

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26

Effects of cattle on vector-borne disease risk to humans: A systematic review

Sulagna Chakraborty¹, Siyu Gao², Brian. F Allan^{1,3}., Rebecca Lee Smith^{1,4}

¹ Program in Ecology, Evolution & Conservation Biology; University of Illinois Urbana-Champaign; Urbana; Illinois, USA

² Crown Family School of Social Work, Policy, and Practice, The University of Chicago, Chicago, Illinois, USA

³ Department of Entomology; Program in Ecology, Evolution & Conservation Biology; University of Illinois Urbana-Champaign; Urbana; Illinois, USA

⁴ Department of Pathobiology; Program in Ecology, Evolution & Conservation Biology; University of Illinois Urbana-Champaign; Urbana; Illinois, USA

*Corresponding author

Email: schkrbr4@illinois.edu

SC and RLS conceived the study, SC and SG surveyed the literature and extracted information from published articles, SC drafted the first version of the manuscript and SC, SG, BFA and RLS contributed to writing the manuscript.

27 **Abstract:**

28 Vector-borne diseases (VBDs) may be transmitted among humans, domestic animals, and wildlife, with
29 cattle in particular serving as an important source of exposure risk to humans. The close associations
30 between humans and cattle can facilitate transmission of numerous VBDs which can impact nations’
31 public health and economic security. Published studies demonstrate that cattle can influence human
32 exposure risk positively, negatively or have no effect. There is a critical need to synthesize the
33 information in the scientific literature on this subject, in order to illuminate the various ecological
34 mechanisms that can affect the risk of humans contracting VBDs from cattle. Therefore, the aim of this
35 systematic review was to review the scientific literature, provide a synthesis of the possible effects of
36 cattle on VBD risk to humans, and propose future directions for research. This study was performed
37 according to the PRISMA 2020 extension guidelines for systematic review. After screening 470 peer-
38 reviewed articles published between 1999 – 2019 using the databases Web of Science Core Collection,
39 PubMed Central, CABI Global Health, and Google Scholar, and utilizing forward and backward search
40 techniques, we identified 127 papers that met inclusion criteria. Results of the systematic review indicate
41 that cattle can be beneficial or harmful to human health with respect to VBDs depending on vector and
42 pathogen ecology and livestock management practices. Cattle can increase risk of exposure to infections
43 transmitted by tsetse flies and ticks, followed by sandflies and mosquitoes, through a variety of
44 mechanisms. However, cattle can have a protective effect when the vector prefers to feed on cattle instead
45 of humans and when chemical control measures (e.g., acaricides/insecticides), semio-chemicals, and other
46 integrated vector control measures are utilized in the community. We highlight that further research is
47 needed to determine ways in which these mechanisms may be exploited to reduce VBD risk in humans.

48

49

50

51 **Author Summary:**

52 Vector-borne diseases (VBDs) are caused by infections transmitted by blood-feeding arthropods from an
53 infected to an uninfected organism. These infections may be caused by pathogenic bacteria, viruses, or
54 protozoans and arthropods may transmit these infections to humans, domestic animals, and wildlife.
55 Humans and cattle spend a significant amount of time in close proximity with each other through various
56 activities such as agriculture, animal husbandry, trading, and animal farming, which can potentially
57 increase risk to human health. Previously published studies indicated cattle can impact VBD transmission
58 both positively and negatively, however, there has not been a recent synthesis of the scientific literature
59 on this subject. Through this global systematic review of the scientific literature, we found that cattle
60 could have either harmful or beneficial impacts on human health when it comes to VBDs, but most often
61 increase exposure risk to VBDs in humans. We identified various mechanisms from the scientific
62 literature by which cattle can impact VBD risk in humans. Further research is needed to better understand
63 specific ecological mechanisms by which cattle impact human health and develop measures that will
64 prevent and reduce VBD exposure risk in humans.

65

66 **Introduction:**

67 Vector-borne diseases (VBDs) are caused by infectious agents that are transmitted by
68 hematophagous arthropods, which can transmit a wide range of pathogens to other organisms (1).
69 Important arthropod vectors of infectious diseases include ticks (*Ixodoidea*), mosquitoes (*Culicidae*),
70 sandflies (*Phlebotominae*), tsetse flies (*Glossinidae*), black flies (*Simuliidae*), and kissing bugs
71 (*Triatominae*). For over a century, vector-borne diseases have been the subject of scientific research
72 because of the severe concern they pose to human and animal health (2 - 5). VBDs account for more than
73 one billion cases, one million deaths, and one-sixth of worldwide disability and illnesses annually (6).

74 Common examples of VBDs include malaria, Lyme disease, Rift valley fever, Chikungunya, West Nile
75 virus and other bacterial, protozoal, and viral diseases (7). Torto and Tchouassi (8) estimate ~80% of the
76 world's human population is at risk of exposure to one or more VBDs. Along with their negative impacts
77 on human and animal health, VBDs may have detrimental effects on sustainable development and can
78 cause significant economic losses (9). When a VBD's prevalence reaches a critical level in a country,
79 human mobility, trade, foreign investment, savings, and land use are all likely to suffer unfavorable
80 consequences (10). As a direct result, VBDs are not only an increasing public health problem, but also
81 have a negative macroeconomic impact on society. Therefore, it is vital to continue efforts to better
82 understand, analyze, and manage health risks due to VBDs and inform effective preventative measures.

83 Transmission cycles for many VBDs may involve humans, domestic animals, wildlife, and
84 various facets of their environment (11). Environmental factors such as climate may strongly affect the
85 rate of transmission of VBDs; for example, changing temperatures and precipitation due to climate
86 change have been associated with an increase in vector prevalence and transmission (12). VBD exposure
87 risk to humans is especially increased in low-income countries, driven in part by people who are involved
88 in occupations where they handle cattle and other livestock, notably farmers, agricultural laborers,
89 slaughterhouse workers etc. Additionally, people who live in close proximity to cattle or are allied to
90 animal husbandry, as well as those involved in treating and caring for livestock, often are at higher risk of
91 VBDs (13). Socioeconomic disparities have also been associated with increased disease incidence.
92 Individuals in disadvantaged areas may be unaware of these diseases or associated risk factors, lack
93 access to health facilities and infrastructure, and may follow few to no preventive measures, such as use
94 of insecticide-treated bed nets or vaccines (14). Finally, some tropical VBDs such as leishmaniasis are
95 classified as neglected, and so do not receive sufficient public health attention and funding, complicating
96 disease prevention efforts (15).

97 Cattle are among the most economically and culturally significant domesticated animals globally
98 (16). There is considerable overlap between cattle and humans through our economic activities,

99 occupations, and cattle being a source of food and recreation (17). Proximity between humans and cattle
100 through agriculture, animal husbandry, and trade provides opportunities for disease transmission. Biotic
101 factors including age, sex, and breed of cattle and their interactions with domestic and wild animals along
102 with abiotic factors such as climate and environmental conditions may influence disease transmission.
103 These factors interact with vector species abundance, longevity, feeding cycle and blood meal host choice
104 as key predictors for how VBD transmission occurs (18).

105 The overarching role of cattle in the transmission and spread of VBDs in humans is a major gap
106 in our understanding of the ecology and epidemiology of these diseases. Thus, it is important to determine
107 if these human-cattle connections can impact human health via VBDs. Since vectors such as ticks and
108 mosquitoes often feed on multiple host species and may spread various pathogens to humans, livestock,
109 and wildlife, the role of cattle in VBD transmission is complicated. Cattle have various roles to play when
110 it comes to vector-borne disease transmission. For example, they can function as blood meal hosts for
111 arthropod vectors and thereby increase the abundance of vector species (19 - 20), and as reservoir hosts
112 for pathogens and thereby increase pathogen prevalence (21 - 22). In contrast, cattle can be more
113 attractive to biting vectors than humans and thereby act as shields against vector bites to humans
114 preventing pathogen transfer in specific circumstances (23 - 24).

115 Through this systematic review, we have been able to identify multiple VBDs for which cattle
116 have a direct or indirect role in infection transmission; however, for many VBDs the exact role of cattle in
117 the ecology of these diseases remains undetermined. Arguably the most contentious matter has been that
118 of the zoo-prophylactic role of cattle (i.e., cattle acting as a barrier against disease transmission by
119 absorbing vector bites and thereby having a protective effect for humans). There is a significant debate in
120 the scientific literature over whether the presence of cattle near humans can substantially reduce disease
121 incidence. There are studies that have both supported and failed to support the zoo-prophylactic effect of
122 cattle on VBD risk to humans, such as in the case of malaria (25-26).

123 Globally, there are numerous studies that directly investigate whether cattle increase or decrease
124 risk of VBD exposure in humans, and yet currently there is no synthesis of the existing information on

125 this subject. This gap can impact public health and epidemiological measures that countries can take to
126 prevent VBD transmission. Thus, our goal was to conduct a systematic review of the scientific literature
127 to synthesize and present the findings on the conditions by which cattle increase or decrease human risk
128 of exposure to VBDs and by what ecological mechanisms.

129

130 **Methods:**

131 **Search strategy:**

132 We conducted a systematic review of the published scientific literature to determine whether
133 studies report a positive, negative, or neutral impact of cattle on human exposure risk to vector-borne
134 diseases (i.e., whether cattle increased, decreased, or had no effect, respectively). Following the PRISMA
135 2020 (Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses) guidelines (27), we
136 developed a search algorithm that would enable us to extract scientific papers on this subject from various
137 databases, using the following search string:

138 TS = (cattle AND (tick-borne illness OR tick borne disease OR mosquito-borne illness OR
139 mosquito borne disease OR vector-borne illness OR vector borne disease) AND human health) AND
140 LANGUAGE: (English), year range 1999 to 2019.

141 The initial step after developing the search string was to check if there were other systematic
142 reviews on this topic through the Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews. We used the keyword search
143 comprising “cattle AND vector-borne diseases AND human health” on Cochrane, which did not yield any
144 systematic review; it did yield one article (28) which was outside the scope of this study. Subsequently,
145 we used the following databases to execute the search string to identify relevant articles: CABI Global
146 Health, Web of Science Core Collection, PubMed Central and Google Scholar. Articles were also
147 identified through forward and backward searches from citations in both included and excluded articles.
148 Titles and abstracts of the articles identified through keyword search, forward, and backward searches

149 were screened against the study inclusion criteria. Potentially relevant articles were retrieved for
150 evaluation of the full text and duplicates were removed.

151 Full text articles were further screened and evaluated using the full study inclusion criteria, which
152 were: a) study should be published between 1999 - 2019 to ensure recency; b) study language should be
153 in English; c) study incorporates all of the key terms: vector (specifically searched for the terms tick-
154 borne, mosquito-borne), vector-borne disease, humans, and cattle; d) study explores a possible connection
155 between vector, cattle, and human; e) full texts of the articles available (full texts were accessed through
156 University of Illinois library, Google Scholar and World Cat database). Articles were excluded from the
157 study if they met any of the following exclusion criteria: a) analysis excludes vector-borne diseases; b)
158 study fails to mention a vector arthropod that transmits disease; c) study does not include cattle
159 involvement; d) control studies, vaccine studies, therapeutic studies, or review papers; e) studies
160 involving only experimental lab infection; f) studies whose full texts could not be accessed after multiple
161 attempts from various sources; g) non-English language articles; h) studies that only include pathogens
162 that do not cause human infection; i) studies conducted outside our time period. This review had no
163 geographical restrictions.

