

1 **Knowledge, Perception, and Preventive Practices of Livestock Workers and Household**
2 **Animal Owners Regarding Anthrax in Nigeria**

3 **Short title: Knowledge, perception and preventive practices about Anthrax**

4 Cadmus E.¹, Adesokan H.K.², Awosanya E.J.², Iziomo P.M.³, Akinseye V.O.^{3,4}, Besong M.A.⁵,
5 Jolaoso A.O.⁶, Nma Bida A.⁷, Akangbou J.P.⁸, Nwanga E.⁹, Orum G T.⁹, Omileye A.O.¹⁰,
6 Adeleye A.A.², Owoicho S.⁵, Taiwo O.J.¹¹, Ansumana R.¹², Vakuru C.⁵, Cadmus S.I.^{2,4,13,14}

7 ¹ Department of Community Medicine, College of Medicine, University of Ibadan, Ibadan, Nigeria

8
9 ² Department of Veterinary Public Health and Preventive Medicine, University of Ibadan, Ibadan, Nigeria.

10
11 ³ Damien Foundation Genomic and Mycobacteria Research & Training Centre, University of Ibadan,
12 Ibadan, Nigeria

13
14 ⁴ Department of Chemical Sciences, Augustine University, Ilara-Epe, Lagos, Nigeria

15 ⁵ Department of Veterinary and Pest Control Services, Federal Ministry of Agriculture and Food
16 Security, Abuja, Nigeria

17
18 ⁶ Department of Veterinary Services, Ministry of Agriculture and Natural Resources, Ogun State,
19 Nigeria

20
21 ⁷ Africa Centre of Excellence for Mycotoxin and Food Safety, Federal University of Technology,
22 Minna, Niger State, Nigeria

23
24 ⁸ Department of Veterinary Services, Ministry of Agriculture and Natural Resources, Bayelsa
25 State, Nigeria

26
27 ⁹ Ministry of Agriculture and Natural Resources, Ebonyi State, Nigeria

28
29 ¹⁰ Department of Veterinary Services, Lagos State Ministry of Agriculture.

30
31 ¹¹ Department of Geography, University of Ibadan, Ibadan, Nigeria

32
33 ¹² School of Community Health Sciences, Njala University, Bo, Sierra Leone

34
35 ¹³ Centre for Control and Prevention of Zoonoses, University of Ibadan, Ibadan, Nigeria

36
37 ¹⁴ Nigeria Institute of Medical Research, Lagos, Nigeria

38
39

40 **Abstract**

41 Anthrax disease outbreak is a significant public health and socioeconomic problem, especially in
42 low and middle-income countries (LMIC) like Nigeria. Inadequate knowledge and poor
43 preventive practices against the disease among livestock workers and household animal owners
44 remain important for disease transmission. Following the recent outbreaks in Nigeria, a cross-
45 sectional study was carried out to assess the knowledge, perception and preventive practices of
46 livestock workers and household animal owners regarding anthrax and the associated
47 socioeconomic implications in Nigeria.

48 A pretested, semi-structured, interviewer-administered questionnaire was used to elicit relevant
49 information from the respondents (n=1025) in seven of the 36 states in Nigeria. Data were
50 analysed using SPSS version 29. Univariate analysis was done and Chi-square test statistics was
51 test for association between the knowledge/perception and other variables.

52 Of the 1025 respondents, 58.6% and 79.9% demonstrated good knowledge and positive
53 perception towards anthrax. However, there were important exposure practices, including a lack
54 of preventive measures against anthrax infection (22.0%). Besides, only 27.7% of the
55 respondents knew about the anthrax vaccination programme for livestock in the study area. With
56 respect to the socioeconomic effects of the disease outbreak, 23.8% of the respondents indicated
57 that the regulations imposed during an anthrax outbreak affect their livestock-related activities,
58 while 40.6% were worried they might go out of business due to the anthrax outbreak. The
59 respondents' knowledge of anthrax was significantly associated with higher education (p=0.000),
60 level of awareness (p=0.000) and perception of risk (p=0.000).

61 The study reveals a relatively high level of perception but an average knowledge level regarding
62 anthrax with associated socioeconomic impacts among livestock workers and household animal
63 owners in Nigeria. An important knowledge gap includes the poor knowledge of the routine
64 annual vaccination of animals. Hence, mitigation strategies should include educational
65 programmes targeting this gap.

66

67

68

69

70

71

72

73

74

75

76

77

78

79

80 **Introduction**

81 Anthrax is a zoonotic disease of significant public health importance caused by a gram-positive,
82 rod-shaped bacterium, *Bacillus anthracis* [1]. The bacterium occurs naturally in soil and
83 commonly affects domestic and wild animals around the globe. Livestock workers and
84 household animal owners are directly exposed to anthrax disease due to their close interactions
85 with animals [2]. Generally, rearing animals either for consumption or commercial purposes is a
86 major source of livelihood in many low- and middle-income countries (LMICs) with increased
87 exposure and susceptibility to the infectious agent and disease [3, 4].

88 Anthrax is endemic in many parts of Africa, with recurrent outbreaks reported in several regions
89 of the continent [3, 5]. The major risk factors for outbreaks and spread of anthrax between
90 species include environmental contamination and exposure through grazing or ingestion [5, 6].
91 Outbreaks tend to occur mostly during the dry season, affecting humans, livestock, and wildlife
92 [3, 5]. For instance, about 67% of wildlife anthrax outbreaks in Kenya occurred during the dry
93 season [3]. Similarly, most of the human anthrax cases recorded in Tanzania's hotspot regions
94 were diagnosed during the dry season [7].

95 Nigeria is the most populous country in Africa, with an estimated population of 206 million in
96 2022 [8]. Agriculture is the country's mainstay, having one of the highest populations of
97 livestock (19.5 million cattle, 72.5 million goats, 41.3 million goats) in the continent [9].
98 Livestock rearing, including pastoralism, is very prominent, and most households have close
99 contact with domestic animals. Nonetheless, awareness of the public health implications of
100 zoonotic diseases is poor [10, 11]. Anthrax is ranked as one of the first five priority zoonoses in
101 Nigeria [12].

