

1 **Relational One Health: a more-than-biomedical framework for more-** 2 **than-human health, and lessons learned from Brazil, Ethiopia, and** 3 **Israel**

4
5 Authors: Julianne Meisner^{1,2,3}, Hilary McLeland-Wieser³, Elizabeth E. Traylor³, Barak Hermesh⁴,
6 Tabata Berg⁵, Amira Roess⁶, Lauren Van Patter⁷, Anat Rosenthal⁴, Nadav Davidovitch⁴, Peter
7 M. Rabinowitz^{1,3}

8
9 ¹Department of Global Health, University of Washington, Seattle, WA, USA

10 ²Department of Epidemiology, University of Washington, Seattle, WA, USA

11 ³Center for One Health Research, Department of Environmental and Occupational Health
12 sciences, University of Washington, Seattle, WA, USA

13 ⁴School of Public Health, Faculty of Health Sciences, Ben-Gurion University of the Negev, Be'er
14 Sheva, Israel

15 ⁵University of Brasilia, Brasilia, Brazil

16 ⁶George Mason University, Fairfax, VA, USA

17 ⁷Ontario Veterinary College, University of Guelph, Guelph, ON, Canada

18 19 **ABSTRACT**

20 The One Health conceptual framework envisions human, animal, and environmental health as
21 interconnected. This framework has achieved remarkable progress in the control of zoonotic
22 diseases, but it commonly neglects the environmental domain, implicitly prioritizes human life
23 over the life of other beings, and fails to consider the political, cultural, social, historical, and
24 economic contexts that shape the health of multispecies collectives. We have developed a
25 novel theoretical framework, Relational One Health, which expands the boundaries of One

26 Health, clearly defines the environmental domain, and provides an avenue for engagement with
27 critical theory. We present a systematic literature review of One Health frameworks to
28 demonstrate the novelty of Relational One Health, and to orient it with respect to other critically-
29 engaged frameworks for One Health. Our results indicate that while Relational One Health
30 complements several earlier frameworks, these other frameworks are either not intended for
31 research, or for narrow sets of research questions. We then demonstrate the utility of Relational
32 One Health for One Health research through case studies in Brazil, Israel, and Ethiopia.
33 Empirical research which is grounded in theory can speak collectively, increasing the impact of
34 individual studies and the field as a whole. One Health is uniquely poised to address several
35 wicked challenges facing the 21st century—climate change, pandemics, neglected zoonoses,
36 and biodiversity collapse—and a unifying theoretical tradition is key to generating the evidence
37 needed to meet these challenges.

38

39 **HIGHLIGHTS**

- 40 • One Health views human, animal, and environmental health as interconnected
- 41 • Biomedical reductionism in One Health has resulted in a focus on human health threats
42 from animals
- 43 • The environmental domain and more-than-biomedical contexts are commonly ignored in
44 One Health
- 45 • Relational One Health is a new theoretical framework which addresses these limitations
- 46 • This theoretical framework is relevant to all One Health research, increasing the field's
47 impact

48

49 **BACKGROUND**

50 The COVID-19 pandemic has increased interest in institutionalizing a One Health approach
51 to prevent future pandemics. This is rooted in a growing consensus that zoonotic emergence is
52 caused by human-environment relations grounded in colonial-capitalism and resulting in habitat
53 loss and climate change, and thus likely to continue. At the same time, social movements
54 accelerated by the pandemic have collided with the undeniable fact that infectious diseases are
55 not just biomedical phenomena: rather, the transmission and impacts of pathogens follow long-
56 established gradients of social difference. These gradients are politically, historically, and
57 geographically contextual: their deep historical roots have been perpetuated and upheld by
58 social, economic, and political structures, and today manifest as socioeconomic inequities.
59 Within One Health, white papers and reports published by multilateral agencies and
60 commissions have reflected this growing acceptance that One Health cannot occupy a solely
61 biomedical position. Yet to our knowledge, this awareness is not coupled with a suitable
62 theoretical framework for One Health research.