164 Two reviewers independently assessed inclusion and exclusion criteria. A third reviewer assessed
165 studies for which the reviewers disagreed. We calculated Cohen's Kappa statistic to estimate inter-rater
166 agreement between the first two raters. Article search was conducted between September 30, 2019, until
167 June 8, 2020.

168 Data extraction and synthesis:

169 Methodological and outcome variables from each selected study were collected in a database,
170 including article title, authors, publication year, country, study type, vector taxa, main implications of
171 each study, and database source for this review. We summarized the common themes and findings of the
172 included studies narratively. To better illustrate the impact of cattle on human health due to VBDs, we
173 characterized the effect of cattle on VBD exposure risk to humans into three categories: a) neither

174 beneficial nor harmful (no association), b) beneficial, or c) harmful, and identified any mechanisms
175 investigated or proposed by the authors that contributed to human risk of exposure to VBDs by cattle.

176 Study quality assessment:

177 To evaluate the quality of the included studies, we used The Strengthening the Reporting of
178 Observational Studies in Epidemiology (STROBE) Statement guidelines for reporting observational
179 studies (29). The first two authors independently rated each included study. These articles were rated on a
180 score ranging from 0 - 2, depending on whether the criteria were unmentioned or $< \frac{1}{4}$ met (0), $\frac{1}{4} - \frac{3}{4}$ met
181 (1), or $> \frac{3}{4}$ met (2). The following were the critical criteria used in rating the study quality: (a) was the
182 research question clearly stated? (b) what was the study design and study setting used? (c) what was the
183 sample size used? (d) were the subjects in the study representative of the target population? (e) were the
184 main findings clearly described? (f) were there any confounding variables? (g) did the researchers use
185 appropriate analytical methods? and (h) was the study located in the predefined area of interest? The
186 study quality score measured the strength of study evidence for reporting here, but studies were not
187 excluded based on quality.


188 Results:

189 Study selection, Inter-rater agreement & Study quality assessment:

190 We screened 470 articles through a keyword search using our search algorithm. The number of
191 articles identified from each database, and number of articles included and excluded in our review, are
192 listed in Fig 1. After removal of 12 duplicates, we identified 458 unique articles. Out of these, 331 did not
193 meet the inclusion criteria. The remaining 127 articles are the final pool of studies included in this review.
194 S1 Appendix provides the complete reference list of all studies that were finally included after performing
195 the database search. Cohen's Kappa statistic for inter-rater agreement between two raters was calculated
196 to be 0.835, indicating strong agreement between the article reviewers (30). Averaging the ratings

197 provided by two members who conducted the study quality assessment, the reviewed studies averaged a
198 score of 1.22 out of 2, with a standard deviation of 0.55 for 127 articles.

199 **Fig 1: Flowchart for the systematic review process**



200


201

202 Study characteristics:

203 The most common study methods used by researchers worldwide were observational studies,
204 studies that utilized molecular biology, phylogenetic, and genetic techniques, mathematical modeling
205 studies, and entomological studies. Several studies involved more than one research method or study
206 design to collect various kinds of data from the study population. Articles were included from 69
207 individual countries and the European Union. Of note, only one study from the United States was in the
208 final pool of included studies. The majority of the papers included in this review were from the African
209 continent (N = 82), followed by Asia (N = 37), Europe (N = 24) and only a few papers from South
210 America (N = 4), North America (N = 4) and one study from Oceania/Australia (N = 1; Fig 2). Note that
211 there were several studies that were based in more than one country; for example, if a study was
212 conducted both in Cameroon and Nigeria, it was counted twice in Fig 2.

213 **Fig 2: World map representing countries and number of studies included in this review.**

214




215

216 Based upon the findings reported by study authors, effects of cattle on human health with respect
217 to exposure to VBDs were divided into three categories: beneficial, harmful, or neither beneficial nor
218 harmful (no association) (Fig 3, Table 1). The most beneficial impact of cattle was observed in the case of

219 infections spread by mosquitoes and sandflies. Cattle sometimes had beneficial impact when it came to
220 tick-borne diseases, especially in integrated cattle and wildlife communities. In such communities, when
221 cattle were treated with acaricides they reduced the abundance of host-seeking ticks in the environment,
222 thereby reducing tick-borne disease risk for wildlife and humans (31-32). However, effects of cattle on
223 tick-borne disease risk were sometimes harmful as well. Cattle have been found to be a major risk factor
224 for humans when it comes to diseases spread by tsetse flies. There were some studies for each vector
225 taxon that stated that cattle had neither harmful nor beneficial exposure impacts on human health, with the
226 exception of tsetse flies. From this systematic review, we found that in the case of six VBDs and in the
227 case of few tickborne pathogens, cattle impacted VBD exposure risk in humans both positively and
228 negatively, for 14 major VBDs cattle were harmful and for 2 VBDs cattle were beneficial (Table 1). We
229 also identified various mechanisms from these published studies by which cattle can positively or
230 negatively impact human exposure risk to VBDs (Table 2). Seven mechanisms were identified by which
231 cattle may impact VBD exposure risk in humans. Overall, we find that cattle tend to increase the risk of
232 exposure to VBDs in humans, but there are circumstances when cattle can reduce or have no effect on
233 VBD exposure risk as well.

234 **Fig 3: Cattle impact on risk of exposure to vector-borne diseases on human health, divided into**
235 **beneficial, harmful and no effect by major vector taxon, covered in this review.**



236

237 **Table 1: Role of cattle on risk of exposure to vector-borne diseases in humans from studies included**
 238 **in this review**

Vector-borne disease	Vector	Role of cattle	Selected Sources
Rift valley fever (RVF)	Mosquitoes (primary vector- <i>Aedes</i> species, secondary vector <i>Culex</i> species)	Harmful. (See Table 2: 4 - 6)	33 - 35
Malaria	Mosquitoes (female <i>Anopheles</i> species)	Both harmful and beneficial effects observed. (See Table 2: 1, 4, 7)	18, 24, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41
Japanese Encephalitis (JE)	Mosquitoes (<i>Culex</i> species)	Beneficial and potentially harmful effects observed. (See Table 2: 1, 3)	42-43
Chagas disease	Kissing bug (<i>Triatoma brasiliensis brasiliensis</i>)	Potentially harmful (See Table 2: 1, 4)	44 -45 (Not part of included studies)
West Nile Virus (WNV)	Mosquitoes (<i>Culex</i> species)	Possibly harmful but in rare instances (debatable) (See Table 2: 4)	46-47 (Not part of included studies)

St. Louis Encephalitis (SLE)	Mosquitoes (<i>Culex</i> species)	Potentially harmful (See Table 2: 4)	48
Human African Trypanosomiasis (HAT) or sleeping sickness	Tsetse fly (<i>Glossina</i> species)	Harmful & Beneficial. (See Table 2: 4-7)	49, 50, 51, 52
Lyme Disease	Ticks (<i>Ixodes scapularis</i> , <i>Ixodes pacificus</i> , <i>Ixodes ricinus</i>)	Beneficial (See Table 2: 2 - 3)	53-54
Crimean-Congo hemorrhagic fever (CCHF)	Ticks (primary vector <i>Hyalomma</i> species; secondary vector <i>Rhipicephalus</i> , <i>Haemaphysalis</i> and <i>Dermacentor</i> species)	Harmful and Beneficial (See Table 2: 4 - 5, 7)	31, 32, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59.
Anaplasmosis	Ticks (<i>Ixodes scapularis</i> , <i>Ixodes pacificus</i> , <i>Ixodes ricinus</i>)	Harmful (See Table 2: 4, 6)	60, 61, 62, 63
Babesiosis	Ticks (<i>Babesia divergens</i> ; <i>Babesia microti</i> , <i>Babesia bovis</i> , <i>Babesia bigemina</i>)	Harmful (See Table 2: 6)	64, 65, 66 (Not all papers are part of included studies)
Dugbe virus	Ticks (<i>Hyalomma</i> , <i>Amblyomma</i> and <i>Rhipicephalus</i> species)	Harmful and Beneficial (See Table 2: 4, 7)	67; 68, 69 31, 32

Thogoto virus	Ticks (<i>Rhipicephalus praetextatus</i>)	Potentially beneficial (See Table 2: 7).	31, 32
Alkhurma/Alkhumra hemorrhagic fever (AKHV)	Ticks (<i>Ornithodoros savignyi</i> , <i>Hyalomma dromedari</i>)	Harmful (See Table 2: 5)	70, 71, 72 (Not all papers are part of included studies)
Kyasanur Forest Disease (KFD)	Ticks (<i>Haemaphysalis spinigera</i> , <i>Haemaphysalis turturis</i>)	Harmful (See Table 2: 4 - 6)	73, 74, 75, 76 (Not all papers are part of included studies)
Ehrlichiosis	Ticks (<i>Amblyomma americanum</i> , <i>Ixodes scapularis</i>)	Harmful (See Table 2: 4)	62, 77
Tickborne Encephalitis Virus (TBEV)	Ticks (<i>Ixodes ricinus</i> , <i>Ixodes persiculatus</i> , <i>Haemaphysalis punctata</i> , <i>Dermacentor marginatus</i>)	Harmful (See Table 2: 4, 6)	78, 79
African tick bite fever (ATBF)	Ticks (<i>Amblyomma variegatum</i> , <i>Amblyomma hebraeum</i>)	Harmful (See Table 2: 4)	80, 81, 82 (Not all papers are part of included studies)
Rocky Mountain Spotted Fever (RMSF)	Ticks (<i>Dermacenter variabilis</i> , <i>Amblyomma americanum</i> , <i>Rhipicephalus sanguineus</i> , <i>Amblyomma cajennense</i>)	Harmful (See Table 2: 4)	83

Spotted fever group (SFG) rickettsioses	Ticks (<i>Amblyomma maculatum</i> , <i>Rhipicephalus</i> , <i>Dermacentor</i> , <i>Hyalomma</i> and <i>Ixodes</i> species)	Harmful (See Table 2: 4)	22, 80, 84
Q fever	Ticks (<i>Dermacentor</i> species, <i>Hyalomma</i> species, <i>Haemaphysalis</i> species, <i>Rhipicephalus</i> species, <i>Ixodes</i> species)	Harmful (See Table 2: 4 - 5)	85, 86
Cutaneous Leishmaniasis and Visceral Leishmaniasis (Kala azar)	Sandfly (<i>Lutzomyia gomezi</i> , <i>Lutzomyia longipalpis</i> , <i>Lutzomyia ovallesi</i> , <i>Phlebotomus argentipes</i> , <i>Phlebotomus papatasi</i> <i>Phlebotomus sergenti</i> , <i>Sergentomyia squamipleuris</i>)	Both harmful and beneficial effects observed. (See Table 2: 2, 4, 7)	87, 88,89, 90, 91, 92, 93