102 Similar to other LMICs, the burden of zoonotic diseases, including anthrax, in Nigeria is often
103 underestimated partly due to poor awareness, inadequate preventive measures, and non-existence
104 of active surveillance mechanism, which increases the risk of their spread [13, 14]. The
105 knowledge of causative agents, modes of transmission, clinical manifestations, and potential
106 consequences of zoonotic diseases are key for effective control. As a zoonotic and vaccine-
107 preventable disease, adequate vaccination of susceptible animal populations reduces the risk of
108 transmission to humans. Hence, reducing exposure to infected animals or their by-products and
109 the control of animal anthrax reduce human risk. While the primary control measure for anthrax
110 in animal is annual preventive vaccination, control measures, such as ring vaccination, proper
111 carcass disposal, isolation and quarantine of new or affected animals, could reduce the spread of
112 the disease, especially during outbreaks [15]. In addition, re-vaccination of animals on antibiotic
113 regimens is very pertinent to ensure proper protection [15, 16].

114 The recent outbreak of anthrax in Nigeria is a matter of public health concern, especially
115 considering the weak surveillance in the country. Nigeria activated its emergency preparedness
116 and response activities to prevent the incursion of the disease into the country in response to the
117 confirmation of the outbreak in Ghana on the 1st of June, 2023. The Federal Ministry of
118 Agriculture, through the Department of Veterinary and Pest Control Services, activated the
119 National Anthrax Technical Working Group (NTWG). The NTWG is a
120 multisectoral/multidisciplinary committee comprising stakeholders from the human, animal and
121 environmental health sectors and partners. The activities included creating an increased
122 awareness of the outbreak among the Directors of Veterinary Services and the State and Federal
123 Epidemiology officers in all 36 States and the Federal Capital Territory. Media houses also
124 intensified their efforts to increase awareness among the general public about the outbreak of

125 anthrax and the necessary precautions to be taken. Also, the necessary steps and reporting
126 channels in the event of a suspect were defined.

127 Despite the prompt response and preventive measures, on the 16th of July 2023, the Niger State
128 Ministry of Agriculture, with support from the Federal Ministry of Agriculture and Food
129 Security (FMAFS), Nigeria Center for Disease Control (NCDC) and partners, confirmed an
130 outbreak of anthrax in a farm in Suleja, Niger State, North Central Nigeria. In addition, Lagos
131 State reported a suspected outbreak. Since the declaration of the outbreak, several activities were
132 initiated, including intensive risk communication activities and heightened public awareness
133 campaigns on anthrax at abattoirs, livestock markets and hunting communities. Also,
134 surveillance activities were intensified at national and international control posts, abattoirs, cattle
135 markets and other livestock and “bush meat” markets. Considering this background, this study
136 sought to assess the knowledge, perception, and preventive practices of livestock workers and
137 household animal owners toward anthrax in Nigeria and the associated socioeconomic impacts of
138 the disease.

139

140 **Materials and methods**

141 **Study Area**

142 Nigeria is situated in the western part of Africa. It is bordered in the north by the Niger and Chad
143 Republics, in the east by Cameroon, in the west by the Benin Republic, and in the south by the
144 Gulf of Guinea and the Atlantic Ocean. Nigeria has a land mass that spans an area of 923,769
145 square kilometres and has a population of over 230 million people [8]. On the globe, Nigeria lies
146 between 4 °15’- 13 15’North latitude and longitude 2 °40’-14 °45 East [18]. The climate in

147 Nigeria varies largely, with tropical rainforests and an average annual rainfall of 1500-2000
148 millimetres found in the southernmost region of the country. The entire land mass between the
149 far north and far south of the country is savannah, with an average annual rainfall between 500 –
150 1500 millimetres [17].

151 Agriculture, including livestock farming, is the major occupation, with most households having
152 regular contact with animals. The country has several food animal slaughter facilities across the
153 states and Local Government Areas. Aside from serving as meat processing facilities, these areas
154 constitute critical points for the exposure of humans to zoonotic diseases. Seven out of the 36
155 states in Nigeria were enrolled for the study: these included, Niger, Lagos, Ogun, Oyo, Benue,
156 Ebonyi and Bayelsa (Figure 1). The choice of the states was informed by having reported anthrax
157 outbreak, being a contiguous state to reporting states and presence of livestock activities and ease
158 of logistics.

159 **Study Design**

160 Using a cross-sectional design, relevant data were obtained to assess the knowledge, perception,
161 and preventive practices of livestock workers and household animal owners toward anthrax, as
162 well as the risk of exposure and socioeconomic impacts associated with the disease. The study
163 was carried out from August to September 2023. Data were obtained using REDCap (Research
164 Electronic and Data Capture) software.

165

166 **Fig 1: Map of Nigeria showing study sites, with percentage of respondents interviewed in each state.**

167 **Source: Department of Geography, University of Ibadan; <https://Grid3.org>**

168

169 **Study Population**

170 The study population included livestock workers (meat sellers, livestock traders, pastoralists) and
171 household animal owners.

172

173 **Sample Size Determination and sampling**

174 A total of 1025 participants were interviewed for this study. This number was determined using
175 the formula for survey [19] at a 95% confidence level, a 5% level of precision, and assuming a
176 50% expected proportion of community members with knowledge of the cause/symptom or
177 mode of transmission of anthrax. The estimated sample was adjusted for design effect of 2.0 and
178 a 25% non-response rate. Cluster sampling was adopted and all consenting livestock workers and
179 households with animals were involved in the study.

180

181 **Eligibility Criteria**

182 **Inclusion Criteria**

183 Males and females aged 18 years and above, who have previously or presently owned, reared, or
184 sold livestock animals were involved in the study.

185 **Exclusion Criteria**

186 Livestock workers and household animal owners who refused to give their consent or who were
187 unable to give a response due to incapacitation or communication problems were excluded from
188 the study.

189

190 **Data Collection**

191 A semi-structured, interviewer-assisted questionnaire was used for data collection. The
192 questionnaire consisted of ten sections, including respondents' information, sociodemographic
193 characteristics, animal ownership, and the risk of exposure to anthrax and other zoonoses. Other
194 variables included awareness about anthrax, knowledge of on anthrax, perception about anthrax,
195 practices towards anthrax prevention, history of anthrax vaccination, and socioeconomic impacts
196 of anthrax. Ten and six-item questions were used to assess the knowledge and perception on
197 anthrax, respectively.

198 The demographic section of the questionnaire was developed from the Nigeria Demographics
199 and Health Survey (NDHS). Other sections were developed from similar studies [4, 20] and
200 reviewed by experts in the field. Fifteen research assistants who understand the local dialects of
201 the study sites were recruited for the study. The research assistants were trained in the use of the
202 REDCap software and the identification of common external symptoms of anthrax disease in
203 animals and humans. The questionnaire was translated into the common local dialects and back-
204 translated into the English language to ensure the original meanings were retained.