63 The One Health High Level Expert Panel (OHHLEP) was convened in 2021 by the
64 Quadripartite partners—Food and Agriculture Organisation of the UN (FAO), UN Environment
65 Programme (UNEP), World Health Organisation (WHO) and World Organization for Animal
66 Health (WOAH)—to support development of the Quadripartite’s One Health Joint Plan of Action.
67 OHHLEP’s first task was to develop a new, action-oriented definition of One Health, from the
68 many dozens of definitions in circulation (1). Indeed, OHHLEP’s new definition is certainly more-
69 than-biomedical, supported by key underlying principles which emphasize “sociopolitical and
70 multicultural parity, socioecological equilibrium, and epistemological equity.” However, it is
71 intended to guide policy, not research. Conversely, the Lancet One Health Commission
72 published a new definition of One Health in 2020 focused on research (2). While there are
73 more-than-biomedical dimensions to the Commission’s definition, they do not extend to the
74 knowledge generating process itself, rather beginning when research is translated into policy:

75 “...evidence generation must be used to drive context-driven governance, progressive policy,
76 and legislation that are sensitive to gender, community,
77 equity, and ethics.”

78 Beyond biomedical reductionism, One Health has
79 also been criticized for failing to define the
80 environmental domain, or ignoring it entirely. The
81 original vision for One Health integrated human, animal,
82 and environmental health with other social science
83 disciplines: a truly holistic “more-than-human”
84 approach. In practice, One Health has largely stopped
85 at integrating human and animal health, focused on
86 zoonotic diseases within the veterinary and healthcare
87 sectors. Further, donor priorities have led to an implicit
88 hierarchy which places humans over other beings.
89 Animals are often viewed as “exposures” or threats to
90 human health, rather than health bearers in their own

Box 1: Key definitions

One Health*: A collaborative approach to attain optimal health for people, domestic animals, wildlife, plants, and our environment.

EcoHealth*: A movement which recognizes the inextricable dynamic linkages between the health of all species and their environments.

Planetary Health*: Achievement of the highest attainable standard of health, wellbeing, and equity worldwide through judicious attention to human systems and the Earth’s natural systems that define the safe environmental limits within which humanity can flourish.

Ecosystems: Communities of interacting beings, biotic and abiotic.

Environment: The biophysical, social, cultural, political, historical, and economic contexts (systems, structures, and circumstances) in which humans, animals, and ecosystems exist.

**Adapted from Lerner and Berg, 2017*

91 regard, and exceptions to this are usually framed in terms of agricultural productivity and
92 economic losses, and thus still reflect human priorities. It is quietly accepted that this neglect of
93 the environmental domain in One Health motivated the advent of the Planetary Health
94 movement in 2014 (3), however Planetary Health takes an anthropocentric view of health, and
95 thus aligns more with Global Health than with One Health. EcoHealth, by contrast, is interested
96 in the wellbeing of all living creatures. There is significant overlap between EcoHealth and One
97 Health, however One Health focuses on the health of individuals, while EcoHealth focuses on
98 aggregations (4) (Box 1). In 2017 the COHERE guidelines were published to encourage better
99 representation of the environmental domain in One Health papers (5), and in 2020 the Tripartite
100 (WHO, FAO WOA) expanded to include the UNEP as the new Quadripartite. These shifts are

101 accompanied by attempts to better define the environment (plants, soil, water, etc.) within One
102 Health policy statements and white papers. We argue, however, that One Health's
103 conceptualization of the environment has yet to crystallize, despite these efforts. The
104 environment can be defined very broadly—all elements of the physical, cultural, social, and
105 political milieu—or narrowly—the immediate built environment and its hazards—and thus this
106 omission is non-trivial.

107 We introduce Relational One Health (Figure 1) as a novel, critically-engaged theoretical
108 framework which seeks to clarify how the environment is conceptualized within One Health,
109 challenge One Health researchers to think beyond biomedical dimensions and determinants of
110 multispecies health, and subvert the implicit prioritization of humans over other living beings.
111 Under this framework, the distribution of health is a collective over and within humans, non-
112 human animals (“animals”, for simplicity), and ecosystems, each of which are health bearers.
113 Ecosystems subsume animals, and animals subsume humans, reflecting the relationality
114 between them. These health bearers share a common environment which determines the
115 distribution of health and has social, cultural, historical, political, economic, and biophysical
116 dimensions. This framework revisits One Health's initial holistic vision, challenging the
117 constraints that have settled around One Health over the past few decades. It also provides
118 foundation for critically-engaged scholarship within One Health, as the environmental domain
119 cannot be fully examined or understood if systems of power and oppression, which ultimately
120 shape the circumstances that determine health, are ignored. We first present our findings from a
121 systematic review of One Health frameworks. We then detail the Relational One Health
122 theoretical framework's assumptions and origins, and conclude by presenting brief case studies
123 from Brazil, Israel, and Ethiopia, from the lens of the Relational One Health theoretical
124 framework.