239 **Table 2: Mechanisms identified from included studies by which cattle impact vector-borne disease**
 240 **exposure risk in humans**

Potential mechanisms of cattle	Select vector-borne diseases	Effect on human health
1A. Diversion of blood meals away from humans.	Malaria	Beneficial

1B. Attraction of vectors to humans.	Malaria	Harmful
2. Modification of the environment.	Lyme disease, Leishmaniasis	Beneficial
	Leishmaniasis	Harmful
3. Incompetent host	Lyme disease, Japanese encephalitis	Beneficial
4. Competent host (maintenance/reservoir of pathogens, quality source of blood meals for vectors)	Tick-borne rickettsial diseases, Human African Trypanosomiasis (HAT), Kyasanur Forest Disease (KFD), Anaplasmosis, African Tick Bite fever, Rocky Mountain Spotted fever, tick-borne Dugbe virus, Malaria, Q fever, Leishmaniasis, West Nile virus, Ehrlichiosis, Chagas disease, Japanese encephalitis, St Louis encephalitis, Tick-borne encephalitis, Chandipura virus	Harmful
5. Direct contact between cattle or cattle by-products and humans affecting disease transmission	Crimean Congo Hemorrhagic fever (CCHF), Kyasanur Forest Disease (KFD), tick-borne encephalitis, Alkhurma/Alkhumra hemorrhagic fever, Q fever, Rift valley fever	Harmful

	(RFV), Human African Trypanosomiasis (HAT).	
6. Disease transmission through cattle movements and interaction with wildlife/other animals.	Rift valley fever, Kyasanur Forest Disease, Human African Trypanosomiasis, Anaplasmosis, Tick-borne encephalitis	Harmful
7. Impact of insecticidal/acaricidal treatment of cattle on disease transmission.	Malaria, Human African Trypanosomiasis, Onchocerciasis, tick-borne pathogens, Leishmaniasis, CCHF, Thogoto virus and Dugbe virus	Beneficial

241 **Discussion:**

242 Cattle and other livestock animals are principal elements in agriculture, animal husbandry, trade,
 243 economic activities as well as in cultural practices of people around the world. People who are in close
 244 contact with cattle due to employment, commerce or for traditional reasons often are at higher risk for
 245 contracting various vector-borne and zoonotic diseases (13, 94).

246 We identified a critical gap in the scientific literature about the various roles cattle can play in
 247 vector-borne disease transmission. We systematically reviewed articles from the scientific literature to
 248 synthesize the available information to better understand how cattle impacts VBD exposure risk in
 249 humans. We categorized the impacts of cattle on VBD exposure risk in humans by effect (positive,
 250 negative, neutral) and by vector taxa (mosquitoes, sandflies, ticks, tsetse flies). We also identified seven
 251 mechanisms by which cattle positively or negatively impact VBD exposure risk in human health.

252 Research on this topic has been concentrated geographically in countries located in sub-Saharan Africa
253 and southern Asia. Cattle appear to have both beneficial and harmful impacts on human health with
254 respect to VBDs, but they tend to overwhelmingly increase risk of exposure to VBDs in humans. These
255 effects of cattle on VBD exposure risk in humans depends on various ecological conditions, on the vector
256 taxa along with other environmental factors.

257 In order to understand the mechanisms by which cattle can impact risk of human exposure to
258 vector-borne diseases we define some key terms here, which are sometimes used inconsistently in the
259 literature we reviewed. A reservoir is defined as one or more epidemiologically connected populations of
260 host species in which the pathogen can be permanently maintained and from which infection is
261 transmitted (95). A maintenance population can be defined as a host population in which a pathogen
262 persists because the population size is greater than the critical community threshold (95, 96). An
263 amplifying host is an organism in which an infectious agent (such as a virus or bacterium) that is
264 pathogenic for some other species is able to replicate rapidly and to high concentrations (97) as evidenced
265 in the case of Japanese encephalitis virus for which pigs are the amplifying host species (98). The ability
266 to obtain and transmit pathogens to other organisms refers to the competence of the host in transmitting
267 that infection (99).

268 In our review and synthesis of the studies included in this systematic review, we identified seven
269 classes of mechanisms by which cattle can impact risk of exposure to vector-borne diseases in humans,
270 which are discussed below. We also recorded the number of times the papers within our included studies
271 invoked one or more of these mechanisms.

272 Mechanism I: Diversion and attraction of vector blood meals

273 There is considerable evidence in the published literature to support scenarios in which there is a
274 zoo-prophylactic effect of cattle on human health. Zoo-prophylaxis occurs when the presence of cattle can

275 function as a barrier against potential vectors and as an alternative host that deflect blood meals away
276 from humans. This phenomenon has been observed and studied greatly in the context of malaria (24, 26,
277 39, 100, 101). This mechanism was observed 16 times from the included studies. Contrastingly, there is
278 also evidence of instances when zoo-prophylaxis has not been observed (25, 39, 101, 102, 103, 104, 105,
279 106, 107). Multiples studies indicate that certain requirements/conditions need to be present for zoo-
280 prophylaxis to occur (24, 26, 38). In the case of malaria specifically these conditions are a) zoophilic and
281 exophilic vector, b) habitat separation between human and host animal quarters, and c) augmentation of
282 zoo-prophylaxis with insecticide treatment of animals or co-intervention of long-lasting insecticide-
283 treated nets and/or indoor residual spraying. Presence or absence of these requirements might explain to a
284 certain extent why cattle may or may not always be observed to be zoo-prophylactic.

285 The opposite of zoo-prophylaxis is zoo-potential, whereby livestock contribute to an increase
286 in VBD transmission by attracting vector bites to humans; this often occurs where livestock are housed
287 within or near human sleeping quarters and for vector species that prefer human hosts, such as with some
288 species of mosquitoes that transmit human malaria (24). As opposed to zoo-prophylaxis, the improved
289 availability of blood meals by increasing the presence of cattle increases mosquito survival, which
290 counters the beneficial impact of diverting blood meals on endemic and epidemic malaria (104). Tirados
291 et al (101) showed in field studies that in outdoor conditions, cattle had no prophylactic effect on humans
292 but the presence of cattle outside with humans indoors had some protective effect. Clearly the mere
293 presence of cattle may not always be sufficient to protect humans from malaria-carrying mosquitoes.
294 Cattle may attract more vectors (108), and they can increase local abundance of specific vectors causing
295 both cattle and human VBDs such as tick-borne pathogens, malaria and leishmaniasis. We observed this
296 mechanism within our included studies 18 times.

297 Mechanism II: Modification of the environment

298 A second mechanism by which cattle may impact VBD risk is through physical modification of
299 the environment. Cattle may be able to modify the environment making it either suitable or unsuitable for
300 certain vectors thereby impacting VBD exposure. For example, cattle can modulate the risk for Lyme
301 disease by reducing the prevalence of questing vector ticks in a managed pasture (53). In this study, cattle
302 modified the vegetation by their grazing thereby rendering the microclimate more arid and making the
303 environment less suitable for the survival of ticks. Another instance where cattle may have a beneficial
304 impact on human exposure is the case of Leishmaniasis: Bern et al (88) found that household cattle
305 ownership was associated with lower risk of contracting the infection and presence of large numbers of
306 cattle around houses had a protective effect. Conversely research by Singh et al (92) found that one of the
307 primary vectors of Leishmaniasis in India, *Phlebotomous argentipes*, preferred to mate in cattle sheds and
308 in soils that were more alkaline than in human houses, whereas another vector *P. papatasi* preferred the
309 soil of human houses with neutral pH. This is another example where cattle may modify environments to
310 be more suitable for vector survival and where it can have a negative and positive effect on human health
311 depending on ecological attributes of the vector. We found only 6 instances when this mechanism was
312 discussed in our pool of studies.

313 Mechanism III: Incompetent host

314 Cattle have been found to be an incompetent reservoir host species for certain pathogens such as
315 the causative agent for Lyme disease (54). Non-infected ticks that feed on cattle fail to acquire
316 spirochetes, but also infected ticks may even lose their infection during the course of blood meals from
317 cattle (53). Similarly, Samuel et al (43) reported that a decrease in the cattle-to-pig ratio might be one of
318 the reasons for an increase in Japanese encephalitis virus (JEV) infection among children in India. Pigs
319 are competent reservoir hosts for JEV, whereas cattle are a dead-end host for JEV, and presence of cattle
320 may have a protective effect on humans. This mechanism was only observed 3 times within our pool of
321 studies.

322 Mechanism IV: Competent host

323 In other cases, cattle may serve as competent reservoirs, maintenance hosts, quality source of
324 bloodmeals or amplifying hosts for several vector-borne diseases. In some circumstances, cattle can
325 maintain vector-borne pathogens in their system that remain undetected, which may cause an outbreak
326 when the right conditions arise (109). For example, in the case of Human African Trypanosomiasis
327 (HAT), cattle along with pigs serve as reservoirs of human infective *Trypanosoma brucei rhodesiense* and
328 also serve as blood meal hosts for the tsetse fly vector (49, 110). Cattle have been found to harbor all life
329 stages of ticks that can transmit Kyasanur Forest Disease (KFD) to humans and have also found to
330 maintain a low level of the KFD virus infection without succumbing to the disease (73, 75, 111). Cattle
331 are reservoirs for the pathogens that cause Anaplasmosis and can be co-infected with two or more
332 *Anaplasma* species simultaneously (61, 112, 113). Cattle can be reservoirs for several species of tick-
333 borne rickettsial pathogens as well (22, 84). Cattle are also known to maintain tick-borne Dugbe virus in
334 the environment, which primarily affects children (68, 69). Cattle and other ungulates are important
335 reservoirs of the causative agent of Q fever, *Coxiella burnetii* (114, 115). This was the most commonly
336 observed mechanism (found 63 times) in our systematic review and appears to be a better studied
337 mechanism than some of the other mechanisms mentioned here.

338 Mechanism V: Direct contact between cattle or cattle by-products and humans affecting disease
339 transmission

340 Several sources indicate that consumption of dairy products from infected cattle (i.e., after they
341 have been bitten by ticks) or consumption of infected meat itself are risk factors for diseases transmitted
342 by vector arthropods, such as Crimean Congo hemorrhagic fever (CCHF), tick-borne encephalitis, Rift
343 Valley Fever (RVF), and Alkhurma/Alkhumra hemorrhagic fever (57, 70, 78, 116, 117). Handling both
344 live and dead infected cattle and contact with raw animal skins and body fluids of infected cattle can also
345 be risk factors for CCHF and RVF (59, 118, 119). Various studies have also shown that people working

346 in professions in close contact with cattle, such as veterinary professionals, abattoir workers, butchers,
347 farm workers, livestock handlers, traditional pastoralists, tannery workers, and human health
348 professionals, are at risk of contracting CCHF, RVF, HAT, Q fever and other VBDs, either through direct
349 contact with cattle or indirectly via vector bites on the cattle (33, 55, 57, 28, 116, 118, 120, 121). In
350 addition, congregations of large herds of cattle with humans due to trade and religious festivals at trading
351 posts, live animal markets, quarantine facilities, and in slaughterhouses, allow for more opportunities for
352 VBD transmission such as in the cases of RVF and CCHF (56, 122, 123, 124). This is the second most
353 commonly observed mechanism in the reviewed literature, with a count of 28 times.

