There was also limited information about water, sanitation, and hygiene (WASH; <https://www.who.int/health-topics/water-sanitation-and-hygiene-wash>, accessed 20 August 2021) conditions associated with live wildlife trade, such as butchering and slaughter of wildlife, contamination of other food products or the environment, or contact between wildlife and other species, including people. Although

market regulations are often aimed at reducing the risk of zoonotic and foodborne disease, and some countries – for example China, Indonesia, and Thailand – have specific WASH regulations applied to wet markets (The Law Library of Congress, 2020), there appears to be a gap in knowledge about the range of microorganisms and WASH risks associated with live wildlife. A greater understanding of current WASH conditions around activities associated with live wildlife trade (including market infrastructure such as hand washing facilities, adequate drainage, and separation of animals) is required to inform risk assessment exposure pathways. In addition, previous recommendations to increase surveillance of wildlife to identify potential pathogens and to detect and respond to emerging infectious disease (Grogan et al., 2014; Kuiken et al., 2005; Vrbova et al., 2010) appear to have been largely overlooked in the context of live wildlife in markets and should be adopted more comprehensively.

The greatest number of live wildlife species was reported from studies in markets in China and Southeast Asia. Wide species diversity might provide more opportunity for EID events due to a greater number of potential reservoir-spillover host pairs. However, following previous patterns of disease emergence, species from classes Mammalia and Aves have been considered a higher disease-risk due to their association with potentially pathogenic microorganisms (Olival et al., 2017; White and Razgour, 2020; Woolhouse et al., 2012), and a greater focus on these classes of wildlife might be warranted. Consistent with this, the World Health Organization have recommended suspension of trade of live-caught mammalian wildlife in traditional food markets (World Health Organisation, 2021). In this review, live mammalian wildlife species that could be considered high risk were identified in studies from markets in Africa, Southeast Asia, and China, and wild birds were also reported in markets from South America and the Middle East in addition to these regions. However, the likelihood of spillover will also depend on additional characteristics of the wildlife-potential spillover host interface, including its magnitude (amount of live wildlife traded and

contact with the potential spillover species) and factors that affect transmission, such as stressors that might influence the shedding of microorganisms (including travel, overcrowded housing, comorbidities and the physical condition of the wildlife), the type of contact occurring and the susceptibility of the potential spillover host (Plowright et al., 2017; Wikramanayake et al., 2021). The scale of interfaces could not be determined in this review, and although most studies and species were identified from China and Southeast Asia, this might not be representative of the global distribution of markets or volume of live wildlife sold. Ultimately, resources for mitigation strategies will be limited, and development of effective policy will require assessment of relative risk dependent on the diverse global contexts that were apparent in this review, such as market type (for example, markets in this review were predominantly bushmeat in Africa, wildlife in Southeast Asia, and food in China) and species sold, as well as local, market-specific factors.

The scope of policy to mitigate EID risks associated with trade of live wildlife in markets is also important to define. If the goal is to prevent dissemination of disease from markets and an epidemic – and not only to prevent spillover of microorganisms from live wildlife reservoir hosts – social and geographic pathways from markets also need to be considered in risk assessments. Short value-chains that support local producers and ensure a supply of fresh food at low cost – due to the limited requirement for transport and refrigeration – have been considered an advantage of wet markets (Goldman et al., 1999; Zhang and Pan, 2013).

However, several studies in this review described how markets were located to facilitate trade and distribution, and highlighted that wildlife trade is a high-value, global activity with long value chains and movement of wildlife across many regions. In 2017, the value of the global wildlife trade was an estimated USD23 billion (van Uhm and Wong, 2019). They also described a multitude of people associated with live wildlife trade, consistent with the typologies defined by Phelps et al. (2016). Long value-chains which involve many people



might be specific features of markets selling live wildlife that could be related to the purpose and value of wildlife. Although quantitative methods can be used to characterise risks and their pathways within markets (such as species abundance and contact durations), social science and ethnographic methods, such as those described by Edwards (2012) in the context of markets in Mali, Africa, are likely to be of greater value to understand complex wildlife trading networks. Understanding the drivers and risks behind network structure is valuable to identify potential control points (Phelps et al., 2016), and will also serve to understand the socio-economic impacts of regulations to mitigate risks. Networks involving people and transport are often small-world networks and it is possible that wildlife trade networks are of this type; such networks can be robust in the face of disruption (Hu and Verma, 2011). Therefore, as well as not addressing the drivers of wildlife consumption, banning trade of live mammalian wildlife in markets might not be an effective strategy to mitigate EID risks. It has already been suggested that those whose livelihoods depend on wildlife trade are likely to find alternative trade routes that avoid regulations; trade diverted to hidden networks could inadvertently pose a greater risk to public health (Roe et al., 2020).

