

1 **Innovative Approaches to Improve Knowledge of Zoonoses among Wildlife Hunters and**  
2 **Traders in Epe, Lagos, Nigeria: A Community Action Network-Based Intervention**

3 **Short title: A Community Action Network-Based Intervention for improving knowledge of**  
4 **zoonoses**

5  
6 **Cadmus E<sup>1</sup>., Awosanya E,J.<sup>2</sup>., Adesokan H.K.<sup>2</sup>, Akinseye V.O.<sup>3,4</sup>, Olaleye F.<sup>4</sup>, Morenikeji O<sup>5</sup>,**  
7 **Fawole E.O.<sup>5</sup>, Rashid Ansumana<sup>6</sup>, Ayinmode K.O.<sup>7</sup>, Oluwayelu D.O.<sup>8</sup>, Cadmus S.<sup>2, 4, 9, 10\*</sup>**

8  
9 **\*Cadmus S: Corresponding Author**

- 10  
11 <sup>1</sup> Department of Community Medicine, College of Medicine, University of Ibadan, Ibadan, Nigeria  
12 <sup>2</sup>Department of Veterinary Public Health and Preventive Medicine, University of Ibadan, Ibadan, Nigeria.  
13 <sup>3</sup>Department of Chemical Sciences, Augustine University, Ilara-Epe, Lagos, Nigeria  
14 <sup>4</sup>Damien Foundation Genomic and Mycobacteria Research & Training Centre, University of Ibadan,  
15 Ibadan, Nigeria  
16 <sup>5</sup>Department of Zoology, University of Ibadan, Ibadan, Nigeria  
17 <sup>6</sup>School of Community Health Sciences, Njala University, Bo, Sierra Leone  
18 <sup>7</sup>Department of Veterinary Parasitology and Entomology, University of Ibadan, Ibadan, Nigeria  
19 <sup>8</sup> Department of Microbiology, University of Ibadan, Ibadan, Nigeria  
20 <sup>9</sup>Centre for Control and Prevention of Zoonoses, University of Ibadan, Ibadan, Nigeria  
21 <sup>10</sup>Nigeria Institute of Medical Research, Lagos, Nigeria

22  
23  
24  
  
25  
  
26  
  
27  
  
28  
  
29

## 30 **Abstract**

31 The West Africa One Health project is a multi-country project designed to utilise the One Health  
32 approach and deploy the Community Action Networks (CAN) to improve knowledge of high-risk  
33 communities on zoonoses. Majority of emerging zoonoses occur at the human-wildlife interface,  
34 of which wildlife hunters and traders are critical stakeholders. We assessed the effectiveness of a  
35 CAN-based intervention involving the use of a video documentary and case studies as model tools  
36 in improving the knowledge of zoonoses among wildlife hunters and traders in Epe, an established  
37 hunting community in Lagos State, Nigeria.

38 A quasi-experimental study design involving a total of 39 consenting registered wildlife  
39 stakeholders was adopted. A pre-tested, semi-structured, interviewer-administered questionnaire  
40 was used to obtain data on the participant's sociodemographic characteristics, awareness level, and  
41 knowledge of zoonoses pre and post CAN-based intervention. Data were analysed using  
42 descriptive statistics McNemar and Wilcoxon Signed Ranks tests at a 5% level of significance.

43 The mean age of the participants was  $46.7 \pm 10.9$  years. Most (76.9%) identified as male and had  
44 at least secondary education (89.7%). The number of participants who were aware that diseases  
45 could be contracted from animals and that it could be through inhalation and close contact  
46 increased significantly from 13 (33.3%), 2 (5.1%), and 9 (23.1%) pre-intervention to 37 (94.9%),  
47 11 (28.2%), and 21 (53.8%) post-intervention, respectively. The overall median knowledge score  
48 increased significantly from 1 (Interquartile range (IQR): 0 – 2) pre-intervention to 3 (IQR: 2 – 4)  
49 post-intervention.

50 The CAN-based intervention involving the use of a video documentary and case studies as model  
51 tools was effective in improving the knowledge of zoonoses among wildlife hunters and traders in  
52 the hunting community and may be beneficial for future practice.

53

## 54 **Introduction**

55 Hunting of wildlife by humans is an ancient practice associated with a considerable risk for cross-  
56 species infection transmission. Bush meat processing-related activities, including hunting, trading  
57 and consumption of wildlife, prevalent in sub-Saharan Africa, have historically and currently  
58 represent a source of zoonotic disease transmission, and their potential to trigger future outbreaks  
59 remains a concern [1]. Over 75% of emerging disease pathogens are zoonotic, 60% of which  
60 spread from domestic or wild animals to humans, while 80% are of concern regarding bioterrorism  
61 [2]. Worldwide, these emerging zoonoses account for 2.5 billion cases and 2.7 billion deaths each  
62 year [2, 3, 4].

63 Bushmeat trade and consumption remain an important interface for the transmission of zoonotic  
64 pathogens [5, 6]. At such an interface, transmission could occur directly through skin-to-skin  
65 contact, scratches, animal bites, or contact with body fluids. Zoonosis transmission could also  
66 occur via the oral route with accidental ingestion of pathogens present in contaminated water, food  
67 and unhygienic practices [6]. The different points along the bushmeat value chain from the time  
68 of harvest, exsanguination, dehairing, de-feathering, evisceration and consumption are critical  
69 sources of direct contamination [7, 8].

