

1 **Full Title**

2 The epidemiology of Brucellosis and Q fever in a cross-sectional serosurvey of occupationally
3 exposed groups in peri-urban Lomé, Togo

4 **Short Title**

5 Occupational exposure to *Brucella* and *Coxiella burnetii*

6 **Authors and Affiliations**

7 Charlotte L. Kerr¹, Akouda Patassi², Pidemnéwé S. Pato³, Javier Guitian⁴, Sylvie Audrey Diop⁵, Punam
8 Mangtani¹, Patrick Nguipdop-Djomo¹

9 1. London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine, London WC1E 7HT, UK

10 2. CHU Sylvanus Olympio, Lomé, Togo

11 3. Laboratoire Central Vétérinaire de Lomé, Lomé, Togo

12 4. Veterinary Epidemiology, Economics and Public Health Group. WOAHA Collaborating Centre
13 in Risk Analysis and Modelling. Department of Pathobiology and Population Sciences. The
14 Royal Veterinary College.

15 5. UFR of Health Sciences, University of Thiès, Thiès, Senegal

16

17 **Author Contributions**

18 CK and PND conceived and designed study. PM, SAD, PP and AP contributed to the design. CK, JG
19 and PP developed the sampling frame and recruitment. CK performed data collection and analysed
20 data with supervision from PM and PND. AP and PP provided in-field support and resources. CK
21 wrote a first draft of the paper. PND, PM, AP, SAD, JG and PP provided critical review of the paper.

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

22 Abstract

23 Background:

24 *Brucella* species and *Coxiella burnetii* have been detected in livestock populations in Togo.

25 Populations exposed to livestock ruminants through occupation may be at increased risk of
26 infection.

27 Methods/Principal Findings:

28 A cross-sectional serosurvey was conducted in 108 abattoir and 81 dairy farm workers (from 52 dairy
29 farms) in peri-urban Lomé, Togo in 2019-2020. Sera were tested using the Rose Bengal plate
30 agglutination test (RBT) and the indirect Brucella IgG Enzyme-Linked Immunosorbent Assay (ELISA)
31 for Brucella, and the IgG ELISA for *Coxiella burnetii* in Phase 1 and in Phase 2. Fresh bulk milk from
32 farms were tested using an indirect milk ELISA for Brucella IgG.

33 Eighteen workers (9.5%, 95% CI 5.5-16.0) were Brucella seropositive. Twenty-eight percent (95% CI
34 22.5-34.3) of workers were seropositive for *C. burnetii*. Twenty of fifty-one farms which gave milk
35 samples tested positive for Brucella (39.2%, 95% CI 26.6 - 53.4%).

36 Farmworkers had nearly twice the odds of being Brucella seropositive compared to abattoir workers
37 (OR 1.93, 95% CI: 0.94-3.93, p=0.07). In farmworkers, working on farms with animal ill health, a
38 positive milk test, participating in small animal husbandry and assisting with cattle abortion were all
39 associated with increased odds of seropositivity. Workers who consumed unboiled milk at least
40 every month were more likely to be seropositive (OR 3.79, 95% CI: 2.34-6.13, p<0.001) while
41 participants who consumed fermented milk and cheese had greater odds of being seropositive for
42 *C. burnetii* (OR 1.59, 95% CI: 1.26-2.00, p<0.001 and OR 1.70, 95% CI: 0.97-2.98, p=0.07 respectively).

43 Conclusions:

44 Livestock workers in peri-urban Lome have been exposed to both *Brucella* and *Coxiella burnetii*
45 bacteria. The widespread consumption of unboiled dairy products and lack of PPE use is of concern

46 as both dairy consumption and participation in animal husbandry activities have been seen to
47 increase odds of seropositivity for both pathogens.

48 **Author summary:**

49 Human and animal health are inextricably linked, particularly for those who live and work closely
50 with animals. Brucellosis and Q fever are two zoonotic diseases transmitted through animal contact
51 and dairy product consumption, which cause non-specific fevers and for which diagnostic tests are
52 lacking in many LMIC contexts. Previous studies have shown that both bacteria circulate in livestock
53 in Togo. We undertook a survey in dairy farm and abattoir workers in peri-urban Lomé, Togo, and
54 found that 9.5% and 28% of workers were seropositive for *Brucella* and *C.burnetii* respectively. We
55 found that risk factors included animal husbandry practices and consumption of dairy products.
56 Mitigating practices such as the use of PPE and boiling milk are simple ways that livestock workers
57 could protect themselves from these and other zoonotic disease.

58

59 **Introduction**

60 Zoonotic pathogens maintained by ruminant reservoirs, such as *Brucella* species and *Coxiella*
61 *burnetii*, are of concern in agricultural communities, particularly in low-income countries (LICs)
62 where animals and humans frequently interact, infection status of livestock holdings is often
63 unknown and controls are lacking. Workers in the livestock industry, including slaughterhouse
64 workers, farmers of ruminants, animal healthcare workers and veterinarians, are particularly
65 vulnerable to such zoonoses which not only impact health and wellbeing but also livelihoods through
66 worker's reduced capacity to do labour and through livestock productivity losses [1].

67 Both brucellosis and Q fever are neglected zoonoses associated with ruminant reservoirs,
68 transmitted, to a varying extent, via contact with infected animals and their bodily fluids,
69 consumption of animal products and inhalation of aerosols [2,3]. They present clinically as non-

70 specific febrile illnesses which are often misdiagnosed as diseases such as malaria and typhoid fever
71 due to lower awareness and lack of laboratory tests [2,4-7]. Both diseases can also result in more
72 serious, chronic sequelae such as osteoarticular disease including spondylitis and osteomyelitis,
73 neurological disease and endocarditis in Brucellosis, and hepatitis, pneumonia, heart disease and
74 chronic fatigue in Q fever [5,8,9].

75 More than half of people in Togo work in agriculture, despite a rapidly urbanising population [10].
76 Local livestock production systems are largely informal and may magnify risk of exposure to these
77 pathogens due to unrestricted grazing and transhumance, leading to a high-level of mixing between
78 species and across large areas, and manual milking and slaughter of animals which is lacking hygiene
79 measures [11].

80 A recent study looking at peri-urban dairy production in West and Central Africa found a *Brucella*
81 herd prevalence of 62% in dairy herds from the surroundings of the capital city of Togo, Lomé [12].
82 *Brucella melitensis* was isolated from cattle hygroma samples in this region (personal
83 communication). Another livestock study, in Northern Togo, found an individual *C.burnetii*
84 seroprevalence of 16.1% in cattle, 16.2% in sheep, and 8.8% in goats [13]. However, there is a
85 scarcity of good quality data on the level of human exposure to *Brucella* species and *C.burnetii* in
86 Sub-Saharan Africa [7,14]. An increased focus on assessing the risk in these populations is required
87 to control the burden of such preventable poverty-related diseases.

88 To our knowledge, no previous studies to ascertain the prevalence of *Brucella* or *C.burnetii*
89 seropositivity have been undertaken in people who work with dairy cattle in Southern Togo. In this
90 study we aim to focus on known at-risk populations, given the high prevalence of Brucellosis in large
91 ruminants in the maritime region of Togo, to ascertain the burden of Brucellosis, and Q fever. We
92 used a cross-sectional serosurvey in abattoir and farm workers in the peri-urban area of Lomé, Togo.
93 We also assessed factors associated with higher odds of infection from these pathogens.