Overall, this review demonstrates that accurate assessment of the risk of EIDs associated with live wildlife trade in markets is currently infeasible due to massive epistemic uncertainty. The magnitude of live wildlife-potential spillover host interfaces is unknown, high-risk species and microorganism pairs are largely unknown, there is limited information about activities that could influence exposure to microorganisms, and there is limited evidence to associate EID events with wet markets. Although this review did not identify records in languages other than English, the small proportion of records which focused on disease indicates that assessing EID risks in markets has had less research focus than the conservation impacts of live wildlife trade. This does not mean that markets are not a risk for EID emergence and that a precautionary approach is unwarranted. Ultimately however, policy will need to be

evidence-based and commensurate with risk so that it can be implemented and sustained. The high-profile association of early COVID-19 cases with a wet market in Wuhan and the current recommendation to ban trade of live mammalian species in markets has catalysed the need to understand these risks. This review provides a baseline of currently available, peer-reviewed information about live wildlife trade in markets globally. Addressing the gaps in knowledge to accurately assess risks across the wide range of market types, activities and wildlife species purpose globally will provide the framework in which policy to promote biodiversity, protection of livelihoods and prevention of EIDs can be supported.

### **Declaration of competing interest**

The authors declare that they have no known competing financial interests or personal relationships that could have appeared to influence the work reported in this paper.

### **Acknowledgments**

We thank the Australian Department of Education, Skills and Employment, Enabling Growth and Innovation Program for their funding and support.

### **References**

- Aisher A. Scarcity, alterity and value: decline of the pangolin, the world's most trafficked mammal. *Conservation and Society* 2016; 14: 317-329.
- Akani GC, Amadi N, Eniang EA, Luiselli L, Petrozzi F. Are mammal communities occurring at a regional scale reliably represented in "hub" bushmeat markets? A case study with Bayelsa State (Niger Delta, Nigeria). *Folia Zoologica* 2015.
- Aloufi A, Eid E. Conservation perspectives of illegal animal trade at markets in Tabuk, Saudi Arabia. *Traffic Bulletin* 2014.

- Andersen KG, Rambaut A, Lipkin WI, Holmes EC, Garry RF. The proximal origin of SARS-CoV-2. *Nature Medicine* 2020; 26: 450-452.
- Bai C, Garner TWJ, Li Y. First evidence of batrachochytrium dendrobatidis in China: Discovery of chytridiomycosis in introduced American bullfrogs and native amphibians in the Yunnan Province, China. *EcoHealth* 2010.
- Baía PC, Jr., Guimarães DA, Le Pendu Y. Non-legalized commerce in game meat in the Brazilian Amazon: a case study. *Rev Biol Trop* 2010.
- Catenazzi A, Vredenburg VT, Lehr E. Batrachochytrium dendrobatidis in the live frog trade of Telmatobius (Anura: Ceratophryidae) in the tropical Andes. *Diseases of Aquatic Organisms* 2010.
- Chen N, Zhou M, Dong X, Qu J, Gong F, Han Y, et al. Epidemiological and clinical characteristics of 99 cases of 2019 novel coronavirus pneumonia in Wuhan, China: a descriptive study. *The Lancet* 2020; 395: 507-513.
- Cheung SM, Dudgeon D. Quantifying the Asian turtle crisis: market surveys in southern China, 2000–2003. *Aquatic Conservation: Marine and Freshwater Ecosystems* 2006.
- Chng SC, Shepherd CR, Eaton JA. In the market for extinction: birds for sale at selected outlets in Sumatra. *TRAFFIC Bulletin* 2018.
- Chow AT, Cheung S, Yip PK. Wildlife markets in south China. *Human-Wildlife Interactions* 2014.
- Cronin DT, Woloszynek S, Morra WA, Honarvar S, Linder JM, Gonder MK, et al. Long-Term Urban Market Dynamics Reveal Increased Bushmeat Carcass Volume despite Economic Growth and Proactive Environmental Legislation on Bioko Island, Equatorial Guinea. *PLoS One* 2015.
- D'Cruze N, Assou D, Coulthard E, Norrey J, Megson D, Macdonald DW, et al. Snake oil and pangolin scales: insights into wild animal use at “Marché des Fétiches” traditional medicine market, Togo. *Nature Conservation* 2020; 39: 45.
- da Nobrega Alves RR, Pereira Filho GA. Commercialization and use of snakes in North and Northeastern Brazil: Implications for conservation and management. *Biodiversity and Conservation* 2007.
- Davenport D, Heatwole H. Wild terrestrial vertebrates sold as food in open markets in Laos. *Pacific Conservation Biology* 2013.
- Delahay RJ, de la Fuente J, Smith GC, Sharun K, Snary EL, Flores Girón L, et al. Assessing the risks of SARS-CoV-2 in wildlife. *One Health Outlook* 2021; 3: 7.
- Dong BQ, Liu W, Fan XH, Vijaykrishna D, Tang XC, Gao F, et al. Detection of a novel and highly divergent coronavirus from asian leopard cats and Chinese ferret badgers in Southern China. *J Virol* 2007.