125 **METHODS**

126 This PRISMA checklist was used to guide this review and its presentation (6).

127 *Objective*

128 The objective of this systematic review was to evaluate the need for a novel, politically-
129 engaged theoretical framework for One Health, effectively ensuring that Relational One Health
130 doesn't duplicate other efforts. We sought to find One Health conceptual models or theoretical
131 frameworks, hereafter referred to as "frameworks," and evaluate the extent to which they
132 engage with more-than-biomedical definitions of health.

133 *Search strategy*

134 Searches were conducted in PubMed and Web of Science. Results were imported into
135 Research Rabbit (7) to identify similar publications not found in these databases. Search terms,
136 developed by EJT and JM in collaboration with a health sciences librarian, were:

- 137 • PubMed: "one health"[Title/Abstract] AND ("framework"[Text Word] OR "model"[Text
138 Word] OR "theor*"[Text Word])
- 139 • Web of Science: ALL=("One Health" AND ("framework" or "model" or "theor*"))

140 *Selection of publications*

141 Two authors with expertise in One Health [EET and HMW] selected publications, with a
142 third author [JM] consulted when there was uncertainty whether a publication should be
143 included or excluded. Publication titles were subjected to two rounds of reviews by EJT, with
144 selected publications imported into Research Rabbit between these two rounds, and
145 publications found in Research Rabbit incorporated into the second round of title review. Full-
146 text review was then conducted by HMW and JM to select the final publications to be reviewed
147 according to the following criteria:

148 Inclusion criteria:

- 149 • English language
- 150 • Full text available

151 • Title contains the following terms: (“framework” or “model” or “system”) and (“One
152 Health” or “EcoHealth”)

153 • Framework reconceptualizes and/or re-theorizes One Health (*what is One Health*)

154 • Framework includes more-than-biophysical contexts for health

155 Exclusion criteria:

156 • Title includes the term “impact”

157 • Publication focuses on a specific pathogen or disease

158 • Framework focuses on implementation (*how to do One Health*)

159

160 All publications were stored in a shared Zotero folder, with subfolders used to identify
161 database(s) of origin and review fate (inclusion/exclusion).

162 *Data extraction*

163 Once the final selection of publications had been established, HMW extracted data from each
164 included publication into an Excel matrix with the following fields, meeting bi-weekly with JM to
165 discuss the evolution of her findings and resolve conflicts:

166 • Metadata: title, first author, year published, journal

167 • Summary of the framework presented

168 • Framework is presented as novel conceptualization of One Health [Y/N]

169 • Framework includes sociocultural contexts for health [Y/N]

170 • Framework includes political contexts for health [Y/N]

171 • Framework includes economic contexts for health [Y/N]

172 • Framework includes other more-than-biophysical contexts for health [free text]

173 • Framework is critically-engaged [Y/N]

174 We define critically-engaged frameworks as those which discuss or reference critical theory
175 (anti-racist, decolonial, feminist, posthumanist, and others), typically with a lens towards justice
176 and rights.

177 In this review, we are seeking to capture the same directionality implied by Relational
178 One Health. For example, we are interested in frameworks which examine political economies
179 as causes of multispecies disease distribution, not frameworks for drawing economic arguments
180 in favor of One Health, or frameworks for identifying policies and institutional structures required
181 for successful implementation of One Health.

182 **RESULTS**

183 Literature review

184 PubMed was searched on February 2nd, 2023, and Web of Science on February 23rd, 2023,
185 producing 1,171 and 1,294 results, respectively. After the first round of title review, 94
186 publications remained. These were imported into Research Rabbit, which found 30 additional
187 publications. The second round of title review excluded an additional 95 publications, leaving 29
188 for full-text review. Following full-text review an additional 10 publications were identified from
189 the reference lists, and an additional 31 were excluded. A total of eight publications presented
190 new definitions, theoretical frameworks, or conceptual models for One Health which considered
191 health as a more-than-biomedical phenomenon (i.e., shaped by more-than-biophysical contexts)
192 (Figure 2). All were published since 2009, with the majority published after 2018.