94 **Methods**

95 **Study design and setting**

96 The cross-sectional serosurvey in abattoir workers and livestock keepers was conducted between
97 December 2019 and March 2020. It was embedded in a larger project on Brucellosis in animals in
98 West and Central Africa which had surveyed 100 randomly sampled dairy farms in peri-urban Lomé
99 in 2017 to 2018 [12]. Farmworkers were recruited from these and other farms in the three Western
100 prefectures of the Maritime region which supply fresh cow milk to Lomé. Abattoir staff were
101 additionally recruited at the municipal abattoir in Lomé.

102 **Participant selection**

103 All staff employed by the abattoir and veterinary staff were selected for study participation given the
104 small number. Of the 167 independent butchers registered at this abattoir and enumerated for this
105 study 50% (84) were selected by simple random sampling with replacement when selected sampled
106 workers were unavailable or refused.

107 Dairy farms from the larger project were preferentially enrolled, however due to herd movement,
108 replacement farms for those who had left the area were selected by animal health workers using
109 convenience sampling. Up to 3 individuals were randomly selected from a list of workers on each
110 farm. An information leaflet describing the study was provided in French. A fieldworker explained in
111 a local language where participants did not read French. Written consent was obtained prior to
112 interview and blood collection. If the participant was illiterate a witness also signed the consent
113 form. This sampling strategy was expected to be able to detect an estimated Brucella seroprevalence
114 of 10% with 5% precision [13,15,16].

115 **Sample collection and processing**

116 The phlebotomist collected 4mls of peripheral venous blood. Samples were labelled with unique
117 identification numbers linked to questionnaire data, transported to the laboratory (Institut National
118 d'Hygiene, Lomé) in a cool box at 4-8°C and centrifuged to obtain serum on the same day.

119 All sera were tested for anti-*Brucella* antibodies using the Rose Bengal plate agglutination test (RBT)
120 (APHA, UK) and then stored in freezers at -20°C . This assay detects both agglutinating and non-
121 agglutinating IgM, IgG and IgA antibodies [17]. All samples were also tested after sample collection
122 was complete using the indirect Brucella IgG Enzyme-Linked Immunosorbent Assay (ELISA) (Serion
123 ELISA classic, Germany) as per manufacturer's instructions.

124 Sera were also analysed for detection of IgG antibodies against *Coxiella Burnetii* in either Phase 1,
125 which predominates in chronic disease, or Phase 2, which predominates in acute disease, using the
126 Serion ELISA classic (Institut Virion/Serion GmbH, Germany) and classified as positive, borderline or
127 negative according to manufacturer's instructions.

128 In addition, samples of fresh bulk milk were collected in 15ml plain tubes from each farm visited,
129 transported in a cool box ($4-8^{\circ}\text{C}$) to the laboratory (Department de l'Elevage, Lomé) where they
130 were aliquoted into 1.5ml cryotubes and stored in freezers at -20°C . These were analysed as one
131 batch using an indirect milk ELISA for *Brucella* IgG (APHA, UK).

132 **Data collection and study variables**

133 In-person interviews were carried out in the participant's language using a structured questionnaire
134 with close-ended questions, on tablet computers using Open Data Kit (ODK) by trained interviewers.

135 The questionnaire consisted of three sections, respectively on farm-level risk factors, livestock
136 contact, and consumption of livestock products.

137 Farm-level variables included number of animals on farm by species, morbidity and mortality in
138 animals including abortion and hygroma, animal movements and mixing. Animal numbers were
139 dichotomised into none or some, where ownership was rare, or using the median as cut-off.

140 Questions about livestock contact examined both husbandry and slaughter activity, with cattle, small
141 ruminants and pigs examined separately, as well as asking about frequency of activity and duration,
142 and use of protective equipment.

143 Consumption of liquid milk in any form, processed dairy products, and dried meat were noted, with
144 products from cattle and from small ruminants assessed separately. Information on the frequency of
145 consumption and whether products had been boiled or not was collected.

146 To deal with issues of scarcity for some variables a number of categories were merged. Assisting
147 with cattle abortions was a rare occurrence and was classified as never or sometimes, whereas
148 manual milking of cattle was commonly carried out on a daily basis and frequency was therefore
149 classified as daily or less than daily/never.

150 Data were collected on potential confounders including age, sex, ethnicity, religion and education.
151 Information was also gathered on recent health and healthcare-seeking behaviours, including recent
152 episodes of pyrexia, muscle or joint pain and night sweats


153 The outcomes were positive *Brucella* or *C.burnetii* serology, defined as any individual who tested
154 positive to either RBT or Brucella IgG ELISA for *Brucella*, and either Phase 1 or Phase 2 ELISA for
155 *C.burnetii*. Borderline results were considered seronegative.

156 **Statistical analysis**

157 Data were analysed using Stata 17 (Statcorp, College Station, TX, USA). Cross-tabulations were used
158 to describe participants. Prevalence was calculated for both *Brucella* and *C.burnetii* seropositivity
159 and 95% confidence intervals were computed using cluster-robust standard errors, with clustering at
160 the site (individual farm/abattoir) level, and chi-square tests were used to compare clinical
161 symptoms by serological status.




162 A hierarchical conceptual framework (Fig 1) was developed to guide the analysis, grouping potential
163 risk factors from distal to proximal. Age and site of work (abattoir or farm) were considered *a priori*
164 confounders. The association between seropositivity and farm-related exposure variables in
165 farmworkers, slaughter-related exposure variables in abattoir workers, and animal products
166 consumption in all participants, were respectively investigated using logistic regression, with robust

167 standard errors to account for site-level clustering. The likelihood ratio test for heterogeneity was
168 used to check for interaction between site of work (abattoir or farm) and the exposure variables.
169 Due to limited statistical power in the data, multivariable analysis only examined the association
170 between consumption variables and *Coxiella* seropositivity. The Wald test was used to assess
171 evidence of association between the exposure variables and the outcome in the multivariable
172 model. Models were assessed for multicollinearity and if detected the collinear variable which was
173 least associated with the outcome was removed. Confounding was assessed by a 20% or more
174 change in main exposure odds ratios when potential confounders were included in the model.



175
176 **Fig 1:** Hierarchical conceptual framework of the risk factors for seropositivity for *Brucella* and
177 *Coxiella burnetii*.

178 Legend: Shading becomes darker the more proximal a variable is to the outcome.

- 179  Solid shading: variables on the pathway from site of work (abattoir or farm)
180  Diagonal lines: variables on the pathway from age
181  Diamonds: variables on both pathways (site of work, and age)

182

183 Results

184 Participant characteristics

185 Overall, 189 participants were recruited including 108 abattoir workers, and 81 farmworkers from 52
186 dairy farms. Three abattoir workers refused to take part. Farm workers tended to be younger than
187 the abattoir workers with less formal education (Table1). While eight abattoir workers also did
188 some work on farms, no farmworker worked in abattoirs.