205

206 **Reliability and Validity**

207 A pretest was conducted among 10 participants with similar characteristics in a different location
208 from the study area. The questionnaire was adjusted accordingly after the pretest. The
209 consistency indicator (Cronbach's alpha coefficient) for the questions used to assess the
210 knowledge and perception on anthrax were 0.90 and 0.76, respectively.

211 **Data Analysis**

212 Data were analysed using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) version 29. The
213 demographic characteristics of the respondents were analysed using descriptive statistics and
214 were presented using frequencies and percentages. Each item on the risk of exposure to anthrax
215 was graded as 0, 2 and 4 representing low, moderate and high risk, respectively. The maximum
216 obtainable score was 34, with less than 8 representing low risk, while 8 to 16 was categorized as
217 moderate risk and greater than 16 as high risk. The questions on knowledge were allocated
218 unequal points based on the weight of each question. The maximum point obtainable was 72.
219 Respondents with score of 36 and above were categorized as having good knowledge. The
220 perception of the respondents towards anthrax was calculated using a 4-point Likert scale with 1
221 point allocated to strongly disagree, and 4 points to strongly agree. The maximum obtainable
222 score was 24. Respondents with aggregate score of ≥ 15 were categorized as having positive
223 perception.

224 The preventive practices against anthrax and the socioeconomic impacts of anthrax on the
225 respondents were analyzed using frequencies and percentages. The associations between the
226 independent variables (sociodemographic factors) and risk of exposure, as well as knowledge
227 were determined accordingly using Chi-square test. All tests were two-tailed and statistical
228 significance was set 5% level.

229

230 **Ethical Consideration**

231 Ethical approval was obtained from the University of Ibadan/University College Hospital
232 Institutional (UI/UCH) Ethics Review Committee (UI/UCH/22/0305). Informed consent was
233 obtained from respondents, after which the questionnaires were administered. Due to the
234 documented low literacy level among the study population, endorsement of the consent form

235 included signing by those who could and thumbprint or verbally. The respondents were assured
236 of the voluntary nature of the study and the right to decline or withdraw. This action will not be
237 held against them, and they were assured that there will be no adverse consequences. The data
238 collected were strictly confidential and stored on a password-protected computer. Identifiers such
239 as names and addresses were excluded.

240

241

242 **Results**

243 **Sociodemographic characteristics of participants**

244 A total of 1025 respondents from seven states in Nigeria participated in the study. Table 1 shows
245 the sociodemographic characteristics of the respondents. The mean age of the respondents was
246 46.7 ± 11.67 years. The respondents were from Lagos (18.0%), Niger (18.0%), Benue (16.8%),
247 Ebonyi (15.1%), Ogun (14.5%), Oyo (13.0%) and Bayelsa (4.5%) states. The majority of the
248 respondents were males (75.6%) and married (79.4%). About half were Moslems (51.3%) while
249 only (36.6%) had up to secondary level education, and 3.0% of the respondents had no formal
250 education. The majority (86.2%) of the respondents were employed and were livestock workers
251 (69.3%).

252 **Table 1. Sociodemographic characteristics of the respondents**

Variables	Category	Frequency (n)	Percentage (%)
Stakeholder's Grouping	Household animal owners	311	30.3
	Livestock workers	714	69.7
	Bayelsa	46	4.5
	Benue	172	16.8
	Ebonyi	155	15.1

State of Residence	Lagos	185	18.0
	Niger	185	18.0
	Ogun	149	14.5
	Oyo	133	13.1
Age Group (in years)	21 – 40	323	31.6
	41 – 60	575	56.1
	61 and above	126	12.3
Gender	Male	775	75.6
	Female	250	24.4
Marital Status	Unmarried	209	20.4
	Married	816	79.6
Religion	Christianity	456	44.5
	Islam	526	51.3
	Others	43	4.2
Education	No formal education	133	13.0
	Primary	162	15.8
	Secondary	375	36.6
	Tertiary	355	34.6
Employment Status	Unemployed	90	8.8
	Self-employed	627	61.2
	Employed	257	25.1
	Retired	51	5.0

253

254 **Respondents' risk of exposure to anthrax**

255 Most 773 (75.4 %) of the respondents had low risk of exposure to anthrax (Table 2). Exactly
 256 67.6% of the respondents indicated having contact with the soil through day-to-day activities.
 257 Only about a third (39.0%) of the respondents said they would report an animal death of
 258 unknown cause to a veterinary centre; 38.8% indicated discarding the animal by burying it, with
 259 only 6.6% and 2.0% either eating or selling it, respectively. The majority (86.6%) reported that

260 they would go for vaccination to protect themselves from anthrax, while most (91.6%) of the
 261 participants agreed that it was important to take their animals for vaccination. Up to 68.7% of the
 262 respondents indicated they would be concerned if the body of a dead animal did not become stiff.
 263 More than half (61.6%) of the respondents said they would call a veterinary doctor if they saw
 264 frank, unclotted blood coming out of the natural openings of their animals, while almost a
 265 quarter (23.3%) said they would throw the animal away (Table 2).

266 **Table 2. Respondents’ risk of anthrax disease (n = 1025)**

Variable	Frequency (n)	Percentage (%)
Do your day-to-day activities involve contact with the soil?		
Yes	693	67.6
No	332	32.4
What will you do if you see an animal that dies of an unknown cause?		
Sell it	21	2.0
Eat at home	68	6.6
Throw it away	282	27.5
Discard by burying	398	38.8
Report to veterinary	400	39.0
Others	52	5.1
Will it be of concern to you if the dead animals’ bodies did not become stiff?		
Yes	704	68.7
No	321	31.3
Will it be of concern to you if you see an animal with unclotted blood coming out of its natural opening?		
Yes	905	88.3
No	120	11.7
What will you do if you see an animal with unclotted blood coming out of its natural opening?		
Quickly slaughter for consumption	52	5.1
Slaughter for sale?	98	9.6
Clean the blood?	63	6.1

Call a veterinarian?	629	61.4
Throw it away?	238	23.2
Others?	51	5.0
Is vaccination of animals important in preventing animal diseases?		
Yes	939	91.6
No	86	8.4
Would you go for vaccination as a means of preventing yourself from diseases?		
Yes	888	86.6
No	137	13.4
Risk of exposure to anthrax		
Low	773	75.4
Moderate	244	23.8
High	8	0.8

267

268 **The awareness of respondents about anthrax disease**

269 About 71.2% reported they have heard of anthrax previously. The main sources of respondents'
 270 information about anthrax were radio (38.7%), community health workers/veterinarians (30.2%),
 271 and television (25.9%). The social media (22.6%), friends/neighbour/family (18.5%), health
 272 professionals (6.7%), print media (6.3%), posters (5.7%), religious leaders (2.9%) and billboards
 273 (1.8%) were the other sources of information about anthrax. The majority (67.3%) of the
 274 respondents were aware of the recent anthrax outbreak in Nigeria, but only 2.4% and 6.8% had
 275 seen a person or an animal with anthrax disease, respectively.