70 In sub-Saharan Africa, in particular, there are no regulated food safety standards along the often  
71 informal trade chains from the harvesting, transportation and butchering of the animals to the  
72 preservation of meat. This lapse further exposes wildlife hunters, butchers, vendors and consumers  
73 to the transmission of zoonotic diseases and food-borne illnesses [9]. In the tropical forests of  
74 Africa, people in the local settings depend heavily on bushmeat as a cultural, economic and  
75 nutritional component of their livelihood [10]. For instance, in Nigeria, the bushmeat trade is  
76 growing at an alarming rate, with an estimated volume of 900,000 kilograms sold annually [11].

77 Large profit margins create incentives for the bushmeat trade across all levels of the commodity  
78 and supply chain biased towards larger and rare species, allowing bushmeat to reach national and  
79 international markets [11, 12].

80 Raised awareness is the most important strategy for preventing occupational diseases, yet available  
81 data show poor awareness of zoonoses among occupationally exposed individuals in Nigeria [13].  
82 Worse still, this poor awareness is often enshrined in cultural backgrounds established over the  
83 years of practice as hunters or wild animal traders. Therefore, an intervention targeted towards  
84 achieving improved awareness and ultimately safeguarding the health of the bushmeat hunters,  
85 consumers and the general public is imperative.

86 The West Africa One Health (WAOH) project is a multi-country project designed to utilise the  
87 One Health approach and deployment of the Community Action Networks (CAN) to improve  
88 knowledge of high-risk communities on zoonoses. The CAN is a concept rooted in the principles  
89 of Community-Based Participatory Research (CBPR), a collaborative approach that empowers  
90 communities to engage in research from project inception [14]. The CBPR has shown success in  
91 addressing various public health issues, fostering community trust, improving data quality, and  
92 enhancing the relevance of health interventions. Its primary advantage lies in empowering  
93 communities to identify and solve their problems, aiding decision-makers and service providers in  
94 resource mobilisation and policy improvement [15, 16].

95 The CAN plays a critical role in community involvement in disease surveillance and has resulted  
96 in community empowerment, enhanced data quality, and more effective response to health threats  
97 [17]. The process often starts with a community needs assessment, and assessment of baseline  
98 knowledge with regards to zoonotic diseases. Information obtained may then be used for the design  
99 of targeted interventions, communication needs and subsequent knowledge transfer. Over the past

100 years, different methods have been deployed to improve awareness of communities on zoonoses.  
101 However, the use of video documentaries and case studies has not been explored, especially within  
102 the CAN set-up.

103 Meanwhile, health interventions and health education via videos have been shown to provide a  
104 convenient, accessible and cost-effective method to encourage positive change and improvement  
105 in patient behaviour [18, 19]. Besides, the case study approach is widely recognised as offering an  
106 invaluable resource for understanding the dynamic and evolving influence of context on complex,  
107 system-level interventions [20-21]. The present study employed a CAN-based intervention  
108 involving the use of a video documentary and case studies as model tools for improving knowledge  
109 of zoonoses among wildlife hunters and traders in Epe, an established hunting community in Lagos  
110 State, Nigeria.

111

## 112 **MATERIALS AND METHODS**

### 113 **Study Settings**

114 The study area is Epe with geo-coordinates of 6°35'N and 3° 59'E (Figure 1). Epe is one of the  
115 five divisions in Lagos State, South West Nigeria. It lies within the lowland rainforest zone and is  
116 bounded by the north bank of the coastal Lagos Lagoon. The human population in Epe LGA was  
117 estimated at 269,000 in 2022 [22] and mostly of the Yoruba speaking tribe. The primary occupation  
118 is fishing; however, agriculture is also practised. Historically, one of the settlers of the town was a  
119 hunter and hunting is still commonly practised in the area. Epe is home to five higher institutions  
120 of learning and 20 Primary Health Care Centres [23]. It has both fresh, seafood and wildlife  
121 markets.

122 **Fig 1: Map of Epe Local Government areas (LGA) with Lagos State and Nigeria inset**

123

124 **Community Entry**

125 Prior to the training, an initial visit was made to interact with the community gatekeepers, including  
126 the market leader, head hunter and youth leader. During the visit, the project aim and the modalities  
127 were explained. The process was facilitated by a member of the team, OAM, who had a pre-  
128 existing linkage with the community. The head of the hunters association assisted with the  
129 recruitment of members who were registered on their platform, while the market and youth leaders  
130 recruited the wildlife traders.

131

132 **Study Design and Period**

133 The study adopted a quasi-experimental design and was conducted between 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> of August  
134 2023.

135 **Study Participants**

136 The study participants were wildlife hunters and traders who also doubled as processors. Members  
137 (72.5%) of the hunters association (N=40) and consenting members (34.5%) of the wildlife traders  
138 (N = 29) of the registered population in Epe town were included in the study.

139 **Sampling and Data Collection**

140 Total sampling was adopted because of the finite population of hunters and wildlife traders in the  
141 study area. A total of 39 individuals, 29 hunters and 10 wildlife traders, respectively, were  
142 available and consented to participate in the study. Four Focus Group Discussions (FGD) were

143 conducted. Each FGD consisted of nine to eleven participants and lasted between 45 to 60 minutes.  
144 The discussions were used to elicit information on precautions taken when trading or handling  
145 wildlife and self-dead animals due to idiopathic causes. Other information included the  
146 participant's experience and perceived role in zoonotic disease surveillance and reporting, as well  
147 as prevention of the spread of zoonotic diseases. In addition, access to and promotion of healthcare  
148 services and participant views on the prioritisation of economic gain over personal health among  
149 the study participants were also evaluated.