189

190 **Table 1: Characteristics of the study population, both overall and by site of work**

| | Total (%) (N=189) | Abattoir workers-n(%) (N=108) ^b | Farm workers- n(%) (N=81) |
|-------------------------------------|----------------------|---|------------------------------|
| Site of work | | | |
| Abattoir | 108 (57.1) | na | na |
| Farm | 81 (42.9) | na | na |
| Age (in years) ^{ac} | | | |
| <25 | 33 (17.6) | 7 (6.5) | 26 (32.5) |
| 25-34 | 52 (27.7) | 23 (21.3) | 29 (36.3) |
| 35-44 | 45 (23.9) | 36 (33.3) | 9 (11.3) |
| 45+ | 58 (30.9) | 42 (38.9) | 16 (20.0) |
| Sex | | | |
| Female | 10 (5.3) | 3 (2.8) | 7 (8.6) |
| Male | 179 (94.7) | 105 (97.2) | 74 (91.4) |
| Education level ^a | | | |
| None/Coranic | 99 (52.9) | 30 (27.8) | 69 (87.3) |
| Primary or above | 88 (47.1) | 78 (72.2) | 10 (12.7) |
| Marital status ^a | | | |
| Married/partnership | 146 (77.7) | 89 (83.2) | 57 (70.4) |
| Single | 42 (22.3) | 18 (16.8) | 24 (29.6) |
| Religion ^a | | | |
| Christian | 54 (28.7) | 52 (48.2) | 2 (2.5) |
| Muslim | 128 (68.1) | 53 (49.1) | 75 (93.8) |
| Other/unknown | 6 (3.2) | 3 (2.8) | 3 (3.8) |

| Ethnicity | | | |
|---|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Adja/Ewe/Mina/Kabye/Tem | 44 (23.3) | 40 (37.0) | 4 (4.9) |
| Hausa | 32 (16.9) | 31 (28.7) | 1 (1.2) |
| Fulani | 74 (39.2) | 0 (0.0) | 74 (91.4) |
| Other | 39 (20.6) | 37 (34.3) | 2 (2.5) |
| Years working in occupation^{ac} | | | |
| 0-10 | 66 (37.5) | 30 (31.3) | 36 (45.0) |
| 11-20 | 57 (32.4) | 34 (35.4) | 23 (28.8) |
| 21-70 | 53 (30.1) | 32 (33.3) | 21 (26.3) |
| Role in abattoir^a | | | |
| ONAF employees ^d | na | 14 (14.4) | na |
| Independent butcher | na | 62 (63.9) | na |
| Veterinary inspector | na | 10 (10.3) | na |
| Other | na | 11 (11.3) | na |

191 a Missing values for age n=1 (1 farmworker); education n=1 (1 farmworker); marital status n=1 (1 abattoir worker); religion n=1 (1
192 farmworker); years working in occupation n=13 (12 abattoir workers, 1 farmworker); Role in abattoir n=11
193 b One worker is an animal health worker who works both in abattoirs as well as visiting farms
194 c Age and years working in occupation Pearson correlation coefficient=0.74
195 d ONAF (Office National Des Abattoirs Et Frigorifiques) are abattoir staff who conduct other abattoir activities, such as cleaning down
196 na: not applicable

197 Dairy farm characteristics

198 There were high-levels of livestock ill health on farms, including ruminant abortions and cattle
199 hygromas (Table 2). Fifty-one (98.1%) farms gave bulk milk samples, of which 20 (39.2%, 95% CI 26.6
200 - 53.4%) tested positive for Brucella.

201 **Table 2: Farm characteristics of the 52 participating dairy farms: a) farm composition by animal**
202 **and group, b) husbandry and management practices, c) morbidity and mortality in animals.**

| | | MEDIAN | NUMBER OF FARMS: n/N (%) |
|---|---------------------------|----------------|---------------------------------|
| | | (RANGE) | |
| FARM COMPOSITION BY ANIMAL AND GROUP | | | |
| | Number lactating cows | 10 (1-70) | |
| | Number dry cows | 10 (0-100) | |
| | Number bulls | 3 (1-26) | |
| | Herd size | 42 (17-153) | |
| | Goats present on farm | na | 21/51 (41.2) ^a |
| | Number of goats, if owned | 10 (2-20) | |
| | Sheep present on farm | na | 19/51 (37.3) ^a |
| | Number of sheep, if owned | 8 (1-30) | |
| HUSBANDRY AND MANAGEMENT PRACTICES | | | |
| | Transhumance practiced | | 5/52 (9.6) |
| Mixing with | Never | | 11/52 (21.2) |

| | | |
|---|-----------|---------------------------|
| other herds | Sometimes | 27/52 (51.9) |
| | Regularly | 14/52 (26.9) |
| Herd ever mixes with goats and/or sheep | | 8/52 (15.4) |
| MORBIDITY/MORTALITY IN ANIMALS | | |
| Abortion in cows (in last year) | 1 (1-20) | 33/52 (63.5) |
| Abortion in sheep (in last year) | 0 (0-10) | 11/52 (21.2) |
| Abortion in goats (in last year) | 0 (0-7) | 11/52 (21.2) |
| Hygroma in cattle (at time of visit) | 0 (0-20) | 18/52 (34.6) |
| Deaths in herd (last 30 days) | | 28/52 (53.9) |
| Deaths in young in herd (last 30 days) | 0 (0-7) | 24/52 (46.2) |
| Deaths in adults in herd (last 30 days) | 0 (0-4) | 19/52 (36.5) |
| Deaths in sheep (last 30 days) | | 9/52 (17.3) |
| Deaths in young sheep (last 30 days) | 0 (0-6) | 7/52 (13.5) |
| Deaths in adult sheep (last 30 days) | 0 (0-10) | 8/52 (15.4) |
| Deaths in goats (last 30 days) | | 10/52 (19.2) |
| Deaths in young goats (last 30 days) | 0 (0-8) | 8/52 (15.4) |
| Deaths in adult goats (last 30 days) | 0 (0-20) | 9/52 (17.3) |
| Milk ELISA for Brucella (positive) | na | 20/51 (39.2) ^b |

203 a: 1 farm did not answer this question
 204 b: 1 farm declined to provide a milk sample
 205 na: not applicable

206 Seroprevalence against *Coxiella burnetii* and *Brucella* species (S1 Table)

207 Seven abattoir workers (6.5% (95% CI: 5.1-8.2)) and 11 farmworkers (13.6 % (95% CI: 6.9-24.9)),
 208 were seropositive for *Brucella*. *Coxiella* seroprevalence was higher at 31.5% (95% CI 24.6-39.3) in
 209 abattoir workers and 23.5% (95% CI: 15.4-34.1) in farmworkers. Eight (4.2%) participants were
 210 positive for both pathogens, including six farmworkers.

211 Overall animal contacts at the individual level (S2 Table)

212 Forty-one percent of abattoir workers and 95% of farm workers took part in animal husbandry in the
 213 last year. The majority of both abattoir and farm workers had been involved in cattle slaughter while
 214 more than 30% had slaughtered small ruminants in the past. Of the 79 abattoir workers who took
 215 part in slaughter only 5% wore protective equipment to protect their eyes, hands or mouth during
 216 husbandry and slaughter activities with ruminants and only 4% of farmworkers did so during
 217 husbandry activities with ruminants.

218 **Consumption of dairy and other livestock products (S3 Table)**

219 More than two-thirds of participants consumed cheese (78.3%), milk (76.7%), yoghurt (68.3%), and
220 fermented milk (66.7%). More people ate dairy products made from boiled cow's milk than from
221 unboiled at least once a month (84/189 (44%) and 56/189 (30%) respectively). The majority reported
222 consumption of unboiled (57%) and boiled milk (56%) on at least a monthly basis. History of
223 consumption of milk (12%) or dairy products (16%) from small ruminants was not common.