193 All publications considered all of the more-than-biomedical contexts we evaluated
194 (sociocultural, political, and economic), thus Table 1 summarizes the framework briefly, and
195 indicates whether the framework was critically-engaged and provided a clear definition of the
196 environmental domain. Of the frameworks labeled as not critically-engaged, several (8,9)
197 contained text which indicated the authors' openness towards critical theory principles,
198 particularly posthumanism and decolonial theory.

199 Baquero presents One Health of Peripheries (10), which draws from the perspective of
200 Latin American collective health and more-than-human biopolitics. Central to Baquero's
201 framework are marginalizing apparatuses, which legitimize exploitation against living beings
202 on the other side of the margins. Latin American collective health addresses power hierarchies
203 in the social determination of health, but does not consider animals as health bearers and
204 therefore reproduces marginalizing apparatuses that create more-than-human health inequities.
205 Conversely, One Health views animals as health bearers, but largely ignores social processes
206 in both theory and research. Baquero reviews the history of animalization, domestication,
207 colonialization, and slavery to demonstrate that marginalization is a political process which is
208 common not only to humans, but to other animals and the environment, calling for multispecies
209 intersectionality. However, One Health of Peripheries is intended to be a discursive tool, rather
210 than a foundation for research, and no figure or visual is presented.

211 Hardy & Standley (11) review the symbiotic relationship between One Health and
212 intersectional feminist thought, which originated in Black feminism and has been applied to
213 many overlapping systems of power. General biological classification which was popularized
214 during the Enlightenment era formed the basis for racial classification established during the
215 expansion of Western colonialism. This system of classification led to the historical isolation of
216 health sectors which One Health seeks to address, and to the false binaries that One Health
217 (i.e., animal vs. human) and feminist and Queer theory (i.e., man vs. woman) seek to
218 decompose. This doesn't mean categories are discarded, but rather their points of intersection
219 are studied and viewed as products of culture, rather than inflexible laws of nature.

220 The framework presented by Lerner & Berg (12) challenges normative definitions of both
221 health and non-human animals, the latter challenge justified by the huge variety of animal life
222 forms. Health is presented as an individual-level construct: individuals nest in populations, and
223 population-level health is simply the use of statistics to measure the health of individuals that
224 comprise the population (public health for humans, population health/herd health for animals).

225 Populations then nest in ecosystems, which the authors appear to treat as a health bearer
226 though this is not stated explicitly. A new definition of health that applies to all animals, including
227 humans, is comprised of physiological health, mental health, and balance theory. Similar to
228 Baquero, they consider animals and humans to be part of the same multispecies community.
229 However, Lerner & Berg are focused on definitions, not determinants, of health.

230 Rock et al. (13) use the concept of a syndemic—two or more afflictions that interact
231 synergistically to result in an excess burden of disease—to re-conceptualize One Health
232 preventions. A syndemic orientation focuses on connections between health problems when
233 developing health policies, aligning with other values for social change to achieve health for all.
234 Using the example of the mental health impacts of widespread animal culls during the 2001 foot
235 and mouth disease outbreak in the UK, the authors demonstrate that prevention strategies
236 should consider not just the need to control infections, but also the economic, cultural,
237 emotional, and political principles that shape the “entwining of biology with social systems.”
238 While this framework is presented as a tool for examining the impacts of policies and
239 interventions and rather than determinants of health, its theoretical foundation couples nicely
240 with the Relational One Health theoretical framework. However, it does not provide an explicit
241 definition of the environment.

242 Sleeman et al. (14) propose a systems-based harm-reduction approach to One Health
243 interventions, conceptualized through a One Health impact pyramid. At the base of the pyramid
244 are socioeconomic and environmental determinants of health, which act together to underpin
245 decisions and interventions. The authors emphasize that actions should be prioritized here for
246 long-term sustainability, but their examples highlight very proximal risk factors and similarly
247 proximal solutions: e.g., providing alternative sources of income for mining communities during
248 high-risk periods for Marburg transmission so workers don't enter caves. The environment is
249 clearly defined in this framework: humans, wildlife, and domestic animals are health bearers,

250 which share an environment defined by ecosystem health and environmental quality
251 (presumably air, water, soil, etc.).