150 A pre-tested, semi-structured, interviewer-administered questionnaire was also used to obtain data  
151 on the participant's sociodemographic characteristics, awareness level, knowledge, health and  
152 safety measures among the respondents on some zoonoses of public health concerns pre-and post-  
153 intervention. The interventions included a viewing of a short documentary and discussions using  
154 case studies on zoonoses at the human-wildlife interface. The short video documentary was  
155 produced in the local language (Yoruba) and titled "IFURA", meaning "Beware", and had four  
156 sections.

157 **Section 1:** Introduction to Zoonotic Diseases: which provided an overview of wildlife and zoonotic  
158 diseases, how they spread from animals to humans, and the potential impact on public health

159 **Section 2:** Recognising Zoonotic Disease Symptoms: common symptoms of zoonotic diseases  
160 were highlighted, and the importance of timely medical attention was emphasised.

161 **Section 3:** Preventive Measures for Hunters and Bushmeat Sellers: practical preventive measures  
162 that hunters and bushmeat sellers could adopt in their daily practices, which included proper  
163 hygiene, the use of personal protective equipment (PPE), and safe animal handling techniques,  
164 were highlighted



165 **Section 4:** Collaboration with Local Health Authorities: the focus was on the importance of  
166 working closely with local health authorities to report suspected zoonotic cases and facilitate  
167 disease surveillance.

168 The documentary, which lasted 9:01 minutes, was played three times. After the first viewing of  
169 the video, there was an opportunity for participant feedback, questions and clarifications. After  
170 that, the process was repeated two more times. The session was followed by a discussion using  
171 hypothetical case studies on Mpox and anthrax, which focused on the risk of exposure, safety  
172 precautions for handling and processing wildlife, health-seeking behaviour and information  
173 dissemination.

#### 174 **Ethical Consideration**

175 Ethical approval was obtained from the University of Ibadan/University College Hospital  
176 Institutional Review Board (UI/UCH/22/0305). Informed verbal consent was obtained from the  
177 study participants, and confidentiality of the data was maintained

#### 178 **Data Analysis**

179 Data obtained from the study were coded, entered into Microsoft Excel 16.0, and analysed using  
180 SPSS version 16<sup>®</sup>. Thematic analysis was done for the qualitative data. Descriptive analyses such  
181 as frequencies, means, and proportions were also performed. The significant differences in the  
182 proportion of knowledge of zoonoses pre- and post-intervention among the participants were done  
183 using the McNemar test. Each item in the knowledge scale was given an equal weight of one for  
184 each correct option with a total obtainable score of 10. The significant difference in the median  
185 knowledge scores pre- and post-intervention was assessed using the Wilcoxon Signed Ranks test.  
186 The level of significance was 5%.

187 **RESULTS**

188 **Sociodemographic Characteristics of Study Participants**

189 The mean age of the study participants was  $46.7 \pm 10.9$  years. Most (76.9%) identified as male,  
 190 while more than half (56.4%) were Christians. The majority (89.7%) of the participants had  
 191 secondary education. Furthermore, less than half (41.0%) of the participants reported wildlife  
 192 hunting activity as a full-time occupation. A majority (87.2%) of the participants had been  
 193 involved in the business of hunting or trading wildlife for over 10 years (Table 1).

194 **Table 1. Sociodemographic characteristics of wildlife hunters and traders in Epe, Lagos**  
 195 **State, Nigeria (N = 39)**

	Frequency (n)	Percentage (%)
<b>Gender</b>		
Female	9	23.1
Male	30	76.9
<b>Age(in years)</b>		
<40	8	20.5
40 – 49	16	41.0
>50	15	38.5
<b>Religion</b>		
Christianity	22	56.4
Islam	17	43.6
<b>Years in business</b>		
1 – 5	2	5.1
6 – 10	3	7.7
>10	34	87.2
<b>Time Involved</b>		
Full Time	16	41.0
Part-Time	23	59.0
<b>Level of education</b>		
No formal	1	2.6
Primary	14	35.9
Secondary	20	51.3
Tertiary	4	10.3
<b>Reasons for hunting/wildlife trading</b>		
Cultural/ Medical Purpose	20	51.3
Source of Income	26	66.7
Source of Protein	20	51.3

196

197 **Knowledge of Participants on Zoonoses**

198 About a third, 13 (33.3%), of the participants were not aware that diseases could be contracted  
 199 from animals pre-intervention. However, awareness of zoonotic disease transmission increased  
 200 significantly ( $p < 0.001$ ) post-intervention. On the possible route of infection, only 2 (5.1%), 9  
 201 (23.1%), and 5 (12.8%) participants indicated that it could be through inhalation, close contact and  
 202 eating products from infected animals, respectively, pre-intervention. The responses increased  
 203 significantly post-intervention to 11 (28.2%) for inhalation ( $p = 0.012$ ) and 21 (53.8%) for close  
 204 contact ( $p = 0.004$ ). However, there was no different significant increase in the response to eating  
 205 products from infected animals 6 (15.4%). There was no significant difference in the response to  
 206 symptoms of diseases in animals that they knew pre and post-intervention. Majority of the  
 207 participants indicated that it is not safe to sell or eat animals that are dead from unknown causes  
 208 pre- (37; 94.9%) and post- (38; 97.4%) interventions. In addition, the majority (31; 79.5%) of the  
 209 respondents knew that it is unsafe to kill an animal displaying evident signs of sickness pre-  
 210 intervention. However, the percentage improved significantly (37; 94.7%) following the  
 211 intervention ( $p = 0.031$ ) (Table 2).