- Edmunds K, Robertson SI, Few R, Mahood S, Bui PL, Hunter PR, et al. Investigating Vietnam's Ornamental Bird Trade: Implications for Transmission of Zoonoses. *Ecohealth* 2011.
- Edwards IB. The social life of wild-things: Negotiated wildlife in Mali, West Africa. 2012.
- Eisemberg CC, Rose M, Yaru B, Georges A. Demonstrating decline of an iconic species under sustained indigenous harvest - The pig-nosed turtle (*Carettochelys insculpta*) in Papua New Guinea. *Biological Conservation* 2011.
- Fa JE, Yuste JEG, Castelo R. Bushmeat markets on Bioko Island as a measure of hunting pressure. *Conservation Biology* 2000.
- Fasanmi OG, Ahmed SSU, Oladele-Bukola MO, El-Tahawy AS, Elbestawy AR, Fasina FO. An evaluation of biosecurity compliance levels and assessment of associated risk factors for highly pathogenic avian influenza H5N1 infection of live-bird-markets, Nigeria and Egypt. *Acta Trop* 2016.
- Fernandes-Ferreira H, Mendonca SV, Albano C, Ferreira FS, Nobrega Alves RR. Hunting, use and conservation of birds in Northeast Brazil. *Biodiversity and Conservation* 2012.
- Gilbert M, Bickford D, Clark L, Johnson A, Joyner PH, Ogg Keatts L, et al. Amphibian pathogens in Southeast Asian frog trade. *Ecohealth* 2012.
- Goldman A, Krider R, Ramaswami S. The Persistent Competitive Advantage of Traditional Food Retailers in Asia: Wet Markets' Continued Dominance in Hong Kong. *Journal of macromarketing* 1999; 19: 126-139.
- Greatorax ZF, Olson SH, Singhalath S, Silithammavong S, Khammavong K, Fine AE, et al. Wildlife Trade and Human Health in Lao PDR: An Assessment of the Zoonotic Disease Risk in Markets. *Plos One* 2016.
- Greengrass E. Commercial hunting to supply urban markets threatens mammalian biodiversity in Sapo National Park, Liberia. *Oryx* 2016.
- Grogan LF, Berger L, Rose K, Grillo V, Cashins SD, Skerratt LF. Surveillance for emerging biodiversity diseases of wildlife. *PLoS Pathogens* 2014; 10: e1004015.
- Guan Y, Zheng B, He Y, Liu X, Zhuang Z, Cheung C, et al. Isolation and characterization of viruses related to the SARS coronavirus from animals in southern China. *Science* 2003; 302: 276-278.
- Haibin W, Kunming G. Wildlife trade in Yunnan Province, China, at the border with Vietnam. *Traffic Bulletin* 1999.
- Hamid NA, Sadiq MB, Ramanoon SZ, Mansor R, Watanabe M, Nur Mahiza Md I, et al. Seroprevalence and Risk Factors of *Toxoplasma gondii* in Ruminant Meats from Wet Markets in Klang Valley and Abattoirs in Selangor, Malaysia. *Animals* 2020; 10: 1139.