276 **Knowledge of respondents about anthrax disease**

277 The majority (58.6%) of the respondents had good knowledge of anthrax disease (Mean + SD:
 278 38.75+14.18). The respondents agreed that consumption of contaminated meat (43.6%) and
 279 direct contact with infected animals (44.6%) are sources of disease transmission to humans. The

280 common symptoms of anthrax disease in humans identified by the respondents were skin rash or
 281 sores/wounds (38.3%), fever (35.5%), fatigue (23.4%), respiratory distress (28.4%) and muscle
 282 aches and pain (21.3%). Also, bleeding from natural openings (51.4%), sudden death (41.0%),
 283 and unclotted, dark red blood (38.6%) were the symptoms of anthrax in animals indicated by the
 284 respondents. In terms of respondents' knowledge of anthrax prevention, vaccination of livestock
 285 (49.7%), hand washing after handling animals (37.0%), and isolating and treating infected
 286 animals promptly (36.9%) were the preventive measures highlighted (Table 3).

287 **Table 3. Respondent's knowledge of anthrax disease (n = 1025)**

Variable	Frequency n (%)	
	Yes	No
Common sources of anthrax transmission?		
Consuming contaminated meat	447 (43.6)	578 (56.4)
Direct contact with infected animals	457 (44.6)	568 (55.4)
Insect bites	31 (3.0)	994 (97.0)
Sharing personal items with infected individuals	179 (17.5)	846 (82.5)
Drinking contaminated water	121 (11.8)	904 (88.2)
Airborne transmission	160 (15.6)	865 (84.4)
Contaminated soil	195 (19.0)	830 (81.0)
Knowledge about anthrax		
Anthrax is caused by a virus	210 (20.5)	815 (79.5)
Anthrax affects humans only	7 (0.7)	1018 (99.3)
Anthrax can be transmitted from person to person	190 (18.5)	835 (81.5)
Anthrax affects animals and humans	537 (54.3)	468 (45.7)
Can anthrax be transmitted from animals to humans?	266 (26.0)	759 (74.0)
Anthrax can be transmitted through skin contact with infected animals	416 (40.6)	609 (50.4)
Signs and Symptoms of anthrax among humans		

Skin rash, sores/wounds	393 (38.3)	632 (61.7)
Fever	364 (35.5)	661 (64.5)
Chills	130 (12.7)	895 (87.3)
Fatigue (extreme tiredness)	240 (23.4)	784 (76.6)
Respiratory distress or difficulty in breathing	291 (28.4)	734 (71.6)
Muscle aches and pain	218 (21.3)	807 (78.7)
Headache	200 (19.5)	825 (80.5)
Lack of appetite	134 (13.1)	891 (86.9)
Irritability	62 (6.0)	963 (94.0)
Excessive sweating	59 (5.8)	966 (94.2)
Nausea and vomiting	99 (9.7)	926 (90.3)
Diarrhea	62 (6.0)	963 (94.0)
Signs and symptoms of anthrax among animals		
Sudden death	461 (41.0)	564 (55.0)
Sluggishness	156 (15.2)	869 (84.8)
Bleeding from natural openings	527 (51.4)	498 (48.6)
Unclotted dark red blood	396 (38.6)	629 (61.4)
Incomplete rigor mortis	117 (11.4)	908 (88.6)
Nodules	42 (4.1)	983 (95.9)
Persistent cough	47 (4.6)	978 (95.4)
Awareness of programmes for anthrax prevention and control		
Anthrax can be treated with antibiotics	511 (49.9)	514 (50.1)
Diseases can be transmitted from animals to humans	888 (86.6)	137 (13.4)
Consumption of products from infected animals can be harmful to health	865 (84.4)	160 (15.6)
Can processing or handling of infected animals harm your health?	804 (78.4)	221 (21.6)
Prevention of anthrax		
Annual vaccination of livestock	509 (49.7)	516 (50.3)

Avoiding consumption of undercooked food	352 (34.3)	673 (65.7)
Wearing personal protective equipment when handling animals	351 (34.2)	674 (65.8)
Washing hands thoroughly after handling animals or animal products	379 (37.0)	646 (63.0)
Isolating and treating infected animals promptly	378 (36.9)	647 (63.1)
Burying all suspected anthrax carcasses	331 (32.3)	694 (67.7)
Burning all suspected anthrax carcasses	166 (16.2)	859 (83.8)

288

289 **Perception of respondents about anthrax disease**

290 The majority (79.9%) of the respondents showed a positive perception towards anthrax disease,
291 the mean±SD score being 11.62±3.42. Up to 67.6% believed that anthrax was a significant threat
292 to human and animal health. More than half (54.8%) of the respondents were very concerned
293 about the possibility of an anthrax outbreak in their area, and 74.0% considered educating the
294 public about anthrax as very important. However, more than half (58.0%) of the respondents did
295 not think that anthrax was a serious disease in animals. In comparison, only 9.0% considered it a
296 disease of serious public health implication in humans (Table 4).

298 **Table 4. Respondents' perception towards anthrax disease (n = 1025)**

Variable	Frequency (n)	Percentage (%)
Do you believe that anthrax is a significant threat to human and animal health in Nigeria?		
Yes	693	67.6
No	332	32.4
In your opinion, how serious a disease is anthrax in animals in your area?		
Very serious	149	14.5
Somewhat serious	281	27.4
Not very serious	595	58.1
In your opinion, how serious a disease is anthrax in humans in your area?		
Very serious	92	9.0
Somewhat serious	151	14.7
Not very serious	782	76.3
How would you rate your knowledge of anthrax		
Very knowledgeable	217	21.2
Moderately knowledgeable	268	26.2
Slightly knowledgeable	351	34.2
Not at all knowledgeable	189	18.4
How concerned are you about the possibility of an anthrax outbreak in your area?		
Very concerned	583	56.9
Moderately concerned	150	14.6
Slightly concerned	168	16.4
Not at all concerned	124	12.1
In your opinion, how important is it to educate the public about anthrax?		
Very important	768	74.9

Moderately important	110	10.7
Slightly important	83	8.1
Not at all important	64	6.2

299

300 **Respondents' preventive practices towards anthrax**

301 About half (50.2%) of the respondents practised a mix of free range and zero grazing, and about
 302 a third (35.2%) bought commercial fodder to feed their animals. However, only 22.0% had ever
 303 taken any measure to protect themselves or their animals from anthrax infection. In all, 0.7% of
 304 the respondents had a history of anthrax infection in their animals, while 0.8% of them had had a
 305 family member infected with anthrax (Table 5).