252 Wallace et al.'s Structural One Health (15) critiques analyses of risk factors for pathogen
253 emergence which only examine conditions in geographic proximity to the emergence event, and
254 the implicit assumption of neoliberalism as the status quo in such analyses. In contrast,
255 Structural One Health hypothesizes that global capital accumulation is a key determinant of
256 ecosystem health, and pathogen emergence in turn. This framework empirically formalizes the
257 connections between global circuits of capital, deep-time histories, and cultural infrastructure,
258 which together result in landscape changes and shifts in wildlife, agricultural, and human health.
259 The authors present a schematic for their model in the form of a pyramid, with Structural One
260 Health at the bottom (comprising the broadest context of disease) and emergency medicine at
261 the top, and discuss several applications of the framework which are not yet published.
262 However, Structural One Health is a framework for a particular type of One Health research
263 question (e.g., focused on distal, structural causes), while Relational One Health is intended to
264 be a tool for all One Health investigations (e.g., encompasses structural, distal, and proximal
265 causes), and thus serves a broader purpose.

266 Woldehanna and Zimicki (8) present a framework for systematically examining the
267 proximate determinants of human-animal contact, with the goal of considering socioecological
268 factors that can contribute to disease emergence at the local level. They refer to this as an
269 “expanded One Health model,” which theorizes that different people living in the same location,
270 affected by the same large-scale drivers, may be at differential risk of spillover due to social
271 factors. Categories of determinants the authors examined include biological characteristics of
272 individuals; social characteristics of individuals, households, and communities, including norms,
273 livelihood systems, and settlement patterns; and at the public policy level, local and international
274 governance and politics.

275 Finally, Zinsstag et al. (9) present the “Health in Socio-ecological Systems” framework,
276 an extension of One Health, EcoHealth, systems biology, and socioecological systems
277 conceptual thinking. Humans and animals are health bearers existing in a socioecological
278 continuum: animals, including wildlife, are part of the social systems of humans, and part of the
279 environment. The authors present a reciprocal relationship between health and social, cultural,
280 economic, and political contexts: these contexts shape health, and are also determined by
281 health.

282 Relational One Health

283 Despite the promise of One Health, its application has been criticized as reductionist in
284 scope with inter-disciplinary collaborations largely limited to veterinary and healthcare sectors
285 and focused on laboratory methods and surveillance (16). While recent years have seen an
286 increase in more-than-biomedical frameworks for One Health, as reviewed here, these
287 frameworks are either not well-suited to research, or deal only with a specific type of research
288 question. Further, many do not explicitly define the environmental domain (Table 1).

289 We developed the Relational One Health (Figure 1) theoretical framework to expand the
290 scope of One Health research to include macrosocial determinants of multispecies health,
291 coupled with a clear definition of the environmental domain as distinct from ecosystems.
292 Relational One Health was inspired by several earlier One Health frameworks, particularly
293 Baquero’s One Health of Peripheries (10), which inspired the subsumption in Figure 1, as well
294 as Wallace et al.’s Structural One Health (15) and Hermesh et al.’s Political One Health (17).
295 Relational One Health also draws inspiration from Kreiger’s ecosocial theory of disease
296 distribution (18), which combines social, ecological, and historical context with a postulated
297 mechanism for their influence on health, termed embodiment.

298 We will now present three case studies which use the Relational One Health theoretical
299 framework to guide research. At the study development stage, this theoretical framework can be
300 used to develop conceptual models, which are then linked to data collection and analysis plans.

301 Later in the research lifecycle, the Relational One Health theoretical framework can be used to
302 contextualize results, triangulate findings with other literature (including outside of the
303 biomedical sciences), and identify directions for future research.

304 *Case study 1: Emancipatory land rights and arboviruses in Brazil* Emancipatory land rights
305 is defined as secure land control and land access for communities facing dispossession of their
306 land. This is the focus of a research project we are implementing among Quilombola
307 communities in the midwest of Brazil, the descendants of individuals who escaped slavery
308 among Brazil's regional biomes. Figure 3 presents a conceptual model developed from the
309 Relational One Health theoretical framework to guide this research. Land control is a facet of
310 the environment which itself has political and historical determinants, namely land policy,
311 constitutional rights for Quilombola peoples, and the history of emancipation and rural
312 settlement. Land control influences ecosystem preservation through social and economic
313 intermediates, with weak land rights allowing conflict within and between communities to
314 manifest as ecosystem destruction through capitalist exploitation of the land. This ecosystem
315 destruction increases vectorial capacity and drives arbovirus transmission, an embodiment of
316 land control. Animals, humans, and ecosystems (indicated by colored shading) are all health
317 bearers, and insect vectors are both a component of ecosystems, and also comprise the
318 biophysical environment within which animals and humans exist.