- He F, En-Fu C, Fu-Dong L, Xin-Yi W, Xiao-Xiao W, Jun-Fen L. Human infection and environmental contamination with Avian Influenza A (H7N9) Virus in Zhejiang Province, China: risk trend across the three waves of infection. *BMC Public Health* 2015; 15.
- Hu Z, Verma PK. Topological resilience of complex networks against failure and attack. 2011 Fifth IEEE International Conference on Advanced Telecommunication Systems and Networks (ANTS), 2011, pp. 1-6.
- Huang C, Wang Y, Li X, Ren L, Zhao J, Hu Y, et al. Clinical features of patients infected with 2019 novel coronavirus in Wuhan, China. *The lancet* 2020; 395: 497-506.
- Ingram DJ, Cronin DT, Challender DWS, Venditti DM, Gonder MK. Characterising trafficking and trade of pangolins in the Gulf of Guinea. *Global Ecology and Conservation* 2019.
- Janssen J, Gomez L. Common sun skink *eutropis multifasciata* (kuhl 1820) sold for traditional medicine in indonesia and potential conservation implications. *Ethnobiology and Conservation* 2019.
- Jones KE, Patel NG, Levy MA, Storeygard A, Balk D, Gittleman JL, et al. Global trends in emerging infectious diseases. *Nature* 2008; 451: 990-U4.
- Kayed AS, Kandeil A, Gomaa MR, El-Shesheny R, Mahmoud S, Hegazi N, et al. Surveillance for avian influenza viruses in wild birds at live bird markets, Egypt, 2014-2016. *Influenza Other Respir Viruses* 2019.
- Kottawattage SAK, VanBergen MAP, Abeynayake P, Wagenaar JA, Veldman KT, Kalupahana RS. *Campylobacter* in Broiler Chicken and Broiler Meat in Sri Lanka: Influence of Semi-Automated vs. Wet Market Processing on *Campylobacter* Contamination of Broiler Neck Skin Samples. *Foods* 2017; 6: 105.
- Krishnakumar K, Raghavan R, Pereira B. Protected on paper, hunted in wetlands: exploitation and trade of freshwater turtles (*Melanochelys trijuga coronata* and *Lissemys punctata punctata*) in Punnamada, Kerala, India. *Tropical Conservation Science* 2009.
- Kuiken T, Leighton FA, Fouchier RAM, LeDuc JW, Peiris JSM, Schudel A, et al. *Public Health. Pathogen Surveillance in Animals*, 2005.
- Kusrini MD, Alford RA. Indonesia's exports of frogs' legs. *Traffic Bulletin* 2006.
- Lam TT-Y, Jia N, Zhang Y-W, Shum MH-H, Jiang J-F, Zhu H-C, et al. Identifying SARS-CoV-2-related coronaviruses in Malayan pangolins. *Nature* 2020; 583: 282-285.
- Magouras I, Brookes VJ, Jori F, Martin A, Pfeiffer DU, Dürr S. Emerging Zoonotic Diseases: Should We Rethink the Animal–Human Interface? *Frontiers in Veterinary Science* 2020; 7.
- Maloney JG, Molokin A, da Cunha MJR, Cury MC, Santin M. Blastocystis subtype distribution in domestic and captive wild bird species from Brazil using next generation amplicon sequencing. *Parasite Epidemiol Control* 2020.