306

307 **Table 5. Respondents' preventive practices towards anthrax (n = 1025)**

Variable	Frequency (n)	Percentage (%)
What animal husbandry do you practice?		
Zero grazing	193	18.8
Free range	222	21.7
Mixed free range and zero grazing	515	50.2
Others	95	9.3
Where do you get fodder for your animals?		
I graze in the field	335	32.7
I cut and carry fodder	230	22.4
I buy commercial fodder	361	35.2
Others	99	9.7
Have you ever taken any preventive measures to protect yourself or your livestock from anthrax?		
Yes	226	22.0
No	799	78.0
Has any of your animals died suddenly before		
Yes	131	12.8
No	894	87.2
Has anthrax infected your animal		

Yes	7	0.7
No	1018	99.3
Has any member of your family suffered from anthrax		
Yes	8	0.8
No	1017	99.2
How did family members contract it?		
Eating dead animal	4	50
Carrying hide from a dead animal	0	0
Carrying meat from the dead animal	1	12.5
Others	3	37.5
What actions did you take?		
Took the person to the nearest health facility	2	25.0
Bought medicine from a chemist	0	0
Took the person to a traditional healer	3	37.5
Others	37.5	37.5

308

309 **History of Anthrax Vaccination**

310 Only a few (27.7%) of the respondents knew about the anthrax vaccination programme for
 311 livestock in their area. Also, only 19.7% had encountered or heard about anthrax outbreaks or
 312 cases in their community or nearby areas, out of which 82.2% heard about the cases less than six
 313 months ago. The majority (84.7%) of the respondents who had encountered or heard about
 314 anthrax cases in their community confirmed veterinary intervention regarding the cases, and
 315 80.2% of them said animal vaccination was embarked upon during the period. Regarding the
 316 frequency of animal vaccination, 32.9% reported that the veterinary personnel were always
 317 available to vaccinate in their area, while 12.5% indicated that the vaccination was done yearly
 318 in their area. Slightly above half (55.1%) of the respondents said they often take their animals for
 319 vaccination. In comparison, 32.6% of the respondents who do not often take their animals for
 320 vaccination said it was because they were not informed of any vaccination (Table 6).

321

322 **Table 6. History of anthrax vaccination**

Variable	Frequency (n)	Percentage (%)
Do you have any knowledge of the anthrax vaccination program for livestock in your area?		
Yes	275	27.7
No	718	72.3
Have you encountered or heard of any anthrax cases in your community or nearby areas?		
Yes	202	19.7
No	823	80.3
If yes, when did you encounter or hear about it		
Less than 6 months ago	166	82.2
One year ago	12	5.9
More than one year ago	4	2.0
Others	20	9.9
Was there any response from the veterinary department in your area		
Yes	171	84.7
No	31	15.4
Was there vaccination during the period		
Yes	162	80.2
No	40	19.8
If yes, were all animals vaccinated		
Yes	146	72.3
No	56	27.7
If anthrax vaccination programs for livestock are available in your area, would you be willing to participate		
Yes	832	81.2
No	193	18.8

How often is animal vaccination done in your area?		
Twice a year	25	2.4
Once a year	128	12.5
The veterinary personnel are always available to vaccinate	337	32.9
Never available	336	32.7
Other	200	19.5
Do you take your animals for vaccination?		
No	460	44.9
Yes	565	55.1
What prompts you to take your animal for vaccination		
To protect animals	312	55.2
To protect humans	19	3.4
Because others do so	3	0.5
Because it is a requirement	227	40.2
Others	4	0.7
If you do not always take your animals for vaccination, what are the reasons?		
No vet services	13	2.8
Financial difficulties	30	6.5
Don't get informed when it occurs	150	32.6
The vaccination centre is far	20	4.3
Others	247	53.7
In your opinion, would vaccination of animals help to prevent anthrax		
Yes	863	84.2
No	162	15.8

323

324

325 **The Socioeconomic impact of anthrax**

326 Most (99.1%) of the respondents said that anthrax disease had never affected their livestock,
 327 farm, or household animals, while 79.7% said that the current anthrax outbreak had a minor
 328 effect on their business. Again, only 23.8% of the respondents agreed that restrictions or
 329 regulations imposed during the anthrax outbreak affected their livestock-related activities (Table
 330 7).

331 **Table 7. Socioeconomic impact of anthrax**

Variable	Frequency (n)	Percentage (%)
Would you be willing to report suspected anthrax cases to the relevant authorities if you come across them?		
Yes	952	92.9
No	73	7.1
Has anthrax ever affected your livestock, farm, or household animals		
Yes	9	0.9
No	1016	99.1
To what extent has the current anthrax outbreak affected your business		
High	10	1.0
Moderate	198	19.3
Low	817	79.7
Do any restrictions or regulations imposed during an anthrax outbreak affect your livestock-related activities		
Yes	244	23.8
No	781	76.2
Are you afraid or worried that you might go out of business due to the current anthrax outbreak?		
Yes	416	40.6
No	609	59.4
Have you ever sought financial or medical assistance from the government or other organisations due to anthrax-related issues?		
Yes	8	0.8
No	1017	99.2

332

334 **Factors associated with knowledge of anthrax among livestock workers and household**
335 **animal owners in Nigeria**

336 There was a significant association between the respondents' knowledge of anthrax and their
337 level of education ($p=0.000$), awareness level ($p=0.000$), perception ($p=0.000$) and risk level
338 ($p=0.000$) (Table 8). The respondents with education below secondary level were less likely
339 (aOR: 0.69; 95%CI: 0.51–0.94) to have good knowledge of anthrax than those with secondary
340 education and above. The respondents who were aware of anthrax were about 5 times more
341 likely (aOR: 5.35; 95%CI: 3.87–7.39) to have good knowledge of anthrax than those without
342 awareness of the disease. Respondents with positive perception about anthrax were about twice
343 more likely (aOR: 2.00; 95%CI: 1.38 – 2.90) to have good knowledge of anthrax than those with
344 negative perception (Table 8).