224 **Risk factors for Brucella seropositivity**

225 No variable was associated with Brucella seropositivity in the abattoir group (Table 3).

226

227 **Table 3: Age-adjusted associations^a between animal-contact risk factors and Brucella and Coxiella seropositivity in abattoir workers**

| | | Coxiella burnetii | | | Brucella | | |
|--|------------|-------------------------|------------------|----------|-------------------------|-------------------|----------|
| | | Number seropositive (%) | OR (95% CI) | p value* | Number seropositive (%) | OR (95% CI) | p value* |
| ONAF activity in abattoir ^b | | | | | | | |
| | No | 28/91 (30.8) | | | 5/91 (5.5) | | |
| | Yes | 6/16 (37.5) | 1.22 (0.39-3.76) | 0.73 | 2/16 (12.5) | 2.31 (0.39-13.66) | 0.36 |
| Slaughter activity in abattoir - all species ^b | | | | | | | |
| | No | 32/97 (33.0) | | | 7/97 (7.2) | | |
| | Yes | 2/10 (20.0) | 0.50 (0.10-2.51) | 0.4 | 0/10 (0) | na | na |
| Any butchery/skinning in abattoir - all species ^b | | | | | | | |
| | No | 11/44 (25.0) | | | 2/44 (4.6) | | |
| | Yes | 23/63 (36.5) | 1.81 (0.76-4.30) | 0.18 | 5/63 (7.9) | 1.87 (0.35-10.18) | 0.47 |
| Any butchery/skinning in abattoir - sheep/goats ^b | | | | | | | |
| | No | 16/60 (26.7) | | | 5/60 (8.3) | | |
| | Yes | 13/28(46.4) | 2.30 (0.89-5.92) | 0.09 | 1/28 (3.6) | 0.40 (0.04-3.60) | 0.41 |
| Years working in abattoir ^b | | | | | | | |
| | 0-15 years | 14/50 (28.0) | | | 3/50 (6.0) | | |
| | 16+ years | 17/45 (37.8) | 1.23 (0.39-3.82) | 0.72 | 3/45 (6.7) | 0.61 (0.07-5.10) | 0.65 |
| Any husbandry activities with cattle ^b | | | | | | | |
| | Never | 23/75 (30.7) | | | 6/75 (8.0) | | |
| | Sometimes | 8/25 (32.0) | 1.14 (0.42-3.05) | 0.8 | 1/25 (4.0) | 0.50 (0.06-4.40) | 0.53 |
| Any husbandry activities with sheep/goats ^b | | | | | | | |
| | Never | 22/81 (27.2) | | | 7/81 (8.6) | | |

| | | | | | | |
|-----------|-------------|------------------|------|----------|----|----|
| Sometimes | 9/19 (47.4) | 2.47 (0.88-6.96) | 0.09 | 0/19 (0) | na | na |
|-----------|-------------|------------------|------|----------|----|----|

228 *P-values calculated from Wald test

229 a Model is adjusted for age only, using logistic regression.

230 b Missing values for ONAF activity in abattoir n=1; Slaughter activity in abattoir - all species n=1; Any butchery/skinning in abattoir - all species n=1; Any butchery/skinning in abattoir - sheep/goats

231 n=20; Years working in abattoir n=13; Any husbandry activities with cattle n=8; Any husbandry activities with sheep/goats n=8

232 There was some evidence that animal ill health on farms was associated with Brucella seropositivity
233 in farmworkers (abortion in goats OR 5.22, 95% CI: 1.01-26.99, p=0.05; death of young cattle OR 6.42
234 95% CI: 0.72-57.40, p=0.1; death of young goats OR 5.81 95%CI: 1.0-33.81, p=0.05) (Table 4). The
235 odds of human seropositivity were five times higher on farms with a positive milk test than those
236 with a negative test (OR 5.15, 95% CI: 1.21-21.97, p=0.03).

237

Table 4: Age-adjusted associations^a between farm-level and animal husbandry risk factors and *Brucella* and *Coxiella* seropositivity in farmworkers

| | <i>Coxiella burnetii</i> | | | <i>Brucella</i> | | |
|--------------------------------|--------------------------|------------------|----------|-------------------------|-------------------|----------|
| | Number seropositive (%) | OR (95% CI) | p value* | Number seropositive (%) | OR (95% CI) | p value* |
| Farm-level variables | | | | | | |
| Number lactating cows | | | | | | |
| <=median | 10/53 (18.9) | | | 5/53 (9.4) | | |
| >median | 9/27 (33.3) | 2.14 (0.76-6.02) | 0.15 | 6/27 (22.2) | 2.77 (0.64-11.90) | 0.17 |
| Sheep or not | | | | | | |
| none | 14/49 (28.6) | | | 5/49 (10.2) | | |
| some | 3/27 (11.1) | 0.27 (0.07-1.13) | 0.07 | 6/27 (22.2) | 2.61 (0.54-12.59) | 0.23 |
| Goat or not | | | | | | |
| none | 11/44 (25.0) | | | 5/44 (11.4) | | |
| some | 6/34 (17.7) | 0.66 (0.22-1.96) | 0.45 | 6/34 (17.7) | 1.74 (0.40-7.53) | 0.46 |
| Herd mixes with other herds | | | | | | |
| No | 4/17 (23.5) | | | 1/17 (5.9) | | |
| Yes | 15/64 (23.4) | 0.91 (0.29-2.89) | 0.87 | 10/64 (15.6) | 2.79 (0.33-23.19) | 0.34 |
| Presence of abortions in cows | | | | | | |
| No | 6/32 (18.8) | | | 2/32 (6.3) | | |
| Yes | 13/49 (26.5) | 1.60 (0.56-4.60) | 0.38 | 9/49 (18.4) | 2.86 (0.53-15.34) | 0.22 |
| Presence of abortions in sheep | | | | | | |
| No | 16/64 (25.0) | | | 7/64 (10.9) | | |
| Yes | 3/17 (17.7) | 0.66 (0.19-2.29) | 0.51 | 4/17 (23.5) | 2.00 (0.48-8.39) | 0.35 |
| Presence of abortions in goats | | | | | | |
| No | 15/68 (22.1) | | | 6/68 (8.8) | | |
| Yes | 4/13 (30.8) | 1.73 (0.46-6.57) | 0.42 | 5/13 (38.5) | 5.22 (1.01-26.99) | 0.05 |
| Deaths of young in herd | | | | | | |
| No | 9/46 (19.6) | | | 2/46 (4.4) | | |
| Yes | 10/35 (28.6) | 1.76 (0.59-5.21) | 0.31 | 9/35 (25.7) | 6.42 (0.72-57.40) | 0.1 |

| | | | | | | | |
|--|--------------|------------------|------|-------------|-------------------|------|--|
| Deaths of young sheep | | | | | | | |
| No | 17/70 (24.3) | | | 8/70 (11.4) | | | |
| Yes | 2/11 (18.2) | 0.73 (0.21-2.59) | 0.63 | 3/11 (27.3) | 2.13 (0.45-10.02) | 0.34 | |
| Deaths of young goats | | | | | | | |
| No | 16/72 (22.2) | | | 7/72 (9.7) | | | |
| Yes | 3/9 (33.3) | 1.97 (0.49-7.97) | 0.34 | 4/9 (44.4) | 5.81 (1.0-33.81) | 0.05 | |
| Presence of hygroma in cattle ^b | | | | | | | |
| None | na | | | 5/52 (9.6) | | | |
| Some | na | | | 6/29 (20.7) | 2.38 (0.55-10.28) | 0.25 | |
| Brucella ELISA milk test | | | | | | | |
| Negative | na | | | 3/46 (6.5) | | | |
| Positive | na | | | 8/33 (24.2) | 5.15 (1.21-21.97) | 0.03 | |

