



AGRICULTURE-ASSOCIATED DISEASES: ADAPTING AGRICULTURE TO IMPROVE HUMAN HEALTH

John McDermott and Delia Grace

Agriculture is critical for human welfare, providing food, employment, income, and assets. In the past, agricultural research and development largely focused on improving production, productivity, and profitability of agricultural enterprises. Nutrition and other benefits of agriculture were not always optimized, while the negative impacts on health, well-being, and the environment were often ignored. This was especially problematic for livestock systems, with especially complex negative and positive impacts on human health and well-being.

An important negative effect of agricultural intensification is disease. Highly pathogenic avian influenza (HPAI) is a notorious example of a disease that was fostered by intensified agricultural production and spread through lengthened poultry value chains and the global movement of people and animals. Large-scale irrigation projects, designed to increase agriculture productivity, have created ecosystems conducive to schistosomiasis and Rift Valley fever.

The responses to disease threats are often compartmentalized. Instead of analyzing the tradeoffs between agricultural benefits and risks, the agriculture sector focuses on productivity, while the health sector focuses on managing disease. A careful look at the epidemiology of diseases associated with agriculture, and past experience of control efforts, shows that successful management must be systems-based rather than sectorally designed.

What Are Agriculture-Associated Diseases?

Any disease related to agrifood value chains can be considered agriculture-associated. Such diseases may be associated with agriculture inputs, primary agricultural production, post-harvest processing and handling along marketing chains, or even final preparation by the consumer. The category also includes diseases influenced by ecosystem change (for example, large dams) for food production and those associated with incursion of agroecosystems into self-regulating systems that do not involve much human interference or manipulation (for example, harvesting wildlife) called natural ecosystems.

The link between agriculture and disease has long been established. This brief examines the range of agriculture-associated diseases to discover commonalities that can be leveraged to achieve better health outcomes. To frame the discussion, Box 1 presents a typology of four categories

of these diseases based on causation and transmission pathways, ranking them by overall impact on human health as measured in disability-adjusted life years (DALYs); DALYs are used to measure the healthy years of life lost due to premature death and disability produced. As with any typology of disease, there are overlaps and ambiguities; the categories are not intended to be absolute but rather to have pragmatic relevance for policy and practice.

Box 1 — Agriculture-Associated Diseases

Zoonoses and emerging infectious disease. At least 61 percent of all human pathogens are zoonotic (transmissible between animals and man), and zoonoses make up 75 percent of emerging infectious diseases. A new disease emerges every four months; many are trivial, but HIV, SARS, and avian influenza illustrate the huge potential impacts. *Zoonoses and zoonotic diseases recently emerged from animals are responsible for 7 percent of the total disease burden in least-developed countries.*

Food-associated disease. Diarrhea is one of the top three infectious diseases in most poor countries, killing an estimated 1.4 million children each year. Between 33 and 90 percent of diarrhea is attributed to food, and animal source food is the most risky. More than 90 percent of food sickness is caused by biological pathogens. Toxins and chemical hazards associated with food are also important health threats, and in many cases can be prevented only by farm-level intervention. *Food-associated disease is responsible for 5 percent of the disease burden in the least-developed countries.*

Water-associated disease. These include diseases spread by contaminated irrigation water—such as cholera, cryptosporidiosis, and chemical intoxication—and those that breed within irrigation and water storage systems, such as schistosomiasis and malaria. Malaria alone kills 1.1 million people annually. For most diseases, water is only one contributing factor. *Around 6 percent of the disease burden in least-developed countries is attributed to water-associated disease.*

Occupational disease and drug resistance. People working in agrifood systems are directly exposed to a range of biological, chemical, and physical hazards. The use of antibiotics in farm animals is known to contribute to the crisis of drug resistant bacteria in human medicine, although there is debate about its importance and the best way of tackling it. *The contribution to disease burden of this category has not been comprehensively assessed; it appears to be an order of magnitude less than the other disease categories.*

Source: IFPRI (International Food Policy Research Institute) and ILRI (International Livestock Research Institute), Agriculture for Improved Nutrition and Health (Washington, DC, and Nairobi, Kenya: IFPRI and ILRI, 2010). Available at <http://crp4.cgxchange.org/>. See page 44 for disease burden estimates cited in this brief.

Why Do Agriculture-Associated Diseases Matter—and to Whom?