354 Mechanism VI: Disease transmission through cattle movements and interaction with wildlife/other
355 animals

356 Movement of animals from disease-endemic to non-endemic places and the interaction between
357 cattle and other animal species during grazing activities can also result in geographic spread of VBDs to
358 new foci (117, 124, 125). Omondi et al (62) state that wildlife translocations from areas with vector
359 presence to areas without vector presence can also lead to VBD transmission. Diseases that typically are
360 rare in humans, such as babesiosis, have been found to increase due to dissemination of pathogens
361 through cattle movement (66). Movement of otherwise free-ranging cattle to forest and back into villages
362 have been hypothesized to be a risk factor in the spread of Kyasanur Forest Disease in India (75, 76, 126).
363 Rutto et al (49) showed that in areas where untreated cattle, humans and other livestock come into contact
364 with each other, especially during dry periods at watering points, there can be risk of bovine and human
365 trypanosomiasis transmission. Murase et al (127) demonstrated that cattle might be contracting
366 *Anaplasma phagocytophilum* from contact with wildlife and could easily transmit it to humans in Japan.
367 Similar to mechanism V, anthropogenic activities, and areas such as trading posts, wet markets, religious
368 festivals etc. where there are congregations of cattle, humans, and other domestic or wild animals; these
369 afford opportunities for spillover of pathogens from one species to another (122, 123, 128, 129). We
370 observed this mechanism 26 times in our included pool of studies.

371 Mechanism VII: Impact of insecticidal/acaricidal treatment of cattle on disease transmission


372 A major beneficial impact of cattle on VBD exposure risk in humans is through treatment of
373 cattle with insecticides/acaricides. There is research that shows treatment of cattle with insecticides is
374 associated with a significant decrease of malarial vectors in the environment, when used in conjunction
375 with insecticide-treated bed-nets, indoor residual spraying, and other vector control approaches (37, 38,
376 104, 130, 131, 132, 133, 134). When cattle are treated with insecticides against tsetse flies or
377 trypanocides against the parasites, it reduces the abundance of vectors and parasites thus preventing
378 transmission of HAT (49, 50, 51, 135). Insecticidal or acaricidal treatment of cattle also has positive
379 impacts in controlling other mosquito vectors (136), blackflies (137), leishmaniasis (138, 139, 140) and
380 preventing tick-borne diseases in non-integrated ecosystems (141, 142).

381 Acaricidal treatment of cattle can also have beneficial impacts in wildlife and livestock integrated
382 communities. Allan et al (31) and Keesing et al (32) describe that in such integrated communities in
383 Kenya, treatment of cattle with acaricides can reduce abundance of host-seeking ticks in the environment.
384 This could also improve the health of wildlife, domestic animals and humans that co-occur in such shared
385 ecosystems. Treatment of the cattle with specific acaricides reduced the abundance of host-seeking
386 nymph and adult life stages of several tick species (vectors of diseases such as CCHF, Thogoto virus and
387 Dugbe virus), thereby reducing potential for disease transmission. Interactions between cattle and wildlife
388 can have important epidemiological consequences. For example, Ruiz-Fons et al (143) found that in game
389 reserves in Spain where cattle and ungulates coexist, cattle abundance influenced the prevalence of *B.*
390 *burgdorferi* sensu lato and *A. phagocytophilum* in *I. ricinus* nymphal ticks. Increasing abundance of cattle
391 seemed to increase the risk of other hosts becoming infected by *A. phagocytophilum*, while reducing the
392 risk of becoming infected by *B. burgdorferi* sensu lato. We observed this mechanism in our included pool
393 of studies 17 times.

394 Treatment of cattle with insecticides either topically or through ingestion can reduce the
395 circulating parasites in the environment along with the targeted vector species, thereby reducing disease

396 burden and vectorial capacity of the vectors. However, efficacy of insecticide treatment of cattle is
397 dependent not just on the feeding preferences of the vector but also on behavioral adaptations of vectors,
398 potential development of resistance among the vectors and parasites, and potential negative consequences
399 for the environment (41, 132, 144, 145, 146). If the targeted vector species in an area are all
400 anthropophilic, then there has to be a multi-pronged approach to control the vectors and VBDs in that
401 area. We summarize this intricate interaction between vector feeding preference and insecticide treatment
402 of cattle on human health in Fig 4.

403 **Fig 4: Proposed effects of insecticide-treated cattle and vector feeding preference on human**
404 **exposure risk.**



405
406 We hypothesize that when cattle are treated with insecticides and/or vectors preferentially feed on cattle,
407 cattle likely reduce VBD exposure risk in humans by deflecting vector blood meals away from humans
408 and/or reducing the abundance of vectors in the environment. Conversely, when vectors prefer to feed on
409 humans and/or cattle are not treated with insecticides, cattle are likely to increase VBD exposure risk in
410 humans by contributing to an increase in vector abundance, attracting vectors to feed on humans, and/or
411 serving as pathogen reservoir hosts that can transmit the infection to vector arthropods.

412 Treatment of cattle with various insecticides to prevent disease transmission has been shown to be
413 a critical step in vector control. However, factors such as inadequate market infrastructure, poor
414 awareness, expensive nature of treatments, and local policy enforcement failures can lead to low rates of
415 cattle treatment (49, 125). There is research underway to investigate alternative methods that can be used
416 to control vectors and thereby vector-borne diseases, such as the use of plant-based odor baits (147) and
417 semio-chemicals.

418 Semio-chemicals are organic compounds that function as signals and enable intra- and inter-
419 specific chemical communication (148). The information conveyed is used for modulating physiological
420 and behavioral activities through the olfactory and taste system (148). Mosquitoes use a variety of sensory
421 cues to find their prey which can differ depending on the specific life stages of the mosquito (149).
422 Various semio-chemicals have been identified that mosquitoes use during oviposition, mating, sugar
423 feeding and host-seeking (149). When semio-chemicals are applied to cattle and livestock, they can attract
424 specific vectors to the cattle and then kill the vectors (150); or they can disrupt mating in the vector (151);
425 additionally, they can be used to repel vectors from finding their preferred hosts (e.g., humans) (151). The
426 search is on for other alternative methods or compounds that can be used in vector control methods that
427 might be less environmentally harmful. For instance, Singh et al (92) evaluated application of plant
428 products at potential sandfly breeding sites to reduce soil pH that might help in preventing vector mating
429 and can be a useful alternative to chemical insecticides for sandfly control/management. Other vector
430 control approaches being developed include gene drive technology (152), infection of *Aedes* mosquitoes
431 with *Wolbachia* to prevent VBD spread (153, 154), and a variety of environmental modifications (154).

432 No effect/no association of cattle on VBD risk:

433 There were some papers that met our inclusion criteria and yet did not explicitly study the impact
434 of cattle on human exposure risk to VBDs (155, 156). In addition, other studies found unclear
435 associations between cattle and VBD risk to humans (157, 158; 159, 160, 161, 162). As we found few

436 such papers in our pool, this indicates the need for diversity of study designs and research methodologies
437 that might better investigate the impact of cattle on VBD exposure risk in humans.

438 Limitations:

439 It is important to consider study limitations. Since we opted to focus on more recent papers, the
440 final pool of studies did not include papers published before 1999, which may overlook older but still
441 important research. There may be articles published on this topic in languages other than English which
442 we could not include, and there have been review articles published that may have included otherwise
443 unpublished data which we did not include. In some articles it was difficult to parse out effects of cattle
444 from effects of other livestock since some studies group cattle as part of multiple livestock species,
445 despite our specific use of the term ‘cattle’ instead of ‘livestock’ in our search algorithm. Of note, since
446 this systematic review encompasses information from multiple fields such as ecology, epidemiology,
447 parasitology etc., certain terms/jargons and concepts are interchangeably used making this a challenging
448 question to answer. Finally, our evaluation of mechanisms by which cattle affect VBD exposure risk in
449 humans was dependent on mechanisms invoked by the authors of these studies, some of which were
450 supported by experimental evidence, but others based on field observations or informed opinions.

451 Future recommendations and research:

452 The role of cattle in vector-borne disease transmission can be complicated and can prove to be
453 beneficial or harmful in the context of specific VBDs and in specific settings. We recommend future
454 studies explicitly study the various mechanisms by which cattle impact vector-borne disease transmission,
455 as more than one mechanism may operate in specific environmental contexts. We encourage researchers
456 to use a wider variety of study designs than just modeling, serology, molecular analyses, cross-sectional,
457 and retrospective methods. Apart from human and animal health, other factors such as cultural practices,
458 societal norms, age, sex, occupation, human activities and behaviors, and seasonality can predispose
459 individuals to vector-borne diseases. More research is needed to investigate all these factors as well as
460 identify situations in which cattle can be zoo-prophylactic beyond the well-studied example involving

461 human malaria. Since published studies tended to be concentrated from a few specific regions, more
462 research and funding on this topic from other geographic areas (e.g., North America) might yield
463 interesting results. The results from this research could inform public health measures globally to prevent
464 and reduce vector-borne disease transmission. Policy measures, increased funding, and public awareness
465 are all critical steps in the fight against vector-borne diseases since many vectors are opportunistic and
466 can parasitize many different host species.

467 **Conclusion:**

468 The goal of this systematic review was to determine the impact of cattle on human health with
469 respect to vector-borne diseases. Our results show that cattle often increase VBD exposure risk in humans
470 but there is evidence to show that cattle can have a beneficial impact on human health as well. We
471 hypothesized seven mechanisms from the literature through which cattle can impact VBD exposure risk
472 in humans; these mechanisms are dependent on ecological conditions, vector taxa and other
473 environmental factors. In addition, some mechanisms are less studied than others and require further
474 investigation. Hence, it is critical for future studies to delve deeper into the many ways cattle, humans,
475 wildlife, and vectors interact in the environment and develop holistic measures that can be used to protect
476 humans and animals from VBDs as well as prevent negative side effects on the environment.

477

478 **Acknowledgements:**

479 We would like to thank Kelli Trei, Biosciences Librarian and Associate Professor at the University of
480 Illinois Urbana-Champaign, who helped us in the study search process.