Animal contact

| | | | | | | | |
|---|--------------|------------------|------|--------------|-------------------|------|--|
| Years working on farm | | | | | | | |
| <=median | 10/42 (23.8) | | | 6/42 (14.3) | | | |
| >median | 9/38 (23.7) | 0.88 (0.29-2.67) | 0.82 | 5/38 (13.2) | 1.55 (0.32-7.44) | 0.58 | |
| Frequency of milking cattle | | | | | | | |
| Less than daily | 5/17 (29.4) | | | 1/17 (5.9) | | | |
| Daily | 14/63 (22.2) | 0.65 (0.19-2.30) | 0.51 | 10/63 (15.9) | 2.32 (0.22-24.17) | 0.48 | |
| Assisting with birthing of cattle | | | | | | | |
| Never | 4/17 (23.5) | | | 1/17 (5.9) | | | |
| Sometimes | 15/63 (23.8) | 0.87 (0.27-2.77) | 0.82 | 10/63 (15.9) | 4.05 (0.51-32.12) | 0.19 | |
| Assisting with abortion of cattle | | | | | | | |
| Never | 7/30 (23.3) | | | 2/30 (6.7) | | | |
| Sometimes | 12/50 (24.0) | 0.96 (0.37-2.50) | 0.94 | 9/50 (18.0) | 3.66 (0.85-15.84) | 0.08 | |
| Frequency of other activities with cattle including handling dung | | | | | | | |
| Less than daily | 6/19 (31.6) | | | 1/19 (5.3) | | | |
| Daily | 13/61 (21.3) | 0.56 (0.16-1.91) | 0.35 | 10/61 (16.4) | 2.53 (0.31-20.94) | 0.39 | |

| | | | | | | | |
|---|-----------|--------------|------------------|------|-------------|------------------|-------|
| Any husbandry activities with sheep/goats | | | | | | | |
| | Never | 13/49 (26.5) | | | 4/49 (8.2) | | |
| | Sometimes | 6/31 (19.4) | 0.58 (0.17-1.95) | 0.38 | 7/31 (22.6) | 3.9 (0.81-19.13) | 0.09 |
| Any cattle slaughter activities | | | | | | | |
| | Never | 9/34 (26.5) | | | 8/34 (23.5) | | |
| | Sometimes | 10/44 (22.7) | 0.71 (0.27-1.89) | 0.5 | 3/44 (6.8) | 0.26 (0.07-1.01) | 0.051 |
| Any sheep/goat slaughter activities | | | | | | | |
| | Never | 14/54 (25.9) | | | 8/54 (14.8) | | |
| | Sometimes | 5/24 (20.8) | 0.71 (0.22-2.32) | 0.57 | 3/24 (12.5) | 0.90 (0.23-3.52) | 0.89 |

239

240 *P-values calculated from Wald test

241 a Model is adjusted for age only, using logistic regression with clustered robust standard errors where individual farm is the cluster. As age of a participant and years working in their occupation were
 242 strongly correlated it was considered that adjusting for age will also largely account for confounding by the number of years working in these occupations.

243 b Hygroma reported by farmworkers, not diagnosed by an animal health worker

244

245 There was weak evidence that participating in small ruminant husbandry was associated with nearly
246 four times higher odds of Brucella seropositivity (OR 3.9 95% CI 0.81-19.13, p=0.09), as did assisting
247 with cattle abortions (OR 3.66, 95%CI: 0.85-15.84, p=0.08).

248 Farmworkers had nearly twice the odds of being seropositive compared to abattoir workers (OR
249 1.93, 95% CI: 0.94-3.93, p=0.07). Consuming unboiled milk on a monthly basis or more was
250 associated with higher odds of Brucella seropositivity (OR 3.79, 95% CI: 2.34-6.13, p<0.001) (Table 5).

251

252 **Table 5: Associations between socio-demographic and dairy consumption factors and seropositivity to the two pathogens *Brucella* species and *Coxiella burnetii* in all participants^a**

| | | Coxiella burnetii | | | Brucella | | |
|--|-------------------|---------------------|------------------|----------|---------------------|------------------|----------|
| | | Number positive (%) | OR (95% CI) | p value* | Number positive (%) | OR (95% CI) | p value* |
| Education level | None/coranic | 25/99 (25.3) | | | 14/99 (14.1) | | |
| | Primary or above | 28/89 (31.5) | 1.11 (0.64-1.94) | 0.71 | 4/89 (4.5) | 0.34 (0.19-0.61) | <0.001 |
| Site type | Abattoir | 34/108 (31.5) | | | 7/108 (6.5) | | |
| | Farm | 19/81 (23.5) | 0.76 (0.45-1.29) | 0.32 | 11/81 (13.6) | 1.93 (0.94-3.93) | 0.07 |
| Consume fermented milk including Caille | no | 16/63 (25.4) | | | 4/63 (6.4) | | |
| | yes | 37/126 (29.4) | 1.64 (1.22-2.19) | 0.001 | 14/126 (11.1) | 1.29 (0.58-2.90) | 0.53 |
| Consume cheese | no | 9/41 (22.0) | | | 3/41 (7.3) | | |
| | yes | 44/148 (29.7) | 1.69 (0.98-2.92) | 0.06 | 15/148 (10.1) | 1.27 (0.47-3.38) | 0.64 |
| Consume yoghurt | no | 15/60 (25.0) | | | 5/60 (8.3) | | |
| | yes | 38/129 (29.5) | 1.30 (0.83-2.04) | 0.25 | 13/129 (10.1) | 1.32 (0.52-3.36) | 0.56 |
| Consume unboiled cows dairy products | Less than monthly | 38/133 (28.6) | | | 12/133 (9.0) | | |
| | At least monthly | 15/56 (26.8) | 1.09 (0.47-2.53) | 0.83 | 6/56 (10.7) | 0.91 (0.29-2.88) | 0.88 |
| Consume unboiled cows milk | Less than monthly | 24/81 (29.6) | | | 3/81 (3.7) | | |
| | At least monthly | 29/108 (26.9) | 1.12 (0.8-1.58) | 0.5 | 15/108 (13.9) | 3.79 (2.34-6.13) | <0.001 |
| Frequency of consuming any cows milk | Less than monthly | 17/54 (31.5) | | | 2/54 (3.7) | | |
| | Monthly | 36/135 (26.7) | 0.97 (0.74-1.28) | 0.74 | 16/135 (11.9) | 2.63 (1.97-3.49) | <0.001 |
| Consume kilichi | Less than monthly | 26/98 (26.5) | | | 12/98 (12.2) | | |
| | At least monthly | 26/90 (28.9) | 1.03 (0.66-1.61) | 0.89 | 6/90 (6.7) | 0.57 (0.22-1.46) | 0.24 |
| Consume any milk/dairy from sheep/goats | No | 27/88 (30.7) | | | 6/88 (6.8) | | |
| | Yes | 26/101 (25.7) | 0.76 (0.52-1.11) | 0.16 | 12/101 (11.9) | 0.48 (0.22-1.05) | 0.07 |

253

254

255

256

* P-values calculated from Wald test

^a Model is adjusted for age and type of site of work (abattoir or farm), using logistic regression with clustered robust standard errors where site of work is the cluster. No interaction was observed between the site type of participants and any of the risk factors examined

257 **Risk factors for Coxiella seropositivity**

258 Adjusting for age and considering farm-level clustering, there was no evidence of an association with
259 any livestock husbandry or livestock health variable in farmworkers (Table 4).

260 After adjusting for age only, there was no evidence that abattoir activities were associated with
261 seropositivity, other than weak evidence of an association with butchery/skinning of small ruminants
262 (p=0.09) or in participating in any husbandry with sheep/goats (OR 2.47, 95% CI 0.88-6.96, p=0.09)
263 (Table 3).

264 The odds of Coxiella seropositivity in those who consumed fermented milk (OR 1.59, 95% CI: 1.26-
265 2.00, p<0.001) and in those who consumed cheese (OR 1.70, 95% CI: 0.97-2.98, p=0.07) were greater
266 than in those who did not when looking at all participants in a multivariable model considering dairy
267 product consumption (Table 6).