As well as sickening and killing billions of people each year, these diseases damage economies, societies, and environments. While there is no metric that captures the full cost of disease, assessments of specific disease outbreaks suggest the scale of potential impacts. For example, the SARS epidemic cost US\$50–100 billion; the potential costs of an avian influenza pandemic are estimated at US\$3 trillion.¹ These findings have stimulated rich and middle-income countries to invest heavily in a global program of pandemic prevention and risk reduction.

Most of the absolute burden falls on poor countries. Among low-income countries, diseases directly associated with agriculture (zoonoses of domestic animals and food-borne disease) make up at least 16 percent of all infectious disease and 6 percent of the total burden. (For comparison, in high-income countries they make up just 4 percent of the infectious disease burden and only 0.1 percent of the total disease burden.) The direct economic, social, and environmental costs of these diseases are probably proportionate to the adverse health impacts: for example, fungal toxins (mycotoxins) in food lead to trade losses of up to US\$1.2 billion a year. Indirect costs of disease are also important. Impaired human health lowers both labor productivity and human capital accumulation (as through schooling and training), worsening livelihood outcomes in both the short run and the long run. Malnutrition itself is responsible for 3 percent of the disease burden in low-income countries.² Malnutrition enhances vulnerability to disease and is, in turn, exacerbated by disease symptoms—leading, for example, to a 30-fold increase in the risk for death from diarrhea.³

Diseases are influenced by socioeconomics, environments, and policies. There are two broad scenarios that characterize poor countries. At one extreme are neglected areas that lack even the most basic services; in these “cold spots” diseases that are controlled elsewhere persist with strong links to poverty, malnutrition, and powerlessness. At the other extreme are areas of rapid intensification, where new and often unexpected disease threats emerge in response to rapidly changing practices and interactions between people, animals, and ecosystems. These areas are hot spots for the emergence of new diseases (of which 75 percent are zoonotic). They are also more vulnerable to food-borne disease, as agricultural supply chains diversify and outpace workable regulatory mechanisms.

Metrics, Partnerships, and Systems Approaches to Solve Complex Problems

Improved Metrics

What cannot be measured cannot be effectively and efficiently managed. Addressing agriculture-associated disease requires assessing and prioritizing its impacts, by measuring not only the multiple burdens of disease but also the multiple costs and benefits of potential interventions—across health, agriculture, and other sectors. For assessing

the human health burden, the DALY is the standard metric. There are established methodologies, such as cost analysis and computable general equilibrium models, to measure the cost of illness to households and to the public health sector, as well as the economic costs of livestock disease to agriculture, food industry, and other sectors such as tourism. Costs in terms of non-marketed goods and services (such as loss of ecosystem services) can be estimated through willingness to pay and other indirect methods. (Sporadic and potential diseases are better assessed through decision analysis.)

But these assessment tools and results have rarely been integrated to yield a comprehensive assessment of the health, economic, and environmental costs of a particular disease. When they are brought together, surprising insights can emerge regarding the true impacts of disease and who bears them, with implications for appropriate policy responses. An example comes from Mongolia, where brucellosis control was shown to be cost-effective from an integrated perspective (see Box 2).

Improved metrics for estimating the full costs of disease would open new approaches for the control of agriculture-associated diseases in developing countries. But even with better assessment tools, there remains the challenge of using the results to inform policy decisions. Decisionmakers require more than metrics: they need clear evidence on control options and the expected health and economic returns, and they need to consider the sociopolitical factors that affect the feasibility, sustainability, and acceptability of implementation. In the case of brucellosis, these assessments were relatively straightforward. For other agriculture-associated diseases, however, there are high levels of uncertainty regarding epidemiology, impacts, and control options. (This is true especially for emerging diseases and diseases sensitive to new drivers, such as climate change and evolving agroecosystems and food chains.) Other diseases have persisted despite medical interventions—especially the neglected tropical zoonoses—indicating a need to tackle the underlying determinants of disease, such as poverty, inequity, lack of information, and powerlessness.

Stronger Partnerships

Compiling convincing evidence is only the first step in shaping policy. Strong partnerships and high trust will be needed among researchers, stakeholders, and policymakers. Policy discussions must go beyond specific control measures to examine the incentives that underpin behavior and behavior change.