481

482 **Conflicts of interest:**

483 The authors declare no competing interests financial or otherwise.

484

485

486 **References:**

- 487 1. Santiago PB, de Araújo CN, Motta FN, Praça YR, Charneau S, Bastos IMD, et al. Proteases of
488 hematophagous arthropod vectors are involved in blood-feeding, yolk formation and immunity-a
489 review. *Parasit Vectors*. 2017; 10(1), 1-20.
- 490 2. Athni TS, Shocket MS, Couper LI, Nova N, Caldwell IR, Caldwell JM, et al. The influence of
491 vector-borne disease on human history: socio-ecological mechanisms. *Ecol Lett*. 2021; 24(4),
492 829-846.
- 493 3. Campbell-Lendrum, D, Manga L, Bagayoko M, & Sommerfeld, J. Climate change and vector-
494 borne diseases: what are the implications for public health research and policy? *Philos Trans R*
495 *Soc Lond B Biol Sci*. 2015; 370(1665), 20130552.
- 496 4. Stuchin M, Machalaba CC, & Karesh WB. Vector-borne diseases: animals and patterns. In
497 *Global health impacts of vector-borne diseases: Workshop summary*. National Academies Press
498 (US); 2016.
- 499 5. Day MJ. One health: the importance of companion animal vector-borne diseases. *Parasit Vectors*.
500 2011; 4(1), 1-6.
- 501 6. World Health Organization. A global brief on vector-borne diseases (No.
502 WHO/DCO/WHD/2014.1). 2015. Available from <https://apps.who.int/iris/handle/10665/111008>
- 503 7. Savic S, Vidic B, Grgic Z, Potkonjak A, Spasojevic L. Emerging vector-borne diseases -
504 incidence through vectors. *Front Public Health*. 2014; 2.
- 505 8. Torto B, & Tchouassi DP. Grand challenges in vector-borne disease control targeting vectors.
506 *Front Trop Dis*. 2020; 1, 1

- 507 9. Hagenlocher M. Supporting Vector-borne Disease Prevention and Control with Geo-information.
508 In Supporting Vector-borne Disease Prevention and Control with Geo-Information. Herbert
509 Wichmann Verlag; 2016.
- 510 10. Malaney P. Micro-economic approaches to evaluating the burden of malaria. CID Working Paper
511 No. 99, Center for International Development at Harvard University, Cambridge, MA; 2003.
512 Available from chrome-
513 extension://efaidnbmninnibpcajpcglclefindmkaj/https://www.hks.harvard.edu/sites/default/files/ce
514 nters/cid/files/publications/faculty-working-papers/099.pdf
- 515 11. Baum SG. Zoonoses-with friends like this, who needs enemies? Trans. Am. Clin. Climatol.
516 Assoc. 2008; 119, 39–51.
- 517 12. Thongsripong P, Hyman JM, Kapan DD, Bennett SN. Human–mosquito contact: a missing link
518 in our understanding of mosquito-borne disease transmission dynamics. Ann Entomol Soc Am.
519 2021; 114(4), 397-414.
- 520 13. Klous G, Huss A, Heederik DJJ, Coutinho RA. Human–livestock contacts and their relationship
521 to transmission of Zoonotic Pathogens, a systematic review of literature. One Health, 2016; 2,
522 65–76.
- 523 14. Springer YP, Johnson PT. Large-scale health disparities associated with Lyme disease and human
524 monocytic ehrlichiosis in the United States, 2007–2013. PLoS One. 2018; 13(9).
- 525 15. Hotez PJ. Forgotten People, Forgotten Diseases: The Neglected Tropical Diseases and their
526 Impact on Global Health and Development. UK: ASM Press. 2013.
- 527 16. Thornton PK. Livestock production: recent trends, future prospects. Philos Trans R Soc Lond B
528 Biol Sci. 2010; 365(1554), 2853-2867.
- 529 17. Narladkar BW. Projected economic losses due to vector and vector-borne parasitic diseases in
530 livestock of India and its significance in implementing the concept of integrated practices for
531 Vector Management. Vet World. 2018; 11(2), 151–160.

- 532 18. Killeen GF, McKenzie FE, Foy BD, Bøgh C, Beier JC. The availability of potential hosts as a
533 determinant of feeding behaviours and malaria transmission by African mosquito populations.
534 *Trans R Soc Trop Med Hyg.* 2001; 95(5):469-76.
- 535 19. Zeru MA, Shibru S, Massebo F. Exploring the impact of cattle on human exposure to malaria
536 mosquitoes in the Arba Minch area district of southwest Ethiopia. *Parasit Vectors.* 2020; 13(1), 1-
537 8
- 538 20. Seyoum A, Balcha F, Balkew M, Ali A, Gebre-Michael T. Impact of cattle keeping on human
539 biting rate of anopheline mosquitoes and malaria transmission around Ziway, Ethiopia. *East Afr*
540 *Med J.* 2002; 79(9), 485-490.
- 541 21. Magona JW, Walubengo J. Mass-treatment and insecticide-spraying of animal reservoirs for
542 emergency control of Rhodesiense sleeping sickness in Uganda. *J Vector Borne Dis.* 2011; 48(2),
543 105.
- 544 22. Reye AL, Arinola OG, Hübschen JM, Muller CP. Pathogen prevalence in ticks collected from the
545 vegetation and livestock in Nigeria. *Appl Environ Microbiol.* 2012; 78(8), 2562-2568
- 546 23. Mburu MM, Zembere K, Mzilahowa T, Terlouw AD, Malenga T, van den Berg H, et al. Impact
547 of cattle on the abundance of indoor and outdoor resting malaria vectors in southern Malawi.
548 *Malar J.* 2021; 20(1), 1-11.
- 549 24. Donnelly B, Berrang-Ford L, Ross NA, Michel P. A systematic, realist review of zoo-prophylaxis
550 for malaria control. *Malar J.* 2015; 14(1), 1-16.
- 551 25. Hasyim H, Dhimal M, Bauer J, Montag D, Groneberg DA, Kuch U, et al. Does livestock protect
552 from malaria or facilitate malaria prevalence? A cross-sectional study in endemic rural areas of
553 Indonesia. *Malar J.* 2018; 17(1), 1-11.
- 554 26. Asale A, Duchateau L, Devleeschauwer B, Huisman G, Yewhalaw D. Zoo-prophylaxis as a
555 control strategy for malaria caused by the vector *Anopheles arabiensis* (Diptera: Culicidae): a
556 systematic review. *Infect Dis Poverty.* 2017; 6(1), 1-14.

- 557 27. Boutron I, Hoffmann TC, Mulrow CD, Shamseer L, Tetzlaff JM, Ak, EA et al. The PRISMA
558 2020 statement: an updated guideline for reporting systematic reviews. *BMJ*. 2021; 372(n71).
- 559 28. Madzimure J, Nyahangare ET, Hamudikuwanda H, Hove T, Stevenson PC, Belmain SR, et al.
560 Acaricidal efficacy against cattle ticks and acute oral toxicity of *Lippia javanica* (Burm F.)
561 Spreng. *Trop Anim Health Prod*. 2011; 43(2), 481-489.
- 562 29. Von Elm E, Altman DG, Egger M, Pocock SJ, Gøtzsche PC, Vandenbroucke JP. The
563 Strengthening the Reporting of Observational Studies in Epidemiology (STROBE) statement:
564 guidelines for reporting observational studies. *Bull World Health Organ*. 2007; 85, 867-872.
- 565 30. McHugh ML. Interrater Reliability: The kappa statistic. *Biochem Med (Zagreb)*. 2012; 276–282.
- 566 31. Allan BF, Tallis H, Chaplin-Kramer R, Hockett S, Kowal VA, Musengezi J, et al. Can integrating
567 wildlife and livestock enhance ecosystem services in central Kenya? *Front Ecol Environ*.
568 2017; 15(6), 328-335.
- 569 32. Keesing F, Allan BF, Young TP, Ostfeld RS. Effects of wildlife and cattle on tick abundance in
570 central Kenya. *Ecological applications*. 2013; 23(6), 1410–1418.
- 571 33. Alhaji NB, Babalobi OO, Wungak Y, Ularamu HG. Participatory survey of Rift Valley fever in
572 nomadic pastoral communities of North-central Nigeria: The associated risk pathways and
573 factors. *PLoS Negl Trop Dis*. 2018; 12(10), e0006858.
- 574 34. Umuhoza T, Berkvens D, Gafarasi I, Rukelibuga J, Mushonga B, Biryomumaisho S.
575 Seroprevalence of Rift Valley fever in cattle along the Akagera-Nyabarongo rivers, Rwanda. *J S
576 Afr Vet Assoc*. 2017; 88(0), e1–e5
- 577 35. Mhina AD, Kasanga CJ, Sindato C, Karimuribo ED, Mboera LE. Rift Valley fever potential
578 mosquito vectors and their infection status in Ngorongoro district in Northern Tanzania. *Tanzania
579 Journal of Health Research*. 2015;17(4).
- 580 36. Pooda HS, Rayaisse JB, Hien DF, Lefèvre T, Yerbanga SR, Bengaly Z, Dabiré RK, Belem AM,
581 Sidibé I, Solano P, Mouline K. Administration of ivermectin to peridomestic cattle: a promising
582 approach to target the residual transmission of human malaria. *Malar J*. 2015;14:1-2.

- 583 37. Iwashita H, Dida GO, Sonye GO, Sunahara T, Futami K, Njenga SM, et al. Push by a net, pull by
584 a cow: can zoo-prophylaxis enhance the impact of insecticide treated bed nets on malaria control?
585 Parasit Vectors. 2014; 7(1), 1-15.
- 586 38. Kawaguchi I, Sasaki A, Mogi M. Combining zoo-prophylaxis and insecticide spraying: a
587 malaria-control strategy limiting the development of insecticide resistance in vector mosquitoes.
588 Proc R Soc Lond B Biol Sci. 2004; 271(1536), 301-309.
- 589 39. Bogh C, Clarke SE, Pinder M, Sanyang F, Lindsay SW. Effect of passive zoo-prophylaxis on
590 malaria transmission in the Gambia. J Med Entomol. 2001; 38:822–828
- 591 40. Yakob L. Endectocide-treated cattle for malaria control: a coupled entomological-
592 epidemiological model. Parasite Epidemiol Control. 2016; 1(1):2-9.
- 593 41. Habtewold, T., Prior, A., Torr, S. J., & Gibson, G. (2004). Could insecticide-treated cattle reduce
594 Afrotropical malaria transmission? Effects of deltamethrin-treated Zebu on *Anopheles arabiensis*
595 behavior and survival in Ethiopia. Medical and veterinary entomology, 18(4), 408-417.
- 596 42. Kanojia PC. Ecological study on mosquito vectors of Japanese encephalitis virus in Bellary
597 district, Karnataka. IJMR. 2007; 126(2):152-7.
- 598 43. Samuel PP, Thenmozhi V, Muniaraj M, Ramesh D, Jerald Leo SV, Balaji, T, et al. (2018).
599 Changing paradigm in the epidemiology of Japanese encephalitis in a non-endemic region. J
600 Vector Borne Dis. 2018; 55(3), 203–207.
- 601 44. Bezerra CM, Barbosa SE, Souza RD, Barezani CP, Gürtler RE, Ramos AN, Diotaiuti L. *Triatoma*
602 *brasiliensis* Neiva, 1911: food sources and diversity of *Trypanosoma cruzi* in wild and artificial
603 environments of the semiarid region of Ceará, northeastern Brazil. Parasit Vectors. 2018;11:1-4.
- 604 45. Lima-Neiva V, Toma HK, Abrantes Aguiar LM, Lopes CM, Dias LP, Monte Gonçalves TC,
605 Costa J. The connection between *Trypanosoma cruzi* transmission cycles by *Triatoma brasiliensis*
606 *brasiliensis*: A threat to human health in an area susceptible to desertification in the Seridó, Rio
607 Grande do Norte, Brazil. PLoS Negl Trop Dis. 2021; 15(11):e0009919.