212 **Table 2. Knowledge of zoonoses pre- and post-intervention among wildlife hunters and**  
 213 **traders in Epe, Lagos State, Nigeria (n = 39)**

	<b>Pre- intervention</b>	<b>Post- intervention</b>	<b>McNemar test P value</b>
<b>Aware that there are diseases that can be contracted from animals?</b>			
Yes	13 (33.3)	37 (94.9)	<0.001*
<b>Man can get diseases from animals</b>			
Inhalation	2 (5.1)	11 (28.2)	0.012*
Close Contact	9 (23.1)	21 (53.8)	0.004*
Eating products from infected animals	5 (12.8)	6 (15.4)	1.000
<b>Symptoms of diseases in animals that you know</b>			

Abnormal discharges	1 (2.6)	0	1.000
Diarrhoea	0	0	1.000
Sluggishness/ Unthriftiness	10 (25.6)	14 (35.9)	0.390
Abnormal swellings /protrusions	5 (12.8)	12 (30.8)	0.065
<b>Safe to sell or eat animals that are dead from unknown causes?</b>			
No	37 (94.9)	38 (97.4)	1.000
<b>Safe to kill an animal that shows obvious signs of sickness?</b>			
No	31 (79.5)	37 (94.9)	0.031*

214 \*Significant difference

215

### 216 **Difference in Knowledge Before and After the Intervention**

217 The median knowledge score, pre-intervention, was 1.00 (Interquartile range: 2). This, however,  
 218 increased to 3 (Interquartile range: 2) post-intervention. The difference in the median knowledge  
 219 scores pre- and post-intervention was significant ( $p < 0.001$ ) (Table 3; Fig. 2).

220

221 **Table 3. Difference in Knowledge Score pre- and post-intervention among wildlife hunters**  
 222 **and traders in Epe, Lagos State, Nigeria (n = 39)**

Intervention	Median knowledge score	Interquartile range (Q3 – Q1)	Wilcoxon Signed Ranks test, p-value
Pre-intervention	1.00	2 – 0 = 2	$p < 0.001^*$
Post-intervention	3.00	4 – 2 = 2	

223 \*Significant difference

224

### 225 **Fig. 2. Procedures for data collection and interventions used**

226

## 227 **Health and Safety Measures among Wildlife Hunters and Traders**

228 All the hunters and wildlife traders had at least once or twice contact with wildlife animals, and  
229 the majority, 30 (76.9%), washed their hands immediately after such contact. The majority, 30  
230 (76.9%), have not received any training on zoonotic diseases and their prevention. Almost half, 19  
231 (48.7%) of the participants, have occasionally or never gone for medical check-ups or health  
232 screenings. The majority, 32 (82.1%), reported not to have experienced any work-related health  
233 issues. Although more than half (56.4%) of the participants reported a cut or injury related to their  
234 work, only 2 (9.1%) reported becoming sick after such a cut or injury. About two in every three of  
235 the participants, 24 (61.5%), reported to have seen ticks on either their body or hunting dogs.  
236 Nearly all 38 (97.4%) eat what they hunt or trade in. About all 38 (97.4%) indicated an interest in  
237 receiving training on zoonotic diseases and safe wildlife trading practices (Table 4).

238 **Table 4. Health and safety measures among wildlife hunters and traders in Epe, Lagos State,**  
239 **Nigeria (N= 39)**

	Frequency (n)	Percentage (%)
<b>Frequency of contact with wildlife animals</b>		
Always (Everyday)	16	41.0
Sometimes (Once/twice a week)	18	46.2
Often (> twice a week)	5	12.8
<b>Frequency of handwashing following animal contact</b>		
Immediately	30	76.9
Once in a while	8	20.5
Never	1	2.6
<b>Received training on zoonotic diseases and prevention</b>		
No	30	76.9
Yes	9	23.1
<b>Frequency of medical check-ups or health screenings</b>		
Not at all	14	35.9
Occasionally	5	12.8
Regularly	15	38.5
Sometimes	5	12.8
<b>Ever experience of work-related health health issues</b>		

No	32	82.1
Yes	7	17.9
<b>Reported work-related cuts or injuries</b>		
No	17	43.6
Yes	22	56.4
<b>Reported sickness after work-related cut or injury (n = 22)</b>		
No	20	90.9
Yes	2	9.1
<b>Have you ever seen ticks on yourself or animals you hunt or trade?</b>		
No	15	38.5
Yes	24	61.5
<b>Interest in receiving training on zoonotic diseases and safe wildlife trading practices</b>		
No	1	2.6
Yes	38	97.4
<b>Do you or your family eat what you hunt or trade?</b>		
No	1	2.6
Yes	38	97.4

240 **Qualitative Findings**

241 The majority of participants did not believe that humans can contract diseases from wildlife.  
 242 However, part of the precautions taken during hunting expeditions included the use of gloves,  
 243 boots, nose masks, protective clothing, glasses, herbs, and charms, while the traders hardly took  
 244 any precautions. One of the popular views among the discussants:

245 *“But that a wild animal would have a zoonotic disease that will affect humans, I haven't*  
 246 *experienced it before. Contrary to what they're saying around in the news, it is not real. It's not*  
 247 *real to me.” (Hunter, FGD 1)*

248

249 **Experience and Handling of Animals found Dead**

250 Most of the participants have experienced the situation of self-dead animals during hunting  
 251 expeditions. However, the majority would take such animals home and process them for eating,  
 252 provided they could attribute the cause of death to trap or gunshot wounds, old age or killed by

253 another animal. In situations where the participants could not ascribe the cause of death to any of  
254 the earlier reasons mentioned, if the carcass is fresh, it could as well be eaten.