268 **Table 6: Multivariable^a model for consumption variables associated with Coxiella seropositivity in all**
269 **participants**

| Variable | Adjusted OR (95% CI) | p-value* |
|--|----------------------|----------|
| Consume fermented milk including Caille | | |
| No | 1 | |
| Yes | 1.59 (1.26-2.00) | <0.001 |
| Consume cheese | | |
| No | 1 | |
| Yes | 1.70 (0.97-2.98) | 0.066 |
| Frequency of consuming any cow's milk | | |
| Less than monthly/never | 1 | |
| Monthly | 0.73 (0.54-0.98) | 0.002 |
| Ever consumed sheep/goat's milk or dairy products | | |
| No | 1 | |
| Yes | 0.75 (0.53-1.06) | 0.099 |
| Type of site | | |
| Abattoir | 1 | |
| Farm | 0.66 (0.37-1.19) | 0.17 |

270 *P-values calculated from Wald test
271 a Logistic regression model includes variables Consumption of fermented milk including Caille, Consumption of cheese, Frequency of
272 consuming any cow's milk, Ever consumed sheep/goat's milk or dairy products, and the *a priori* variables age and type of site and
273 clustered robust standard errors where site of work is the cluster No interaction between exposure variables and whether a worker's site
274 of work was an abattoir or farm was seen.
275

276 **Fever history and related behaviours in all workers**

277 Fever in the last year was commonly reported in the livestock workers (149/188, 79.3%) (S4 Table).
278 Participants reporting fever in the last month were three times more likely to be *Brucella*
279 seropositive (OR 3.63, 95% CI 1.21-10.90, $p=0.014$) and no fever-related variable was associated with
280 *Coxiella* seropositivity. The majority of participants who had experienced fever in the last year
281 received no testing (82/141) or only for malaria (59/141). Antimalarials (76/142) and antibiotics
282 (55/142) were commonly taken as treatment. Those seropositive for *Brucella* were highly likely to
283 have taken antimalarials during a fever in the last year (68.8%) compared to those who were
284 seronegative (51.6%) ($p=0.044$).

285 **Discussion**

286 We found, through a cross-sectional study of livestock workers, that *Brucella* and *Coxiella burnetii*
287 were present concurrently in people with occupational exposure in peri-urban Lomé with overall
288 human seroprevalences of 9.5% and 28% respectively. Seroprevalence varied with site type, with a
289 higher seroprevalence to *Brucella* on farms (13.6% compared to 6.5% in abattoirs) and to *C. burnetii*
290 in abattoir workers (31.5% compared to 23.5% on farms). Bulk milk samples from associated cattle
291 herds found that 39% (95% CI 27-53%) of farms also had *Brucella*-positive milk samples, lower than a
292 previous study in Lomé's peri-urban herds in 2017(62%, 95%CI 55-69%) [12]. For both diseases there
293 was an association with the consumption of dairy products (unboiled milk in the case of *Brucella* and
294 fermented milk and cheese in the case of Q fever), and ruminant husbandry (small ruminant
295 husbandry and assisting with cattle abortion in farmworkers for *Brucella*, and small ruminant
296 husbandry in abattoir workers for Q fever). The odds of Brucellosis seropositivity in farmworkers was
297 also increased with morbidity/mortality of owned ruminants (death of young cattle and goats and
298 abortion in goats). Considering this, the widespread ill-health in livestock including death of young
299 animals and abortions which are consistent with Brucellosis/Coxiellosis, consumption of unboiled
300 milk and dairy products, and lack of PPE usage is of concern.

301 Heterogenous incidence of both diseases in human and animal populations, both between and
302 within low and middle income countries, and over time, means that it is difficult to extrapolate from
303 previous studies [7,14]. Our findings on *Brucella* seroprevalence were in contrast to a 2013 study in
304 Northern Togo which found a seroprevalence of 2.4% in Fulani villagers, a comparable population to
305 the farm workers in this study who had a seroprevalence of 13.6% [13]. This may be due to a lower
306 prevalence in animals (9.2% in village cattle, 7.3% in transhumant cattle and 0% in small ruminants)
307 though these results are from individual serology rather than bulk milk sampling [13]. The higher
308 seroprevalence to *Coxiella burnetii* we note is aligned with the same study which found more than
309 ten times the prevalence against *Coxiella* compared to *Brucella* in both Fulani and non-Fulani groups
310 [13]. Similar, though not as marked, findings were seen in studies in Ethiopia, and Kenya [15,16,18].
311 Despite a higher seroprevalence of *Coxiella burnetii* in many African contexts, Brucellosis is often
312 given greater attention by health agencies and research funders [19,20]. Q fever can have severe
313 health sequelae, being responsible for up to 5% of endocarditis cases globally, and if this disparity in
314 seroprevalence is reflected in clinical burden then it is important to reassess Q fever as a priority
315 [21].

316 Q fever had a seroprevalence of 31.5% in the abattoir workers, despite the lack of abattoir-specific
317 activities being associated with seropositivity. This was in line with de Boni et al who found no
318 specific abattoir activity was a risk factor and hypothesised that workers were exposed when the
319 bacterium was aerosolized during slaughterhouse activities [22]. Aerosols are a major transmission
320 mode for *Coxiella burnetii* and this abattoir with its lack of ventilation provides ideal conditions for
321 exposure of employees regardless of role [9]. The finding that Dutch cull workers were at greater risk
322 of seroconverting if they worked indoors rather than outdoors supports this [23].

323 For both diseases infected livestock are the main reservoir, shedding bacteria in birth and abortion
324 materials, milk, faeces, and urine [8,9]. Close contact with ruminants has been shown to be

325 associated with seropositivity in Brucellosis and Q fever, as was seen in our study in those who
326 participated in small ruminant husbandry and assisting with cattle abortions [24,25].

327 Abortion, birth of weak offspring and death of neonatal animals are symptoms of ruminant
328 Brucellosis and Coxiellosis [26,27]. We demonstrated associations between human Brucella
329 seropositivity and livestock ill-health markers (abortion in goats, and the death of young cattle on
330 farm). Literature on this is limited and largely confined to animal abortion [28]. Animal-health
331 variables such as abortion, and mortality in neonatal animals, may be indicators of herd/flock
332 infection, and could be monitored using syndromic surveillance to mitigate risk to workers and
333 livelihood losses. The association between Brucella seropositivity with presence of abortion in goats,
334 and with participating in small ruminant husbandry is of particular interest as we know *B.melitensis*
335 is circulating in ruminants in this region (personal communication). This highlights the complexity of
336 transmission amongst species and to humans and the need for multi-species studies.

337 This population consumed a high-level of bovine dairy products, including those sourced from
338 unboiled milk. We found both consuming fermented milk and cheese were associated with *Coxiella*
339 *burnetii* seropositivity. A Latvian study published in 2021 found a high prevalence of *C.burnetii* DNA
340 in these products, showing they are viable transmission vehicles [29]. Previously dairy products were
341 considered to rarely contribute to *C.burnetii* transmission but the evidence is mixed with some
342 studies finding an association [2,13,30].

343 Regular unboiled milk consumption increased the odds of Brucella seropositivity. Multiple studies
344 have found consumption of unpasteurised milk to be a risk factor [31-33]. Consumption of small
345 ruminant dairy products has also been shown to be a risk factor for Brucellosis [34,35]. However,
346 consumption of small ruminant dairy products isn't culturally common in Togo, despite large
347 numbers of these species, and those who did consume these weren't found to have increased odds
348 of seropositivity.

349 Sampling frames for occupational groups in LICs are unlikely to pre-exist and without a
350 comprehensive census sampling a representative group is a challenge. There are also practical
351 limitations in carrying out a questionnaire-based survey in occupational groups with limited time for
352 participation. Dean et al regarded a lack of detailed information on exposures as a limitation in
353 thoroughly assessing risk [13]. While our questionnaire allowed more nuanced examination of risk
354 factors it also limited the sample size. For this reason we could not perform certain analyses such as
355 adjusting for other exposures of interest, including other animal husbandry and dairy consumption
356 variables, in multivariable analysis for *Brucella* seropositivity.