- 608 46. Hubálek Z, Halouzka J. West Nile fever--a reemerging mosquito-borne viral disease in Europe.
609 Emer Infect Dis. 1999; 5(5):643.
- 610 47. McLean RG, Ubico SR, Bourne D, Komar N. West Nile virus in livestock and wildlife. Curr Top
611 Microbiol Immunol. 2002; 271-308.
- 612 48. Thompson NN, Auguste AJ, Coombs D, Blitvich BJ, Carrington CV, da Rosa AP, Wang E,
613 Chadee DD, Drebot MA, Tesh RB, Weaver SC. Serological evidence of flaviviruses and
614 alphaviruses in livestock and wildlife in Trinidad. Vector Borne Zoonotic Dis. 2012; 12(11):969-
615 78.
- 616 49. Rutto JJ, Osano O, Thurania EG, Kurgat RK, Odenyo VAO. Socio-economic and cultural
617 determinants of human African trypanosomiasis at the Kenya–Uganda transboundary. PLoS Negl
618 Trop Dis. 2013; 7(4), e2186.
- 619 50. Meisner J, Barnabas RV, Rabinowitz PM. A mathematical model for evaluating the role of
620 trypanocide treatment of cattle in the epidemiology and control of *Trypanosoma brucei*
621 *rhodesiense* and *T. b. gambiense* sleeping sickness in Uganda. Parasite Epidemiol Control. 2019;
622 5, e00106.
- 623 51. Hargrove JW, Ouifki R, Kajunguri D, Vale GA, Torr SJ. Modeling the control of trypanosomiasis
624 using trypanocides or insecticide-treated livestock. PLoS Negl Trop Dis. 2012; 6(5), e1615.
- 625 52. Simarro PP, Cecchi G, Franco JR, Paone M, Diarra A, et al. Estimating and Mapping the
626 Population at Risk of Sleeping Sickness. PLoS Negl Trop Dis. 2012; 6: e1859.
- 627 53. Richter D, & Matuschka FR. Modulatory effect of cattle on risk for Lyme disease. Emerg Infect
628 Dis. 2006; 12(12), 1919
- 629 54. Matuschka FR, Eiffert H, Ohlenbusch A, Richter D, Schein E, Spielman A. Transmission of the
630 agent of Lyme disease on a subtropical island. Trop Med Parasitol. 1994; 45(1), 39-44.
- 631 55. Msimang V, Weyer J, le Roux C, Kemp A, Burt FJ, Tempia S, et al. Risk factors associated with
632 exposure to Crimean-Congo hemorrhagic fever virus in animal workers and cattle, and molecular
633 detection in ticks, South Africa. PLoS Negl Trp Dis. 2021; 15(5), e0009384.

- 634 56. Nieto NC, Khan K, Uhliah G, Teglas MB. The emergence and maintenance of vector-borne
635 diseases in the Khyber pakhtunkhwa province, and the federally administered tribal areas of
636 Pakistan. *Front Physiol.* 2012; 3, 250.
- 637 57. Yadav PD, Gurav YK, Mistry M, Shete AM, Sarkale P, Deoshatwar AR, et al. Emergence of
638 Crimean-Congo hemorrhagic fever in Amreli district of Gujarat state, India, June to July 2013.
639 *IJID.* 2014; 18, 97-100.
- 640 58. Mourya DT, Yadav PD, Shete AM, Gurav YK, Raut CG, Jadi RS, et al. Detection, isolation, and
641 confirmation of Crimean-Congo hemorrhagic fever virus in human, ticks and animals in
642 Ahmadabad, India, 2010–2011. *PLoS Neg Trop Dis.* 2012; 6(5), e1653.
- 643 59. Chinikar S, Ghiasi SM, Moradi M, Goya MM, Shirzadi MR, Zeinal, M, et al. Geographical
644 distribution, and surveillance of Crimean-Congo hemorrhagic fever in Iran. *Vector Borne*
645 *Zoonotic Dis.* 2010; 10(7), 705-708.
- 646 60. Okuthe OS, Buyu GE. Prevalence and incidence of tick-borne diseases in smallholder farming
647 systems in the western-Kenya highlands. *Vet Parasitol.* 2006;141(3-4):307-12.
- 648 61. Hosseini-Vasoukolaei N, Oshaghi MA, Shayan P, Vatandoost H, Babamahmoudi F, Yaghoobi-
649 Ershadi MR, Telmadarraiy Z, Mohtarami F. Anaplasma infection in ticks, livestock, and human
650 in Ghaemshahr, Mazandaran Province, Iran. *J Arthropod Borne Dis.* 2014; 8(2):204.
- 651 62. Omondi D, Masiga DK, Fielding BC, Kariuki E, Ajamma YU, Mwamuye MM, et al. Molecular
652 detection of tick-borne pathogen diversities in ticks from livestock and reptiles along the shores
653 and adjacent islands of Lake Victoria and Lake Baringo, Kenya. *Front Vet Sci.* 2017; 4, 73.
- 654 63. Yang J, Li Y, Liu Z, Liu J, Niu Q, Ren Q, Chen Z, Guan G, Luo J, Yin H. Molecular detection,
655 and characterization of *Anaplasma* spp. in sheep and cattle from Xinjiang, northwest China.
656 *Parasit Vectors.* 2015 ; 8:1-7.
- 657 64. Haapasalo K, Suomalainen P, Sukura A, Siikamäki H, Jokiranta TS. Fatal babesiosis in man,
658 Finland, 2004. *Emerg Infect Dis.* 2010; 16(7), 1116.

- 659 65. Skrabalo Z, Deanovic Z. Piroplasmosis in man; report of a case. *Doc Med Geogr Trop*. 1957;
660 9(1), 11-16.
- 661 66. Kumar A, O'Bryan J, Krause PJ. The Global Emergence of Human Babesiosis. *Pathogens*. 2021;
662 10(11), 1447
- 663 67. Kobayashi D, Ohashi M, Osei JH, Agbosu E, Opoku M, Agbekudzi A, Joannides J, Fujita R,
664 Sasaki T, Bonney JK, Dadzie S. Detection of a novel putative phlebovirus and first isolation of
665 Dugbe virus from ticks in Accra, Ghana. *Ticks Tick Borne Dis*. 2017; 8(4):640-5.
- 666 68. Daodu OB, Eisenbarth A, Schulz A, Hartlaub J, Olopade JO, Oluwayelu DO, et al. Molecular
667 detection of dugbe orthonairovirus in cattle and their infesting ticks (*Amblyomma* and
668 *Rhipicephalus* (*Boophilus*)) in Nigeria. *PLoS Negl Trop Dis*. 2021; 15(11), e0009905.
- 669 69. Guilherme JM, Gonella-Legall C, Legall F, Nakoume E, Vincent J. Seroprevalence of five
670 arboviruses in Zebu cattle in the Central African Republic. *Trans R Soc Trop Med Hyg*. 1996;
671 90(1), 31-33.
- 672 70. EFSA Panel on Biological Hazards (BIOHAZ). (2015). Scientific opinion on the public health
673 risks related to the consumption of raw drinking milk. *EFSA Journal*, 13(1), 3940.
- 674 71. Abdulhaq AA, Hershan AA, Karunamoorthi K, Al-Mekhlafi HM. Human Alkhumra hemorrhagic
675 Fever: Emergence, history, and epidemiological and clinical profiles. *Saudi J Biol Sci*. 2022;
676 29(3):1900-10.
- 677 72. Horton KC, Fahmy NT, Watany N, Zayed A, Mohamed A, Ahmed AA, Rollin PE, Dueger EL.
678 Crimean Congo hemorrhagic fever virus and Alkhurma (Alkhumra) virus in ticks in Djibouti.
679 *Vector Borne Zoonotic Dis*. 2016; 16(10):680-2.
- 680 73. Balasubramanian R, Yadav PD, Sahina S, Arathy Nadh V. Distribution, and prevalence of ticks
681 on livestock population in endemic area of Kyasanur forest disease in Western Ghats of Kerala,
682 South India. *J Parasit Dis*. 2019; 43:256-62.

- 683 74. Kasabi GS, Murhekar MV, Yadav PD, Raghunandan R, Kiran SK, Sandhya VK, Channabasappa
684 GH, Mishra AC, Mourya DT, Mehendale SM. Kyasanur forest disease, India, 2011–2012. *Emerg*
685 *Infect Dis.* 2013; 19(2):278.
- 686 75. Boshell M. Kyasanur Forest disease: Ecologic considerations. *Am J Trop Med Hyg.* 1969;18(1).
- 687 76. Rajagopalan PK, Sreenivasan MA. Ixodid ticks on cattle and buffaloes in the Kyasanur forest
688 disease area of Karnataka state. *IJMR.* 1981.
- 689 77. Adelabu OA, Iweriebor BC, Okoh AI, Obi LC. Phylogenetic profiling for zoonotic Ehrlichia spp.
690 from ixodid ticks in the Eastern Cape, South Africa. *Transbound Emerg Dis.* 2019; 67(3):1247-
691 56.
- 692 78. Cisak E, Wójcik-Fatla A, Zajac V, Sroka J, Buczek A, Dutkiewicz J. (2010). Prevalence of tick-
693 borne encephalitis virus [TBEV] in samples of raw milk taken randomly from cows, goats, and
694 sheep in Eastern Poland. *Ann Agric Environ Med.* 2010; 17(2), 283-286.
- 695 79. Ionescu LU, Alexse AU, Ceianu CO, Neculescu M, Popescu DI, Bicheru SI, Dumitrescu GA,
696 CUMPĂNĂȘOIU C, CUMPĂNĂȘOIU C, PASAT L, Tirziu E. Investigation methods used for
697 identifying the presence of tick-borne encephalitis virus (TBEV) in vector arthropods. *Sci. Pap.*
698 *Vet. Med.* 2009; 42:288-93.
- 699 80. Kumsa B, Socolovschi C, Raoult D, Parola P. Spotted fever group rickettsiae in ixodid ticks in
700 Oromia, Ethiopia. *Ticks and tick-borne diseases.* 2015; 6(1):8-15.
- 701 81. Kelly PJ, Mason PR, Manning T, Slater S. Role of cattle in the epidemiology of tick-bite fever in
702 Zimbabwe. *Journal of clinical microbiology.* 1991; 29(2):256-9.
- 703 82. Katswara T, Mukaratirwa S. Knowledge, attitudes, and practices on African tick bite fever of
704 rural livestock communities living in a livestock-wildlife interface area in the Eastern Cape
705 Province of South Africa. *BMC Infect Dis.* 2021; 21(1):1-1.
- 706 83. Rodríguez-Vivas RI, Apanaskevich DA, Ojeda-Chi MM, Trinidad-Martínez I, Reyes-Novelo E,
707 Esteve-Gassent MD, de León AP. Ticks collected from humans, domestic animals, and wildlife in
708 Yucatan, Mexico. *Vet Parasitol.* 2016; 215:106-13.