319 *Case study 2: Distrust and brucellosis in Israel* Case Study 2 examines human-animal
320 contact networks as an intermediary between larger social contexts and zoonotic disease
321 transmission (Figure 4). Specifically, distrust of formal institutions (veterinary, agricultural, public
322 health, economic, etc.) among Bedouin communities in southern Israel is caused by current and
323 historical political, racial/ethnic, and economic contexts. These distal contexts intertwine with
324 more proximal social and economic forces which determine the structure and stability of human-
325 animal and animal-animal contact networks, for instance herd size and husbandry, purchase of
326 animals and animal products from the West Bank, household size, distribution of husbandry

327 tasks within the household, etc. These contact networks in turn facilitate the transmission of
328 pathogens between animals and humans including *Brucella*, a major cause of human and
329 livestock morbidity in Israel.

330 *Case study 3: MERS-CoV in Ethiopia* Case Study 3 examines the impact of human-
331 domesticated animal, domesticated animal-wildlife, and human-wildlife relationships and
332 interaction on zoonotic disease emergence and transmission in the larger social, cultural,
333 economic, political and environmental contexts. Historically, semi-pastoralists of specific
334 ethnicities dominated the camel markets and most camel trade was for local and national
335 consumption. The demand for camel products by wealthier countries increased exponentially
336 following MERS-CoV outbreaks in the Arabian peninsula. In response semi-pastoralists have
337 faced increased demand for their services, and are competing with other ethnicities perceived to
338 have social, and economic advantages. Concurrent with these shifting market forces, changes
339 in precipitation and temperature due to climate change are leading herders to graze camels in
340 protected areas, bringing them into contact with wildlife and increasing the risk of disease
341 transmission—MERS-CoV and others—between humans, camels and wildlife. Finally, camel
342 husbandry has become dangerous in some areas due to political and cultural unrest.

343 **DISCUSSION**

344 We present here a systematic review of One Health conceptual models and theoretical
345 frameworks which seek to re-conceptualize One Health in a more-than-biomedical light. We
346 then place the findings of this review in the context of Relational One Health, and review its
347 theoretical foundations. Finally, we present three case studies which operationalize the
348 Relational One Health theoretical framework for research.

349 Recent decades have seen an increase in critically-engaged One Health frameworks
350 which reject a reductionist view of health as a solely biomedical phenomenon. The Relational
351 One Health theoretical framework is in many ways complementary with these earlier
352 frameworks, being inspired by One Health of Peripheries (10) and Structural One Health (15),

353 and being well-suited to expanding the application of the syndemic approach proposed by Rock
354 et al. (13), and to application of the methods proposed by Woldehanna et al. (8). However, none
355 of these earlier frameworks have succeeded in gaining broad traction within the One Health
356 community. There are several likely explanations for this that originate in the dispersed nature of
357 One Health, and its disciplinary foundations within fields that are proudly “purely scientific,” and
358 may not be open to critical theory. However, there are also explanations that originate in the
359 frameworks themselves: namely, these frameworks were either not intended for research, or
360 only a select type of research question. We present the Relational One Health theoretical
361 framework as a valuable addition, which can guide all One Health inquiries interested in
362 knowledge generation regarding the determinants of multispecies health. As demonstrated
363 through our case studies, this framework can be used to develop conceptual models which can
364 guide and be validated through research.

365 Importantly, Relational One Health does not suggest that research which is solely
366 biomedical in scope is not One Health. In such cases, Relational One Health can still be used to
367 triangulate findings across research studies and identify gaps for further research. Relational
368 One Health also does not prescribe a certain definition of health, which could encompass the
369 absence of a given disease, the presence of social wellbeing or political agency, the
370 maintenance of biodiversity, etc. The implication of this is that Relational One Health can serve
371 as the theoretical foundation for all One Health inquiry, increasing the impact of One Health
372 research by orienting the findings of individual studies within a shared theoretical framework.
373 Relatedly, despite its many problems, we choose to retain the term “environment” in this
374 framework—where it refers to the contexts in which humans, animals, and ecosystems reside
375 and embody—to align with existing definitions of One Health, signaling that this framework is
376 intended to be an addition to the discipline, rather than a departure from it. This framework can
377 also serve as the basis for a more holistic examination of the intersection between One Health

378 and critical social theory such as feminist care theory, posthumanism, and anti-colonial theory,
379 the subject of a recent review by Van Patter et al. (19).