255 As reflected by a participant: *“I have eaten dead animals that I didn't know how they died before.*  
256 *It is even usually very delicious. If I see a dead animal that is fresh and not rotten, it is suitable for*  
257 *eating for me.”(Hunter FGD 2)*

258 Exceptions mentioned included when putrefaction has set in the carcasses or suspected death due  
259 to snake bite. On the disposal of a carcass not suitable for consumption, few would bury it, but the  
260 majority would leave it to decompose in the open.

## 261 **Participants’ Perceived Roles in Zoonotic Disease Surveillance and Reporting and** 262 **Contribution to Public Health**

263 The discussants did not perceive they had a role to play in disease reporting because they were not  
264 convinced that diseases were transmissible between humans and wildlife. As a participant  
265 emphasised during the discussion:

266 *“We don't even experience the spread of diseases, so we cannot report what we do not have.”*  
267 *(Hunter FGD1)*

268 However, they indicated their role in upholding communal security and reporting any threat to the  
269 community due to the incursion of dangerous animals such as pythons, lions and hyenas. Also,  
270 most agreed that they have roles to play in promoting public health, which include proper disposal  
271 of inedible offal through burying or service of waste management truck in order to prevent  
272 environmental pollution and disease spread by flies; proper processing and cooking of wildlife;  
273 non-sales of putrefying meat.

274

275 **Awareness and Personal Experience on Zoonoses and Access to Promotion of Healthcare**  
276 **Services**

277 The unanimous position was that all have neither witnessed nor heard of any incident where  
278 zoonotic diseases were transmitted within their trade or to consumers of their products. The general  
279 view was that the government should improve the healthcare delivery services to their group. As  
280 such, the healthcare system would be better positioned to support hunters and wildlife traders, not  
281 in terms of zoonotic disease prevention, but access to healthcare.

282 In one of their views:

283 “Although hunters take herbs often, modern medicine is also important.”

284 *“I would like the government to provide good healthcare for those that sell bush meat, teaching*  
285 *them about proper hygiene.” (Trader, FGD4)*

286

287 **View on Prioritisation of Economic Gain over Personal Health**

288 All agreed that health is more important than economic gain, as expressed by one of the  
289 discussants, *“if you are not healthy, you cannot work.” (Hunter FGD2)*

290

291 **Discussion**

292 Improving knowledge, attitudes, and behaviours regarding zoonotic diseases among high-risk  
293 groups, such as wildlife hunters and traders, is vital for the formulation and effective



294 implementation of appropriate disease prevention and control strategies in any given area [24].

295 The CAN-based intervention using model tools of video documentaries and case studies employed  
296 in the present study significantly enhanced the knowledge and perception of zoonotic diseases  
297 among hunters and wildlife traders in Epe, Lagos State, Nigeria. The increases in most of the  
298 variables evaluated and improvement in the overall knowledge base post-intervention serve as a  
299 pointer that our model (CAN-based intervention) could be adopted for behavioural change  
300 communication for zoonotic diseases, especially in resource-limited settings. Leveraging CAN  
301 strategies, individuals and communities can be empowered to make informed, health-related  
302 choices, thereby mitigating the risks associated with zoonotic diseases. Our findings of the role of  
303 CAN-based intervention in improving knowledge are in agreement with the previous work [25]  
304 on using integrated knowledge translation to move knowledge into action for more effective  
305 practice, programme and policy as a way to increase the relevance, applicability and impact of  
306 research.

307 Our model embraced the Information, Education, and Communication (IEC) approach, which has  
308 been acknowledged as a potent tool for catalysing essential shifts in understanding, attitudes, and  
309 behaviours [26]. The present study, through the video documentary and case studies, provided  
310 information, education and communication on zoonoses to the wildlife community in a  
311 participatory, interactive manner. As previously reported, videos are a type of IEC material that  
312 can be used to convey clear public health messages without relying on written or verbal  
313 explanations and to promote behavioural change [27]. Corrales et al. [28], in their study carried  
314 out in Medellin, Colombia, highlighted how a video intervention improved high school pupils'  
315 awareness of zoonotic diseases spread by dogs. Again, the National Center for Emerging and  
316 Zoonotic Infectious Diseases (NCEZID) used animation and video to spread the word about its

317 efforts to protect people from infectious disease dangers that exist both domestically and  
318 internationally [29]. These multi-media materials act as spotlights of knowledge, showcasing  
319 subjects like antibiotic-resistant diseases and the crucial One Health idea.

320 A systematic review [30] also supported the effectiveness of video-based interventions in changing  
321 knowledge and attitudes about infectious diseases. The video documentary as well as case studies  
322 employed in the present study among the wildlife hunters and traders not only raised awareness  
323 but could also provide important insights for policymakers useful in developing informed, all-  
324 inclusive mitigation strategies against zoonotic diseases.

325 Moreover, this study shows that, at pre-intervention, the majority did not believe and were not  
326 aware that humans could contract any diseases from wildlife. This observation is worrisome  
327 considering such an occupationally exposed group, coupled with the fact that up to 60% of  
328 emerging zoonotic diseases spread from domestic or wild animals to humans [2]. This incorrect  
329 position may spread to other people within the country, ultimately contributing to poor disease  
330 control [31]. This finding is similar to previous reports. For instance, Kusumaningrum et al. [32]  
331 reported a low level of awareness of zoonotic diseases among communities involved in the wildlife  
332 trade value chain in Indonesia.

333 Similarly, a study [33] showed that the majority of bushmeat hunters and traders studied indicated  
334 that diseases cannot be transmitted from bushmeat to humans in Nigeria. In contrast, however, a  
335 relatively higher level (55%) of zoonotic disease awareness was reported among Nigerian hunting  
336 communities [34]. Differences across study sites may be due to educational campaigns in the  
337 respective areas. We are unaware of public health outreach campaigns related to wildlife and  
338 disease in this present region of study.