345 Further, Table 9 shows the relationship between the respondents' knowledge and their
346 educational level, awareness, perception and risk of exposure. Respondents who were married
347 had lower odds of exposure risk (aOR: 0.57 95%CI: 0.28 – 0.83) to anthrax than those who were
348 unmarried. Respondents with education below secondary level had higher odds of exposure risk
349 (aOR: 1.85; 95%CI: 1.33 – 2.56) than those with education above secondary level. Respondents
350 who were aware of anthrax had lower odds of exposure risk (aOR: 0.32; 95%CI: 0.23 – 0.45)
351 than those without awareness. Respondents with positive perception about anthrax had lower
352 odds of exposure risk (aOR: 0.47; 95%CI: 0.33 – 0.68) than those with negative perception.

353

354

355 **Table 8. Factors associated with knowledge of anthrax among livestock workers and**
 356 **household animal owners in Nigeria**

	Knowledge of Anthrax		OR (95% CI)	AOR (95% CI)	P-Value
	Good (n = 601)	Poor (n = 424)			
Stakeholders Grouping					
Household animal workers	188	123	0.898 (0.684 – 1.178)		0.436
Livestock workers	413	301	ref		-
Sex					
Male	450	325	0.908 (0.679 – 1.214)		0.514
Female	151	99	ref		
Age Group					
46 and above	325	235	1.056 (0.823 – 1.356)		0.669
Below 46	276	189			
Marital Status					
Married	477	339	1.037 (0.761 – 1.412)		0.819
Unmarried	124	85	ref		
Level of Education					
Less than secondary school	133	162	0.46 (0.35 – 0.60)	0.69 (0.51 – 0.94)	0.02
Secondary school and above	468	262	ref	ref	
Employment Status					
Unemployed	87	54	0.862 (0.599 – 1.242)		0.426
Employed	514	370	ref		
Awareness					
Yes	523	207	7.03 (5.18 – 9.53)	5.35 (3.87 – 7.39)	<0.001
No	78	217	ref	ref	
Perception Level					
Positive	535	284	4.00 (2.88 – 5.54)	2.00 (1.38 – 2.90)	<0.001
Negative	66	140	ref	ref	
Exposure Risk Level					
Low	484	289	1.93 (1.45 – 2.58)		<0.001
Moderate & High	117	135	ref		

357

358 **Table 9. Factors associated with risk of exposure to anthrax among livestock workers and**
 359 **household animal owners in Nigeria**

	Exposure risk to Anthrax		OR (95% CI)	AOR (95% CI)	P-Value
	Moderate & High (n = 252)	Low (n = 773)			
Household animal workers	78	233	0.96 (0.71 – 1.31)		0.81
Livestock workers	174	540	ref	-	
Sex					
Male	180	595	0.748 (0.543 – 1.030)		0.075
Female	72	178	ref		
Age Group					
46 and above	131	429	0.868 (0.653 – 1.154)		0.331
Below 46	121	344	ref		
Marital Status					
Married	181	635	0.65 (0.52 – 0.83)	0.57 (0.28 – 0.83)	<0.01
Unmarried	71	138	Ref		
Level of Education					
Less than secondary school	112	183	2.58 (1.91 – 3.48)	1.85 (1.33 – 2.56)	<0.001
Secondary school and above	140	590	Ref		
Employment Status					
Unemployed	31	110	0.85 (0.55 – 1.30)		0.60
Employed	221	663	Ref		
Awareness					
Yes	114	616	0.21 (0.16 – 0.29)	0.32 (0.23 – 0.45)	<0.001
No	138	157	ref		
Perception Level					
Positive	156	663	0.33 (0.27 – 0.50)	0.47 (0.33 – 0.68)	<0.001
Negative	96	110	ref		
Knowledge Level					
Good	117	484	0.52 (0.39 – 0.69)		<0.001
Poor	135	289	ref	-	-

360

361

362 **Discussion**

363 This study investigated the knowledge and perception of anthrax as well as the socioeconomic
364 impacts of the disease among populations at risk (livestock owners and household animal
365 owners) in Nigeria. The sociodemographic characteristics of the respondents in this study
366 provide important insights into the wide age range profile of individuals engaged in livestock-
367 related activities and their potential exposure to anthrax. Such diversity in age groups
368 underscores the need for tailored educational campaigns that are accessible and relevant to both
369 young and old. Again, the predominance of male participants in this study aligns with the
370 traditional gender roles often associated with livestock farming and animal husbandry [21]. The
371 involvement of physical tasks and outdoor work may explain the higher male participation.
372 Similar to the findings by Sitali *et al.* [22], this study revealed a significant association between
373 the educational level of the respondents and their knowledge of anthrax. Similar findings were
374 reported from Zambia [22] and Ethiopia [20] both indicated good awareness about anthrax
375 among respondents. This high level of awareness may be connected to the sensitisation
376 campaigns by the Nigerian government consequent upon the recent outbreak of anthrax [23]. The
377 most common sources of information were radio, community health workers/veterinarians and
378 television, which highlight the role of mass media and healthcare professionals in disseminating
379 information about anthrax and other health-related issues.

380 Regarding the disposition of the respondents to vaccination, the majority reported that they
381 would go for vaccination to protect themselves from anthrax and that it was important to take
382 their animals for vaccination. This finding is encouraging since routine vaccination policy is a
383 major mitigation and prevention strategy against anthrax [7].

384 Further, our findings reveal that just over half of the respondents had good knowledge of
385 anthrax. This is lower compared to the findings of Dutta et al. [4], where 62.73% of the livestock
386 farmers in selected rural areas of Bangladesh had good knowledge about anthrax. It is also lower
387 when compared with 64% earlier reported [24] among livestock farmers and consumers in
388 Southern Ethiopia. However, our finding is similar to the 53.8% reported among selected
389 households in villages of Southern Kenya [25]. This level is low considering the recent
390 sensitisation campaigns by the Nigeria government against anthrax and the fact that the
391 respondents, assessed in this study, were an at-risk population who were expected to be abreast
392 of health-related issues associated with animals. This therefore, suggests that there are key
393 knowledge gaps among the respondents that interventional programmes should be focused on.
394 Such gaps should include annual vaccination of animals, training on recognition of common
395 signs of anthrax in animals, and knowledge of transmission routes of anthrax. Hence, subsequent
396 sensitization and educational programmes should take into consideration such knowledge gaps
397 from the planning phase of the intervention. Notably, in this study, the knowledge level of the
398 respondents was significantly associated with their education, awareness, perception and risk of
399 anthrax. Consequently, programmes geared towards increasing knowledge levels on anthrax
400 should include activities that could promote education and awareness as well as positively
401 influence the perception of the livestock workers and household animal owners in Nigeria.