380 The wicked problems to which One Health is most suited—pandemics of zoonotic origin,
381 neglected zoonotic diseases, climate change, and biodiversity collapse—cannot be addressed
382 through solely biomedical counter measures or ministry of health-level programs; instead, they
383 require large-scale political and social change. Empirical research can play a role in creating
384 social change, but research holds greater value and impact when it can speak holistically, rather
385 than in independent parts, and a shared theoretical foundation is critical to achieving this end.
386 This approach has far reaching consequences, from the way the research questions are
387 framed, to who is included in the research team, and which research traditions and languages
388 are integrated and how. With climate change and pandemics looming, the scientific community
389 will have to adapt its scientific tools and theories not only to the rapid pace of events, but also to
390 the interrelatedness of phenomena surrounding us, and Relational One Health positions One
391 Health to lead this charge.

392

393 **REFERENCES**

- 394 1. One Health High-Level Expert Panel (OHHLEP), Adisasmito WB, Almuhairi S, Behravesh
395 CB, Bilivogui P, Bukachi SA, et al. One Health: A new definition for a sustainable and
396 healthy future. Dvorin JD, editor. PLOS Pathog. 2022 Jun 23;18(6):e1010537.
- 397 2. Amuasi JH, Lucas T, Horton R, Winkler AS. Reconnecting for our future: The Lancet One
398 Health Commission. The Lancet. 2020 May;395(10235):1469–71.
- 399 3. Horton R, Beaglehole R, Bonita R, Raeburn J, McKee M, Wall S. From public to planetary
400 health: a manifesto. The Lancet. 2014 Mar;383(9920):847.
- 401 4. Lerner H, Berg C. A Comparison of Three Holistic Approaches to Health: One Health,
402 EcoHealth, and Planetary Health. Front Vet Sci. 2017;4:163.
- 403 5. Davis MF, Rankin SC, Schurer JM, Cole S, Conti L, Rabinowitz P, et al. Checklist for One
404 Health Epidemiological Reporting of Evidence (COHERE). One Health. 2017 Dec;4:14–21.
- 405 6. Page MJ, McKenzie JE, Bossuyt PM, Boutron I, Hoffmann TC, Mulrow CD, et al. The
406 PRISMA 2020 statement: an updated guideline for reporting systematic reviews. BMJ. 2021
407 Mar 29;n71.
- 408 7. ResearchRabbit [Internet]. [cited 2023 Sep 14]. ResearchRabbit. Available from:
409 <https://www.researchrabbit.ai>
- 410 8. Woldehanna S, Zimicki S. An expanded One Health model: integrating social science and
411 One Health to inform study of the human-animal interface. Soc Sci Med 1982. 2015
412 Mar;129:87–95.
- 413 9. Zinsstag J, Schelling E, Waltner-Toews D, Tanner M. From “one medicine” to “one health”
414 and systemic approaches to health and well-being. Prev Vet Med. 2011 Sep 1;101(3):148–
415 56.
- 416 10. Baquero OS. One Health of Peripheries: Biopolitics, Social Determination, and Field of
417 Praxis. Front Public Health [Internet]. 2021 [cited 2023 Jun 21];9. Available from:
418 <https://www.frontiersin.org/articles/10.3389/fpubh.2021.617003>
- 419 11. Hardy E, Standley CJ. Identifying intersectional feminist principles in the One Health
420 framework. One Health Amst Neth. 2022 Dec;15:100404.
- 421 12. Lerner H, Berg C. The concept of health in One Health and some practical implications for
422 research and education: what is One Health? Infect Ecol Epidemiol. 2015 Jan 1;5(1):25300.
- 423 13. Rock M, Buntain BJ, Hatfield JM, Hallgrímsson B. Animal–human connections, “one health,”
424 and the syndemic approach to prevention. Soc Sci Med. 2009 Mar;68(6):991–5.
- 425 14. Sleeman JM, Richgels KLD, White CL, Stephen C. Integration of wildlife and environmental
426 health into a One Health approach. Rev Sci Tech Int Off Epizoot. 2019 May;38(1):91–102.