- McEvoy JF, Connette G, Huang Q, Soe P, Pyone KHH, Valitutto M, et al. Two sides of the same coin—Wildmeat consumption and illegal wildlife trade at the crossroads of Asia. *Biological Conservation* 2019; 238: 108197.
- Min S. Impacts of Wildlife Trade on Conservation in Kachin State, Myanmar. *TRAFFIC Bulletin* 2012.
- Nadimpalli ML, Pickering AJ. A call for global monitoring of WASH in wet markets. *The Lancet Planetary Health* 2020; 4: e439-e440.
- Naguib MM, Li R, Ling J, Grace D, Nguyen-Viet H, Lindahl JF. Live and Wet Markets: Food Access versus the Risk of Disease Emergence. *Trends in Microbiology* 2021.
- Nekaris KAI, Shepherd CR, Starr CR, Nijman V. Exploring cultural drivers for wildlife trade via an ethnoprimateological approach: A case study of slender and slow lorises (*Loris* and *Nycticebus*) in South and Southeast Asia. *American Journal of Primatology* 2010.
- Ngan WY, Rao S, Chan LC, Sekoai PT, Pu Y, Yao Y, et al. Impacts of Wet Market Modernization Levels and Hygiene Practices on the Microbiome and Microbial Safety of Wooden Cutting Boards in Hong Kong. *Microorganisms* 2020; 8: 1941.
- Nijman V, Bergin D. Reptiles traded in markets for medicinal purposes in contemporary Morocco. *Contributions to Zoology* 2017.
- Nobrega Alves RR, Rosa IL. Trade of Animals Used in Brazilian Traditional Medicine: Trends and Implications for Conservation. *Human Ecology* 2010.
- Olival KJ, Hosseini PR, Zambrana-Torrel C, Ross N, Bogich TL, Daszak P. Host and viral traits predict zoonotic spillover from mammals. *Nature* 2017; 546: 646-650.
- Phelps J, Biggs D, Webb EL. Tools and terms for understanding illegal wildlife trade. *Frontiers in Ecology and the Environment* 2016; 14: 479-489.
- Plowright RK, Parrish CR, McCallum H, Hudson PJ, Ko AI, Graham AL, et al. Pathways to zoonotic spillover. *Nature Reviews Microbiology* 2017; 15: 502-510.
- Pruvot M, Khammavong K, Milavong P, Philavong C, Reinharz D, Mayxay M, et al. Toward a quantification of risks at the nexus of conservation and health: The case of bushmeat markets in Lao PDR. *Science of the Total Environment* 2019.
- Roe D, Dickman A, Kock R, Milner-Gulland EJ, Rihoy E, 't Sas-Rolfes M. Beyond banning wildlife trade: COVID-19, conservation and development. *World Development* 2020; 136: 105121.
- Schweikhard J, Kasper K, Ebert C, Lehmann M, Erbe P, Ziegler T. Investigations into the illegal wildlife trade in central Lao PDR. *Traffic Bulletin* 2019; 31: 19-25.
- Sekoai PT, Feng S, Zhou W, Ngan WY, Yang P, Yao Y, et al. Insights into the Microbiological Safety of Wooden Cutting Boards Used for Meat Processing in Hong Kong's Wet Markets: A Focus on Food-Contact Surfaces, Cross-Contamination and the Efficacy of Traditional Hygiene Practices. *Microorganisms* 2020; 8: 579.

- Shepherd C, Nijman V. An assessment of wildlife trade at Mong La market on the Myanmar-China border. *Traffic Bulletin* 2007; 21: 85-88.
- Sigal S. The Coronavirus Likely Came from China's Wet Markets. They're Reopening Anyway. 2021. *Vox*, 2020.
- Sodeinde O, Soewu D. Pilot study of the traditional medicine trade in Nigeria. *TRAFFIC BULLETIN-CAMBRIDGE-TRAFFIC INTERNATIONAL-* 1999.
- Soewu DA, Ayodele IA. Utilisation of Pangolin (*Manis* spp) in traditional Yorubic medicine in Ijebu province, Ogun State, Nigeria. *J Ethnobiol Ethnomed* 2009.
- Sogbohossou EA, Kassa B, Akpona HA, Amahowe IO, Djagoun J, Sinsin B. TRADE IN PRIMATE SPECIES FOR MEDICINAL PURPOSES IN SOUTHE IMPLICATIONS FOR CONSERVATION. *TRAFFIC Bulletin* 2018.
- Stuart BL, Smith J, Davey K, Din P, Platt SG. Homalopsine watersnakes: the harvest and trade from Tonle Sap, Cambodia. *TRAFFIC BULLETIN-CAMBRIDGE-TRAFFIC INTERNATIONAL-* 2000; 18: 115-124.
- Tam JS. Influenza A (H5N1) in Hong Kong: an overview. *Vaccine* 2002; 20: S77-S81.
- Taylor LH, Latham SM, Woolhouse ME. Risk factors for human disease emergence. *Philos Trans R Soc Lond B Biol Sci* 2001; 356: 983-9.
- The Law Library of Congress. Regulation of Wild Animal Wet Markets in Selected Jurisdictions: Law Library of Congress, Global Legal Research Directorate, 2020.
- Tricco AC, Lillie E, Zarin W, O'Brien KK, Colquhoun H, Levac D, et al. PRISMA Extension for Scoping Reviews (PRISMA-ScR): Checklist and Explanation. *Annals of Internal Medicine* 2018; 169: 467-473.
- van Uhm DP, Wong RW. Establishing trust in the illegal wildlife trade in China. *Asian Journal of Criminology* 2019; 14: 23-40.
- Van Vliet N, Nebesse C, Gambalemoke S, Akaibe D, Nasi R. The bushmeat market in Kisangani, Democratic Republic of Congo: Implications for conservation and food security. *ORYX* 2012.
- Vijaykrishna D, Smith GJ, Zhang JX, Peiris JS, Chen H, Guan Y. Evolutionary insights into the ecology of coronaviruses. *J Virol* 2007.
- Vrbova L, Stephen C, Kasman N, Boehnke R, Doyle Waters M, Chablitt Clark A, et al. Systematic review of surveillance systems for emerging zoonoses. *Transboundary and emerging diseases* 2010; 57: 154-161.
- Wang F, Li W, Hua L, Gong S, Xiao J, Hou F, et al. Spirometra (Pseudophyllidea, Diphyllbothriidae) severely infecting wild-caught snakes from food markets in Guangzhou and Shenzhen, Guangdong, China: implications for public health. *ScientificWorldJournal* 2014.