Box 2 — Brucellosis Control in Mongolia

In Mongolia, a cost-benefit analysis of brucellosis control, examining both medical and veterinary impacts, found that the public health sector reaps only about 10 percent of the benefits.⁴ Brucellosis control would thus appear less attractive than other disease control expenditure options, in an analysis based solely on DALYs averted. But when the benefits for the livestock sector were included, and the costs shared proportionally between the public health and the agricultural sector, the control of brucellosis actually offered a net gain for both sectors.

Systems Approaches

The complexities of agriculture-associated diseases call for more integrated and comprehensive approaches to analyze and address them, as envisioned in One Health and EcoHealth perspectives (see Box 3). These integrated approaches offer a broad framework for understanding and addressing complex disease: they bring together key elements of human, animal, and ecosystem health; and they explicitly address the social, economic, and political determinants of health. Both of these global approaches recognize agriculture- and ecosystem-based interventions as a key component of multi-disciplinary approaches for managing diseases. For example, food-borne disease requires management throughout the field-to-fork risk pathway. Zoonoses in particular cannot be controlled, in most cases, while disease remains in the animal reservoir. Similarly, agriculture practices that create health risks require farm-level intervention.

Box 3 — One Health and EcoHealth

One Health focuses on the integration of human medicine, veterinary medicine, and environmental science. The One Health approach has been defined as the collaborative effort of multiple disciplines to attain optimal health for people, animals, and our environment.

EcoHealth, with origins in ecosystem health, has been defined as systemic, participatory approaches to understanding and promoting health and well-being in the context of social and ecological interactions.⁵

The two approaches have much in common and are increasingly aligned; both emphasize multidisciplinary action and the importance of agriculture and ecosystem-based interventions.

Systemic One Health and EcoHealth approaches require development and testing of methods, tools, and approaches to better support management of the diseases associated with agriculture. The potential impacts justify the substantial investment required. An ex ante assessment in Ghana evaluated an integrated package of risk-based measures relating to the use of wastewater for irrigation; it was judged capable of averting up to 90 percent of an estimated 12,000 DALYs, at an overall cost of less than US\$100 per averted DALY.⁶

Policy Implications

Better Information

As a basis for framing sound policies, information is needed on the multiple (that is, cross-sectoral) burdens of disease and the multiple costs and benefits of control, as well as the sustainability, feasibility, and acceptability of control options. An example of cross-disciplinary research that effectively influenced policy is the case of smallholder dairy in Kenya. In light of research by ILRI and partners, assessing both public health risks and poverty impacts of regulation, the health regulations requiring pasteurization of milk were reversed; the economic benefits of the change were later estimated at US\$26 million per year. This positive change required new collaboration between research, government,

nongovernmental organizations, and the private sector, as well as new ways of working.

Many agriculture-associated diseases are characterized by complexity, uncertainty, and high potential impact. They call for both *analytic* thinking, to break problems into manageable components that can be tackled over time, and *holistic* thinking, to recognize patterns and wider implications as well as potential benefits.

The analytic approach is illustrated in the new decision support tool developed to address Rift Valley fever in Kenya. In savannah areas of east Africa, climate events trigger a cascade of changes in environment and vectors, causing outbreaks of Rift Valley fever among livestock and, ultimately, humans. Improving information on step-wise events can lead to better decisions about whether, when, where, and how to institute control.⁷

An example of holistic thinking is pattern recognition applied to disease dynamics, recognizing that emerging diseases have multiple drivers. A synoptic view of apparently unrelated health threats—the unexpected establishment of chikungunya fever in northern Italy, the sudden appearance of West Nile virus in North America, the increasing frequency of Rift Valley fever epidemics in the Arabian Peninsula, and the emergence of Bluetongue virus in northern Europe—strengthens the suspicion that a warming climate is driving disease expansion generally.

Complex problems often benefit from a synergy of various areas of expertise and approaches. The Foresight groups successfully bring together experts in health, environment, agriculture, and social development to look at emerging issues. (See, for example, the Foresight group in the United Kingdom at <http://www.bis.gov.uk/foresight>.) Complex problems also require a longer-term view, informed by the understanding that short-term solutions can have unintended effects that lead to long-term problems—as in the case of agricultural intensification fostering health threats. Not every problem requires this broad-spectrum approach, so a first task is to identify specific problems that call for integrative solutions.