- 427 15. Wallace RG, Bergmann L, Kock R, Gilbert M, Hogerwerf L, Wallace R, et al. The dawn of
428 Structural One Health: a new science tracking disease emergence along circuits of capital.
429 Soc Sci Med. 2015;
- 430 16. Hermesh B, Rosenthal A, Davidovitch N. Rethinking “One Health” through Brucellosis:
431 ethics, boundaries and politics. Monash Bioeth Rev. 2019 Oct;37(1–2):22–37.
- 432 17. Hermesh B, Rosenthal A, Davidovitch N. The cycle of distrust in health policy and behavior:
433 Lessons learned from the Negev Bedouin. Clegg S, editor. PLOS ONE. 2020 Aug
434 20;15(8):e0237734.
- 435 18. Krieger N. Ecosocial Theory of Disease Distribution: Embodying Societal & Ecologic
436 Context. In: Epidemiology and the People’s Health. New York, NY: Oxford University
437 Press; 2011. p. 202–35.
- 438 19. Van Patter LE, Linares-Roake J, Breen AV. What does One Health want? Feminist,
439 posthuman, and anti-colonial possibilities. One Health Outlook. 2023 Mar 10;5(1):4.
- 440




Figure 1: The Relational One Health theoretical framework. The distribution of health is a collective over and within human, animal, and ecosystem health, with each component recognized as health bearers. Humans are subsumed by animals, and animals are subsumed by ecosystems. These biotic and abiotic beings share a common environment which has economic, biophysical, political, historical, and social, cultural dimensions. This shared environment influences health through the active, reciprocal process of embodiment, through which health bearers interface with and influence their environment.




Figure 2: Inclusion flow chart




Figure 3 Conceptual model for Case Study 1. Land control is a component of the environment which has political (land policy, Quilombola rights) and historical (emancipation, rural settlement) antecedents, and shapes the health of ecosystems (green shading), and animals and humans (beige/purple gradient), embodied through the transmission of arboviruses. The effect of land control on ecosystem preservation has social (conflicts within and between communities) and economic (capitalist exploitation of land) determinants. The ecosystem (green shading), including the vectors it contains, is both a health bearer and comprises the biophysical environment which shapes animal (beige shading) and human (purple shading) health.




Figure 4 Conceptual model developed for Case Study 2. Among Bedouin communities in southern Israel, political, historical, and economic contexts have resulted in institutional distrust. Institutional distrust, through social and economic intermediates, shapes human-animal contact networks on which pathogens such as *Brucella* spp. are transmitted between humans (purple shading) and food producing animals (beige shading).




Figure 5 Conceptual model developed for Case Study 3. Among pastoralist communities in Ethiopia, increasing market demand and climate change, which are shaped by political and economic contexts, are changing camel husbandry. Camel husbandry has deep historical roots, and shifts in husbandry intersect with social and biophysical contexts to drive conflict and increased wildlife contact, which ultimately impact both human and animal health.

Publication	Framework objective and summary	Critically-engaged?	Clear definition of environment?
Baquero et al. (2021) (9)	Core thesis focuses on marginalizing apparatuses which operate on humans, animals and ecosystems, and identifying structural alternatives for multispecies justice. <i>Name: One Health of Peripheries</i>	Yes	Yes; environment is ecosystem health
Hardy and Standley (2022) (10)	Identifying commonalities with feminist and Queer theory: decomposing false binaries, challenging reductionism, and examining intersections	Yes	No
Lerner and Berg (2014) (11)	Redefining health and questioning the normative connotation behind the term “non-human animals.”	Yes	Yes; environment is ecosystem health
Rock et al. (2009) (12)	Uses the idea of syndemics to examine the links between biology and social systems to align with other values for social change and achieve health for all. Focus is on developing prevention and intervention strategies, not examining the determinants of health.	Yes	No
Sleeman et al. (2019) (13)	Systems-based harm reduction approach to One Health interventions.	No	Yes; ecosystem is a health bearer, and distinct from the environmental quality
Wallace et al (2015) (14)	Empirical framework for studying structural causes of novel pathogen emergence. <i>Name:</i>	Yes	Not explicitly; assumed to be

	<i>Structural One Health</i>		ecosystems
Woldehanna and Zimicki (2015) (7)	Framework for examining proximal determinants of human-animal contact (social, cultural, livelihood, etc.). <u>Name:</u> <i>Expanded One Health</i>	No	No
Zinsstag et al. (2009) (8)	An extension of One Health, EcoHealth, systems biology, and socioecological systems conceptual thinking: <u>Name:</u> <i>Health in Socio-ecological Systems</i>	No	Yes; describe a socioecological continuum

Table 1: Summary of publications reviewed