- 709 84. von Fricken ME, Lkhagvatseren S, Boldbaatar B, Nymadawa P, Weppelmann TA, Baigalmaa
710 BO, et al. Estimated seroprevalence of *Anaplasma* spp. and spotted fever group *Rickettsia*
711 exposure among herders and livestock in Mongolia. *Acta tropica*. 2018; 177, 179-185.
- 712 85. Koka H, Sang R, Kutima HL, Musila, L. *Coxiella burnetii* detected in tick samples from pastoral
713 communities in Kenya. *BioMed Res Int*. 2018
- 714 86. Rapti D, Postoli R, Bizhga B, Zalla P, Koleci X, Selmani, R. PRELIMINARY DATA ON
715 SEROLOGICAL INVESTIGATION TO Q FEVER, LYME DISEASE AND ECHINOCOCCUS
716 IN ALBANIA. *Macedonian Journal of Animal Science*. 2011; 1(1), 21–25
- 717 87. Barnett PG, Singh SP, Bern C, Hightower AW, Sundar, S. Virgin soil: the spread of visceral
718 leishmaniasis into Uttar Pradesh, India. *Am J Trop Med Hyg*. 2005; 73(4), 720-725
- 719 88. Bern C, Hightower AW, Chowdhury R, Ali M, Amann J, Wagatsuma Y, et al. Risk factors for
720 kala-azar in Bangladesh. *Emerg Infect Dis*. 2005; 11(5), 655.
- 721 89. Bern C, Joshi AB, Jha SN, Das ML, Hightower A, Thakur GD, et al. Factors associated with
722 visceral leishmaniasis in Nepal: bed-net use is strongly protective. *Am J Trop Med Hyg*. 2000;
723 63(3), 184-188.
- 724 90. Bern C, Courtenay O, Alvar, J. Of cattle, sand flies and men: a systematic review of risk factor
725 analyses for South Asian visceral leishmaniasis and implications for elimination. *PLoS Negl Trop*
726 *Dis*. 2010; 4(2), e599.
- 727 91. Bucheton B, Kheir MM, El-Safi SH, Hammad A, Mergani A, Mary C, Abel L, Dessein A. The
728 interplay between environmental and host factors during an outbreak of visceral leishmaniasis in
729 eastern Sudan. *Microbes and infection*. 2002; 4(14):1449-57.
- 730 92. Singh R, Lal S, Saxena VK. Breeding ecology of visceral leishmaniasis vector sandfly in Bihar
731 state of India. *Acta tropica*. 2008; 107(2):117-20.
- 732 93. Votýpka J, Kasap OE, Volf P, Kodým P, Alten B. Risk factors for cutaneous leishmaniasis in
733 Cukurova region, Turkey. *Trans R Soc Trop Med Hyg*. 2012; 106(3):186-90.

- 734 94. McDaniel CJ, Cardwell DM, Moeller RB, Gray GC. Humans and cattle: a review of bovine
735 zoonoses. *Vector Borne Zoonotic Dis.* 2014; 14(1), 1-19.
- 736 95. Haydon DT, Cleaveland S, Taylor LH., Laurenson MK. Identifying reservoirs of infection: a
737 conceptual and practical challenge. *Emerg Infect Dis.* 2002; 8(12), 1468-1473.
- 738 96. Viana M, Mancy R, Biek R, Cleaveland S, Cross PC, Lloyd-Smith JO, et al. Assembling
739 evidence for identifying reservoirs of infection. *Trend Ecol Evol.* 2014; 29(5), 270-279.
- 740 97. “Amplifying host.” Merriam-Webster.com Dictionary, Merriam-Webster, [https://www.merriam-
741 webster.com/dictionary/amplifying%20host](https://www.merriam-
741 webster.com/dictionary/amplifying%20host) Accessed 10 Nov. 2022.
- 742 98. McLean RK, Graham SP. The pig as an amplifying host for new and emerging zoonotic viruses.
743 *One Health.* 2022; 100384.
- 744 99. Chen L, Chen S, Kong P, Zhou L. Host competence, interspecific competition and vector
745 preference interact to determine the vector-borne infection ecology. *Front Ecology Evol.* 2022;
746 834.
- 747 100. Bogh C Clarke SE Walraven GEL, Lindsay SW. Zoo-prophylaxis, artefact, or reality? A paired-
748 cohort study of the effect of passive zoo-prophylaxis on malaria in The Gambia. *Trans R Soc Trop
749 Med Hyg.* 2002; 96:593–596
- 750 101. Tirados I, Gibson G, Young S, Torr SJ. Are herders protected by their herds? An experimental
751 analysis of zoo-prophylaxis against the malaria vector *Anopheles arabiensis*. *Malar J.* 2011;
752 10:68
- 753 102. Sota, T., & Mogi, M. Effectiveness of zoo-prophylaxis in malaria control: a theoretical inquiry,
754 with a model for mosquito populations with two bloodmeal hosts. *Med Vet Entomol.* 1989; 3(4),
755 337-345.
- 756 103. Schultz, G. W. Animal influence on man-biting rates at a malarious site in Palawan, Philippines.
757 *Southeast Asian J Trop Med Public Health.* 1989; 20(1), 49-53.

- 758 104. Saul A. Zoo-prophylaxis, or zoo potentiation: the outcome of introducing animals on vector
759 transmission is highly dependent on the mosquito mortality while searching. *Malar J.* 2003; 2(1),
760 1-18.
- 761 105. Bouma M, Rowland M. Failure of passive zoo-prophylaxis: cattle ownership in Pakistan is
762 associated with a higher prevalence of malaria. *Trans Roy Soc Trop Med Hyg.* 1995; 89(4), 351-
763 353.
- 764 106. Ghebreyesus TA, Haile M, Witten KH, Getachew A, Yohannes M, Lindsay SW, et al. Household
765 risk factors for malaria among children in the Ethiopian highlands. *Trans Roy Soc Trop Med Hyg.*
766 2000; 94(1), 17-21.
- 767 107. Mayagaya VS, Nkwengulila G, Lyimo IN, Kihonda J, Mtambala H, Ngonyani H, et al. The impact
768 of livestock on the abundance, resting behaviour and sporozoite rate of malaria vectors in southern
769 Tanzania. *Malar J.* 2015; 14(1), 1-14.
- 770 108. Poldy J. Volatile cues influence host-choice in arthropod pests. *Animals.* 2020; 10(11):1984.
- 771 109. Lugaj A, Koni M, Mertens M, Groschup M, Berxholi K. Serological survey of Crimean-Congo
772 hemorrhagic fever virus in cattle in Berat and Kolonje, Albania. *Albanian Journal of Agricultural*
773 *Sciences.* 2014; 325.
- 774 110. Simarro PP, Cecchi G, Paone M, Franco JR, Diarra A, Ruiz JA, Fèvre EM, Courtin F, Mattioli
775 RC, Jannin JG. The Atlas of human African trypanosomiasis: a contribution to global mapping of
776 neglected tropical diseases. *Int J Health Geogr.* 2010; 9(1):1-8.
- 777 111. Anderson CR, Singh KRP. The reaction of cattle to Kyasanur Forest disease virus. *IJMR.* 1971;
778 59(2), 195-8.
- 779 112. M'ghirbi Y, Bèji M, Oporto B, Khrouf F, Hurtado A, Bouattour A. *Anaplasma marginale* and *A.*
780 *phagocytophilum* in cattle in Tunisia. *Parasit Vectors.* 2016; 9(1), 1-8.
- 781 113. de la Fuente, Contreras M. Tick vaccines: current status and future directions. *Expert Rev*
782 *Vaccines.* 2015; 14(10), 1367-1376.

- 783 114. Madariaga MG. Q fever wildlife reservoir. *Emerg Infect Dis.* 2005; 11(5): 776–777. doi:
784 10.3201/eid1105.041272
- 785 115. Minnick MF, Raghavan R. Genetics of *Coxiella burnetii*: on the path of specialization. *Futur*
786 *Microbiol.* 2011; 6(11), 1297-1314.
- 787 116. Lagare A, Fall G, Ibrahim A, Ousmane S, Sadio B, Abdoulaye M, et al. First occurrence of Rift
788 Valley fever outbreak in Niger, 2016. *Vet Med Sci.* 2019; 5(1), 70-78.
- 789 117. Lancelot R, Béral M, Rakotoharinome VM, Andriamandimby SF, Héraud JM, Coste C, et al.
790 Drivers of Rift Valley fever epidemics in Madagascar. *Proc Nat Acad Sci.* 2017; 114(5), 938-943.
- 791 118. Mustafa ML, Ayazi E, Mohareb E, Yingst S, Zayed A, Rossi CA, et al. Crimean-Congo
792 hemorrhagic fever, Afghanistan, 2009. *Emerg Infect Dis.* 2011; 17(10), 1940.
- 793 119. Rai MA, Khanani MR, Warraich HJ, Hayat A, Ali SH. Crimean-Congo hemorrhagic fever in
794 Pakistan. *J Med Virol.* 2008; 80(6), 1004-1006.
- 795 120. Nyakarahuka L, de St. Maurice A, Purpura L, Ervin E, Balinandi S, Tumusiime A, et al.
796 Prevalence and risk factors of Rift Valley fever in humans and animals from Kabale district in
797 Southwestern Uganda, 2016. *PLoS Negl Trop Dis.* 2018; 12(5), e0006412.
- 798 121. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC). (2019). Q Fever Transmission. Available from
799 <https://www.cdc.gov/qfever/transmission/index.html> on November 10, 2022.
- 800 122. Horton KC, Wasfy M, Samaha H, Abdel-Rahman B, Safwat S, Abdel Fadeel M, et al. Serosurvey
801 for zoonotic viral and bacterial pathogens among slaughtered livestock in Egypt. *Vector Borne*
802 *Zoonotic Dis.* 2014; 14(9), 633-639.
- 803 123. Ansari JA, Khan MA, Ranjha MA, Rathore TR, Khan G, Salman M, et al. CRIMEAN CONGO
804 HEMORRHAGIC FEVER IN PAKISTAN: CASE CONTROL STUDY, 2012-2015. *Pak J Pub*
805 *Health.* 2018; 8(1), 22-26.
- 806 124. Napp S, Chevalier V, Busquets N, Calistri P, Casal J, Attia M, et al. Understanding the legal trade
807 of cattle and camels and the derived risk of Rift Valley Fever introduction into and transmission
808 within Egypt. *PLoS Negl Trop Dis.* 2018; 12(1), e0006143.