339 Regarding some of the behaviours that could increase the risk of exposure of wildlife hunters and  
340 traders to zoonotic diseases, our findings reveal that most of the participants had experienced the  
341 situation of animals that died of unknown causes during hunting expeditions. The majority would  
342 take such animals home and process them for eating, as long as the carcass is still fresh. This kind  
343 of practice opens up the hunters and wildlife traders, as well as the unsuspecting public, including  
344 members of their families, to zoonoses. The risk of spillover may be associated with wild meat  
345 consumption [35], which is a global occurrence and is not just limited to wildlife markets and  
346 hunting practices in low-income and middle-income countries. Similarly, Wikramanayake et al.  
347 [36] developed a risk-assessment tool to evaluate disease risk presented by the food processing  
348 and handling of traded species in specific markets, therefore enabling the identification of high-  
349 risk trading conditions. Enhanced surveillance of human population groups, who could be more  
350 readily exposed through the consumption of at-risk animals and of the animal populations to which  
351 they are exposed, could help to predict spillover risk and enable early intervention [37]. Our  
352 finding is similar to a report [38] which indicated the practice of consumption of dead animals.  
353 According to these workers, carcass disposal among the Ilchamus was by consumption as it was  
354 against the culture to bury a dead animal. Often, this practice is reinforced by the notion that boiled  
355 meat is safe for consumption and could carry no disease [39].

356 Again, on the issues related to health and safety measures taken by the wildlife hunters and traders,  
357 all the participants had at least once or twice contact with wildlife animals. Despite being such a  
358 high-risk occupational group, the majority had not received any training on zoonotic diseases and  
359 their prevention. Worse still, about half of the participants had only occasionally or never gone for  
360 medical check-ups or health screenings. Self-care and home remedies have been associated with  
361 cultural beliefs and practices [40]. This is substantiated by the use of herbs and charms as part of

362 the precautions taken by the hunters and wildlife traders in this study when handling or trading  
363 wildlife. Such cultural practices could result in a delay in treatment-seeking. Such cultural  
364 practices could also affect awareness and recognition of the severity of illness, availability of  
365 service and acceptability of service. It is very plausible that the lack of training on zoonotic  
366 diseases by the majority of these participants also contributes to the current practices among this  
367 occupational group. Judging by the significant differences observed following the interventions  
368 administered, it suffices to say that training this group of hunters and wildlife traders will go a long  
369 way in improving their understanding of zoonoses as well as positively redirecting their beliefs  
370 and practices.

371 Although the sample size was small, this was representative of the cohort in that setting. We  
372 believe the information obtained could be generalised to the larger population, given the cultural  
373 ties common to this set of people. In addition, the post-survey was immediately after the  
374 intervention. Future research would provide an opportunity to ascertain whether the result obtained  
375 will be sustained. The information obtained from the study will be useful to inform policy and the  
376 design of targeted interventions in the future.

377

## 378 **Conclusion**

379 This study employed a Community Action Network-based intervention using a video  
380 documentary and case studies as model tools towards influencing the knowledge of zoonoses  
381 among wildlife hunters and traders in Epe, Lagos State, southwest Nigeria. The intervention  
382 significantly improved the knowledge of zoonoses among the studied population. Besides, the  
383 study documented important gaps in knowledge and cultural practices that could serve as a guide

384 for the formulation of policies aimed at achieving effective control of zoonotic diseases in  
385 Nigeria. Considering the burden of zoonoses, particularly at the human-animal-wildlife interface,  
386 we propose the CAN-based intervention using a video documentary and case studies as a  
387 mitigation strategy towards raising the knowledge level and promoting behavioural changes  
388 regarding zoonotic diseases, especially among occupationally exposed communities in Nigeria  
389 and other sub-Saharan African countries.

390

### 391 **Acknowledgments**

392 We sincerely appreciate the support of the participants particularly the hunters who made this study  
393 possible. We acknowledge the support of the West Africa One-Health Consortium supported by  
394 the International Development Research Centre (IDRC) Canada.

395

### 396 **Author Contributions**

397 C.S. conceived and designed the study. C.S., C.E., A.E.J., A.H.K., M.O., O.F., and F.E.O.,  
398 developed the study survey tool. C.S., C.E., M.O., A.E.J., A.H.K., A.V.O., O.F., and F.E.O.,  
399 carried out field work and data gathering. C.S., C.E., O.F., M.O., A.E.J., A.H.K., A.V.O., and  
400 A.K.O., carried out data analyses and visualization. A.H.K., A.E.J., C.E. conducted the quality  
401 appraisal and wrote the initial draft of the manuscript. C.S., O.D.O., R.A., and A.V.O., carried out  
402 a critical review of the manuscript and all authors approved the final version.