402 Moreover, an assessment of the perception of the respondents shows that the majority had a
403 positive perception towards anthrax disease and believed that anthrax was a significant threat to
404 human health. This finding is suggestive of the readiness of respondents to embrace educational
405 programmes about anthrax. As such, achieving behavioural change in a positive direction could
406 be enhanced. It is however worrisome that more than half of the respondents did not think that

407 anthrax was a serious disease in animals. This is of great concern, since anthrax is a zoonotic
408 disease that is mostly transmitted from animals to humans. Livestock owners are supposed to be
409 the first gatekeepers.

410 Again, the respondents engaged in certain practices that could expose their animals to anthrax
411 infection as well as jeopardise human health, such as open grazing, and cutting of fodder for
412 animal feeding. However, a majority reported not taking any preventive measures to either
413 protect themselves or their animals against anthrax. As reported, ingestion is the most natural
414 route of infection, resulting in fatal gastrointestinal anthrax with massive replication of bacilli in
415 all organ tissues [26]. Considering the poor handling of dead carcasses, as observed in this study,
416 unguarded open grazing or harvesting of fodder might constitute a health threat to the animals.
417 This is because decomposition of animal carcasses and exposure to air (oxygen) trigger a
418 differentiation process that releases spores [26]. While they do not replicate, spores persist in the
419 environment until ingested by the next grazing host.

420 The health-seeking behaviour of respondents who reported having a family member who had
421 contracted anthrax was poor and mostly delayed, and from unorthodox sources such as
422 traditional healers. Such delay in treatment-seeking behaviour has been reported among livestock
423 workers, especially in other LMICs [27, 28]. It is worth noting that anthrax disease has great
424 socioeconomic impacts on the livestock community. In this study, up to 40% were concerned
425 that they might go out of business due to the current anthrax outbreak. Losses attributable to
426 anthrax outbreak could be through mortality withholding of milking infected dairy herds for a
427 period following vaccination. Other devastation may be caused by animal deaths, leading to a
428 reduction of animal products and complete condemnation of carcasses and by-products, as well
429 as closure of abattoirs [29].

430 The above findings notwithstanding, this study had some limitations. First, the performance of an
431 on-spot assessment of the preventive practices among the livestock workers and household
432 animal owners would have helped verify the reported claims of the respondents regarding the
433 practice of preventive measures. Secondly, only seven of the 36 states in the country were
434 selected for the study. However, these span the various geopolitical regions of the country.
435 Hence the findings are generalisable and reflect the situations in other states in the various
436 geographical regions in the country, including Niger and Lagos states, where the most recent
437 anthrax outbreaks occurred.

438

439 **Conclusion**

440 The study reveals a relatively high level of awareness and perception but an average knowledge
441 level regarding anthrax among livestock workers and household animal owners in Nigeria.
442 Significant associations were observed between the knowledge level of the respondents about
443 anthrax and their level of education, awareness, perception as well and risk of exposure. There
444 were important knowledge gaps, including knowledge of annual vaccination of animals,
445 recognising common signs of anthrax in animals, and knowledge of its transmission routes.
446 Hence, anthrax control educational programmes should target, among others, these important
447 gaps towards achieving better outcomes. The socioeconomic impacts of anthrax expressed by the
448 respondents in this study reiterate the need for proactive interventions from relevant
449 stakeholders, including government, non-governmental organisations and the community.

450

451

452 Acknowledgments

453 The support of all participants who participated in the study is duly appreciated. We
454 acknowledge the West Africa One-Health Consortium supported by the International
455 Development Research Centre (IDRC) Canada.

456

457 Author Contributions

458 C.S. conceived and designed the study. C.S., C.E., A.E.J., and A.H.K., developed the study
459 survey tool. J.A.O., N.B.A., O.P.O., N.E., O.G.T., O.A.O., A.A.A., carried out field work and
460 data gathering. A.E.J., I.P.M., B.M.A., A.V.O., and T.O.J carried out data analyses and
461 visualization. A.H.K., A.E.J., C.E. conducted the quality appraisal and wrote the initial draft of
462 the manuscript. C.S. O.S., A.R., V.C. carried out a critical review of the manuscript and all
463 authors approved the final version.

464

465

466 References

- 467 1. Fasanella A, Serrecchia L, Chiaverini A, Garofolo G, Muuka GM, Mwambazi L. Use of
468 Canonical Single Nucleotide Polymorphism (CanSNPs) to characterise *Bacillus*
469 *anthracis* outbreak strains in Zambia between 1990 and 2014. Peer J **2018**; 6: e5270.
- 470 2. Abdirahim M, Gathura, PB, Shukri J.G. Assessment of Knowledge, Attitude and Practices
471 (KAPS) of Anthrax among Pastoralists in Wajir, Isiolo and Marsabit Counties, Kenya. J
472 Agri Sci Technol A. 2019; 9(1).
- 473 3. Gachohi JM, Gakuya F, Lekolool I, Osoro E, Nderitu L, Munyua P, et al. Temporal and
474 spatial distribution of anthrax outbreaks among Kenyan wildlife, 1999–2017. Epidemiol
475 Infect. 2019; 5;147:e249. .