- 809 125. Selby R, Bardosh K, Picozzi K, Waiswa C, Welburn SC. Cattle movements, and trypanosomes:
810 restocking efforts and the spread of *Trypanosoma brucei rhodesiense* sleeping sickness in post-
811 conflict Uganda. *Parasit Vectors*. 2013; 6(1), 1-12.
- 812 126. Mehla R, Kumar SR, Yadav P, Barde PV, Yergolkar PN, Erickson BR, Carroll SA, Mishra AC,
813 Nichol ST, Mourya DT. Recent ancestry of Kyasanur Forest disease virus. *Emerg Infect Dis*.
814 2009; 15(9):1431.
- 815 127. Murase Y, Konnai S, Hidano A, Githaka NW, Ito T, Takano A, et al. Molecular detection of
816 *Anaplasma phagocytophilum* in cattle and *Ixodes persulcatus* ticks. *Vet Microbiol*. 2011; 149(3-4),
817 504-507.
- 818 128. Ellwanger JH, Chies JA. Zoonotic spillover: Understanding basic aspects for better prevention.
819 *Genet. Mol. Biol*. 2021; 44.
- 820 129. Jones BA, Grace D, Kock R, Alonso S, Rushton J, Said MY, et al. Zoonosis emergence linked to
821 agricultural intensification and environmental change. *Proceedings of the National Academy of*
822 *Sciences*. 2013; 110(21), 8399-8404.
- 823 130. World Health Organization (WHO). World Malaria Report 2015. Geneva: World Health
824 Organization; 2015. Available from <https://apps.who.int/iris/handle/10665/200018>
- 825 131. Chaccour CJ, Ngha'bi K, Abizanda G, Irigoyen Barrio A, Aldaz A, Okumu F, et al. Targeting
826 cattle for malaria elimination: marked reduction of *Anopheles arabiensis* survival for over six
827 months using a slow release ivermectin implant formulation. *Parasit Vectors*. 2018; 11(1), 1-9.
- 828 132. Franco AO, Gomes MGM, Rowland M, Coleman PG, Davies CR. Controlling malaria using
829 livestock-based interventions: a one health approach. *PloS One*. 2014; 9(7), e101699.
- 830 133. Rowland M, Durrani N, Kenward M, Mohammed N, Urahman H, et al. Control of malaria in
831 Pakistan by applying deltamethrin insecticide to cattle: a community-randomized trial. *Lancet*.
832 2001; 357: 1837–1841.
- 833 134. Ruiz-Castillo P, Rist C, Rabinovich R, Chaccour C. Insecticide-treated livestock: a potential One
834 Health approach to malaria control in Africa. *Trends in parasitology*. 2021.

- 835 135. Bekele J, Asmare K, Abebe G, Ayelet G, Gelaye E. Evaluation of Deltamethrin applications in the
836 control of tsetse and trypanosomosis in the southern rift valley areas of Ethiopia. *Vet Parasitol.*
837 2010; 168: 177–184
- 838 136. Nasci RS, Mclaughlin RE, Focks D, Billodeaux JS. Effect of Topically Treating Cattle with
839 Permethrin on Blood Feeding of *Psorophora columbiae* (Diptera: Culicidae) in a Southwestern
840 Louisiana Rice—Pasture Ecosystem. *J Med Ent.* 1990; 27(6), 1031-1034.
- 841 137. Schmidtman ET, Lloyd JE, Bobian RJ, Kumar R, Waggoner JW, et al. Suppression of mosquito
842 (Diptera: Culicidae) and black fly (Diptera: Simuliidae) blood feeding from Hereford cattle and
843 ponies treated with permethrin. *J Med Ent.* 2001; 38: 728–734
- 844 138. Poche DM, Wang HH, Grant WE. Visceral leishmaniasis on the Indian Subcontinent: Efficacy of
845 fipronil-based cattle treatment in controlling sand fly populations is dependent on specific aspects
846 of sand fly ecology. *PloS Negl Trop. Dis.* 2020; 14, e0008011.
- 847 139. Poche R. M., Githaka N., Van Gool F., Kading R. C., Hartman D., Polyakova L., et al.
848 Preliminary efficacy investigations of oral fipronil against *Anopheles arabiensis* when administered
849 to Zebu cattle (*Bos indicus*) under field conditions. *Acta Trop.* 2017; 176, 126–133.
- 850 140. Poche DM, Grant WE, Wang HH. Visceral leishmaniasis on the Indian subcontinent: modelling the
851 dynamic relationship between vector control schemes and vector life cycles. *PloS Negl Trop. Dis.*
852 2016; 10(8):e0004868.
- 853 141. Walker AR. Eradication and control of livestock ticks: biological, economic, and social perspectives.
854 *Parasitology.* 2011; 138, pp. 945-959
- 855 142. Mutavi F, Heitkönig I, Wieland B, Aarts N, Van Paassen A. Tick treatment practices in the field:
856 Access to, knowledge about, and on-farm use of acaricides in Laikipia, Kenya. *Ticks Tick-borne Dis.*
857 2021; 12(5), 101757.
- 858 143. Ruiz-Fons F, Fernández-de-Mera IG, Acevedo P, Gortázar C, de la Fuente J. Factors driving the
859 abundance of *Ixodes ricinus* ticks and the prevalence of zoonotic *I. ricinus*-borne pathogens in natural
860 foci. *Appl Environ Microbiol.* 2012; 78(8), 2669-2676.

- 861 144. Eisler MC, Torr SJ, Coleman PG, Machila N, Morton JF. Integrated control of vector-borne diseases
862 of livestock—pyrethroids: panacea or poison? *TRENDS in Parasitology*. 2003; 19(8), 341-345.
- 863 145. Njoroge MM, Tirados I, Lindsay SW, Vale GA, Torr SJ, Fillinger U. Exploring the potential of using
864 cattle for malaria vector surveillance and control: a pilot study in western Kenya. *Parasit Vectors*.
865 2017; 10(1), 1-16.
- 866 146. Sokhna C, Ndiath MO, Rogier C. The changes in mosquito vector behavior and the emerging
867 resistance to insecticides will challenge the decline of malaria. *Clin Microbiol Infect*. 2013;
868 19(10):902-7.
- 869 147. Nyasembe VO, Tchouassi DP, Kirwa HK, Foster WA, Teal PE, Borgemeister C, et al. Development
870 and assessment of plant-based synthetic odor baits for surveillance and control of malaria vectors.
871 *PLoS One*. 2014; 9(2), e89818.
- 872 148. Mweresa CK, Mukabana WR, van Loon JJA, Dicke M, Takken W. Use of semiochemicals for
873 surveillance and control of hematophagous insects. *Chemoecology*. 2020; 30(6), 277-286.
- 874 149. Wooding M, Naudé Y, Rohwer E, Bouwer M. Controlling mosquitoes with semiochemicals: a
875 review. *Parasit Vectors*. 2020; 13(1), 1-20.
- 876 150. Mafra-Neto A, Saroli J, da Silva RO, Mboera LE, White GB, Foster W, et al. Getting them where
877 they live—semiochemical-based strategies to address major gaps in vector control programs: Vectrax,
878 SPLAT BAC, Trojan Cow, and SPLAT TK. In *Advances in the Biorational Control of Medical and*
879 *Veterinary Pests* (pp. 101-152). American Chemical Society. 2018.
- 880 151. El-Shafie HAF, Faleiro JR. Semiochemicals and their potential use in pest management. *Biological*
881 *control of pest and vector insects*. 2017; 10-5772.
- 882 152. Hammond AM, Galizi R. Gene drives to fight malaria: current state and future directions. *Pathog*
883 *Glob Health*. 2017; 111:412–23
- 884 153. Anders KL, Indriani C, Ahmad RA, Tantowijoyo W, Arguni E, Andari B, et al. The AWED trial
885 (Applying Wolbachia to Eliminate Dengue) to assess the efficacy of Wolbachia-infected mosquito

- 886 deployments to reduce dengue incidence in Yogyakarta, Indonesia: study protocol for a cluster
887 randomised controlled trial. *Trials*. 2018;19:302
- 888 154. Wilson AL, Courtenay O, Kelly-Hope LA, Scott TW, Takken W, Torr SJ, Lindsay SW. The
889 importance of vector control for the control and elimination of vector-borne diseases. *PLoS Negl*
890 *Trop Dis*. 2020; 14(1):e0007831.
- 891 155. Zhou Z, Li K, Sun Y, Shi J, Li H, Chen Y, Yang H, Li X, Wu B, Li X, Wang Z. Molecular
892 epidemiology, and risk factors of *Anaplasma* spp., *Babesia* spp. and *Theileria* spp. infection in cattle
893 in Chongqing, China. *PloS One*. 2019; 14(7):e0215585.
- 894 156. Farjana T, Ahmmmed MS, Khanom TF, Alam N, Begum N. Surveillance of mosquitoes larva at
895 selected areas of Mymensingh district in Bangladesh. *Bangladesh Journal of Veterinary Medicine*.
896 2015; 13(1), 79-88.
- 897 157. Rjeibi MR, Ayadi O, Rekik M, Gharbi M. Molecular survey and genetic characterization of
898 *Anaplasma centrale*, *A. marginale* and *A. bovis* in cattle from Algeria. *Trans Emerg Dis*. 2018; 65(2),
899 456-464.
- 900 158. da Silva JB, Vinhote WMS, Oliveira CMC, André MR, Machado RZ, da Fonseca AH, et al.
901 Molecular and serological prevalence of *Anaplasma marginale* in water buffaloes in northern Brazil.
902 *Ticks Tick-Borne Dis*. 2014; 5(2), 100-104.
- 903 159. Sriwichai P, Samung Y, Sumruayphol S, Kiattitubtr K, Kumpitak C, Payakkapol A, et al. Natural
904 human *Plasmodium* infections in major *Anopheles* mosquitoes in western Thailand. *Parasit Vectors*.
905 2016; 9(1), 1-9.
- 906 160. Barros SL, Madruga CR, Araújo FR, Menk CF, de Almeida MAO, Melo EP, et al. Serological survey
907 of *Babesia bovis*, *Babesia bigemina*, and *Anaplasma marginale* antibodies in cattle from the semi-arid
908 region of the state of Bahia, Brazil, by enzyme-linked immunosorbent assays. *Memórias do Instituto*
909 *Oswaldo Cruz*. 2005; 100, 513-517.
- 910 161. Azmi SA, Das S, Chatterjee S. Seasonal prevalence, and blood meal analysis of filarial vector *Culex*
911 *quinquefasciatus* in coastal areas of Digha, West Bengal, India. *J Vector Borne Dis*. 2015; 52(3), 252.

912 162. Gonzalez J, Echaide I, Pabón A, Piñeros JJG, Blair S, Tobón-Castaño A. Babesiosis prevalence in
913 malaria-endemic regions of Colombia. *J Vector Borne Dis.* 2018; 55(3), 222.

914 **Supporting information**

915 **S1 Appendix. This is the list of the final pool of included studies in this systematic review**

916 **S1 Table. Completed PRISMA 2020 checklist**