403

404

405

406

## 407 References

- 408 1. Dell BM, Souza MJ, Willcox AS. Attitudes, practices, and zoonoses awareness of  
409 community members involved in the bushmeat trade near Murchison Falls National Park,  
410 northern Uganda. PLoS ONE 2020; 15(9): e0239599.  
411
- 412 2. World Organisation for Animal Health. One Health. 2022. Available from:  
413 <https://www.woah.org/en/what-we-do/global-initiatives/one-health/>  
414
- 415 3. World Economic Forum. What are zoonotic diseases - and how dangerous are they? 2022.  
416 Available from: <https://www.weforum.org/agenda/2022/07/zoonotic-disease-virus-covid/>  
417
- 418 4. One Health Commission. Why One Health? 2022. Available from:  
419 [https://www.onehealthcommission.org/en/why\\_one\\_health/](https://www.onehealthcommission.org/en/why_one_health/)  
420
- 421 5. Wolfe ND, Switzer WM, Carr JK, Bhullar VB, Shanmugam V, Tamoufe U, et al.  
422 Naturally acquired simian retrovirus infections in central African hunters. The Lancet  
423 2004; 363(9413): 932–937.  
424
- 425 6. Loh EH, Zambrana-Torrel C, Olival KJ, Bogich TL, Johnson CK, Mazet JAK, et al.  
426 Targeting transmission pathways for emerging zoonotic disease surveillance and control.  
427 Vector Borne Zoonotic Dis. 2015; 15:432–7.  
428
- 429 7. Gao XL, Shao MF, Luo Y, Dong YF, Ouyang F, Dong WY, et al. Airborne bacterial  
430 contaminations in typical Chinese wet market with live poultry trade. Sci Total Environ.  
431 2016; 572: 681–687.  
432
- 433 8. Bertran K, Balzli C, Kwon YK, Tumpey TM, Clark A, Swayne DE. Airborne  
434 transmission of highly pathogenic influenza virus during processing of infected poultry.  
435 Emerg Infect Dis. 2017; 23(11): 1806  
436
- 437 9. Food and Agriculture Organisation. White paper: Build back better in a post-COVID-19  
438 world – Reducing future wildlife-borne spillover of disease to humans: Sustainable  
439 Wildlife Management (SWM) Programme. FAO. 2020. Available from:  
440 <http://www.fao.org/3/cb1490en/CB1490EN.pdf>.  
441
- 442 10. Nasi R, Taber A, Van Vliet N. Empty forests, empty stomachs? Bushmeat and  
443 livelihoods in the Congo and Amazon Basins. Inter Forestry Rev. 2011; 13(3): 355-368.  
444 One Health One World, 2020  
445
- 446 11. Petrozzi F, Amori G, Franco D, Gaubert P, Pacini N, Eniang EA, et al. Ecology of the  
447 bushmeat trade in West and Central Africa. Trop Ecol. 2018; 57(3): 547-559.  
448
- 449 12. Coad L, Abernethy K, Balmford A, Manica A, Airey L, Milner-Gulland EJ. Distribution  
450 and use of income from bushmeat in a rural village, central Gabon. Conser Biol. 2010; 24  
451 (6): 1510-1518.

- 452  
453 13. Adesokan HK, Akinseye VO, Sulaimon MA. Knowledge and practices about zoonotic  
454 tuberculosis prevention and associated determinants amongst livestock workers in  
455 Nigeria; 2015. PLoS ONE 2018; 13(6): e0198810.  
456  
457 14. Collins SE, Clifasefi SL, Stanton J, The Leap Advisory Board, Straits KJE, Gil-  
458 Kashiwabara E, et al. Community-based participatory research (CBPR): Towards  
459 equitable involvement of community in psychology research. *Am Psychol.* 2018;73(7):  
460 884-898.  
461  
462 15. Macaulay AC, Commanda LE, Freeman WL, Gibson N, McCabe ML, Robbins CM, et  
463 al. Participatory research maximises community and lay involvement. *BMJ.* 1999;  
464 319(7212): 774–778.  
465  
466 16. Gaventa J, Cornwall A. Challenging the boundaries of the possible: participation, knowledge,  
467 and power. *IDS Bulletin.* 2006; 37(6): 122–128.  
468  
469 17. Olson B, Brennan M. From Community Engagement to Community Emergence: The  
470 Holistic Program Design Approach. *Intl J Res Service-Learning and Comm Eng.* 2018;  
471 5(1): 5-19.  
472  
473 18. Tuong W, Larsen ER, Armstrong AW. Videos to influence: a systematic review of  
474 effectiveness of video-based education in modifying health behaviors. *J Behav Med.*  
475 2014; 37(2):218–33.  
476  
477 19. Moffitt R, Mohr P. The efficacy of a self-managed acceptance and commitment therapy  
478 intervention DVD for physical activity initiation. *British J Hlth Psychol.* 2015;  
479 20(1): 115–129.  
480  
481 20. Greenhalgh T, Robert G, Macfarlane F, Bate P, Kyriakidou O. Diffusion of innovations  
482 in service organisations: systematic review and recommendations. *Milbank Q.* 2004;  
483 82(4): 581–629.  
484  
485 21. Raine R, Fitzpatrick R, Barratt H, Bevan G, Black N, Boaden R, et al. Challenges,  
486 solutions and future directions in the evaluation of service innovations in health care and  
487 public health. *Health Serv Deliv Res.* 2016; 4: 16.  
488  
489 22. City Population 2022. City Population 2022. Epe. Available from:  
490 <https://citypopulation.de/en/nigeria/admin/lagos/NGA02500epe/>.  
491  
492 23. LSPHCB. List of Primary Health Care Centres (PHCCS) in Lagos State. Available from:  
493 <https://lspghcb.lg.gov.ng/wp-content/uploads/2020/02/LIST-OF-PHCCs-4.xlsx>.  
494  
495 24. Babu AJ, Ramya P, Rao LV, Swetha CS, Sudhanthiramani RK. A study on the awareness  
496 and knowledge of zoonotic diseases among the public in and around Proddatur, YSR  
497 Kadapa District, Andhra Pradesh, India. *Int J Recent Sci Res.* 2015; 6: 5131–5138.