357 There is a paucity of studies looking at linked animal and human data. Here we were able to link
358 human data on Brucellosis to milk sourced from associated cattle to show an association between
359 presence of a positive bulk milk sample and human seropositivity. Bulk milk sampling is relatively
360 affordable and easy and could be utilised in regular herd surveillance. To expand on this study,
361 future studies which conduct direct multi-species sampling including small ruminants with, in the
362 case of *Brucella*, speciation of any isolated bacteria would improve understanding of how the
363 organisms are cycling through the ecosystem.

364 There were low levels of PPE use in both groups. Many studies, though not all, have found PPE to be
365 beneficial in protecting against both diseases [36,37]. PPE use should be recommended, particularly
366 adequate masks (P2/N95) in abattoir areas where aerosols are produced [38].

367 This population is affected by both zoonoses, and there is a need for preventative measures.
368 Implementation should involve at-risk workers, trusted community leaders, health practitioners and
369 policymakers using culturally sensitive, pragmatic and economically feasible approaches. Our study
370 highlights the need for increased clinician awareness about zoonoses, and for relevant history taking
371 including occupation, which might raise clinical suspicion, particularly as malaria prevalence declines
372 [39]. Seropositive participants commonly experienced febrile disease though no symptoms were
373 found to be associated, and this non-specific clinical picture hinders diagnosis by clinicians. Many

374 seropositive participants were only tested for malaria and treated with antimalarials and non-
375 specific antibiotics, similar to other studies [40, 41]. In order to improve diagnosis healthworkers
376 require resources to test and treat non-malarial illnesses, both to improve clinical outcomes and to
377 reduce inappropriate prescribing which contributes to selection for antimicrobial resistance.

378 The need for complex interventions involving interdisciplinary public health teams is exacerbated in
379 zoonoses [19]. However, integrated control of multiple zoonotic diseases, such as Q fever and
380 Brucellosis, through interventions targeting both the animal and human populations could have a
381 dual benefit through improving animal health and livelihoods, while simultaneously decreasing
382 human disease, to alleviate the cycle of poverty. Such integrated approaches would be more cost-
383 effective by optimising resource use, especially when working with marginalised communities who
384 are isolated from public services [42]. The findings of our study provide evidence which can be used
385 to tailor such public health interventions against both Brucella and Q fever in occupational groups
386 working with livestock.

387

388 **Acknowledgements**

389 We thank all the livestock workers and abattoir workers from the municipal abattoir in Lomé who
390 participated in this study, and community leaders who facilitated this study. This study was part of a
391 larger UKRI Zoonosis in Emerging Livestock Systems project and we thank the PI of this study Javier
392 Guitian, as well as Ayayi Akakpo and Imadidden Musallam for facilitating the study. We thank
393 Wemboo Afiwavi Halatoko, Koffi Akolly, Zoulkarneiri Issa, Adjaho Komla Koba and Afeignidou Telou
394 at the INH and Emilie Go-Maró, Rufine Yempab, and Komlan Mawufemo Adjabli at the Department
395 de l'Élevage who were involved in processing, testing and storage of samples. Our appreciation goes
396 to the zootechnicians of the Department de l'Élevage Koffivi Amewou, Kom Agbéssi Adjessoklou and
397 Dossou Zanou who facilitated all visits to dairy farms. Thanks also go to the field team; Kodjo
398 Afangbegnon, Robertine Amoussou and Kocou Jean-Paul Amoussou.

399

400 **References**

- 401 1. Roth F, Zinsstag J, Orkhon D, Chimed-Ochir G, Hutton G, Cosivi O, et al. Human health benefits from
402 livestock vaccination for brucellosis: Case study. *Bulletin of the World health Organization*. 2003;81(12):867–
403 76.
- 404 2. Njeru J, Henning K, Pletz MW, Heller R, Forstner C, Kariuki S, et al. Febrile patients admitted to remote
405 hospitals in Northeastern Kenya : seroprevalence , risk factors and a clinical prediction tool for Q-Fever. *BMC*
406 *Infectious Diseases*. 2016;16:1–15.
- 407 3. Tumwine G, Matovu E, Kabasa JD, Owiny DO, Majalija S. Human brucellosis: sero-prevalence and
408 associated risk factors in agro-pastoral communities of Kiboga District, Central Uganda. *BMC Public Health*.
409 2015;15(1):1-8
- 410 4. Bouley AJ, Biggs HM, Stoddard RA, Morrissey AB, Bartlett JA, Afwamba IA, et al. Brucellosis among
411 hospitalized febrile patients in northern Tanzania. *Am J Trop Med Hyg*. 2012;87(6):1105–11.
- 412 5. Adetunji SA, Ramirez G, Foster MJ, Arenas-Gamboa AM. A systematic review and meta-analysis of the
413 prevalence of osteoarticular brucellosis. *PLoS Negl Trop Dis*. 2019;13(1):e0007112.
- 414 6. Ezama A, Gonzalez JP, Majalija S, Bajunirwe F. Assessing short evolution brucellosis in a highly brucella
415 endemic cattle keeping population of Western Uganda: A complementary use of Rose Bengal test and IgM
416 rapid diagnostic test. *BMC Public Health*. 2018;18(1):1–5.
- 417 7. Vanderburg S, Rubach MP, Halliday JEB, Cleaveland S, Reddy EA, Crump JA. Epidemiology of *Coxiella*
418 *burnetii* Infection in Africa: A OneHealth Systematic Review. *PLoS Negl Trop Dis*. 2014;8(4): e2787.
- 419 8. Olsen SC, Palmer M V. Advancement of Knowledge of *Brucella* Over the Past 50 Years. *Vet Pathol*.
420 2014;51(6):1076–89.
- 421 9. Maurin M, Raoult D. Q Fever. *Clin Microbiol Rev*. 1999;12(4):518–53.
- 422 10. African Development Bank Group. Togo 2016-2020 Country Strategy Paper. Abidjan: African
423 Development Bank group, 2016 September.19p

- 424 11. Akakpo AJ, Têko-Agbo A, Koné P. The impact of brucellosis on the economy and public health in
425 Africa. Compendium of technical items presented to the OIE World Assembly of Delegates or to OIE Regional
426 Commissions. Paris: OIE (World Organisation for Animal Health) 2009. P.71-84
- 427 12. Musallam I, Ndour AP, Yempabou D, Ngong CAC, Dzousse MF, Mouiche-Mouliom MM, et al.
428 Brucellosis in dairy herds: A public health concern in the milk supply chains of West and Central Africa. *Acta*
429 *Trop.* 2019; 197: 105042.
- 430 13. Dean AS, Bonfoh B, Kulo AE, Boukaya GA, Amidou M, Hattendorf J, et al. Epidemiology of Brucellosis
431 and Q Fever in Linked Human and Animal Populations in Northern Togo. *PLoS One.* 2013;8(8): e71501.
- 432 14. Ducrotoy M, Bertu WJ, Matope G, Cadmus S, Conde-Álvarez R, Gusi AM, et al. Brucellosis in Sub-
433 Saharan Africa: Current challenges for management, diagnosis and control. *Acta Trop.* 2017; 165:179–93.
- 434 15. Nakeel MJ, Arimi SM, Kitale P, Nduhiu G, Njenga JM, Wabacha JK. A sero-epidemiological survey of
435 brucellosis, Q-fever and leptospirosis in livestock and humans and associated risk factors in kajiado county-
436 Kenya. *J Trop Dis.* 2016;4(3):8.
- 437 16. Fèvre EM, de Glanville WA, Thomas LF, Cook EAJ, Kariuki S, Wamae CN. An integrated study of human
438 and animal infectious disease in the Lake Victoria crescent small-holder crop-livestock production system,
439 Kenya. *BMC Infect Dis.* 2017;17(1):1-14.
- 440 17. Díaz R, Casanova A, Ariza J, Moriyón I. The rose Bengal test in human brucellosis: A neglected test for the
441 diagnosis of a neglected disease. *PLoS Negl Trop Dis.* 2011;5(4): e950
- 442 18. Ibrahim M, Schelling E, Zinsstag J, Hattendorf J, Andargie E, Tschopp R. Sero-prevalence of brucellosis,
443 Q-fever and Rift Valley fever in humans and livestock in Somali region, Ethiopia. *PLoS Negl Trop Dis.*
444 2021;15(1): e0008100
- 445 19. TDR Disease Reference Group on Zoonoses and Marginalized Infectious Diseases of Poverty., World
446 Health Organization. Research priorities for zoonoses and marginalized infections : technical report of the TDR
447 Disease Reference Group on Zoonoses and Marginalized Infectious Diseases of Poverty. Geneva: WHO press,
448 2012. 136p.