- 476 4. Dutta PK, Biswas H, Ahmed JU, Shakif-Ul-Azam M, Ahammed BMJ, Dey AR.
477 Knowledge, attitude and practices (KAP) towards Anthrax among livestock farmers in
478 selected rural areas of Bangladesh. *Vet Med Sci.* 2021;7(5): 1648-1655. doi:
479 10.1002/vms3.561. Epub 2021 Jul 7. PMID: 34232568; PMCID: PMC8464224.
- 480 5. Olani A, Dawo F., Lakew M. Laboratory diagnostic methods and reported outbreaks of
481 anthrax in Ethiopia. *European J Biol Res.* 2020; 10: 81-95.
- 482 6. Elelu N, Aiyedun JO, Mohammed IG, Oludairo OO, Odetokun IA, Mohammed KM, et
483 al. Neglected zoonotic diseases in Nigeria: role of the public health veterinarian. *Pan Afr*
484 *Med J.* 2019; 32:36. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.11604/pamj.2019.32.36.15659>.
- 485 7. Mwakapeje, E.R., Høgset, S., Fyumagwa, R, Nonga HE, Mdegela RH, Skjerve
486 E. Anthrax outbreaks in the humans - livestock and wildlife interface areas of Northern
487 Tanzania: a retrospective record review 2006–2016. *BMC Public Health.* 20118; 18:
488 106.?
- 489 8. Abubakar I, Dalglish SL, Angell B, Sanuade O, Abimbola S, Adamu AL, et al.. The
490 Lancet Nigeria Commission: investing in health and the future of the nation. *Lancet.*
491 2022;399(10330):1155-1200.
- 492 9. Onusi A. Retreat on livestock and dairy development in Nigeria – Keynote address
493 delivered by the Hon. Minister of Agriculture And Rural Development, Chief Audu
494 Ogbeh – Federal Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development. [http://fmard.gov.ng/retreat-on-livestock-and-dairy-development-in-nigeria-keynoteaddress-](http://fmard.gov.ng/retreat-on-livestock-and-dairy-development-in-nigeria-keynoteaddress-delivered-by-the-hon-minister-of-agriculture-and-rural-development-chief-audu-ogbeh/)
495 [delivered-by-the-hon-minister-of-agriculture-and-rural-development-chief-audu-ogbeh/](http://fmard.gov.ng/retreat-on-livestock-and-dairy-development-in-nigeria-keynoteaddress-delivered-by-the-hon-minister-of-agriculture-and-rural-development-chief-audu-ogbeh/).
496
497 Accessed 17 August 2017.

- 498 10. McDaniel CJ, Cardwell DM, Moeller RB, Gray GC. Humans and cattle: a review of
499 bovine zoonoses. *Vector Borne Zoonotic Dis.* 2014; 14 (1): 1–19.
- 500 11. Pieracci EG, Hall AJ, Gharpure R, Haile A, Walelign E, Deressa A, et al. Prioritising
501 zoonotic diseases in Ethiopia using a one health approach. *One Health.* 2016; 2: 131–135.
- 502 12. Ihekweazu C, Michael CA, Nguku PM, Waziri NE, Habib AG, Muturi M, et al.
503 Prioritisation of zoonotic diseases of public health significance in Nigeria using the one-
504 health approach, *One Health*, 2021; 13: 100257.
- 505 13. Munyua P, Bitek A, Osoro E, Pieracci EG, Muema J, Mwatondo A, et al. Prioritisation of
506 zoonotic diseases in Kenya, 2015. *PLoS One.* 2016; 11 (8): e0161576.
- 507 14. Adesokan HK, Akinseye VO, Sulaimon MA. Knowledge and practices
508 about zoonotic tuberculosis prevention and associated determinants amongst livestock
509 workers in Nigeria; 2015. *PLOS One.* 2018; 13(6): e0198810.
- 510 15. World Health Organisation. Anthrax in humans and animals. 4th ed. 2008. Accessed 19
511 July 2023. Available at: <https://www.who.int/publications-detail-redirect/9789241547536>
- 512 16. Sidwa T, Salzer JS, Traxler R, Swaney E, Sims ML, Bradshaw P, et al. Control and
513 prevention of anthrax, Texas, USA, 2019. *Emerg Infect Dis.* 2020; 26(12): 2815.
- 514 17. Samuel A, Olufemi I, Titilayo O. Perspective Chapter: microclimate, plant stress and
515 extension of cacao frontiers to marginal agroecologies of the rainforest tropics
516 IntechOpen; 2023. Available from: <http://dx.doi.org/10.5772/intechopen.113388>
- 517 18. Ayoade MA. Spatio-temporal patterns of under 5 mortality in Nigeria. *SSM Popul*
518 *Health.* 2018; 6: 116-124.
- 519 19. Thrusfield M. *Veterinary Epidemiology.* 3rd Edition, Blackwell Science Ltd., Oxford,
520 2007.

- 521 20. Romha G, Girmay W. Knowledge, attitude and practice towards anthrax in Northern
522 Ethiopia: a mixed approach study. *BMC Infect Dis.* 2020; **20**: 814.
- 523 21. Gebre GG, Isoda H, Rahut DB, Amekawa Y, Nomura H. Gender differences in the
524 adoption of agricultural technology: The case of improved maize varieties in southern
525 Ethiopia. *Women's Stud Int Forum.* 2019;76: 102264..
- 526 22. Sitali DC, Mumba C, Skjerve E, Mweemba O, Kabonesa C, Mwinyi MO, et al.
527 Awareness and attitudes towards anthrax and meat consumption practices among affected
528 communities in Zambia: A mixed methods approach. *PLoS Negl Trop Dis.* 2017; 11(5):
529 e0005580. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pntd.0005580>
- 530 23. Nigeria Centre for Disease Control and Prevention. Confirmation of Anthrax Outbreak in
531 Nigeria. 2023. [https://ncdc.gov.ng/news/491/confirmation-of-anthrax-outbreak-in-](https://ncdc.gov.ng/news/491/confirmation-of-anthrax-outbreak-in-nigeria)
532 [nigeria.](https://ncdc.gov.ng/news/491/confirmation-of-anthrax-outbreak-in-nigeria)
- 533 24. Asha AA, Liang S, Wan CS. Current knowledge, attitude, and practices towards
534 anthrax infection prevention among community members and professionals in Sodo
535 Zuriya District of Wolaita Zone, Southern Ethiopia. *J Zoonotic Dis Public Health.* 2021;
536 5(4): 10.
- 537 25. Mbai JM, Omolo JO, Wamamba D, Maritim D, Gura Z, Obonyo M. Assessment of
538 knowledge, attitudes and practices towards anthrax in Narok County, Southern Kenya.
539 *Pan Afr Med J.* 2021; 38:120.
- 540 26. Beyer W, Turnbull PCB. Anthrax in animals. *Mol. Aspects of Med.*
541 2009; 30(6): 481-489.

- 542 27. Kunda J, Fitzpatrick J, Kazwala R, French NP, Shirima G, MacMillan A. et al. Health-
543 seeking behaviour of human brucellosis cases in rural Tanzania. BMC Public Health.
544 2007; 7(1): 315.
- 545 28. Adesokan HK, Jenkins AO, van Soolingen D, Cadmus SIB. *Mycobacterium bovis*
546 infections in livestock workers in Ibadan, Nigeria: evidence of occupational exposure.
547 The Intl J Tuberc Lung Dis.2012; 16(10): 1388 - 1392(5).
- 548 29. Turnbull PC, Hugh-jones M, Cosivi O. World Health Organization activities on anthrax
549 surveillance and control. J. Appl. Microbiol. 2005; 72: 318-320.
- 550
551




Figure 1