- 498  
499 25. Graham ID, Kothari A, McCutcheon C. On behalf of the Integrated Knowledge  
500 Translation Research Network Project Leads. Moving knowledge into action for more  
501 effective practice, programmes and policy: protocol for a research programme on  
502 integrated knowledge translation. *Implementation Sci.* 2018 ; 13 : 22.  
503
- 504 26. Acharya D, Devkota B, Gautam K, Bhattarai R. Association of information, education,  
505 and communication with enrolment in health insurance: a case of Nepal. *Arch Public*  
506 *Hlth.* 2020; 78(1).  
507
- 508 27. Thorseth AH. Development and dissemination of communication materials | COVID-19  
509 Hygiene Hub Resources. 2020. Available from: [Resources.hygienehub.info](https://resources.hygienehub.info).  
510 [https://resources.hygienehub.info/en/articles/4228079-development-and-dissemination-](https://resources.hygienehub.info/en/articles/4228079-development-and-dissemination-of-communication-materials)  
511 [of-communication-materials](https://resources.hygienehub.info/en/articles/4228079-development-and-dissemination-of-communication-materials).  
512
- 513 28. Corrales NU, Giraldo KV, Garcés CMS, Giraldo ALN. Improving the knowledge of high  
514 school students about zoonotic diseases from pets in Medellín-Colombia. *Vet World,*  
515 2021; 3091–3098.  
516
- 517 29. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, National Center for Emerging and Zoonotic  
518 Infectious Diseases (CDC/NCEZID). Animations and Videos | Multimedia | NCEZID |  
519 CDC. Available from:  
520 <https://www.cdc.gov/ncezid/multimedia/animations-and-videos.html>  
521
- 522 30. Bieri FA, Gray DJ, Raso G, Li Y.S, McManus DP. A Systematic review of preventive  
523 health educational videos targeting infectious diseases in school children. *Amer J Trop*  
524 *Med Hyg.* 2012; 87(6), 972–978.  
525
- 526 31. Omemo P, Ogola E, Omondi G, Wasonga J, Knobel D. Knowledge, attitude and practice  
527 towards zoonosis among public health workers in Nyanza province, Kenya. *J Public*  
528 *Health Afr* 2012; 3:e22.  
529
- 530 32. Kusumaningrum T, Latinne A, Martinez S. Kalengkongan J, Wiyatno A, Dewantari AK,  
531 *et al.* Knowledge, attitudes, and practices associated with zoonotic disease transmission  
532 risk in North Sulawesi, Indonesia. *One Health Outlook,* 2022; 4, 11.  
533
- 534 33. Ozioko KU, Okoye CI, Obiezue RN, Agbu RA. Knowledge, attitudes, and behavioural  
535 risk factors regarding zoonotic infections among bushmeat hunters and traders in Nsukka,  
536 southeast Nigeria. *Epidemiol Hlth.* 2018; 40: Article ID: e2018025, 6 pages.  
537
- 538 34. Friant S, Paige SB, Goldberg TL. Drivers of bushmeat hunting and perceptions of  
539 zoonoses in Nigerian hunting communities. *PLOS Negl Trop Dis.* 2015; 9(5): e0003792.  
540
- 541 35. Milbank C, Vira B. Wildmeat consumption and zoonotic spillover: contextualising  
542 disease emergence and policy responses. *Lancet Planet Hlth.* 2022; 6(5): e439-e448.  
543



- 544 36. Wikramanayake E, Pfeiffer DU, Magouras I, Conan A, Ziegler S, Bonebrake TC, et al. A  
545 tool for rapid assessment of wildlife markets in the Asia-Pacific Region for risk of future  
546 zoonotic disease outbreaks. *One Hlth.* 2021; 13:100279.  
547
- 548 37. Kurpiers LA, Schulte-Herbrüggen B, Ejotre I, Reeder DAM. In: *Problematic wildlife.*  
549 Angelici FM, Editor. Springer; Cham: Bushmeat and emerging infectious diseases:  
550 lessons from Africa; 2016. pp. 507–551.  
551
- 552 38. Mutua EN, Bukachi SA, Bett BK, Estambale BA, Nyamongo IK. We do not bury dead  
553 livestock like human beings: Community behaviors and risk of Rift Valley Fever virus  
554 infection in Baringo County, Kenya. *PLOS Negl Trop Dis.* 2017; 11(5): e0005582.  
555
- 556 39. Ng'ang'a CM, Bukachi SA, Bett BK. Lay perceptions of risk factors for Rift Valley fever  
557 in a pastoral community in northeastern Kenya. *BMC Public Hlth.* 2016; 16:32.  
558
- 559 40. Yamasaki-Nakagawa M, Ozasa K, Yamada N, Osuga K, Shimouchi A, Ishikawa N, et al.  
560 Gender difference in delays to diagnosis and health care seeking behavior in a rural area  
561 of Nepal. *Int J Tuberc Lung Dis* 2001; 5: 24–31.  
562  
563  
564  
565  
566




Figure 1

## Pre-Intervention



### HUNTERS

- Lack knowledge of Zoonoses
- Do not use PPE
- Do not believe zoonotic diseases exist
- Do not see reason to go for medical check-up
- Animals are free of diseases



### BUSHMEAT SELLERS

- Do not believe animals could harbour infection
- Lack the knowledge of Zoonoses
- Do not use PPE

## Interventions

### VIDEO DOCUMENTARY ON DISEASE AWARENESS



### CASE STUDIES ON DIFFERENT OCCUPATIONAL LIFE SCENARIOS



## Post-Intervention



### HUNTERS

- Improved knowledge of Zoonoses
- Understand the importance of using PPE
- Agreed to the existence of zoonotic diseases
- Understand the need for medical check-up



### BUSHMEAT SELLERS

- Agreed that animal could harbour infectious diseases
- Improved knowledge of zoonosis
- Understand the importance of using PPE
- Appreciate the need for medical check-up

Figure 2