- 449 20. Welburn SC, Beange I, Ducrotoy MJ, Okello AL. The neglected zoonoses—the case for integrated
450 control and advocacy. *Clin Microbiol Infect.* 2015;21(5):433–43.
- 451 21. Deyell MW, Chiu B, Ross DB, Alvarez N. Q fever endocarditis: A case report and review of the
452 literature. *Can J Cardiol.* 2006;22(9):781–5.
- 453 22. De Boni L, Mall S, Msimang V, de Voux A, Rossouw J, Freaun J. Exposure of South African Abattoir
454 Workers to *Coxiella burnetii*. *Trop Med Infect Dis.* 2022;7(2):28
- 455 23. Whelan J, Schimmer B, Schneeberger P, Meekelenkamp J, Ijff A, van der Hoek W, et al. Q fever among
456 culling workers, the Netherlands, 2009-2010. *Emerg Infect Dis.* 2011;17(9):1719–23.
- 457 24. McDermott JJ, Arimi SM. Brucellosis in sub-Saharan Africa: Epidemiology, control and impact. *Vet*
458 *Microbiol.* 2002;90(1–4):111–34.
- 459 25. Rahaman MR, Milazzo A, Marshall H, Bi P. Is a One Health Approach Utilized for Q Fever Control? A
460 Comprehensive Literature Review. *Int J Environ Res Public Heal.* 2019;16(5):730.
- 461 26. Megid J, Mathias LA, Robles CA. Clinical Manifestations of Brucellosis in Domestic Animals and
462 Humans. *Open Vet Sci J.* 2010;4:119–26.
- 463 27. Njeru J, Henning K, Pletz MW, Heller R, Neubauer H. Q fever is an old and neglected zoonotic disease
464 in Kenya: A systematic review. *BMC Public Health.* 2016;16(1):1–8.
- 465 28. John K, Fitzpatrick J, French N, Kazwala R, Kambarage D, Mfinanga GS, et al. Quantifying risk factors
466 for human brucellosis in Rural Northern Tanzania. *PLoS One.* 2010;5(4): e9968.
- 467 29. Valkovska L, Mališevs A, Kovaļenko K, Bērziņš A, Grantiņa-Ieviņa L. *Coxiella burnetii* DNA in milk, milk
468 products, and fermented dairy products . *J Vet Res.* 2021;65(4):441–7.
- 469 30. Eldin C, Mélenotte C, Mediannikov O, Ghigo E, Million M. From Q Fever to *Coxiella burnetii* Infection :
470 a Paradigm Change. *Clinical microbiology reviews.* 2017;30(1):115–90.
- 471 31. El Kholy AA, Gomaa HE, Anany MG El, Abd E, Rasheed E. Diagnosis of human brucellosis in Egypt by
472 polymerase chain reaction. *East Mediterr Heal J.* 2009;15(5): 1068-1074.

- 473 32. Ahmed MO, Elmeshri SE, Abuzweda AR, Blauo M, Abouzeed YM, Ibrahim A, et al. Seroprevalence of
474 brucellosis in animals and human populations in the western mountains region in Libya, December 2006-
475 January 2008. *Euro Surveill.* 2010;15(30):19625.
- 476 33. Muturi M, Bitek A, Mwatondo A, Osoro E, Marwanga D, Gura Z, et al. Risk factors for human
477 brucellosis among a pastoralist community in South-West Kenya, 2015. *BMC Res Notes.* 2018;11(1):1–6.
- 478 34. Mangtani P, Berry I, Beauvais W, Holt HR, Kulashri A, Bharti S, et al. The prevalence and risk factors for
479 human *Brucella* species infection in a cross-sectional survey of a rural population in Punjab, India. *Trans R Soc*
480 *Trop Med Hyg.* 2020;114(4):255–63.
- 481 35. Abo-Shehada MN, Abu-Halaweh M. Risk factors for human brucellosis in northern Jordan. *Eastern*
482 *Mediterranean Health Journal,* 2013; 19 (2): 135-140
- 483 36. Igawe PB, Okolocha E, Kia GS, Irmiya IB, Balogun MS, Nguku P. Seroprevalence of brucellosis and
484 associated risk factors among abattoir workers in Bauchi State, Nigeria. *Pan Afr Med J.* 2020;35(1).
- 485 37. Esmaeili S, Naddaf SR, Pourhossein B, Shahraki AH, Amiri FB, Gouya MM, et al. Seroprevalence of
486 Brucellosis, Leptospirosis, and Q Fever among Butchers and Slaughterhouse Workers in South-Eastern Iran.
487 *PLoS One.* 2016;11(1): e0144953.
- 488 38. NSW Ministry of Health. Q fever prevention - how to fit a P2 mask.
489 <https://www.health.nsw.gov.au/Infectious/factsheets/Factsheets/qfever-p2-mask.pdf> [Accessed 23 July 2024].
- 490 39. WHO. World malaria report 2023. 2023. [https://www.who.int/teams/global-malaria-](https://www.who.int/teams/global-malaria-programme/reports/world-malaria-report-2023)
491 [programme/reports/world-malaria-report-2023](https://www.who.int/teams/global-malaria-programme/reports/world-malaria-report-2023) [Accessed 23 July 2024]
- 492 40. Bouley AJ, Biggs HM, Stoddard RA, Morrissey AB, Bartlett JA, Afwamba IA, et al. Brucellosis among
493 Hospitalized Febrile Patients in Northern Tanzania. *Am J Trop Med Hyg.* 2012;87(6):1105.
- 494 41. Njeru J, Melzer F, Wareth G, El-Adawy H, Henning K, Pletz MW, et al. Human brucellosis in febrile
495 patients seeking treatment at remote hospitals, northeastern Kenya, 2014–2015. *Emerg Infect Dis.*
496 2016;22(12):2160–4.

497 42. Welburn SC, Beange I, Ducrotoy MJ, Okello AL. The neglected zoonoses--the case for integrated
498 control and advocacy. Clin Microbiol Infect. 2015;21(5):433–43.

499

500 **Supporting Information captions**

501 S1 Table: Serological results of each test for *Brucella* species and *Coxiella burnetii*

502 S2 Table: Livestock contact, including by site of work

503 S3 Table: Dairy product and kilichi consumption, including by site of work

504 S4 Table: Health and health seeking behaviours in participants in the previous 12 months

505