New Institutions

New, integrative ways of working on complex problems, such as One Health and EcoHealth, require new institutional arrangements. Agriculture, environment, and health sectors are not designed to promote integrated, multi-disciplinary approaches to complex, cross-sectoral problems. Many exciting initiatives provide examples of successful institutional collaboration.⁸ For short-term outbreaks, joint task forces may be adequate, as in preventing an avian influenza outbreak. For longer-term planning and assessment, stronger cross-sectoral mechanisms may be required: joint animal and human health units; integrated knowledge management and information sharing; and integrated training programs. Institutional arrangements must carefully consider incentives for changing behavior, tailored to local contexts, needs, and cultures.

Conclusion

Agriculture and health are intimately linked. Many diseases have agricultural roots—food-borne diseases, water-associated diseases, many zoonoses, most emerging infectious diseases, and occupational diseases associated with agrifood chains. These diseases create an especially heavy burden for poor countries, with far-reaching impacts. This brief views agriculture-associated disease as the dimension of public health shaped by the interaction among humans, animals, and agroecosystems. This conceptual approach presents new opportunities for shaping agriculture to improve health outcomes, in the short and long term.

Understanding the multiple burdens of disease is a first step in its rational management. As agriculture-associated diseases occur at the interface of human health, animal health, agriculture, and ecosystems, addressing them often requires systems-based thinking and multi-disciplinary approaches. These approaches, in turn, require new ways of working and institutional arrangements. Several promising initiatives demonstrate convincing benefits of new ways of working across disciplines, despite the considerable barriers to cooperation.

NOTES

1. World Bank, *People, Pathogens and our Planet: One Health Approach for Controlling Zoonotic Disease* (Washington, DC: World Bank, 2010).
2. WHO (World Health Organization), *Global Burden of Disease* (Geneva: WHO, 2010).
3. J. Flint et al. "Estimating the Burden of Acute Gastroenteritis, Foodborne Disease, and Pathogens Commonly Transmitted by Food: An International Review," *Clinical Infectious Diseases* 41 (2005): 698–704.
4. F. Roth et al. "Human Health Benefits from Livestock Vaccination for Brucellosis: Case Study," *World Health Organization Bulletin* 81, no. 12 (2003): 867–876.
5. D. Waltner-Toews, "Eco-Health: A Primer for Veterinarians," *Canadian Veterinary Journal* 50, no. 5 (2009): 519–521.
6. IFPRI (International Food Policy Research Institute) and ILRI (International Livestock Research Institute), *Agriculture for Improved Nutrition and Health* (Washington, DC, and Nairobi, Kenya: IFPRI and ILRI, 2010).
7. Anon, "Decision-Support Tool for Prevention and Control of Rift Valley Fever Epizootics in the Greater Horn of Africa," *American Journal of Tropical Medicine and Hygiene* 83, no. 2 Supplement (2010): 75–85.
8. VSF (Vétérinaires sans Frontières/Veterinarians without Borders), *One Health for One World: A Compendium of Case Studies* (Victoria, British Columbia, Canada: VSF, 2010).

John McDermott is the deputy director general of research at the International Livestock Research Institute (ILRI), Nairobi, Kenya. **Delia Grace** is a veterinary epidemiologist and food safety specialist at ILRI. This brief has not been peer reviewed. Any opinions stated herein are those of the authors and are not necessarily endorsed by or representative of IFPRI or of the cosponsoring or supporting organizations.

This brief was prepared for a global policy consultation, coordinated by IFPRI, on "Leveraging Agriculture for Improving Nutrition and Health," the centerpiece of which is an international conference in New Delhi, India, on February 10–12, 2011.

IFPRI gratefully acknowledges the support of the following conference sponsors:

- ◆ Asian Development Bank
- ◆ Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation
- ◆ Canadian International Development Agency
- ◆ Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit (GIZ) GmbH
- ◆ IFAD
- ◆ Indian Economic Association
- ◆ International Development Research Centre, Canada/Le Centre de recherches pour le développement international, Canada
- ◆ Irish Aid
- ◆ PepsiCo
- ◆ UK Department for International Development (DFID)
- ◆ United States Agency for International Development (USAID)
- ◆ Feed the Future Initiative
- ◆ The World Bank



INTERNATIONAL FOOD POLICY
RESEARCH INSTITUTE
sustainable solutions for ending hunger and poverty
Supported by the CGIAR

2033 K Street, NW
Washington, DC 20006-1002 USA
Phone: +1 202-862-5600 • skype: ifprihomeoffice • Fax: +1 202-467-4439
ifpri@cgiar.org • www.ifpri.org



<http://2020conference.ifpri.info/>