- Wang F, Zhou L, Gong S, Deng Y, Zou J, Wu J, et al. Severe infection of wild-caught snakes with *Spirometra erinaceieuropaei* from food markets in Guangzhou, China involves a risk for zoonotic sparganosis. *J Parasitol* 2011.
- White RJ, Razgour O. Emerging zoonotic diseases originating in mammals: a systematic review of effects of anthropogenic land-use change. *Mammal Review* 2020; 50: 336-352.
- Wikramanayake E, Pfeiffer DU, Magouras I, Conan A, Ziegler S, Bonebrake TC, et al. A tool for rapid assessment of wildlife markets in the Asia-Pacific Region for risk of future zoonotic disease outbreaks. *One Health* 2021; 13: 100279.
- Williams VL, Moshoeu TJ, Alexander GJ. Reptiles sold as traditional medicine in Xipamanine and Xiquelene Markets (Maputo, Mozambique). *South African Journal of Science* 2016.
- Woo PC, Lau SK, Yuen K-y. Infectious diseases emerging from Chinese wet-markets: zoonotic origins of severe respiratory viral infections. *Current opinion in infectious diseases* 2006; 19: 401-407.
- Woolhouse M, Scott F, Hudson Z, Howey R, Chase-Topping M. Human viruses: discovery and emergence. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences* 2012; 367: 2864-2871.
- Woolhouse MEJ, Haydon DT, Antia R. Emerging pathogens: the epidemiology and evolution of species jumps. *Trends in Ecology & Evolution* 2005; 20: 238-44.
- World Health Organisation. Reducing public health risks associated with the sale of live wild animals of mammalian species in traditional food markets. In: Safety NaF, editor. World Health Organization, WHO Headquarters (HQ), 2021, pp. 8.
- World Health Organization. A guide to healthy food markets. World Health Organization, Geneva, Switzerland, 2006.
- Xiao X, Newman C, Buesching CD, Macdonald DW, Zhou Z-M. Animal sales from Wuhan wet markets immediately prior to the COVID-19 pandemic. *Scientific reports* 2021; 11: 1-7.
- Xu RH, He JF, Evans MR, Peng GW, Field HE, Yu DW, et al. Epidemiologic clues to SARS origin in China. *Emerg Infect Dis* 2004; 10: 1030-7.
- Yiming L, Dianmo L. The dynamics of trade in live wildlife across the Guangxi border between China and Vietnam during 1993–1996 and its control strategies. *Biodiversity & Conservation* 1998.
- Yu D, Li H, Xu R, MPH, He J, Lin J, et al. Prevalence of IgG antibody to SARS-associated coronavirus in animal traders--Guangdong Province, China, 2003. *MMWR. Morbidity and mortality weekly report* 2003; 52: 986-987.
- Yudhana A, Praja RN, Supriyanto A. The medical relevance of *Spirometra* tapeworm infection in Indonesian Bronzeback snakes (*Dendrelaphis pictus*): A neglected zoonotic disease. *Vet World* 2019.



- Zhang L, Hua N, Sun S. Wildlife trade, consumption and conservation awareness in southwest China. *Biodivers Conserv* 2008.
- Zhang QF, Pan Z. The transformation of urban vegetable retail in China: Wet markets, supermarkets and informal markets in Shanghai. *Journal of Contemporary Asia* 2013; 43: 497-518.
- Zhang T, Wu Q, Zhang Z. Probable Pangolin Origin of SARS-CoV-2 Associated with the COVID-19 Outbreak. *Current Biology* 2020; 30: 1346-1351.e2.
- Zhong S, Crang M, Zeng G. Constructing freshness: the vitality of wet markets in urban China. *Agriculture and Human Values* 2020; 37: 175-185.
- Zhou P, Yang X-L, Wang X-G, Hu B, Zhang L, Zhang W, et al. A pneumonia outbreak associated with a new coronavirus of probable bat origin. *Nature* 2020; 579: 270-273.